# CHANGES IN PICTORIAL CONSTRUCTION AND TYPES OF REPRESENTATION WHICH FORMED THE BASIS OF MODERN ART.

## The erosion of traditional French academic methods of picture-construction, and the eclipse of hierarchical subject-matter, ensured the emergence of a diversity of new painting styles in France by 1900 and the possibility of even more drastic departures from tradition in the 20th century, particularly in the work of Picasso, from 1900 to 1914.

by

Anne Marie Collins

Rhodes University

1986

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

PART I - THE NINETEENTH CENTURY IN FRANCE - THE ACADEMY AND CHANGING TYPES OF REPRESENTATION 11

- History of the Academy 11
- Functions of the Academy 17
  - i) Training 17
  - ii) Material Success of Artists 29
- Changing Types of Representation, 1800-1830 30
- Progressive Developments During the July Monarchy, 1830-1848 47
- Courbet's Realism, 1849-1855 56
- Manet and the Painting of Modern Life, 1859-1883 70
- Impressionism and the Rendering of Visual Truth, 1864 - ±1880 102
- Diverse Styles of the Last Quarter of the Century 120

PART II - THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY - PICASSO'S CONTRIBUTION TO A RADICALLY NEW RENDERING OF TANGIBLE REALITY 138

- Picasso's Childhood and Adolescence, 1881-1900 140
- Picasso's First Visits to France and The Blue Period 173
- The Rose Period - Circus Themes, 1904-1905 197
- The Rose Period - Archaic Themes, 1905-1906 209
- Demoiselles d'Avignon, 1907 230
- The Development of Analytical Cubism, 1908-1911 251
- Synthetic Cubism, 1912-1914 288

CONCLUSION 307

# INTRODUCTION

When writing an introduction to an extended essay such as this, one is confronted with two tasks : that of formulating, as clearly as possible, the questions which prompted the research at the outset; and, once this has been done, of explaining the way in which the essay itself evolved until it reached its present form. In the case of this essay this is particularly necessary, because, at its commencement, its scope was far more limited than it became once the research got under way. Usually, the reverse is true. This somewhat unexpected outcome arose from the complexities of the subject, discovered along the way, and also from the increasing conviction that, somehow, these had to be incorporated, even if this altered, quite seriously, the emphasis of the essay, which had been concentrated upon Picasso's individual achievements. Instead, Picasso came to be regarded as a very important figure in the wider Modernist movement. By following this more difficult course, it seemed possible to arrive at a more profound - if more circuitous - understanding of the issues involved than was initially envisaged. The result has been an essay of disconcerting length. For this reason, these introductory remarks will be kept to a minimum in the hope that the facts, sequences of events and artistic styles, and analyses of key works comprising the bulk of the essay will adequately reveal the issues involved.

The topic of research, at the time when this had to be decided, was centred around those radical changes in pictorial representation and construction so much in evidence in Picasso's mature work. The reason for this was straightforward. If changes in types of representation and pictorial construction were to be the subject of such an investigation, an artist whose work epitomizes such changes should be singled out for specific study. Such an artist was Picasso. He not only represents, to a very wide public, all that modern art stands for, he was also instrumental - possibly more than any other single artist - in the creation of this modern art. The topic, as stated in the title and sub-title, therefore, was to lead to a thorough investigation of ruptures with artistic traditions, particularly those for which Picasso was responsible. The most crucial period, for this purpose, was the Cubist period, from about 1907 to about 1914, by which date the most drastic ruptures had been accomplished, freeing artists, in an umprecedented way, from the constraints of traditional procedures. This was achieved in an atmosphere of assertive enthusiasm which was to colour the attitudes of subsequent generations of artists in the matter of representation. If, as the avant-garde asserted, the break with the past was decisive and, furthermore, had taken place in the name of progress, then, presumably, earlier types of representation were to be regarded as defunct. The reason why this particular - apparently well-worn - field of study was chosen was because it seemed to be at the root of artistic problems not entirely resolved or fully understood to this day. Whether this was true or not, would, hopefully, emerge during the course of the investigation.

The way in which this very noticeable break with the past occurred gave rise to an attitude, particularly on the part of the avant-garde, which endorses a split between our older tradition and modern culture which has made it difficult for serious representational artists, with something of subtlety and significance to say, to feel comfortable with their art unless it strikes an uneasy balance between the demands of conceptualism on the one hand and those of representational art on the other. That Picasso, Braque and others were grappling with this same problem from 1907 to 1914 tends to be obscured by the general enthusiasm for the superficial appearance of abstraction which was the result. Consequently this very real artistic problem has remained largely unresolved and there is, today, still a clearly discernable anxiety about modern representational art. It was hoped that a better understanding of this would result from this attempt to place modern breaks with tradition in historical perspective. This, in turn, would, hopefully, reveal that the problem has been compounded by a twentieth century reluctance, on the part of many artists, to betray avant-garde imperatives, one of the most persistent of which has been the demand for frequent, radical, change. Artists, including Picasso, catered to this demand by plunging into the creation of a new type of painting, very often spurred on by writers and intellectuals who wished to see a dramatic overthrow of tradition in the interest of a new art for a new, technologically advancing, urbanizing, society. The results of the propaganda which thus accompanied the sincere efforts of the artists themselves, was an over-simplified view of a complex issue. This view led to the idea of a categorical division between traditional and modern art which, as the research demonstrated, was not a reflection of the true situation at the time. It was the belief that misconceptions have, wittingly and unwittingly, been cultivated with regard to the real significance of the artistic experiments early in the century, particularly as far as Cubism was concerned, that prompted this re-investigation. It seemed, for instance, that, while Picasso, Braque and Gris were preoccupied with the re-creation of pictorial volumes and space, it was left to others to propagandize their discoveries. This was demonstrated by the fact that the two chief innovators, Picasso and Braque, were so absorbed in their work that they all but ignored the Cubist movement which had grown up around them, asserting itself in the Press and the independent French Salons. That Picasso was not particularly interested was also demonstrated by his eventual lack of rigid allegiance to the principles of Cubism. He recognized the style for what it was - a new means of representation based on a conceptual rendering of observable reality, rather than a rendering based on conventional visual truth. His (as well as Braque's and Gris') was a truly astonishing achievement, but it should not be seen as one signifying a final break with the past. Rather, it should be seen as a valid new type of two-dimensional representation alongside the equally valid Post-Renaissance type. There is no better example of Picasso's understanding of this than in the so-called "back to Ingres" drawings he began making in

1914. These, incidentally, were criticized, as a betrayal of principles, by those who wished to perpetuate Cubism as a system. Obviously, these critics failed to understand that it was doctrine and rigidly applied method which the principal cubists sought to prove was of relative value. These Cubists certainly did not see the necessity of inventing new principles which could be systematically applied. Indeed it was well understood that the rigid application of principles had been the undoing of what was, fundamentally, a great artistic tradition. Another thing the critics of Picasso's drawings evidently did not notice was how he had, in fact, very deftly and subtly established visually correct contours by means of accurate outlines, apparently in tribute to neo-classical models, but that the chiaroscuro was minimal and partially applied in a manner reminiscent of Analytical Cubism, not Ingres-like finish. Close inspection of these drawings reveals several details as well as devices derived from Cubism. Quite clearly, Picasso did not feel bound by any system, including the one he himself had invented. Equally clearly, he did not regard other systems as invalid.

The questions which prompted this research arose from the above considerations. Perhaps the question most central of all can be phrased as follows : If the break with the past, as far as the initiators were concerned, stemmed from concerns which went deeper than a mere overthrow of tradition for its own sake, what were the most signficant factors underlying their efforts? If, at the time, Cubism was seen as the most advanced style to emerge early in the century, what, if any, were the enduring characteristics of the style? Immediately after becoming known, Cubism was seen to consist of anti-traditional procedures which could be utilized for various purposes. Thus, many superficial aspects of Cubism were adapted and incorporated by other artists who were also motivated by a desire to create new artistic forms and structures. An unfortunate byproduct of this process was the widening of the rift between traditional and progressive art. In the light of what was discovered during the course of this research, this rift seemed to have been cultivated on the basis of some misconceptions concerning the aims of the major innovators. Picasso himself made this clear when, on more or less abandoning pure Cubism after 1921, he used Cubist devices and concepts in conjunction with traditional ones. This enabled him to utilize the most potent aspects of old and new systems in order to represent figures and objects in a powerful, expressive manner. Although these Post-Cubist works are most noticeable for the way in which reality was distorted, dislocated, fragmented, dismembered and re-assembled in a way seemingly in antithesis to all conventional renderings, their idiom, while explicitly modern, was intensely personal, and, on close inspection, they reveal that Picasso did not hesitate, where necessary, to resort to traditional devices such as drawing and chiaroscuro. His Minotauromachie (1935) is a good illustration of this.

When it came to adherents of the Modernist lobby who used Cubist devices such as faceting, geometrical scaffolding, multiple view-points and contradictory perspective, the irony was that they saw all these devices as useful for abstract ends, evidently ignoring the important fact that all Cubist pictures were representations of objective reality, not arbitrary abstractions nor imaginative "experiences". It was, however, these artists who were largely responsible for the spread of variants of Cubism all over Europe, and as far as Russia and America. While it is not the argument here that these manifestations were any less valid as modern artistic expressions, the point must be made that they tended to obscure the real issues behind Picasso's experiments and to endorse the idea that conceptualism and abstraction was the goal of the new 20th century art which must necessarily replace the old. This somewhat narrow, doctrinaire approach particularly stressed the notion that the older tradition had, as far as meaningful art was concerned, virtually disappeared, This was, of course, far from being the case. There are, to this day, still sufficient artists, good and indifferent, working in traditional styles or modified traditional styles, to warrant the assertion that two traditions now exist, if somewhat uncomfortably, side by side. From a polemical point of view, however, the odds tend to be loaded in favour of the newer tradition, which, in turn, testifies to a continuing belief in advancement and progress as a quality worth striving for, no matter what the cost. The large number of artists who cling, uncritically, to the older conventions, are, in general, despised by the avant-garde for catering to an old-fashioned public which still reacts with astonishing vehemence to the mere mention of

Picasso's name, and is, for the most part, ignorant of subsequent modern artistic developments. This, roughly, is a situation which has put considerable strain on artists who fall somewhere between the two extremes. Many such artists remain convinced that representational painting still has the potential to express ideas, feelings, experiences and concepts, even in our modern age. Yet such artists are inhibited by their awareness of those imperatives mentioned earlier, including that which dictates wariness of illusionistic or realistic renderings. It is clear that a constant effort is made by numerous artists to avoid the use of traditional devices so as to produce as conceptual a rendering of reality as possible. It seemed a pity that painters should be thus constrained by notions just as conformist as the traditional ones. It also seemed regrettable that the origins of this state of affairs are frequently traced to the major innovative experiments early in the 20th century, particularly to Picasso's controversial art. This research has revealed that such perceptions are based on over-simplified, even prejudiced, views of the evolution of Modernism as a whole. It is hoped that in the resulting essay, something of the full complexity and richness of our modern tradition will emerge. Hopefully, this in turn, will provide an insight into those lessons which still hold good and can be a perennial source of inspiration.

The above remarks are an attempt to explain the underlying motivations of this research. It remains to say something about the form the essay itself has taken. At the outset, research was concentrated specifically on Picasso's development as an avant-garde artist in the hopes that this would provide some answers to the questions posed. It soon became obvious that this was insufficient because it simply highlighted the already well-documented phenomenon of Picasso himself - the prodigious innovator, exotic Spaniard, the genius of mercurial temperament, etcetera. Early on, a stumbling block manifested itself which indicated that further research was necessary. This occurred when adequate explanations for Picasso's entry into mainstream French avant-garde art had to be found. Despite his prodigious talents and his production of a startling picture, Les Demoiselles d' Avignon, which rivetted important avant-garde attention on himself after spending six or seven years attempting to establish himself in Paris - all of which was readily understood after studying the necessary sequence of events in his life - there was, nevertheless, a sense of incompleteness on the subject. Picasso's innovations were, in fact, merely the most spectacular product of generations of developments, which had, however, not taken place in his country of origin. This, of course, led to an investigation of these developments, from their neo-classical source, which when placed alongside that of Picasso himself, especially in the artistic climate in Barcelona prior to his departure for Paris in 1900, made it all much clearer. However, by thus including the fruits of this further research, the format of the essay changed, so that it came to be divided into two, almost equal, parts, further subdivided into sections under paragraph headings. Sometimes, this seemed like a particularly arduous way of going about it. But, in the end, it did seem like the right approach, especially when attitudes we have inherited were traced to their roots. The resulting insights did, without doubt, facilitate the formulation of more balanced conclusions at the end of the essay.

# PART I

## THE NINETEENTH CENTURY IN FRANCE - THE ACADEMY AND CHANGING TYPES OF REPRESENTATION

An understanding of what motivated the pioneering efforts of 19th century French painters such as Courbet, Manet and the Impressionists, will be partial as long as the inhibiting effects of the academic tradition from which they sprang is dealt with cursorily. Such cursory treatment creates a one-sided impression of the century as a whole as well as failing to convincingly explain changes and innovations. The truth is that academic doctrine determined the choice of subject-matter and the rendering of it in most of the painting produced in France until the last quarter of the century. The reasons for this will become apparent on closer examination of the Academy and its ramifications throughout the art world. After this, the nature of independent movements can be examined in the context of the particular circumstances from which they arose.

### History of the Academy [1]

The French Academy began in 1648, when the discontented alliance of Court painters was given royal sanction to form such a body. Two important implications of this should be mentioned. The first is that the church lost its control of art through sanctioned guilds in favour of control by the state. The second

[1] The details in the following paragraphs have been summarized from a thorough study of the Academy, its history, influence and the application of principles by Boime, A. in The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth Century, unless otherwise stated.

was the achievement, long-sought, of an elevated status for artists by means of a separation of arts and crafts, and, with it, an increasing emphasis on a theoretical basis for art. By 1663, the principles and structure of an organization - the Académie Royale - had been accepted by parliament, thus centralizing control over the arts, ensuring that only Academy-approved art enjoyed prestige. The first Academy, formed during the reign of Louis XIV under the directorship of Charles Le Brun, had, as its theoretical foundation, a system derived from Italy as well as from the School of Fontainebleau. Membership, until the 19th century, was unlimited. Every artist who had proved his worth by passing through the necessary stages could become an _académicien_. These stages included an initial - or _élèves_ - stage, similar to an apprenticeship. If the pupil showed sufficient ability, which was usually, according to Boime,[1] confirmed by winning the Prix-de-Rome contest, he was promoted to the category of _agréés_, during which he prepared and executed a special "presentation piece" which, if accepted, elevated him to the status of _académicien_. The style of painting which prevailed during the 17th and 18th centuries was determined by the tastes of the ruling classes who were the patrons. Other patrons were, at this stage, too few in number to affect the academic style. Independent styles developed only when middle-class, amateur buyers were wealthy and numerous enough to ensure the flourishing of such non-academic art.[2]

---

1. Boime, _op. cit._, p. 4.

2. Hauser, A. _The Social History of Art_, Vol. 2, p. 648. We are told of the growth of an unspecialized art public after the Salon of 1699. By this is meant a public - particularly buyers - which had had no training in art appreciation to assist in the purchasing of works, as against the specialists who had been trained for this purpose. By 1725, a much larger public - from every class - as well as mass publications about art, ensured a gradual change in patronage and thus aristocratic monopoly of style.

In 1793, after the French Revolution, the Académie Royale was disbanded, but in 1795, the Institut de France was established, taking over the administrative and teaching functions of the old Academy. Instrumental in these changes was Jacques Louis David (1748 - 1825). An ardent republican, he had voted for the execution of Louis XVI in 1793. Having enjoyed enormous prestige since 1784 after the success of his Oath of the Horattii, he found himself in a position of power in the art world so that when, after the disbanding of the Academy, a re-organization of art schools and teaching methods took place, his principles prevailed. Imprisoned after the death of Robespierre in 1794, he was re-instated in his position of prominence in the Institut and his own teaching studio. In 1801, after the completion of his portrait of Napoleon, he was persuaded to support the Napoleonic régime, and in 1804 was appointed official painter. As Le Brun had been a propagandist for Louis XIV, so David filled the same role for Napoleon, functioning as a virtual dictator of the arts. David's Italianized Classicism was applied rigidly throughout the system even after the fall of Napoleon in 1815 when David was forced into exile.

The organisation of the Institut differed from that of the old Academy in some important respects, chief of which was the limiting of membership to a small élite corps which held sway over all matters pertaining to the arts. Boime [1] has described the 18th century Academy as "a large inclusive body", the functions of which were focussed on the education of potential academicians, most of its members participating actively in all matters of artistic concern. The Institut was, from the outset, differently constituted. Initially, it consisted of three classes, representing all cultural interests. The third of these - the arts - were grouped together with literature. Each class was subdivided into sections comprising six members. In 1803, the Fine Arts Class was granted independent status and was composed of twenty-eight members under a secrétaire perpétual. Only ten of these were painters. During Napoleon's "Hundred Days" (1814), the Minister of the Interior granted the Class an increased membership of forty members divided into five sections. Boime[1] tells us that this small, fixed membership was the major difference between the old Academy and the Institut, and that, furthermore, membership was for life.[2] Such an exclusive system could only have led to widespread frustration and dissatisfaction amongst those not chosen. When we learn that this small, élite body controlled virtually every aspect of artistic endeavour monopolistically and without serious challenge during the first half of the 19th century, we can understand why so many artists saw themselves as part of an opposition to this. Not only did the Institut control the primary teaching functions of the central École des Beaux-Arts by recruiting the professors from its ranks and supervising the Prix-de-Rome competition; it also advised the government on all matters pertaining to art so that its taste prevailed when it came to substantial government commissions. Lastly, members of the Institut

---

[1] Boime, op. cit., p. 6.

[1] Boime, op.cit., p. 4.

[2] Hauser, op.cit., p. 652. This undemocratic system replaced one in which there had been about 150 members.

controlled the Salon juries which were responsible for choosing works to be exhibited biennially or annually at the exhibitions which were of utmost importance to the critical and material survival of artists. According to Hauser,[1] immediately after the Revolution and until the state intervened from 1830 onwards, many artists starved as a result of their exclusion from the system. Notwithstanding the problems which soon became apparent, however, this structure remained the definitive one.

With the restoration of the Bourbon régime in 1816, the Institut reverted to the name "Academy", but retained its exclusiveness of membership together with its active role in state education which had been particularly pronounced since the Revolution. However, some of the honorary privileges its members had enjoyed before the Revolution were restored, in spite of the fact that the Academy was still a state-ruled body. Also in 1816, Quatremère de Quincy was elected secrétaire perpétual of the Académie des Beaux-Arts. His term of office came to typify the despotism and inflexibility of the Academy. In 1779, he had made the acquaintance of David in Rome and had exerted a powerful influence over the young painter to renounce personal expression in favour of austere Classicism based on an archaeological enthusiasm for the antique and for Roman civic virtues. On David's return to Paris, this classical style was taught in his studio, and, after Quatremère de Quincy's election to secrétaire, David's disciples were in a favourable position in that Quatremère could - and did -

---

1. Hauser, op.cit., p. 652.

use his influence to ensure that most of those elected as academicians came from David's studio. This explains why the so-called style historique predominated in academic art at the expense of other styles, such as the romantic, which Quatremère consistently denounced even after the 1830 Revolution. His term of office lasted until 1839, and, through him, the application of David's principles gained the Academy the reputation of preserving traditions at the expense of innovation. Ironically, therefore, the ideals of the Revolution did not lead to a more popular art, but to one expressing, in classical terms, the "ethos" of the Revolution. It also led to a more constricted organization of the Academy. The limiting of membership led to a situation where the lofty ideals of its members, and the difficulty of being elected, meant that a great many aspiring artists were excluded from its ranks, thereby becoming more or less independent, critical and dissatisfied with the status quo, as has been suggested. During the reign of Louis-Philippe (1830 - 1848), sincere attempts were made by the state to remedy this situation and to improve the material prospects of artists outside the Academy by arbitrating to a greater extent between artists and the buying public, and also increasing state commissions to such artists. Henceforth, academic and official tastes were at variance; academic painters withdrawing more and more into their traditional élitism while those finding official favour tended to dilute strict academic principles in the production of a more popularly acceptable type of painting. The relative security provided to independent artists by the state, therefore, made it possible for styles other than the Davidian one to gradually enjoy success.

## Functions of the Academy

### i) Training

One of the initial reasons for the forming of the Academy had been the replacement of the old guild system, which had existed since the Renaissance, with a new system which was to put an end to the old master/apprentice relationship with its emphasis on the training of young artists in the skills of their chosen art. But, as the elevated status desired by Court painters depended upon their ability to reach the standards required for the winning of the Prix-de-Rome and acceptance as academicians, teaching remained of paramount importance and was the basis of the Academy's existence. Towards the end of the 18th century, teaching had become far less rigorous because academicians tended to preoccupy themselves with administrative and honorary functions instead of professorial duties. After the Revolution, the conviction that classical principles should be perpetuated, went hand in hand with a revived insistence on training as the means of ensuring this.

The complexities of the system through which the Academy entrenched its control over the training of artists are not of as much concern here as the practical implications of the training itself.[1] It should be mentioned, however, that

---

1. For a detailed account of the administrative structures of the Class of Fine Arts and the École des Beaux Arts, see Boime, op.cit., p. 5-8.

the teaching of art was centralized under the École des Beaux-Arts, whose professors were chosen from the ranks of the Class of Fine Arts (or Academy), and that the curriculum followed was subject to their approval. This curriculum was basically the same as that of the old Academy and consisted predominantly of drawing the live model and plaster-casts. There were also courses in anatomy and perspective, and, from 1819, in ancient history. The competitions remained an important part of training. In 1816, the introduction of a Prix-de-Rome for landscape painting signified a change in attitude towards this genre, as did the new competition for compositional sketches. Instruction at the École, which only taught drawing, was supplemented by the teaching in the private studios of masters - not necessarily academicians - who took in pupils.[1] In these studios, drawing was also of major importance, but it was here that pupils learned painting. On the whole, the private studios collaborated with the École and followed its basic curriculum. Even more than the École, these studios were geared for the preparation of pupils for the Prix-de-Rome competition. Those who succeeded in winning the Prix went to Rome where their education was completed according to the tradition whereby classicized styles were held in highest esteem. After this, the fully fledged artist was eligible for election to the illustrious Class of Fine Arts as, and when, vacancies occured. The limited opportunities,

[1] The existence of such independent studios could only have contributed to the dilution of academic style, particularly later in the century when a strong spirit of defiance replaced the initial adherence to traditional principle - for example, in the studio of Thomas Couture (See p.81-6 in text). The Academy's hold over artists dwindled in the matter of training, but was retained longer through the Salon Jury system. (A strict academician like Ingres was a member of the jury as late as 1863.)

mentioned earlier, had as a consequence - apart from dissatisfaction - a particularly pronounced sense of competition amongst pupils (and their masters) which made itself felt in the daily life within the studios.[1] Traditional principles, then, were maintained through the vehicle of education. It is therefore to the actual content of this education that we must now turn if we are fully to understand the art produced by those adhering to the system, and the differences between this art and that of innovators who challenged the system.

It should be noted that there was a broad distinction between formal and informal aspects of the training received by aspiring artists. All in all, pupils underwent a long and arduous education, but the formal part of this was naturally the most rigorous. This will be described first, after which the other, informal, processes will be looked at. Instruction centred around the mastery of the human form as the basis of a predominantly figurative art. Drawing was the first technique learned by the pupil and this was by slow stages, following a set procedure. The first step was the drawing of individual features of the head - nose, lips, eyes, chin and ears - seen from every conceivable angle until a satisfactory standard was reached. After this, the whole head could be tackled, and finally, the entire figure. The student was, therefore, thoroughly trained to see the part before the whole. Equally clear-cut was the technical procedure to be followed. The pupil began by

---

1. Boime, op.cit., in the chapter "The Social Organization of the Atelier". p. 48-52.

meticulously copying engravings - line for line, advancing from this to pencil drawings of plaster-casts and only then, the live model. At the beginning of the 19th century, the favoured pencil technique was that by which modelling was rendered with tiny parallel strokes, hatched for darker tonal effects. But, gradually, a smudging technique gained favour. Later in the century, charcoal replaced pencil as the principal drawing tool for pupils' work. The basic object of this drawing technique was the achievement of an effect - or illusion - of relief. To begin a drawing, the pupil drew, lightly, a linear design establishing the contours of the head or figure, then, also lightly, blocked in the major areas of deepest shadow. After this, the mid-tones (demi-teintes) were added. These mid-tones were regarded as of utmost importance, as they tested the pupil's degree of skill. Principles of anatomical proportion and perspective were strictly applied, except that, when drawing from the live model, the student was expected to "correct" actual "defects" in proportion, and render the figure as though it possessed classical proportions. This special way of drawing a figure was referred to as an académie. Stereotyped poses, conforming to ideas of heroism or nobility, were expected of the model, and were intended to prepare the pupil for the type of pose familiarly used in historical, heroic or mythological themes.

The teaching of painting followed the same principles as those applied to drawing, but was deferred until the pupil had acquired suitable proficiency in the latter. It too was a painstaking procedure with set methods. The first step was also copying. This was usually done from a head by an old master, preferably Flemish or Venetian, after which, the pupil completed a head from a live model. Technically, the work commenced with a thin wash of oil paint made by mixing one of the earth colours - reddish-brown was a favourite - with plenty of turpentine. With this, the contours were lightly established, then - as in drawing - the darkest tones, followed by the lightest, which naturally consisted of thicker paint due to the necessary addition of sufficient white paint. After this, the mid-tones - at least six of them - were placed in position in tiny areas, somewhat resembling a mosaic. At this stage, they were kept separate, but juxtaposed. When the master and pupil were satisfied that these tones were situated in such a way that the overall effect gave the desired illusion of relief, the tones were blended at the edges. This stage of a painting was known as an ébauche. The palette was restricted to a range of earth colours with the addition of white, black and Prussian Blue. When this paint had dried and been scraped, the final stages of the painting, in which other colours were added and highlighting enhanced, took place. The procedure of applying and blending tones was repeated. A painting completed by this method was translucent in the shadows, luminous in the light areas. Special effects could be created in the way the light areas were treated with more or less impasto, and in the dark areas by the use of glazes of transparent colour.

In this system, with its stress on competent draughtmanship, the problems of composition were only introduced to pupils once they had mastered the principles of drawing prior to learning painting techniques. Until the 19th century, there was no composition course as such in the curriculum, but pupils were expected to visit the Louvre in the afternoons[1] and make copies - in pencil, or for those already learning to paint, in oil - of paintings by old masters. The intention was that, by emulation, pupils would develop their own imaginations and an understanding of compositional possibilities. Boime[2] tells us that academic doctrine dictated that the type of composition thus copied should preferably be of a classical theme and that beginners were expected to use the rigidly controlled techniques already absorbed. This resulted in an "academic" copy.

Before turning to the less formal aspects of training, which, especially as regards composition, were interwoven with the rigid methods sofar described, some general comments about academic composition in the 19th century should be made. The type of composition which was prevalent was based on the premise that art should be elevated above the mundane experiences of life. For the viewer, a work of art was unsuccessful unless it had upon him an ennobling, or uplifting, effect. When some 19th century work comes to be discussed later, there will frequently be occasion to refer to this, and the work itself will explain what was meant by "upliftment". Here, it is sufficient to mention

[1] Formal instruction in the studios ended at noon. See Boime, op.cit., p. 42.

[2] Ibid., p. 43.

that, upliftment being the purpose of art, the choice of subject-matter was governed by a "hierarchy of genres" in which classical, mythological, historical, allegorical and exotic themes were deemed worthier than realistic, naturalistic, introspective or modern themes,[1] for expressing the eternal issues of life, such as death, herosim, betrayal, love, etcetera. It was, therefore, necessary to refer to these topics obliquely and allegorize them. This explains the significant gestures and relationships between figures, the inclusion of symbolic accessories and literary allusions so familiar in this type of painting. If meaning was not to be directly expressed, it also explains why those innovators who chose to ignore this dictum had such difficulty finding acceptance for their type of rendering. The academic painter, therefore, held imagination and originality as essential to great works of art. The ability to resolve the compositional problems of imaginary themes was a test of erudition and skill. This was why such a high standard of draughtsmanship was required together with the versatility to create a variety of combinations of pictorial elements. The end result was a composite arrangement of parts, the final effect of which could be calculated with certain conventions in mind. Especially after David's principles permeated the system, a tableau type of composition was prevalent. In this, the figures, their gestures and glances were carefully arranged to accentuate the central theme, or drama by a system of direction-lines leading constantly back towards the key elements in the drama. Perspective devices, such as floor-tiles, columns, cornices, colonnades, functioned as they had since the Renaissance by converging more or less at the point of most interest, or by framing it. Lastly, aerial perspective and chiaroscuro were carefully managed so that heightening focussed on the imporant elements at the expense of the peripheral ones. This type of self-contained composition, which persistently emphasized a focal point, was fundamental to all painting in the 19th century which did not radically depart from the academic outlook.

---

[1] In a footnote, Boime tells us that "the early Academy accepted without reservation landscapists, genre and stillife painters" op.cit., p. 187. The dogmatic attitude towards subject-matter seems to have originated at the time of David's strong influence. Boime elsewhere makes a point of mentioning that in 1816 a Prix-de-Rome for landscape was introduced and that this was a step in the direction of once again admitting it as an esteemed genre. It should be noted, however, that this Prix-de-Rome was for historical landscape. Ibid. p.8.

The underlying visual principle of such compositions - the illusion of relief - was what determined the manner in which figures and objects were rendered. As we have seen, this was one in which each figure (or object) was treated as a separate entity confined within its own contour, and then modelled to give the effect of relief. Compositions, therefore, tended to be an assemblage of parts, in which the achievement of unity was the principal problem. Academic painters were well aware of this drawback and it was for this reason that certain direct, spontaneous techniques were encouraged as part of the generative procedure of finished paintings.

In general, the term "sketch" applies to all the techniques which were part of the less formal (or rigid) process of academic training. All of them implied that, contrary to commonly held attitudes in this regard, spontaneity was recognized as a valued part of the creative process. Away from the studios, pupils were expected to sketch constantly, in pocket sketch-books, anything from life which appealed to them. This was the most casual form of sketching. Its purpose was the accumulation of a personal fund of information which could be used in compositions. The copying of paintings in the Louvre was also not always as rigidly accurate as that done as a beginners exercise. Often, it too consisted of quick sketching, which was part of the pupils' regular homework.

The types of sketch-like work which are of most significance here, however, were more or less part of the curriculum, or the generative stages of finished compositions. The first of these has already been described : the *ébauche* or brownish underpainting. All that needs to be added here is that the application of paint in the initial stage of boldly putting down areas of dark and light, was broad and spontaneous in comparison with subsequent applications. It was when mid-tones were introduced and blended, and subsequent layers of colour applied, that a refining process took place which tended to destroy some of the freshness which was part of the initial effect. In a later paragraph, it will be seen how Manet's teacher, Couture, developed a technique, based on the immediacy of a good *ébauche*, which was contrary to academic intentions.

The second of these sketch-like techniques was an important addition to the École's curriculum in 1816. This was a course in composition, which took the form of a twice-yearly contest. In 1816, a special Prix-de-Rome competition for compositional sketches had been introduced. It was upon the urging of masters from some studios, whose task it was to prepare pupils for these competitions, that this course had been proposed to, and accepted by, the Academy.[1] Such a sketch was referred to as an esquisse peinte. It referred to an arrangement of all the elements comprising a picture as the artist, in his imagination, envisaged it. Subjects were set in the studio and, the same day, pupils, working in separate cubicles, completed sketches which could be used as the basis for a finished painting. Unlike an ébauche, which was an underpainting, an esquisse was a separate entity to which the artist could refer when he needed reminding of the effect he had originally intended. As in the other courses, pupils began by copying compositions by masters before being allowed to invent their own compositions. An esquisse was an oil sketch intended boldly to reflect initial inspiration by means of a rapid execution of thicker paint than was usual in an ébauche. It was unrefined and usually consisted of broad areas of light and dark, masses and movement. The esquisse was recognized as an important part of the creative process. Like the ébauche, it too provided the basis for stylistic innovation when romantic artists like Géricault and Delacroix introduced some of its expressive qualities into Salon paintings, in spite of initial disapproval.

---

[1] The actual practice was not new, however. It had existed since the 17th century.

The third, and last, type of sketch to be mentioned here was one which was made, in oil, directly from nature, and called an étude. It necessitated excursions to the countryside to paint out of doors - or en plein air. Pupils were often accompanied on these trips by their masters, but it was not part of the curriculum. As a practice, it was in common use, not just by pupils, but by all artists. The purpose was to provide the artist with points of reference when composing major works. Like an esquisse, an étude was freely and quickly executed, but where the former registered an imaginative idea, the latter recorded a response to nature. These études were stored away in studios for future use.[1] Their function in relation to finished paintings has been described in detail by Boime.[2] Briefly it was this : besides recording details about terrain and vegetation, they recorded "values", or degrees of luminosity, accurately, as they appeared to the eye. These are those subtle differences of tone between different colours, or of light and shade upon or surrounding objects. The highest values are the lightest - in terms of paint, those containing most white. While the purpose of an étude was to control "the light values of the finished work",[3] the chiaroscuro built up in the latter was not a literal imitation of the

[1] Subsequent generations have unearthed these small studies and been astonished at their freshness compared with finished works by the same painters.

[2] Boime, op.cit., p. 149 - 165.

[3] Ibid., p. 150.

actual values, but a "synthesis of natural lighting conditions and the personal vision of the painter."[1] Boime[2] goes on to explain that, bound by the convention taught in art schools, which pre-determined a minimum number of half-tones, it was not always possible for the artist to adhere faithfully to naturalistic values. Because, too, of the limitations of pigment in expressing the highest and lowest values in nature, an artifice was necessary. The difference between gradations was lessened for the sake of including the full range. When independent artists began, in the 1830's, to avoid this artificial chiaroscuro and render values accurately, they met with the same hostility on the part of the establishment as had Géricault and Delacroix.

The formal and informal aspects of training described above were a reflection of the type of representation held in high esteem early in the 19th century, and were designed to perpetuate it as a tradition. Even though, as we have just seen, spontaneity and naturalism were encouraged, one point must be made clear. While all types of sketching were seen as necessary to the creative process, they were associated with *métier* - a term which was used in connection with the technical, or manual procedures involved. The meticulous refining processes mentioned earlier, had to be applied if a satisfactory *fini* was to be achieved. This term was associated with erudition and a professionally finished

1. Boime, *op.cit.*, p. 150
2. *Ibid.*

pictorial surface. For exhibition purposes, the free execution allowed in sketches was unacceptable as it would display a deplorable lack of proficiency.

### ii) Material Success of Artists

Although training was an important function of the Academy, it was not the only one. Patronage, in the form of commissions, and the purchasing of work by wealthy collectors, was another of its concerns. Initially, the court was the only patron of consequence. The formation of the Academy, with its high standard of training, ensured a prestigious court art. But soon it became necessary to find new buyers, and this was - and remained - the reason for the holding of the Salon exhibitions, the first of which was held in 1673. In 1737, this became a biennial event. Until the Revolution, only members of the Academy could exhibit works. In 1791, in accordance with the democratic ideals of the Revolution, the Salon was open to all, thus doing away with the need for exhibitions for non-academic artists (the Exposition de la Jeunessé) which had accommodated less prestigious art.[1] But during the following years, the number of artists and public interest in the exhibitions increased to such an extent that selection once again became necessary. The old jury system, comprising members of the Academy, was revived. This was prompted by the need to control the quality of art in what had become an important market at home and abroad. Prices

[1] Hauser, op.cit., p. 648 - 649.

rose as Paris increasingly became the centre of this market, and French artists' work fetched higher prices than that from elsewhere. Success at the Salons was crucial for aspiring artists, and as this was effectively controlled by the academic jury, it was not until after the 1830s, when the pattern of patronage changed and the number of critics in favour of innovative styles increased, that independent artists could confidently work outside this system.

## Changing Types of Representation, 1800 - 1830

The neo-classical style with which David returned from Rome in the 1770s, formed the basis of academic doctrine in the 19th century to such an extent that it is often forgotten that, in its day, it too was a break with the past. This began, more or less, with the enormously successful Oath of the Horattii in 1884. The stern qualities of this painting - its austere, frieze-like composition; the stark linear emphasis on the coldly-lit figures against the equally cold background; the perfection of design and drawing - were a renunciation of the court style which was frivolous and lyrical, as well as of the bourgeois style with its preference for domestic intimacy. From 1784 until 1794, David's style epitomized the republican ideals and austere ethos of the Revolution. His paintings of this period were intentionally moralistic. Thus, Oath of the Horattii, which had been inspired by Corneille's play, Horace (1782), extolls the virtue of patriotic self-sacrifice;[1] Death of Socrates

[1] Leymarie, J. French Painting. The Nineteenth Century, p. 18.

(1787) allegorizes self-sacrifice for the good of the state; The Lictors bringing to Brutus the Bodies of his Sons (1789) extolls civic virtue at the expense of paternal love; Sabine Women (1799) preaches reconciliation; and Leonidas at Thermopylae (1814), once more extolls patriotic sacrifice.

Stylistically, these paintings, as well as portraits like the Murdered Marat (1793), are prototypes of neo-classical pictorial construction, sparing in the inclusion of accessories such as furniture and still-life objects, lacking in deep pictorial space and atmospheric effects, and meticulously correct in anatomical detail. There is a static quality about the figures, notwithstanding their theatrical gestures, which can be accounted for by David's unrelenting contours and the stage-like setting in which they act out their drama. The use of sombre colours, except for occasional slashes of scarlet, golden-yellow or blue, and a tendency towards grey in the flesh-tones, accentuates the severity of these representations.

After David's compromise with the Napoleonic régime, the severity of his early style gave way to one which was grand in every sense of the word. The best-known example of this is The Coronation of Napoleon (1805-07). It is enormous in scale, (610 x 932 cm), and grandiosely ambitious. It succeeded in conveying an awesome effect because David applied to it his customary strict principles. These included his compositional skill, the accurate rendering of individual portraits and restraint in the use of trappings other than the richly elaborate costumes worn by the important figures. As in his other works, no concessions were made towards melodrama, sentimentality or subjective expression.

Neo-classicism, as David applied it, could not be sustained consistently by his followers, no matter how thoroughly the system which perpetuated it was regulated. Besides, there were elements in his later, Napoleonic, works which encouraged a different approach. He had, in 1801, painted a portrait of Napoleon. This, and other works, portraying the glory of the era, inspired a tendency at variance with neo-classicism - a romantic yearning for heroism and glory. This was especially the case in the decade or so after the collapse of Napoleon's empire, during the Restoration which was, in many ways, the negation of all the Revolution and the Empire had stood for.

Although David was a rigorous and energetic teacher, even his most prominent pupils soon showed divergencies in their style. As we shall see, changes took place within the system, but these were gradual and consisted of changes in content and emphasis, rather than the type of radical change which might challenge underlying principles and academic procedures.

Leymarie[1] tells us that David trained, in his studio, about four hundred students. She names four of the most prominent as Ingres, Gros, Girodet and Gérard. Of these, Jean-Dominique Ingres (1780 - 1867), more than the others, faithfully upheld the superiority of Davidian doctrines, naming them "the truest, the strictest and the purest."[1] Nevertheless, Ingres' early style failed to find favour in Parisian official circles. For this reason, he prolonged his stay in Rome where he had gone in 1806 to fulfil his Prix-de-Rome acceptance. He returned to Paris in 1824 with his first real success at the Salon when his painting *Vow of Louis XIII* met with approval.

---

[1] Leymarie, op.cit., p. 25.

After this, he persevered with similar large-scale, ambitious paintings which were less suited to his talents than smaller, more intimate portraits and nudes. At the same time, from 1815, he held a professorship at the École des Beaux-Arts and opened a school of his own. His doctrinaire teaching methods earned him the reputation of clinging to outmoded styles and genres in the face of changes in the art world around him. At the end of his life, his outlook was unmodified and he could say, "I feel the rightness of my steadfast convictions."[2] Even so, in spite of this lifelong loyalty to David's doctrines, Ingres' work displays some notable qualities distinguishing them from David's, particularly in his portraits with their soft golden colouring and subtle psychological interpretation and in his odalisques

1. Leymarie, *op.cit.*, p. 40.

2. *Ibid.*

and late Turkish Bath (1862) in which David's insistence on the integrity of contours has been adhered to, but Ingres transformed these into delicate, flowing lines exaggerated to emphasize the sensuousness of the figures.

Of David's pupils, it was Antoine-Jean Gros (1771 - 1835) who, upon David's exile in 1815, took over his studio and felt under obligation to obey David's exhortation to him "to maintain his doctrines in their pristine purity and to return to the antique and mythological subjects."[1] This, according to Leymarie,[2] he did to his detriment. The paintings he is best known for preceded this period and include Bonaparte at the Battle of Arcola (1796) and Napoleon on the Battlefield of Eylau (1808). Paintings inspired by the Napoleonic epic by Gros and others, including Nicolas Charlet (1792 - 1845), differ in some essential ways from David's. The battle scenes represent the real horrors of contemporary warfare. In Charlet's Retreat from Russia (n.d.), the heroic figure of Napoleon himself is absent. Delacroix admired Gros' battle scene for its un-Davidian exaggerations and dark poetry. In Charlet's retreat scene, a similar intensity of feeling - pathos - prevails at the expense of Davidian structure and clearly defined contours. In fact, these paintings are romantic in execution and concept.

A good example of a painting which adheres faithfully to

1. Leymarie, op.cit., p. 54.
2. Ibid.

David's teaching, is Pierre-Narcisse Gũerin's The Return of Marcus Sextus (1799), but, when compared with his Aeneas tells Dido of The Misfortunes of Troy (1815), it can be seen how, in spite of the classical theme, the academic construction of pictorial elements, and the carefully retained delineation of contours, a relaxed, lyrical atmosphere has been introduced by the use of soft lighting, a picturesque scene disappearing into a haze, and a sentimentalized version of ideal classical types. Harding[1] has placed a reproduction of this painting opposite David's Leonidas at Thermopylae (1814), so that the differences are unmistakeable. The languid atmosphere of Guérin's painting contrasts, in all but method, with the steely masculinity of David's. A similar shift in emphasis can be seen in paintings by Anne-Louis Girodet (1767 - 1824) and Francois Gérard (1770 - 1873)[2] who also faithfully applied classical method in their work, but imbued it with an aura of mystery or fantasy, by the use of an other-worldly light and type of female figure. David's strict principles were clearly giving way to romantic tendencies. His method remained intact, however, until the 1820's when a new generation, influenced by romantic philosophies, literature and music[3]

---

1. Harding, J. Artistes Pompiers, p. 10,11.

2. Ibid., p. 25. Girodet's Atala at the Tomb (1808) p. 20 Gérard's Ossian (1801).

3. A few names associated with the Romantic movement were Goethe, Hegel, Chateaubriand, Gautier, Hugo, Baudelaire, Byron, Keats, Rousseau, Liszt, Chopin, Schumann, Berlioz, Constable and Turner.

found this method inadequate for the type of expressive painting they were doing.

Romanticism, as a movement, was as short-lived as austere Neo-Classicism.[1] It lasted until the early 1830's, after which, as we shall see, it too lived on in a watered-down, pompous form. Initially, it enjoyed the status of a breakaway movement - the first of its kind in the 19th century, and the first to challenge a fundamental aspect of academic method. It coincided with a period of social upheaval in France, the rest of Europe, and England. The political struggle, in France, for full democracy had, for the time being, been thwarted by the return of the Bourbons under Louis XVIII. This Restoration régime was far from stable, however.[2] The yearning for a republic continued to simmer in radical left-wing circles. Political instability was aggravated by industrialization and its consequence - urbanization and the rising power of the moneyed Bourgeoisie. There was a growing perception amongst the discontented that the real beneficiaries of the political upheavals so far had been these moneyed classes. (The Academy itself, as we have seen, was an example of the paradoxical way in which, after re-structuring, institutions emerged less democratic than before, after the Revolution. In spite of

---

1. As a movement in painting, but not as individually practised by individuals like Delacroix.

2. Tannenbaum, E.R. European Civilization Since the Middle Ages. A summary of the troubles besetting the Restoration can be found on p. 389.

the republican virtues reflected in David's work, his doctrines were fundamentally exclusive.)[1] What is important, as far as artistic development was concerned, is that bourgeois taste became a determining factor in the measure of success achieved by artists at the Salons. Those who sought prestige were increasingly under pressure to compromise in order to cater for this new type of patron, who was, at this stage, less educated in artistic matters than the specialists of the past. The demand for highly finished paintings of subjects to which the public had become accustomed, meant that innovative artists, together with other members of the intelligentsia, tended to reject bourgeois values as well as approved art. Themselves mostly of bourgeois origin, the Romantics of the 1820s were the first modern artists to manifestly reject their own background, deliberately cultivating a bohemian lifestyle along with notions about personal genius.[2]

Some general remarks may help explain how Romanticism differed from Neo-Classicism (and thus Academicism). Romantic

---

1. Hauser, op. cit., points out that David's wife was wealthy, and so he had no need to concern himself over the financial implications for those excluded from the newly limited Academy and the attendant hardships they underwent, p. 652.

2. Leymarie, op.cit., quotes Géricault "the truly creative artist is constrained by a law of his being to shine, illuminate and amaze the world", p. 57, and describes Delacroix's self-conscious awareness of his role as leader of the movement, p. 67-8, and how he moved in avant-garde circles (as well as Restoration society drawing-rooms), p. 74.

painting was not theory-dominated, nor did it have a method by which specific results could be calculated. It represented an attitude in which temperament was the important factor. A highly subjective approach was, therefore, the hallmark of this attitude and was reflected in the choice of subject-matter and manner of execution. Romantic painters preferred subjects in which drama, tragedy, pathos, heroism, exaltation, ominous portent, etcetera, were given fullest possible expression - in fact to the point of melodramatic, flamboyant exaggeration. For this reason, they chose themes in which surging, agitated figures and animals were engaged in a frenzy of activity, accentuated by heightened colours and chiaroscuro. The impact was intentionally immediate. Thus, there is no mistaking the desolation in Géricault's Raft of the Medusa (1818) or Delacroix's The Drawing of Lots in the Boat at Sea (1840), the sense of impending tragedy in Delacroix's Hamlet and Horatio in the Graveyard (1839), the heroic energy of Géricault's Cavalry Officer of the Imperial Guard (1812), the disturbing cruelty of Géricault's Bull Market and Horse-Race on the Corso in Rome (1817). The lack of restraint in these, and most other romantic paintings is diametrically opposed to the neo-classical attitude towards subjects, which is one of detachment. However, in one respect with regard to subject-matter, these two styles were in agreement. This was that imagination and originality were an essential ingredient - even if the concept of these differed. They shared the view that art should concern itself with a higher, timeless meaning which is removed from the material reality of things and mundane human experience. Romantic painters, like neo-classical painters, rejected contemporary subjects as unfit for worthwhile art. There are some exceptions to this; for example Géricault's Insane Kleptomaniac (1822) which is as realistic as anything by Velasquez or Goya, but while he often interested himself in types such as this, it must be noted that this interest was confined to those living on the fringes of society. Delacroix's most famous romantic painting, Liberty Leading the People (1830) is an odd combination of Realism and Romanticism. Not only the symbolic figure of Liberty striding alongside the rioting mob and corpses, but the presence of the artist in top hat, brandishing a gun, makes this a self-consciously romantic painting, if we compare it with de Boisdenier's Episode in the Retreat from Russia (1835). But even the latter deals with a subject which was popular at the time - the suffering caused by war - and its intensity of feeling is characteristically romantic. The cause of the controversy surrounding Romanticism which was at its height during the 1820s, was not the choice of theme, but the subjective approach and the manner in which emotional impact was achieved.

