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Dmitri Nikolaevich Kardovsky

Born 1866, Pereslavl' Zalesskij (Vladimir Province, NW of Moscow).
Died 1943.
Portrait of Marya Anastasievna Chroustchova. 1900.

50.1189

Oil on canvas, 59¼ × 37¾ (150.4 × 94.9)
Signed with monogram and dated l.r.: DK / 1900; inscribed on stretcher, not in the artist’s hand (photographed before replacement of stretcher, but barely visible): Herr F. Kardofsky—Elizabethplatz ¼.

PROVENANCE:
Alexander de Chroustchoff, Munich, and Harrow-on-the-Hill, England, 1901-08; purchased from Otto Stangl, Munich, 1950.2

CONDITION:
In 1957 the work was lined with wax resin and cleaned; some minor losses along the edges, a 1 x 4 in. area 5 in. from the left and 33 in. from the bottom, and some tiny losses in the face were inpainted with PBM; the work was surfaced with PBM and placed on a new stretcher. In 1961 a 4 in. damage 2½ in. from the bottom was repaired and inpainted.
There is slight wear at the edges, and some ground cracks (closed through the lining process) are visible in places, but the condition is otherwise excellent. (Aug. 1974.)

Biographical information about the sitter and her husband is fragmentary. According to their son, the late Boris Chroustchoff, who was in correspondence with J. J. Sweeney in 1959-60, his parents owned a large estate in southern Russia as well as a house in Munich and one in St. Prex near Geneva. Corroborating evidence for the existence of the latter is provided by Jawlensky, who in his memoirs speaks of going to St. Prex at the outbreak of the First World War precisely because his friend “de Chroustchoff” had an estate there, and he adds that “Frau Chroustchoff half uns, in St. Prex ein kleines Häuschen zu mieten” (A. Jawlensky, “Lebenserinnerungen,” in C. Weiler, Jawlensky, Köpfe, Gesichte, Meditationen, Hanau, 1970, p. 116, trans., London, 1971, p. 101).

Boris Chroustchoff adds that his father was “a very great friend of Kandinsky and other members of the Blaue Reiter school (especially Jawlensky). . . . Both Kandinsky and Jawlensky often used to stay with us in the Ukraine, and were constant visitors when we lived in Munich. . . . Our house was always full of painters, who found a very good subject in my mother. In fact Jawlensky painted a very fine portrait of her in a red dress which has now disappeared” (letters of December 27, 1939, and January 10, 1960).

Marya Anastasieva and Alexander were separated in 1901. She returned to Russia with her daughter, who died soon afterwards, and Marya herself apparently perished during the Revolution. Alexander remained in Western Europe with his son and they moved to England. Boris completed his educa-

1. According to Boris Chroustchoff, son of the sitter, his father and mother, who had been living in Munich, were separated in 1901, and his father, Alexander, took the portrait with him to England, where it hung in their house in Harrow-on-the-Hill until 1908, when it apparently “disappeared” (correspondence with the Museum, 1960). Whether it was actually stolen, or whether it was sold remains to be established. Boris Chroustchoff has since died, and further information has not hitherto been discovered.

2. It has hitherto not been possible to establish where or when Stangl acquired the picture.
tion at Harrow and subsequently served as a volunteer for the British Air Force in World War I. He later settled in Oxford (information contained in part in the de Chroustchoff letters, in part supplied by Isaiah Berlin in correspondence with the author, 1974).

The painting was acquired in 1950 as a Kandinsky, an attribution that was accepted both by Eichner and by Grohmann (see below references). In August 1961, E. Steneberg of Frankfurt presented the Museum with convincing evidence for an attribution to Kardovsky. He noted in particular that the monogram DK (as opposed to WK) was that of Kardovsky and that his particular form of it, reminiscent of a Japanese printmaker’s mark, was used only during Kardovsky’s Munich period. Further research into the attribution initiated by D. Robbins and carried out by L. Berryman, both in the Soviet Union and in New York, confirmed Steneberg’s findings, and the change in attribution was formally accepted and recorded in 1967.

The earliest source for the attribution of the portrait to Kandinsky is as yet unclear, although it appears to have originated with Grohmann. According to Stangl, L. Grote and Grohmann were both consulted about the work in 1950 and both concurred that it was the work of Kandinsky (correspondence with the author, 1974). Whether the work had been so attributed earlier is not known. Boris Chroustchoff speaks of the painting as a Kandinsky, but this may merely reflect his acceptance of Grohmann’s attribution rather than any prior association of the picture on his own (or his father’s) part with Kandinsky’s name. In 1959 he had received a letter from Grohmann asking whether he were related in any way to the “Marie de Chroustchoff whose famous portrait by Kandinsky is in the Guggenheim Museum.” Chroustchoff, who had not seen or heard of his mother’s portrait since it had “disappeared” (as he put it) from his father’s Harrow-on-the-Hill house in about 1908, was “staggered” to discover that the painting was in the Museum (correspondence with Sweeney, 1960). His failure to mention Kardovsky’s name in relation to it is understandable both in view of the number of years that had elapsed since he had last seen it and of Grohmann’s clear conviction that the attribution to Kandinsky was not in question. Moreover, Chroustchoff’s attribution of a portrait of his father (fig. a) to Kandinsky (when he wrote to Sweeney about it) would

---

fig. a.

Kardovsky, Alexander de Chroustchoff
Hunting Hares on his Estate, oil on canvas, 25 3/8 x 28 in., 65 x 71 cm., present whereabouts unknown.
seem to have been based in part at least upon the identical monograms and
dates borne by the two works, rather than upon any more compelling stylistic
or documentary factors, thus suggesting that he possibly lacked such addi-
tional evidence. ("I am enclosing a photograph of another painting by Kan-
dinsky which he painted in the same year, and which bears the same signature
as my mother's portrait. This is a painting of my father, shooting hares on his
Estate in southern Russia on an autumnal day" [letter to Sweeney, January
1960].)

Whether the Guggenheim portrait was painted in Munich or in Russia is
unclear. Kardovsky's movements during the year 1900 are well documented
and would have allowed him to paint the picture in either place. Having begun
his studies at the St. Petersburg Academy of Art in 1892 under Pavel Chistiakov
and Ilia Repin, he had in 1896, together with his fellow-students Jawlensky,
Werefkin, and Grabar, decided to go abroad. They departed in the summer of
that year, spent some time in Paris and elsewhere, and arrived in November in
Munich, where they spent the next four years studying in the school of Anton
Ažbe (Dmitri Nikolaevich Kardovsky: ob iskusstve, ed. E. D. Kardovskaia,
Iz. Akademi Khudozhestv USSR Moscow, 1960, p. 66. See also Weiler, Lon-
don, 1971, p. 95. For extensive information on the Ažbe school and its influence
on Kandinsky and his circle see Weiss, 1973, chapter 1, et passim). Early in
April of 1899 Jawlensky reports that he, Werefkin, Kardovsky, Grabar, and
Ažbe went to Venice together (Weiler, 1971, p. 96). By April 25, 1899, Kardov-
sky was back in Russia for his wedding to Olga Della-Vos, a pupil of Repin
to whom he had been engaged for less than one year. The young couple set out
on a protracted wedding trip visiting many cities, and they finally settled in
Munich (at an unrecorded date), remaining there until the spring of 1900. They
then returned to St. Petersburg, where Kardovsky continued his studies at the
Academy. He was, however, ill with pleurisy for most of the summer of 1900
and spent the first part of the following winter in the Crimea recuperating
(Kardovskaia, 1960, pp. 69, 76).