The leading figure in the Romantic movement as such was Eugène Delacroix (1798 - 1863). He and most others associated with the movement - Théodore Géricault (1791 - 1824), Léon Cogniet (1794 - 1880), Ary Scheffer (1795 - 1858) to name some[1] - received an academic training in the studio of Guérin. The two most innovative of these were Géricault, who enrolled in 1810, and Delacroix, who enrolled in 1816. Delacroix had this to say about Guérin's studio, "It was here that the seeds were sown of that so-called Romantic art of which ... I am now the moving spirit."[1] The style developed, particularly by Géricault (until his early death) and then Delacroix, had its origins in Guérin's enthusiasm for the sketch program. Guérin had been one of the masters who, in 1816, had been instrumental in the introduction of this program as part of the curriculum, and one of those who had proposed the new requirement for the Prix-de-Rome, which was that the work submitted for the preliminary trial should be an esquisse peinte.[2] The expressive possibilities of the sketch-technique as part of the final work was readily understood by Guérin's two most progressive pupils. Delacroix perceived that a methodical approach was not suited to his inspired and imaginative ideas and saw a separate esquisse as "a needless repetition of the work". He was able to "obtain(s) the qualities of the esquisse in the picture itself, by means of the vagueness in which one leaves the details."[3] In other words, Delacroix combined the esquisse with his ébauche as part of the picture itself. Géricault was particularly receptive to experimentation, and most of the work of his brief career was in the form of sketches, studies and free copies from his favourite masters in the Louvre,[4] as well as plans for large-scale works. There appears to have been, at least on Delacroix's part, a deliberate "aloofness from the standardized types of painting prescribed in the Schools."[1] It was, therefore, not long before a controversy over this new style arose. The beginning of the quarrel over spontaneous, sketch-like execution and Davidian, or academic, finish was around 1822. The critic, Delécluze, was prominently involved on the side of professional execution and had therefore dismissed Delacroix's paintings as daubs on occasion.[2] In 1824, with Delacroix's exhibiting of his Massacre at Chios, Delécluze found this, and other works at the Salon, deficient in technical competence. To him, this was a sign of debasement of previous high standards.[3] However, at this Salon, where Delacroix's painting was hung in the same room as Ingres' Vow of Louis XIII, it was apparent that there were, by then, two powerful schools of thought with pronounced differences about method. The history of the controversy itself is not our concern. It is sufficient to note that, in spite of opposition from conservative quarters, Delacroix's style thrived and by 1830 he enjoyed considerable success at the Salons. The public responded well to the direct appeal of the style. After the July Revolution, Delacroix enjoyed official approval in the form of large commissions.

---

[1] Leymarie, op.cit., p. 58.

---

[1] Leymarie, op.cit., p. 67.

[2] See Boime, op.cit., p. 44.

[3] Ibid., p. 90.

[4] Leymarie, op.cit., p. 58-9. The Baroque, Mannerist and Caravaggeschi featured among these.

As we can see, the controversy about Delacroix's Romanticism centred around the question of academic criteria which were seen to be flouted by the blatant display of a technique which was not considered fit for exhibition purposes. The romantic style was fundamentally different from the neo-classical style in its manner of execution as well as in its approach to pictorial construction. An adequate rendering of intense emotional content was not possible unless academic methods were abandoned or modified. Even though academic painters made esquisses, the actual finished work was necessarily constructed by first establishing the contours of figures, etcetera, in a satisfying design, and then proceeding through the prescribed stages of execution. This was anathema to Romantics who desired a unified effect. Boime[1] has pointed out that Delacroix commenced a composition in the opposite way, interesting himself in interior modelling, proportion, perspective, tonal effect and colour at the outset. He ignored contours at this stage, concentrating instead on the interaction of masses and dynamic movement, maintaining that, "when the tones are accurate, the lines all but draw themselves."[2] Some typical examples of this approach can be seen in Géricault's The Death of Hippolytus (n.d.), Delacroix's sketches, Emperor Justinian Composing his Institutes (1826), Apollo Subduing the Python (1849) and his entries in the Mirabeau competition[3] compared with entries by two more academic painters.[4] If we compare Delacroix's and Géricault's sketches with plans by David for Leonidas at Thermopylae (1814) and The Grief of

---

[1] Leymarie, op.cit., p. 68.

[2] Ibid., p. 68.

[3] Boime, op.cit., p. 89. Delécluze was not against the sketch as such. In fact, he admired Delacroix's energetic handling of paint. But, to him, this technique could not replace high finish.

---

[1] Boime, op.cit., p. 90-1.

[2] Leymarie, op.cit., p. 79.

[3] See Boime, op.cit., pl. 104, 105. Leymarie, op.cit., p. 78.

[4] Ibid., pl. 106, 107.

Andromaque (1783) or Ingres for Antiochus and Stratonice (1866),[1] the differences are even more striking. It should be noted, however, that romantic painters did not question one of the basic principles of academic composition. They too arranged pictorial elements and lighting around a focal point for maximum effect.

As far as execution is concerned, little else needs to be said, except that the Romantics' rejection of academic finish was based on the fact that this finish was a denial of the sensuous appearance of the paint itself and the subjective character of colour. But the romantic preference for exuberant use of paint does not mean that these artists saw the esquisse, with which their work was frequently compared, as sufficient in itself. They were in favour of a technique which combined the freedom of the esquisse with the thoughtfulness of a judicious amount of finish, which should not destroy the freshness of the original execution. The result depended entirely on the artist's discretion in this regard - unlike the guaranteed result of academic execution. Delacroix well understood the delicacy of the problems facing artists who chose his style of excecution, and that this often gave rise to a sense of anxiety. Boime[2] tells us that Delacroix did not think that the sketch on its own could adequately express the artist's original intention. If a painting was to reach its full potential, the artist's intellectual ability and skill were put to the test in adjusting parts of the picture, where this seemed essential. In the words of Delacroix himself, "No, one does not spoil a picture finishing it! ... When the artist renounces the vagueness of the sketch, he shows off more of his personality, thus unveiling the entire range - but also the limits - of his talent."[1] This method of finishing a picture was fraught with difficulties of a personal nature, which were not so evident in academic practice.

---

[1] See The Royal Academy and Victoria and Albert Museum, The Age of Neo-Classicism, pl. 82-4.

[2] Boime, op.cit., p. 91.

The status of romantic painting as a breakaway movement must be seen in the context of French tradition. If we compare the products of French Romanticism with examples of painting in which there was a similar preference for a subjective approach towards subject-matter, and a similar exuberance of technique, we come across many manifestations of a like style. Since Titian and Veronese and Rubens, there had been Hals, Rembrandt, Velasquez, Goya, and, in France, Watteau, Fragonard and Boucher. Some of Delacroix's large-scale decorative work, such as Apollo subduing the Python was reminiscent of Baroque and Rococo ceiling painting in which a heightened illusion is created by the use of foreshortened figures floating in a sky of billowing clouds. Correggio, Romano, Battista come to mind. Delacroix's style was a break with the neo-classical tradition which had effectively suppressed rival styles since the 1780s in France.

---

[1] Boime, op.cit., p. 91.

After 1830, Delacroix lost interest in the strident type of romantic painting of his youth as he became more interested in the pictorial problems emerging from the sketch/finish dichotomy. His admiration for the English Landscapists,[1] whose work appeared regularly at the Salons, together with his experiences in Morocco in 1832, had opened his eyes to the expressive potency of colour. This, too, preoccupied him after 1830.

A version of Romanticism became popular at the Salons during the July Monarchy. As we shall see, Louis-Philippe was instrumental in increasing the influence of official and public tastes through the Salons, thus undermining strict academic principles. Louis-Philippe himself had a preference for a romantic type of representation,[1] but one which had been made more acceptable by the application of neo-classical method to romantic themes. This attempt to reconcile the two opposing styles resulted in the production of a large number of manneristic paintings which continued to be popular for many decades. The emphasis, in this style, was on painstaking authenticity of detail and the trivial aspects of subject-matter together with a pedantically expert academic execution. The results were a far cry from those achieved by the great masters of the two opposing styles. One example of this is the way in which, although historical and classical themes continued to find favour, the moral

---

1. Including Constable, Bonington and Turner.
2. Boime, op.cit., p. 14.

or heroic intent was eclipsed by the concentration of interest on the details which were intended to help reconstruct a particular scene. A good example of this is Gérôme's Hail Caesar! We who are about to die salute you (1859). So too, a romantic type of historical theme was favoured by Delaroche. The Princes in the Tower (1831) and The Execution of Lady Jane Grey (1834) are two examples of historical reconstructions in which authentic details of costume and accessories were combined with romantic chiaroscuro and a certain judicious use of virtuoso brushwork. Delacroix[1] was particularly scathing about such history painting, which was no more than a pretext for anecdote and picturesque décor, and had little to do with true heroism. The same can be said of the many mythological paintings which were executed in this eclectic style, for example, Gérôme's The Cock Fight (1846), Bouguereau's Zenobia found on the banks of the Araxes (1850), Chassériau's The Tepidarium (1853). Some of these, such as Cabanel's Birth of Venus (1862) and Baudry's The Toilet of Venus were blatantly erotic. These, and many other examples, show that painters who enjoyed prestige by virtue of their skill in the academic style, were willing to incorporate the superficial elements of Romanticism into their repertoires, thus extending the range of acceptable subject-matter. But, they were unwilling to accommodate real pictorial innovations if these in any way challenged established methods of painting. This meant that innovative, or avant-guarde, art was still not able to flourish without a battle.

---

1. Nochlin, L. Realism, p. 24.

## Progressive Developments During the July Monarchy, 1830 - 1848

Fundamental changes of method and approach, after 1830, took place in circumstances somewhat different from those in which Romanticism had challenged the neo-classical tradition. First of all, as we have seen, Romanticism had succeeded in modifying the outlook of academic artists, as well as paving the way for future experimentation with their partial rejection of academic method. The Naturalists and Realists who were the innovators of the 1830s, '40s and '50s had an example in the free technique introduced by the romantic painters. Secondly, the régime had once again collapsed and, as we shall see, was replaced by one which affected the outlook for artists as far as official success was concerned. Lastly, there was a growing trend towards a type of painting independent from both academic and official approval, inspired, in part, by the ideas of certain writers.

The July Revolution of 1830 had ended the Restoration, but, instead of achieving the desired republic, the nation was persuaded to accept a constitutional monarchy under the Duke of Orleans - otherwise known as Louis-Philippe. Here, it is sufficient to note that, in an effort to divert attention from the fact that his monarchy was not a full democracy,[1] Louis-Philippe introduced a number of measures designed to satisfy the moderates who supported his government. These were predominantly members of the wealthy bourgeois classes. In areas in which political and social issues were not at stake, he could afford to pay lip-service to democracy by introducing liberal measures. One of these areas was the arts. A sincere effort was made to demonstrate state responsibility towards the arts by increasing state patronage, not only by commissioning large works,[1] but by financing the network of pedagogical institutions throughout the country. In spite of his own preference for the type of history painting exemplified by Ary Scheffer, Louis-Philippe did make a genuine attempt to see that a more democratic system came into effect. This he did by holding the Salons annually, instead of biennially, as had been the case up until 1831. The idea behind this was to increase public participation, thereby reducing the power of the Academy in the matter of taste. In this way, Louis-Philippe hoped to please a wider public- or juste milieu - in the interests of what he saw as democracy. The results of this policy were an increased demand for the types of representation favoured by the wealthy Bourgeoisie - (the types described earlier as resulting from the blend of romantic and neo-classical styles) - as well as the opening of opportunities for independent artists. According to Boime[2] it had been these artists who had requested the annual Salon. But, in a compromise typical of his reign,

---

[1] Only 200 000 adult males qualified to vote - an improvement on the 90 000 who could vote during the Restoration.

---

[1] See Boime, op. cit., p. 11-12, 115-121, for an explanation of how commissions were awarded to the winners of sketch competitions. On the whole academic painters were against the sketch as a basis for such awards.

[2] Ibid., p. 12.

Louis-Philippe bowed to pressure from the Academy and appointed the jury from its ranks, making it difficult for Independents to have their work accepted. However, the first such Salon - of 1831 - opened by Louis-Philippe himself, did feature some paintings by Independents, including those who formed the Barbizon group. Boime[1] tells us that it was through the Salons that these painters gained official support and, through it, private patronage. The number of wealthy patrons increased after the 1830s, especially those from America.[2] What is more, these patrons were, by now, more knowledgeable than they had been in the 1820s, so that there were many with discriminating tastes. The security for those whose work deviated from academic norms was greater than it had ever been.

The other factor contributing towards this independence - one which derived, partly, from the general broadening of the art world - was the increasingly important role of criticism and art theory in determining which styles enjoyed favour in which circles. Not only were there more art critics than in the past,[3] whose task it was to mediate between artists and the public, but there were more writers with specific political ideologies - especially those with leftist, republican sentiments - who supported those artists whose work had a content and was executed in a style at variance with the prevailing prestigious art. In a later paragraph[1] progressive art theory will be discussed in more detail. Here it is sufficient to note that avant-garde artists of the 1830s were being encouraged in the direction of a type of painting which was based on scrupulous observation of nature, of "man-in-nature", or the glory of work - in short, an art in which Naturalism and Humanitarianism were the important considerations. The implications of this trend favoured a realistic rendering, in opposition to the artificial construction, anecdotal or allegorical content, and studied execution of academic painting.

---

[1] Boime, op. cit., p. 12.

[2] Harding, J. Artistes Pompiere, p. 23-4.

[3] Criticism had come into its own in the 18th century in response to the need created by the increasing production of art works. Diderot had been one of the first prominent critics. See Historical Summary, Brion-Guerry, L. et.al., in Larousse Encyclopedia of Renaissance and Baroque Art, p. 388.

From 1830, then, there was a complex situation in which, in the first place, academic taste was no longer dominant, but became the preserve of an aloof minority. Louis-Philippe's measures had succeeded in separating official from academic taste.[2] But, as the curriculum in art schools remained academic, and the jury of the Salons consisted of members of the Institut, the basic principles of officially approved art remained Davidian, and large-scale paintings at the Salons continued to conform to the same principles, although these had been bent to some extent to accommodate newer trends. The fact that Independents were able to exhibit at the more democratic Salons, was because, on the whole,

---

1. See p. 60-4 in the text.

2. By popularizing academic and romantic subjects and opening the market to a wider public academic principle was antagonized.

their landscapes and genre scenes were on a smaller scale and were without pretence of competing with large-scale works. Where they attempted larger works for the purpose of prestigious approval, they compromised their free style with academic finish. In the second place, matters were further complicated by the critical debate on art and the increasingly vociferous opposition to academic monopoly.

The trend towards Realism, by gaining a foothold at the Salons, broadened the choice of subject-matter for all artists, in the same way as romantic themes had done in the preceding decade. But, because of attitudes towards subject-matter which should be well-understood by now, contemporary themes presented the difficulty that, without considerable transformation, they would be seen as sordid by those who held to the principle that art should be uplifting. The result was that some would-be Realists compromised with what Harding refers to as an "oblique approach to Realism".[1] Some artists found a solution by travelling to Rome, where they could, with impunity, paint rustic scenes like Vernet's Roman Herdsman driving Cattle (1829). The French countryside and peasantry was "discovered" in the same way. As Harding[2] points out, rustic subjects are not contaminated by evidence of modernization. This type of painting included farmyard scenes featuring animals such as Jacques', genre paintings by Bonvin, scenes of mourning or of orphanages run by the Sisters of Mercy by

---

1. Harding, op.cit., p. 59. Not a straightforward, blunt approach as would later be the case in works by Courbet or Manet.

2. Ibid.

RHO... UNIVER... LIBRARY

Legros and Bonvin, or of death by Ary Scheffer. The three last-named categories were considered acceptable by virtue of the fact that traditional costumes worn on these occasions gave them a timeless quality. Lastly, the landscape itself was found to offer a solution to those who wished to avoid the contentiousness surrounding figure painting. Landscapes, provided they excluded modern installations, offered scope to Romantics who wished to be at one with nature, but also to Realists who chose to base their art on scrupulous observation.

Independent artists were particularly attracted to landscape painting as a means of freeing themselves from some of the constraints inhibiting figurative painting. It is to them that we must attribute the initial steps towards a type of Realism which made fewer concessions to academic dogma. The painters who, in about 1830, formed an artistic colony at Barbizon - amongst whom were Théodore Rousseau (1812 - 1867), Diaz de la Pena (1807 - 1876), Charles Daubigny (1817 - 1878) and Jean-Francois Millet (1814 - 1875) - had express aims opposed to academic procedures and subject-choices. Although to some extent inspired by romantic painting, they wished to avoid the excessive, dramatizing trends of Romanticism. With these aims and a love of nature, they concentrated their efforts on scrupulous observation and analysis of natural phenomena. Many of their paintings were executed out of doors before the motif with the addition of minor finishing touches executed in their studios. To Daubigny goes the credit of having been the first painter to have worked entirely out of doors from a houseboat - a practice later emulated by the younger Monet.[1] It was this group which was responsible for the popularity of plein air painting especially amongst painters interesting themselves in the effects of light.

As could be expected, this type of painting which, apart from its subject-matter, lacked the approved finish, met with opposition from the establishment. In order to gain recognition at the Salons, the artists felt obliged to make compromises, so that, alongside their sincere, lyrical representations of massive oaks, woodland pools, mossy forest glades, marshy scenes, many of which appear in the glow of dawn or sunset, they produced larger over-finished works in their studios. The preferred free, direct style of the Landscapists was rejected in academic and official circles for the same reasons romantic execution had been rejected, namely that it went against traditional dogma. Landscape painting, like all other genres, was regulated by specific doctrines and procedures which were rooted in the classicizing ideals of the Academy. As we have seen, the genre had been revived as one suitable for a Prix-de-Rome in 1816. It must be remembered, however, that this prize was specifically for historical landscapes. This was a form of composite landscape painted in the studio, preferably with an Italian theme,[2] which bore almost no

[1] Leymarie, op.cit., p. 122.

[2] Valenciennes (1750 - 1819) painted this type of landscape.

resemblance to the directly observed, freely executed works of the Independents, which, in the academic view, were little more than _études_. As such, they, like romantic paintings which resembled _esquisses_, did not qualify as suitable for exhibition. One of the qualities emphasized by the Barbizon group was sincerity. To this end, they based their compositions on the type of unity the Romantics had achieved, which was a departure from the traditional composition in which separate entities were combined in an artificial pictorial scheme. But, unlike the Romantics, who conceived their compositions imaginatively, the Barbizon group based theirs on an empirically observed scheme of light and shade, such as that of a typical _étude_. To them, the traditional artifice of chiaroscuro with its elaborate method of building up gradations of tone, seemed unnecessary. Directly observed values were the basis, therefore, of a type of pictorial scheme quite different from academic schemes. In it, drawing, which was the cornerstone of academic construction, was relatively unimportant.

Camille Corot's (1796 - 1875) style of painting is of special interest for the unassuming manner in which he intuitively applied his innate sense of light and colour values to landscape painting. No fighter for causes, he was content with his classical background, so that his best works are examples of sound construction, together with innovative technique. His _Colosseum as seen from the Farnese Gardens, Rome_ (1826) is a testimony to his respect for such Italian subjects, but also of the abandonment of the high finish of academic painting in favour of broad, unblended brushstrokes in colours which immediately struck the right note. Leymarie[1] tells us that he avoided the highlights and translucent shadows of traditional procedure. Instead, he mixed all his colours, including the darks, with some white, so that the final result was not only an immediacy of values, but a homogeneous surface texture. This painting of the Colosseum, in line with the current trend, which Corot admired, was painted from the motif. It was nevertheless only exhibited in 1849. Aware of the prejudices of the Academy and Salon Jury, Corot, like most painters of the time, produced larger, historical paintings for acceptance at the Salon. Corot's success, from about 1850, was modest, but satisfying. Amongst his admirers were Baudelaire, Champfleury, Delacroix, his patron, Dutilleux and Thoré. One of his most delicate and beautifully constructed paintings was The Port of La Rochelle (1851) and was the first work painted directly from nature to be accepted for exhibition at the 1852 Salon. From this, it can be seen how long it took for a style based on the generative procedures of painting at the expense of executive procedures, to find acceptance at the Salons. But this difficulty did not succeed in suppressing the development of the newer trends, which, in spite of criticism from conservative critics, were often liked by the public.

[1] Leymarie, op.cit., p. 106-7.

The trend towards realism was even more marked towards the end of the 1830s, and by the end of the '40s the lyrical Realism of the Landscapists began to be replaced by a far less compromising figurative Realism in which the political message was unmistakeable. Of these, one was Jean-François Millet, who, for a while, was connected to the Barbizon group, but soon started introducing figures into his landscapes. The emphasis was on the solid, earthy appearance of peasants engaged in dignified toil. But, the simplification of forms, shapes and chiaroscuro and the lack of individualization in the figures, give these paintings an idealistic, even romantic, quality which the Realists of the '50s and '60s sought to avoid. As the most important stylistic changes were introduced by the latter, they are the subject of the following paragraphs.

## Courbet's Realism, 1849 - 1855

In many ways, the Realism which replaced that just described, was intentionally a reflection of political and social issues which had remained unresolved during the July Monarchy. By the late 1840s, the period during which Courbet was beginning to find his own painting style, but having little success at the Salons or in the press, revolutionary sentiments were again running high, especially in Paris. Louis-Philippe's middle-of-the-road policy had resulted in uncontrolled economic growth and its consequence was a tremendous increase in poor urban populations. In 1846-7, an agricultural failure and economic collapse aggravated the situation, especially in Paris, when destitute rural people flocked to the partially industrialized cities in search of employment, which was not, in most cases, to be had. It was this discontented, poverty-stricken urban population, led, however, by middle-class intellectuals with socialist ideals and philosophies, which successfully overthrew the régime on 24 February 1848. A republic was proclaimed and universal male suffrage declared. A provisional government took over power until the first elections for a constituent assembly in April. The results of the election were disappointing as far as the Parisian socialists were concerned, as a majority of conservatives were voted into power - mainly by the provinces. A second revolution was attempted in May, but the only result was the arrest of the leaders and a hardening of attitude towards welfare spending to alleviate the lot of the poor. When the government tried to solve the problem of unemployment by offering the jobless the choice of returning to the provinces or joining the army, the barricades went up for the third time - in June. The crushing of this uprising by General Cavaignac, in which over 1 000 workers were killed or deported in follow-up incidents, was one of the most shocking events in Paris during the century. But the constitutional business of drafting a constitution was not side-tracked and in November the most democratic constitution in Europe went into effect. It consisted of a single legislative assembly chosen for three years and a president chosen for four by election. The successful candidate for president was a nephew of Napoleon's - Louis-Napoleon. Within four years, by means of plebiscites, he had made himself Napoleon III, Emperor of France (December 1852).[1] The policy of his régime, from the outset, ignored the social problems in the cities, and more than ever, favoured the ambitious expansion of industry and the infrastructure necessary to support it. Once again, the enterprising upper Bourgeoisie benefitted the most from the change of government, as it had after the previous revolutions.

The most prominent figure in the Realist movement which co-incided with these events was Gustave Courbet (1819 - 1877) who had left his native Ornans, in the Franche-Comte in 1839 so that he could further his career as an artist in Paris. But, by the end of the 1840s he had had scant success at the Salons,[2] which, like all other artists of the time, he perceived as the only possibility of fulfilling his ambitions. During this decade, his style and approach had wavered considerably,[3] but there was already

[1] Tannenbaum, op.cit., p. 415-6, 420-1, 423-5.

[2] From 1844 to 1846, one work per year was accepted. In 1847 a particularly harsh jury accepted the works by Courbet. See Forges, M.-T. de, Biography in Gustave Courbet 1819 - 1877 (Arts Council of Great Britain), p. 24.

[3] Courbet's early training at Besançon manifested itself in the portraits of his father (1840?) and Paul Ansout (1842?), his attempts to pander to Salon criteria led to carefully-contrived, in places, over-finished works such as Lot and his Daughters (1844), the two troubadour-style self-portraits, Guittarero and The Sculptor (1844-5). His predelection, at this stage, for romantic attitudinizing shows in various self-portraits, some frankly derivative. See Nochlin, L. Gustave Courbet : A Study of Style and Society, p. 10 - 42.

evidence of a forthright, concrete rendering of observed forms[1] which, once his sense of direction became clearer, developed into his mature style.

Courbet's special position in the history of 19th century French painting was due to a combination of circumstances. The first of these to have a dramatic effect on his standing as an artist, occurred in 1848 after the February uprisings. For the first time since 1791, there was no jury and thus no selection of work for the Salon, which opened in March. Courbet submitted ten paintings which were hung, together with approximately 5 000 other paintings. For Courbet, and, we assume, many others, this was a long-awaited opportunity, and he was rewarded with favourable attention from some members of the Press, notably Haussard and Champfleury.[2]

From this time onwards, Courbet was a much-discussed figure in the art world as, with increasing daring, he exhibited paintings which flouted the conventions.[3]

---

1. In Man with a Black Dog (1844) and the rendering of landscape features in several of these early paintings.

2. Forges, op.cit., p. 26

3. Although the totally democratic 1848 Salon was not repeated. The following year there was again a jury, but it was chosen from the ranks of submitting artists - not academicians! From 1852, the number of works per artist was limited to three. In 1849, Courbet was awarded a medal (for After Dinner at Ornans) exempting him from jury approval. These changes might have precipitated the acceptance of new styles, had they not been short-lived. In 1857, the Salon became a biennial event, the number of works submitted per artist again unlimited, and the selection committee once more in the hands of the Academy, and privileges, such as Courbet's, removed, except in the case of members of the Institut or those with decorations.

The second circumstance which encouraged Courbet arose from his temperament, which was anti-authoritarian, and his countryman's outlook, which he never modified. These attributes, as well as feelings of sympathy for ordinary working people, led him to associate with a group of writers, poets, philosophers, political dissenters and artists whose sympathies lay with the revolution and, incidentally, supported Courbet in his struggle to achieve recognition. Together with some of these intellectuals, who met regularly at the Brasserie Andler, Courbet belonged to a group calling themselves "Realists", to which he referred in a letter to his parents in 1847 when we wrote that he was "on the verge of success, having around me people of great influence in the newspapers and the arts who are keen on my painting, and in short we are about to form a new school of which I shall be the chief member as far as painting is concerned."[1] What constituted Realism to this group was closely allied to their political and social theories, which embraced a wide range of activities including art. Courbet very soon felt at home in this circle and found himself in accordance with its notions about the role of art in society.

It has already been mentioned that theories played a part in the development of Naturalism and Humanitarianism. By the mid-1840s, critics and theorists were increasingly prescriptive about the course to be taken by progressive art. A summary of these theories is necessary if the motivations behind Courbet's pictorial innovations are to be adequately understood. The theories concerned emanated from the ideas of those who supported radical social reforms and who saw art as part of the program. The idea of an art of social significance, which would subvert the political - and, incidentally, artistic - system, was not new. It had been started by Diderot, and had been through several stages by the 1840's. But the thinking behind the ideas was basically the same. This was that academic and official art was ēlitist in the sense that it was only comprehensible to the educated and accessible to the privileged. It was described as l'art pour l'art and as such should be replaced by an art for the people. The concept of what constituted an art for the people had undergone several changes. Various reformers with Fourierist or Saint-Simonian leanings had, in the 1820s and '30s appealed to artists for an art which was humanitarian or insurrectionist in a naïvely didactic sense.[1] During the '30s, Laviron and Galbaccio, while rejecting l'art pour l'art, took a less moralistic stance, proposing, instead, that the style, not simply the content, ought to change away from the artifices of traditional procedure towards a less systematic rendering of nature. They cited Caravaggio as an example to follow. It was these two who are credited with the identification of Realism with left-wing thought, as well as the notion that

---

[1] Forges, op.cit., p. 26. The group included Buchon, Courbet's childhood friend, the essayist Champfleury, Baudelaire, Proudhon, Planche and many others.

---

[1] Nochlin, op.cit., p. 86-7.

Naturalism was the art of progress.[1] Another democratic writer of this period was De Camps who also rejected the didactic ideas of earlier reformers in favour of a new way of rendering form. He and Blanc, who wrote from the mid-'40s, confirmed the theory of Laviron and Galbaccio that an unpretentious art, based on straightforward, even naîve, contemplation of nature, was the only one readily understood by the mass of people. This l'art sociale would be, therefore, a suitable art with which to replace the old aristocratic art. Gradually, then, the tone of progressive theory changed from one which was overtly moralistic to one in which the social significance was latent.

Finally, mention must be made of Blanc, Thoré and Champfleury, who wrote from the late '40s, stressing the necessity for an indirect way of expressing the issues of the time. Thoré and Champfleury were particularly active in the revival of interest in examples from the past which suited their preference for simplicity, faithfully recorded appearance and direct method. Their favourites included Caravaggio, Rembrandt, Veronese, the Spanish School, Dutch painters like Ostade, Jordaens, Potter and French painters like the Le Nains and Chardin. More recent painting which found favour with these writers was that of Delacroix, Corot, Rousseau and others of the naturalistic school, as well as Bonvin whose still-lifes resembled those of the Dutch genre painters. Champfleury, who, as a fellow-countryman, was particularly close to Courbet, added to this the criticism that so far French 19th century Realists had confined themselves too much to landscapes and other uncontentious subjects at the expense of contemporary life which needed a means of expression.[1] According to Nochlin,[2] in 1848, Champfleury saw in Courbet's painting the possibility of fulfilling his own ideas. If Champfleury's ideas influenced Courbet, they were reinforced by the assertions of Buchon, poet and childhood friend of Courbet. Buchon was one of the increasingly popular "worker/poets" whose radical ideas were combined with notions regarding the common countryman who, without academic erudition, yet possessed an unspoiled genius. Nochlin[3] has extensively researched the connection between all the folk- and nature-oriented expressions in writing, popular singing and poetry, their political alignment and the way in which they affected Courbet's art. That they did, is evident in the work of the fruitful period following Courbet's success at the 1848 Salon and his absorption into the group which encouraged him in the direction of a socialist approach. It is the extent to which this art, which sought to be Realist, constituted a departure from established artistic traditions which is under consideration here. It is therefore the art itself which must now receive closer attention. Two paintings - After Dinner at Ornans

---

[1] Nochlin, op.cit., p. 88.

---

[1] Nochlin, op.cit., p. 89-94.

[2] Ibid., p. 92-3.

[3] Ibid., p. 86-107.

(1849) and Funeral at Ornans (1850) - will serve the purpose of demonstrating how Courbet's Realism not only differed from past paintings with comparable themes, but from most painting of the past.

The theme of After Dinner at Ornans - friends and family around a table, the convivial atmosphere accompanying a country meal, lighthearted musical entertainment - had numerous precedents. Two paintings by Louis Le Nain[1] are strikingly similar in subject. But, as Nochlin[2] has pointed out, Courbet's handling of the theme is as different from Le Nain's as it is from any other traditional painting. The way in which Le Nain has used traditional devices so that his figures form composite groups with a focal centre, as well as his relatively generalized peasant types give his paintings a specific meaning - in this case the virtuous serenity of people of the soil. In this, Le Nain's work conformed to the tradition which insisted that pictures should be constructed in such a way that the viewer's attention is drawn to a psychological or symbolic point of interest. This was usually achieved by a strategic placement of figures and the organization of their gestures and glances; also - especially in interiors - of perspective devices such as tiles, cornices, etcetera, placing the figures in the type of space which would add meaning to the theme; and lastly, the chiaroscuro heightened those parts of the picture which carried most impact,

---

1. Peasants' Repast (1642), Peasant Family in an Interior (1643)
2. Nochlin, op.cit., p. 62-4.

at the expense of peripheral parts which were either in shadow or fading into distance. Courbet's rendering of the group around the table, listening to a friend playing the violin, does not conform to these requirements. His group is arranged, together with furniture, still-life objects and dog, in the random manner in which they probably appeared in reality. In this, Courbet was observing his own dictum of objectivity without comment on the part of the artist, and lack of selection of any particular figure or feature as of central importance. The painting, in which no gesture, pose, placement, or heigtened chiaroscuro was used for compositional effect, emphasizes the separateness of the figures. This is further stressed by the fact that each one of them is portrayed as an individual. We do not know whether Courbet set out deliberately to paint a picture lacking traditional devices, or whether he was merely intent upon a strictly objective rendering, but the result was less contrived and theatrical than almost anything with a similar theme from the past. The paintings which come closest to a real resemblance to After Dinner at Ornans are by Adriaen Brouwer (1605 - 1638) a Flemish painter whose tavern scenes have something of the same simplicity in handling space and masses, the same haphazardness of composition, individuation and contemporary dress. This type of genre scene was not unfamiliar at the Salons in Courbet's day,[1] but, apart from the unconventional rendering, another factor contributed to the astonishment with which it was greeted.[1] This was its size (195 x 257 cm) and the fact that the figures themselves were life-size, in contradiction to the generally held rule that painting on this scale should be reserved for historical or other heroic genres.

---

[1] Leymarie, op.cit., p. 136. Bonvin and Decamps exhibited genre subjects.

What has been said about After Dinner at Ornans applies also to Funeral at Ornans. This time, the dimensions (315 x 668 cm) were truly monumental. Again, the subject - a funeral with priest and mourners - was not unusual. What was was the fact that such a subject, which was of profound emotional significance, could be dealt with so unpretentiously. The topic of death demanded a treatment in keeping with the awe-inspiring notions surrounding it. Had Courbet painted his funeral scene on a smaller scale, it would probably have escaped the violent reaction against it on the part of many critics and the public, who were accustomed to allegorized renderings, or ones in which a suitable piety or sense of drama was displayed.[2] As in his painting of the previous year, Courbet avoided allusions as well as any grouping, chiaroscuro or use of colour which would artificially create unity. In his rendering of the people gathered around the grave, a deliberately naïve style was adopted, to give the scene an atmosphere of simple veracity in which there is no erudition. Again there is a lack of emotional or compositional focus. The group fills the entire width of the canvas in a casual, open-ended way which was seen as the antithesis of composition. The handling of paint and colour is democratically applied throughout. The colour is factual rather than a device in the service of luminosity or overall pictorial unity. The individuation of the members of the group was an assertion against the generalizing tendency of both Classicists and Romantics, and is reminiscent of Dutch and Spanish works rather than French ones.[1] Nochlin[2] has pointed out that there is a limited use of elaborate foreshortening and aerial perspective. Disregarding these devices, which were associated with academic erudition, not only limited the space into which the figures were placed, it added to the primitive look of the picture. While all these unconventional ways of representing such a subject were severely criticized, the few critics who supported Courbet[3] were enthusiastic about the down-to-earth concreteness of his forms and the randomness of composition which they saw as a significant advance towards an art which was democratic.

---

[1] Leymarie, op.cit., p. 136.

[2] Forges, op.cit., p. 27.
Examples : Atala at the Tomb - Girodet (1808)
The Death of Géricault - Scheffer (1824)
Liberty Leading the People - Delacroix (1830)
Tintoretto Painting his Dead Daughter - Cogniet (1846)

The type of consistent realism of After Dinner at Ornans and Funeral at Ornans together with other works such as The Stone-Breakers (1849), the incomplete Departure of the

---

1. Nochlin, op.cit., compares Courbet's funeral scene with Zurbaran's St. Bonaventure on his Bier and van der Helst's The Banquet of Captain Bicker, p. 140-2. She also illustrates other possible sources in figs. 74-8.
One example of a similar rendering of faces is Hals' The 'Regentessen' of the Haarlem Almshouse (1664).

2. Nochlin, op.cit., p. 132-3.

3. Nochlin, L., Realism and Tradition in Art 1848-1900 quotes Champfleury on p. 43, Buchon on p. 46.

Toussaint, H., Notes to the Catalogue of Gustave Courbet 1819-1877, quotes Proudhon on p. 209, Mantz on p. 212.

Fire-Brigade (1850-1) and the curious Toilet of a Dead Woman (or Bride) (1850), was short-lived. Bowing to criticism, in spite of loud verbal protestations to the contrary, Courbet modified his handling of subjects and composition, so that, by 1855, at the climax of Realism as a movement, when the huge (359 x 598 cm) L'Atelier was defiantly exhibited with forty other works independently of the World Exhibition,[1] compromises with conventional methods were present in this and other works. L'Atelier itself is an artificial construction of the composite type[2] and the addition of canvas above the original plan which was somewhat constricted, was a concession to the complaint that Courbet's figures frequently lacked "breathing-space". After 1850, Courbet's ability to create substantial forms and natural appearances was applied increasingly to landscapes. Where figures appeared, they were often superimposed onto landscapes painted out of doors in the studio - with stylistically conflicting results. Notwithstanding his inconsistency and relatively conventional procedure,[3] Courbet was a great innovator.

If we briefly consider the way academic doctrines were applied by most of his contemporaries, this will become

[1] Courbet nevertheless had 11 paintings accepted for the Exhibition.

[2] Kozloff, M., Renderings, p. 17-34.

[3] Courbet observed, without question, the principle of starting with a brown ébauche and proceeding with more opaque paint in building up modelling, although he had a distinctive technique of applying impasto with a palette-knife or manipulating it with his fingers, emphasizing its materiality.

plain. In the matter of "focus", this is particularly striking. Remembering how important the esquisse was in establishing the "effect" desired in the final work, it can be seen that "focus" was established at this initial stage by all artists of the first half of the century, including progressive ones like Millet, Delacroix and Daumier,[1] not to mention those working within the tradition.[2] Once this was achieved to the artist's satisfaction, all the devices and skill of years of training were employed in bringing this effect to its conclusion in the finished work. As far as Realism was concerned, academic artists were not unaware of or unaffected by the increasing demand for it. But, what constituted Realism to them was a far cry from the Realism of the innovators like Courbet and Manet. Artists liked Gérôme, Vernet, Belly, Robert-Fleury and many others,[3] were convinced that Realism was a matter of research, to ensure that details were authentic. As they did not consider it a question of style, they simply applied their formidable repertoire of traditional skills to such authenticated subjects. These were almost invariably drawn from history or exotic parts of North Africa. Scenes from everyday, urbanized French reality were inconceivable for reasons which have already been discussed. Thus there are many examples of works such as Vernet's Arab Tale-teller (1833), Robert-Fleury's Charles V at the

---

1. Boime, op.cit., Illustrated as follows : Millet, pl. 86,87, Delacroix, pl. 104,105, Daumier, pl. 109.

2. Ibid., Illustrated on pl. 51-85, 90-5.

3. Harding, op.cit., Many examples appear throughout the book.

Monastry of Yuste (1856), Gérôme's Hail Caesar! We who are about to die salute you (1859), Flandrin's Theseus recognized by his Father (1832) in which painstaking detail is represented, but fails to convince us of the reality of what is depicted because - as usual - the compositions obey all the old rules, as does the chiaroscuro, the generalizing and idealizing of types. A glance at the list of Prix-de-Rome winners and the titles of the works submitted[1] shows that this type of representation retained its position of prominence in academic circles. At the Salons, and, for the most part, for wealthy buyers, admiration for such painting continued to ensure financial and prestigious success for the artists. Innovators found themselves in an opposition role to both academic and offical styles, but their impact was nevertheless felt, if the comments of critics,[2] from 1848 onwards, is an indication of overall changes in art exhibited at the Salons. In time, the innovations themselves invariably came to be acceptable - at least at the Salons, if not at the Institut.

## Manet and the Painting of Modern Life,
## 1859 - 1883

Although Manet and the other progressive artists whose development coincided with the Second Empire and the Third

---

1. Harding, op.cit., p. 91-101.

2. Nochlin, L., Gustave Courbet A Study of Style and Society, p. 76.

Republic were not as politically motivated as Courbet and his generation of socialists, the quest for contemporaneity, begun in Courbet's youth, continued. This was necessarily influenced by aspects of whichever regime was in power. Those which, directly or indirectly, affected art, must, therefore, be mentioned. The following paragraphs are concerned with Manet's development, which spanned both régimes. As the latter part of his career was interwoven with the experiments of the younger generation of Impressionists, it is convenient to treat the period up to 1870 - when Napoleon III's régime ended - separately. This period was one of sweeping changes, for which Louis-Napoleon was largely responsible. These included scientific, technological, industrial, financial and marketing developments which changed France into a modern state and inevitably changed the social life of the French people, particularly in the cities. Such changes profoundly affected attitudes, not least of all those held by artists and writers. As Manet's painting was the first consistent attempt to reflect modern life in Paris, it is necessary briefly to mention some factors which were realities in his day.

As we have already mentioned, Louis-Napoleon's régime tended to ignore the social problems which had caused the uprisings in 1848. By the mid '50s, Socialists, including Courbet and many of his associates, had become disillusioned, as their ideals seemed increasingly beyond reach. Louis-Napoleon had embarked on a program of modernization and industrialization from which the Socialists would not benefit. This program was systematic and was supported by authoritarianism which was particularly rigid during the '50s. The aims of Louis-Napoleon's government were to uphold and increase French prestige by modernizing Paris, and some provincial cities,[1] so that a modern, industrial economy could flourish, and so that visitors from abroad would be encouraged to avail themselves of the architectural, engineering and artistic attractions to be found there. Such a city would also attract merchandise from abroad, so that a cosmopolitan atmosphere would add to the indigenous attractions. The twin ideals of material progress and national glory led to a belief in progress and advancement on the part of those who stood to gain by the changes they brought in their wake. There were, however, those who had good reason to be sceptical about modernization as they experienced its negative side.[2]

The most visible and permanent of the programs undertaken at the behest of Louis-Napoleon was the re-planning of Paris - or "Haussmannization", as the program came to be known. Hemmings[3] describes the reasons for the massive project which involved the demolition of whole neighbourhoods to make way for wide, straight boulevards and modern office and apartment blocks. The old Paris had been a warren of crooked streets and alleys, harbouring disease, crime, drunkenness and prostitution. One of Louis-Napoleon's

[1] Marseilles, Lyons, Toulouse. See Hemmings, F.W.J., Culture and Society in France 1848 - 1898, p. 121.

[2] Clark, T.J., The Painting of Modern Life, p. 23-78.

[3] Hemmings, op.cit., p. 121-123.

ambitions was to clear these slums, and, at the same time, to forestall further revolutions by dispersing the revolutionary elements emanating from them. Another was to facilitate the transport of tourists and merchandise from the newly constructed railway terminals. For this, a rational street layout was necessary. An outbreak of cholera in 1848-9, claiming approximately 20 000 victims, leant urgency to the need for re-housing, clean drinking water and a modern sewerage system. The vast project this entailed was entrusted to the Prefect of the Seine, Baron Georges Haussmann, an Alsatian with a passion for straight lines and uniformity. His chosen style was based on Roman horizontal lines, which is reflected in the even skyline of the new buildings, but with this difference - the facades were loaded with elaborate ornamentation. Apart from the wide avenues and boulevards and new buildings, a feature of Haussmann's planning was the provision of large open spaces, and trees with which the streets were lined. The Bois de Boulogne was landscaped, but otherwise street plantings were regular, in keeping with the straight lines everywhere. Criticism was a natural accompaniment of such drastic alterations. The regularity and generous scale of the new boulevards were seen by many inhabitants as inhuman. And the pulling down of old neighbourhoods and the consequent removal of people destroyed old small, intimate neighbourhood economies in favour of large-scale finance capitalism. The government's attitude towards these displaced people was one of laissez faire . The rents for the new apartments were such that the poor were forced to move to tenements with few amenities situated on the outskirts of Paris. Cynics held that this was in keeping with a plan to remove trouble-makers from the city centre and have them live, instead, close to the newly established factories on the outskirts, for which industrialists had received concessions by way of incentives. The fact that the new roads led from the main railway terminals, was also seen, by some, as a means of moving troops in times of upheaval.[1] From the aesthetic point of view, the outskirts of Paris were seen as the negative side of the coin in that they presented an unsightly, drab spectacle, at times the subject of paintings and illustrations.[2]

Other undertakings included the installation of gaslight and the building of sewers and an aquaduct across country for the supply of fresh water, as well as the provision of piped gas in the city. Apart from the necessity of such installations in a large, modern city, the Great Exhibition, in 1855, had contributed to the desire to create a favourable impression on visitors to Paris. The results, then, of Haussmann's planning were a new-looking Paris, a flourishing economy, especially in the construction and building sector, the large-scale financing of big businesses and the sophistication of the banking system. A new class - the Petit Bourgeoisie - was increasing in number and becoming better-off than ever before, so that, in clerical and other

---

1. Clark , op.cit., p. 29.

2. Ibid. Some depictions of the "banlieu" are reproduced, including ones by Faffaëlli, Van Gogh, p. 25-31.

employment, they enjoyed leisure time for which recreational facilities had to be provided. These were generally to be found, not far from Paris, on the banks of the Seine.

Other characteristics of Louis-Napoleon's régime were that it was - especially during the 1850s - authoritarian in that it did not tolerate political criticism. The result was censorship, which mainly affected writers. On the other hand, there was a licentious, dissolute gaiety to be found in the many places of entertainment which sprang up in Paris. As long as politics was left out of it, Louis-Napoleon encouraged this as part of what was known as the Fête Impériale. In this atmosphere, courtesans and other demi-monde types flourished. The triumph of the Great Exhibition of 1867 epitomized Louis-Napoleon's domestic policy. As far as the artistic establishments were concerned, the state continued to finance these, so that - as in the past - considerable coercion to conform to official taste, ensured a somewhat stifling limitation of style. As politics was banned, the tendency - in writing, as well as painting - was towards frivolity and triviality. The Salon remained the most important means by which painters could launch and sustain their careers until the 1870s when this function was usurped by dealers. However, the tendency to hold independent exhibitions became more and more a feature of artistic life, especially after Courbet's act of defiance in 1855 when he had set up his own pavilion for this purpose alongside the Great Exhibition. In 1867, Manet emulated him in a similar gesture. A glance at Manet's chronology shows us, though, that he frequently held independent exhibitions.[1] The authoritarianism of the régime was relaxed to some extent during the 1860s. One event reflecting this was the response of the Emperor to the complaints about the rigidity of the Salon jury. This was to allow a second Salon to exhibit the rejected works - the famous Salon des Refusés of 1863, at which three of Manet's paintings, including Déjeuner sur l'herbe, were exhibited. Although this experiment was not repeated for the reason that it was seen to have "vindicated the Academy"[2] by making plain the unacceptability of the exhibits, Hemmings[3] points out that its importance lay in the fact that the public was able to see unscreened art and judge for itself,[4] and also that the artists who had been subjected to public derision on this occasion henceforth had a clear choice between bowing to Salon criteria or asserting their independence. Many artists, in the late '60s,chose the latter course. Manet, who is under consideration here, sought Salon representation throughout his life, but without compromising his style. His battles for Salon acceptance are, however, not as important here as the development of his art towards a Realism which would oppose the prevailing prejudices about contemporary subject-matter and towards a style of painting in

1. Bataille, G., Biographical and critical study in Manet, p. 5-15.

2. Hemmings, op.cit., p. 166.

3. Ibid., p. 164.

4. This had, presumably, also been the case on the occasions when there had been no jury, in 1791 and 1848.

which paint application was based on what he regarded as optical truth, but which, in academic and official circles, was seen as a violation of accepted procedures. The latter once again highlighted the question of techniques acceptable in sketches, but not in finished paintings.

Edouard Manet's (1832-1883) Realism was very different from Courbet's for reasons which have to do with his background and the fact that he belonged to a younger generation whose notoreity at the Salons had replaced that of Courbet, who had become relatively accepted by the 1860s. Manet was born of a well-to-do middle-class Parisian family. According to Bataille,[1] his father was chief of personnel in the Ministry of Justice, his mother, the daughter of a diplomat, and, by all accounts, Manet grew up with the social attitudes of his class. Leymarie[2] describes him as a man of the world, at home in society drawing-rooms, elegant, sociable, sincere, eager for recognition in the right circles and not rebellious like Courbet. Elsewhere[3] we are told that Manet viewed, with distaste, the loud and unrefined propaganda of Courbet and his circle. He was, nevertheless a left-wing Republican,[4] disillusioned with the outcome of the 1848 uprisings and disdainful of the vulgarities to which the régime and the new rich were prone. His political beliefs did not stem

1. Bataille, op.cit., p.5.
2. Leymarie, op.cit., p. 161.
3. Pool , P., Impressionism, p. 124.
4. Ibid., p. 125.

from sentimental sympathy for the proletariat, but from disgust with the Empire.[1] Any comment about this in Manet's work is not overt, but is, rather, a reflection of his restrained, ironical attitude and the concise, epigrammatic style which was promoted by those who formulated theories about Realism at the time.

Manet's artistic aims seem to have been fairly clear from an early age. Leymarie[2] tells us that, as a schoolboy, he commented on Diderot's dictum that art should not record contemporary events with the following words : "An artist had got to move with the times and paint what he sees". Manet's development towards the achievement of this goal can be attributed to the way in which he emancipated himself from the conventional artifices in common practice at the time. His efforts were reinforced by his associations, which included close ties with the writers who were attempting, in their own work, to avoid the excesses of Romanticism by replacing verbosity and heavy sentiment with conciseness and subtle wit. Of these, Baudelaire and Émile Zola were of particular importance to Manet. As far as Manet's stylistic development was concerned, by far the most important factor was his lengthy training in the studio of Thomas Couture which contained elements from which Manet's technique was formed. Another formative influence was the taste for things

[1] Pool , op.cit., p. 124.

[2] Leymarie, op.cit., p. 161.

Spanish currently in vogue in which Manet shared. From about 1855 to 1869, there was a strong Spanish flavour in many of Manet's works.

When it came to composition, there was little in recent French tradition which could serve as a model from which he could develop a means of expressing the truth of contemporary life. It is for this reason that Manet and others, like the Impressionists, interested themselves in exotic or novel pictorial solutions and turned their backs on traditional ones. The theatrical grouping of figures and objects, the artificial lighting and modelling based on sculptural relief typical of French academic painting were inadequate for the new realistic purpose. In his efforts to invent a new type of composition with which to record real groupings, and a new procedure for the rendering of real light, Manet depended to a large extent on his own ingenuity. He was also undoubtedly assisted in this by his awareness of the peculiarities - to Western eyes - of composition and rendering in the Japanese prints which were immensely popular from about 1850 - 1880.[1] Japanese art was seen as naturalistic in the simplicity with which details were recorded. At the same time, what fascinated Westerners was the lack of linear perspective, in favour of other devices such as the extreme diminution of figures and objects in the distance, overlapped by large ones in the foreground. Although the high horizon line - another exotic feature of this art - tended to flatten the receding plane, this was

---

1. Hanson, A. Coffin, Manet and the Modern Tradition, p. 187.

contradicted by the size of figures or, in landscapes, by the sequence of planes intended to indicate their relative distance from the viewer. Another unusual feature of these prints was that figures and objects were frequently cut off by the edges of the picture in a way unheard of in French tradition with its insistence on self-contained compositions. Lastly, the elegant, decorative lines outlining shapes, and the flat colours within those shapes appealed to artists like Manet with his strong decorative sense.

Some of the attributes of Japanese art were also to be found in photographs. The invention of photography had radically changed perceptions about external reality. Of these, Manet was certainly aware.[1] Like Japanese prints, figures and objects were often "cropped", except that, in the case of photography, this was arbitrary. There was also, frequently, a similar, peculiar distortion of objects in the foreground, accompanied by severe, exaggerated foreshortening. The casualness, or lack of selection, particularly in street scenes, as well as the simplification of detail and tone was strange to those accustomed to carefully constructed, tonally graded paintings. Although photographs were regarded with suspicion and rejected as an aid to painting by traditionalists, progressive artists certainly used photographs, instead of numerous studies, particularly for portraits.[2] They also certainly affected the notions about composition of would-be Realists like Manet.

1. Hanson, op.cit., p. 195.

2. Bazille's group family portrait, Family Reunion (1867) is quoted as one example by Pool , op.cit., p. 16.

As Manet's innovations were not merely compositional but also involved technical procedures which were different from traditional ones, it is important to understand how these developed. It is, therefore, necessary to digress slightly and describe the methods of Manet's teacher Couture, from which his own characteristic technique derived. This done, a discussion of some of Manet's important works, in terms of breaks with the past, will be easier.

Couture's methods of painting and of teaching his pupils have been described in considerable detail by both Boime[1] and Hanson,[2] as has Manet's debt to Couture, particularly with regard to the acquiring of extensive skills in the manipulation of paint and a positive attitude towards a fresh, spontaneous approach. Here, only a summary is possible.

Thomas Couture (1815 - 1879) had been unsuccessful in the Prix-de-Rome competitions[3] and was, therefore, not a member of the Institut. The result was a lifelong dislike of the academic establishment, and a determination to win official acclaim, which he did with his immensely successful Romans of the Decadence (1847). He urged upon his pupils the same striving for official recognition, rather than academic conformity. This ambition was particularly noticeable in two of his pupils - Manet and Puvis de Chavannes. The

[1] Boime, op.cit., p. 65-78.

[2] Hanson, op.cit., p. 141-176.

[3] Boime, op.cit., p. 67

organization of his independent studio and the curriculum was, however, typical of academic instruction at that time. He too believed in a sound basis of drawing prior to the teaching of painting. The drawing taught by him was likewise based on classical proportions, anatomical knowledge and the principle of "correcting" nature where necessary. When it came to copying, however, he encouraged a freer interpretation of his favourite masters, Correggio and the Venetians.

In painting, Couture upheld the principle of starting the finished work with an *ébauche*. It was in this area that his teaching was novel and ahead of his time.[1] Because Couture liked the vibrancy and spontaneity of technique to be found in sketches and many paintings by the Venetians, he saw the *ébauche* as a means of achieving similar results. This he did by allowing it to become an important part of the finished work instead of being merely a residual part of shadows as it was in traditional paintings. Couture developed an original technique of dragging or scumbling thicker paint over the *ébauche*, varying the opacity of this paint so that, on top of the simplified tones of the underlying *ébauche*, numerous mid-tones emerged. With the darker paint showing through the layer of lighter paint, these mid-tones appeared remarkably luminous in comparison with mid-tones created by mixing paint and applying it in an opaque layer. Couture thus eliminated the necessity for mixing special mid-tones, and, by this method, achieved a wide range of subtle effects and differences of surface which gave a painting a lively appearance. Hanson[1] describes one of the effects achieved by Couture's method as what she terms "optical grays". This is based on a principle by which white paint, when applied over a colour in thinner and thinner layers, thus altering the value of both, has the peculiar effect of taking on the colour complementary to the underlying colour.[2] Thus, white, applied in this way, over a warm brown ébauche takes on a cold appearance as of gray. But it has the advantage of liveliness compared with mixed gray.

---

[1] Hanson, *op.cit.*, p. 146-7, tells us that Couture's method was not entirely original, having appeared, in one or another form, from about 1830 onwards in various manuals on painting.

Another advantage of allowing the ébauche to become an important part of the finished work, was in the use of colour. Couture was insistent on the use of colour mixed as little as possible for his sought-after effect of freshness.[3] By allowing the brown paint of the ébauche to show through in the manner described, it was possible to avoid unnecessary mixing of colours. Couture's teaching emphasized simplification of the palette.

The recomendation, in established practice, that the ébauche be allowed to dry thoroughly before proceding with

[1] Hanson, op.cit., p. 148.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Boime, op.cit., p. 69.

fresh layers of paint, was often disregarded by Couture, especially while demonstrating techniques to his pupils.[1] This meant that surface irregularities occurred where a "wet-on-wet" technique was used, and also that, to be successful, a far quicker, looser technique was necessary. The old method of scraping the entire surface after applying the ébauche was intended to remove the possibility of irregularities. Couture encouraged differences of texture both in the use of the "wet-on-wet" technique, and in partial scraping, both of the ébauche and of subsequent layers of paint.

For Couture's method to succeed in achieving the desired effects, derived from a vibrant play of surface effects, with canvas sometimes showing through, as well as subtle effects of translucency and luminosity obtained by a mixture of techniques, a brilliant, deft application was required. Such application, usually termed "facility", became the hallmark of pupils who had studied under Couture, and was disapproved of by the Academy.[2] It was associated with facture which, from the time of Delacroix, had been a source of controversy[3] because of its informal, expressive qualities which undermined dutiful finish.

To complete this summary of Couture's unconventional methods, it must be mentioned that, with regard to the ébauche, he

---

1. Hanson, op.cit., p. 149
2. See Boime, op.cit., p. 68-9.
3. Ibid., p. 9-10.

disliked the practice whereby this initial sketch all but disappeared under layers of mixed paint. He often kept ébauches, if they were good, as separate entities from finished works. It must be noted, however, that, notwithstanding his liking for vivacious painting, he was committed to the principle of finish, especially in large Salon paintings, for more or less the same reasons Delacroix had had.[1] By this method, however, he could reduce trivial details as well as the use of glazing - an academic device for obtaining refined effects. In many of his smaller works[2] lively effects were achieved by the deliberate use of broken outlines and details merely suggested by a few deft strokes. Lastly, Couture had a novel way of loading his brush with paint. Hanson[3] tells us that he was interested in the relation of one colour to another and was aware of the colour theories of Chevreul, especially with regard to the latter's "Law of Simultaneous Contrasts".[4] Couture had a habit of "lifting unmixed strands of paint"[5] onto his brush, applying this quickly and obtaining optical results with the "threads" of colour which were thus juxtaposed.

Many of Couture's pupils remained devoted to his method,[6]

---

1. Hanson, op.cit., p. 150.
2. Boime, op.cit., pl. 33, 35, 39.
3. Hanson, op.cit., p. 151.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Boime, op.cit., p. 68-9.

which he taught almost like a cult.[1] From his method, especially his manipulation of the ébauche, evolved a style in which a freer, more enjoyable use of paint opposed traditional procedures. For this reason, few of his pupils achieved success where academic standards were the criteria. Boime[2] has described the profound influence of Couture's instruction on his pupils, including Manet, and provided several examples demonstrating their debt to the master.[3] One of his pupils, Carrière, developed Couture's way of incorporating the ébauche into the whole painting by using, in the 1880s and '90s, monochrome ébauches, thus extending the possibilities of the method. But Manet, of all Couture's pupils, was the one who disagreed with him most, both in the matter of subjects, which Couture believed should not be prosaic, and in the matter of execution. Although Manet continued to use the technique he had learned - at least partially - during the 1850s and '60s, he too quickly moved away from the use of exclusively brown ébauches, using instead local colours,[4] getting, immediately, the right value and, ultimately, dispensing with the ébauche altogether. Manet's development, and emancipation, from Couture's teaching will become apparent when we turn to some of those works which demonstrate his own innovations. But we should not underestimate the value of Couture's teaching as a liberating force in the process as a whole. His procedure was an advance against the academic doctrine of fini.[1]

---

[1] Boime, op.cit., p. 68-9.

[2] Ibid., p. 75.

[3] Ibid., pl. 34, 36, 37, 38, 40.

[4] Ibid., p. 76.

Manet spent six years (1850-1856) as a pupil of Couture's once he had overcome parental opposition to this choice of career. It is not the purpose here to trace Manet's development step by step, but rather to pay particular attention to a limited number of his paintings so that the extent of their departure from tradition can be seen. But, as it is of interest here to see how new styles were gradually accepted, a brief account of Manet's experiences at the Salons is appropriate. The first painting submitted by Manet to the Salon of 1859 was the Absinthe Drinker (1858). Already, there were certain things, in this work, which contradicted Salon norms. The only vote in its favour was cast by Delacroix. From then until 1865, only two paintings by Manet[2] were accepted at the Salon (1861). His most daringly innovative works, Concert in the Tuileries (1860), Dejeuner sur l'herbe (1863), Mademoiselle Victorine in the costume of an Espada (1863) and The Kearsage and the Alabama (1864) were rejected. The rejected 1863 paintings were exhibited, amidst a storm of derision, at the Salon des Refusés. From 1861, Manet exhibited paintings away from the Salon at private venues.[3]

---

[1] This doctrine, or dogma, according to Boime, op.cit., p. 92-3, was most firmly entrenched during the July Monarchy. It was based on the principle that the artist owed the public (and buyer) the product of the executive, not the generative, phase of the work. It was a question of professional ethics and explains the "orientation of the Academy during the first half of the 19th century".

[2] Spanish Guitar Player (1860), Portrait of M. and Mme. Manet (1860), Bataille, op.cit., p. 7.

[3] Ibid.

In 1865, however, Olympia, his most controversial painting to date, and Christ insulted by Soldiers, were accepted by the Salon. The former caused such an outcry that it was moved to a less prominent position.[1] After this, Manet made the trip to Spain which made a marked impact on his style until about 1869. He had also become a well-known figure for his non-conformism and was looked up to by the group which gathered at the Café Guerbois in the Batignolles.[2] In 1866, The Fifer and The Tragedian were rejected by the Salon. In 1867, Manet, stung by repeated rejections, submitted nothing to the Paris World's Fair, setting up his own pavilion, as has been stated. The public laughed at the 24 paintings thus shown. After this, Manet's record of acceptance by the Salon improved in that he was represented each year, until 1876. At the same time, he continued holding private exhibitions, and in 1871 the picture-dealer, Paul Durand-Ruel bought 30 of his paintings. In 1873, Manet's Le Bon Bock was a great success at the Salon. In 1878, he again sent nothing to the World's Fair Exhibition. By 1881, however, the new style was accepted to the extent where Manet won two second-class medals thus enabling him, in future, to exhibit at the Salon without jury intervention.

From the above remarks it can be seen that Manet's work

---

1. We should note that the acceptance of these paintings does show that the Salon jury was more relaxed in its criteria than hitherto. There had been a gradual widening of stylistic range acceptable by the juries.

2. Bataille, op.cit., The group included Antonin Proust (Manet's childhood friend, later Minister of Culture), Fantin-Latour, Bazille, Whistler, Nadar (the photographer), Duranty, Degas, Monet, Cézanne, Henner and (after 1868) Renoir. p.7.

included a wide range of subject-matter; including Realism reminiscent of Velasquez, themes borrowed from well-known old masters, or pastiches, historical and religious ones, ones dealing with various aspects of contemporary life, portraits, gardens and still-lifes. The first painting by Manet to cause Couture to have misgivings about his pupil was The Absinthe Drinker (1859). It was the younger artist's first attempt at Realism, and was based on the type of realistic depiction of low-life destitution to be seen in Spanish, Dutch and Flemish pictures enjoying a vogue in progressive circles at the time. It was not, in itself, unusual, therefore. Couture disapproved of it, not so much because of the lack of "moral character"[1] portrayed, as for the reasons that its size (181 x 106 cm) was unsuitable for a sordid subject and the technique showed some daring departures from his teachings. Manet's debt to Couture is evident in the use of light over dark and his skilful application of optical grays in the background. But, one of the most striking characteristics of Manet's mature style is already present, namely in the radical simplification of tones in the beggar's clothing and the foreground. Instead of careful transitions from light to dark, built up either by the academic or by Couture's method, some unacceptably abrupt passages occur. Manet, apparently,[2] had definite ideas about these stark contrasts of value. Antonin Proust[3] relates that Manet "declared that for him the light

---

1. Hanson, op.cit., p. 54.
2. Ibid., p. 159.
3. Ibid.

presented itself with such unity that a single tone sufficed to render it."[1] This he demonstrated in paintings such as Déjeuner sur l'herbe, Olympia, The Fifer, Bar at the Folies Bergére in which the source of light on the model is from the front and is so bright that shadows are almost obliterated. The resulting flatness of colour and undifferentiated value has the optical effect of flattening the forms and making them appear close to the picture plane. Traditionally, lighting was from the side so that maximum chiaroscuro could be applied. Manet's use of front lighting in some of his paintings was an important departure from tradition.

Manet soon abandoned the traditional method of applying a brown ébauche, in favour of the application of the direct rendering of values onto the white canvas, especially in areas where flesh tones occurred, together with a personal version of an ébauche in which he drew, directly onto the canvas, with "sauce",[2] not necessarily brown, and frequently thicker than was usual.[3] Another novelty in Manet's use of colour was in his use of black, traditionally avoided because it is not a colour. In the Absinthe Drinker, pure black was used in the shoes and bottle, with startling optical results described by Hanson.[4] The highlight on

[1] Hanson, op.cit., p. 159.

[2] Ibid., p. 164.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., p. 158.

the bottle - a warm brown - has the effect of making the pure black of the bottle appear dark green.

The development of Manet's technique complemented his development towards a new, specifically modern, approach to all types of subject-matter. It was this combination which caused reactions of outrage during the 1860s. The two paintings which best illustrate how, even using borrowed themes, Manet infuriated the public with his interpretation, are Déjeuner sur l'herbe (1863) and Olympia (1865). The first was derived from Giorgione's Fête Champêtre (1510) and Raphael's Judgement of Paris (1520), the second from Titian's Venus of Urbino (1538). Manet's handling of these familiar themes offended moral attitudes about prostitution, a social problem which was piously denied by a pretence of bourgeois virtue, yet widespread amongst this class. It also offended the current expectations regarding the nude in art, an important genre by mid-century. It was well-known at the time[1] that most of these nudes, their mythological trappings notwithstanding, were, in reality, representations of courtesans and prostitutes. As long as the subject remained ostensibly mythological, their lascivious eroticism was tolerated by a large section of the public. Another proviso was that they should conform to the current idealization, that is, be subject to "correction" of anatomical idiosyncracies, and, of course, be painted by traditional methods, including "finish". Manet's rendering

[1] Harding, op.cit., p. 49-50.

was a far cray from Cabanel's Birth of Venus - said to be the most popular painting at the 1863 Salon.[1] We are told that Louis-Napoleon declared Déjeuner sur l'herbe immodest[2] and that the Empress Eugénie averted her eyes from it.[3] The reasons for this were; firstly, that this was not a demonstration of reverance for Giorgione's or Raphael's theme; secondly, because Manet's handling of the theme stripped the subject of prostitution of its 19th century hypocracy. The frank, individualistic portrayal of an unidealized model, of obviously questionable virtue, judging by her bold glance and attitude, in the open air, in the company of men in contemporary dress was unacceptable. The model's own discarded, contemporary clothes, and the overflowing cornucopia, confirmed the blatancy of the relationship of the woman to the men. To the 19th century viewer, an unmentionable social practice was blatantly paraded without the customary embellishments. If we compare Manet's picnic scene with a similar one by an academic painter - for example, The Picnic, by A.-B. Glaize (1850-1) - in which the proprieties, as well as academic execution, have been respected, the negative public reaction to Déjeuner sur l'herbe are understandable.[4] Manet's technique, based on the brilliant brushwork taught by Couture, in which a few deft

---

1. Harding, op.cit., Other examples are printed in his and Clark's book.

2. Pool, op.cit., p. 76.

3. Hemmings, op.cit., p. 166.

4. Harding, op.cit., p. 67 provides a reproduction of Glaize's painting.

strokes sufficed to suggest features like eyes, fruit, folds in clothing, leaves, etcetera, accentuated his blunt approach to the subject. So too did his equal treatment of human features and other pictorial elements, traditionally accorded secondary place in the overall scheme by the relative lack of "heightening". Nothing was artificially stressed or muted. In addition, the use of front lighting on the "uncorrected" nude figure not only stressed Manet's frank approach to the subject, but was in contradiction to conventional procedures in nude painting.

In 1865, Olympia caused a similar uproar. Again, the signs of the courtesan's profession were undisguised, and the nude rendered without concession to beautification or traditional modelling or lighting. She was branded as ugly, flat, vicious and unwashed - to name a few of the derisive epithets used, at the time, to describe her.[1] Although critics were prepared to praise original techniques such as Manet's,[2] his cursory handling of anatomical details, in this case, was seen as a deliberate provocation of the conventions. The lack of chiaroscuro made the model's belly and limbs appear to be made of "India rubber",[3] and Manet's use of slightly fuzzy black outlines, especially in the left hand

---

[1] For a detailed account of the criticism at the time, see Clark 's chapter "Olympia's Choice", op.cit., p. 79-146.

[2] Ibid., p. 90.

[3] Ibid., p. 94.

and defining the left breast, were a breach of the traditional finish along contours, in nude painting,[1] and caused Olympia to be referred to as dirty, or gorilla-like.

Manet's compositions of modern life subjects, while not as shocking as his treatment of the nude, show that, in seeking ways of expressing the new subjects modern life presented, it was necessary to question some of the principles on which two-dimensional composition had been based since the Renaissance. Manet was not unique in this, but, until the Impressionists overturned traditional notions about seeing, he was in the forefront of those who realised that perception based on single-point vision was not a reliable basis on which to compose realistic pictures. Nor was the principle of perspective based on geometry, presumed correct until the 19th century. Photography, Japanese prints, and advances in knowledge about the mechanisms of vision, increasingly cast doubt on the validity of the old system in which vision was thought to be static, instead of depending on the constant movement of both eyes. At the time, Manet's compositions were considered faulty, even incompetent.[2] But, as he was trying to find a method different from the artificial one he had been taught, the awkwardness of some of his compositions - particularly those with many figures - is understandable. Until he took to plein air painting during the 1870s, his method of composing pictures was based

1. Clark , op.cit., prints Ingres' Venus Anadyomène (1848) pl. x as an example.

2. Hanson, op.cit., p. 197-205.

on the old piecemeal one of combining elements in one format. But, in Manet's case, these elements were not the result of research, but of direct observation of nature, either in the form of numerous "thumbnail" sketches made on the spot and in random situations, or in his studio where he could carry out an idea by setting up models and accessories. By trying to avoid the old type of groupings arranged in the hollowed-out "perspectival box", Manet favoured casual groupings, lack of selection and oddly "cropped" shapes. In the process, he created entirely novel types of composition.

The first ambitious attempt at such a picture was Concert in the Tuileries (1860). The subject of a street or park scene was in itself unusual, but it was unusual also in the sense that it lacked a focal point. In this, Manet was emulating Courbet, except that his scene took place in Paris and showed a random selection of people - many of them Manet's friends - in typical fashionable dress, occupied in one of the new leisure activities. In this early attempt at representing modern city life, another of Manet's notorious characteristics is present. This is the noticeable lack of comment in the portrayal of the people, as well as their phlegmatic expressionlessness. Nochlin[1] tells us that Manet was frequently accused of moral and emotional indifference towards his subjects. Hanson[2] points out that, as Manet's skill increased, he developed a nice understanding of the strange, disturbing optical effects to be obtained by using changes of surface in one painting. This, combined with his restrained psychological approach to subjects, creates powerful contrasts at times more gripping than the heightened effects in Romantic painting. This applies particuarly to his seemingly detached rendering of the Execution of Maximilian, the first version of which was started in 1867 when the news of the event reached Paris.

---

[1] Nochlin, L., Realism, p. 31.

[2] Hanson, op.cit., p. 175.

Two examples of strange, apparently disjointed compositions by Manet are The Universal Exhibition (1867) and On the Beach at Boulogne (1869). About the former, Clark [1] offers an interpretation to the effect that the lack of integration of foreground, figures and distant view of the new Paris, was the result of a basic unwillingness to accept the less picturesque aspects of modernity, or that there was nothing in known imagery to provide a basis for relationships between the brash new buildings, chimneys and clothes, never mind the relationships of human beings to all these things. Whether this is so, or whether it was, rather, the result of Manet's problems composing such pictures in his studio, using sketches almost unchanged, thereby often inadvertently creating discrepancies of scale, we do not know. Similar discrepancies occur in the beach scene named above. The

---

1. Clark , op.cit., p. 66.

scattered placing of the figures is even more marked here, as they do not have the dark lines of railings or the connecting device of a road to give them a feeling of contact. In both of these pictures, traditional perspective rules have been ignored, giving them the effect of real casualness. Hanson[1] maintains that the effect of unexpected sizes of figures is to deny the old premise of seeing everything in a picture at once. Manet's odd compositions "invite the eye to jump from group to group"[2] (or figure to figure) in the way it really would when viewing a wide scene with lots of figures and features. Knowing that Manet firmly believed in basing his art on real vision, this is probably a sounder explanation than Clarke's.

The high horizon-line in On the Beach at Boulogne and The Battle of the Kearsage and the Alabama (1864) was another unconventional feature, probably derived from Manet's interest in Japanese prints.[3] It was a device which suggested a different, impossibly high viewpoint for the spectator, and which was also in contradiction to traditional perspective. In the beach scene, the horizon-line shows a slight curve which Hanson[4] thinks was in keeping with Manet's "acceptance of his own fleeting observations"[5] rather than

1. Hanson, op.cit., p. 201.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., p. 188-190.
4. Ibid., p. 189.
5. Ibid., p. 201.

to the questions being asked about the teaching of perspective in the 19th century.[1] The new ways of seeing had made the old, geometric, single-point perspective, seem artificial in comparison with "picturesque perspective"[2] which resulted from observation. Also in keeping with the fleeting observation which is the real way of seeing, was the device of cutting-off shapes, or "cropping" which gradually became a hallmark of the modern type of composition. This too had been inspired by Japanese prints and photographs, which demonstrated that a piece of a scene was more effective in creating an impression of something fleeting than a self-contained, complete grouping. Added to this was another Japanese device, extensively used by Manet in paintings like Mlle Victorine as an Espada (1862) and The Railway (1873). This was the placing of figures, either whole, or "cropped", in the foreground, in such a way that they occupy a large area. Beyond these figures, a diminutive scene unfolds. This is further emphasized in The Railway by the inclusion of railings separating the two dominant figures from the rest of the scene, thus stressing the two different planes.[3]

After the upheavals caused by the Franco-Prussian war, in which Manet served as a lieutenant, the brutal crushing of the Paris Commune, and the establishment of the Third

---

[1] Hanson, op.cit., p. 178-182.

[2] Ibid., p. 201.

[3] Ibid., p. 120, 121 shows an example of a similar Japanese composition alongside The Railway.

Republic,[1] Manet interested himself in the techniques being evolved by the group of younger artists whom he met regularly at the Café Guerbois. This group included those, like Renoir, Monet and Sisley, who formed the core of the Impressionist group, about whom there will be more detail in a later paragraph. Although they looked up to Manet as an innovator in the matter of values, free brushwork and representation of modern life and as a notorious figure at the Salon, their own innovations had a marked effect on Manet's own style, especially from 1869 to 1874. The most important effect was that Manet learned to appreciate fully, the value of plein air painting. The consequence was a lightening of his palette and the use of broken brushstrokes in an Impressionist manner. But he did not adhere to a consistent Impressionist style for long, soon returning to his preference for contrasting types of paint application, in general using broader areas of flat colour and a more subdued palette than the Impressionists. Evidently, he was not as interested in a homogeneous surface as they were, nor in the shimmering effects of light and reflected light, for he soon returned to his old habit of working in a studio as well as retaining black as an important element in his work. The culmination of his "Impressionist period" occurred after their independent exhibition in 1874, in which he refused to take part, although invited to do so.

---

1. Details about the transition from Second Empire to liberal Third Republic, the bitterness of Socialists and renewed triumph of Bourgeoisie can be found in Tannenbaum, op.cit., p. 498 - 501.

Manet, according to Hanson,[1] was unwilling to risk jeopardizing his hoped-for success at the Salon. This may have been borne out by the critical and financial failure of the venture, a direct consequence of which was that the group was reduced to poverty, necessitating a temporary move from Paris to a cheaper life in the country. Manet joined them at Argenteuil, on the banks of the Seine, for the Summer of 1874. It was there that he painted various boating scenes such as Argenteuil, Boating, Claude Monet in his Floating Studio, and The Seine at Argenteuil all showing Manet's characteristic compositional devices and his gift for opposing bold areas of contrasting colour, achieving a remarkable impression of relief without much modelling or chiaroscuro. The difference in these paintings is that his customary facture has given way to one closer to Impressionist brushwork - at least in places - and his colours are brighter.

Although Manet never wholly adopted the Impressionist technique, he adapted what he liked about it to his own, so that all his paintings after 1870 have a look attributable to the influence of Impressionism. In Manet's all but last painting, A Bar at the Folies Bergère (1881) we can see, crystallized, all that he had been striving to do. The subject is characteristically modern in that the girl is a typical modern Parisian working behind a bar in a typical place of entertainment (café concert). She has the in-

---

1. Hanson, op.cit., p. 172.

scrutable, blank expression inspired by her occupation. The composition presents the viewer with several problems arising from the position of the mirror, the edge of which is parallel to the top and bottom edges of the picture, and yet, apparently, reflecting the back of the girl and the customer to whom she is listening, at an impossible angle. Manet's intentions as far as this was concerned are not known. Clark [1] has, once again, seen ambiguous social implications in this displacement - that the transaction between the girl and man was not as innocent as it might seem, and that the man, according to the position of the real figure of the girl, would possibly be the spectator. As this could not, with impunity, be overtly implied, the mirror image is unattached to the real girl. This is such a complicated explanation that it is hard to believe that Manet, in his own time, would have calculated such intricate subtleties. That he wished to pose the model "front-on", as well as the mirror, and also include the mirror image, but not behind the girl, as logic demanded, seems an easier explanation. The girl was, in fact, posed in front of a table of fruit, flowers and bottles in his own studio,[2] and Manet, possibly, had to improvise when it came to the mirror. The technique epitomizes Manet's style in its skilful manipulation of the minimum of fussy brushwork, the minimum of modelling, the relative lack of importance of drawing, the use of black as a unifying element and a means of creating

---

1. Clark , op.cit., p. 249-255.

2. Leymarie, op.cit., p. 170.

elegant silhouettes, and the flatness imparted to the girl's face by front lighting.

After his death in 1883, a posthumous exhibition of Manet's work was held - ironically - at the École des Beaux Arts. In 1889, 15 of his paintings, including Olympia, were shown at the World's Fair. In 1890, Olympia, which Manet always regarded as his masterpiece, was purchased by public subscription and offered to the state. But it was only in 1907, that it was regarded as fit to be hung in the Louvre.

## Impressionism and the Rendering of Visual Truth, 1864 - ± 1880

Manet's long struggle for Salon success was the last of its kind on the part of an independent artist unwilling to compromise his style. From the 1870s, there was an increasing tendency for daring young artists to stage demonstrations against the dominance of the Institut at the Salon and to attempt to sell their work through other channels, mainly to dealers, or by staging exhibitions. The reasons for this were partly financial. Courbet had been fortunate in finding a rich patron, Bruyas, and, besides, belonged to a family of substance. Manet, as a Parisian of private means, could afford to wait for recognition in auspicious circles. The group of Impressionists, who, in their turn, were responsible for major changes in French painting during the final quarter of the century, were not so fortunate. Apart from their early financial struggles, though, their style of painting was a far more radical departure from tradition than either Courbet's or Manet's, making it more difficult for conservative viewers to accept. As the century wore on, there was a decrease in the authority of the Academy in the education of artists. As early as Courbet's time, the tendency towards partial training had undermined the type of long, thorough training process the Neo-Classicists saw as a necessary part of the formation of artists. In the case of the Impressionists, most of them had had a taste of less formal ways of learning before they entered the studio of a Parisian master, with the result that they disliked the traditional discipline, based on drawing, from the outset.

The group was a loose association, with most cohesion from the time of their first independent exhibition in 1874 until about 1886, the date of their final group exhibition. The core members, however, had known one another since the early 1860s, as pupils in the studio of Charles Gleyre.[1] They were Claude Monet (1840 - 1926), Auguste Renoir (1841 - 1919), Alfred Sisley (1839 - 1899) and Frédéric Bazille (1841 - 1870). But Camille Pissarro (1830 - 1903) had known Monet since 1860,[2] and was also part of the movement, though older than the others. There were others, who, if briefly, were at one time or another associated with Impressionism. Cézanne was one of these, as was Degas (who

[1] Boime, op.cit., p. 61 - 65.

[2] Pool , op.cit., p. 40.

was Manet's contemporary, and with whom he had much in common[1]), Gauguin and Seurat.

The earliest aims of the Impressionists were rooted in ideals which were fundamentally romantic. Pool [2] has pointed out that certain attitudes were shared between these two seemingly opposed groups - namely; their antipathy for "finished" academic execution; their notion of themselves as daring experimental innovators opposed to the established style; and finally, a sense of oneness with nature. Their strictly objective approach towards nature evolved gradually as they learned to work before the motif rather than in the studio, and as they became aware of those theories of optics and colour which re-inforced their observations.[3]

While it is not possible, here, to trace, in detail, the early development of each individual, it is, nevertheless, necessary to mention a few of those factors which explain their collaboration, or which demonstrate the direction already taken by each towards a new type of realistic representation based on visual objectivity, by the 1860s, when they met. One factor, already mentioned, was that, by the time they arrived at Gleyre's studio in 1862, some of their ideas were in an early stage of formation. This

1. Pool , op.cit., p. 118-146.

2. Ibid., p. 9-10.

3. Ibid., p. 78. It was in 1864 that Monet expressed his opinion that the artist has no right to add to reality.

was particularly true of Monet, who had known Eugène Boudin, Courbet, Millet and Troyon since about 1856, Jongkind since 1862. Boudin and Jongkind in particular, had influenced Monet with their already formulated ideas about the shimmering effects of colour and fleeting light which could only be achieved by completing paintings out of doors.[1] Monet was the most dominant personality in the group, with strong convictions to which he stuck, even when it meant splitting the group in later years. Renoir, Monet's closest friend and partner during the vital years, in the late '60s, when the Impressionist style was formed, had, unlike Monet, who grew up in Le Havre, grown up in Paris and, before entering Gleyre's studio, had been apprenticed to a porcelain painter, but had also made numerous visits to the Louvre, where he took a liking to French 18th century painting. Sisley entered Gleyre's studio after four years in London where he was being prepared for a businesss career, and Bazille took time off from his medical studies to attend classes at the studio. Pissarro, ten years older than the others, had no contact with Gleyre. Born of mixed descent in the Virgin Islands, educated in Paris until 1847, he had wandered about the Carribean until returning to Paris in 1855. We are told[2] that he attended classes at the École des Beaux-Arts for a short spell, after which he attended the informal sessions at the Académie

---

1. Pool , op.cit., p. 64.
2. Ibid., p. 38.

Suisse,[1] where he met Monet in about 1860.[2]

As far as the training in Gleyre's studio was concerned, Boime[3] has provided an account. Here, it is only necessary to mention that Gleyre himself was, like Couture, an Independent, that is, not an academician, and that he encouraged pupils to paint landscapes, particularly to execute _études_ directly from nature. In keeping with this, all the young Impressionists had made an excursion to Chailly in 1863 for the purpose of working out of doors. Although we are told[4] that this group found Gleyre's academic discipline, as he applied it to drawing and composition, irksome, they nevertheless remained in his studio until he closed it in 1864. Boime[5] tells us that, at this stage, members of the group were eager for official success, also that the early procedures followed by the Impressionists were based on those - especially the _ébauche_ - learned from Gleyre.

The formation of the Impressionist style was, then, the result of a combination of early influences and preferences, of formal training, self-education and absorption of tendencies from older progressive artists. We have already mentioned Monet's early contacts with some of the latter. To this list, we must add the names of Delacroix,[1] to whom Renoir owed a particular debt, but whose gifts as a colourist were appreciated by the whole group,[2] and Corot, whose influence on Pissarro was noticeable up to about 1863.[3] From 1864, the whole group manifested a tendency towards Courbet's style. This coincided with the first of the group's prolonged visits to the country - to Chailly, not far from Barbizon, where Courbet's influence was strongly felt. But, in 1863, the group had been impressed by Manet's *Déjeuner sur l'herbe* as well as his notoriety and, while in Paris, frequented the same café. This admiration inspired Monet to paint his own version of a picnic under the trees, in 1866, in which the subject is not shocking, nor is it centered around the human content, but is, rather, concerned primarily with the landscape; the effects of dappled light filtering through the leaves and playing on the various textures of the picnickers' clothing. It was around this time (1864), that Monet stated that the artist has no right to add to reality, and that he began to paint the same subject under different weather conditions.

---

[1] Boime, _op.cit_, p. 196-7, Note 26. The Académie Suisse was an independent studio without curriculum, which provided space and a model for a nominal fee. Most art students made use of these facilities as a supplementary part of their training. Courbet, for example, had done so. The atmosphere there encouraged a free exchange of ideas and was, therefore, liked by independents.

[2] Pool , _op.cit._, p. 40.

[3] Boime, _op.cit._, p. 58-65.

[4] Pool , _op.cit._, p. 68.

Hemmings, _op.cit._, p. 168.

[5] Boime, _op.cit._, p. 63-4.

[1] Pool, *op.cit.*, p. 48.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 26-7.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 40.

By the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war in 1870, which disrupted the group for its duration, the Impressionist style had not yet acquired all of its most striking characteristics, but had advanced to the extent where the group was convinced that shadows were coloured, not black, or darkened with black, also that the colour of shadows was influenced by the surroundings. Renoir and Monet, by 1869, were already developing techniques for expressing the shimmering qualities in the atmosphere at La Grenouillère, on the Seine. Such water and boating scenes leant themselves to the use of broken surfaces. The close collaboration of Renoir and Monet, at this time, was responsible for the evolution of the famous technique which included coloured shadows, broken brushstrokes and the use of unmixed colours, the use of primary, not earth, colours, and the unifying factor of light over all pictorial elements. There were nevertheless personal differences in the renderings of the same subjects, for example, Renoir developed his delicate, feathery technique alongside Monet's blunter, broader one.

It was, possibly, around the end of the 1860s that the Impressionists became aware of the scientific theories about colour and the optical mechanism by which the eye re-constructs light "from the prismatic colours of which it is composed."[1] Pool [2] has described some of these theories and their origins. The most significant of these

---

1. Pool , op.cit., p. 15.
2. Ibid., p. 12-15.

was formulated by Eugène Chevreul, a chemist who had been in charge of the dyeing processes at the Gobelins tapestry factory. His The Principles of Harmony and Contrast of Colours, and their Application to the Arts had been published in 1839 and were based on his observation that colours "in proximity influence and modify one another."[1] The most important way in which this occurred was that a colour, seen in isolation, appeared to "be surrounded by a faint aureole of its complementary colour."[2] In the case of red, the aureole would appear green, and so on. Other investigations yielded the phenomenon that when placed side by side in small amounts, and viewed from a distance, such "optical mixtures" of colours appeared to be a single colour different from the components. The relationships of these theories to the Impressionists' use of complementary colours in shadows, small dabs of juxtaposed colours which the eye "fused" at a distance, as well as the device of intensifying large areas of one colour by juxtaposing it with its complementary, or creating a neutral tone by using complementaries in small quantities together has been pointed out by Pool.[3] She also tells us that it was Pissarro who studied the work of physicists, who realized that, in painting, the "brilliance of light could be rendered by allowing

1. Pool , op.cit., p. 14.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., p. 15.

the spectator's eye to reconstruct"[1] the prismatic colours mentioned above. Hemmings[2] maintains that Renoir's portrait of his mistress, Lise, in 1868, demonstrates this type of analysis of colour, and that the 1868-9 snowscapes by Monet, Pissarro and Sisley, "were essentially experiments to discover what happened when objects cast shadows on the white expanse in strong or weak sunlight." Hemmings[3] also points out that these new concepts were in opposition to traditional ones in which local colour was believed to be an unalterable property, except in the question of value. This meant that objects having a specific colour were rendered in varying degrees of that colour alone. The manner in which the Impressionists applied these theories to their own observations led to their use of broken brushstrokes and kaliedoscopic colour effects which critics, viewing their work, found difficulty accepting. Apparently,[4] thanks to the intervention of Daubiguy, works by Monet, Pissarro, Renoir, Sisley and Morisot were exhibited at the 1868 Salon. Gautier,[5] reviewing the work, understood their aims, but complained that the style did "not stand up to close examination"; finding it "rough, blunt and primitive." This difficulty - of "reading" Impressionist paintings -

---

1. Pool , op.cit., p. 15.
2. Hemmings, op.cit., p. 175.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., p. 176.
5. Ibid.

persisted until the late 1870s.

Until the temporary dispersal of the group in 1870, when Monet and Pissarro, being Socialists, had taken refuge in London, they had all attempted to have their work accepted at the Salons. Pissarro, in particular, had usually succeeded since 1859. Renoir had had no luck in this respect until 1868, but not for lack of trying. Monet, we are repeatedly told,[1] struggled throughout his youth for survival, due to lack of success in finding buyers for his work, in spite of the acceptance of two paintings at the 1866 Salon. Of the other two, Bazille and Sisley, we know that Sisley's parents were fairly accommodating towards him, while Bazille shared with Renoir what his extreme poverty at this time allowed.

During their time in London, Monet and Pissarro developed a looser style - according to some historians[2] attributable to the influence of Constable and Turner, which was verified in letters by Pissarro.[3] It is certainly true that, at this time, there was a marked development in their rendering of light.[4] An important event, in London, was the meeting between the two Impressionists and the dealer

---

[1] Pool , op.cit., p. 78. Hemmings, op.cit., p. 171.

[2] Pool , op.cit., p. 100.

[3] Ibid., p. 101.

[4] Examples : Pissarro's Upper, and Lower Norwood paintings (1870) his Crystal Palace (1871); Monet's Westminster Bridge (1871), Hyde Park (1871).

Durand-Ruel who was also taking refuge from the situation in France.[1] During the same time, Renoir remained in France and, being conscripted, had little time to paint. Immediately after the war, followed, according to Poole,[2] Renoir's "purest Impressionist work". One of the Impressionists, Bazille, was tragically killed in action at the end of 1870. Sisley, it seems, remained in France, consistently painting in the freer technique learned from his friends[3] and consistently producing delicate, characteristic Impressionist paintings. It should be mentioned that, prior to the war, the group had been joined by Berthe Morisot, a member of Manet's circle. After the war, another newcomer, Cézanne, had his first practical contact with the group when he spent some time with Pissarro in the district of Pontoise where he learned to paint before the motif in the Impressionist manner. Pissarro, always generously disposed towards new talent, was, at this stage, the only member of the group to understand the significance of Cézanne's emerging gifts.

Back in Paris, when the war was over, the group's financial prospects had fluctuated to such an extent that, by 1873, they began to plan an independent exhibition.[4] A second Salon des Refusés had been set up in 1873 in response to complaints similar to those of 1863.[1] The Impressionists, learning from Manet's experiences, and unwilling to compromise their integrity, were not prepared to submit work to either Salon.[2] Their exhibition, held in the vacant studios of the photographer, Nadar, featured over 165 works by 39 painters, including Degas, who did not usually associate with the group or their aims, and Cézanne, whose inclusion was upon the insistence of Pissarro. The name "Impressionism" was applied to the style from this date - the result of a critic's derisive skit about "L'École des Impressionistes", when poking fun at Monet's Impression : Sunrise. The most persistent criticism of the paintings on the exhibition were that they were slap-dash, showed a deplorable lack of drawing and, of course, finish. The duty of artists to produce competent paintings which were the fruit of painstaking work, was seen to be flouted. Much has been written about the ridicule and lack of comprehension which greeted this first large display of Impressionist works.[3] Undaunted by the fact that hardly any of the work was sold, as well as by the negative critical reaction, the Impressionists embarked on a productive period during which their early experiments were synthesized into what Pool [4] terms "High Impressionism". This lasted until the

---

[1] Pool , op.cit., p. 100.

[2] Ibid., p. 108.

[3] Ibid., p. 60.

[4] Having enjoyed relative success through the dealer, Durand-Ruel, immediately upon their return, they were the victims of the 1873 financial crash and ensuing 6-year depression of the market. Pool, op.cit., p. 112, Hemmings, op.cit., p. 198-9.

---

1. Hemmings, op.cit., p. 198-9.
2. Ibid.
3. Pool, op.cit., p. 113-7.
   Hemmings, op.cit., p. 200-1.
   Keller, H. The Great Book of French Impressionism, p. 35.
4. Pool, op.cit., p. 151-178.

late 1880s, when they were no longer the avant-garde, and new trends were making their style appear old-fashioned. They continued to hold group exhibitions until 1886, there being eight in all. Hemmings[1] tells us that, by 1877, when the third exhibition was held, there was a significant number of appreciative art-lovers, amongst the scoffers, who were prepared to take the new style seriously. Renoir, for example, found a patron in the publisher, Charpentier, which led to a number of fashionable portraits, particularly of children. There is no doubt about it that the way in which the Impressionists operated as a group strengthened their resolve to hold out against conservative pressures. But the cohesiveness of the group lasted only until the fourth exhibition (1879), when Renoir did not take part because he had a painting, The Cup of Coffee, accepted at the Salon. After this, he continued exhibiting at the Salon, until the last two Impressionist exhibitions. After 1879, Monet followed Renoir's example, although, as his paintings had less of the seductive charm of Renoir's, he had continued to be dogged by financial problems. This was nowhere reflected in his work, however, which continued to develop along lyrical, at times, ecstatic, naturalistic lines. Pool [2] thinks that he ended his association with the group because of his "purist" principles on what constituted Impressionism. This was possibly because, once again, Pissarro wanted to introduce a promising newcomer to the

---

1. Hemmings, op.cit., p. 203.

2. Pool , op.cit., p. 167.

group, who did not altogether fit in with its aims - Gauguin. Later, in 1886, Pissarro again caused dissention when he wanted to include Seurat in their exhibition.

Space does not allow a complete analysis of each Impressionist's contribution towards the flowering of the style during its heyday. As our purpose is to investigate those aspects of new styles which constitute significant breaks with the past, either in the matter of subjects chosen for painting, or in the rendering, these paragraphs on Impressionism will best be concluded by a summary of the ways in which the style diverged from some important basic premises of traditional French painting.

Firstly, something ought to be said about subject-matter and how it was approached - remembering that each individual had preferences. Most of the subject-matter chosen recalls that already in use by Independents since the 1830s, with the exception of snow, mist and steam. In general, the Impressionist approach towards subjects was not contentious in the way Courbet's and Manet's were, but their "composition" of pictures owed much to what these older artists had achieved - namely, the lack of comment, of selection, and the random, natural, placement of figures and landscape features. Such subjects were well-established in avant-garde painting by the 1870s. The Impressionists did not "choose" subjects in the traditional sense. In fact, they were opposed to the type of originality which presupposed allegorical, psychological or sociological motives in the "inspiration" behind choice of subject on the part of the artist. Objective indifference towards all subjects which appeared, in a natural way, to the eye, was the essence of the Impressionist attitude in this regard. Until the 1880s, Monet, Renoir, Pissarro and Sisley attempted to adhere to this precept as far as it was humanly possible. However, a glance at the paintings of these four reveals considerable personal preference in the choice of site : Monet, with his Gare St. Lazare (1877) paintings of steam, his love of water, changing weather and dappled sunlight;[1] Pissarro, with his Corot-like feeling for scenes comprising structural elements, such as his Pontoise pictures featuring bridges, walls, trees with bare branches, houses and streets;[2] Renoir, with his liking for figures, at this stage fashionably clothed, occupied in various forms of modern recreation, such as his famous Moulin de la Galette (1876) and La Loge (1874);[3] Sisley, with his landscapes in which, like Pissarro, he revealed a feeling for space and construction.[4]

---

[1] Examples : In Monet's Garden at Argenteuil (1875), Argenteuil (1875), Winter in Vétheuil (1878-81).

[2] Examples : Landscape in February (1875), Street Scene in Pontoise (1879), Little Bridge at Pontoise (1875).

[3] Others are : After Luncheon (1879), The Boatmen's Lunch (1881).

[4] Examples : Bridge at Hampton Court (1874), Floods at Port-Marly (1876), The Seine at Marly (1876).

The most significant aim of the Impressionists was to record and transcribe the visual truth of whatever was before them. Although, like Manet, (and Degas), they were concerned with capturing the fleeting moments of life, including "modern life", they had their own ideas about achieving this. Unlike Manet, they were not interested in the social implications of painting, nor in the irony to be derived from defying the traditional artistic conventions. The "fleeting moment", intellectually understood, and compared with Japanese prints and photographs, was of no importance to the Impressionists. Their method was based on their insistence on trusting their own first visual impression of a motif, putting as much of this down as possible while the lighting conditions remained the same, then leaving it until the following day at the same time. In this way, they sought to capture, in paint, the fugitive effects of light upon objects, the means by which the eye perceives shapes and forms, either static or moving. They did not, if possible, rely on memory to complete the picture. This perception of the true nature of visual reality, which in human experience, is made up of a direct response to stimuli, coupled with memory, formed the basis of their approach and was diametrically opposed to the traditional one which relied heavily on memory followed by intellectual invention. It is for this reason that Impressionist paintings often appear asymmetrical, disordered, blurred and even chaotic. It is also in keeping with Monet's rule about adding nothing to nature.

In the process of attempting this type of truthful transcription in terms of painting, the Impressionists dispensed with several fundamental traditional doctrines regarding pictorial construction and execution. The first attempts, on their part, in this difficult direction, show the residue of their early training and the influence of Corot, Courbet and Manet. Construction, especially in Monet's Quai du Louvre (1866-7) and Renoir's Pont des Arts, Paris (1867) is still solid. The integrity of shapes is still evident in the clear outlines in Monet's Déjeuner sur l'herbe (1866). The facture, in these paintings, is broad and precise compared with that in the 1870s-'80s paintings. Compare, for example, Monet's 1867 Girls in a Garden, with his 1872-4 The Luncheon, also a garden scene including figures, or Renoir's 1868 Alfred Sisley and his Wife, with his 1876 La Moulin de la Galette. By the 1870s, all the elements comprising their subjects were beginnning to be subjected to an overall treatment depending on the play of light upon these elements, so that the solidity of structures and the clarity of shapes began to disintegrate. This was due, in the first instance, to the increasingly agitated brushwork with which tones, which were different colours, were broken up into a myriad of tiny surfaces; in the second, to the exclusion of outlines, which were considered an artifice not visible in reality. By the 1880s, shapes and forms had become amorphous, with almost no drawing and a blurring of contours. Examples of this are Renoir's L'Estaque (1882) and Arab Festival in Algiers (1881); Pissarro's Vegetable Garden and Trees in full bloom (1877) and Landscape near

Chaponnal (1880); Monet's Winter in Vétheuil (1878-81) and Vétheuil (1884); and Sisley's Misty Morning (1874). As light was the means by which the eye perceived the external world, so too was it the unifying factor in pictures based on this principle. For this reason, the Impressionists eschewed, as far as they could, artificial studio lighting in favour of natural light, preferably out of doors. This provided them with favourable opportunities to put their ideas into practice.