Thus, Kardovsky was in Munich in the early months of 1900 and in Russia
for the remainder of that year and could have painted the portrait of Marya
Anastasievna in either place.

The movements of the de Chroustchoff family are much more difficult to
trace. Boris Chroustchoff's letters seem to imply that the family was living
in Munich in the period immediately preceding the break-up of his parents' marriage, but this would presumably not have prevented them from spending
some months annually on their Russian estate, and indeed it would have been remarkable if they did not. The presence on the original stretcher of a Munich
address for Kardovsky establishes only that if painted in Russia, the picture was
brought back to Munich by the time of the de Chroustchoff's 1901 separation.
The portrait of Alexander (fig. a), which Boris Chroustchoff described as hav-
ing been painted on his father's estate in Russia on an autumn day, would—if
the description is accurate—have been painted in the fall of 1900, and since
this work was definitely brought back to Munich in 1901 (and thence to England) it is certainly plausible to imagine that the Guggenheim painting had a similar history. There is, however, no compelling evidence on this point and the question remains for the time being unsolved.

EXHIBITIONS:
New York, SRGM 74, 118, 132 (checklists; as Kandinsky).

REFERENCES:
Paul Klee

Born December 1879, Münchenbuchsee, Bern.
Died June 1940, Muralto-Locarno.

NOTE: Klee kept a detailed record of his work in an Oeuvre Catalogue (hereafter OC), which he began in the spring of 1911 and continued until his death. It is not totally complete, and omissions are especially frequent in the pre-1911 years. The document is preserved in the Klee Stiftung, Bern. It covers the years 1883-1940 and records seven hundred and thirty-three paintings, three thousand, one hundred and fifty-nine so called “colored sheets,” fifty-one glass paintings, fifteen sculptures, and one collage; the numbers inscribed upon the works themselves coincide in almost all cases with the numbers in the OC, although there are exceptions.

The entries in the OC include date, number, title, and description of medium; the latter category is not always complete nor in every case totally accurate, and an effort has been made, therefore, to analyze the medium and technique independently of, as well as in relationship to, the OC entry. The entries in the present catalogue include Klee’s OC entry verbatim; any discrepancy between this and the actual medium of the work is noted.

M. Poser of the Guggenheim Museum made the transcriptions from the Klee manuscript in Bern. J. Glaesemer of the Klee Stiftung examined the Guggenheim Museum’s Klee collection with the author in April 1973 and made many invaluable suggestions, especially concerning the artist’s often complex medium and technique; these are gratefully incorporated in the entries which follow.

146 Flowerbed. 1913.
(Blumenbeet; Flower garden).

OC 1913, 193, Blumenbeet Öl, auf Pappe A.1
48.1172 x 109
Oil on board, 11⅛ x 13¼ (28.2 x 33.7)
Signed and dated u.l.: Klee / 1913 193.
PROVENANCE:
Early history unknown; Karl Nierendorf, New York, by 1948; acquired with the Estate of Karl Nierendorf, 1948.
CONDITION:
At an unrecorded date filling and inpainting of 3 damages (1½ in., 2½ in., and 2¼ in.) near the top center were performed. The surface was then coated with natural varnish.

There are some losses along the edges, down to the dark underpainting in some places, down to the board in others. Traction cracks are present in most areas, both in the upper paint layer and in the white layer beneath. A very slight rabbet mark ca. ¼ in. wide is visible only in a raking light. The board has a slight convex warp. The overall condition is good. (Apr. 1973.)

1. The “A” notation in the OC stands for “ohne Natur” and indicates that the work was done from imagination or fantasy rather than from nature.

There is a layer of dark underpainting over which is a layer of white oil paint. The composition was drawn onto the white paint in pencil, and penciled outlines are visible in places. Both the white base and the pencil underdrawing are common practice in Klee’s early oils (see The Diaries of Paul Klee, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1964, pp. 231, 243, 244).
Jordan suggests that the use of segmented, triangular forms in this, and a closely related oil entitled Flower Path, 1912, 124 (present whereabouts unknown, Cahiers d'Art, vol. 20-21, 1945/46, repr. p. 17), probably reflects the influence of Cubist paintings. He cites Le Fauconnier's Abundance and Gleizes’ Landscape with Figures, both of which were reproduced in the Blaue Reiter Almanach, as possible sources of this influence, but also emphasizes that the relationship of one plane to the next, and the compositional structure in the Klee paintings are even more reminiscent of Fauve models than they are of Cubist ones.

The segmented and triangular shapes of these two paintings occur in many of the watercolor landscapes of Bern and its surroundings which Klee painted during 1913. (See, for example, In the Quarry, 1913, 135, where they are used to define the trees and bushes along the side of the quarry.) However, whereas in the watercolors these forms are integrated into a clear landscape composition, in Flower Path and Flowerbed they become an all-over pattern which is the composition itself. In this respect they are more closely related to the abstract compositions of the following year such as Colored Circles Linked by Bands of Color, 1914, 218 (Paul Klee Stiftung, Kunstmuseum Bern).

EXHIBITIONS:
Munich, Muenchener Neue Seccession IV Ausstellung, 1918, no. 69 (Blumenbeet); New York, SRGM 74, no. 109; 192, Paul Klee, no. 14, repr.; 276 (no cat).

REFERENCE:
Dance You Monster to My Soft Song! 1922.
(Tanze Du Ungeheuer zu meinem sanften Lied!).


38.508
Watercolor and oil transfer drawing on plaster-grounded gauze mounted on gouache-painted paper. Approximate dimensions of unevenly cut gauze support: 13 1/4 x 11 1/2 (35 x 29.2); approximate height of gauze plus painted borders: 15 1/4 (40); dimensions of paper mount: 17 1/8 x 12 7/8 (44.9 x 32.7)
Not signed; inscribed by the artist across lower edge of gauze support: Tanze Du Ungeheuer! Zu meinem sanften Lied; across lower edge of paper mount: 1922/54 Tanze Du Ungeheuer zu meinem sanften Lied!

PROVENANCE:
St. Annen-Museum, Lübeck, Germany, 1927-37 (information supplied by Max Hasse, St. Annen-Museum, correspondence with the author, August 1974; he is not sure whether the work was purchased directly from the artist or from an intermediary); banned by the German government as degenerate art, 1937; purchased from Rudolf Bauer by Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1938; Gift of Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1938.

CONDITION:
The work has received no treatment. There are a considerable number of losses both of pigment and of plaster. These are scattered over the entire surface and readily visible to the naked eye. Although there is no apparent incipient cleavage at present, the surface is clearly vulnerable to flaking and the condition in general is fragile. (Feb. 1974.)