The way in which the Impressionists arrived at their use of colour in order to realise their aims has already been explained, as well as what this meant in terms of local colour. Knowing what we do about traditional use of colour, this too was a revolutionary procedure, as was the application of paint, which was, like Corot's, based on the immediate placing of observed values onto the canvas, except that the Impressionists arrived at these values by juxtaposing dabs of pure colour instead of mixed colour in broader areas. As with all the innovative art of the century, the Impressionist execution was derived from the free techniques of the sketch, in their case, the ébauche and the étude.

In summing up the innovative achievements of the Impressionists, Pool [1] has quoted a passage by Jules Laforgue, written in 1883. In this, he picks out three areas in which they abandoned traditional means of creating an illusion "- line, perspective and studio lighting."[1] Traditional outlines and contours were replaced by what he terms "the real living lines, built not in geometric forms but in a thousand irregular strokes which, at a distance, establish life."[2] Traditional linear perspective, based on one-point vision, gave way to a new version of aerial perspective, in which nuances, or "touches of tone"[3] establish spatial dynamics. Static studio lighting was replaced by the fleeting real light. We have, in earlier paragraphs, added to this list, the refusal to construct pictures in the traditional, piecemeal fashion, or to imbue them with literary meanings or outbursts of emotionalism, or to make any compromises in the matter of "finish" for the sake of success with the public.

---

[1] Pool , op.cit., p. 178.

## Diverse Styles of the Last Quarter of the Century

By the 1880s, the strict Impressionist approach to subjects was being questioned by the new avant-garde including writers like Zola and Strindberg, and a number of artists, who saw the Impressionist obsession with literal truth and its related style as a dead-end. The Impressionists themselves went through a crisis of conviction at this time, and emerged with more interpretive types of representation. In fact, their aims were impossible to achieve without some measure of subjective intervention. Laforgue[1] pointed out the paradox inherent in their method by demonstrating that it is virtually impossible to record a first impression accurately with paint as, in the process, modification takes place. What they achieved, instead, was "the record of the response of a certain unique sensibility to a moment of time which can never be exactly reproduced."[2] They themselves realized that subjectivity entered into the matter anyhow.

---

[1] Pool , op.cit., p. 178.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

The new trends making themselves felt in avant-garde circles were, to some extent, a reaction against the unimaginative aims and amorphous effects of Impressionism. The styles which emerged did not, however, revive the academic styles of Neo-Classicism or academic Romanticism. The Academy was not as powerful throughout the art world as it had been earlier in the century. Independent studios, partial education and the profound changes made by all the progressive artists, from Delacroix's time onwards, had eroded the authority of the École. The holding of independent exhibitions and the rise of the professional dealer, challenged the centuries-old monopoly of the official Salon as the means of gaining a livelihood and prestige by artists. Whether new trends reacted against those immediately in the past or not, traces of all the radical changes of the century are present in the diverse products of the last

1. Pool , op.cit., p. 178.
2. Ibid.

couple of decades.

One of the styles which opposed Impressionism as the avant-garde movement from about 1880, was the one named "Symbolism" in 1886.[1] It was not, however, a new phenomenon, but a trend which had been present at various times from about 1860, after Baudelaire's Fleurs du Mal was published in 1857. As it was rooted in literary and philosophical ideas, and not in realistic transcription of nature, it had not enjoyed the same prominence, in avant-garde circles, as had the Realist movements in the decades following Romanticism. Stylistically, the Symbolism of the '60s and '70s reflected a nostalgia for Classicism as well as Romanticism. Delacroix, in particular, was looked up to for inspiration. The change in the political and literary climate, following the humiliation and disillusionment of 1871, contributed to the eclipse of Naturalism in favour of an art which expressed inner realities. Backed by literary figures such as Mallarmé, Moréas and Aurier, it is not surprising that Symbolism was well-defined. To summarize a definition by Aurier, quoted in full by Florisoone[2] - Symbolist art must be ideological, symbolical, synthetic, subjective and decorative. The first manifestation of such an art had been more or less concurrent with Impressionism, and the main exponents of this art were Gustave Moreau (1826-1898), Pierre Puvis de Chavannes (1824-1898)

---

1. Christian, J. Symbolists and Decadents, Introduction, p. 2.
2. Florisoone, M., In Larousse Encyclopedia of Modern Art, p. 191.

and Odilon Redon (1840-1916). Examples of their work demonstrate the revival of imaginative originality - in some cases, taken to fantastical lnegths.[1] The content and intent of this style was, at the time, the most extreme demonstration of anti-Impressionist sentiment. But, in some respects, especially in the work of Puvis de Chavannes, the debt to Impressionism can be seen in a palette far lighter than the traditional one. All of them employed freer techniques together with a degree of draughtsmanship foreign to Impressionism. Boime[2] has pointed out that these combinations of technique constituted a compromise between the old laborious procedures of picture construction, and the attractive aspects of the Indpendents' freedom of handling. Puvis de Chavannes was an active member of the Third Republic juste milieu which sought a compromise between lofty Academicism and incomprehensible Impressionism - one which would be more popular. Under the administration, Puvis executed large-scale mural decorations, and was one of the group[3] which persuaded the state to make important changes in the Salon system in 1881. Henceforth, juries were to consist of elected artists who were exhibiting, instead of members of the Institut. Later, in 1889, the

---

[1] Examples : Moreau's obscure iconography based on his archaeological, mythological, visionary approach can be seen in Salome dancing before Herod (1876), The Unicorns (1885); Puvis' nostalgia for classical simplicity combined with literary meaning, in The Poor Fisherman (1881), A Vision of Antiquity : Symbol of Form (1884-5); Redon's submission to his own subconscious dream-world in Orpheus (1903).

[2] Boime, op.cit., p. 16-7.

[3] Ibid., p. 17.

Salon, again through persuasion of the juste milieu artists, was split into two organizations, the original, more conservative one, under the Société des Artistes Francais, the more progressive, supported by Puvis, Carriere, Rodin et al, under the Société Nationale des Beaux-Arts.[1] As the state took greater responsibility for the institutions affecting artists, so the authority of the Academy declined. Another important factor, mentioned by Boime,[2] in connection with the compromise in style of these artists (including some Symbolists), was the popularization of what he terms a "quasi-Impressionist execution", thus expanding "the aesthetic viewpoint of the French public."[3] Both academics and Impressionists, however, regarded the products of this compromise as a debasement of style.

A totally different reaction against Impressionism, at the end of the 1880s, was Neo-Impressionism, or Divisionism. All this style had in common with Symbolism, was the generally held opinion that a more conceptual approach to subject-matter was desirable, and, in line with this, that a more solid structure and rendering of form was needed in order to express something other than mere sense-data. Unlike the Symbolists, the Neo-Impressionists' subject matter was, on the whole, realistic, in the sense that it was taken from

1. Boime, op.cit., Oxford Companion to Art, p. 765.
2. Ibid, p. 17-18.
3. Ibid., p. 18.

very ordinary aspects of modern life - recreation on the banks of the Seine, harbours, nudes posing in studios, circus performers and Petit Bourgeois on a Sunday outing. The aims, however, were very different from Realist aims, which up until then had been obsessed with recording the fleeting aspect of such scenes. Neo-Impressionists, like Georges Seurat (1859-1891) and Paul Signac (1863-1935), simplified the elements comprising their paintings, giving them a timeless quality. At the same time, as Clark [1] has pointed out, they did not subject these elements to that film of shimmering light which effectively effaced less palatable features of the industrialized surroundings. Thus, in Seurat's Une Baignade à Asniers (1883-4), factories and chimneys are not blurred in the way they would be in a typical Monet painting of the same scene. Likewise, in his Sunday Afternoon on the Île de la Grande Jatte (1884-6), no attempt has been made to unify the numerous figures as Renoir would have done. Instead, each is carefully separated from neighbouring figures. The unity of these, and other Neo-Impressionist paintings derives from the consistently applied technique of meticulously painted dots, or dabs, of colour. This technique, known as Pointillism, evolved from the same theories of colour and light as had Impressionism,[2] together with the development of "a colour harmony circle".[3] The difference was one of purpose. Unlike the Impressionists, who had relied on their own sense-perceptions, the Pointillists'

[1] Clark , op.cit., p. 259-268.

[2] Pool , op.cit., p. 243-4.

[3] Florisoone, op.cit., p. 188, Col. 2.

new technique was an attempt to apply theories to painting scientifically, not intuitively. This was so that ideas they wished to express could be approached methodically, and the outcome calculated. They had no need, therefore, to paint out of doors - one of the basic rules of true Impressionism.

The remaining styles which need mentioning here were in the hands of individuals, rather than groups. Each, in one way or another, made a major contribution towards the overall change in representation which came to be termed, broadly, as "Modernism". Amongst all the artists to whom this applied at the end of the 19th century, three stand out from the rest - Paul Cézanne (1839-1906), Paul Gaugin (1848-1903) and Vincent Van Gogh (1853-1890). Cézanne, the oldest of the three, and the most loyal to the aims of Impressionism, was, as far as his artistic achievement was concerned, the most enigmatic. The true implications of his style were not fully appreciated until 1904, when a whole room at the Salon d'Automne was devoted to his work,[1] although he was becoming better-known by 1900, and was represented at the Centennnial Exhibition that year. Cézanne had, at the outset of his artistic career, painted in a lurid, heavy style based on romantic and erotic fantasies. After 1872, Pissarro's influence on him at Pontoise helped him to abandon the dramatic subjects and the heavy blacks and earth

[1] For this reason, these implications will be disucssed in Part II when they became relevant to Braque and Picasso.

colours contrasting with the impasto of creamy whites, as in his Black Clock (1869-70). From then onwards, Cézanne learned to rely on observation of nature and apply pure colours rather than mixed ones. Black and earth colours disappeared from his palette, in keeping with the Impressionist principles. As we have seen, Cézanne exhibited with the Impressionists in 1874. He did so again in 1877, after which, although retaining contact with members of the group, he distantiated himself from Impressionism. Like all other artists of the time, he made attempts at Salon acceptance - from 1866, but without success until 1882.[1] In 1886, he inherited a comfortable income from his father, so that financial success with his art became irrelevant. As is well-known, after his brief experience of Impressionism, he settled in the country, where he had been born and brought up - at Aix-en-Provence.

We cannot, here, describe Cézanne's development in detail, but must confine ourselves to those aspects of his mature work which are significant in this context. Realism remained a fundamental aim to Cézanne, but he had a different approach to this from the Impressionist one. His was based on the search for a way of rendering that in nature which he regarded as profound and timeless. Forms and volumes, and their relationships to one another and to surrounding space were more important to Cézanne than the

---

1. Raynal, M., in the Chronological Survey in Cézanne, p. 6-8.

fugitive effects of changing light on objects. His way of achieving this was analytical. By close, intense observation of his motifs, he hoped to discover the optical truth about them and find a way of rendering this in paint. His analysis resulted in a breaking down of volumes into their simplified components, which seemed to him to consist of variations of three basic geometric forms : the cylinder, the cone and the sphere. As the light fell on these volumes, they appeared, to the eye, to be composed of nuances of varying shape, tone and colour. Whether he was painting still-life objects, portraits, figures, houses, trees, or rocks, it was possible to reduce them to a complex system of carefully observed facets, or nuances. Cézanne called these his "little sensations". In terms of paint, they consisted of small, precise areas of paint, of meticulously chosen colour and tone, layed on separately in such a way that they describe the complex structures visible to the eye. The persistent observation required to do this was the antithesis of the trust in first impressions insisted upon by Monet, Renoir and Pissarro. But the lessons of Impressionism were of value to Cézanne, as he learned to use colours to express tones, or for their warm or cold optical effect. Colour, rather than drawing and shading, could "express modelling and changes of plane."[1] From the late 1870s this method of working was apparent, for example, in Madame Cézanne in a Red Easychair (1877), The Bridge of Maincy (1879) and a

---

[1] Raynal, op.cit., p. 62.

Still-life (1877-9). Also from the Impressionists, Cézanne learned to break up the surface of paintings by using small, separate brushstrokes, but, in his case, these usually changed direction from facet to facet, as planes changed. This method of rendering volumes had paradoxical results. Sometimes, planes were "staggered" in such a way that, together with changes of colour, they built up a feeling of recession. At other times, they appeared flat and close to the picture plane. This was particularly true in still-life paintings and portraits where the intense process followed by Cézanne often resulted in distortions in the shapes of objects, which sometimes bothered him.[1] His method tended to cause lines defining shapes to "melt away".[2] He resisted the temptation to rectify such "mistakes", however, preferring to leave them as evidence of the shifts in vision which occur naturally, and liking the freedom with which shapes escaped the rigidity of firmly established contours.[3] This device, which will be discussed again in the section on Cubism, was known as "passage". Its effect was to render ambiguous the boundaries between objects and surrounding space. Added to the analysis of volumes into relatively flat abstract shapes, this made Cézanne's achievements in painting a radical departure from traditional

[1] Raynal, op.cit., p. 95.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Examples : Boy in a Red Waistcoat (1890-95), many of the still-lifes after 1877, The Card Players (1885-90) and many of the late renderings of Montagne Sainte-Victoire (1885 onwards).

procedures in which the nuances would have been blended, and forms confined within contours, "legible" according to traditional perspective theories. Cézanne made no effort to hide the process whereby painting attempts to artificially create an effect of three-dimensional relief. Cézanne's late works reached near-abstraction as his method, instead of becoming more elaborate, became simplified to the point where objects all but disappeared into the scheme of nuances. One such is Montagne Sainte-Victoire (1904-6) reproduced by Keller.[1] A very few cursory lines "rescue" the objects from completely merging with one another.

Cézanne, Gauguin and Van Gogh were, in varying degrees, "outsiders", as far as position in the art world, as well as in society, was concerned.[2] Gauguin had been a "Sunday painter" until 1883 when he gave up his career as a stockbroker to devote his time to painting.[3] Although he had, early on, been attracted to independent styles, such as Corot's, and had been taken - reluctantly, on their part - under the Impressionist wing for a while, he had, by the late 1880s renounced his connections with Impressionism and gravitated towards a group with more esoteric aims. Impressionism, however, according to Pool,[1] had effectively liberated Gauguin's use of colour. By the late 1880s and early 90s, he was still using broken brushstrokes, but covering large areas with the same bright colours, which, in places, were becoming arbitrary. There was little blurring of shape in the interests of light. On the contrary, figures, such as those in Bonjour, Monsieur Gauguin (1889) had clear, simple outlines which were black in places. The transformation of Gauguin's style took place at this time at Port Aven (1886) where he met Émile Bernard and, later that year in Paris, when he met Van Gogh.[2] From the former, he learned the style of "Cloisonnism", from the latter his interest in literary, especially Symbolist, ideas. The Vision after the Sermon (1888) demonstrates the emphasis on flat areas of colour, enclosed by lines of strong, dark colour, exaggerated arabesques, which had been inspired by Japanese prints, and the title speaks of the desire to imbue subjects with symbolic meaning. By 1890, Gauguin had become absorbed in the Symbolist movement,[3] but for different reasons from Moreau, Puvis, or Redon. Gauguin preoccupied himself, from this time on, with a symbolic renunciation of European civilization, identifying himself almost completely with the primitive culture he finally found on the island of

---

[1] Keller, op.cit., pl. 201.

[2] Cézanne had had a thorough classical education, but no formal art training. He was taciturn, moody and unsociable.

[3] Gauguin had attended independent, liberal studios sporadically. He cultivated uncouth, flamboyant attitudes towards conventional behaviour.

---

1. Pool , op.cit., p. 202.
2. Ibid., p. 206.
3. Including Sérusier, Denis, Valloton, Bonnard, Vuillard.

Tahiti. Gauguin's mature style was the epitomy of "Synthetism". It was inventive, original, flamboyant - above all, it was non-naturalistic. It was to inspire several new developments to a considerable extent : Primitivism which manifested itself in the most obvious way in Fauvism, but which was a cult with implications, also, for Expressionism, and for Picasso, early in the 20th century; the late, fin-de-siécle, Symbolism of Maxence, Point and Aman-Jean; finally, Gaugin, together with Denis, demonstrated the decorative possibilities of flowing arabesques, enclosing brightly coloured shapes which - at least partly - provided the inspiration for the Art Nouveau style.

Van Gogh had come from Holland to Paris in 1886, the victim of mental illness which finally led to his suicide in 1890. His contribution to French painting was the result of a passionate outpouring of work during these few years. The type of abstraction in either Cézanne's or Gauguin's work was foreign to Van Gogh, who retained a strong sense of form, and construction through draughtsmanship - even when this became, towards the end of his life, convulsive. He too, had, for a while, been influenced by Impressionism[1] through Pissarro, but his tastes leaned more towards Rubens, Delacroix, Millet, Daumier, the Marseilles artist, Monticelli, and, like most of his generation, Japanese prints.[2] The brushstroke of Impressionism was transformed, by Van Gogh, into a means of subjective expression, not of achieving optical effects. But, from the Impressionists, he too learned to use brighter, purer, colours. His significance lies in his intensely personal identification with his subjects, which varied, depending on what was at hand, in his circumstances,[1] and the sense of tragedy which emerged as his own tragedy crowded in on him. This was very different from anything in the work of either Géricault or Delacroix, whose romantic expressiveness was controlled by the academic discipline of their picture construction and execution.

---

[1] Pool , op.cit., p. 210-11.

[2] Ibid.

Mention must be made, before ending this study of 19th century French artistic changes, of two artists who do not fit neatly into categories, nor were they figures of such significance as to merit separate treatment in detail. The first of these is Edgar Degas (1834-1917), whom we have frequently mentioned in passing. The second is Henri Toulouse-Lautrec (1864-1901). Pool [2] tells us that Degas always refused to be considered an Impressionist although he was active in the organization of their independent exhibitions. But he saw these as Realist ventures[3] and himself as a realistic painter of Parisian social life. He nevertheless benefited from the new ways of using colour

[1] Much of his time was spent in an asylum.

[2] Pool , op.cit., p. 144.

[3] Ibid., p. 113.

and light. He is best known as the master of instantaneousness, by his ability to capture fleeting movements, especially in his favourite subjects, such as the ballet and the races. Even more than Manet, he used the Japanese device of "cropping" forms, and of using a variety of novel compositions - for example, in his Place de la Concorde (1875) in which most of the picture surface is occupied by the open paving of the Place, the figures merely passing across the spectator's line of vision.

Toulouse-Lautrec, like Degas, recorded Parisian life. In his case, this applied particularly to the most blatantly sordid sectors of society. He is best-known for his caricature-like renderings of music-hall stars such as Jane Avril, Yvette Guilbert and Cha-U-Kao, frequently caught at undignified moments, the grotesqueness of which Lautrec incisively illustrated. His renderings included the most unglamorous side of prostitution - for instance in Rue des Moulin (The Medical Inspection) (1894) and In Bed (1893). The first depicts two prostitutes waiting for their inspection for venereal disease, the second exposes the lesbianism of many prostitutes. Lautrec was one of the few late 19th century Modernists of significance to have received training[1] under an established Salon master, Leon Bonnat,[2] and this may explain his respect for construction and integrity of forms. He liked the Impressionists as

---

1. Shone, R., Toulouse-Lautrec, in the Introduction, p. 2.

2. Boime, op.cit., p. 131-2, tells us that Bonnat was known for his virtuoso performance in sketch-techniques.

well and, to some extent his technique reflects this. In Bed is an example of his brushwork which illustrates a debt to Manet's Impressionist period, but a debt, as well, to the sketch-techniques of Salon masters like Couture. But, in his best-known works, including his famous posters, the most pronounced influence came from Japanese prints, so that, although he did not dissolve forms in the Impressionist manner, his interest in them was primarily decorative, with emphasis on exaggerated linear expression and compositional novelty. His colour, frequently arbitrary, was also decorative rather than primitive like Gauguin's, or expressive like Van Gogh's. Lautrec, because of his sordid personal life-style, as well as the incisive cruelty of his representations, was much admired in those circles which, at the turn of the century, cultivated the decadent outlook and an equally sordid life-style, including the circle to which Picasso belonged in Barcelona. Picasso's earliest notions about French art were based, vaguely, on Modernism derived from those currents stemming from Symbolism, Gauguin's Primitivism and Lautrec's decadence.

By the end of the 19th century, the results of a complex process of change were clearly visible in French art. The difficulty experienced by independent artists to gain recognition within the Academy-dominated system had, gradually, been overcome. By mid-century there was a flourishing progressive movement of individuals and groups, backed by sympathetic literary friends, whose work was an assertion of the feasibility of deviating from the established norm. This movement gathered impetus so that, by the end of the century, it included types of representation which varied greatly, and were no longer merely different genres within one tradition. They differed in subject-choice, in emphasis and in style, both from one-another and from traditional neo-classical/romantic painting. As far as attitude was concerned, two broad streams existed, however - one aligned to tradition, the other to innovation. The doctrinaire rigidity of the academic system made it impossible for more than the superficial aspects of innovative painting to be accommodated within the system so that it was inevitable that innovation took place independently. This gave rise to the conviction, in progressive circles, that exciting new styles were perpetually in opposition to a hostile establishment.

We have seen something of the diversity of style which could be seen in Paris by 1900. On the one hand, Salon art continued to be immensely popular, on the other, there were styles which demonstrated, in varying degrees, the extent to which traditional doctrines had been eroded. In the second part of this research, the further erosion of this tradition will be investigated. Within the bounds of representation, it will be seen how Picasso and his French contemporaries took this to the brink of abstraction. By 1900, in spite of the incipient abstraction becoming apparent in Monet's paintings, and those abstract elements, which have been mentioned, in the work of others including

Cézanne, Gauguin and Lautrec, painting, in general, remained firmly representational. The truly significant breaks with the past had been: the liberation of painting from the old procedures ensuring an illusion of sculptural relief and perspectival depth; at the same time, the liberation of subject-matter from its traditional content; and, finally, the challenging of the Renaissance optical theories on which pictorial construction had been based. The artists of the 20th century were the beneficiaries of this legacy.

RHODES UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

## PART II

## THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY - PICASSO'S CONTRIBUTION TO A RADICALLY NEW RENDERING OF TANGIBLE REALITY

Compared with the daring innovations in painting which are to be described in the following paragraphs, those described in Part I appear cautious. Some of the most drastic of the innovations to be considered here occurred in the work of Picasso. For this reason, it was decided that this, second, part of the research should concentrate on those of his achievements which significantly affected the art of the 20th century. At the same time, as modern art is manifestly different from the traditional art discussed in Part I, what is of interest here about Picasso's art are also those aspects of it which represent fundamental breaks with tradition, and the processes by which these were achieved. By devoting the whole of Part I to an account of the gradual erosion of traditional norms in French painting, it should be possible to understand Picasso's achievements in their proper context. Instead of reinforcing the prevailing notions about his isolated prodigiousness, it would be more to the point to accord him his place in the process already described. One of the results of this process had been the liberation of painting from the limitations regarding subject-choice, approach and procedure, imposed by the Academy, which upheld tradition, so that, by 1900, when Picasso visited Paris for the first time, a diversity of styles was flourishing, alongside the styles still favoured by the academic or official establishment. But, although these diverse independent styles were the outcome of the abandonment of many traditional methods of picture construction, there had, as yet, been no serious attempts to violate the integrity of shapes and forms and spatial conception based on the old norms handed down from the Renaissance, in the way in which 20th century artists were to do. There had certainly been hints at such possibilities, in the tendency for outlines to disappear and forms to dissolve in Impressionist painting; for liberties taken with shapes by Gauguin and some Symbolists; and for expressive exaggerations of shapes and forms to occur in paintings by Van Gogh and Lautrec. There had also been hints at abstraction in the use of relatively flat areas of colour in place of traditional modelling, particularly in works by Gauguin and Denis. In Manet's work, the absence of modelling, together with bluntly realistic shapes, had introduced an element of irony, which, together with metaphor, was to become a familiar characteristic of some modern art. We have also seen that Cézanne had been working towards an analysis of forms which sometimes tended to fragment and flatten these to such an extent that he was obliged to resort to a minimal use of traditional lines to "rescue" forms and shapes from unintelligibility. Occasionally, distortions also occurred in his paintings as a result of his method of observation. The way in which some of these tendencies gathered impetus, resulting in entirely new renderings of objects, figures and spatial relationships, can be well illustrated by a study of Picasso's development during the period 1900 to about 1914. During these years, and in collaboration with others, particularly Braque, Picasso, with a disregard for the traditions and hallowed systems which had held French artists in check, succeeded in discarding almost all vestiges of the old types of representation, but without abandoning representation altogether. How this came about cannot be properly explained, however, without taking into account those factors in Picasso's background which influenced his development. This is especially true in his case, as there was much in his childhood in Spain, and in his precocious early development, which tended to instill in him a sense of personal genius and destiny - factors which contributed to many of the peculiarities of his painting style. This sense of his own unique powers was reinforced later, in Paris, where he was looked upon as an exotic, even prophetic, innovator of phenomenal stature.

## Picasso's Childhood and Adolescence, 1881 - 1900

One of the most persistent factors in discussions about Picasso's life and work is that of the legendary quality surrounding his personal genius. An aura of mystery and portent has been cultivated about his background and childhood, by writers, including some of those who knew and admired him,[1] attributing to him special powers, defying normal human understanding. In these ways, attempts have

[1] Sabartes, J. and Boeck, W. Picasso.
D'Ors, E. Pablo Picasso.
Uhde, W. Picasso and the French Tradition.
Raynal, M. Picasso.

been made to explain his meteoric rise to fame and fabulous wealth in his own lifetime. Even his detractors feel obligated to deal with "Picasso the Legend".[1] Such has been the tendency to create a myth that, according to Penrose,[2] even his ancestry has been subject to romantic speculation. Attempts have been made to find traces of Basque, Italian, Moorish, Jewish and Gipsy blood on either side of Picasso's family. But Penrose[3] and Cirlot[4] agree that the family was of predominantly Andalusian origin. Picasso's father was named José Ruiz Blasco and was, by profession, an artist of moderate talent and a teacher in the art school at Malaga. He married Picasso's mother, María Picasso López in 1880. The following year on 25 October, Picasso was born in Malaga and christened, according to Spanish tradition, with eight family names,[5] the first of which was Pablo. Until about 1900 or 1901, he went by the name Pablo Ruiz Picasso.

The circumstances of the Ruiz family and the atmosphere of their home have been described as conventional for a Spanish middle-class family of modest financial means. Penrose[6] tells us that, according to Picasso's memories and the evidence of photographs, they were "in politics, religion and ... way of living ... a conventional, law-abiding, provincial family." Sabartes[1] confirms that this was the atmosphere in which Picasso grew up, and explains that, in accordance with the family's artistic leanings, it was natural that, from an early age, Picasso explained himself through images, but he asserts that Picasso's "childhood way of seeing ... [was] ... not ... that of an ordinary child."[2] We are also told that, from birth, the family regarded the child with awe, owing to the portentous manner in which he was saved from death immediately after his birth.[3] Once Picasso's remarkable talent became apparent, his family encouraged his development as a prodigy. Berger,[4] particularly, has emphasized the importance, for Picasso's future development, of the perception, within the family and community, of the implications of such prodigious talent. In Spain, furthermore, there is a special reverence accorded those with such gifts. They are regarded as being possessed by a benign demon, or duende, which is at the root of the mystery of giftedness.[5] Picasso, from an early age, found himself the centre of this type of mystery.[6]

---

[1] Berger, J. Success and Failure of Picasso provides several examples of the type of writing which has this tendency and points out that Picasso, himself, in many of his pronouncements, often contributed to notions of himself as an extraordinary phenomenon.

[2] Penrose, R. Picasso His Life and Work, p. 4-8.

[3] Ibid., p. 8

[4] Cirlot, J.-E. Picasso, Birth of a Genius, p. 13.

[5] Penrose, op.cit., p. 9.

[6] Ibid., p. 16.

[1] Sabartes, J. and Boeck, W., op.cit., p. 20.

[2] Ibid., p. 10.

[3] Penrose, op.cit., p. 10.

[4] Berger, op.cit., p. 27-39.

[5] Ibid., p. 38.

[6] Ibid., p. 32.

In 1891, financial circumstances obliged Don José to take up the post of art master at a secondary school in Corunna. The family moved there in September 1891. Although they were unhappy in the cold, damp climate which was so different from that of Malaga, it was there that the young Pablo's artistic development began in earnest, under the tutelage of his father. It seems that Don José, in recognition of his son's exceptional talent had allowed him to spend most of his time drawing and painting at the college where he taught. Pablo drew incessantly, awing his father with his gifts of concentration and remarkable skill in mastering "the academic technique of charcoal drawing with its insistence on modelling from light to shade."[1] Although, in the sources available for this research, none of these attempts at academic drawing are reproduced, there are a few sheets of sketchbook drawings which offer us glimpses of the boy's abilities, particularly in the sketches of pigeons. Otherwise, they are the typical, random jottings of a child.[2] As far as formal schooling went, Pablo's education was rudimentary. Sabartes[3] tells us that, in line with the family's belief that "magic forces had welcomed him at birth", Pablo was "able to ignore many of ... [the rules] ... with impunity" and that his real education took place at his own whim. In painting and drawing, however, his progress from the relatively childish efforts of 1891, was rapid. By the time the family left Corunna in 1895, Pablo was able to complete parts of his father's pictures so skilfully that Don José handed over his own brushes and palette to his son in a symbolic gesture of capitulation which firmly established the boy's status as a prodigy.

---

[1] Penrose, op.cit., p. 17.

[2] Examples can be found in Cirlot, op.cit., pl. 5-10, 370-386.

[3] Sabartes and Boeck, op.cit., p. 16.

The precocious development of Picasso's ability from his juvenile beginnings began, according to Cirlot,[1] after 1893, when the childish quality began to disappear from his work. Numerous examples of different types of drawings, including academic studies, as well as paintings, dating from this period (1893-1895), are available[2] in reproductions. These all demonstrate that, indeed, although still a child, Pablo was able, without much difficulty, to master forms with a proficiency which would take most pupils years of hard work. Amongst these early examples of remarkable achievement, there are numerous pages from sketchbooks filled with lively, perceptive, thumbnail sketches of figures, showing an instant grasp of posture, gesture and individuality, as well as of relationships and a sense of proportion.[3] In more serious works, such as the paintings, Man with a Beret (1895) and Head of a Man (1894), this innate sense of proportion and likeness is particularly apparent. Although a lot of oil paintings from this period consist of somewhat

1. Cirlot, op.cit., p. 14.
2. Ibid., pl. 9-27, 297-323, 382-407.
3. Cirlot, op.cit., pl. 391-401.

heavily executed landscapes and interiors,[1] the sketchbooks betray a preoccupation with human figures which would later be a dominant feature of Picasso's oevre. In these paintings, a tendency to exaggerate certain features, such as feet and ankles was already present, according to Penrose.[2] He cites a painting of a young girl, Girl with Bare Feet (1895)[3] as an example. A drawing entitled Hercules (1894-5)[4] is another. Penrose[5] also notices the "freshness and sureness of touch ... with strong accents and contrasts that suggest Zurbarán." All in all, there are, already manifested, "elements that betray an individual trend."[6] There is certainly a distinct difference between purely academic studies, such as the plaster-cast drawing of an arm,[7] and the looser pen and ink drawing of clasped hands,[8] and also between Don José's rendering of pigeons[9] and his son's.[10] At this stage, however, it is doubtful whether there was any deliberate attempt, on Picasso's part, to distort forms.

[1] Cirlot, op.cit., pl. 22, 23, 308-323.

[2] Penrose, op.cit., p. 21.

[3] Ibid., pl. 2.

[4] Cirlot, op.cit., pl. 18.

[5] Penrose, op.cit., p. 21.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Cirlot, op.cit., pl. 405.

[8] Ibid., pl. 407.

[9] Rubin, W. ed. Pablo Picasso A Retrospective, M.O.M.A., p. 16.

[10] Cirlot, op.cit., pl. 24-5.

In general, an individualistic, unidealized Naturalism prevailed in his work of this period.

The family's next move was to Barcelona, where Don José had secured a post as instructor at the La Lonja[1] School of Fine Arts. They arrived in Barcelona in October 1895, having visited Madrid and Malaga on the way. In Madrid, Picasso saw, for the first time, paintings by Velasquez, Zurbarán and Goya. In Barcelona, although he was only fourteen, he was allowed to take an examination allowing him entrance "to the higher class, known as 'Antique, Life, Model and Painting'."[2] He completed the test in one day - a month being the normal time allowed - in September 1896. Penrose[3] tells us that, having, once again, proved himself a prodigy, no "steady and methodical career as a student" followed. Although he drew and painted as obsessively as ever, it seemed that the School had little to teach him. But, Cirlot[4] mentions work done there, in oils, crayon, pen-and-ink and charcoal, which was "anatomically perfect with the strength or weakness which comes from live models." There are also drawings done from plaster-casts. Many of these, according to Cirlot,[5] indicate that - at least

[1] Mendoza, C., in Homage to Barcelona, published by Arts Council of Great Britain, spells this Llotja. p. 155.

[2] Penrose, op.cit., p. 32.

[3] Ibid., p. 33.

[4] Cirlot, op.cit., p. 39, 43.

[5] Ibid., p. 43.

sporadically - Picasso was "voluntarily submitting to classical standards."[1] When we look at examples of these drawings,[2] it is clear that these standards were virtually the same as the classical principles which prevailed in studios and art schools under Academy jurisdiction in France. But, it is true that a large quntity of work was done by Picasso outside the school, and manifestly outside its sphere of influence. Many of these are a continuation of his earlier habit of filling sketchbook pages with numerous quick sketches of figures, heads, hands, etcetera, except that there is an increased competence in the 1895-6 drawings. Portrait studies of his father recur frequently. But there are other drawings and paintings belonging to this period which reflect the influence of non-academic trends in Barcelona, especially from 1897 onwards. These trends were to have far more impact on Picasso's subsequent development than did the academic teaching offered at La Lonja. For this reason, it is important that something of the general cultural trends in Barcelona in the last decade of the 19th century, particularly those with which Picasso had close contact, be understood.

Penrose[3] has described something of the peculiarities of Barcelona's history, both politically and artistically, with

[1] Cirlot, op.cit.

[2] Ibid., pl. 50-1, 461-481.

[3] Penrose, op.cit., p. 27-9.

its centuries-old linguistic and cultural links with Roussillon in France. Both were Catalan by heritage. For Barcelona, the result of this heritage was a tradition far more liberal than any to be found in Castillian Spain. Another result had been strong Separatist political feelings which had given rise to sporadic rioting and rebellion in the province, with Barcelona - the largest centre there - usually the scene of such distrubances. Picasso and his family arrived there at one such time, but do not seem to have involved themselves with any of the political events around them. Far more important for the purpose of understanding Picasso's formative years was the cultural renewal taking place in and around the city. In general, this was inspired by a restlessness which can be ascribed to a yearning for progress and modernity - a reaching outwards , predominantly towards France, but to England, Germany and Scandinavia as well - as part of a reaction against Castillian domination. In a recent publication,[1] resulting from an exhibition in London of memorabilia from this era in Barcelona, illustrations and written articles provide us with an excellent and detailed description of the atmosphere of lively cultural activity there at the time of the Ruiz family's arrival. From about 1888, when a Universal Exhibition took place there, there was a determined effort to bring about a cultural revival as well as to promote an economic and industrial revolution which would be comparable

---

1. Arts Council of Great Britain, Homage to Barcelona.

with that of other European centres.

Some of the ways in which this movement manifested itself were to be found in the deliberate revival of the Catalan language and the renewed desire for political separation from the rest of Spain. Artistic manifestation of renewal was lively at this time. A new architecture, with a distinct style, grew in response to the needs of the expanding city. This architectural style was rooted in local tradition which included a specifically Catalan flavour, with its Romanesque and Gothic background, as well as Moorish elements. Influences from outside Spain, affecting this style, were varied, tending to avoid Classicism, and favour Art Nouveau, German and Flemish Styles. Also admired was William Morris' English Arts and Crafts movement and Ruskin's brand of Medievalism.[1] The new Barcelona style was not, therefore, simply an imitation of Art Nouveau, or Modernist, styles from elsewhere. The principal architects responsible for the creation of this distinctive style were Lluís Domènech (1850-1923), Antoni Gaudí (1852-1926) and Josep Puig (1867-1957) although the most famous examples of their work date from 1900 onwards. But the School of Architecture, founded in 1875, sought to promote a national style which came to be known as Modernista.[2] This term was used by painters as well, to distinguish them from Spanish academic painters.

---

[1] Arts Council of Great Britain, op.cit., p. 16-7.

[2] Mendoza, op.cit., p. 149. The term was used for the first time in 1884 in the magazine L'Avene.

In painting, the Modernista style also began in the 1880s, and was based on a type of Naturalism initially taught at La Lonja School of Art[1] by Ramon Marti (1826-1894). This, in turn, was based on a knowledge of Courbet's Realism, Barbizon landscape painting and the romantic tradition in which Marti had been trained, and was an attempt to replace the anecdotal history painting which had prevailed until then. However, the generation of painters who came to be known as the prime movers in the Modernista movement had not been trained at La Lonja, but in private academies. They were mostly from wealthy bourgeois backgrounds and were thus able to travel to Paris and stay there as long as they saw fit. In general, the aims of the Modernista painters were the same as those mentioned above, that is, to search for a distinctive style at once modern and in keeping with local traditions. In the process, a number of seemingly incongrous ideas were promoted, and a diverse selection of styles and approaches were admired in all the arts. Thus, Ibsen, Wagner, Böcklin, César Franck, Puvis de Chavannes, Maeterlinck, the Pre-Raphaelites and William Morris were sources of inspiration alongside the Catalan Primitives, whom Penrose[2] has described as "bucolic and uncouth", disturbing "the usual decorum of the Byzantine

[1] Mendoza, op.cit., p. 155.

[2] Penrose, op.cit., p. 28.

formula by outbursts of emotion that appear in their facial expressions and their gestures." The dominant figures in the movement were Santiago Rusinõl (1861-1931) and Ramon Casas (1866-1932). Rusinõl was regarded as the leading personality in the movement. From 1892 to 1899, his coastal home at Sitges was the gathering place and centre of Modernist activity. Most notable were the _festes_ held there for the purpose of holding exhibitions and discussions pertinent to their ideas. It was on several of these occasions that Rusinõl made famous speeches expounding the aims of Modernism.[1] Sincerity, not rhetoric, was one of these, experimentation another. In searching for a new style, various contradictory attributes were looked on with approval - mysticism, sensuality, refinement, barbarism, medievalism and modernism. In the process of rejecting the style in which "common sense smothers us",[2] imposed by their country with its excessive prudence, almost anything, even decadence, was preferable. It was this type of speech, as well as the deliberate adoption of some elements of _fin-de-siécle_ art from abroad, that earned the Modernistes their negative reputation as decadents, causing the older generation, under the leadership of Gaudí, to form a separate, morally conservative group.[3] Another event which took place as one of the unusual entertainments at Sitges, was the revival, by way of a Holy Week-type procession, bearing two of his

---

1. Mendoza, _op.cit._, p. 149-150.
2. _Ibid._, p. 150.
3. _Ibid._, p. 23. _The Cercle Artístic de Sant Lluc._

RHO
UNIVERS
LIBRA

paintings aloft, of enthusiasm for El Greco.

As could be expected from a movement with such wide-ranging, and at times, vague, aims, and diverse sources of inspiration, in addition to individual interpretations, the paintings produced under its mantle are not easy to categorize stylistically. In searching for a factor in common which pervades most of the painting of the new Catalan style, the rendering of light and its effects on the visible world has been named as crucial.[1] This interest in light was derived from the efforts of the older Barcelona generation's discovery of Courbet and the Barbizon school, as well as from more recently discovered Impressionism. Another common factor was the representation of contemporary urban life. While these two factors were the result of visits to France and the consequent importation of a new, foreign, style to Barcelona, by members of the avant-garde, the way in which they were incorporated into Barcelona painting was quite distinctive. Rusiñol's paintings, for instance, are suffused with a mood which demonstrates a feeling of affinity with the currently fashionable literary Symbolism as well as with the Modernism of Degas, Lautrec and Whistler. Although his Parisian paintings are realistic depictions of interiors with figures in contemporary dress and occupied in fairly mundane activity, or in contemplative poses,[2] they have an evocative atmosphere unlike that in similar subjects by the French artists whom Rusiñol admired. This can be attributed to the placing of figures in the middle distance so that a more or less bare - or lonely - space intervenes between them and the viewer. The technique in these paintings is not in keeping with that of French Impressionism with its homogeneous surfaces of broken brushstrokes with resulting shimmering effects. Nor is the use of colour, which, in Rusinol's case, is muted and tends towards warm brownish-lavender tonalities. The otherwise clearly defined figures and objects are softened by the use of sfumato lines more reminiscent of Degas and Whistler[1] than of Monet or Renoir. This technique was, however, thought of in Barcelona as a sort of Impressionism. Later, back in Barcelona, Rusiñol resorted to a more overt Symbolism with overtones of his debt to the Pre-Raphaelites, Botticelli, Puvis de Chavannes and The Nabis, especially Denis. These are decorative in their rendering rather than painterly, depending for their effect on Botticelli-like flat colours and patterned surfaces contained within graceful, arabesque lines. The subjects are allegorical or pseudo-religious[2] and the effect is often whimsical or pretty, in the manner of fairly-tale illustrations of that time, or Art Nouveau posters.

---

[1] McCully, M. in Homage to Barcelona, p. 23.

[2] Examples : Interior with Figures (1894), The Bohemian (Erik Satie in his studio) (1891).

Casas, like Rusiñol, painted modern life subjects, but with a technical bravura and elegance all his own. He too,

---

1. Mendoza, op.cit., p. 156.
2. McCully, op.cit., p. 59.

however, employed some devices which, if not strictly Impressionist, were familiar in paintings by Manet and Degas. A high horizon line and "cropped" figures are the most noticeable of these.[1] His subject-matter included scenes in familiar Impressionist haunts like the Moulin de la Galette (1890) portraits of Bohemian personalities like Erik Satie (1891) and crowd scenes of political import.[2] He was a powerful draughtsman and must have been a significant influence on Picasso, whose drawing often resembled his.

Until 1897, Picasso, still very young, remained very much under the wing of his family, although he had been provided with a studio of his own near to the family's home, where, at the same time as attending classes at La Lonja, he worked under the eye of his father. During 1896, there was a large exhibition of paintings held in Barcelona, featuring works by Rusiñõl, Casas and others of the Modernist movement.[3] There is no evidence that, at this stage, Picasso had any direct, personal contact with any of these artists, but he must have been aware of their work. We are told that he befriended fellow-students at La Lonja. Even they, were, of course, slightly older. Amongst those with whom Picasso formed lasting friendships, were Manuel Pallares, Manolo Hugué, Sebastian Junyent and Carlos Casagemas.

[1] Examples : La Carga (1899), The Garroting (1894).

[2] See the above examples.

[3] Cirlot, op.cit., p. 27.

When we look at the work done by Picasso in 1896, apart from his strikingly precocious progress towards a skill and confidence quite phenomenal for his age, we can see that several different tendencies were freely manifesting themselves. There are drawings, done at the Art School, which are impeccably academic in execution, but with a forthright, objective approach quite different from the idealizations expected in such work in academic institutions. This is particularly true of his drawings from the live model.[1] His paintings of this period were serious, ambitious constructions within the norms approved in respectable circles. Best-known of these is The First Communion, a carefully constructed picture in the academic style, in which his father and sister, Lola, served as models. He entered this painting for the large exhibition mentioned above, which indicates that, though only fifteen, he felt confident enough to compete with older, well-known artists. There are beautifully painted realistic portraits of members of his family, including the poignant one of his mother and that of Aunt Pepa. These demonstrate an advanced ability in the use of free brushwork in the romantic, sketch-like style, combined with an unembelished Realism which reminds us of Velasquez. None of this work constituted any defiance on his part towards conservative, academic tastes.

It is when we turn to the numerous sketchbook drawings done by Picasso in 1896, that his tendency towards vigorous

---

1. Examples : Cirlot, op.cit., pl. 476, 477, 480, 481.

experimentation becomes apparent. Apart from the pages filled with hands, faces, figures and caricatures, there are some which show how Picasso was attempting quite complex compositional themes involving figures in various relationships to one-another.[1] These are reminiscent of the type of esquisse discussed in Part I of this research. All the drawings and paintings of this period were realistic in a traditional way, in that attention was paid to natural detail, proportion and chiaroscuro. But one drawing, Bust of a Woman in Profile[2] shows an altogether different approach - one in many ways similar to Modernist drawings of the decorative type. It shows a fashionable young woman whose hair and dress are rendered by means of decorative lines and patterns, and whose proportions are exaggerated, especially in the length of the neck, to produce an elegant, graceful effect. This drawing surely indicates that Picasso was interested in the style which was becoming popular in Rusinõl's circle. Picasso's last 1896 painting, begun at the end of the year, and completed in 1897, was, according to Cirlot[3] in keeping with "the contemporary trend of social realism, using an academic technique with fin-de-siècle colours," which tended towards lilac-mauves and ochre-greens. The painting, named Science and Charity, depicts

1. Cirlot, op.cit., pl. 57-62, 454-8.
2. Ibid., p. 43.
3. Ibid., p. 37.

a sick-bed scene of the type reminiscent of earlier 19th century French death-bed scenes such as A. Scheffer's Death of Géricault. Again, Picasso's father was the model for the figure of the doctor. Cirlot[1] tells us that the painting was a success, being sent to the National Exhibition of 1897 and an exhibition at Malaga, where it won an honourable mention, and a gold medal, respectively. This was, indeed, a remarkable achievement for a boy only a little older than fifteen. However, the style of the painting was, to a great extent, within the current academic taste in Spain.

It was from 1897 that Picasso's emancipation from this style gained momentum. A contributing factor to this was the gradual loosening of his bonds with his family and the inevitable parental authority this entailed. More importantly, he was freer from his father's artistic guidance, as he had prevailed upon the latter to allow him to move from the studio close to the family home to one further away late in 1896.[2] The result was a far greater independence both in his lifestyle and work. The influence of Modernism became more apparent in both his paintings and drawings. In his paintings - mainly landscapes, at this time - the technique is lighter, compositions less cluttered, and there is a deliberate use of soft Modernist colours which merge with

[1] Cirlot, op.cit., p. 39.

[2] Ibid., p. 40.

one another gently, and the adoption of sfumato lines, as a device enhancing this softness. In his drawings, an interesting new manner made its appearance for the first time. This was a very emphatic, assured, angular rendering, tending towards stylization, in several studies in crayon, charcoal, and ink of his sister, his father, the nude model, etcetera.[1] According to Cirlot,[2] the 1896-97 sketchbooks "show real progress" at the same time as a tendency which became increasingly noticeable in Picasso's work, to vary his style and approach, apparently at random, but usually out of curiosity to try out new ways of expressing himself. These were frequently inspired by the sight of works by other artists, whom Picasso, within a short period, was usually able to outstrip at their own style. This tendency, to which we shall refer many times again in this research, gave rise to Picasso's reputation for unpredictable stylistic changes, often accounted for by writers as a manifestation of his restlessness, or contradictoriness. For example, while, during the same period, continuing with more-or-less academic studies, Picasso also made numerous sketches and drawings, such as those mentioned above, in which he employed a type of drawing reminiscent of work by Casas and Rusiñol, except that Picasso's are less romantic and more angular.[3]

[1] Examples : Cirlot, op.cit., pl. 68-71 (Lola), pl. 508-510, 518 (Don José et al).

[2] Ibid., p. 39.

[3] Examples : Molas, I. in Homage to Barcelona, p. 84.

But there are other drawings, such as Girl and Goat[1] in a more curvilinear, decorative style, like the profile bust of a woman mentioned earlier,[2] as well as a realistic, but not academic, self-portrait,[3] in conté crayon and charcoal, with a remarkable simplicity and solidity which impart to it a gravity similar to that in many portraits by Casas and Rusiñol.

We must assume that these stylistic experiments, with their obvious debt to Modernism, are evidence that Picasso was now at liberty to associate more freely with members of the avant-garde and that he probably frequented, with his friends, the new tavern, Els Quatre Gats, which became their gathering place.

Els Quatre Gats, a café-cum artistic, musical and literary venue styled after similar establishments in Montmartre, such as the Moulin de la Galette and Chat Noir, was opened by Pere Romeu in July 1897. His own sojourn in France had provided him with an idea of bohemian life which he sought to emulate in Barcelona. This included a style of dress featuring "a long waistcoat and flat-brimmed hat"[4] affected by aspiring bohemians, and reflected in many drawings and paintings of the period. Picasso himself appears frequently

1. Cirlot, op.cit., pl. 507.
2. See p. 156 in the text.
3. Cirlot, op.cit., pl. 514.
4. McCully, op.cit., p. 34.

in the shabby attire and hat characteristic of this fashion[1] from 1897 onwards. The café was housed in a building designed by Puig[2] and the setting was eminently suited for the type of entertainment which took place there, including poetry readings, musical performances and meetings. Paintings, ceramics, neo-Gothic furniture and fittings created the atmosphere condusive to these events. What is of most concern here is that space was provided for exhibitions in an informal setting quite different from that of the official Salons or the commercial gallery, the Sala Parés. Young artists were afforded the opportunity of pinning their work up on the walls alongside that of seasoned artists. In this way they hoped to draw attention from the Press. But, in spite of the stimulating atmosphere provided by Els Quatre Gats and its frequenters, Picasso's restlessness increased, and, not long after the opening of the café in October 1897, he left La Lonja Art School to go to Madrid, presumably in search of something which would satisfy his need for new challenges. He entered the Royal Academy of San Fernando, having completed the requirements for admission in the same phenomenal way as he had done at La Lonja. He was on the register of the Academy in 1897 and 1898 and, in keeping with a similar practice in the French Academy, described himself as the pupil of one of the established

---

1. McCully, op.cit, p. 32., Cirlot, op.cit., pl. 675.

2. Ibid, pl. 30. This is a photograph showing the interior of the café and illustrates typical Modernist architectural features, as well as the famous painting by Casas of himself and Romeu astride a tandem cycle.

masters, Munoz Degrain.[1] But he spent little time there,[2] interesting himself more in the Prado Museum, where he copied the works of masters such as Velasquez. Otherwise, he immersed himself in the life of poverty and bohemianism which was to be found in some quarters of Madrid, and to which he was attracted. There were no longer any parental curbs on his participation in the type of activity to be found in such places.

The work Picasso did while in Madrid was, in some ways, a continuation of his preceding phase. Cirlot[3] speaks of two paintings of the Park in Madrid, El Retiro and A Lake at El Retiro, as revealing "the first stirrings of Modernism in Picasso." However, these display a use of sfumato effects and a mauve/green/grey colouration already in evidence in earlier works. Cirlot[4] finds a subtle difference of feeling in these two paintings, though, which he describes as an undercurrent of restlessness and uneasiness, due to the elusive atmosphere in which the subject is bathed. This quality is usually not present in traditional works.

But, as in most of Picasso's adolescent developments, the most interesting and signficant progress must be looked for in his sketchbooks. Two types of sketches predominate, those from life, and those drawn from imagination. The first type consists mainly of street scenes, horses, city people, park scenes, workers and carters in caps and smocks, and animals, particularly goats. The second consists of female figures dressed in swirling, curvilinear skirts, sometimes oddly striped - horizontally, following the bodily contours of shoulders, hips and busts.[1] The attitude of these figures is elegant, decorative, sometimes languid, in keeping with the fashion of the time. Some of these drawings, notably the carters and goats have heavy, at times, fuzzy, outlines which are exaggerated in such a way that the shapes they confine are billowing and distorted.[2] There are two sketches,[3] one a typical fin-de-siécle woman, the other a caricature of a man, in which the outline is repeated, parallel to the real one, several times, in a way resembling ripples. Cirlot[4] draws our attention to an inscription on the latter sketch with the words, "Rechs prerafaelista", which makes it clear that Picasso was acquainted with the English movement of that name.

---

[1] Cirlot, op.cit., p. 65.

[2] Penrose, op.cit., p. 39-42. Apparently, Picasso mostly absented himself from the Academy, saying afterwards, to his friend, Sabartes, "Why should I have gone there?" The aristocratic portrait-painting and history-painting done by Academy artists held no interest for Picasso, who already had a taste for the new.

[3] Cirlot, op.cit., p. 65.

[4] Ibid.

In June 1898, Picasso contracted scarlet fever and, as a consequence, left Madrid to convalesce in the village, Horta de Ebro with his friend, Pallares, who had grown up there. In February 1899, he returned to Barcelona, this

[1] Examples : Cirlot, op.cit., pl. 533, 107.

[2] Ibid., pl. 104, 569 - 573.

[3] Ibid., pl. 109, 527.

[4] Ibid., p. 66.

time to live in a studio which he shared with a friend.[1] Until then, he had lived with his family and worked in his own studio. Cirlot[2] tells us the reasons for this move were that Picasso and his family were at odds with one another at this time. This additional liberty resulted in his acquaintance with older, more seasoned intellectuals and artists who were part of the Modernist movement and who met at Els Quatre Gats. As far as his apprenticeship at Art School and Academy was concerned, this was over, and in 1899 and 1900, Picasso could pursue a course inspired by his own unbridled vitality, combined with the stimulating ideology which was part of Modernism.

Some aspects of this ideology have already been described : that is, as it had been a few years earlier when Rusiñõl's seaside home had been the centre of Modernist activity. But, by 1899, a younger generation of Modernistes was beginning to make its mark. They too had essentially bourgeois backgrounds, but with this difference - theirs was a predominantly lower-middle-class background as against that of Rusiñõl and Casas. Consequently, they were more susceptible to the cultivation of sympathy with marginal, or deprived, sectors of the community. They gravitated towards the "so called Chinatown of Barcelona ... with its ... gay and sordid"[3] atmosphere and its dangerous

---

1. Penrose, op.cit., p. 43.
2. Cirlot, op.cit., p. 87.
3. Penrose, op.cit., p. 45.

lifestyle of which resistance to the established order, and anarchy, were components. Picasso was soon accepted as a junior member of this group which began to replace Rusiñol and Casas as the most colourful personalities at Els Quatre Gats. Most of these artists were almost ten years older than Picasso, and had spent some time in Paris where they, like the older generation, absorbed those features of Impressionism and Post-Impressionism which were suited to their individual styles. Mendoza[1] has provided the names of some of these together with brief accounts of the trends which can be seen in some of their work. Isidre Nonell (1873-1911) was, possibly, the most dominant of this group, which, from 1893-96, had been known as the Colla del Safrà, and we hear mention of his name most frequently in connection with Picasso. His work, as far as subject matter is concerned, centers around the representation of Gipsies in which the emphasis is on the bulk of the figures, dressed in voluminous garments which occupy most of the pictorial space.[2] Warmth, dignity and mystery are imparted to these figures by the extreme simplicity of composition, the large areas of dark colour in some garments, in the swarthy heads with their closed expressions and black hair, contrasted with equally large areas of loosely applied, rich, lighter-coloured impasto. The brushstrokes are particularly distinctive. Even in a small reproduction, they appear broad and un-

[1] Mendoza, op.cit., p. 162-7.

[2] Examples : Seated Woman (1899), Repose (1904), La Manuela (1906), Two Gypsy Women (1903).

refined. In a later paragraph, it will be necessary to refer to Nonell's figure paintings again, as they certainly provide us with an insight into Picasso's Blue Period paintings of similar types.

Others, identified by Mendoza[1] as responsible for "this brilliant phase of Catalan painting", include Joaquim Mir (1873-1940), and Hermen Anglada (1871-1959). Mir was the exception, within the group, in that he never made the trip to Paris, but remained in Catalonia, whereas Anglada took up permanent residence in Paris in 1898. Mendoza[2] has described Mir as "the purest representative of Catalan landscape painting in this period." The reproduction of one of his works certainly shows obvious Modernist borrowings from French painting but also a quality quite unlike anything outside Catalonia. Anglada, on the other hand, seems to have been interested in the decorative aspects of Modernism as derived from Degas and Lautrec.

The general atmosphere at Els Quatre Gats, of sympathy with those artists who were, in the words of the anarchist writer, Jaime Brossa,[4] out to "defeat the 'bourgeois and the philistine'", suited Picasso's temperament. He was not particularly preoccupied with political issues, but the unruly ideas and

---

1. Mendoza, _op.cit_.,
2. _Ibid_., p. 167.
3. _Ibid_., pl. 170.
4. Penrose, _op.cit_., p. 48.

mannerisms adopted by the group appealed to him. Like them, he enjoyed expressing himself in a deliberate, somewhat affected, anarchist style. This, as has already been mentioned,[1] was extended to their manner of dress which, together with the mannerisms imported from bohemian Paris, sought to imitate that of the "anarchist agitators who were the heroes of the working class",[2] which took the form of "a proletarian dandyism."[3] The exhibitions which were held at Els Quatre Gats, provided an outlet for the artistic expression of these, and other, impulses. Nonell had had his first one-man show there in 1893, although Rusiñol and Casas hung paintings there regularly, as did other Modernists. Roughly the same artistic, literary, musical and philosophical figures were admired there around 1899-1900 as had been the case at Sitges, with the addition of Nietzsche, Huysmans, Steinlen and Munch.[4] As far as painting was concerned, the curious blend of Symbolism, Naturalism and local subject-matter was now combined with an even stranger version of Modernist execution as evidenced particularly in Nonell's paintings. From the time of his return to Barcelona, Picasso, apparently, attended the tertulias, or gatherings, held regularly at the café.[5] On these occasions, plays were read or performed, music concerts took place, and works by

[1] See p. 159 in the text.

[2] Penrose, op.cit., p. 48.

[3] Ibid.

[4] See p. 150 in the text.

[5] Mendoza, op.cit., p. 167.

artists were displayed. Picasso exhibited there, for the first time in February 1900, works which consisted mainly of charcoal and coloured drawings, the subjects of which were portraits of friends and patrons of the café.[1] The reviews of this work were not altogether favourable but "his role as artistic provacateur was well secured within the group."[2] Furthermore, soon afterwards, one of his paintings was chosen as part of the Spanish contribution to the 1900 Universal Exhibition in Paris.[3]

This brief account of the avant-garde life-style which Picasso shared after 1899, having freed himself to a large extent from the constraints imposed by both family and academic institutions, should make it easier to understand his extremely unconventional development from that time onwards. His natural, abnormally brilliant, ability, prolific production, insatiable curiosity, and those facets of his temperament which have been variously described as mercurial, impulsive, etcetera, also explain this development. When we examine his paintings of 1899 to 1900, prior to his first visit to Paris, it is clear that his tendency to experiment was becoming bolder. Until then, most of his really unusual work was to be found in sketchbooks, which, obviously, were not always taken seriously by him. Now, in his paintings, although the Modernist sfumato effect is still a feature, there is an assurance not always present in 1898 paintings. Also noticeable is that Picasso seemed to have little desire to continue along traditional lines and produce compositions of the type seen in First Communion and Science and Charity. In fact, the contrary was the case. Whatever the subject-matter - portraits, a seated woman, a Barcelona street-scene viewed from a high window, a window[1] - the compositions are very simple, and the execution as economical as possible. The paint, often so thin that it resembles wash,[2] has been hastily applied with consequent streakiness.[3] The variation in style shows that Picasso freely used whatever styles took his fancy at the moment. Thus, we can detect the French influence in the soft forms and sweeping lines in some paintings, while in others he obviously drew inspiration from the current interest in El Greco.[4] However, in all these paintings, the colour-range is sombre in comparison with that in the previous year's work.[5] Cirlot[6] points to an interesting development in Riera de San Juan (1900), in which the brushstrokes are extremely simple and are used to indicate shapes as well as foreshortening in an abbreviated way which amounts to abstraction. An interesting departure from naturalistic detail can be seen in Andalusian Courtyard (1899-1900) and Girl in White [Lola] by a Window (1900).

---

[1] Examples : Rubin, op.cit., p. 19, includes Romeu, Rusiñol, Self-portrait, Anglada, Casas, Manolo, Casagemas.

[2] McCully, op.cit., p. 39.

[3] Ibid.

---

1. Cirlot, op.cit., pl. 150-3.
2. Ibid., pl. 152, Seated Woman Reading (1899).
3. Ibid., pl. 151, Barcelona (1900).
4. Ibid., pl. 150.
5. Ibid., pl. 118,119.
6. Ibid., p. 93.

Not only are the shapes of figures and objects simplified, but they are rendered almost entirely without modelling, relying on contrasts in local colour for tonal effects. Furthermore, the heads and faces are devoid of features, consisting simply of hastily brushed-in ovals of flat colour approximating to that of flesh. What Picasso seems to have been concentrating on, in these figures, was the gesture, or stance, of each figure as a whole. These are markedly different from the Seated Woman Reading, in which the woman's features are sensitively, and accurately, represented in considerable detail. Lastly, there are paintings which indicate an interest in fin-de-siécle pathos or a type of Expressionism which may have been inspired by Munch's work. One such painting is Interior Scene (1899-1900) in which a sickbed scene with a dark, ominous atmosphere is portrayed.

Picasso, as always, produced vast quantities of drawings in 1899 and 1900. Many of these are Modernist in style and conception. As with his paintings however, in which, no matter what the influence, the style is peculiarly his own, so too, in the drawings, while influences, such as Casas' are obvious, there is an individuality which is Picasso's own. Cirlot[1] warns against over-rigorous attempts to explain the style of Picasso's drawings purely in terms of influences. If they sometimes remind us of Casas, Steinlen or Munch, the resemblances are often superficial. For

---

1. Cirlot, op.cit., p. 93.

example, if we look at three drawings by Casas, reproduced in Homage to Barcelona,[1] their similarity to Picasso's drawing of Ramon Reventos is striking, and not surprising when we notice that they are all dated, 1899. But Casas' drawings show a different attitude towards characterization. In his case, despite powerful draughtsmanship and obvious accuracy as far as likeness is concerned, there is none of the piquant, at times, cruel, characterization which often amounts to caricature in Picasso's drawings. Furthermore, in this particular Picasso drawing, we can see that Picasso was not particularly interested in portraying the complete figure, nor in including more detail than was barely necessary. Although Picasso was openly intrigued and affected by whatever he saw, his independence usually manifested itself. Cirlot[2] insists that Picasso's work should be seen in terms of his own development; that is, where odd new styles appear, these are most likely the sequel or forerunner of one of his own periods.

A thorough study of Picasso's early drawings makes Barr's[3] evaluation of them as "not particularly distinguished", astonishing. Quite apart from the quality of many of these drawings - astounding if we consider that Picasso was not yet twenty - there is such a great variety of styles and subjects in them that they are of utmost interest, especially

[1] Mendoza, op.cit., pl. 151-3.

[2] Cirlot, op.cit., p. 93.

[3] Barr, A.H., Jnr. Picaso - Fifty Years of His Art, p. 17.

if we are to understand the contradictoriness which was increasingly noticeable at this time and which is one of the baffling characteristics of Picasso's work as a whole. Sometimes, Picasso continued to draw in a fairly traditional manner.[1] At other times he adapted this manner by combining it with a Modernist one, producing very emphatic drawings with clear, simplified tonal contrasts, forthright Realism[2] and a monumental effect. There are other, thematic sketches in which different ways of interpreting a subject were attempted.[3] The decorative Modernist trend also occurred frequently and was manifested in the continued use of flowing lines and fashionable shapes. But the lines are subtler than they were in similar earlier drawings. They vary in thickness, and are often left open.[4] The earlier trend towards angularity was sometimes combined with a geometric rendering of forms, but with a more powerful effect than in the 1898 drawings of Lola.[5] Satire and caricature abound in the sketchbooks, as well as the usual heads, feet, hands etcetera.[6] Self-portrait sketches appear on the same pages as sketches of friends or characters from the streets, taverns and brothels of Barcelona. As in the paintings of the period, scenes of pathos, destitution and degradation are explored in various ways.[7] Finally, the theme of the

---

1. Cirlot, op.cit., pl. 626, Torso of a Youth.
2. Ibid., pl. 627-632. Clothed and Nude figures.
3. Examples : Cirlot, op.cit., pl. 657-9, 198-206.
4. Examples : Ibid., pl. 194-7, 207-8.
5. Examples : Ibid., pl. 662-3.
6. Examples : Ibid., pl. 675-684.
7. Examples : Ibid., pl. 198-201.

bullfight, which was to preoccupy Picasso at various stages throughout his life, appeared, at this time, in some interesting pen-and-ink and wash drawings, in which a very abbreviated, calligraphic technique was used for the first time.[1]

If we wish to summarize the salient features of Picasso's youthful development, it could be said that the unusual freedom with which, by 1900, he was trying out a variety of themes, approaches and techniques, was the result, partly, of a youthful lack of direction on his part, partly, of the lack of conventional restraint which had marked his education and upbringing as a whole, and partly as a result of the family's move to Barcelona at such an imporant time in the city's cultural history. Experimentation and impatient discovery began, for him, at an early age. Progress took place at a phenomenal pace, so that slow, evolutionary shifts in emphasis, or modification of traditional styles could not, for long, satisfy his restless temperament. His tendency, well established by 1900, to be at variance with tradition and - with apparent capriciousness - to toy with different styles in which to render these, led, inevitably, to an increase in his use of exaggeration and distortion for expressive purposes. In spite of the vibrant cultural atmosphere in Modernist Barcelona circles, it was not long before Picasso longed to travel further afield and discover the wider European Modernism for himself. His arrival in Paris on a short visit later in 1900 must be seen against his Barcelona background which had instilled in him a perpetual search for the new and the dynamic.

---

[1] Examples : Cirlot, op.cit., pl. 179-181.

## Picasso's First Visits to France and the Blue Period

In October 1900, Picasso, in the company of his friend, Carlos Casagemas, made the first of a series of visits to Paris. This visit was inspired by the Modernist sentiment about the "North" which was prevalent amongst frequenters of the Els Quatre Gats as well as by the notions about modern styles of painting with which older artists had returned to Barcelona. It has been noted that a painting of Picasso's had been chosen for the Universal Exhibition. All these considerations, as well as the knowledge that a great deal of modern painting would be on view in Paris that year, were the probable reasons for this particular visit. The visit lasted only until December, when the two friends ran out of money, but in that time, they managed to see a great deal and Picasso returned to Spain with some work. On this first visit to Paris, Picasso and Casagemas stayed in a studio rented by Nonell. They remained close to the Spanish colony in Paris, which, at that time, included Paco Durio and Manolo Hugué. Picasso painted his first Parisian pictures, Le Moulin de la Galette and The Blue Dancer in these two months. Apart from visiting the Exposition, he visited dealers where he saw works by Cézanne, Lautrec, Degas, Signac, Bonnard and Vuillard, as well as meeting the dealers Berthe Weill and Mañach. The latter must have been impressed by the young Spanish artist because he made a contract with him for 150 francs a month in exchange for paintings.[1]

It is quite obvious that the inspriration for the two paintings mentioned above was derived from works within recent French Impressionist tradition. Their subject-matter led them, and other similar ones, painted on subsequent visits to Paris, to be referred to as Picasso's "cabaret" series. However, there is an un-French quality about these pictures which Hilton[2] has described as "a social downgrading" of the French way of rendering contemporary café life as Manet, Renoir and even Lautrec had done. He attributes this to the fact that Picasso's connection with French art, at this time, was tenuous, as was his understanding of French social conditions.[3] Picasso's rendering of the Moulin de la Galette is very similar to Renoir's in composition. In both versions, a table at which a group of figures is seated, occupies the foreground, but slightly to one side. The middle ground consists of dancing couples above whom the lights of the café shine. But Renoir's rendering of the light in this scene is dappled, and the forms of the figures are sensuous. The overall

1. Rubin, op.cit., p. 28.
2. Hilton, T. Picasso, p. 16.
3. Ibid., p. 17.

feeling of his painting is light-hearted and convivial. By comparison, Picasso's rendering is dark, the atmosphere heavy, due to his way of starkly contrasting light and dark shapes. The figures on the left, in the foreground, do not form a cheerful group as do those in Renoir's seated group. The table in the Picasso picture is incomplete as is the figure closest to the viewer, whose relationship to the other figures is ambiguous. In social outlook, Picasso's Moulin de la Galette is closer to Lautrec's. They share a tendency to enhance the grotesque aspects of the subject by caricaturing the figures, except that Lautrec was more specific, in that he individualized the three figures in the foreground, whereas the quality of caricature in Picaso's picture lies more in a generalized oddity of pose and grouping of the figures. Thus, Picasso's version lacks the caustic wit peculiar to Lautrec's renderings of low-life subjects. At this stage, Picasso's work was striking for its lack of that lightness of touch which characterized French painting in the Impressionist tradition. All the same, whether, as a result of his exposure to styles related to Impressionism, or to natural development, Picasso made great strides in painting at this time, so that it is possible, from this point onwards, to discuss his paintings, rather than his drawings, in terms of the progress he was making. His Moulin de la Galette, in composition, in distribution of light and dark, in piquancy of shapes and in technique, is a decided advance upon Andalusian Courtyard. The most striking thing about Picasso's painting style from this time onwards is the emphatic quality which, until then, had been present to a far greater extent in his drawings. Here, it should be noted that Picasso was never particularly interested in painterly procedures or effects, except when these added to the ironical or metaphorical content of pictures, as in his Cubist period.[1] On the whole, his painting was directed, in a single-minded fashion, towards the particular expression of subjects, or towards experimenting with a variety of solutions in which pictorial elements were freely arranged and rearranged. Given these preoccupations, his straightforward technical procedure is understandable. Unlike French progressive artists of an earlier generation, Picasso was not inhibited by considerations stemming from academic doctrine regarding either method or subject matter, having rejected the traditional approach applied in Spanish institutions at such an early age that he was free to follow his own course. This course led him to leave Spain and take up residence in France, but this only happened in 1904. In the meantime, he went through a period of uncertainty and transition in which he made several trips to and from Paris. If we remember how young he was at the time, we realise that, not only was he making the difficult decision to break his ties with his own country and make his way in another, he was also maturing artistically and otherwise.

[1] For example, in the "painterly" phase of Cubism, or when textures were employed in the "Collage" and "Synthetic" phases.

On his return to Spain, after his initial trip to Paris, in December 1900, Picasso did not go to Barcelona. Instead he went to Madrid. The reasons for this were probably various. Sabartes[1] has suggested that restlessness was the reason. The idea of remaining in France had not occurred to him, yet he was searching for a prospect which would satisfy his need to develop his unusual talent. Another reason for the move may have been a serious rift which troubled relations between himself and his family. On this subject, Penrose[2] says that "Picasso was quick to realize that a barrier had once and for all blocked the way between the conventional respectability of his family and his own ideas." By this time, these were decidedly unconventional. But, while in Madrid, news reached him of the unhappy fate of his companion, Casagemas, who, while in Paris, had fallen in love, and returned to Paris, only to be bitterly disappointed in the outcome. In February 1901, he committed suicide by dramatically shooting himself in a café in Paris. At the time, Picasso was involved in illustrating the review Arte Joven, and the news of Casagemas' tragic end probably provided the impetus for his departure from Madrid in April, a brief stay in Barcelona, and a second trip to Paris in May. Casegemas' death affected him profoundly and his grief and shock were, in due course, expressed in several paintings

---

1. Sabartes and Boeck, op.cit., p. 52.

2. Penrose, op.cit., p. 60.

dated Summer 1901[1] and a final one dated Summer 1903.[2] Obviously, the prospects in Madrid had turned out to have no more holding-power than those in Barcelona. This second visit to Paris was longer, lasting until January 1902. It was also extremely fruitful as far as Picasso's painting, and its reception both in Barcelona, at the Sala Parés,[3] and in Paris, at Ambroise Vollard's Gallery,[4] was concerned. It was also the time when Picasso made friends outside the Spanish circle. The staunchest of these friends was Max Jacob, to whom Picasso had been introduced by his dealer, Mañach. Another thing worth mentioning is that from about June 1901, his paintings began to be signed, simply, "Picasso", replacing his earlier "P. Ruiz Picasso".

Picasso's paintings belonging to this second Parisian period, as well as his drawings, show that, in many ways, he was coming to grips with French preoccupations and styles. At times, there is a glimpse of the self-consciousness behind this effort to become more at home in what was still a very foreign capital. For example, there exists a drawing, Parody of Manet's Olympia, showing himself and Junyer-Vidal on either side of a bed, nude, on which reclines a heavy Black nude woman. In his serious work, however, he continued to work in a manner begun on his first stay in Paris; that

[1] Portrait of the Dead Casagemas, The Death of Casagemas, The Burial of Casagemas (or Evocation).

[2] La Vie.

[3] Rubin, op.cit., p. 29. This show was organized by Miguel Utrillo, one of the leading lights in the Modernista movement. Casas' drawing of Picaso appeared on the catalogue.

[4] Ibid., 15 works were sold and the critic Félicien Fagus praised it.

is, his subjects were often drawn from the night-life to be found in cafés, drinking-places and the like. He also painted several portraits, the Casagemas pictures, a self-portrait and three paintings of a subject which would become important to him in 1904 and 1905 - the people of the circus. In all this work, it can be seen how Picasso rapidly absorbed styles to which he was attracted, or which were important in current developments of which he would have been aware. This being the case, his 1901 work bears testimony to the importance still attached to Impressionism, and its offshoots, in progressive art circles in the first years of the 20th century. Unless this is understood, it will be impossible to explain the emergence of the progressive styles which sought to replace Impressionism as the major factor in the modern movement - namely, Fauvism and Cubism.

Hindsight has tended to make us regard Impressionism as past its heyday by the late 1880s, having been the new style of the 1870s until the last Impressionist exhibition in 1886. After that, as we have seen, a diversification had taken place, but, it has been noted, the impact of Impressionism remained vital, even to those who followed other courses eventually. Most progressive artists had felt this impact at some stage in their development, producing, for a while, more or less Impressionist works before discovering other ways of interpreting Impressionist use of colour, rendering of light, and loose execution, in which broken brushstokes are the most striking feature. Around 1900, Impressionism and its most systematic offshoot, Divisionism, were still very much an issue. This will be discussed in a little more detail in a later paragraph when those aspects of Fauvism important to this research come under consideration. In 1901, Picasso could not have understood all the issues facing French artists, but, like them, he sensed the importance of much of the art which was only then becoming widely known in Paris, including Impressionism. Oppler[1] has demonstrated that, as late as 1900, Impressionism was still being discovered as an exciting alternative to the traditional styles taught in art schools. She reminds us that the first collection of Impressionist paintings were hung in a museum in 1897, also that, although Seurat and Van Gogh were dead, Renoir, Monet and Cézanne were still painting. Works by Renoir and Monet were still being shown at galleries such as Vollard's and Durand-Ruel's. Pissarro, always anxious to nurture young talent, was still giving advice - to Matisse and Friesz.[2]

Although Picasso's paintings of 1901 frequently show that he was trying to incorporate techniques derived from Impressionism into his painting, there was still a very un-French approach underneath the Divisionist brushstokes, the pure colours and the Parisian subject-matter which

[1] Oppler, E.C., Fauvism Reexamined, p. 39-41.

[2] Ibid., p. 41.

distinguished his Moulin de la Galette from its fore-runners. Perhaps this was because Picasso did not hesitate to combine elements from all the Modernist art with which he was familiar. For example, in a small canvas, Enclosure at Anteuil, he combined fin-de-siécle shapes of fashionable women with unmixed Impressionist colours which are, however, confined within the shapes in a manner reminiscent of Gauguin and the Pont-Aven Synthetists. Picasso, in this, and other paintings in which he used broken brushstokes, did not attempt to create the unity of atmosphere and light which is a major factor in Impressionist paintings. It was when he painted portraits or figures in which he wished to emphasize likeness, however, that we are most aware of his Spanish origins. His low-life types have a sinister, brutal ugliness not even present in Lautrec's renderings of the same types. They remind us of the kind of face and figure to be encountered in Goya's work. His interest in these subjects appears to have stemmed from his tendency to caricature human types. Examples of such paintings are the ferocious-looking Woman in Blue (painted at the end of the Madrid episode), Absinthe Drinker, Portrait of Gustave Coquiot and the Self Portrait : Yo Picasso, in which he saw himself in a similar light. But, other paintings of the period show another side of Picasso's personality, the side which understood misery. His paintings of the dead Casegemas' face are a poignant reminder of the tragedy which overtook the latter.

Hilton[1] has analyzed some reasons for rejecting the notion that Picasso's early Parisian paintings were indebted to French painting of the previous thirty years in any but superficial aspects. At all times, Picasso made modifications to styles derived from outside his own immediate sphere, so that something different was created as a result. Hilton[2] has pinpointed some telltale differences, for instance, between Picasso's style and Lautrec's. Picasso's rendering of low-life subjects, for example, shows a relative lack of interest in the elegant lines which created refined silhouettes in Lautrec's renderings. Even when fashionable figures were deliberately chosen as subjects, Picasso did not stress their elegance, but rather their potency in creating interesting shapes and their formal relationships to one-another. Picasso's fundamental indifference to French elegance is particularly striking in two paintings of deformed subjects which he rendered with violence and brutality; Old Woman and Dwarf Dancer. These, like those mentioned above, are more reminiscent of Velasquez and Goya than of Lautrec. Hilton[3] also points out that Picasso used broken brushstrokes and lurid colours arbitrarily in a way unrelated to the systematic application of these by French artists. Finally, Hilton[4] tells us that the other self-portrait painted in 1901 - one of the best known, in

[1] Hilton, op.cit., p. 17-9.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 17-8.

[4] Ibid., p. 22.

which Picasso depicted himself poor, hungry and dramatically dressed in a voluminous black coat - was derived from similar self-portraits by Van Gogh which, he says, Picasso "would have seen at Vollards." It is a self-conscious self-portrait, in which Picasso made himself look older and poorer than he really was, and it is "significantly reminiscent of those self-portraits and mutual portraits which used to circulate at the end of the 1880s among Van Gogh's and Gauguin's friends."[1] It is nevertheless, stylistically, unlike any of the portraits and self-portraits by these two artists.

During Picasso's early visits to Paris, he is known to have visited the Louvre , where he not only studied the old masters, but was interested in the displays of Egyptian and ancient Mediterranean art in the Museum.[2] This may explain the appearance of some "archaisms" in Picasso's work around the end of 1901. Examples of this trend have been reproduced by Cirlot.[3] One of these, Blue Nude, shows that Picasso, whose drawing was usually accurate and versatile, was deliberately adopting a pseudo-naïve manner. There are drawings in which references to primitive sculpture are obvious. In these, figures are heavy and stylized, while heads turn on shoulders stiffly at right angles, in a way

[1] Hilton, op.cit., p. 22.

[2] Barr, op.cit., p. 19.

[3] Cirlot, op.cit., pl. 222, 227, 252-5, 921-9.

foreign to the traditional gentle spiral movement familiar in European art since the Renaissance. This new tendency of Picasso's followed the cabaret series, which did not preoccupy him for long, and it was to become an important ingredient in his work increasingly after 1901.

The period which followed, and which lasted until the end of 1904 is generally known as the "Blue Period". It was one of the first periods of Picasso's career to become well-known. Barr[1] feels that this period has never been convincingly explained, in the sense that, in view of Picasso's preceding period, there was no apparent reason why he abandoned landscapes, boulevard scenes and cabaret subjects to concentrate on the human figure placed in extremely simple or neutral settings, nor why these should have been executed in what was virtually monochrome blue. At this time, Picasso certainly seemed ready for another change, and, as was his wont, this, on the surface, had no connection with preceding works. However, the first paintings in which blue predominated, were, in many respects, quite conservative, and seem to show how, in fact, they developed out of his prevous period. The Blue Room (September-October, 1901) as well as portraits of Sabartés and de Soto were the first of the new "cycle", as Cirlot[2] terms the

---

1. Barr, op.cit., p. 22.
2. Cirlot, op.cit., p. 127.

period as a whole. But, as Raynal[1] puts it, The Blue Room largely retains the Realist technique he had practised in Barcelona, and, we should add, that acquired in Paris, with its rich impasto, broadly applied, in relatively light, pure colours. At this stage, as Raynal[2] goes on to say, there was hardly a hint of the "incisive linework" of the Blue Period proper. One thing we cannot help noticing in this and other early blue pictures such as The Blue Goblet and Roofs of Barcelona is the change of mood from the cynicism of the cabaret series to a contemplative atmosphere of reverie which is, at times, quite tender. Furthermore, in handling, the portraits of late 1901 - early 1902[3] show considerable sobriety, in comparison, for example, to the showy, subjective bravura of Gustave Coquiot. This would seem to indicate an attitude of relative detachment towards the subject which allows for a greater delicacy and sympathy towards the sitter. Such sensitive handling of portaits had, more or less, been in eclipse since Picasso's adolescent representations of members of his family. But the paintings which are quite different from anything Picasso had accomplished sofar, are certainly those in which the archaic influence is a powerful element. The first of these, Blue Nude, has already been mentioned, as have the drawings which

---

1. Raynal, M. Picasso, p. 23.
2. Ibid.
3. Examples : Sebastián Junyent, Fernández de Soto.

show Picasso's new preoccupation around the end of 1901. For the time being, it seems that Picasso was searching for a new direction which did not have much in common with current French progressive trends, even those which had also discovered the strange beauty of exotic primitive art. The exact reasons for the course Picasso now took are not particularly important, although a thorough inspection of as much of his work as is available does reveal a continuity in a special sense applying to Picasso. His practice, developed at an early age, of capriciously changing course, or of "juggling" with all sorts of styles, meant that elements which later appeared in major stylistic developments were frequently already present in his sketchbooks. He was capable of working out diametrically opposed themes, techniques and styles concurrently. Every now and then, something entirely new such as the above-mentioned archaism, was incorporated into his repertoire. With this in mind, the paintings he produced at any given time do not constitute as much of a mystery as is often made out to be the case.

There were other factors, apart from the above considerations, which must be taken into account if we are to understand the vicissitudes of Picasso's career at this stage. These arose out of his personal circumstances. Early in 1902, he had returned to Barcelona with some financial assistance by his family. On this occasion, a reconciliation between him and his parents took place, presumably as Penrose[1]

---

1. Penrose, op.cit., p. 78.

suggests, as a result of his family's eventual acceptance of his independence. It is worth noting that the Blue Period more or less coincided with what were to be Picasso's last two return trips there during which signficant artistic development on his part took place.[1] It is not surprising, if we consider that at this time he was probably already wavering about whether his future lay in Barcelona or in Paris, that the work done in Barcelona reflected a temporary desire to return to his roots. This is confirmed by the fact that, almost immediately after his return, he took up again with his Els Quatre Gats friends while, at the same time, throwing himself into his new style with a confidence derived from his recent first-hand encounter with French Modernism and also from his modest financial success in Paris - no mean achievement for an outsider as young as he was. Back in Barcelona, his discovery of ancient art was reinforced by the enthusiasm for the Catalan Primitives currently enjoying a vogue in the city's Modernista circles. This Primitivism went hand-in-hand with a cultivated fin-de-siécle melancholy outlook and sympathy with the outcasts of society. In this respect, Picasso's renewed contact with Isidre Nonell, in particular, was likely to encourage him in his latest stylistic venture. Nonell exemplified the Modernista habit of identifying with social outcasts. His obsession with the marginal life of Gipsies had led to

[1] In October 1902, Picasso and Junyer-Vidal returned to Paris, but Picasso was back in Barcelona by January 1903 where he stayed until Spring 1904.

his own assimilation into the subculture to such an extent that he went to live with them. But, this tendency was not confined to Gipsies. It was extended to all who were unacceptable by bourgeois standards, including those involved in prostitution. There are caricatures by Picasso, dated 1902[1] which graphically illustrate some aspects of brothel depravity in which he and Nonell involved themselves. Although the element of lurid caricature is absent from the Blue Period paintings, the themes of most of them are concerned with whores, procuresses, beggars and other destitute characters, constituting, as it were, a gallery of waifs and other pitiable types who inhabited Picasso's pictures until autumn 1904 - the date of the etching, The Frugal Rapist, after which a new cast of characters made their appearance. What is particularly significant about the Blue Period rendering of this type of theme, however, is the new way in which Picasso dealt with such subjects - a way which is almost the reverse of that of the cabaret pictures. In spite of the sordidness of the subjects, Picasso avoided the ugly Realism of renderings such as The Absinthe Drinker and Gustave Coquiot, concentrating, instead, on a generalized rendering of misery. With the possible exception of Celestine, the one-eyed procuress, the types who inhabit this doleful blue world with its shallow, at times impenetrable, at times aquatic, space, are not portraits. In the process of developing this theme in this particular way, Picasso made his first significant attempt at a rendering entirely his own. This rendering included features which were a clearcut departure from the traditions and influences which, until then, had dominated his work.

---

[1] Rubin, op.cit., p. 51.

From the outset, Picasso's Blue Period paintings set out on a new, uncharted, course. Two of the earliest examples, Two Sisters and The Soup (1902), show how, by a simplification of shape and form derived from his understanding of primitive art, Picasso set about creating a new way of expressing a much-used theme. The pathos, in these paintings, is restrained by the deliberate use of a simple, sculptural treatment of the figures. In both paintings, the figures, which are stylized in a manner reminiscent of figures in pre-Giotto fresco paintings, are arranged, frieze-like, with their feet almost level with the lower edge of the picture plane, their heads almost reaching the topmost edge, thus occupying most of the space. The modelling of the garments, which are simple, somewhat Biblical, robes, is in the pseudo-naïve style of Picasso's "archaic" manner. The faces are stereotyped and expresssionless either with downcast eyes, or with one eye blankly fixed ahead. There is no real "glance", either towards the other figure, or towards the viewer. The heads are represented in the most simple, profile view. A type of distortion which emulated primitive models has knowingly been employed. Thus in The Soup, the large figure's shoulders and head lean forward, in a classic gesture of humility and privation, so that they are almost parallel to the picture edge. In general, these two pictures, with their simplicity and total lack of reference to any specific time, place or individuality, represent a classicizing stylization very different from the personalized renderings of Picasso's earlier work. They also differ, in this respect, from Nonell's paintings of Gypsies. Compared with Picasso's paintings, with their complex derivations, Nonell's are simple and forthright, even though, here and there, he used similar devices and poses.[1] Nonell's use of these was without the intention of producing a potent, disturbing effect on the viewer, but rather to express the immediate sombre beauty of the specific race of people with whom he was intimately involved. For this reason, Nonell used a lusty technique to create simple shapes of great dignity, but of more or less local interest, whereas Picasso simplified his technique of applying paint to the point of meagreness, and generalized the subjects he dealt with to render them universal and timeless. In this way, it can be said that Picasso, at this time, was attempting a symbolic rendering of basic human conditions.

As the Blue Period progressed in Barcelona in 1903, explicit references to archaic models sometimes alternated with interpretations more in keeping with Art Nouveau sinuousness. Thus, while Woman with a Scarf clearly reflects the former,

---

[1] Poses of crouching figures, figures in which heads are seen in profile on shoulders in three-quarter view from the back or the front and closed facial expressions due to the lack of "glance" are some examples.

Women at a Bar, with its schematic modelling in curvilinear style rendered by the use of sharp contrasts between light and dark in a simplified chiaroscuro, is certainly more reminiscent of paintings by Gauguin, Bernard or Denis. It is, furthermore, interesting to note that portraits of the period,[1] although also predominantly blue in colour and showing the effective use of Picasso's new-found simplicity of handling, are conventional in other respects. In later paragraphs there will again be occasion to mention the fact that Picasso was more hesitant to take liberties with naturalistic human proportions in portraits than in his imaginative thematic paintings.

In October 1903, Picasso, in the company of Junyer-Vidal, interrupted his stay in Barclona with a visit to Paris lasting until January 1903. In April, and again in November, work by Picasso, including Blue Room and other blue canvases, were exhibited at Berthe Weill's gallery, and attracted favourable reactions especially amongst Symbolist writers.[2] Picasso's return to Barcelona was followed by a very fruitful period[3] which saw gradual changes taking place within the Blue Period style. During this time, work began on the most ambitious blue paining, La Vie. This reached completion in the summer. But there was also a steady production of portraits[1] as well as paintings in which the theme of pathos was taken to extremes in a series of mannered representations of emanciated beggars.[2] At this stage, the restrained dignity of Two Sisters and The Soup was exchanged for a somewhat heavy-handed, self-conscious Symbolism. It is notable that in these pictures the linearity referred to by Raynal[3] is a dominant stylistic factor. It should also be noted that a minimal number of anecdotal accessories, such as guitars, tables and the remains of meagre eating and drinking, were introduced into the paintings of beggars. But they are still extremely simple, and the figures themselves and their ragged clothes are still generalized types, not portraits.

---

[1] Examples : Sorina Romeu, Sebastián Junyent.

[2] Rubin, op.cit., p. 47.

[3] Ibid. He produced about 50 works in 14 months.

Before ending this account of the Blue Period, something ought to be said about La Vie - if not the most successful blue painting, certainly the one which can be considered the most ambitious, and the culmination of the period as a whole. It was an attempt at a synthesis of all the elements Picasso had been assimilating over the past two or three years. As such, it was a step towards his maturity as an artist, and the first of such pictures in which Picasso synthesized all the elements of a trend which had preoccupied him for a while. La Vie was also Picasso's tribute to Symbolism. However, the symbolical meaning of

[1] Example : Portrait of Soler.

[2] Example : The Old Guitarist, The Blindmen's Meal.

[3] Raynal, op.cit., p. 23.

the picture has remained somewhat obscure. It appears to be the final picture dealing with the tragedy which overtook Casagemas, the other two being Evocation (1901) and The Mourners (1901). But, in La Vie, Picasso self-consciously included elements which must have been in keeping with his perception of Symbolism as exemplified by great Modernists like Gauguin and Munch, in which questions were posed about the meaning of life.[1] This is quite unlike the highly imaginative, fantastical type of symbolism which creates chimeras and half-human, half-animal, half-plant creatures.[2] It is also not the same as the academic type of Symbolism based on myths and allegories and requiring erudition on the part of the artist as well as the viewer for an understanding of its meanings. Picasso seems to have been simply following a trend, in which the figures and objects in a picture were loaded with secondary meaning. The results, in his case, are obscure from the spectator's point of view because his was an entirely personal Symbolism dealing with his own obsessions about sex, blindness etcetera. Thus, La Vie had, at the outset, a vague idea as its basis. Picasso's preparatory drawings show that he started off wanting to paint a picture

---

1. Examples : Gauguin's Whence do we come? What are we? Where do we go? (1897). Although Gauguin denied symbolical intentions, subsequent generations have read such meanings into works like this one.
Munch's The Dance of Life (1899-1900).

2. Examples : Fantin-Latour's Dawn and Night (1894)
Solomon's Dawn.
Khnopff's Medusa Asleep.

with two nude figures, a woman leaning against a man, which was a self-portrait. Behind them is a picture, in Gauguin's style, of two crouching figures, again a man and a woman, embracing. The "real" man points the finger of one hand meaningfully towards the "picture". Supposedly, this is an allusion to an image within an image. However, Picasso changed his mind and elaborated on this elementary initial idea. The features of the man, in the final picture, became those of Casagemas, and, facing the couple, is a woman holding an infant. This mother and child are rendered in the archaic manner of the early Blue Period pictures, emphasizing their hieratic, symbolical significance. The male figure, furthermore, is no longer entirely naked. He still points in a direction to his left, but it is no longer clear whether this is towards the mother and child or towards the picture behind him. Casagemas' unhappy love affair had been caused by his sexual impotence. Knowing this, the allusions in La Vie are not difficult to unravel.[1] The reason for mentioning them here is to show that Picasso's Symbolist venture was of a personal and emotional, not an intellectual or academic, nature. From the iconographic point of view, large ambitious attempts to emulate the mainstream of Symbolist painting, were bound to result in a somewhat heavy-handed rendering. La Vie, The Tragedy and The Embrace all deal, more or less with Picasso's personal obsessions. In style, they do not remind us so much of Gauguin, or of Cézanne (in his early phase), as of models much admired in Barcelona. Cycle-of-life paintings, on a large scale, were, according to Hilton,[1] quite common at the turn of the century. Those most admired in Barcelona had Northern origins. Hilton[2] names Toorop, Hodler and Segantini as examples, but it should not be forgotten that the Pre-Raphaelites were great favourites as well. There is a definite affinity between paintings such as Rosetti's Beata Beatrix, Astarte Syriaca, Burne-Jones' The Mill or Love Leading the Pilgrim, and Picasso's late Blue Period paintings. Similar elongated physical types, with classical facial features and, if dressed, in flowing robes, occur in all these works. Another common factor is the colouration, which is unrealistic, tending towards monochrome, with cold colours like green and grey predominating. This has the same effect as the use of blue on its own, of creating an eerie light in which the figures exist. When it comes to precedents of which Picasso was conscious, it must also not be forgotten that El Greco understood, and used, to great effect, the emotive power of a bluish palette.

---

[1] Hilton, op.cit., p. 38. Apart from the most obvious meaning - that of Casagemas' physical impotence, there is also an allusion to artistic impotence, which, together with blindness, Picasso feared irrationally.

On the whole, however, the Blue Period is of particular interest here, not so much because of its interesting derivations, as for the way in which it illustrates how Picasso, using all the sources of inspiration available to him at the time, deliberately set out to make his own contribution

---

1. Hilton, op.cit., p. 36-8.
2. Ibid.

to the modern movement. This he certainly did achieve, not only in terms of a break with tradition as a whole, but also in terms of a departure from the Naturalism in his own adolescent work. Even though, at times, references to other Modernist works of the period were explicit, the type of distortion, the chiaroscuro and the way the monochrome was used, has the stamp of Picasso's own style, which, at its best in the smaller works, is emphatic and remarkably mature considering his age.

La Vie is seen by Hilton[1] as completing the Blue Period. He also sees its expression of frustration and impasse as immature. Following its completion, there was a gradual attempt, on Picasso's part to advance out of the enclosed world of the Blue Period and into one more positively humane and optimistic. The Embrace, completed around the same time as La Vie is one such work. Although blue continued, for a while, to pervade the colour schemes of Picasso's work, there were fewer oil paintings and more smaller works done in gouache, pastel and other graphic mediums in which there is a stress on the subtle effects Picasso was able to achieve in these mediums compared with his often crude paint application in the larger oils of the Blue Period. Brooding Woman, for example, is a watercolour with limpid effects and such slight drawing that the figure is barely visible. In The Embrace,[2] on the other hand,

[1] Hilton, op.cit., p. 38.

[2] The Embrace is a pastel.

greater attention has been paid to the drawing, especially to the sensitive areas where the woman's bulging, pregnant belly and the man's lean one, touch, and where the two heads come into contact. According to Hilton,[1] it was through the greater refinement he was able to achieve in graphic works at this time, that Picasso was able to ease himself out of the oppressive melancholy of the Blue Period. But there were also changes in his personal circumstances around the beginning of 1904 which were of importance as well. These, and the changes in style which accompanied them, are the subject of the following paragraphs.

## The Rose Period - Circus Themes, 1904 - 1905

In the Spring of 1904, Picasso left Barcelona again for Paris. This time, he had decided that Paris would be his permanent home, and he never again returned to Spain as a resident. Henceforth, he regarded himslef as a visitor there. Having made this decision, he moved into the famous Bateau-Lavoir, a warren of dilapidated studios on the rue Ravignan. He took over a studio vacated by Paco Durio on the top floor.[2] His friends now included, besides fellow-Spaniards and Catalans like Manolo Hugué, and Max Jacob who, as poor as he was, still stood by him in times of need, an assortement of writers, poets, painters and

---

1. Hilton, op.cit., p. 39.
2. Rubin, op.cit., p. 56.

dealers of various nationalities. Some of those who were closest to him were Reverdy, Salmon, Jarry, Raynal, Vollard and Apollinaire.[1] The Bateau-Lavoir itself was the centre of a bohemian lifestyle which suited Picasso down to the ground.[2] During the summer, he formed a liaison with a woman named Madeleine. She was, possibly, the model for such works as Woman with Helmet of Hair, Woman in a Chemise, Woman Ironing and Woman with a Crow. This affair did not last long, however. In the Autumn, Picasso met Fernande Olivier who became his mistress not long after. She remained with him for seven years, and wrote an account of this period in her life during which she was involved with "La Bande Picasso", the circle of which Picasso was the central figure.[3] By most accounts, including hers, most of those who came into contact with Picasso, were intrigued by his foreign outlook and fascinated by his rivetting personality.[4] Fernande has vividly recaptured their lifestyle which, from the financial point of view, was precarious. In order to live, Picasso sometimes sold work to Vollard as well as to junk dealers such as Sagot and Père Soulier. However, he and Fernande were no longer starving, as he had been in 1900, and their relative poverty did not prevent them from frequently indulging in extravagant and ostentatious

1. Raynal, op.cit., p. 29.
2. Penrose, op.cit., p. 93.
3. Olivier, F., Picasso et ses Amis.
4. Ibid., p. 9., Penrose, op.cit., p. 100.

entertainments. She also tells us that they dabbled in bohemian practices such as smoking hashish. As far as patrons were concerned, Penrose[1] tells us that Picasso "refused to make a gesture towards the public" - meaning that he did not solicit patronage, either by doing the rounds of the galleries, nor by submitting his work for exhibition at any of the main or independent Salons.[2] However, interested visitors were always welcome in the decidedly squalid studio. It was in this way, that important patrons, like the Americans, Leo and Gertrude Stein, began to purchase his work.[3] Another important aspect of Picasso's lifestyle at this time was that the Cirque Médrano was not far from the Bateau-Lavoir and he and his friends visited this circus three or four times a week from 1904.[4] As we shall see, this provided him with new subject-matter which would reach full expression in 1905.