Klee’s oil transfer technique, first used in 1919, has been analyzed and documented by Glaesemer (Paul Klee, Handzeichnungen I, Bern, 1973, pp. 258-260). The artist first brushed Japan paper with black oil color or printer’s ink to create a kind of carbon paper; when it was almost dry, he placed it face down

fig. a.
Klee, Dance You Monster to My Soft Song!, blue ink on paper, 13 1/2 x 10 1/4 in., 34.3 x 26 cm., Galerie Rosengart, Lucerne.

1. The “A” in this case was added by Lily Klee to indicate that the medium was watercolor (Aquarell). Information supplied by J. Glaesemer (Apr. 1973).
on a clean sheet of paper or cloth and laid a preparatory drawing (face up) on top of it. He then traced over the drawing with a stylus, thus transferring its outlines in soft black to the lower sheet. Drawings which have been used for oil transfer are easily identified by the stylus marks which are clearly visible on them. The oil transfers in turn are identified by the residual black smudge marks of the oil color. Klee's earliest experiments in this technique were left as black and white transfer drawings. (See, for example, Glaesemer, nos. 646 and 647.) Only later did he begin to add watercolor and to use the technique in the creation of paintings.

The preparatory drawing used to transfer the composition to the present painting is in the collection of the Galerie Rosengart, Lucerne (fig. a). Although
the dimensions of the drawing sheet are slightly smaller than those of the gauze mount of the painting, the internal dimensions of the actual figure are identical in the two works. The identifying stylus marks are plainly visible on the drawing sheet and, although these marks do not in every detail follow the lines of the drawing itself, they do correspond precisely to the outlines of the forms in the Guggenheim painting. Thus, Klee's alterations were made with the stylus during the actual transfer process. This is the case, for example, of the written inscription along the lower edge of the work, which has been considerably changed in the painted version. It is also true of the top of the central figure's head; Klee's placement of this figure slightly higher in the field of the painted version forced him to reduce the curly top of the head he had used in the drawing to a more formalized and slightly squashed scroll. Had he included the freer curls of the original drawing, they would have run into the top edge of the field.

The apparently mechanical demands of the transfer technique were often modified in this way by Klee at the stylus stage of the process.

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:

Contact of Two Musicians. 1922.
(Kontakt zweier Musiker).

OC 1922, A 93, Kontakt zweier Musiker
Ölfarbezeichnung und Aquarell Nesselstoff,
kreidegrundiert.

48.1172 x 527
Watercolor and oil transfer drawing on
chalk-primed linen gauze, mounted on
gouache-painted board. Approximate
dimensions of unevenly cut gauze support: left
and right sides, 17 7/8 (45.4); top, 11 1/2 (29.2);
bottom, 12 (30.5); dimensions of painted
surround: left side, 17 7/8 (45.1); top, 11 7/8
(30.2); dimensions of entire board, 25 1/4 x
18 7/8 (64.2 x 47.9)
Signed u.r.: Klee; inscribed by the artist
across lower edge of mount: 1922 x 93
Kontakt zweier Musiker; in pencil l.l.
corner of mount: Sond.Cl. (Sonder Classe
Klee) was Klee's designation for works he con-
sidered to be particularly successful, and
these were generally not for sale.); in pencil
on reverse of mount: "Samlg K Privatbesitz"
(possibly referring to the artist's own
collection).

PROVENANCE:
Probably remained in the artist's collection
until his death in 1940 (Klee, exhibition
catalogue, Nierendorf Gallery, New York,
October 1947, specifies that the work came
from the artist's Estate; see also above
inscriptions); acquired with the Estate of
Karl Nierendorf, 1948.

CONDITION:
The work has received no treatment.
There are numerous cracks in the chalk
priming, but these are minor. The condition
in general is good. (Feb. 1974.)

Klee's musicians are attached to one another by means of a wire-like con-
traption reminiscent of that which activates his Automaton, 1922, 228, of the
same year. In both works, Klee is expressing the fascination for E. T. A. Hoff-
mann's view of the world which characterized not only his own work of the
early 1920's but also that of Schlemmer and the Bauhaus theater. Schlemmer
produced a Hoffmann ballet, The Figural Cabinet, in the spring of 1922, and as
C. Geelhaar has pointed out, Klee's works of this period are filled with Hoff-
mannesque characters (Paul Klee and the Bauhaus, Greenwich, Connecticut,
1973, pp. 66-72). The puppet-like automata of Klee's "concert," appearing on
a curtained stage, seem to be almost a direct illustration of Schlemmer's state-
ment: "The endeavor to free man from his physical bondage and to heighten
his freedom of movement beyond his native potential resulted in substituting
for the organism the mechanical human figure (Kunstfigur): the automaton and
the marionette. . . . the Russian Brjusov demands that we 'replace actors with
mechanized dolls, into each of which a phonograph shall be built' " (The
Theater of the Bauhaus, ed. W. Gropius, Middletown, Connecticut, 1961,
p. 28).

For a discussion of the oil transfer technique, see above cat. no. 147.

EXHIBITIONS:
Munich, Galerie Hans Goltz, Paul Klee, 2. Gesamtausstellung, May-June 1925, no. 11
("Privatbesitz"); New York, SRGM 78, 83, 95, 118, 129 (checklists); 192, Paul Klee, no. 55,
repr.; 195 (no cat.); 196 (checklist); 202, p. 114, repr.; 205, Rousseau, Redon, and Fantasy
(checklist); 227 (no cat.); 232, 241, p. 230, repr.; 266, 276 (no cats.).
Red Balloon. 1922.
(Roter Ballon).

OC 1922, 179, Roter Ballon Ölbild kleineres Format Nesselstoff auf Pappe geklebt, kreidegrundiert.

48.1172 x 524

Oil (and oil transfer drawing?) on chalk-primed linen gauze, mounted on board,¹
12 1/2 x 12 3/4 (31.7 x 31.2)

Signed and dated l.l.: Klee / 1922 / 179
(now invisible to the naked eye but clear under UV); inscribed by the artist on
reverse: 1922 // / 179² / Roter Ballon / Klee. / breiter Rahmen. / nicht zu flach / glasen. nicht zu flacher Rahmen / glasen.³

PROVENANCE:
Hermann Lange, Krefeld, by 1931 (Kunstverein exhibition catalogue; Lange's name appears twice on the reverse of the work); Karl Nierendorf, New York, by 1948; acquired with the Estate of Karl Nierendorf, 1948.

CONDITION:
There are numerous abrasions in the upper right quarter of the painting which have been partially retouched; the date of these repairs is unknown. In 1953 surface dirt was removed with benzine and inpainting performed in tiny scattered areas at the upper left and lower right corners. The board was mounted on tempered Masonite.

Some cleavage has occurred between the gauze and the board; it is difficult to determine whether this condition is developing, but it seems to be stable. There is some minor cleavage between the board and the Masonite along the top edge. The overall condition is good. (Apr. 1973.)

The motif of the balloon, both as a mode of travel and as decorative free form, recurs periodically in Klee's oeuvre. (See, for example, The Balloon, 1926; Balloon over Town, 1928; The Balloon at the Window, 1929.)