Immediately after his return to Paris, however, Picasso continued to produce works which, in style and approach, were a continuation of the Blue Period, except that the range of colours used increased to include delicate pinks, buffs and browns. The rendering of figures was an extension

---

1. Penrose, op.cit., p. 102.
2. For more details about these, see p. 212-4 in the text.
3. Penrose, op.cit. Leo Stein purchased his first Picasso in 1905.
4. Rubin, op.cit., p. 56.

of Blue Period manneristic renderings such as The Blind Guitarist (1903). The expressive possibilities of anatomical exaggerations, such as hunched shoulders and extreme emaciation, were explored with a subtlety often absent in Blue Period versions of similar subjects. This was a period in which exquisite technical virtuosity, on his part, was brought to bear on all the subjects he attempted. It is significant, from this point of view, that, at this time, Picasso favoured mediums other than oil paint, mainly ones like watercolour, gouache, pen-and-ink, pastels, crayon or combinations of two or more of these.

During the Spring and Summer of 1904, a gradual transformation took place in Picasso's approach towards his subjects - all more or less centered on the spare figure of an underfed, small-boned woman with pointed features and a hauntingly uncommunicative expression. The harrowing poverty and deprivation of the Barcelona types, typified by the blind beggars, and the undercurrent of evil, which makes Celestina so disturbing, are absent from Woman with Helmet of Hair, Woman Ironing, Woman with a Crow, Woman's Head with Studies of Hands and Woman in a Chemise. These portrayals are of a poor, but not destitute, woman, engaged in activities, such as ironing, which show a degree of domesticity unthinkable in any Blue Period women. Her weary, drudging figure certainly belongs in the realm of ordinary, if deprived, human experience, and this, together with the subtelty of handling , makes her a touching inhabitant of a bohemian world. She commands the viewer's sympathy in a way the more insistent approach of the Blue Period fails to do. This is partly because of her physical attributes, partly because of the warmer colours used and partly because of the way Picasso rendered her facial features with an understated Naturalism which must have been a true likeness.

Also in 1904, but in the Autumn, after meeting Fernande, Picasso completed an etching, the famous Frugal Repast. This was his second attempt at this particular medium and, according to Hilton[1] "has been carefully worked to a completeness that has not been seen in Picasso's drawings beforehand." While this is not strictly true, if we consider the very early academic drawings completed to an exemplary degree of finish, there is something of importance to be noted in the deliberate finish of this work. As a development at this stage of Picasso's career, it is with curiosity that we note how interested he had suddenly become in paying close attention to details, especially those which had the potency to enhance the pathos of the subject. The hands of both the figures, for example, have been elongated, and the fingers tapered, to extremes, as have all the other anatomical details of the two figures, such as facial features and neck tendons. But, these details, in all other respects, such as their relative proportions in relation to one-another, have been accurately observed and

---

1. Hilton, op.cit., p. 41.

painstakingly reconstructed. This gives the scene, as a whole, a probability lacking, for example, in The Blindman's Meal, with its generalized handling of all the details.

After The Frugal Repast, although Picasso abandoned the exaggerations which were so extreme as to border on caricature, he continued paying attention to telltale details such as the hands, the inflection of necks, the assymmetry of faces and the particular poise of figures. For the time being, Picasso's deliberately naïve rendering of such details was abandoned.[1] Hilton[2] attributes this to Picasso's fascination at this time, with elegance and expressiveness, not only as found in El Greco's work, but also in works by members of the School of Fontainebleu, notably Primaticcio. The Frugal Repast was closely followed by a revealing drawing, Woman's Head with Studies of Hands derived from Primaticcio's representation of Charity, but incorporating the hands from The Frugal Repast in more realistic proportions.[3] This return to scrupulously observed detail, coupled with expressive Mannerist exaggerations, according to Hilton,[4] opened the way, for Picasso, to a more graceful, less blatant, means of representing the issues which concerned him. It also opend the way[5] to a more subtle use of caricature and parody than had so far been the case. This was to become an important element in his work henceforth. In the circus pictures, this is apparent in the combination of a deliberately stylish rendering of subjects and a playful use of traditional idealized stereotypes, but in unexpected contexts. Thus, for example, the baby in The Acrobat's Family with a Monkey intentionally refers to Renaissance babies in Madonna and Child, or Holy Family, pictures. The profession of this particular family, and the inclusion of the baboon, rescues this time-worn theme from cliché.

---

[1] For example, there is a "naïvety" in the rendering of fingers, thumb and neck tendon in The Blindman's Meal which has been abandoned.

[2] Hilton, op.cit.

[3] Ibid., p. 42.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid., p. 50-2.

Following this short period of preoccupation with technical facility, Picasso's work reflected the voluptuous bliss of his new affair with the beautiful, indolent Fernande.[1] In late 1904, a couple of watercolour and pen pictures on the theme of a sleeping woman watched over by a thoughtful man were completed. This theme remained a favourite at certain times throughout Picasso's life. The titles of these small, jewel-like works, explain their mood - Meditation and Sleeping Nude. To show, however, that Picasso's moods were seldom consistent, it should be pointed out that, at the same time as these gentle pictures were painted, he was still

[1] Sabartes and Boeck, op.cit., p. 36. Sabartes, who knew Picasso extremely well from 1899 onwards, insisted that the arrival of a new woman in Picasso's life invariably heralded the start of a new, at first, happier, corresponding period in his work.

capable of producing what Hilton[1] terms "unpleasant drawings" of the type he had done at intervals since about 1900, the subject of which dealt openly with grotesque sexual fantasies.[2]

Towards the end of 1904, the first "circus" painting by Picasso was completed. This was the one entitled The Actor, in which the emaciation and elongation of the figure, seen in earlier works of that year, is still present, but used with great effect in creating a simple, but expressive image. As he became increasingly interested in the strange, peripheral life of circus folk, the Mannerist elongations seemed less necessary than the more straightforward representation of the natural grace and suppleness of these people. The consequence was a far easier handling of composition. The paintings which form the bulk of the Circus Period belong to the Spring of 1905. As in much of Picasso's 1904 work, many of these were gouache and ink paintings. Only the largest work in the series appears to have been oil on canvas. This was The Family of Saltimbanques, which, like La Vie was the synthesis and culmination of the past year's discoveries.

The ease with which these pictures were made, in comparison with the awkwardness of La Vie and The Tragedy, resulted in more sympathetic arrangements of figures, although the psychological relationships between individuals are often strange, as in The Family of Saltimbanques, for example.

---

[1] Hilton, op.cit., p. 52.

[2] Examples : The Dance, Caricature.

But, the family in The Acrobat's Family with a Monkey are a close-knit group, which includes the monkey (or baboon). In all of the circus pictures, there is an aloofness on the part of the subjects towards the spectator. They are absorbed in a world quite distinct from the modern bourgeois society they entertain.

Some of the most interesting things about the circus pictures are of a technical nature. First of all, the use of water-based mediums seems to have helped Picasso to achieve a freer paint-application which is fresh and yet not haphazard or arbitrary as it sometimes is in paintings like Evocation or The Tragedy. In many of the gouache paintings, as well as oils like The Actor and The Family of Saltimbanques, Picasso has, with deftness and sensitivity, made use of a warm ground-colour as a unifying device. Over this, he has sparingly applied lighter and darker tones in a nicely balanced choice of colours, predominantly in the blue, pink and brown range. Greens are almost excluded. The effect of this is that the figures which, by now, had become subtle in their drawing and closer to the classical model in their proportions, appear to be the only inhabitants of an otherwise desert-like world. Although the figures are surrounded by more environmental features than were Blue Period figures, this environment is confined to the interiors of circus tents, or to landscapes devoid of any signs of vegetation. By usuing a ground-colour to ensure unity, Picasso did not find it necessary to labour over the creation of consistently realistic environments for the figures.

Consequently, some very interesting inflections occur, so that there are sometimes abrupt transitions where these would not normally have been expected. In many of these pictures, figures are surrounded, partially, by their own aura of colour, adding to the effect of individual isolation, except in the family group which is surrounded by a zone of greenish-blue. In the Saltimbanques, there are inconsistencies in the way the hills flow into one another behind the figures. By and large, these backgrounds are almost abstract in comparison to the figures, being painted with broad brushstrokes in areas of relatively flat colours, which offsets the delicate modelling of the figures. This tendency to place figures in separate spatial compartments, while either connecting them by gestures, or isolating them by the lack of gestures, was a new, and, as it later proved, very significant factor in Picasso's work.

By way of a few final comments concerning this rather short period - its duration was barely nine months - mention ought to be made of its significance with regard to Picasso's position relating to French, as against Spanish, art. We have already noted the stylistic elegance of the figures, modelled on examples from French tradition which intrigued Picasso at the time, and their enhancement by an equally elegant colouration. It is equally important to note the Frenchness of the theme. As we have seen, Picasso had, a few years earlier, in his cabaret paintings, attempted to paint French themes, but with scant understanding of their underlying social or stylistic significance. This time, however, he was able to tackle such a theme with a new-found assurance and more mature comprehension of the issues involved. Hilton[1] draws our attention to the fact that circus subjects, including acrobats and harlequins, were familiar in works by Degas, Lautrec, Seurat, Signac and others of the late 19th century, and Penrose reminds us of Cézanne's Mardi Gras, which had been seen by Picasso at Vollard's gallery. Hilton[2] attributes Picasso's profounder understanding of French art styles to his absorption, which began at this time, into French avant-garde circles. One factor was that his command of the language was improving, another must certainly have been his relationship with Fernande, who was eminently French. But, although there are some obvious affinities with the work of prominent Post-Impressionists like Degas,[3] as far as the overall style of the circus pictures is concerned, we must look elsewhere for their major inspirational influence. Both Hilton[4] and Barr[5] remind us that, at the time, Puvis de Chavannes commanded considerable respect and had set the example of painting pictures full of references to traditional works. Although

---

[1] Hilton, op.cit., p. 50.

[2] Ibid., p. 54.

[3] Ibid. The author compares a racehorse scene with similar scenes by Degas.

[4] Ibid., p. 55.

[5] Barr, op.cit., p. 40.

Picasso's circus theme did not directly draw on any of Puvis' themes, there are so many similarities to Puvis' paintings that there can be little doubt that Picasso was attempting something which he had understood about Puvis' large-scale semi-academic, semi-pastoral, mural paintings. The similarities are to be found in pictoral construction and rendering. So, although Picasso was representing the world of the circus, there is an arcadian atmosphere in Saltimbanques, Young Acrobat on a Ball and Circus Family, clearly related to works by Puvis, such as Vision of Antiquity : Symbol of Form, The Poor Fisherman and Hope. This is due to affinities in the manner in which the figures are arranged, in the anatomical oddities sometimes present, and in the colours, which, as Hilton[1] says, are not so much rose as "terracotta, tawny and plastery", simulating, as Puvis had done, the colours of fresco painting. Picasso's paintings were, as usual, highly individualistic interpretations, both from the thematic and the stylistic point of view. At the same time, they were reflections of a trend which was fairly general in his new artistic environment. Hilton[2] has pointed out that members of the up and coming French avant-garde were themselves affected by Puvis' Arcadianism. Matisse and Derain also produced pastoral paintings around this time.[3] But, their interest in such

---

1. Hilton, op.cit., p. 55.
2. Ibid.
3. Matisse's Joie de Vivre is the best-known example.

subjects was motivated by considerations which recall Cézanne's works, particularly his bather pictures,[1] rather than the symbolical content which attracted Picasso. Steeped as he had been in Modernisme, Symbolism was till of central importance to Picaso. As far as radical breaks with the past in France were concerned, therefore, it was, for the time being, the direction being taken by Matisse and the other Fauves which was of most consequence. Picasso, while enjoying a reputation as an unconventional personality and artist in his own circle, had not yet succeeded in attracting the attention of leading French avant-garde artists, nor had his work, to date, disturbed the mainstream of progressive artistic activity in Paris.

## The Rose Period - Archaic Themes, 1905 - 1906

Before continuing with this account of Picasso's gradual rise to a position of prominence in the French avant-garde, something of this avant-garde and of the artistic situation in general, in France early in the 20th century, ought to be said. Picasso's tentative entry into French art occurred simultaneously with the developments within the Fauve movement. In about 1907, Picasso became intensely aware of what the Fauves were doing and, as we shall see, they were equally aware of his efforts, and one of their number, Braque, became so excited by what he had seen in Picasso's

---

1. Cézanne's work was becoming well-known, at this time, with excitement on the part of the avant-garde.

studio that he abandoned Fauvism and worked from 1907 until 1914 in close collaboration with Picasso instead. At this juncture, therefore, it is appropriate that something be understood about this parallel development which would soon affect Picasso. Before doing so, however, something ought to be said about what sort of role the Academy still played in the formation of French styles, even unconventional ones, and also about the continuing hold over French artists by the Salons, which, by 1905-06 had become differentiated. French artists continued to be, at least to some extent, tied to the particular backgrounds their training had provided. For the most part, this still took place in the studios of masters, but was far less thorough than the training received, for example, by artists like Manet. But studios, even unconventional ones, were still run more or less according to the traditional academic practises described in Part I - that is, with the accent on drawing and craftsmanship. Of equal concern to French artists, as in the past, were the means of becoming known and of finding buyers for their work. As we have seen, the official Salon had been the principal agent in this regard until the 1870s, when the holding of independent exhibitions became commonplace, and private dealers more numerous. Firstly, a brief look at the education of the Fauve painters will show to what an extent the "liberal" studios had taken over the training of modern artists. Secondly, the avenues available for exhibition purposes will be mentioned so that it can be seen how these had improved from the artists' point of view.

The largest group of Fauve painters, including Matisse who was the most senior and the most venerated, had spent some time in the studio of Gustave Moreau until his death in 1898. Oppler[1] tells us that, at the time, the more daring of Moreau's pupils, including Henri Matisse (1869-1954), Henri Manguin (1874-1949), Albert Marquet (1875-1947), Georges Rouault (1871-1958) and Charles Camoin (1879-?) were intrigued by Impressionism at the time, and that it was "a tribute to Gustave Moreau's broadmindedness and generous love of his talented students that he encouraged them to develop according to their individual sensibilities." Knowing Moreau's own leanings towards a highly imaginative and decorative type of Symbolism with particular emphasis on various textural effects, it is indeed surprising that he was able to encourage the naturalistic approach of his pupils. Notwithstanding the fantastic subject-matter of Moreau's work, his own draughtsmanship and skill in the use of colour had been acquired through thorough academic training. This was reflected in his pupils' continuing respect for the practice of working conscientiously from the model. In the case of Matisse, this was a lifelong factor in his work. After Moreau's death, Matisse and his friends, disliking Moreau's successor, Cormon, who was a conservative academic, worked more or less independently, occasionally working in academic studios where models were provided.

---

[1] Oppler, op.cit., p. 43.

Slightly more independent, but, in his own way, as cultivated as Matisse, André Derain (1880-1954) met the group at this time (1899) at the Académie Carrière. In 1900, Derain met Maurice de Vlaminck (1876-1958), the most flamboyant and relatively untrained of the Fauves. Another self-trained artist, Kees van Dongen (1877-1968) joined the group for a while. A second important group of painters with a common background, who arrived in Paris around 1900, and played important roles in the early Fauve development, consisted of Raoul Dufy (1877-1953), Othon Friesz (1879-1949) and the younger Georges Braque (1882-1963). They had come from Le Havre, which was in many ways, the cradle of Impressionism, as we have seen in the paragraphs on Monet. Dufy and Friesz had been trained by Charles Llullier at the École de Beaux-Arts of Le Havre,[1] who, although academically trained by a David pupil, was liberal in his outlook towards his pupils. Braque "was too young to benefit from Pére Llullier's teaching but also attended evening classes at the Academy before transferring to Paris."[2] This, then, was the academic background of the Fauve group.

As far as the second circumstance affecting the group (and other progressive artists as well) was concerned, the official Salon, frequently mentioned in Part I, had undergone some re-organization since 1881, under the Société des Artistes Francais in which the jury was elected from each

[1] Oppler, op.cit., p. 47-8.

[2] Ibid., p. 49.

previous year's exhibitors. In 1890, under the Société National des Beaux-Art, founded by those seceding from the official Salon, the Salon de la Nationale was founded. Puvis, Carrière and Rodin were among those who had a hand in this. Earlier, in 1884, the Société des Artistes Indépendents had founded the Salon des Indépendents. Instrumental in this had been Seurat, Signac et al. There was no jury to select work for this Salon. Any artist could, for a fee, exhibit there. This was the case until the Second World War. The last new Salon to be founded was the Salon d'Automne, the joint accomplishment of the Fauves and members of the Salon de la Nationale.[1] From this, it should be clear that, by 1903, there was ample opportunity for satisfaction for a very wide spectrum of artistic endeavour in Paris at Salons alone. Plenty of other avenues for exhibiting and selling work existed in the form of private galleries and dealers. From the outset, the Fauves did not lack spectators as, for instance, had Courbet, until 1848. From 1901, Matisse and Marquet exhibited at the Indépendents regularly each year, and from 1904, the Fauve style made its first impact via the Salon d'Automne. Another important detail concerning the diverse opportunities now available, was the holding of large retrospective exhibitions of works by the great modern artists such as Gauguin and Cézanne,

---

1. Oxford Companion to Art, p. 1033 (Société des Artistès Francais) p. 765 (Salon de la Nationale), p. 565 (Indépendents), p. 96 (Salon d'Automne).

for the first time presenting the viewer with the overwhelming impact of such large bodies of outstanding innovative work in one venue. Lastly, a glance at Fauvist chronology[1] reveals that most of these artists consistently exhibited their work either at the Indépendents or at the Salon d'Automne as well as at galleries such as Weill's. Picasso, on the other hand, tended to stick to the private galleries and his arrangements for selling were often concluded with various dealers and collectors such as Mañach, Vollard, Weill, Kahnweiler, Shchukin and the Steins.[2]

By now, it should be well understood that French artists had, by 1900, a well-established progressive tradition of resistance to styles which were perpetuated for their own sake, long after their initial impulse had been forgotten. They were the beneficiaries of a legacy which had fought long and hard against academic doctrine. For this reason, the avant-garde in France were committed to a program which made continued breaks with the past an imperative. By 1904, in avant-garde terms, Impressionism was, itself, almost a tradition from which the new avant-garde was expected to break. Oppler[3] tells us that, as had happened since Diderot's time, this expectation was backed by theories. Without going into undue detail, it must be noted that the

[1] Leymarie, J., Fauvism, p. 5-9.

[2] Rubin, op.cit., p. 29 onwards.

[3] Oppler, op.cit., p. 34-8.

prevailing notion, at the time, of a new style, consisted of the rejection of Impressionist characteristics such as "atmospheric naturalism ... and ... sophistication of ... palette",[1] rather than of anything positive. So far, no movement had challenged Impressionism to the extent hoped for by critics and writers. As we shall soon see, this changed as soon as Matisse, Derain, Vlaminck and the other Fauves, having Impressionism as their starting point, managed to break free of it in some revolutionary ways. Once this occurred, they enjoyed the notoriety that came from shocking conservative viewers and critics, while at the same time winning the favour of progressive critics. Oppler[2] tells us that, although the Fauves encouraged a notion of themselves as lonely innovators defying a hostile culture, and creating scandals, the truth is that they enjoyed considerable financial success without a prolonged struggle. She even proves that it is a misrepresentation to assert that the name "Fauve" (or "Wild Beast") which attached itself to the group in 1905, "was not invented by a hostile critic but by a witty sympathizer."[3] From about 1905, they had little difficulty selling their work and, furthermore, soon found themselves in favourable positions on committees such as the one charged with picture hanging at the Indēpendents.[4] The idea of new movements being

1. Oppler, op.cit., p. 39.
2. Ibid., p. 4-6, 13-33.
3. Ibid., p. 18.
4. Ibid., p. 28.

heralded by a scandal had obviously rooted itself in avant-garde thinking in France. By comparison, Picasso's career, by 1905, had been free of any of the matters of such deep concern to the French avant-garde.

Before returning to our main concern, which is Picasso's particular development towards a significant break with tradition, including Impressionism, a brief analysis of those aspects of Fauvism which would prove significant to Picasso and Braque during the Cubist venture must be undertaken. How Fauvist painters arrived at their particular way of using colour and then line, had some interesting implications. Having started off from a more or less Impressionist way of rendering forms so that they have a tendency to dissolve into the surrounding atmosphere, they proceeded to a temporary interest in Divisionism. Around 1905, a number of artists, including Matisse, Derain, Metzinger, Delaunay, Mondrian and de Vlaminck, were busy, according to Clay,[1] revolutionizing Divisionism's original intention which had been the clearer denotion of shape and form as against the vagueness, in this regard, of Impressionism. These artists enlarged the size of the Pointillist dots to such an extent that they became independent dabs without the optical function of Divisionist dots. They thus became autonomous. An interesting, and important element, in this technique, was the deliberately left bare white canvas between dots or dabs of colour. This bare canvas served the

[1] Clay, J. Modern Art : 1890-1918, p. 40-51.

same function as had the careful gradations of value in traditional illusionistic painting - namely of allowing pictures to "breathe".[1] This way of imparting light was quite radical in oil painting. The next step towards what was becoming a conceptual rendering of natural phenomena coincided with the discovery of Gauguin's work. In 1903, shortly after Gauguin's death, his astonishing paintings had been on view in Paris. Matisse, followed by the other members of his group, understood what Gauguin had achieved. Together with the Pointillist possibilities they had been exploring, a new possibility presented itself to them in the form of Gauguin's synthetic use of colour. In addition, therefore, to an even greater enlargement of their isolated dabs of colour, there seemed no reason why the colours should continue to be naturalistic. In 1905-06, the use of arbitrary, rather than local, colour was explored with as much adventurousness and disregard for tradition as had been done by Gauguin. However, as Clay[2] reminds us, Matisse had, in 1898, painted his startling red Nude in the Studio. Alongside similar nudes painted in the same studio by the more conservative Marquet and Manguin, Matisse's was more daring in that he ignored realistic flesh-tones. In this nude, and others of 1905 and 1906, including Joie de

---

[1] Examples : Matisse's Landscape at Collioure (1905)
Dufy's The Fourteenth of July (1906)
Derain's Collioure (1905).

[2] Clay, op.cit., p. 36-9.

Vivre by Matisse, there was another interesting development, which was much slower in manifesting itself in the case of the other Fauves. This can be seen in the lack of outline with which Matisse was, at this time experimenting. At the same time, extremely scant strokes of pigment were applied, leaving a pattern of white canvas flowing throughout. The strokes of pigment are differentiated only by differences in colour. Therefore, the only thing which separates the nude from the surrounding vegetation, is the use of pink strokes as against green ones. The pink, as well as the green, are almost pure colours and no attempt has been made to vary them to imitate the real appearance of flesh or of grass. What had happened was that the dabs of pigment were not the only element to be treated independently - the selection of colours, too, acquired autonomy as did the white canvas itself. We can see the same concept applied to landscapes, particularly Derain's beautiful ones done in England around 1906-07, but also those by other Fauves, including Braque.[1] The practice of applying pigment in dabs did not last beyond 1905. This technique was replaced by a more Gauguinesque use of large areas of ungraded colours which were extremely bright and arbitary. There was also a gradual return to the use of outlines, if we look at Matisse's Brook with Aloes, Collioure and his Blue Nude, both of 1907. The former relies almost completely on differences in colour, broken by bare canvas, to signify various shapes, whereas the latter has a heavy outline defining the contours of the figure. In a later paragraph, it will be necessary to refer again to Blue Nude, as it was this picture which, of all Fauve pictures, was to elicit an immediate reaction from Picasso. The more subtle impact of Fauvism on Picasso's development took place at a later stage through the intervention of Braque, who brought to Cubism many of the concepts mentioned above.

---

[1] Examples : Blackfriars by Derain, Little Boy at la Ciotat by Braque.

In 1905, it should by now be realised, Picasso had little in common with all these, very French, developments. A glance, for instance, at Matisse's sketch for Joie de Vivre, or Braque's The Mountains, Collioure (with its tribute to Van Gogh's brushstrokes), and Picasso's Saltimbanques makes quite plain the extremely wide gap which still existed between Picasso and the French artists. Picasso, in 1905, was still tied to a traditional type of representation, especially of the human figure. These are still rendered with more or less realistic delineation, in that outlines are still very much intact, flesh-tones are graded, even if these are simplified. In Picasso's work, there was, as yet, none of the conceptual ambiguity of the Fauve pictures, which had no bearing on the anecdotal content of pictures. The liberties Picasso, so far, had taken with forms and shapes, stemmed from an entirely different set of impulses, as has been noted. At this stage, then, Picasso was far more conservative than the Fauves. Furthermore, his contact with French avant-garde movements was negligible. This can be attributed to the fact that, in Paris, he retained his close contacts with Spanish artists and that most of his French friends were writers, who were still concerned with Symbolism. This state of affairs did not last long, however. Picasso was far too powerful a personality and gifted an artist to be content with a position on the sidelines. When we recollect that his Barcelona background had prepared him for the type of artistic adventurousness which insisted on constant renewal, then it is hardly surprising that, once he had overcome the obstacles to his entry into the French avant-garde, he was eminently qualified to play a leading role. When this happened, it was in a violently radical way, which was due, partly to his temperament, but also to the fact that he was not part of the gentler French tradition and was able, with impunity, to ride roughshod over considerations which tempered the innovations of his French counterparts.

After the Saltimbanques, which was exhibited with other Rose Period pictures in February/March 1905, Picasso's interest in circus subjects gradually gave way to a greater interest in individual figures. These were still of the same type, but were not placed specifically in circus contexts. The Two Brothers and Boy Leading a Horse, both painted in 1906, are two examples. In these pictures, it is clear that Picasso's interest had shifted from the strange anecdotal intention of the 1905 circus pictures, to one which was more concerned with the simplified representation of the figures themselves. Once again, environment has been reduced to a bare minimum. But, this time, the figures are represented solidly, with proportions in keeping with classical ones. In contrast with the sentimentatlity of the Blue Period and the "outsider" feeling of the Rose Period, these figures are serene and monumental. One of the factors said to have contributed to this particular change in rendering, was the trip to Holland undertaken by Picasso in the Summer of 1905. Although he disliked the country and his stay was short - only a month - he painted several paintings of girls, whose proportions, according to Penrose[1] "encouraged him to emphasize their sculptural and monumental qualities." Significantly, around this time, Picasso made his first sculptures, including heads of Fernande and Alice Derain, and the one called The Jester.

It was on his return from Holland, that changes occurred in Picasso's approach. Although the pink tones still predominated, Penrose[2] tells us that, at this time, Picasso was paying close attention to Greek sculpture, while renewing his interest in Egyptian art. Both Penrose[3] and Barr[4] refer to this as Picasso's first "classic" period, lasting from mid-1905 to mid-1906. The "increasing relaxation and calm"[5] of the pictures Picasso painted during

---

1. Penrose, op.cit., p. 115.
2. Ibid., p. 116.
3. Ibid.
4. Barr, op.cit., p. 40.
5. Ibid., p. 37.

this year may have owed something to an improvement in his personal circumstances due to the patronage of the Steins and the Russian dealer, Shchukin, as well as the sympathy and support of his intellectual friends.

As far as his work of this period was concerned, the influence of Puvis de Chavannes is still evident in paintings like Boy Leading a Horse and in the drawing The Watering Place. But the arcadian atmosphere, borrowed from Puvis, is only one element in the 1905-06 work as a whole. Elsewhere, notably in Boy with a Pipe, but particularly in Girl with a Fan - which, incidentally include the use of a beautiful, celestial blue in the garments which offsets the otherwise tawny colour scheme - there is a hieratic quality, suggesting a return to an archaic inspiration. But another element also made its appearance in The Watering Place. Hilton[1] has drawn our attention to the very obvious similarities between this drawing and Matisse's Joie de Vivre. Picasso's use of the same "general composition, the artificially shallowed depth and the arabesqued line"[2] are so like Matisse's that it is certain that Picasso was aware of Matisse's work. In fact, it had been in October 1905 that the Fauve exhibition at the Salon d'Automne had been on view and had created a sensation. Hilton[3] stresses that this was the closest Picasso ever came to Matisse in style, and was due to their mutual admiration for Puvis at this

---

1. Hilton, op.cit., p. 62.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.

time. On the whole, Picasso and Matisse were very differently motivated. Sometime in 1905 or 1906,[1] Gertrude Stein introduced the two artists to one another. But, they had little in common, which has caused biographers to describe their relationship as an uneasy one. In 1906, Picasso also met Derain. At the same time, there was an exhibition at the Louvre of recently excavated Iberian sculptures which Picasso had seen in May.[2] From this it can be seen that, although Picasso was becoming assimilated into wider Parisian art circles, he was still intensely interested in art forms which were foreign, even obscure, in modern Paris.

In the winter of 1905, Picasso began work on a portrait of Gertrude Stein. Obviously he regarded this as a momentous task, because, uncharacteristically, he insisted on countless sittings.[3] Even so, by the Spring of 1906, he was still unsatisfied with the head, which he then painted out. Instead of proceding with it at once, he painted the first work with a "coiffure", or "toilette" theme, Woman Combing her Hair. One of the three figures portrayed is occupied with the coiffure of another. The monumental element is even more marked than in the paintings of Dutch girls. In addition, the face of the woman who is assisting the other with her hair, is markedly primitive, but not in the same

[1] Hilton, op.cit., p. 62., Rubin, op.cit., p. 59.

[2] Rubin, op.cit., p. 59.

[3] Ibid. She sat eighty or ninety times.

style as in Two Sisters of 1902.

In May 1906, Picasso visited Spain in the company of Fernande. They first went to Barcelona, where Picasso introduced Fernande to his family, after which they proceded to Gosol, a remote village in the Pyrenees, where they remained until late summer, when an outbreak of typhoid made it sensible to leave. While in Gosol, more paintings on the "coiffure" theme were painted, all recalling the Osuna figures, which in themselves recall archaic Greek sculpture.[1] It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the sculptural quality in Picasso's paintings had become quite emphatic. The faces of the women in these paintings, at times resemble Fernande's, but with stylizations of the eyes, eyebrows, noses and mouths which are unmistakably derived from archaic models.[2] As far as colour is concerned, there is still an overall tendency towards pink, but this is a golden pink, rather than the greyer pink of the previous year's work. In Woman with a Comb, for instance - a gouache painting - Picasso has used this kind of colouration. In addition, he has used a textured effect which imitates excavated antique sculpture.

Before leaving Gosol, Picasso painted a quite exceptional picture, compared with the others he was painting at the

[1] Tarradell, M., Arte Iberia, p. 40. Iberian ceramics were found on the same site as Greek importations dated 5th - 4th century B.C.

[2] Examples : Woman with a Comb, Reclining Nude, Woman with Loaves.

time. This picture, named either Peasants and Oxen, The Peasants or, simply, Composition, shows that Picasso, in the midst of his interest in Grecian styles, still retained an interest in El Greco. Barr[1] thinks it is more than likely that Picasso had seen works by El Greco on view in Barcelona and Paris in 1906, and finds parallels between Peasants and Oxen and El Greco's St. Joseph with the Child Jesus. What is worth noting about Picasso's picture here, however, is the unsculptured, animated drawing of the figures and oxen. Although there are vestiges of his current archaic style in the face of the girl, and of his Puvis-inspired Arcadianism in the generally calm feeling of the picture and the presence of the garland of flowers, suggesting that the group is on its way to some or other rustic festivity, it is, in other ways, quite different from the archaicized nudes. It does not have their calm, statuesque and static quality. But, most interesting of all, in the context of this research, are the distortions and dislocations especially of the two human figures. These are, historically, out of keeping with Picasso's development up to this date. The distortions are so great that the viewer has difficulty assembling the figures - especially that of the girl - into comprehensible units. We are accustomed to experiencing this difficulty in Picasso's work following Demoiselles d' Avignon, but not in 1906. Obviously, the anomalies in these figures were not the result of haphazard procedure. They

---

1. Barr, op.cit., p. 48.

appear to have been well thought-out, to the point where Barr[1] is able to comment on the "flickering angular planes which tend to spread throughout the canvas ... creating an over-all unity of design" similar to that in Analytical Cubist pictures.

In the Autumn of 1906, on his return to Paris, Picasso - without any further sittings on her part - hastily completed the portrait of Gertrude Stein. This he did by superimposing a head in his new style onto the body which was retained in his earlier style. The incongruity of this procedure appears not to have bothered him. In fact, in later years, he frequently, and without hesitation, added to paintings in this manner, deliberately imparting to them a quality of contradictoriness. In Gertrude Stein, however, this kind of result was still somewhat unexpected, but this adds to its compelling appearance. Notably, this was the first time, in Picasso's work, that a jarring note which has nothing to do with caricature, made its appearance. In an otherwise serene, chiselled-looking face, the eyes are curiously out of alignment. This serves to accentuate the unseeing, mask-like expression of the face.

For the time being, however, Picasso did not explore the possibilities inherent in the oddities of Peasants and Oxen or Gertrude Stein. Instead, he interested himself in the latest avant-garde preoccupation - a new interest in the

---

1. Barr, op.cit., p. 48.

achievements of Cézanne. For some time, the Paris avant-garde had been made increasingly aware of these achievements. Having, until about 1904, been a somewhat obscure figure working on his own, as has been mentioned in Part I, he emerged into the limelight, right at the end of his life, while he was absorbed in the series of bather pictures which culminated, after seven years of work on this theme, in Les Grandes Baigneuses in 1905. From 1904, when an entire room had been set aside for his work, there were exhibitions each year at the Salon d'Automne and the Indépendents, including the retrospective exhibitions which took place after his death in October 1906. Picasso had not been oblivious to the gathering momentum of interest in Cézanne's procedures, which initially, were understood to have consisted of a method of picture construction based on the juxtaposition of colours chosen for their optical significance, and only later as a method of analyzing forms and simplifying planes for the purpose of constructing two-dimensional volumes. At this stage, there was little comprehension of the more subtle pictorial effects of Cézanne's method - namely, that by using separate nuances which were almost always geometrical in shape and rendered in separate tones and colours, and employing a minimum of linear devices, the multitude of little planes were flattened in a way counter to the traditional method of hollowing out space and of creating an illusion of projection of volumes. It is of interest, here, to remember what was said in Part I about academic procedures for establishing tones which were visible, say, on the human model. It will be recalled that scrupulous observation played a part in this procedure in a way very similar to Cézanne's practice, and that those observed tones, or values, were laid on in a jigsaw-like pattern. The difference between the two procedures was in the shapes of the individual "pieces" of the "jigsaw". In Cézanne's conception, what he observed could be broken down into little block-like shapes, whereas in academic procedure, shapes were more curvilinear and stylized following the known contours of the model. The other difference, of course, was that, according to academic method, these separate zones of colour and value had to be meticulously blended to create the required illusion of verisimilitude.

From about 1904 onwards, there were various attempts, on the part of innovative artists, to incorporate some of Cézanne's procedures into their work. At first, these attempts were concentrated on the more accessible of those procedures, such as Cézannesque brushstrokes, or colouration, or choice of subjects reminiscent of his. The nude bathers seemed to have interested artists more than Cézanne's still-lifes, landscapes or portraits at this juncture, and, for a while, the rendering of nude figures with heavy, clumsy proportions became a trend amongst the avant-garde.

While still at Gosol, Picasso's awareness of Cézanne's nudes began to be noticeable as he incorporated some Cézannisms into his own nudes. Although the themes of the paintings were a continuation and extension of the "coiffure" theme, the physiognomy of the figures became less and less human, and increasingly squat and ungraceful. The classical type gradually disappeared, to be replaced by two totemic, archaic figures who appeared together in various arrangements rendered in oils, gouache or black-and-white mediums. Although the archaic look tends to be the most immediately noticeable characteristic of these works, a more careful look at several examples of the theme reveals some strong likenesses to some of Cézanne's bathers.[1] At other times, Picasso's natural facility in drawing the nude gracefully betrays itself - for example, in the left-hand figure in the incomplete oil version of Two Nudes. Picasso's definitive version of this theme was painted after his return to Paris, and after the exhibition at the Salon d'Automne which was a tribute to Cézanne following his death. Several archaisms are combined with some obvious Cézannisms in this picture, reflecting the current interest in Cézanne's bathers. The extreme simplification of features, so striking in Gertrude Stein, became even more marked, until a nose, for example, became a wedge with a single shadow to the side of the sharply defined ridge. Foreheads, cheeks, necks, breasts, thighs, torsos, etcetera were rendered, in a simulation of extreme naïvete, with the volumes reduced to their simplest concepts and in imitation of materials such as stone or wood. In the last of the Two Nudes paintings, the tubularity of Seated Female Nude with Crossed Legs was replaced by a rendering borrowed from Cézanne. Greater planar complexity has been re-introduced, and this has been analyzed, especially in the forearms, the buttocks of the right-hand figure, the area at the back of the knees, and the breasts, in a geometric way intended to impart greater solidity to the volumes of the figures. The face of the figure which turns to the viewer, however, has the features, and unseeing eyes and expressionless look of Picasso's own archaic style.

---

[1] Hilton, op.cit., pl. 55. A version with three thickset, awkwardly proportioned figures.

Looking at Picasso's work as a whole, from the start of the Rose Period, not only do we see evidence of his usual brilliant assimilation of styles combined with his own personal inventiveness, we see also an increasingly subtle and complex use of all the means now at his disposal. Compared with Two Sisters, the final version of Two Nudes is the product of a mature development.

## Demoiselles d'Avignon, 1907

Very early in 1907, Picasso, evidently considering himself ready to consolidate all the themes and styles he had recently been experimenting with by attempting a large figure composition in the manner of Cézanne's bathers as had Matisse in Joie de Vivre,[1] began the necessary preparations for a major work. Penrose tells us, for example, of the unusual care which went into the preparation of the large canvas which measured 98 3/8 x 90 1/2 centimetres. Numerous preparatory drawings and watercolours preceded the painting of this exceptionally large canvas. This indicates that Picasso regarded the project as a particularly important one.[1] These preparatory sketches have also enabled historians to trace the progress of the painting from its initial conception, which had originated at Gosol, to the final version in which all incidental and anecdotal references were abandoned. At least seventeen such sketches are known to exist.[2]

---

[1] There have been various conjectures about the effect of Matisse's painting on Picasso. Joie de Vivre was exhibited in Spring 1906 at The Indépendents. It was bought by the Steins and was certainly seen there by Picasso on a visit to them soon after his return from Gosol.

At the outset, as demonstrated by the first sketches, the picture was to have as its subject a brothel scene in which a figure of a sailor, as well as of women were to be included. Hilton[3] thinks that Picasso had an allegorical intention which had intrigued him in pictures by Cézanne like Temptation of St. Anthony (1869-70), as well as a stylistic intention inspired by The Three Bathers, from which the pose of the seated right-hand figure is clearly derived. The earliest sketches certainly bear this out. Like Cézanne's Temptation of St. Anthony, a picture was being planned in which figures with similar physiognomies were more or less to fill the canvas. This allegory, according to Hilton[1] was to be "a brutal and sexual [one], not a placid one à la Puvis de Chavannes." As the idea was developed in subsequent sketches, the initial version, which included a sailor and a medical student, bearing in his hands a skull, was modified to exclude all but five female figures which appear in the definitive watercolour sketch painted in May. Direct iconographical references to Cézanne were all but excluded in this as well as in the final painting. The squatting figure on the right is all that remains as far as Cézannesque poses are concerned. The handling of the watercolour, as a whole, however, owes an obvious debt to Cézanne's watercolours. During the months in which the painting, which came to be called Demoiselles d'Avignon,[2] was evolving, several things occurred which influenced the changes which were taking place. The first of these was the showing of Matisse's Blue Nude and Derain's Bathers in March at the Indépendents. Particularly, Matisse's painting has been said to have posed a challenge to Picasso in that Matisse, clearly, had also become interested in Cézanne's method. Both Derain and Matisse had, for the time being, abandoned the flat, arbitrary colours of Fauvism and, although blue predominated in these nudes, there was a return to tones closer to natural flesh-tones, as well as a certain amount of very simplified modelling with Cézannesque brushstrokes. Matisee and Derain had, furthermore, for a while been interesting themselves in African carvings, which Derain had begun collecting. The assimilation of these two elements into their paintings had led to the style being referred to as "Les simplifications barbares".[1] Although Picasso's painting was completed later than the two just mentioned (in July), it seems likely that there was a certain amount of mutual influence involved during the months he was making preliminary sketches. Derain frequently visited Picasso's studio, and the idea of creating monumental, barbaric figures was in the air. Derain and Matisse also, apparently, vied with one another "as to who could paint the best figure in blue."[2] Derain's figures, with simplified, but classical proportions, have a faceted interior modelling with Cézannesque overtones. But, Matisse's Blue Nude shows that he had looked more closely at Cézanne than had Derain and was trying to come to grips with Cézanne's perspectival innovations. Having first made a sculpture, Matisse expressed the theme of the reclining nude on the flat canvas, by looking at it from different viewpoints and deliberately distorting the figure in order to render these. We are told[3] that during the early years of veneration for Cézanne by the Paris avant-garde, he was not seen as a modern

---

[1] Picasso invariably made elaborate preparations for major works. Examples : La Vie, Saltimbanques, and later, Guernica.

[2] Barr, op.cit., p. 54.

[3] Hilton, op.cit., p. 79.

---

[1] Hilton, op.cit., p. 79.

[2] Penrose, op.cit., p. 132. This had nothing to do with Avignon in France, but referred to a street in Barcelona, d'Avinyõ, in which such a brothel was situated.

1. Oppler, op.cit., p. 288.
2. Ibid., p. 289.
3. Ibid., p. 315.

master of Classicism, but as a breakaway Impressionist with barbaric, primitive leanings, and, as has already been said,[1] as a colourist with a refined sense of values. Only after 1905, did Cézanne's art begin to be associated with French Classicism as exemplified by Poussin.[2] This does not mean that Cézanne was seen to have had exactly the same aims as Poussin. On the contrary, whereas Poussin's art was composed from static elements, Cézanne's was based on his knowledge that visual truth shifted all the time as did the viewpoint of the spectator. What they had in common was a deep-seated desire to impose a pictorial order and precision on their respective ways of seeing. When we consider all the intertwined currents running through Parisian avant-garde art, it seems that Picasso's Demoiselles could hardly have been unaffected by what was being done by Matisse and Derain.

As he developed the theme by making studies in oil on canvas, Picasso's concept of the figures became increasingly angular and schematic. Planes became simplified to extremes and were flattened. Until May, or June, Iberian sculptures were still Picasso's source of inspiration, both in sketches for Demoiselles and other paintings such as Bust of a Woman and Self-Portrait. These show figures and faces with bland, doll-like expressions and an innocent-seeming handling of volumes and anatomical detail. Once the actual painting of

1. See p. 227 in the text.
2. Oppler, op.cit, p. 317.

Demoiselles was under way, another element was included, according to Barr.[1] This was an element reminiscent of El Greco. How deliberate this was, is not known, but considering the strong El Greco influence discernible in Peasants and Oxen, it seems likely that Picasso purposefully included these elements. On the whole, Demoiselles is a painting which was made with a great deal of deliberation. The similarities between Picasso's painting and El Greco paintings are to be found in an angular treatment of draperies and a type of highlighting Picasso must have noticed with interest in El Greco's work. He must have seen the abstract possibilities in this aspect of El Greco's rendering, and that, as a device, it could successfully be combined with Cézanne's angular treatment of pictorial elements. The use of an ominous, metallic blue into the area surrounding the far-right figure, surely also owes a debt to El Greco.

The progress of Demoiselles is usually assumed to have taken place from left to right, as it is in the left-hand side that vestiges of Picasso's preceding period are evident, including the warm pink flesh-tones and the treatment of the figures as a combination of primitive Iberian types and classical types. But, at the same time, Picasso abandoned the squat forms of late 1906, as well as their naturalistic curves and the sculpturesque modelling with which these had been rendered. While the pose and gesture of the far-left figure are almost the same as those of the left-hand figure in Two Nudes, a transformation has taken place. Most noticeable is the sharp angularity of the later figure, as well as the overlapping planes which have replaced traditional modelling. Picasso retained mask-like features, similar to those of Two Nudes, in the face of this figure, but took this a step farther by unequivocally drawing the eye in the primitive manner - that is, in frontal view, although the head is seen in profile. This tendency, borrowed from primitive art as well as from Cézanne, to show the viewer more than can normally be seen from one viewpoint - in other words, presenting a conceptual, rather than a visual reality, to the spectator - was carried through in the faces of the two central figures. Although they are facing frontwards, their noses are represented in profile and their ears are more visible than they would normally be. These two faces are very like the childlike, naïve face of Woman in Yellow (Spring 1907), and, according to Penrose[1] bear an affinity to faces found in medieval frescoes in Catalonia. Woman in Yellow shows an interesting, medieval manner of representing underlying muscular structure and joints, such as those of the wrists and the neck, which obviously intrigued Picasso, and traces of which can be found in the overlapping planes used to describe such features in the three left-hand figures in Demoiselles. In the two central figures, there is such deliberate parody of familiar classical and monumental nudes, that our attention has been drawn to the similarity of pose between Picasso's two female figures and traditional figures such as Michelangelo's slaves.[1] This pose, with one, or both, arms raised with the hand(s) behind the head in a long-established classic gesture of pain,[2] together with the relaxed stance of classic grace, in which the weight of the torso rests on one leg while the other leg relaxes from the hip, is one of the most typical in the European traditional repertoire, modelled on Greek sculpture, since the fifth century B.C.[3] The proportions of these two figures, and the way their torsos have been given a suggestion of the divisions to be found in Greek sculptures, as well as the pose and the drapery falling across hips and legs, suggests that Picasso was deliberately alluding to classical tradition.

---

[1] Barr, op.cit., p. 54.

---

[1] Penrose, op.cit., p. 129.

It is the two right-hand figures in Demoiselles, however, which have caused most comment and which give the picture its disturbing feeling of impending violence. These two figures were repainted in early July, there being evidence that they had originally been painted in a style conforming to that of the other three figures.[4] Although there is no mention by Rubin[5] of Picasso leaving Paris in the interval

[1] Rosenblum Cubism and Twentieth-Century Art, p. 15.

[2] Clark, K. The Nude, p. 220.

[3] Precedents : The Kritian Boy (480 B.C.), Hermes by Praxiteles (340 B.C.), Stumbling Niobid (5th c. B.C.), Roman copies of Greek Apollos, etc.

[4] Hilton, op.cit., p. 82. Evidence provided by X-rays.

[5] Rubin, op.cit., p. 87.

between May and July, Hilton,[1] going according to Salmon's account, says that Picasso went on holiday in the summer, after which he probably repainted the two figures in question. Whether this is a true account or not, it seems certain that, sometime in May or June,[2] Picasso visited the ethnographic museum at Palais du Trocadéro, where he saw examples of the type of Negro carving which had already fascinated Matisse and Derain. Excited by this belated discovery, Picasso quickly repainted the two right-hand figures in a savage style conflicting with that of the other three figures. For a reason he himself never explained, he did not rework the other figures in the interests of stylistic unity, leaving the painting as it was, with its baffling, but dynamic, contradictions, intact.

The stylistic innovations resulting from this major effort had implications as complex as the painting's progress, its derivations and iconography. Insofar as they constitute radical breaks-with-the-past, they were potentially of more consequence than anything produced by Picasso before 1907. During the process, of which Demoiselles was the result, the implications of what he was attempting, must have occurred to Picasso in a way which may have been unplanned. Thus, as Hilton[3] points out, there are violent differences between the painting and the drawings preparatory to it. In contrast to a mild Cézannism in these drawings and to Cézanne's own Bathers, the final painting of Demoiselles displays "a wildly jagged articulation [and] a shrieking lack of harmony"[1] not present in any preceding work by Picasso. Whatever motivated him towards such a violent solution, was powerful enough to make him disregard the considerable success he had begun to enjoy through the encouragement of the Steins, Vollard and other dealers. That he was prepared to jeopardize this success by wilfully shocking even the most progressive viewers, who saw this painting in his studio,[2] indicates that even if these blunt innovations were not entirely the result of planning, Picasso was probably fully aware of their awesome implications.

---

[1] Hilton, op.cit., p. 82.

[2] Rubin, op.cit., p. 87.

[3] Hilton, op.cit., p. 79.

Before considering, separately, some of the traditional stylistic elements which underwent radical change in Demoiselles, some general remarks about the picture as a whole should be made. Like all pictures, its compositional elements and the way they were arranged was determined by one or other system. Hilton[3] describes the construction of elements in Demoiselles as "a system of internal torques[4] ... [in which volumes are] ... made into a twisted or scything line." Hilton[1] sees this, rather than that it is a figure painting, as its essential characteristic. But such a narrow view implies that Picasso was not preoccupied with factors other than compositional ones. While it is certainly true that the "system of torques", emphasized as it is by the use of white lines and strips, are compositional devices which serve to unify otherwise discordant elements, Picasso was concerned with many other issues while executing this painting.

---

[1] Hilton, op.cit., p. 79.

[2] The painting was not seen outside Picasso's studio until 1916. See p. 248 in the text.

[3] Hilton, op.cit., p. 79.

[4] Oxford Dictionary, a torque is a necklace of twisted metal.

On the same subject - namely the composition of Demoiselles - Clay[2] has pointed out a difference in format between that of the definitive watercolour and the painting. The latter is a vertical rectangle while the former is a horizontal one. The effect of this is that the same figures have been compressed into a narrower space so that they do not "breathe" as comfortably as the ones in the watercolour. Psychologically, this "tightening of the space"[3] with its consequent crowding of figures which almost interlock, heightens the feeling of claustrophobic anxiety, or of unleashed brutality. Clay[4] is unperturbed by the apparent lack of cohesion in the styles of the figures themselves, also finding sufficient unifying elements in the picture to justify calling it "a work of singular unity". He names these elements as :

---

[1] Hilton, op.cit., p.

[2] Clay, op.cit., p. 135.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

"the triple stare"[1] of the two central figures and the lower right figure; the overall shallow, frontal representation of figures and draperies; the silhouettes of the figures which each occupy a specific space, sometimes overlapping, sometimes apart, but relating to one another like "parts of a collage"[2] and, lastly, the overall angularity of figures, draperies and still-life objects.

This discussion of Demoiselles would be incomplete without a brief analysis of the ways in which some fundamental principles of Post-Renaissance painting were revolutionized. According to Fry,[3] there were two such principles, or characteristics, from which Picasso diverged drastically. These were : the way in which the human figure was rendered; and the illusion of space created by the use of one-point perspective. Linked to these two central issues were the issues of chiaroscuro and the relationship between volumes and volumes and space. As far as the rendering of figures was concerned, it has already been mentioned that Picasso had drawn from his experience of various types and included these in the final picture in incongruous combinations, so that not one figure, in its entirety, truly resembles a specific type, not to mention the ideal type of European tradition. In this regard, Fry[4] has referred to Picasso's

---

[1] Clay, op.cit., p. 135.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Fry, E.F. Cubism, p. 13-6.

[4] Ibid., p. 13.

"complete freedom to re-order the human image." This re-ordering, in the form of a reduction of human anatomy to a system of arcs, triangles, ovals, crescents, wedges and the torques mentioned by Hilton,[1] which sometimes overlap and at other times are re-distributed in such a way that it is difficult for the viewer to re-assemble them in their traditional order, was quite distinct from the expressive distortions to which European viewers were accustomed. Until 1907, the distortions which appeared in Picasso's work, with the exception of those in Peasants and Oxen fell into the latter category.

By far the most radical departure from tradition in Demoiselles, however, lies in the almost total disregard for traditional perspective and its offshoot - spatial relationships - based on visual perception. Riviere[2] has some pertinent things to say on the subject of traditional perspective and what the Cubists were attempting. These apply equally well to Demoiselles - not strictly speaking a Cubist picture, but an important milestone towards Cubist concepts. Perspective, according to Riviere,[3] is "the sign

---

[1] Hilton, op.cit., p. 79.

[2] Riviere, J. Present Tendencies in Painting, in Fry, op.cit. p. 75 - 81.

[3] Ibid., p. 77.

... of a particular position in space. It indicates not the situation of the objects, but the situation of the spectator." He points out that, furthermore, the perspective from which the spectator views objects alters them by optical law, thus mutilating them.[1] But, this limited view of objects is overcome by movement on the part of the spectator, thereby providing a more complete knowledge of the objects in question. When, as in Demoiselles, the limiting one-point perspective was ignored in favour of the greater conceptual knowledge of the figures, what was most revealing about each part of these figures was fully represented. Thus, in the foreground figure on the right we see the back view of the torso, a mangled side view of one arm, the profile of the leg, and the face is turned towards the spectator, but with the nose in profile. According to Fry[2] multiple viewpoints as such were not new. Cézanne had discovered their use, especially in his still-lifes. What was new was the radical manner in which Picasso employed this device. As Cézanne had done, for example, in Still-life with Compote (1877-9), he combined separate viewpoints into single forms, as in the figure described above, but with a violence and purpose distinct from anything in Cézanne's work.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Fry, op.cit., p. 14.

Another device, borrowed from Cézanne, which also has a bearing on perspective is the one called passage. If the purpose of perspective, in the traditional sense, is to separate volumes by a suggestion of surrounding space and of recession, it follows that these volumes must not only be separated from one another and from emptiness, or air, by virtue of linear devices, they must also overlap one-another, in a series of "profiles" which diminish in size according to their supposed distance form the viewer, thus creating the traditional illusion of distance as well as separation of objects. Passage, on the contrary, is a device which creates ambiguities in this stystem. Instead of separating planes in the traditional way, they often merge with one another at unexpected points, so that the viewer is not certain where one plane begins or ends. Sometimes an area which represents space merges in the same way, either with another spatial "pocket", or with the plane of an object, creating further confusion. According to Fry,[1] the difference between the use of this device by Cézanne and Picasso, is that the former adhered to his insistence on "fidelity to the visual world," whereas, the latter, in Demoiselles, used it in a completely arbitrary manner, so that it is not certain, except where overlapping occurs, where the various forms are situated.

The last factor with regard to spatial dynamics in Demoiselles which must be mentioned here is the way in which the space

[1] Fry, op.cit., p. 15.

surrounding the figures is rendered with an equality of handling which makes the spaces between objects appear tangible. This arises from the premise that "depth must be expressed in genuinely plastic terms - by supposing it to have its own consistency - ... [and] ... it must be represented with as much solidity as the objects themselves and by the same means."[1] Thus, these spaces between objects have become "imaginary objects" obtruding where, in traditional pictures, an illusion of vacant space would have been created. In Picasso's last water-colour before proceding with the large canvas, he demonstrated an intention of portraying the spaces between the figures in this way, by interspersing the figures with a play of spots of colour which follow the shape vacated by surrounding figures. The result of this procedure was to bring the spaces, as well as the figures, close to the picture plane, thus creating an extremely shallow illusion of space. Furthermore, the forthright handling of this shallowing, or flattening device, leaves us in little doubt that part of the desired effect was that the viewer be made aware of the procedure itself.

Another fundamental device of Illusionism was dealt with by Picasso, in Demoiselles, with as much disregard as was perspective - namely the chiaroscuro which was so important for a convincing illusion of relief. For the first time,

---

1. Rivière, op.cit., p. 79.

in his work, Picasso played havoc with traditional chiasoscuro by redistributing the light so that it fell indiscriminately and inconsistently on figures and objects. This was quite different from the democratic lighting with which progressive painters since Courbet and Manet had replaced the artificial lighting of neo-classical or romantic paintings. Both academic and progressive lighting principles had a common basis - that is that, whatever the source of the light, natural laws determined how it fell on solid objects. In painting, these laws were adhered to by both schools of thought. The spectator was accustomed to the idea that such natural, or illusionistic, lighting revealed the subject according to expectations. Picasso's arbitrary distribution of light was, therefore, shocking. Shadows were indicated, logically, in one instance, only to be contradicted in another. Furthermore, the method of applying chiaroscuro with softly brushed paint of varying tones, has, in the two right-hand - Africanized - figures, been crudely rendered by means of striations of raw complementary colours. These striations were a direct tribute to African carving with its parallel grooves on the sides of noses, cheeks, etcetera. The lighting applied to the folds of drapery, in which Picasso has combined what he understood of passage with El Greco-inspired angular slashes, was, from a naturalistic point of view, the most illogical. In the interests of the overall compositional unity, dark and light areas have been made to obey the system whereby the figures are arranged rather than any natural laws.

In conclusion, something must be said about the history of Demoiselles, after Picasso finally stopped working on it. It is a painting of momentous significance in the history of modern art and, from the outset, elicited strong reactions from those who saw it. Penrose[1] and Hilton[2] have described some of those reactions. Most of Picasso's friends, who had supported his efforts till then, disapproved when they saw it in his studio for the first time. According to Penrose,[3] Matisse was angry, seeing the picture as a violent parody of the modern movement, of which he was the most prominent figure. Others who had taken Cézanne seriously, saw in it a wilful departure from the venerated master's bather pictures. Georges Braque was introduced to Picasso by Apollinaire, around October/Nobember 1907, when the latter brought him to the Bateau-Lavoir to see the picture. Penrose[4] quotes Braque as saying, on this occasion, "It is as though we are supposed to exchange our usual diet for one of tow and paraffin." Apollinaire and Shchukin expressed their disappointment. Exceptions to this general disapproval were the reactions of Wilhelm Uhde, and Daniel-Henry Kahnweiler.[5] The former was a German connoisseur and critic, the latter a dealer, critic and later historian

[1] Penrose, op.cit., p. 130.

[2] Hilton, op.cit., p. 84.

[3] Penrose, op.cit., p.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid., p. 131.

of Cubism, whom Picasso met at this time.[1] Penrose,[2] in relating the subsequent history of the painting, tells us that it remained rolled up in Picasso's studio for years. In 1916, it was seen by the public for the first time at the Galerie d'Antin. In 1920, it was bought by Jacques Doucet; in 1925, acclaimed by the Surrealists, when its present title, bestowed by André Salmon, was first used. It remained relatively unknown until 1937 when it was shown at the Petit Palais. Afterwards, it was bought by the Museum of Modern Art in New York, where it still hangs. In the following paragraphs, however, our concern will be with the immediate impact the painting had on developments in the Paris avant-garde, once the initial shock of seeing it had died down.

Before doing this, however, it should be mentioned that Picasso himself painted a number of pictures in the Negro style following the completion of Demoiselles. Here, it must be stated that Picasso's interest in Negro masks and carvings was strictly a European interest. Raynal,[3] one of Picasso's friends, reflects this when he ascribes to the Negro artist the following characteristics : "Self-taught, trusting to instinct, the Negro sculptor went ahead with a total disregard for reasoning processes." Apart from this misconception, though, Picasso, and others who followed the vogue for Negro fetishes, were excited by the total disregard of Naturalism inherent in African images. This in turn, inspired a conceptual rendering of the human form, but not a literal adaptation of African concepts into western art. In spite of the mannerisms borrowed from Negro carvings, Picasso's "postscripts" to Demoiselles are essentially European. If we compare his Dancer (Autumn, 1907) with a certain Bakota funerary fetish[1] we can see at once that although Dancer is clearly derived from the fetish, Picasso has imparted an un-African dynamism to the figure by representing it assymmetrically with suggestions of movement.

---

[1] Rubin, op.cit., p. 88.

[2] Penrose, op.cit., p. 136.

[3] Raynal, op.cit., p. 38.

Dancer, or Nude with Raised Arms, was the first of the so-called "postscripts". The trend continued until the end of 1907 and included violently jagged renderings such as Nude with Draperies and Vase of Flowers. The striations, in place of modelling, the mask-like faces and the angular reductions of all forms became, according to Hilton,[2] insistent to the point of stridency. For all this, they do not exude the power of the more enigmatic Demoiselles. Early in 1908, however, an element of calm once more manifested itself in paintings like Large Dryad, Three Women

[1] Reproduced on the same page in Rosenblum, op.cit., pl. 9, 10.

[2] Hilton, op.cit., p. 87.

and others, in which the female nude predominated. Once again, Picasso rendered the forms of the figures in a simplified, straightforward way as regards proportion, viewpoint and modelling. But, unlike the stony figures of Two Nudes, these are deliberately geometric and wooden in appearance. Even the colour is a rich golden-brown. In places, as in Three Women, the forms are faceted in a fairly consistent way so that they serve the purpose of constructing an illusion of solidity, quite unlike the flat, overlapping, angular planes of Demoiselles.

Following the major achievement of 1907, Picasso, for a short while, went through another of his periods of uncertainty. The negative reactions to his work may have discouraged him from exploring the possibilities it contained. But this situation changed when Braque recovered from his initial shock at the sight of the painting and registered its implications from the formal, pictorial point of view. Before turning to a consideration of what followed as a result of this, it must be noted that Braque's interest in Picasso's painting to the point where he wished to take up its innovations in his own work, represents Picasso's real entry into French avant-garde art. Until Demoiselles, he had, for practical purposes, been seen as an interesting outsider, not a major contributor.

## The Development of Analytical Cubism, 1908 - 1911

Before commencing with the subject in question under the above heading, mention must be made of the impossibility of arriving at a satisfactory understanding of Cubism by studying Picasso's contribution alone. It is well-known that the evolution of the style was largely in the hands of both Picasso and Braque, especially in the initial stages now to be considered. A fault of many accounts of Picasso's development is the tendency to minimize the importance of Braque's role during the crucial years between 1907 and 1914. But, as the intention here is not so much a Picasso-oriented study, as a study of important stylistic changes brought about by Picasso, it is of vital importance that Braque's contribution towards these changes are not overlooked. For this reason, there will, at times, be alternating accounts of both artists' progress, although greater attention will still be accorded to Picasso. At times, as we shall soon see, Braque was, conceptually, ahead of Picasso. At other times, the reverse was true. As we shall also see, Braque exerted a definite influence over Picasso as far as persevering with their experiments was concerned. It is, perhaps, due to Braque that for the next seven years Picasso was motivated by a steadier sense of direction than had hitherto been the case. In personality, the two were very different - Picasso was changeable, Braque was single-minded. During the time of their collaboration, the combination worked well.

Braque was born at Argenteuil on May 13 1882, but, in 1890, the family moved to Le Havre in Normandy, where, as we have seen, artists were steeped in the Impressionist legacy of Boudin, Jongkind and Monet. Braque's father was, by trade, a house-decorator with artistic leanings, and in 1899 Braque too entered this trade, but, in his spare time, he attended art classes. Like Picasso, he too arrived in Paris for the first time in 1900, but not immediately to take up an artistic career. He continued learning his father's trade, which would, in due course, prove of artistic value in a most surprising way. After a spell of military service in 1901 near Le Havre, Braque, in 1902, finally embarked on an artistic training by returning to Paris and attending classes at the Académie Humbert and, briefly, at the École des Beaux-Arts.[1] During the next few years, he became involved with fellow artists who were experimenting with styles derived from Impressionism and Post-Impressionism. Then, around 1906, he and Othon Friesz spent some time painting together in Antwerp. They frequently painted exactly the same scene, such as The Port of Antwerp, in a loosely Impressionist style, but Braque's versions show a great understanding of structure and spatial relationships, as well as a more restrained use of colour. Through his friendship with Friesz, Braque got to know older Fauves like Matisse and Derain. By 1907, he himself was painting

[1] Gieure, M., Georges Braque, p. 11-6.

more or less in their current style, which was the broad, free Pointillism already described. Little Bay at La Ciotat (1907) is a good example. Later in the same year, he followed the trend towards a more Gauguinesque style in which the gaps between colours were closed, the dabs all but disappeared, to be replaced by a brightly-coloured design of landscape features with shapes defined almost solely by the broad areas of flat colour confined within them. Hardly any modelling or linear definition was used. The effect is somewhat like a modern free-style patchwork. In Landscape at La Ciotat there are, however, hints of an interest in Cézanne's style in the pine tree to the left of centre.

At the time of Braque's introduction to Picasso by Apollinaire late in 1907, Fauvism, as the latest breakaway movement, was waning. One of the chief reasons for this was the "discovery" of Cézanne by critics, writers and artists alike who hailed him "as a modern master of classicism"[1] and the future source of inspiration. The bright colours and formless shapes of their pictures no longer satisfied the Fauves themselves, which is why, as we have seen, they were beginning to incorporate Cézannisms into their work. The bather theme was the first of Cézanne's themes to grasp the general imagination. It was approached with the intention of emulating Cézanne to a limited extent. Each

[1] Oppler, op.cit., p. 330.

Fauve, within the scope of his individual style, attempted similar large nude figure compositions comprising a more structured, volumetric rendering of figures and surrounding landscape features. Apart from the already mentioned Blue Nude by Matisse and Bathers by Derain, variations on this theme were painted by de Vlaminck and Friesz. Braque was not unaffected by the general mood of the group. The sight of Picasso's Demoiselles, so similar in theme, but so different from Fauve renderings, proved decisive in the direction he now took. Indeed, he was one of the first artists to recover from the initial shock engendered by Picasso's painting and, as he demonstrated, one of the first to understand its potential as a pointer towards the new, truly modern style still eluding progressive artists and theorists.

Rubin[1] tells us that, having seen Demoiselles, Braque left off work on a series of landscapes of La Ciotat and L' Estaque - favourite haunts of Cézanne - to paint a monumental nude of his own. This was the well-known Large Nude (141 x 101 cm) which he only completed in June 1908. What Braque attempted to do in this painting was to combine elements from Demoiselles with what he understood of Cézanne. Although, while painting Demoiselles, Picasso was fully aware of the enthusiasm for Cézanne which was in the air and, as has been shown, had certainly incorporated Cézannisms into the work, it can safely be said that, at this stage,

[1] Rubin, op.cit., p. 88.

he was more fascinated by Negro art than by Cézanne. Braque, on the contrary, was beginning to immerse himself thoroughly in Cézanne's procedures. It is not surprising, therefore, that Large Nude recalls Cézanne to an extent not found in Demoiselles. From the latter, according to Cooper,[1] Braque derived the somewhat clumsy distortions, as well as the twisted pose, which is not a simple profile, and the inconsistent source of light. It seems that the idea of multiple viewpoints had inspired Braque to try and find a way of rendering the distortions, which were the result of such a procedure, without flattening them out as Picasso had done with his overlapping flat planes. Braque applied a Cézannesque modelling to the shapes within the figure to give it a feeling of volume, and, passage has been applied to a limited extent in the background. His own comments on this painting, and on a drawing which preceded it, indicate that he was consciously tackling the problems of what was soon to be called "Cubism"[2] The drawing is of especial interest in that it contains three figures of the same nude woman seen from different viewpoints. It was also accompanied by a statement by Braque to the effect that this represented three aspects of the same woman. If we compare this drawing with Picasso's Three Women, begun in 1908 and completed in January 1909 - six months after the completion of Braque's Large Nude, we can only conclude that Picasso was aware of what Braque was doing and was attempting something very similar. Braque borrowed poses from Demoiselles and Picasso repeated two such poses a year later. It is interesting to note that, instead of multiple viewpoints being combined into one figure, as they had been in Demoiselles, they were now represented by three figures.

---

[1] Cooper, D. The Cubist Epoch, p. 28.

[2] Ibid., p. 27-8.

In the summer of 1908, Braque, accompanied by Dufy, spent the Summer at L'Estaque, where he made considerable progress towards resolving the problems he had set himself. This was particularly difficult because of the inherent contradictions implicit in his aims. These aims were very similar, at this stage, to Cézanne's, namely how to represent "the interaction between different aspects ..., between structure and movement ..., between solids and the space around them ..., between the unambiguous signs made on the surface of the picture and the changing reality which they stand in for."[1] In other words, the problem was how to work out a system of pictorial organization which would, at one and the same time impose order, but discard the static images of the past so that changeability could be represented, and, finally, not attempt to disguise the process by which this was achieved with eye-fooling illusionistic techniques. The type of movement which was now the aim was one based on real visual perception, and had nothing to do with the dynamism of tradition, which represents movement by means of

[1] Berger, op.cit., p. 59-60.

bustling, turbulent, assymmetrical, agitated forms or use of paint, but yet remains an arrested image. The Cubists, by this account, were attempting the well-nigh impossible. Not only did they set out to do all these things, but they also did not want to do so by rendering solid forms insubstantially. They were also concerned with ways in which to "present strongly structured volumes and take into account the frontal plane of the canvas."[1]

While at L'Estaque, Braque made significant advances towards a solution of the seemingly irreconcilable aims he had set himself. He also made an advance which Cézanne, with his faithfulness to visual truth, had been unable to make. Both Cooper[2] and Hilton[3] have noted that, while using obvious Cézannian devices, Braque "did not allow the landscape to impose itself on him ... but instead consciously imposed his own sense of reality on the landscapes."[4] In order to achieve this new reality of the picture as distinct from the motif, Braque made a more extensive use of Cézanne's device of passage than he or Picasso had done in Large Nude or Demoiselles, where passage is confined mainly to the background. The use of this device, when applied to solid volumes, has the effect of flattening out the image. This is counterbalanced by a clear faceting of shapes into cubes

---

1. Clay, op.cit., p. 144.
2. Cooper, op.cit., p. 28.
3. Hilton, op.cit., p. 92.
4. Cooper, op.cit., p. 29.

and triangles by both linear and painterly means in a more emphatic way than Cézanne had ever done. Both Braque and Dufy produced paintings with these characteristics. Also noticeable, as far as composition was concerned, was the exclusion of sky which would have alluded to illusionistic rendering of space and light. This adds to the assertion of frontality already a factor in these renderings. Houses at L'Estaque is typical of the paintings by Braque during this Summer. Finally, it should be noted that an inevitable result of the application of the above-mentioned devices was considerable ambiguity as regards the definition and separation of individual trees, houses, foreground plane etcetera, as well as distortion of shape in terms of traditional one-point perspective.

While Braque was at L'Estaque, Picasso had been working on a series of still-lifes and the composition Three Women. The brutality of the Negro style was disappearing along with references to African masks. If we look at a selection of the work done during 1908,[1] Picasso seems to have been attempting to work out a solution with Cubist implications. But, as usual, he tried to do this in a variety of ways, so that a number of possible solutions presented themselves. Thus, if we look at the series of Three Women studies and paintings, it is clear that Picasso played with all sorts of variations, some more abstract than others. Three Women

---

[1] Rubin, op.cit., p. 106-116.

(version rhythmée), for example, consists of a design of arc shapes to which the combined anatomies and gestures of the figures have been reduced. Throughout, Picasso has applied passage, multiple viewpoints and shifting, slipping outlines in a way far in advance of the final version of Three Women, in which each one is, once again, well defined within traditional contours. But in the final version, Picasso has attempted to apply faceting consistently so that a three-dimensional, rather blocky illusion was created. Compared with Braque's faceting in Houses at L'Estaque, Picasso's method was still elementary. Furthermore, Picasso seemed less able, at this stage, to combine faceting, passage and multiple viewpoints consistently throughout one picture as Braque was doing.

At this stage - Summer 1908 - another fascinating source of inspiration diverted Picasso's attention away from the general trend towards Cézannism. This new source was to be found in the work of the eccentric and childlike Henri (le Douanier) Rousseau (1844-1910). As always, Picasso was attracted towards the Primitivism in Rousseau's work and, himself, acquired one of them, Portrait of a Woman, sometime in 1908.[1] For a short while this new inspiration made itself apparent in his own work. These were the paintings done during the Autumn at Rue des Bois, a small place in the country just north of Paris. He and Fernande went there

[1] Rubin, op.cit., p. 89.

in August, and, while there, Picasso painted figures, still-lifes and landscapes - a subject almost absent from his repertoir since 1896. The landscapes such as House in the Garden,[1] are the most interesting in the context of this research. In them, Picasso demonstrated that he knew that landscapes ã la Cẽzanne were currently the vogue. At the same time, he applied "a primitive Cẽzannism"[2] to the landscape by way of tribute to Rousseau. Picasso was trying to apply, in a limited way, Cẽzanne's fundamental principles to his own ideas. Thus, in these landscapes, his use of passage is not as comprehensive as in Braque's l'Estaque landscapes. Part of this technique involves what Hilton terms a more "brushy melding"[3] and a relative disappearance of drawing. In general, Picasso's natural tendency was towards a more graphic technique and this made him reluctant to "bring all the elements of his painting up to the picture plane."[4] The shapes and forms in the Rue des Bois paintings are, therefore, more closed than those in Braque's landscapes. Furthermore, the influence of Rousseau's naive factual approach is reflected in the "bold literal way of representing a tree, a house, foliage or a surrounding wall."[5] In keeping with this, there are no grotesque distortions of the type to be seen in Demoiselles, and, where ambiguities

[1] Example : Rubin, op.cit., p. 111.

[2] Ibid., p. 88.

[3] Hilton, op.cit., p. 92.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Cooper, op.cit., p. 34.

occur, they do not stem from altogether the same aims as they do in Braque's work. They seem, instead, to be the result of hesitancy. There was also a return to a very simplified modelling within shapes reminiscent of Rousseau's work. For a while after his return to Paris, Picasso continued to paint in this style. In the still-life paintings of this time, more obvious affinities with Cézanne appeared, particularly in the deliberate use of tilted planes of table tops and the use of contradictory linear perspective, in an effort to bring these planes towards the picture plane.

In September 1908, Braque submitted six of his L'Estaque paintings to the Salon d'Automne. They were refused by the jury, which included Matisse who is said to have dismissed the style as "making little cubes".[1] In November, these paintings were exhibited at Kahnweiler's gallery where they attracted considerable attention as a novelty. Hilton[2] tells us that Braque and Picasso were very interested in one-another's work during the Winter of 1908-09, apparently recognizing a common purpose.

The following Summer (1909), both artists again left Paris, Braque to another of Cézanne's favourite sites at La Roche Guyon in the Seine Valley, Picasso, with Fernande, to Spain. The latter spent most of their time at Horta de Ebro

1. Rubin, op.cit., p. 89.
2. Hilton, op.cit., p. 95.

(Pallares' village),[1] until September/October when they returned to Paris with paintings which were a significant contribution to the Cubist venture. The same applied to the paintings done by Braque at La Roche Guyon. Once again, Braque's paintings will be considered first, after which we shall turn to Picasso's.

In all, Braque returned to Paris with eight landscapes, remarkable for their lyrical beauty as well as for the rapid progress they demonstrated towards a solution of one of the immediate problems facing a Cubist painter, namely, that of "representing space without perspective"[2] while still representing the tangible roundness of things.[3] The difference between Braque and Picasso, at this stage, was that Picasso was still adhering to the integrity of solid forms while "flattening their spatial setting to counteract the resulting recession."[4] Braque, on the other hand, flattened, and made ambiguous, the objects to the same extent as the surrounding space so that spatial depth disappeared. Of the two painters, Braque was the more methodical, working systematically and intellectually towards a solution of the problems he had formulated for himself. Prior to his trip to La Roche Guyon, in two paintings of fishing harbours in Normandy, he had already gone a long way towards such a solution. He had achieved this by an increased use of dissolving outlines, a shallow background plane merging with the foreground plane consisting of the sea, and by a complex structure of lines and facets leading the eye backwards and forwards. Light is distributed arbitrarily across the canvas. In the La Roche Guyon paintings, this procedure has been taken even further. Once again, the sky has been excluded. Objects and surrounding space merge with one another to an increasing extent from the first to the last of these paintings, so that in the last of the series, natural phenomena are barely recognizable.[1] The perspective no longer leads the eye into an illusory depth, but spreads and plunges vertically with a logic of its own. The resulting distortions are not disturbing because they belong to an otherwise harmonious system.

---

[1] Sometimes called Horta San Juan.

[2] Cooper, op.cit., p. 37-8.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., p. 37.

While Braque was preoccupying himself with spatial relationships, at the expense of the volumes themselves, Picasso was pursuing his own course at Horta. This still consisted of a struggle to find a new way of rendering volumes without sacrificing their solidity. He continued, therefore, with a more blocklike rendering of forms. At the same time, he still had not abandoned the primitivisms he was trying to combine with Cézannisms, with which they were incompatible. But the landscape, or rather, townscape, at Horta lent itself to a more consistent use of Cézannesque devices, especially

[1] Clay, op.cit., p. 146-7. Three reproductions demonstrate this process.

faceting. Judging by photographs of the place,[1] the landscape was rugged and mountainous, and the town a cluster of block-shaped houses with pitched roofs very close to one another, so that, together, they presented a unified impression. Vestiges of Rousseau-like simple depiction can be seen in the rendering of palm trees in Factory at Horta de Ebro, but these form part of the unified whole, as their treatment is in keeping with the generally consistent structure of pictorial elements. From Picasso's first Horta landscapes, such as the one reproduced by Rubin,[2] there was a distinct development from a more or less literal interpretation of Cézanne's methods of faceting and applying passage, to a more personal one in which Picasso returned to his own preference for a clearer, more linear and angular interpretation. This can be seen in the paintings of that Summer, such as Factory at Horta de Ebro, Houses on the Hill, Horta de Ebro and The Reservoir, Horta de Ebro. Apart from the crisp, clear faceting of forms, passage has been used as a coherent principle throughout these paintings. This was the first time Picasso had successfully combined these two devices so that, instead of abrupt separations occuring between different objects - in this case, mostly buildings - and objects and surrounding space, he has shown a willingness to merge faceted forms into one another, often creating ambiguities from the literal point of view, but creating a

---

1. Fry, op.cit., pl. 14, Rubin, op.cit., p. 120.

2. Rubin, op.cit., p. 129, Mountain of Santa Bárbara.

unified whole from the structural point of view. Even though, unlike Braque, he still included the sky, this too has been faceted and, at times, merged into adjacent shapes. Picasso's way of applying faceting and passage did not blur objects in the same way as Braque's use of these devices did. If we compare Mountain of Santa Bárbara, which is the most Cézannesque of Picasso's landscapes and, by the same token, the most impressionistic as far as atmospheric rendering is concerned, with the Horta landscapes which immediately followed, and, if we remember Picasso's earlier ventures into Impressionist styles, it is clear that visual naturalism, which tends to dissolve the outlines of objects, held little interest for him. Braque, on the other hand, had behind him a tradition of French lyricism about nature, via Impressionism. Within Picasso's overall scheme, facets have clear, sharp edges and the resulting multitude of square and triangular flat shapes are dark or light or mid-toned in a way reminiscent of traditional chiaroscuro except that, as in Braque's paintings and in Demoiselles, the source of light is illogical so that, once again, there is an overall distribution of light rather than focussed light. But, at this stage, the individual differences between Braque and Picasso were still evident; Picasso still showing an intense interest in forms, Braque in a more atmospheric treatment of whole themes. As in Braque's La Roche Guyon paintings, Picasso's Horta paintings also contain distortions, ambiguities and contradictions, but, for the same reason - that is, because they are part of a coherent system - these are undisturbing. The calm atmosphere of these paintings can be attributed to the unemotional way in which Picasso set about solving their purely formal problems. A factor which greatly contributes towards the soberness of the end results is undoubtedly the use of a restricted range of muted colours which seemed necessary when the analytical possibilities of the subject began to appear far more complex than had been the case the previous year at Rue des Bois, when quite a lot of green had been included in Picasso's colour schemes.

The confidence with which Picasso tackled the subject of Horta and surroundings was not carried over to the same extent in the portraits, mainly of Fernande, which were another preoccupation during the Summer at Horta. Hilton[1] has pointed out that portraits, by their very nature, present difficulties to the artist who wishes radically to analyse forms. Whereas it is relatively easy to take liberties with the traditional way of rendering shapes in landscapes and still-lifes, there is an innate reluctance to do the same in portraiture with its personal and emotional overtones. Thus, Picasso's portraits of Fernande, painted in 1909, betray something of this dilemma in their distortions, which are clumsy and sometimes grotesque. Picasso was, perhaps, experiencing difficulty escaping conservative conventions in order to find a valid Cubist solution, such as he was finding in the landscapes. The faceting, according to Hilton,[1] lacks autonomy, so that the rearrangement of features and planes - so necessary in Cubism - does not take place. Instead, Picasso adhered to conventional, but distorted outlines of Fernande's form, preferring to effect relatively minor changes within the outline, but without serious displacements of eyes, nose, mouth, etcetera. Compared with his many portraits, painted after the Cubist period - for instance those of Marie Thérese Walter and Dora Maar in the 1930s - which, though far more radically distorted, yet bear uncanny likenesses to their sitters, these Fernande portraits are a crude travesty of her real appearance. One relevant factor which may partly account for this awkwardness was of a personal nature. The relationship betwen Picasso and Fernande, once such a happy one, had become troubled. Picasso's biographers, in particular Sabartes,[2] have drawn attention to a noticeable correlation between his domestic situations and his approach towards the female human figure in his work. At those times during which his relationship with his current mistress, or wife, had turned acrimonious, there was a tendency towards a type of distortion which was of a personal nature, and certainly of a more disturbing appearance, than those which were the logical outcome of purely formal experiments. That this was so was surely more than mere coincidence.[3] The 1909

---

[1] Hilton, op.cit., p. 97.

---

1. Hilton, op.cit., p. 96.

2. But also Penrose and O'Brian.

3. Another example of this recurring tendency, occurred around 1930 at the time of the disintegration of Picasso's marriage to Olga. Particularly violent distortions and dislocations appeared at this time in his female figures.

portraits of Fernande certainly represent an uncharitable image of her.

It seems that the relative good fortune Picasso and Fernande began to experience, as far as material well-being was concerned, partly contributed to the deterioration in their relationship. On their return to Paris in September 1909, they moved from the Bateau-Lavoir to quarters which were sumptuous by comparison, on the boulevard de Clichy. Here, for a while, they derived a certain amount of pleasure in playing at a pampered bourgeois existence, complete with "maid in white apron",[1] who served meals in a dining room, and Sunday afternoon entertainment of friends. But, it seems, this was the start of an unhappy period which ended in 1911. Fernande remembered their bohemian Bateau-Lavoir days with nostalgia, implying that the upgrading of their lifestyle was responsible for the end of their time together.[2]

When it came to more neutral subject-matter, Picasso was able to apply a more rigorous Cubist discipline to it, as we have seen in the Horta paintings. Apart from portraits and landscapes, Picasso returned to Paris with a stilllife, painted right at the end of his stay at Horta. Called The Botijo, or Stillife with Liqueur Bottle, this picture shows a confidence in the use of faceting and *passage* absent in the portraits. It also differs from the landscapes in its more daring departure from factual reality than anything he had done so far. The faceted shapes are distributed in an arrangement bearing little resemblance to the subject-matter. As in Braque's last La Roche Guyon painting where very few legible shapes have been left for the viewer, so too in The Botijo, very few objects are easily identifiable. Picasso's use of passage in this painting is very close to Braque's understanding of this device. Like Braque's, it has been applied by means of more painterly brushstrokes than the rather graphic treatment in the Horta scenes. But, otherwise, it is typical of Picasso's more hard-edged technique and use of sharper contrasts. At the time, he seemed, in fact, to be adopting a deliberately unsentimental approach and a use of chiaroscuro reminiscent of Spanish Tenebrist painting. The breaking up of the surface into a pattern of light and dark shapes which often merge into one-another is similar to the way the strong chiaroscuro forms patterns in Zurbarān's paintings, except that, in keeping with Cubist principles, Picasso's distribution of light and dark does not refer to a particular source of light.

---

[1] Rubin, *op.cit.*, p. 120.

[2] Olivier, *op.cit.*, p. 132-134, p. 185.

That Picasso was consciously referring to traditional aspects of picture construction such as chiaroscuro becomes even more evident when we examine the still-lifes he painted immediately after his return to Paris, in which he continued to use dark, sombre tonalities very similar to those used by Spanish old masters. On top of this, he composed these still-lifes in such a way that the area of most interest is focussed around the centre of the canvas, more or less within a pyramidal shape - possibly the most classic of all traditional compositions. The highlighting of important facets or shapes was done with obvious deliberation on Picasso's part. Rubin[1] has very conveniently reproduced The Botijo, Carafe and Candlestick and Fan, Salt Box and Melon opposite one another so that we can easily see the direction Picasso was taking late in 1909. Carafe and Candlestick is - apparently - incomplete. In it, a group of objects has been situated in the centre of the horizontal format. They have been rendered in a far more literal way than the objects in The Botijo, as though Picasso needed to concentrate his attention on the objects themselves once more, faceting them fairly realistically and exploring the play of light and dark on their surfaces and in their immediate surroundings. Picasso's chief interest appears to have been this chiaroscuro, which he had begun to work carefully into the painting, which he left incomplete around the edges and towards the corners of the canvas which remain white. Fan, Salt Box and Melon, on the other hand, is complete. In it, Picasso has achieved a well-balanced, traditional pyramidal composition, emphasized by a more coherent use of chiaroscuro than is to be seen in The Botijo, but entirely in the Cubist idiom - that is, with an equally coherent use of faceting, passage, multiple viewpoints and contradictory perspective. It has already been seen that Picasso, from his youth, had been fond of experimenting with devices, no matter what their source. As he matured, this developed into an ability to juxtapose traditional and progressive devices, thereby creating paradoxes, puns and analogies, which sometimes were serious in intention, but at other times, could be humourous or mischievous in spirit. In 1909, the use of traditionally inspired chiaroscuro had serious connotations and implications for Cubism. From a purely formal point of view, as against a realistic or dramatic one, chiaroscuro has always had the effect of fragmenting volumes into abstract shapes. That Picasso chose to interest himself in this device at this time was not accidental, but a sign of his recognition of its possibilities as far as his experiments with breaking up volumes was concerned. Dramatic highlighting, contrasted with dark shadows, assisted in the fragmenting of volumes into facets. At the same time, it exposed the traditional device as merely a device in the service of Illusionism. But, most importantly, it helped Picasso to allow facets to "slip"[1] and be reassembled in such a way that outlines too began to be fragmented.

---

[1] Rubin, op.cit., p. 134-5.

In a portrait of Braque (late 1909), this treatment of the outline is evident, and shows that Picasso was now able to apply this Cubist procedure to a portrait. If, on his return from Spain, he had momentarily wavered between a literal rendering of some elements in his paintings, and a consistently analytical one, his renewed association with Braque seems to have decided him on the latter course.

---

[1] Barr, op.cit., p. 69.

From this time, Picasso and Braque were in closer contact than they had been previously. Such a working relationship was a new experience for Picasso, who, it will be remembered, had been accustomed to experimenting with new styles for relatively short periods, and who, in Paris, had had the status of an exotic foreigner when it came to what were primarily French concerns. The contact with Braque effectively disciplined his efforts for an unusually prolonged period. Likewise, Picasso's personality and artistic dynamism stimulated Braque to pursue solutions to Cubist problems with enthusiasm. This joint enterprise was more fruitful than a single-handed one would have been, for the simple reason that each of the two artists exercised certain controls over the other, or, by turns, spurred the other on when fresh advances had clearly been made. The result was a rigorous application of principles which ensured a rapid, but logical, progress towards an advanced analytical style which was truly new. By 1909, "Cubism" was already an accepted term and there were well-formulated aims attached to it. These were rooted in the same desire to break with the past, which included Impressionism, as that which had been responsible for the Fauve experiements a few years earlier. Cubism had, in fact, replaced Fauvism as far as fame and notoriety, in and outside France, were concerned. Henceforth, Picasso's name was linked with the French avant-garde movement.[1]

---

[1] Rubin, op.cit., p. 121 onwards. The chronology details various group exhibitions in which Picasso took part all over Europe, sometimes with Braque.

So intent were Picasso and Braque on their systematic researches that, from around 1910, they made a conscious effort to exclude subjective elements from their work to the point where they sought anonymity by painting in as similar a style as possible and omitting to sign their names on their work. By thus suppressing personal interpretations, they were able to concentrate on their stated aims,[1] which required not only the representation of as many aspects or facets of reality as possible on the two-dimensional surface, but also to "recreate visual reality as completely as possible in a ... non-imitative form."[2] The first step towards achieving this was to increase the analysis of form in as impersonal a way as possible. For this reason, simple, symmetrical, pyramidal compositions were chosen, so that there could be nothing anecdotal or idiosyncratic to detract from the main purpose. In this, it seems, Picasso was the precursor. His still-lifes inspired Braque to tackle similar themes, in which his love of music led to the inclusion of musical instruments such as the violin in Pitcher and Violin (1909-10). While using a similar vertical format to the La Roche Guyon landscapes and a similar plunging perspective, there is clearly a hint of Picasso's chiaroscuro and symmetrical composition in these works by Braque. But his faceting is far more intricate than Picasso's and he was even more willing to

---

1. Cooper, op.cit., p. 49.
2. Ibid.

allow these facets to slip, which they do more drastically than do Picasso's. From this time onwards, Braque almost exclusively painted indoors in his studio in the Rue Caulaincourt, confining himself to indoor subjects like still-lifes. Around 1910, he introduced a new element into these Cubist pictures, in the form of small trompe l'oeil objects such as the nail in Violin and Palette and Pitcher and Violin, which casts its own illusionist shadow. The intention behind this was to point out the difference between an illusionistic rendering and a conceptual one.

During 1910, Picasso painted a series of figure studies and portraits which, like his still-lifes, were composed in the simplest possible ways - mostly single figures centrally placed on the canvas - so that complex analytical problems presented by the human figure could be explored without the hampering effects of extraneous details. The first of these figure paintings - of seated women[1] - soon taught Picasso to avoid complicated poses which were difficult to resolve in a Cubist manner. His most successful nude figure, of early 1910, was Girl with a Mandolin which seems to have been intended as a modern rendering of traditional figure studies of the type executed in academic institutions. In them, students were meant to master the underlying anatomical structure and stance, and not to represent the model's individual peculiarities. Furthermore, as we have seen,

[1] Rubin, op.cit., p. 136.

students were expected to subject the proportions of the real model to a generalizing, or idealizing process. For these purposes - especially for beginners - straightforward, front-facing poses were customary, and no compositional complexities were tackled. The figure was placed in the most central position in the format. In Girl with a Mandolin, Picasso followed this procedure by placing the upright figure in the centre of the canvas, and by generalizing the model's proportions to the point of stylization. But, instead of meticulously exploring illusionistic solutions to the volumes and their surrounding space, an almost entirely Cubist solution has been attempted. Here and there, allusions to tradition were inlcuded - for instance in the modelling and outline of the inside of the model's right breast, but this was immediately counteracted by the jagged faceting on the other side of the same breast. The instrument, arms and hands, which are the features of most anecdotal interest in this subject, have been left almost intact within their outlines, but the torso and left-hand shoulder of the figure have been subjected to a cubistic construction consisting of rectangles and triangles which have been shaded, not so that they appear rounded, but so that they appear like a series of overlapping flat shapes. Under the model's right breast, there is a gap in this construction so that, where we more or less expect a continuation of the contour from armpit to waist, there is nothing but a darkened space between the belly and the cylinder of the arm. Apparently, Picasso was obliged to leave this painting in an unfinsihed state because the model, Fanny Tellier, refused to continue with the lengthy sittings. Whether or not this explains the above-mentioned radical anatomical treatment, Picasso himself later expressed his satisfaction that this had occurred, when he said, "It may be just as well I left it as it is."[1] What is important here is that Picasso had been able to apply a rigorous Cubist procedure to a meticulously observed natural form, at times omitting or distorting parts of the conventional contours of this form. His recent experiments with chiaroscuro enabled him to suggest the solidity of the form while at the same time fragmenting it.

In collaboration with Braque, with whom he had many discussions on the subject, this analysis intensified. Together, they worked out an elaborate system of faceting, producing the "complex structure of planes at different levels ... [and the] ... network of small interpenetrating planes ... [which] ... unite objects with the space around them,"[2] which gave rise to the term "Analytical Cubism". While this was in progress, both artists limited their use of colour to a more or less neutral palette. Colour, like asymmetrical compositions, would have been an unnecessary complication at this stage when the problem of the interrelationships between volumes, and volumes and

1. Rubin, op.cit., p. 121.
2. Cooper, op.cit., p. 45.

space, had not yet been satisfactorily resolved. In keeping with their respective approaches, Braque was still more interested in working out "a comprehensive system of spatial notation"[1] which he had not yet achieved, while Picasso, characteristically, was still preoccupied with volumetric problems. For this reason, his figures continued, for the time being, to detach themselves from their surroundings. By a systematic process, which they followed from Spring 1910 until that Autumn, Picasso and Braque arrived at a solution to this problem.

This began with two portraits painted by Picasso in the Spring - one of Ambroise Vollard, the other of Wilhelm Uhde. When we recall the earlier difficulties Picasso had experienced with portraiture, it is interesting to note the progress he now made in a renewed effort to resolve the intrinsic problems of the genre in a Cubist manner. These two portraits provide us with an excellent opportunity for observing this progress, because the portrait of Uhde was painted after the one of Vollard was already under way. Once the portrait of Uhde had been completed, Picasso returned to that of Vollard, and applied the more advanced analytical discoveries he had made in the meantime in the Uhde portrait to the lower section of the Vollard one, while leaving Vollard's head, painted at an earlier stage, as it was. The portrait of Uhde was rapidly, and sparingly,

1. Cooper, op.cit., p. 49.

executed, compared to that of Vollard. The result is an analytical and stylistic unity lacking in Vollard's portrait. For all this, the Vollard painting is compelling, perhaps because of the stylistic contradictions it contains. Portrait of Wilhelm Uhde is less representational in its facial features than Portrait of Ambroise Vollard by virtue of the overall system of angular, frequently open, faceting, accompanied by a broken linear definition to which they have been subjected. The latter portrait's head is closer, in its approach, to the earlier Girl with a Mandolin. But, in the lower portion, the rendering of the figure, clothed in suit and cravat, is less representational than the corresponding part of the Uhde portrait. The technique of open, linear faceting has been carried further towards abstraction. The chiaroscuro in these paintings is similar to that in portions of Girl with a Mandolin - that is, the linear planes which are suggested by the facets are shaded so as to appear flat, either meeting one another at angles, or overlapping. It does, however still refer, for the most part, to its illusionist function which is to illuminate features which catch the light so that these emerge from the shadows. Compared with Girl with a Mandolin, the Cubist procedure, in these two portraits, was made far more complex, not only because the facets increased in number, but because of their interlocking in places, their superimposition in others and, here and there, a hint of transparency, which was a new device in the Cubist repertoire.

Braque's still-life paintings at this time were, according to Hilton[1] more conceptual than Picasso's figures and portraits. This was because of Braque's continued insistence on using Cubist devices to bring painted objects, together with their surrounding space, to the surface of the canvas with an equality which Picasso was still resisting. The result was that Braque's objects and the space around them were rendered far more ambiguously than Picasso's, in which there were still suggestions of recession and projection. This was partly due to the fact that Picasso reverted to his preference for linear treatment, whereas Braque preferred a more painterly, atmospheric technique which lent itself to abstraction more readily. It was also due, however, to Picasso's persistent intense interest in the subjects themselves. In _Violin with Palette_ and _Violin with Pitcher_, painted by Braque, at the time Picasso's portraits were in progress, the bland subject-matter was deliberately chosen for its neutrality. Unlike "the powerful personalities of Vollard and Uhde,"[2] such subjects were, in themselves, unobtrusive, thus allowing an approach, on the part of Braque, which was primarily concerned with the process of construction. These attributes were not lost on Picasso and, we are told,[3] he responded in due course with a series of still-lifes and figure studies in an attempt to achieve greater abstraction.

[1] Hilton, _op.cit._, p. 103-4.

[2] _Ibid._

[3] _Ibid._

Having constantly compared notes about their work while in Paris, Picasso and Braque, as was their custom, once again left Paris for the Summer, Picasso to Cadaqués on the coast of Catalonia, Braque to L'Estaque. Fernande still accompanied Picasso and they were joined later by the Derains. Both painters now entered the phase of what was to become known as "High Analytical Cubism", in which the "last traces of sculptural modelling dissolve in luminous shallow space ... [and] ... planes ... [become] ... more fragmentary and increasingly 'transparent'."[1] During this phase, the work of both artists approached near-abstraction. The structure of lines and flat, angular planes, particularly in Picasso's work,[2] became so dominant that the subject was almost indiscernible. The motif all but disappeared into the system of "scaffolding" which replaced faceting. The latter device had served as a means of breaking up forms into their component parts. But, by their very nature, they, like the forms they were intended to analyse, also consisted of closed, albeit small, shapes. This closed element had become a stumbling-block in Picasso's and Braque's search for a truly non-illusionistic method of integrating objects and space. Kahnweiler had a nice understanding of the significance of the open scaffolding which replaced the closed faceting and had this to say about it:

---

1. Rubin, op.cit., p. 121.

2. Ibid., p. 140-1, shows examples of such renderings of nudes, a Woman with a Mandolin, and The Rower.

"Much more important, however, was the decisive advance which freed Cubism from the language previously used by painting. This occurred in Cadaquês ... where Picasso spent his summer. Dissatisfied even after weeks of painful struggle, he returned to Paris in the Fall with his unfinished works. But he had taken the great step. Picasso had pierced the closed form. A new technique had been invented for new purposes."[1]

This meant, as Hilton explains,[2] that the volumetric factor which had been preventing Picasso from achieving "a continuously shallow pictorial structure,"[3] could now be sacrificed. The most daring of the figure studies done by Picasso in Summer 1910 was a restatement of the nude in his Negro Period Nude with Draperies (1907). This was in the form of a very simple charcoal drawing entitled Nude Woman.[4] Like the other paintings of nude figures done at Cadaquês, the format is a narrow vertical rectangle into which the columnar figure comfortably fits. In order to avoid a volumetric rendering, Picasso used "longer lines ... which mark out the general features of the body, or something like those general features."[5] These lines - vertical ones denoting head and torso, diagonal ones, the

---

1. As quoted by Hilton, op.cit., p. 105. But also in Kahnweiler, D.-H. The Way of Cubism in Fry, op.cit., p. 157.

2. Hilton, op.cit., p. 107.

3. Rubin, op.cit., p. 141.

4. Hilton, op.cit., p. 104.

bend of the knee - serve as a loose framework for the "interacting planes"[1] which form the figure, but they do not close these planes off from the surrounding space.