The structural characteristics of Red Balloon bring it into close relationship with Little Fir-Tree Painting, also of 1922 (Kunstmuseum Basel, Öffentliche

1. In consultation with J. Glaesemer, it was tentatively concluded that Klee may have used an oil transfer drawing at a certain stage in his work on this picture. Traces of black in the background and the particular quality of some of the black outlines gave rise to this hypothesis, but further research is necessary before it can be definitely proved. It has also not been finally established whether the chalk priming was applied to the gauze, the board mount, or to both. For a discussion of the oil transfer technique, see above cat. no. 147.  
2. This inscription has hitherto been published as 1922 VI 179. 
3. Glaesemer suggested that Klee's framing instructions were probably for Goltz. The label attached to the lower edge of the reverse has been identified by J. Kornfeld as a label of Hans Goltz's gallery with which Klee had a contract at that time.
Klee's strict concentration on pictorial problems and his exclusion of all discussion of thematic content is characteristic. As R. Verdi has pointed out, Klee insisted that pictures are not born from ideas, but rather from the desire to solve pictorial problems: "Die bildende Kunst beginnt niemals bei einer poetischen Stimmung oder Idee, sondern beim Bau einer oder mehrerer Figuren, bei der Zusammenstimmung einiger Farben und Tonwerte oder bei der Abwägung von Raumverhältnissen..." ("Plastic art never begins with a poetic mood or idea, but with the construction of one or several figures; the harmonization of a few colours and tonal values or in the relative proportion of spaces..."

Paul Klee: Dokumente und Bilder aus den Jahren 1896-1930, ed. Klee Gesellschaft, Bern, 1949, p. 5, trans. R. Verdi, "Paul Klee's 'Fish-Magic: An Interpretation,' Burlington Magazine, vol. cxvi, March 1974, p. 153.) As Verdi suggests, Klee was not prepared to discuss the thematic content of his works; his theoretical writings must thus be seen as a source of elucidation of the formal rather than the philosophical and iconographical aspects of his work.

EXHIBITIONS:
Dusseldorf, Kunstverein für die Rheinlande und Westfalen, Paul Klee, June 14-July 6, 1931, no. 17 ("Bes.Hermann Lange, Krefeld"); New York, SRGM 79, 81, 83 (checklists); Vancouver, SRGM 88-T, no. 34; Montreal, SRGM 93-T, no. 24; New York, SRGM 97 (checklist); London, SRGM 104-T, no. 35; New York, SRGM 112, 118 (checklists); 129 (repr.); Philadelphia, SRGM 134-T, no. 72; New York, SRGM 144 (checklist); Worcester, Mass., SRGM 148-T, no. 19, repr.; New York, SRGM 151, 153 (checklists); Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, Surrealist & Fantastic Art from the Collections of the Museum of Modern Art and the Guggenheim Museum, Feb. 14-Mar. 15, 1964, no. 34; New York, SRGM 173, no. 52, repr. color; 192, Paul Klee, no. 58, repr. color; 198-T (no cat.); 202, p. 112, repr. color; 205, Rousseau, Redon and Fantasy (checklist); 227, 228 (no cats.); 232, 241, pp. 228-229, repr. color; 276 (no cat.).

REFERENCES:
Curtain. 1924.  
(Vorhang; Untitled).  

OC 1924, 129, Vorhang kl. aquarell Nesselstoff aufgeklebt Krapplack Kleistergrund.  
Außerden 129 a, b, c, d. (The final phrase ["Außerden..."] is included as a footnote at the bottom of the page.)  

PROVENANCE:  

CONDITION:  
The work has received no treatment.  
The linen support is slightly cracked at the top edge and there are 3 pinpoint losses in the paint layer. The painted border shows some slight chipping at the upper right, and the board mount is somewhat discolored. The condition in general is good. (Feb. 1974)

The format of the OC entry, with its a-d footnoted addition, is unique and suggests that the original picture 129 was cut into four (thus creating 129 a-d) or five (thus creating 129, and 129 a-d). Only two of the other works in the series have hitherto come to light: Curtain, 129a (fig. a), formerly Saidenberg Gallery, New York, and an untitled work, 129c, in the collection of Angela Rosengart, Lucerne (fig. b, hitherto unpublished; the relationship of this work to the others in the series was first pointed out by J. Glaesemer, in conversation with M. Poser, 1974). The medium, colors, and scale of the motifs in 129a and 129c are identical to those of the Guggenheim example, and it is extremely likely that they originally formed part of a single whole.  

Glaesemer, in conversation with the author, April 1973, has offered yet another possible explanation for the OC entry and for the almost identical nature of the works involved. All of the works listed under 129 might, he suggests, have been cut from 128, Mural (fig. c). Once again the medium, colors, and scale of motifs are identical. If Glaesemer’s theory is correct, the single work must have been divided into two very soon after its completion since the 1925 Goltz catalogue contains an entry for each: “Wandbild, 1924, 128” and “Vorhang, 1924, 129.” (See below EXHIBITIONS and fn. 3.)

1. Fräulein Grunow, who taught a class at the Bauhaus, was in her 60’s in 1924, and was a friend and supporter of many of the Bauhaus artists. See Felix Klee, Paul Klee, New York, 1962, pp. 53-54, 184.  
2. No records have hitherto come to light to indicate where or when Hilla Rebay acquired the work.
The repetitive, serial nature of these compositions made them especially suitable for cutting, and Klee is known to have subdivided several compositions in this way. The most explicit example of the practice is represented by the three works Pirla, Pal, and Between Pirla and Pal. As C. Geelhaar has pointed out, the last of these was cut from the center of the composition originally formed by all three, and the title makes witty reference to this earlier relationship (Paul Klee and the Bauhaus, Greenwich, Connecticut, 1973, p. 89).

The titles Mural and Curtain may in one sense be intended metaphorically since the works are so diminutive. The images themselves, however, which have so often been compared to the abstract signs of a hieroglyphic language, are somewhat reminiscent of the ornamental style and serial patterns of Islamic wall decoration or of Coptic textiles, and something of this implicit relationship may be suggested in the titles. The division of the field into rectangles and bands of tightly juxtaposed small-scale motifs is characteristic of a large group of works produced by Klee between 1924 and 1927. (For other examples see Coolness in a Garden of the Torrid Zone, 1924, 186, Geelhaar, 1973, repr. p. 92; Pastorale, 1927, 20, W. Grohmann, Paul Klee, New York, 1954, repr. cc 82.)

Geelhaar has also suggested that the structures of these paintings were "composed by the artist like a text or musical score," and he sees their free-flowing irregularities as an illustration of Klee's own dictum that spontaneity and vivacity of form are essential ingredients in an abstract, structured composition (1973, p. 94). Klee's advice to his students on this subject is revealing: "What I saw by way of your theoretical exercises in the field of structures was not very rewarding in terms of spontaneity. A certain trend towards rigidity predominated, often resulting in chillingly symmetrical ornamentation... it is hard to retain life in such abstractions. One tends to ignore altogether the bridge that leads from natural and inherently coherent rhythm to its precise representation" (lecture of November 27, 1923, in The Nature of Nature, ed. J. Spiller, New York, 1973, p. 43).

It is also possible that Klee's 1924 pictures were influenced to some extent by ancient Mediterranean scripts such as those reproduced in K. Weule's Vom Kerbholz zum Alphabet, Stuttgart, 1915, a book which Klee apparently owned (The Thinking Eye, ed. J. Spiller, New York, 1961, p. 516).

EXHIBITIONS:
Munich, Galerie Hans Goltz, Paul Klee, 2. Gesamtausstellung, May-June 1925, no. 145 ("Vorhang, 1924, 129"); New York, SRGM 241 (addenda); 276 (no cat.).

3. It is possible that the entry refers to the entire work (including the Guggenheim fragment) prior to cutting. (See above.)
fig. a.
Klee, Curtain, 1924, 129a, 3 3/8 x 9 1/4 in., 9.2 x 23.5 cm., formerly Saidenberg Gallery, New York.

fig. b.
Klee, Untitled, 1924, 129c, canvas only, 9 1/2 x 1 3/8 in., 23.4 x 4 cm., Collection Angela Rosengart, Lucerne.

fig. c.
In the Current Six Thresholds. 1929.  
(In der Strömung Sechs Schwellen).

OC 1929, 92 S.2, in der Strömung sechs Schwellen. Tempera = und Ölfarben 43 x 43 Leinw. auf Keil.  
67.1842
Oil and tempera on canvas, 17⅓ x 17⅓ (43.5 x 43.5)
Signed and dated l.r.: Klee 1929; inscribed by the artist on stretcher (barely visible): in der Strömung Sechs Schwellen / Klee / 1929.

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist by D. H. Kahnweiler, 1936 or 1937; purchased from Kahnweiler by Curt Valentin, New York, 1954; G. David Thompson, Pittsburgh, by 1960 (date and source of acquisition unknown); purchased from Thompson by Galerie Beyeler, Basel, 1960; purchased from Beyeler by Heinz Berggruen, Paris, 1963; purchased from Berggruen, 1967.

CONDITION:
Some losses in the 4 corners were inpainted at an unrecorded date.
Apart from some tiny scattered paint losses the condition is excellent. (Sept. 1972.)

The relationship between Klee’s horizontal band paintings and his month-long Egyptian journey of the winter 1928-29 has been widely accepted in the literature and is based in part upon Klee’s own explicit references to the relationship in his choice of titles for many of these works (B.e.H. [Upper Egypt]; Evening in Egypt; Place near the Canal, Necropolis, etc.). Moreover, in a letter to Lily written on April 17, 1929, he even offers some insights into the way in which one of these paintings, Monument on the Edge of Fertile Country, 1929, 40, is expressive of his Egyptian experience: “I am painting a landscape somewhat like the view of the fertile country from the distant mountains of the Valley of the Kings. The polyphonic interplay between earth and atmosphere has been kept as fluid as possible” (W. Grohmann, Paul Klee, New York [1954?], p. 273).

The statement raises important questions about the content of Monument on the Edge of Fertile Country, which consists of a series of horizontal bands intersected at irregular intervals by verticals and diagonals; at every intersection, moving from right to left, the individual horizontals are divided into two, and according to the number of intersections the original horizontal band is thus divided into halves, quarters, eighths, or sixteenths by the time it reaches the left margin. The colors on the right are pale beige, ochre, gray, and pink; moving towards the left, browns and some blues are gradually introduced, and the ochres and pinks become slightly darker. (For an interesting analysis of the effects of this use of color see Geelhaar, p. 120; also Klee, The Nature of Nature, ed. J. Spiller, New York, 1973, p. 142 [not 235 as stated in Geelhaar, fn. 1].)

1. Information supplied by M. Jardot, in correspondence with the author, Sept. 1972. Although the picture was exhibited at Galerie Simon in 1934, it seems not to have been purchased by Kahnweiler until about 2 years later. The Kahnweiler records show that Curt Valentin purchased the picture in May 1954.

2. A J. B. Neumann label on the reverse, hitherto unidentified with any exhibition, might indicate that he owned the picture before Thompson.
Even with Klee’s own explicit description of this work as “somewhat like the view of the fertile country,” or perhaps precisely because of it, the question of how closely the image itself may be said to reflect an actual landscape setting remains unresolved. Geelhaar’s detailed and poetic reading of the picture is evocative: he sees the pale tones as “the shimmering quality of blinding sunlight and hot desert sand.” The desert is on the right, the Monument in the middle zone, and on the left the “fertile country, where blue irrigation channels cut across the dark brown of the cultivated earth” (p. 120). He sees the work as an illustration of Klee’s 1922 discussion of the relationship between abstraction and reality: “It is interesting to observe how real the object remains in spite of all abstractions.... There are times when something almost seems to be painted after nature, from a model so to speak...” (The Thinking Eye, p. 463).

While it is possible that Klee had such an image in mind as he created the painting, and while the analysis is undoubtedly suggestive, it makes assumptions about the iconography of Klee’s horizontal band paintings which are problematic and require further study. Geelhaar’s explicit reading of the image contrasts strongly with W. Haftmann’s much more general interpretation of the closely related Highway and Byways, which he sees “not [as] a landscape... but rather [as] a kind of pictorial metaphor, a formal simile for an existing emotion, which suddenly revealed itself as a dreamy recollection of Egypt” (The Mind and Work of Paul Klee, New York, 1954, pp. 148-149). The differences in these two approaches to the content in Klee’s 1929 paintings characterizes to some extent the nature of the problems which remain unresolved.

In the Current Six Thresholds poses these problems even more pointedly since the actual linguistic meaning of its title (quite apart from the relationship of that title to the image) is also unclear. The strictly mathematical structure, similar in kind to that of Monument on the Edge of Fertile Country but lacking the diagonal intersections of that painting, is characteristic of many of the works in this 1929-30 series. Following his own technical notes on the Golden Section (The Nature of Nature, pp. 295-296), Klee has divided the horizontals into halves, quarters, eighths, and sixteenths as they are intersected by verticals on their path from right to left. In its dark palette, and in its suppression both of space and light, this picture is clearly an even more austere example of Klee’s constructive principles. Geelhaar (1973) has pointed to the relationship that exists between In the Current Six Thresholds, Movements in Sluices, 1929, 289 (pen drawing), and Moving Thresholds, 1929, 236 (watercolor), suggesting that in all three the subject is that of water or currents in motion. In the drawing and the watercolor (which, he says, followed the painting), Geelhaar sees the static austerity of the Guggenheim painting opening up into a dynamic “character-style” — a much more expressive depiction of the actual movement of rippling water. He implies a progression from a static, earthbound form to a freer mobile one, and in support of this notion he quotes Klee’s discussion of the comparative qualities of the static and the dynamic in art (“Ways of Studying Nature,” The Thinking Eye, p. 67, first published 1923).
Spiller presents the issues in an even more problematic form. He juxtaposes Movement in Locks, 1929, UE9, and Floods, 1929, UE7, with Klee’s November 27, 1923, notes on structural rhythmic, implying a direct connection between these works and the ideas on straight and vibrating lines expressed in the notes, a connection which is difficult to sustain (The Nature of Nature, pp. 43-51). Furthermore, his use of In the Current Six Thresholds to illustrate ideas on the horizontal, vertical, and diagonal which were written in 1921 in the context of a discussion of the problem of balance presents similar problems of context and applicability. The implied relationship of the painting to the two marginal sketches (which do come from the notes for the December 12, 1921, lecture) complicates the issue still further (The Thinking Eye, p. 212).