During the Summer, Picasso and Braque developed this method of integrating space and objects by constructing objects with a free-floating armature of such lines and planes, which often gave the impression of being transparent, to the point where there was a risk of losing sight of tangible objects altogether in the general abstraction of shapes and details. As such total abstraction had never been their aim, however, Picasso and Braque deliberately re-introduced a minimal number of representational details into their paintings when they returned to Paris in the Autumn of 1910. Thus, the portrait of Daniel-Henry Kahnweiler appears like "a retreat from a dangerous position."[2] As we have seen, however, Picasso often made similar retreats to earlier positions as though consolidating what had been achieved before proceeding with more daring experiments. The portrait of Kahnweiler was an important retreat to a more conservative rendering of the figure than that of the Cadaquēs nudes. In it, Picasso took the opportunity of re-introducing descriptive details into an otherwise schematic Cubist painting. This he did with utmost circumspection so that while avoiding suggestions of illusionistic modelling, the most characteristic

1. Hilton, op.cit., p. 104.

2. Ibid., p. 108.

features of Kahnweiler's appearance were included, so that there can be no mistake as to his identity. These naturalistic details were so abbreviated, however, that they are of secondary importance to the overall structure.

In the meanwhile, Cubism had, as an important modern style, gathered impetus. The number of exhibitions on which Cubist works were shown increased during 1910[1] so that examples of the style had been seen, not only in Paris, but in Budapest, Düsseldorf, Munich and London. During 1911, this list increased to include Berlin, New York and Amsterdam. What is striking is that Picasso, for some or other reason, held to his principle of staying away from the Paris Salons. By 1911, he and Braque were no longer the only Cubists. They had been joined by others like Delaunay, Gleizes, Laurencin, La Fresnaye, Léger, Metzinger, Picabia, Le Fauconnier, Archipenko and Duchamp, who were all represented at the April 1911 Indépendents and again at the October Salon d'Automne. The Press pointedly referred to Picasso's absence on these occasions. It should also be noted that a considerable body of theory had begun to accumulate, explaining or expounding on the subject.[2] Apart from statements such as the one published by Fry,[3] Picasso was not in the habit of verbally explaining his work, never mind elucidating complex theories. Braque,

[1] Rubin, op.cit, p. 121.

[2] Fry, op.cit, see the documentary texts.

[3] Ibid., p. 165-8.

it would seem, was equally uninclined to publish theories which may have taken on a doctrinaire character, or to explain his art. In closer collaboration than ever, these two founders of Cubism continued their systematic researches away from the persuasiveness of the theorists. The only newcomer to Cubism who made consistent contributions to Cubism as such, rather than using Cubist devices for other purposes, was Picasso's compatriot Juan Gris, who had understood the fundamental aims of the style from its inception. Having intelligently, and independently, worked through his own initial Cubist pictorial solutions, he became a fully-fledged exhibitor with the group in 1912. After the group's dispersal he continued working in a pure Cubist style which, by then, was in its synthetic phase. Together with Picasso and Braque, he is considered a true Cubist, unlike the others of the Cubist movement.

In July 1911, Picasso went to Céret, a small Pyrenean town where Manolo, his old friend, was living. A rift between himself and Fernande meant that, for a while, he was alone. But, in August, Braque, with Fernande and Max Jacob, joined him there. It was at Céret that Braque and Picasso effectively resolved a difficulty in their work which had still been present up to that Summer, namely how to achieve spatial integration without the loss of tangible reality. The spatial problem could only be solved by avoiding too many realistic details, but as reality was always the point of departure, this was not possible without the inclusion of sufficient references to the motif to make the pictures legible. Cooper[1] explains this point by asserting that the more naturalistic details were included, the more obscure the spatial clarity became. But, the moment spatial relationships were made clearer, the reality of objects disappeared. The linear scaffolding, tentatively begun in 1910, together with other innovations, provided the solution to this dilemma by suggesting planes and distances between them without the need to resort to illusionistic modelling, chiaroscuro or linear perspective. At the same time, this scaffolding holds compositions together in such a way that the planes and cubist shapes thus contained are not confined within specific outlines. Yet, there is a suggestion of volume due to the greater concentration of planes and lines as well as intenser chiaroscuro towards the centre of the format, where, presumably, the subject is situated. The system of angular planes is open, so that it is not clear where volumes and surrounding space begin and end. The uniformly neutral colours used add to the difficulty of distinguishing between objects and space. Without disturbing this overall structure, realistic details were included, but in such a way that they were mere clues, or hints, or "keys" (as they came to be known), which served to signify the subject. As these were meant to replace naturalistic representation, they were kept to a minimum and rendered as rudimentarily as possible. Stylistically, these keys were superimposed on to otherwise Cubist paintings. In The Accordionist, by Picasso, this can clearly be seen in the abbreviated notation of facial features and details of the musical instrument. These in no way disturb the existing structure, which, in a Cubist way, suggests the stance of the musician. It was not long before this device of adding details gained another dimension. Braque, drawing on his early apprenticeship in the painting trade, stencilled some lettering onto one of his paintings, The Portuguese (1911). As Hilton[1] remarks, concerning the letters BAL which Braque superimposed onto this painting, this was an extension of his earlier idea involving the *trompe l'oeil* nail. As Hilton[2] says, this emphasized "the gulf between art and reality." Soon, Picasso followed Braque's example and included letters in paintings such as Still-Life with Fan and Still-Life with Pipe Rack, Cup, Coffee Pot and Carafe (1911). The paintings of this period of High Analytical Cubism remained stylistically similar throughout 1911. It was a period of calm, almost meditative, work, during which the two artists quietly perfected the style, adding relatively minor innovations, such as the letters, numbers, pipes, fingers, guitar scrolls, fringes and glass-stems which appeared in virtually all their late 1911 works. Another such innovation was the occasional use of an oval format. The reason for this was that, with the

---

[1] Cooper, op.cit., p. 52.

[1] Hilton, *op.cit.*, p. 112.

[2] *Ibid.*

subject-matter being concentrated towards the centre of their pictures, the corners were found to be awkward and were consequently left relatively bare. This detracted from the central composiion. An oval format provided a simple means for overcoming this awkwardness. But, the oval shape could have other connotations, in keeping with the liking for double meanings on the part of both Braque and Picasso. A horizontal oval, for example, could refer to a flat, round surface, such as a table-top, seen as an elliptical shape, from a traditional perspectival vantage point. Lastly, dating from the previous year, at Cadaqués (and L'Estaque), Picasso and Braque had begun to pay considerable attention to their brushwork. As we have seen, Picasso's interest in the texture of paint had, in the past, been sporadic and short-lived. But, from 1910 to mid-1912, paint application was an important factor for Picasso as well as for Braque. During 1911, this became particularly noticeable. Both Cooper[1] and Hilton[2] agree that this brushwork, which was deliberately borrowed from Impressionism or Neo-Impressionism for its non-sculptural properties, serves to draw the viewer's attention to the picture surface. This was done expressly as another means of cancelling illusionist depth and volume. As far as Picasso was concerned, he once again enjoyed introducing a precedent from the past and giving it new meaning. In paintings such as the oval Man with a Pipe (1911) and the rectangular Ma Jolie (Winter 1911-12), all the elements of High Analytical Cubism are

1. Cooper, op.cit., p. 53.

2. Hilton, op.cit., p. 110.

present, and are balanced to a point of perfection beyond which it was not possible to go within the strict concept of this phase of Cubism. During the following year Braque and Picasso understood that the analytical handling of space and form could not be taken further without gradually adulterating the style. This process of emancipation from the somewhat ascetic style of Analytical Cubism is the subject of the following paragraphs. But before ending this section, it should be mentioned that Picasso's personal affairs once more underwent an upheaval. Towards the end of 1911, Fernande finally left him, and, very soon, there was a new woman, Eva Gouel, in his life. For a short while, until Eva's illness and death in December 1914, she exerted a gentle influence over him. The lyrical happiness of the paintings of this period once again confirms Sabartes' assertion in this regard.

## Synthetic Cubism, 1912 - 1914

The first signs of a gradual move away from Analytical Cubism appeared during the Spring of 1912. The first tentative efforts to change the style manifested themselves in a simplification of the complex analytical structure within the paintings; in a return to a modicum of representational clarity; and in the introduction of bright colours into the generally sombre colour schemes. There was, therefore, a reduction in the number of planes and facets and, as a consequence, the subjects are slightly more legible. Examples of these first efforts are Picasso's Violin, Glass and Pipe on Table and The Scallop Shell. The first of these shows the characteristic structural complexity of High Analytical Cubism in the lower part of the picture, giving way to larger planes, a clearer definition of the glass, and the timid inclusion of one plane coloured bright blue and two others a creamy yellow. The Scallop Shell shows a consistently simple construction of larger planes, an even clearer, almost illusionistic, rendering of two shells, but includes an awkward rectangular, red, white and blue shape - a flag or a poster, perhaps - with stencilled lettering placed haphazardly across it, to the right of the oval format. This shape is not contained within the format or the central composition, as would usually have been the case in an Analytical Cubist picture. The oval frame cuts the rectangle off near the top. All in all, it has the appearance of an afterthought and disturbs the balance of the whole. Clearly, colour, as a stylistic element in painting, had been shelved since 1909 in the interests of the analysis of volumes and space. Arbitrarily re-introducing such bright colours could only have unsatisfactory results. Integrating colour into Cubist compositions was a task requiring new concepts. In this regard, Braque was the first to take a step towards a solution. He too had started adding small areas of colour to his paintings. But he was more conservative, choosing more muted colours than Picasso's strident red and blue. He carried this even further by introducing another idea derived from the decorator's trade - that of simulating textures such as wood-graining into areas adjacent to the coloured areas, incidentally making the sort of allusion we have already noted about such inclusions. During 1912, Braque developed an interesting non-illusionistic method of colouration. The painterly treatment of the entire picture surface was replaced by an almost paintless rendering, as we can see in The Violincello. Large areas of the surface - particularly the perimeter - have been left colourless. The scaffolding, or armature, has been reduced to a few, often very faint, or slight, lines which are just sufficient to sketch in the basic composition. The object of central interest - the instrument - has a suggestion of pale brownish-buff defining its shifting planes. Otherwise, the details have been depicted in the abbreviated, graphic way typical of earlier analytical pictures. Finally, a panel of simulated wood-graining is situated behind the instrument.

Compared with Braque's 1912 paintings, Picasso's retained the generally dark tonality and impression of chiaroscuro, until Autumn that year, when an abrupt change took place in his work. This was possibly because, in the interval, he was unsure of the direction to be taken away from Analytical Cubism. A sign of uncertainty is manifested in Man with Guitar, which, according to Rubin[1] was begun in 1911 and reworked both in 1912 and 1913. As always,

---

[1] Rubin, op.cit., p. 163.

Picasso lingered over a style which was about to change before making the break. Such a break became apparent to him when Braque introduced textures to Cubist paintings, and he took this further in May 1912 in his Still Life with Chair Caning in which he attached a piece of "American cloth" overprinted with a design simulating chair-caning, to an oval painting. This was the first collage, a method of suggesting visual reality in a paradoxical way without actually rendering it with paint or other traditional artistic materials. In the painting just mentioned, this piece of cloth, representing part of a chair seat, overlaps and is overlapped by, "real" painting in typical Cubist Style.

Before describing the final achievements of Cubism which have been termed "Synthetic" - for reasons which will become apparent - it is appropriate to consider some points of central importance to this study at this stage. The first of these concerns the introduction of elements such as American cloth which, in the words of Barr,[1] "destroyed the integrity of the medium for the first time since Gothic artists abandoned gilded plaster haloes." While a more accurate assessment would have included Fra Angelico as a user of gold backgrounds, until his discovery of Florentine realistic spatial rendering, it is true that mediums had traditional connotations. In Part I of this research, much

---

1. Barr, op.cit., p. 80.

was said concerning technical procedures insofar as they were part of traditional pictorial construction. But, as artists gradually liberated themselves from procedures such as making ébauches, as necessary stages in finished paintings, less has been said about the actual craft. We do not know whether elaborate techniques were involved in Picasso's early training, but if they were, they were soon abandoned in favour of the direct technique which was the legacy of Manet and the Impressionists. Around 1900, the manner in which paintings were executed was no longer an issue. Suddenly, in 1912, this became, once more, an important matter, but one of an essentially modern, intellectual nature, centering around concepts of Realism and reality. By drawing attention to the arbitrariness of the actual materials used in the creation of two-dimensional images, Picasso and Braque were, once more, bringing out into the open an issue which had, on and off, received attention since the time of Delacroix and particularly in the time of Courbet. Objections from conservative quarters about obtrusive uses of paint, such as Delacroix's expressive one and Courbet's manipulative one, had, as we have seen, been rooted in the neo-classical insistence on the exclusion of any use of paint which drew attention to itself. This, as we have also seen, was in the interests of the illusion of sculptural relief which was the desired optical effect. This being so, the smooth, finished surfaces of such neo-classical paintings deliberately played down the process by which they were created. But, even outside the specifically neo-classical tradition, there was a centuries-old convention which assumed the necessity of preserving the integrity of traditional mediums. Now, in 1912, Picasso and Braque put a question mark behind those hallowed traditions by representing objects, not illusionistically, using a respected medium, but by summarily attaching materials with appropriate textures and appearances to painted surfaces in place of painted images.

This raises the second point which must be considered, namely that of Realism and reality in painting. Throughout this essay, categorical definitions of such terms in relation to painting have been avoided because they are merely approximations. The meaning of the term "Realism" has been shown to have been subject to change throughout the 19th century. Therefore, it has been applied, in this study, more or less in the sense in which it was understood by those artists or groups of artists who applied the term to their particular type of rendering. Up to the 20th century, however, it was generally understood that realistic painting portrayed visually recognizable representations of real objects. This was only possible on a two-dimensional surface if a skilful illusion of these objects, as they exist in real space, could be created. Until the advent of Cubism, founded upon the discoveries of Cézanne, much of the disagreement about Realism had been based on differences of opinion about what constituted a satisfactory pictorial illusion of reality, based, either on imaginary constructions, or on visual observation. As we have seen, various solutions to these questions had been attempted, from Courbet's time onwards. During the 19th century, a number of new renderings evolved as a result, and many traditional methods of picture construction as well as notions about appropriate subject matter, were abandoned. But, many of the fundamental principles of Illusionism had remained intact - for instance, the continued respect for more or less accurate anatomical depiction, single-point perspective, and chiaroscuro. As long as these principles went unchallenged, pictures qualified as realistic in the 19th century sense of the word. After Impressionism, Realism tended to refer to optical, rather than illusionistic, symbolical or socially significant, truth. But this optical truth was always based on visually observable reality. It is on the basis of this legacy that Cubism is considered to constitute an advanced form of Realism. It was, however, a difficult and complex Realism because, as the style developed, elements from reality were conceptualized to the point where, as Hilton[1] asserts, the resulting pictures were "the least realistic representational painting one could imagine." Perhaps a better way of putting this would have been to call it "the least illusionistic", because, no matter how geometricized or abbreviated the rendering of observed natural elements became, they were always based on such observation. In this respect, Picasso, Braque, and Juan Gris, when he began his own Cubist experiments after 1911, were faithful to Cézanne's example. Although it sounds like a contradiction in terms, they, like Cézanne, were attempting the difficult task of creating a conceptual rendering of tangible reality. However, Cubism raised questions about Realism on another level - one which Cézanne had merely touched upon. This concerned the reality of the painted surface itself. Flattening the facets of which volumes consisted, and rendering spatial relationships ambiguous were devices derived from Cézanne, but, now, in 1912, a new dimension was added to this concept by the incorporation of unpainterly elements, such as pasted paper, or the addition of sand to paint, in order to create simulated textures. This added to all the other surface-conscious devices of Cubism by drawing attention to the material reality of the foreign substances as well as to the non-reality of the painted images. By so doing, Picasso, Braque and Gris were "calling the bluff of the eye-fooling technique"[1] of Illusionism by reminding the viewer of the truth about two-dimensional representation. Seen in this light, Cubism was realistic on several levels as well as being representational. Even at their most abstract, Cubist pictures always referred to objective reality and minimal use was made of arbitrary elements. The artists themselves liked to assert that Realism was their aim, but that this was to be a new, re-constructed

---

[1] Hilton, op.cit., p. 108.

[1] Cooper, op.cit., p. 58.

type of Realism, even though it was as different as possible, within the bounds of representation, from illusionistic Realism as could be. By clarifying these points, it should be possible to proceed with an account of the Synthetic phase of Cubism without confusing the conceptual nature of Cubism as a whole with abstraction, which was never an issue with the three major Cubists.

As was his custom, Picasso, this time with Eva, left Paris for the Summer of 1912, first for Céret, then for Sorgues where Braque and his wife joined them in July. On their return to Paris in September, Picasso moved to another studio on the boulevard Raspail. Braque, still at Sorgues, made the first papiers collés, Still-life with Fruit-dish and Glass, an extension of Picasso's collage idea in which pieces of paper, with simulated woodgraining, were pasted on to the surface of the picture. This picture consisted of three pieces of grained paper which Hilton[1] describes as "irregular rectangles, not representing anything by their shape", but by their texture suggesting wooden objects. The only other representational elements in this picture consist of "Cubist marks, in charcoal, to indicate still-life elements."[2] At this time, Picasso was still trying to incorporate collage elements into pictures which were still painterly and analytical, except, as we have

[1] Hilton, op.cit., p. 118.

[2] Ibid.

seen that the surfaces became less intricate and shapes clearer. One such picture, which has been termed transitional,[1] was Violin and Grapes in which warmer, more glowing colours have been used more effectively than the jarring ones in the slightly earlier paintings mentioned above. He has also used wallpaper with a woodgrain pattern to signify parts of the violin. During part of the Autumn of 1912, Picasso continued with such transitional paintings, and then suddenly, later that same Autumn, according to Rubin,[2] he made his first papiers collés which consisted of newspaper, charcoal, ink and watercolour by way of materials.[3] In contrast to the largely analytical renderings of the transitional works, these are sparing in their lack of clutter and, most noticeable, their complete lack of painted chiaroscuro. Like Braque's first papiers collés, these, although they represent figures, are also made up of a few non-representational shapes of pasted paper, juxtaposed with one another, as well as with similar painted shapes. The representation is rendered by means of a few rudimentary notations in ink or charcoal.

Picasso's second series of papiers collés were, by contrast, very colourful, as they were made from coloured paper, textured wallpaper, gouache or oil paint or, as in one work,

---

1. Rubin, op.cit., p. 152.
2. Ibid.
3. Examples : Ibid., p. 166-7.

simply pasted paper on cardboard.[1] In these pictures, almost all vestiges of analysis and the techniques used during that phase of Cubism have disappeared. From this time until 1914, when Braque's artistic career was disrupted by the First World War, Picasso proved to be the more innovative and adventurous of the two. According to Cooper,[2] papiers collés once more brought out the differences between the two artists; Braque being more conservative and tied to visual reality; Picasso more open to imaginative fantasy - which was, of course, a strong element in Synthetic Cubism. In Braque's papiers collés work, he never used oil paint, only drawing with charcoal. His pasted pieces of paper either represented themselves or were used as flat planes of colour around which the composition was arranged. Picasso, on the other hand, loved puns and witty references and often selected the printed newspaper specifically for some or other topical item it contained. In these pictures entirely composed of coloured sheets of paper, such sheets served an abstract, formal purpose quite apart from their representational one.

Initially, in Autumn 1912, when Picasso was first experimenting with this entirely new way of making pictures, subjects and compositions were extremely simple. Instead of whole figures, for example, simple, front-facing heads formed the subject, or, where still-life was concerned, the number of

---

1. Examples : Rubin, op.cit., p. 164-5.
2. Cooper, op.cit., p. 188-9.

objects were kept to a minimum and chosen for their ordinariness and simplicity of shape and, like the figures, were viewed frontally. Although the way in which pictorial elements were organized was derived from Analytical Cubism, the scheme which had consisted of facets, numerous planes and linear scaffolding was soon found to be unnecessary. In Bottle of Suze, for example, all the Cubist problems were solved without using analytical methods. The difficulty of representing spatial relationships without perspective was solved by the simple device of overlapping shapes. Thus, the bottle in this picture overlaps the uppermost rim of the table. Yet the bottle is seen in profile, while the table is seen from above. By strategically overlapping shapes of different colours and textures, a concept of separation and distance has been conveyed. This served to replace the complex analytical system as well as the illusionistic one. In the process, objects could, once again, be represented, in an unfragmented way, by the use of simple shapes, either in combinations which conveyed a basic idea of the object in question,[1] or by themselves, with the superimposition of abbreviated signs, such as the label denoting the bottle of Suze. Two things were achieved as far as spatial notation was concerned : objects could be shown from different viewpoints simultaneously while retaining their outlines; and they could be surrounded by space without illusionistic devices to

---

1. Violin and Sheet Music. The violin consists of three basic shapes thus combined.

indicate recession.

One of the problems Picasso and Braque had remained tied to during the analytical phase of Cubism had been chiaroscuro. As we have seen, it remained a major stylistic factor throughout this phase, even though it was used unconventionally. The fact that it was used at all meant, however, that other Cubist devices had to be invented to counteract the effect of sculptural modelling which, together with linear perspective, suggests depth in Illusionist pictures. Papiers collés showed the two artists a way of dispensing with this without the objects losing their integrity. The retention of chiaroscuro had been due to the insistence, particularly on Picasso's part, that a sense of volume remained important in the representation of solid objects. But, as frontality was a fundamental stylistic aim of Cubism, representation of tangible reality had remained a problem. In late 1912, the need to indicate volume by the use of chiaroscuro was found to be no longer necessary. The objects in papiers collés pictures appeared flat in themselves by virtue of the ungraded, unfaceted surfaces by which they were portrayed. But the way in which these surfaces were overlapped or juxtaposed with surfaces of contrasting colour, suggested tonal differences. Sometimes, vestiges of chiaroscuro appeared in these pictures. These were either in the form of black shapes, apparently behind the object where it might cast a shadow,[1] or in the form of a minimal use of scaffolding and analytical chiaroscuro,[1] in combination with pasted shapes. Sometimes, the darker flat shapes echoed the shapes or outlines of depicted objects. This was an invention of Gris', known as a "visual rhyme".

---

[1] Example : Bottle of Suze, Violin and Sheet Music, Man with a Hat.

By dispensing with linear perspective as well as chiaroscuro, the Cubists achieved the frontality they had sought from the outset. In Syntehtic Cubist pictures, all the pictorial elements are on the surface of the picture plane. The essential two-dimensionality of painting has thus been emphasized. Most important of all - and the reason for the complicated stages necessary to arrive at this apparently childlike simplicity - this two-dimensionality was achieved without sacrificing representation. The closest Picasso ever came to abstraction was probably in the two pictures entitled Head and Geometric Composition : The Guitar (both early 1913). They are interesting firstly because Head was made of pasted paper on cardboard over which a few charcoal lines have been drawn, while the other is painted with oil on canvas. After his initial excited experiments with papiers collés, in 1912, Picasso soon started applying the same principles to painted pictures. An early example is Bottle, Guitar and Pipe. In it, Picasso was still, apparently, bound by a convention which implied that an oil painting should be complex, for it consists of

---

1. Examples : Bottle of Vieux Marc, Glass and Newspaper, Head of a Harlequin.

far more planes than the papiers collés pictures, and these still represent facets of objects although they are rendered in colours which are bright, with only vestiges of shading in some. By Spring 1913, however, the papiers collés concept was carried out in paint in Geometric Composition : Guitar. Like Head, this picture consists of a triangular shape with several rectangular bars in contrasting colours, in an arrangement which was determined by the specific subject. Unlike Head, in which the charcoal lines signify the round shape of the cranium, the plane of the face, and two features – a diagonal arrow for a nose and a small circle for an eye – this painting lacks any detail which furnishes a clue as to the object represented. The title of the picture is the most telling sign in this regard.

Before concluding the history of this, almost final, stage of Cubism, something ought to be said about the term "Synthetic" as applied to the style. Hilton[1] thinks the term "was most probably given its original currency by the brilliant young Spanish painter Juan Gris." He was, according to Hilton,[2] referring to a synthesis which he felt had taken place in his own work around this time. But, since then, the words "Synthetic Cubism" "have been taken to mean the construction of new wholes after the period of patient dissection of visual reality."[3] The term does not refer to the use of synthetic materials in terms of purist oil paint-

---

1. Hilton, op.cit., p. 120.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.

ing, nor to the use of non-naturalistic colours which were flat, as in the case of Gauguin's painting.

During 1913 and 1914, Picasso restlessly explored the possiblities of collage. In the process, his individual approach asserted itself once again in what Hilton[1] terms "a real oddness - a peculiar deviation from the normal ... [which] ... now entered Picasso's art, a way with picture-making simultaneously weird and jaunty." At first, papiers collés intrigued him in a way inspired by Braque's use of it, and because of the new shapes which presented exciting possibilities. At the time (early 1913) he made three-dimensional constructions such as Guitar and Bottle of Bass, which complemented Synthetic Cubist pictures in concept. By Summer 1913, however, the decorative possiblities of flat, colourful, textured shapes drew Picasso's attention away from the primary concern of Cubism, namely spatial relationships. This heralded the beginning of the separation between Braque and Picasso as far as their art was concerned. The light-hearted oddity Picasso introduced into Cubism did not appeal to Braque's sense of stability and seriousness. In 1913 and 1914, Picasso tried a number of new techniques, including the mixture of sand with paint as in Violin (1913), which gives areas of the picture a three-dimensional texture. In this, and other ways, Synthetic Cubism was enriched. Colours became rich and

---

1. Hilton, op.cit., p. 121.

sensuous as in Man with a Guitar (1913); compositions became more complex as in this same painting; decorative motifs were included, as in Card Player (1913-14); a painterly element once more made its appearance, but for the purpose of creating different decorative textures such as spots and stripes as in Portrait of a Young Girl (1914); and finally, angular lines and shapes were frequently replaced by curvilinear ones, as in Stillife with Cards, Glasses and Bottle of Rum ("Vive la France") (1914-15).

Late in the Spring of 1914, Picasso and Braque painted together for the last time. In August, after war was declared, Braque was mobilized. In his absence, Picasso and Gris remained in Paris as the only exponents of true Cubism, by virtue of the fact that they were foreigners and, therefore, were not mobilized. Picasso, although continuing to paint Cubist pictures, which consolidated all the discoveries of the crucial formative years of the style, reverted, more and more, to his own personal manner of working in a number of apparently contradictory styles. Thus, in 1914, for instance, he began the famous series of drawings dubbed "back to Ingres" with their seemingly neo-classical approach and technique, which earned him the disapproval of members of the Cubist Movement which had flourished in 1911 and 1912, but which, by 1914, was in a state of disarray, so that those who wished to perpetuate it were particularly insistent about stylistic principles. Towards 1920, many of Picasso's earlier stylistic preoccupations were revived, but they were treated in such a way that their debt to Cubism is unmistakeable. So, for instance, there were, once again, renderings on themes such as groups of three women, harlequins and guitar-players, in styles varying from one which is reminiscent of his earlier monumental, primitive one to purely Cubist ones such as Three Musicians (1921) - considered the last pure Cubist picture painted by Picasso. In later pictures, such as Three Dancers (1925) and Crucifixion (1930), Picasso once again displayed his penchant for caricature and expressive distortion, but, again, Cubist procedures were used with powerful results. In these two works, the fundamental changes in picture construction and types of representaion, resulting from the long Cubist experiment, are manifested to the full. Spatial notation is achieved by Synthetic Cubist means as in Bottle of Suz; chiaroscuro is indicated, not by illusionistic shading, but by means of the dark "visual rhymes" introduced to Cubism by Gris; shapes of figures have been reduced to rudimentary "signs" rather than rendered by imitating real anatomical details. Where dislocations occur, however, they are not consistently the result of the use of Cubist conventions. In the left-hand figure in Three Dancers for example, the Cubist logic has given way to Picasso's personal disjointed interpretation. For the same reason, much of the iconography of the Crucifixion is enigmatic, requiring research into Picasso's personal use of puns and metaphors for understanding. These developments, being more personal to Picasso than significant in the history of pictorial changes wrought by Cubism, are outside the scope of this essay. They are mentioned as a way of ending these paragraphs on Cubism, and of showing that Picasso, as one of the most important inventors of the style, was unperturbed by the protestations of purists who wished to preserve Cubism as a system, which could be applied methodically or which should be perpetuated as the most demonstrably modern style to emerge in this first part of the 20th century. Picasso displayed little interest in the Cubist Movement as such, for reasons which have been touched on in the Introduction to this essay, and which will be referred to again in the Conclusion.

# CONCLUSION

As was stated in the Introduction to this essay, the scope of its topic came to be extended when it seemed that a false perception of the subject would result otherwise. It is hoped that this was the right way of proceeding and that, by beginning with a description of the workings and artistic principles of the French Academy - seemingly far removed from the final topic of Cubism - and, only then, describing 19th and very early 20th century progressive art, the latter will be seen in a way often obscured by our notions of the Modernist tradition, or neglected for lack of pertinent information. It has certainly emerged that progressive art did not, at all times, sever its ties with its academic roots. For the most part, the artists who worked outside tradition to various extents, were engaged in perpetual struggles for official, if not academic, recognition. It was only when the traditional system weakened to such an extent that artists were able to exhibit and sell their work independently of the rigidly controlled Salons, that they could afford to disregard academic norms completely. When this happened, more drastic ruptures with traditional styles and types of representation occurred, almost as a matter of course. The final outcome was, as we have attempted to show, the creation of an art which bore almost no resemblance to traditional art. Only a thorough familiarity with all stylistic developments during the century in question, reveals the thread which runs throughout and can be discerned in vestiges of traditional rendering which are present even in the most extreme instances. For example, as representation and visually observable truth were the declared aims of Picasso, Braque, and - later - Gris, rudimentary vestiges of drawing or outlines of objects were necessary to avoid total illegibility. Even though these concessions to traditional Realism or Naturalism were as conceptual as possible, they were nevertheless concessions, which demonstrates that a pure non-illusionistic style was not possible within the bounds of representation. Picasso's subsequent free use of a blend of new and old devices can be seen as an assertion that, in spite of the radical differences between the two appraoches, they are, in fact, not irreconcilable, nor is there a particular imperative to reject one, totally, in favour of the other. In Picasso's work in its entirety, the traditional threads were never altogether cut.

For practical purposes, quite apart from theoretical ones, the unusual range of study undertaken sometimes caused anxiety, when it seemed unmanageable within the scope of what was meant to be no more than an extended essay of some fifty or sixty pages. But, having persevered, it did seem like the only way of fitting all the parts of the research into place. Also, having prepared the ground, by describing academic procedures such as _ébauches_, _esquisses_ and _études_, it was easy to show exactly what the progressive breaks with tradition signified. Likewise, by explaining something of the fundamental aims and techniques of Impressionism, of the profound discoveries of artists like Cézanne, of movements with Parisian/Modernist links like Modernisme in Barcelona, and a movement like Fauvism, intertwined with the colourist tradition as well as the birth of Cubism, it was easier to proceed with the account of Picasso's, and Braque's, major contribution to the changes in question. By thus studying the background and side-issues of each major development, the problems which would have arisen from side-stepping these were overcome. More importantly, though, the risk of placing false significance on any particular manifestation was reduced. Adopting this approach has, at least for this writer, cleared up many a misconception. Great care has been taken to present as complete and honest a picture as possible, but in spite of this, there are bound to be blind spots and ommissions. Of this, the writer is humbly aware. It is, therefore, not the intention here to come to any categorical conclusions, nor to formulate any binding theories on the strength of the facts and pictorial analyses presented here. Nevertheless, some tricky questions were posed at the outset, and it would not be fitting to conclude such an essay without returning to these and considering, in the light of what has been researched, whether some tentative answers are possible.

The basic concern - namely, puzzling changes in representation and methods - has been re-iterated many times during the course of writing. Having studied all those ruptures with tradition which formed the cycle of progressive art lasting roughly a century, many of their puzzling aspects were understood. But what of their implications, not just at their specific times, but for us today? This is the most difficult question to answer conclusively, especially as this would surely require further study, of an extensive nature, into the ramifications of 20th century art and attitudes since 1914. Without doing this there would be a risk of coming to unfounded conclusions based on this writer's subjective perceptions, rather than on solid facts. But, as such perceptions motivated the research from the outset, the questions raised cannot be ignored. Nevertheless, it must be stressed that any conclusions reached in this regard remain arguable. From a rather general point of view, resulting from the reading of currently held views, as well as from the study of numerous examples of modern art, reproduced in books and journals, it is possible to assert, tentatively, that certain attitudes, which had their roots in the historical development of progressive art, still persist today. Such attitudes were mentioned in the Introduction, and include the notions that change in itself is a worthwhile artistic end, and, that the traditional use of illusionistic Realism in painting constitutes a retrograde step. If it is indeed true that such attitudes exist, they must affect art which is being produced in avant-garde circles. While it is not the purpose, here, to suggest, categorically, that only negative effects have been the result, the findings of this research do indicate that such attitudes as already existed, in certain circles, by 1914, would have had severely inhibiting effects had it not been for the independent way in which individuals, like Picasso, resisted being unduly influenced by them. Knowing this to be the case, certain discrepancies between the aims of artists themselves and those who were articulate in the formulation of theories, were looked at more closely, and the conclusion was drawn that attitudes about art were frequently founded on a partial understanding of the artists' motivations. It seemed that the history of progressive art provided many examples of this trend. In seeking explanations of current attitudes and artistic styles, therefore, a re-investigation of their sources was appropriate and has, certainly, proved enlightening. The "avant-garde imperatives" mentioned in the Introduction, for example, had their origins - at least partly - in the propaganda disseminated by writers, critics and theory-minded artists, from Diderot's time until that of Apollinaire, Salmon, Raynal, et al. A cursory perusal of present-day journals on art reveals that this situation is still in evidence today, in the form of a sort of critics' and writers' dictatorship of what constitutes valid artistic expression, and determines the success or failure of artists. For the most part, such publicity has been very much in favour of the new, at the expense of, rather than alongside, the old, when it comes to subject-matter and style. Just recently, there has been a slight shift in emphasis. Sometimes, thoughtful articles appear, which indicate that a re-assessment is taking place, of much that is usually overlooked about both traditional and modern art. But, in general, the art which receives most attention is that which manifests extreme Modernist or Post-Modernist tendencies. In the representational field, there still seems to be evidence of a pathological fear of renderings which could be construed as conservative. It is not to the point, here, to blame any particular sector for the misunderstandings underlying this state of affairs. Slanted publicity is merely one example of the way in which all sorts of factors influence developments and are, possibly, no more than reflections of existing attitudes. Many other factors affected the development of modern art. It is hoped that these have been adequately described. When it comes to the particular influence of journalism, what is worth noticing is the extent to which propagandistic and artistic strivings at times converged, but, at other times, were at variance. Courbet was a good example of an artist for whom - briefly - political circumstances and journalistic encouragement, were important. Apart from anything else, his participation in the socialistic politics of the day ensured his notoriety and success as an artist. It is also interesting to note that his art was nurtured by particular journalists at the time when it approximated most closely to their ideas of a socially significant art. Picasso, on the other hand, was an artist whose purposes were not, in themselves, of relevance to the avant-garde Press. Although he was on the forefront of the modern movement as regards radical innovation, nothing in his temperament, nor in his powerful creative impulse, could, for long, persuade him to follow any course but his own. While receptive to ideas around him, it was never as a conformist that he interested himself in them. The systems of theorists, in particular, held no interest for him. Although this has been well documented, little significance, as far as attitudes to which Picasso's innovations have given rise, has been attached to the fact that his, and Braque's, Cubist venture took place in relative isolation from the Cubist Movement as such and the propagandistic clamour surrounding it. The result has been a blind conviction that Picasso's prime achievement was the creation of an anti-traditionalist art. Similarly, little has been made of his subsequent free use of traditional and modern devices. Possibly, this has been in the interests of the general enthusiasm over his more strikingly innovative works. This seems like a symptom of the misconceptions which have been cultivated about Picasso in particular, and modern art in general - namely that a break with the past was, in itself, a commendable artistic event, rather than a necessary one if a re-vitalized art was to be produced. This, in turn, has led to the trend to categroize art as either traditional or modern and to favour one category at the expense of the other. The implications for representation, of such an attitude, need little elaboration. As Picasso and Braque proved, representation is not really possible without some Illusionism. But, as this is a traditional device, it is approached with unnecessary circumspection by artists who know it is necessary to avoid abstraction, but who feel constrained to conform to the Modernist dictum that tradition has been discarded.

As for the question, formulated in the Introduction, about what significant factors underlay the obvious break with the past demonstrated by Cubism, it is hoped that by simply describing the development of this style and the issues involved, as they presented themselves, these factors would be understood in their full complexity, and not merely as part of a radical overthrow of traditional values. If, as is hoped, this has been made clear, Picasso's easy abandonment of a pure Cubist style should be comprehensible. It should also be illuminating, as far as the enduring characteristics of Cubism, and all other innovative styles, are concerned. Instead of viewing the paintings produced by innovators as no more than signposts on the road to progress and advancement, they can be viewed as paintings in their own right, which have added to our artistic heritage as a whole. Once it is understood that it was not the Renaissance tradition per se which was discredited by 19th and early 20th century innovators, but those arbitrary practices which had been entrenched as part of a doctrinaire system, resulting in sterile artistic attitudes and trivial productions, then it will also be understood that, fundamentally, the Modernist impulse was creative, not destructive. Such an understanding might prove helpful to those artists today who share the striving for a vital art, with potent meanings, which inspired all the truly great artistic movements, including the modern one.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARAGON
Henri Matisse a novel. Vol. 1. and 2.
London: Collins, 1971.

ARNASON, H.H.
A History of Modern Art.
Painting. Sculpture. Architecture.
London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1977.

ARTS COUNCIL OF GREAT BRITAIN
French Symbolist Painters.
Moreau, Puvis de Chavannes, Redon and their followers.
London: Arts Council of Britain, 1972.

ARTS COUNCIL OF GREAT BRITAIN
Gustave Courbet 1819-1877.
London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1978.

ARTS COUNCIL OF GREAT BRITAIN
Homage to Barcelona.
The City and its Art 1888-1936
London: Arts Council of Britain, 1986.

ASHTON, D.
Picasso on Art: A Selection of Views.
London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1972.

BATAILLE, G.
Manet.
New York: Skira Inc., n.d.

BATTERSBY, M.
Art Nouveau.
Feltham: Hamlyn Publishing Group Ltd., 1969.

BAUDELAIRE, C.
Art in Paris 1845-1862.
Salons and other Exhibitions
Oxford: Phaidon Press Ltd., 1965.

BAUDELAIRE, C.
The Painter of Modern Life and other Essays.
London: Phaidon Press Ltd., 1964.

BENESCH, O.
Rembrandt.
s.l.: Skira Inc., n.d.

BERGER, J.
Success and Failure of Picasso.
Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1965.

BERGER, J.
Ways of Seeing.
Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1972.

BERNIER, G.
Anne Louis Girodet 1767-1824.
Prix-de-Rome 1789
s.l.: Jacques Danase Editions, n.d.

BOARDMAN, J.
Greek Art.
London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1973.

BOECK, W. and SABARTES, J.
Picasso.
New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1957.

BOIME, A.
The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth Century.
London: Phaidon Press Ltd., 1971.

BOLLINGER, H. *Picasso's Vollard Suite.*
London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1956.

BOURET, J. *L'École de Barbizon et le Paysage Français au XIX$^{e}$ siècle.*
Neuchâtel: Editions Ides et Calendes, 1972.

BRASSAÏ *Picasso and Co.*
London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1967.

BRIGHTON, A. and MORRIS, L. (eds.) *Towards another Picture.*
Nottingham: Midland Group Nottingham, 1977.

BROWN, J. *Francisco de Zurbarán.*
New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., n.d.

BUTLER, C. *After the Wake.*
*An Essay on the Contemporary Avant-garde*
Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.

ČELEBONOVIČ, A. *The Heyday of Salon Painting.*
*Masterpieces of Bourgeois Realism*
London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1974.

CHRISTIAN, J. *Symbolists and Decadents.*
London: Bracken Books, 1984.

CHU, P.T.D. *Courbet in Perspective.*
New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1977.

CIRLOT, J.-E. *Pablo Picasso.*
*Birth of a Genius*
London: Paul Elek Ltd., 1972.

CLARK, K. *The Nude: a Study of Ideal Art.*
London: Murray, 1956.

CLARK, T.J. *The Painting of Modern Life.*
*Paris in the Art of Manet and his Followers*
London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1985.

CLAY, J. *Modern Art 1890-1918.*
London: Octopus Books Ltd., 1978.

COOPER, D. *The Cubist Epoch.*
Oxford: Phaidon Press Ltd., 1976.

COPPLESTONE, T. *Modern Art.*
London: Deans International Publishing, 1985.

COUGHLAN, R. *The World of Michelangelo.*
U.S.A.: Time-Life Books Inc., 1981.

CRESPELLE, J.-P. *The Fauves.*
London: Oldbourne Press, 1962.

DERĘGOWSKI, J.B. *Distortion in Art.*
*The Eye and the Mind*
London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984.

D'ORS, E.
Pablo Picasso.
New York: E. Weybe, n.d.

DUNCAN, D.D.
Picasso's Picassos.
New York: Ballantine Books Inc., 1968.

DUPONT, J. and MATHEY, F.
The Seventeenth Century.
The New Developments in Art from Caravaggio to Vermeer
Geneva: Skira Inc., n.d.

EITNER, L.
Géricault.
Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1971.

ELGAR, F.
Van Gogh.
A Study of his Life and Work
London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1958.

FABRE, J.P.i.
Picasso.
New Jersey: Chartwell Books Inc., 1981.

FELD, C.
Picasso.
His Recent Drawings 1966-1968
London: Pall Mall Press, 1969.

FLAM, J.D.
Matisse on Art.
London: Phaidon Press Ltd., 1973.

FRY, E.F.
Cubism.
London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1966.

FULLER, P.
Art and Psychoanalysis.
London: Writers and Readers, 1980.

FULLER, P.
Beyond the Crisis in Art.
London: Writers and Readers, 1980.

FULLER, P.
Seeing Berger: a Revaluation of Ways of Seeing.
London: Writers and Readers, 1981.

FULLER, P.
The Naked Artist. "Art and Biology" and other Essays.
London: Writers and Readers, 1983.

GABLIK, S.
Has Modernism Failed?
London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1984.

GABLIK, S.
Progress in Art.
London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1976.

GALLWITZ, K.
Picasso at Ninety.
The Late Work
London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971.

GAUNT, W. (ed.)
The Flemish School.
London: English Universities Press Ltd., 1954.

GAUNT, W. (ed.) The French School.
London: English Universities Press Ltd., 1954.

GIEURE, M. G. Braque.
London: A Zwemmer Ltd., 1956.

GILOT, F. and LAKE, C. Life with Picasso.
London: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd., 1964.

GOLDSCHEIDER, L. Michelangelo.
London: Phaidon Press Ltd., 1953.

HANSON, A.C. Manet and the Modern Tradition.
New Haven: Yale University Press Ltd., 1979.

HARDING, J. Artistes Pompiers.
French Academic Art in the Nineteenth Century
London: Academy Editions, 1979.

HAUSER, A. The Social History of Art. Vol. 2.
London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1951.

HEMMINGS, F.W.J. Culture and Society in France 1848-1898.
Dissidents and Philistines
London: B.T. Batsford Ltd., 1971.

HILTON, T. Picasso.
London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1975.

HUYGHE, R. (general ed.) Larousse Encyclopedia of Modern Art.
London: Hamlyn, 1965.

HUYGHE, R. (general ed.) Larousse Encyclopedia of Renaissance and Baroque Art.
London: Hamlyn, 1964.

JOHNSON, E.H. Modern Art and the Object.
A Century of Changing Attitudes
London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1976.

JOHNSON, L. The Paintings of Eugène Delacroix.
A Critical Catalogue 1816-1831 Vol. 2., Plates
Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.

JOURDAIN, F. Lautrec.
Paris: Les Éditions Braun & Cie, 1951.

KELLER, H. The Great Book of French Impressionism.
New York: Hudson Hills Press, 1980.

KOZLOFF, M. Renderings.
New York: Simon and Schuster, 1968.

LÉGER, F. Functions of Painting.
London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1973.

LEYMARIE, J. French Painting.
The Nineteenth Century
Geneva: Skira Inc., 1962.

LEYMARIE, J. Fauvism.
s.l.: Skira Inc., 1959.

LEYMARIE, J. *Picasso.*
*The Artist of the Century*
London: Macmillan London Ltd., 1972.

LULLIES, R. *Greek Sculpture.*
London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1960.

NOCHLIN, L. *Gustave Courbet: A Study of Style and Society.*
New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1976.

NOCHLIN, L. *Realism.*
New York: Penguin Books Ltd., 1971.

NOCHLIN, L. *Realism and Tradition in Art 1848-1900.*
*Sources and Documents*
New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1966.

NOVOTNY, F. *Cézanne.*
Oxford: Phaidon Press Ltd., 1972.

O'BRIAN, P. *Pablo Ruiz Picasso.*
*A Biography*
London: W. Collins Sons & Co. Ltd., 1976.

OLIVIER, F. *Picasso and His Friends.*
London: W. Heinemann Ltd., 1964.

OPPLER, E.C. *Fauvism Reexamined.*
New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1976.

OSBORNE, H. (ed.) *The Oxford Companion to Art.*
Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.

PENROSE, R. *Picasso.*
*His Life and Work*
London: Granada Publishing Ltd., 1981.

POOL, P. *Impressionism.*
London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1967.

RAYNAL, M. *Cézanne.*
New York: Skira Publishers Inc., n.d.

RAYNAL, M. *Picasso.*
New York: Skira Publsihers Inc., n.d.

ROBERTS, K. *Corot.*
London: Spring Brooks, 1965.

ROSE, B. *The Golden Age of Dutch Painting.*
London: Pall Mall Press, 1969.

ROSENBLUM, R. *Cubism and Twentieth-Century Art.*
New York: Harry N. Abrams Inc., 1976.

ROTHENSTEIN, J. *The Moderns and Their World.*
London: Phoenix House Ltd., 1957.

| | |
|---|---|
| ROYAL ACADEMY AND VICTORIA & ALBERT MUSEUM | The Age of Neo-Classicism.<br>London: The Arts Council of Britain, 1972. |
| RUBIN, W. (ed.) | Pablo Picasso.<br>A Retrospective<br>New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1980. |
| RUSSELL, F.D. | Picasso's Guernica.<br>The Labyrinth of Narrative and Vision<br>London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1980. |
| SHONE, R. | Manet.<br>London: Bracken Books, 1984. |
| SHONE, R. | Toulouse-Lautrec.<br>London: Bracken Books, 1984. |
| TANNENBAUM, E.R. | European Civilization Since the Middle Ages.<br>New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 1965. |
| TARRADELL, M. | Arte Iberico.<br>Barcelona: Ediciones Poligrafa, 1968. |
| TERRASSE, A. | Degas.<br>London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1974. |
| UHDE, W. | Picasso and the French Tradition.<br>Notes on Contemporary Painting<br>New York: E. Weyhe, 1929. |
| VALLERY-RADOT, J. | French Drawings.<br>From the Fifteenth to the Early Nineteenth Century<br>London: Studio Vista Ltd., 1964. |
| WHITE, J. | The Birth and Rebirth of Pictorial Space.<br>London: Faber and Faber, 1967. |
| WILDENSTEIN, G. | Ingres.<br>London: Phaidon Press, 1954. |
| WILLET, F. | African Art.<br>An Introduction<br>London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1971. |

RHODES UNIVERSITY LIBRARY