Geelhaar’s reading of the three works is both illuminating and evocative, but once again it raises the problems posed by Klee’s iconography, the problem of relationship between title and picture, and the problems posed both by Klee’s theoretical writings themselves and by their applicability to his own paintings. The iconographical relationship of In the Current Six Thresholds to its own title, to the other horizontal band paintings, to the Egyptian experience, and to the theoretical notion of the static and the dynamic, are questions that require further investigation. (For illuminating discussion of some of these problems see Büchner, pp. 365-370; Geelhaar, op. cit., passim; Ch. Kröll, Die Bildtitel Paul Klee’s, Inaugural Dissertation, Bonn, 1968, passim; Haftmann, The Mind and Work of Paul Klee, New York, 1954, passim.)

EXHIBITIONS:


REFERENCES:

Open Book. 1930.
(Offenes Buch).

OC 1930, 206 E6, Offenes Buch Wasserfarben gefirnisst Leinwand (Keidrahmen) Weisslace grundiert orig.leisten 1.045 0.42.

48.1772 x 526

Gouache over white lacquer on canvas. Dimensions inside tape: 17¼ x 16¾ (44.8 x 41.7); entire support: 18 x 16¾ (45.7 x 42.5)


PROVENANCE:

CONDITION:
At an unrecorded date brown paper tape was applied to the edges, apparently to hold down the narrow tacking margins; it covers approximately 3/16-¼ in. of the painted surface. In 1967 cleavage in the upper left corner was set down with parchment size, and some other cleaving areas had previously been set down with wax. Neither treatment has proved effective.

Areas of cracking and active cleavage in the white lacquer, notably along the lower margin, around the upper left corner of the book, and at the center of the right margin, pose considerable dangers and have hitherto not been successfully counteracted. There is an extensive overall crackle pattern in the 2 solid colors, and almost invisible cracks throughout the areas of crosshatching. Some minimal flaking of the pale brown wash has exposed the white lacquer in places. (Apr. 1973)

EXHIBITIONS:
New York, SRGM 78, 87, 95, 97 (checklists); London, SRGM 104-T, no. 36, pl. 4; New York, SRGM 118, 129, 151 (checklists); 153 (checklist; commentary; repr. color); 171, no. 60, repr. color; Pasadena, SRGM 193-T, Paul Klee, no. 113, repr. color; New York, SRGM 202, p. 113, repr. color; Columbus, Ohio, SRGM 207-T, p. 32, repr. color; New York, SRGM 227, 228 (no cats.); 232, 241, p. 234, repr. p. 235; 266, 276 (no cats).

REFERENCES:

1. Possibly refers to a frame made by Klee. The white lacquer mentioned in Klee’s OC description was applied over sizing which contained granules, as well as some blue and red underpainting. This was then followed by the light brown wash which covers the entire surface. The composition was then outlined, in part colored, and the crosshatching added; the darker brown substance, concentrated in the margin areas, probably came last, before the varnishing of the entire surface. The blue and red underpainting shows through in certain places; it is unclear whether this was Klee’s original intention, or whether this has emerged as the lacquer film has shrunk and lost its opacity. Some intersecting horizontal and vertical impressions in the white lacquer are visible near each of the 4 corners of the book; it is unclear whether these too have become visible only as the lacquer has aged.

2. A Galerie Flechtheim label on the stretcher may indicate Nierendorf’s source. Alternatively, it may date from a hitherto unidentified exhibition in which the picture appeared.
Rolling Landscape. 1938.  
(Wogende Landschaft).

OC 1938, 409 Y9, Wogende Landschaft  
Aquarellfarben Segelleinen mit gestaltetem  
Kreide = Kleistergrund.

48.172 x 529

Gouache on chalk-and-glue-primed sail-cloth, mounted on tempera-painted board.  
Sailcloth support: 15 7/8 x 21 1/4 (40.2 x 54.2);  
board mount: 18 1/2 x 24 3/8 (47.1 x 61.9)

Formerly signed u.l.: Klee. (The signature has been lost through flaking [see below condition]. Although the signature is recorded in the Guggenheim’s 1948 and subsequent records, no photograph of it exists.);  
inscribed on reverse, not in the artist’s hand (transcribed but not photographed before mounting): Wogende Landschaft / 1938.  
No. 682. (No. 682 is the Nierendorf inventory number, suggesting that this entire inscription dates from his ownership.) Not dated.

PROVENANCE:
Karl Nierendorf, New York, by 1942 (Nierendorf Gallery Inventory of September 9, 1942, No. 682); acquired with the Estate of Karl Nierendorf, 1948.

CONDITION:
In 1954 the picture was mounted on Masonite with PVA emulsion and a rigid frame support added to the reverse. Edges of the board, especially the left, were filled and inpainted. In 1955 the center and some of the margin areas were set down with PVA.  
The board is extensively chipped along all edges. The gray border area has an overall fine crackle pattern with some incipient cleavage, and there are some water stains in this area. Extensive flaking and cleavage in the colored areas, especially at the upper left, the left and right edges, and the left half of the lower edge, has proved impossible to prevent. The overall condition of the paint layer is fragile. (Feb. 1974.)

EXHIBITIONS:
Toronto, SRGM 85-T, no. 44; New York, SRGM 107 (checklist); 118 (checklist; Rolling Landscape substituted for Severing of the Snake, Apr. 20); 129 (checklist); Philadelphia, SRGM 134-T, no. 89; New York, SRGM 144 (checklist); 173, no. 65, repr.; 192, Paul Klee, no. 162, repr. color; 195 (no cat.); 196 (checklist); 202, p. 115, repr.; 227 (no cat.); 232, 241, p. 240, repr. p. 241; 266, 276 (no cats.).

REFERENCE:
Severing of the Snake. 1938.
(\textit{Zerteilung der Schlange}).

\textit{OC} 1938, 262 R2, \textit{Zerteilung der Schlange}.
\textit{Aquarellfarben auf gestaltetem Kreide—Kleistergrund fute.}

48.1172 x 57

Gouache on burlap mounted on built up chalk and gesso-primed burlap, mounted on Masonite board. Unevenly cut burlap support: left side, 20 1/2 (52.1); right side, 19 1/2 (50.6); top and bottom, 15 1/2 (39.4); gesso-primed mount: 28 1/4 x 23 (72.0 x 58.4)

Signed u.r.: \textit{Klee}. Not dated.

\textbf{Provenance:}
Karl Nierendorf, New York, by February 1940 (exhibition catalogue); Mrs. Horatio Gates Lloyd, Haverford, Pennsylvania, ca. 1944-46?; \textsuperscript{1} returned to Nierendorf, ca. 1946; acquired with the Estate of Karl Nierendorf, 1948.

\textbf{Condition:}
In 1974 the chipped and fragile edges of the work were consolidated, filled, and inpainted with PVA.

The gessoed mount is extremely fragile, with extensive chipping and flaking at all edges; there is an overall irregular crackle, and considerable loss of gesso. There is also some minor flaking of the paint film. In the painted area of the composition, there is some minor abrasion with paint loss. The overall condition is fair but fragile. (Feb. 1974.)

The metaphorical significance of the snake in Klee's oeuvre is variously seen as a premonition of death, a symbol of rebirth, a reminiscence of ancient Egyptian religion, a symbol of time, of eternity, or of the irreversible course of fate. As a central element in \textit{Insula Dulcamara}, also of 1938, the snake is interpreted by M. Hugger as a symbol of the eternal flux of the universe, the birth of the World and the Soul out of Chaos (\textit{Paul Klee: Die Malerei als Blick in den Kosmos}, Frauenfeld, 1969, pp. 188-191, 221-222). C. Geelhaar's comprehensive analysis of the same painting sees the snake as a symbol rather of time and eternity ("Et in Arcadia Ego . . .", \textit{Berner Kunstmuseum Mitteilungen}, no. 118, May-June 1973, pp. 1-4).

Iconographic precedents for the severing of a snake with a knife have hitherto not been found, and the particular meaning which Klee may have attributed to the image is not clear.

\textsuperscript{1} Mrs. Gates Lloyd was the lender to the 1944 Philadelphia exhibition. She remembers buying the work from Nierendorf at approximately the time of the exhibition and returning it to him about 2 years later in exchange for another work by Klee, but she is not sure of the exact dates of these transactions (correspondence with the author, Feb.-Mar. 1972).

A label on the reverse bears the inscription "collection J. B. Neumann." It has hitherto not been possible to establish when Neumann owned the work.
EXHIBITIONS:


REFERENCES:

Franz Kline

Born May 1910, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania.
Died May 1962, New York.

Elizabeth. 1944.

62.1613

Oil on canvas, 20 x 16 (50.9 x 40.6)
Signed and dated u.l.: Franz Kline / 44;
with monogram on reverse: FK 44.

PROVENANCE:
Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Leon A. Mnuchin,
1962.

CONDITION:
The work has received no treatment.
The edges and corners are in good condition. Some scattered pigment cracks show signs of incipient cleavage, and some small losses have occurred. This is especially true of an area 4 in. long running vertically to 9 in. from the bottom and 6 in. from the right. There is a heavy coat of discolored varnish. The condition in general is fair to good.
(Feb. 1974.)
Several existing paintings of the artist’s wife Elizabeth suggest that the present work (hitherto known as *Untitled*) does indeed represent her. Three paintings in the collection of Mr. and Mrs. I. David Orr depict a similar head. (Two of these, painted in the mid 1940’s, are reproduced in *Franz Kline*, exhibition catalogue, Whitney Museum of American Art, New York, 1968, figs. 15 and 16; the third, dated 1941, is reproduced in E. de Kooning, “Kline,” *Art News Annual*, vol. 27, part II, November 1957 [1958 no.], p. 90, center left.) While the first two show Elizabeth with her long hair loose and the Guggenheim and *Art News* versions show her with her hair up, the structure of the face is extremely close in all four works. David Orr, who was a close friend of the artist, confirms that Elizabeth is represented in all four works (in conversation with the author, May 1974). (For a discussion of this period in Kline’s work and of some of the other paintings of Elizabeth, see H. Gaugh, “Kline’s Transitional Abstractions, 1946-50,” *Art in America*, vol. 62, July-August 1974, p. 44.)

Even more striking is the relationship between the Guggenheim painting and a sepia drawing of Elizabeth which must have served as the preliminary study for the painting (fig. a). The features of the figure are delicately indicated in the drawing, and her right hand holds a spoon—elements which have been eliminated in the painted version—but the layout of the forms upon the canvas and the structural basis of the composition is directly traceable to the drawing.

Elizabeth was born in England and became a dancer. She met Kline in London in 1937 and they were married in New York in December 1938.

**EXHIBITIONS:**

Self-Portrait, ca. 1945.

62.1612

Oil on canvas, 10 3/4 x 7 (27.3 x 17.9)

Signed l.r.: Franz Kline. Not dated.

PROVENANCE:
Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Leon A. Mchnin, 1962.

CONDITION:
At some point prior to its acquisition by the Museum, the canvas was inpainted in 2 areas: a 3 x 3 in. area at the center of the sitter’s chest; scattered spots ca. 1/2 in. from the top edge.

Although undated, this painting is closely related in style to a self-portrait which is signed and dated 1945 (Collection Mr. and Mrs. I. David Orr, Franz Kline, exhibition catalogue, Whitney Museum of American Art, New York, 1968, fig. 5). A pencil study for the Orr self-portrait (fig. a) is also clearly related to the Guggenheim painting.

Although there are 1946 pictures to which the present work is comparable (such as the dated self-portrait in the collection of Mr. George W. Staempfli, New York), its 1945 date is corroborated by David Orr, who clearly remembers that both his own portrait and the Guggenheim work were painted and hung in Kline’s apartment at 150 West 4th Street. The artist had moved out of this apartment by the end of 1945 (David Orr in conversation with the author, October 1974).
EXHIBITIONS:
See above cat. no. 155.

REFERENCE:
Oskar Kokoschka

Born March 1886, Pöchlarn, Austria.
Lives in Villeneuve, Switzerland.

Knight Errant. 1915.
(Der Irrende Ritter).

48.1172 x 380
Oil on canvas, 35 1/4 x 70 1/2 (89.5 x 180.1)
Signed l.r.: OK; on reverse: OKOXOK. Not dated.

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist by Oskar Reichel, Vienna, before March 1916; purchased from Reichel by Otto Kallir (-Nirenstein), Paris and New York, 1934; purchased from Kallir by Karl Nierendorf, New York, ca. 1946; acquired with the Estate of Karl Nierendorf, 1948.

CONDITION:
In 1953 acute cleavage between the paint and priming layers was treated by infusion of wax; some losses were filled with gesso and inpainted. In 1955 the canvas was lined with wax resin, the surface cleaned, and some losses filled and retouched with PBM. The inpainted areas are as follows: the entire top edge up to 1/2 in. in width; the lower half of the right edge up to 1/2 in. in width; an area approximately 1 1/2 x 4 in. near the top right corner where heavy impasto apparently flaked off; 2 small areas above the signature, and 2 very small areas in the sky. Some additional cleavage was arrested in 1972 by further infusion of wax resin.

Cracks in the paint layer are visible in a limited number of scattered locations, and there has been some flaking. The edges and corners show considerable wear. An unidentified pale brown powdery substance, possibly a mold, is visible to varying degrees in portions of the knight's body and is particularly prominent on the left knee, the left foot, the lower portion of the jacket, and around the right armpit. Tests to define the nature of this condition have so far proved inconclusive. (Feb. 1972.)
The composition centers upon a figure in gray armor stretched out as if floating above a barren landscape bordering on the sea. In the stormy sky a small blue figure with the body, claws, and widely spread wings of a bird and the head of a man is perched on a long green branch, which extends below the knight’s left arm. On the far right a nude female with long blond hair rests her head upon her left hand, as if deep in thought.

The “knight” has been almost universally accepted as a self-portrait, and was described as such by Kokoschka (Studio International, January 1971). Interpretations of the composition as a whole beyond this fact have been based to some extent on whether the picture was thought to have been painted before or after Kokoschka’s war experience on the Russian front where, in September 1915, he was seriously wounded and abandoned on the battlefield. (His own vivid account of this experience, written in Prague in 1934, was first published by Wingler in 1956, Oskar Kokoschka Schriften, 1907-1955, Munich, pp. 69-76.) Among those who have dated the picture during the artist’s convalescence and thus regarded it as illustrative of his personal experience at the hands of the Russians are Westheim (1917 and 1918), Einstein, and C. S. Pond (exhibition catalogue, Springfield, Massachusetts, 1945).

E. Hoffmann (p. 153) first corrected this error in chronology and established that the picture was in fact painted just before Kokoschka’s departure for the front, and this has been confirmed on more than one occasion by the artist himself (Wingler, no. 105; Studio International, January 1971). Within this chronological context, various interpretations have been offered. The picture is seen by some as a strangely prophetic vision of the artist’s own impending fate and thus an imagined depiction of himself wounded and abandoned upon the battlefield (Selz, p. 310; Wingler, no. 105; Bultmann, 1961, p. 32; Hodin, p. 58). Others have seen the knight as overcoming “by the forces of war and destruction” and the artist as thereby symbolically yielding to forces beyond his control (Myers, p. 62). Still others have seen the composition as more generally symbolic of man confronted by his destiny, or as reminiscent of the Agony in the Garden (E. Hoffmann, p. 154; Wilckens, p. 46; Plaut, 1948, p. 55; W. Hoffmann, p. 60).

E. Hoffmann, Selz, and Hodin all see the bird-man in the sky as the figure of Death; E. Hoffmann first suggested (and Hodin concurred) that the white scrawled shapes to the right of this creature were the letters “E S,” an evoca-

1. On Mar. 24, 1916, Rainer Maria Rilke visited Oskar Reichel, and in response to Kokoschka’s Knight Errant which he saw there, he wrote the following lines in the guest book: “Rühren einer die Welt: dass sie ihm stürze ins tiefe / fassende Bld: und sein Herz wölbe sich drüber als Rub. / Herrn Dr. Reichel dankbar unter den Eindruck dieses / Nachmittags: / Rainer Maria Rilke / (Wien am 24. März 1916).” (“Let someone touch the world: [so] that it may fall [for him] into the profound, framing picture; and may his heart arch above it as tranquillity. To Dr. Reichel, gratefully, under the impression of this afternoon.” An elegiac distich [pattern for Duino Elegies], trans. Theodore Ziolkowski, Professor of German Literature, Princeton University.)

When Reichel sold the painting to Kallir in 1934, he also gave him the page from the guest book specifying that it had been written in relation to the Kokoschka.
tion of Christ's despairing cry: “Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani” (“My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” St. Mark 15.34, St. Matthew 27.46).

As in most of Kokoschka’s paintings of this period, many of the individual details are ambiguous; but it is clear that the interrelationships between the various works of 1914-15 and their obvious connections with events in the artist’s own life are crucial ingredients in the iconography and must be taken into account in any attempt to explain it. By 1914 Kokoschka’s three-year tumultuous relationship with Alma Mahler was in its final phase, and all of the major works produced during this and the preceding year reflect his preoccupation with this intense experience. In works of 1914-15 (Der gefesselte Kolumbus [The Fettered Columbus], the Bach Cantata, The Tempest, the six fans which Kokoschka painted for Alma, “Allos Makar,” and The Burning Briarbush) the artist expresses, sometimes in explicitly narrative terms, sometimes in more remotely symbolic terms, a combination of his own direct experience with Alma and of the more general and eternal dilemma of man’s tortuous relations with woman. It is precisely in the combination of the autobiographical and the symbolic, the actual and the imaginary, that the ambiguities of his iconographic motifs are most apparent and their meaning most elusive, but it is nonetheless clear that his relationship with Alma provided the material for both the writings and paintings of this period. The imagery of Knight Errant, though open to a variety of interpretations, is to a considerable extent explicable within the same context.

The nude female in the lower right of Knight Errant inevitably evokes the memory of Alma, who appears throughout Der gefesselte Kolumbus and the Bach Cantata similarly generalized and lacking in detailed facial characteristics.
but nonetheless unmistakable. Her identification in this instance is further supported by analogy with the final plate in the *Bach Cantata*—a direct portrait of Alma—in which she is shown thoughtfully resting her head upon her hand. The crouching pose of the “Alma” in *Knight Errant*, by itself almost indecipherable, becomes clear if compared with Kokoschka’s use elsewhere of the sphinx (or other feline form with human head) in connection with the Alma theme. (See, for example, the fifth fan.) E. Hoffmann has pointed out that the sphinx had already been used by Kokoschka as the symbol of the femme fatale in the artist’s play *Sphinx and Strauman* in 1907, and its significance in the fan context is no less clear.

The bird-man in the sky, so often interpreted as a figure of death, may also be symbolically linked to the sphinx-like Alma, and in turn throw light on her presence in the painting. The human features of the bird bear a remarkable resemblance to those of Kokoschka himself. (Compare, for example, the 1911 self-portrait, Wingler, repr. p. 29.) Moreover, in the 1915 illustration for his poem “Allos Makar” (an anagram for Alma-Oskar), Kokoschka portrayed himself as a comparable bird-man, this time explicitly juxtaposed with Alma as sphinx (fig. a). They are shown side by side battling over a snake or worm, and the anguished theme of the poem is the draining and futile nature of human love.

The position and meaning of the knight himself has been variously interpreted, but once again iconographical analogies within his contemporary writings and paintings can throw light on the problem. Plate 8 of *Der gefesselte Kolumbus* (fig. b) depicts the artist as Columbus, suspended in the air in a pose almost identical to that of the Knight in the Guggenheim painting. His
eyes appear to be fixed in terror upon the skeleton in the lower right corner who lies, as if in wait, propped up on both elbows and staring out at the spectator. (A preparatory drawing for this lithograph, published by E. Rathenau as a drawing for Die chinesische Mauer [Oskar Kokoschka Drawings 1906-1965, Coral Gables, 1970, p. 83], shows the fearful, tormented face of Columbus even more clearly.) Nothing in the text of Kokoschka’s play provides explicit sources for the iconography of the composition, but death appears as a leitmotif throughout this drama in which the cruelty of human love is the central theme; the final lines suggest that only when the body is sacrificed can the naturally painful relationship between man and woman achieve peace.

In the Bach Cantata and Kokoschka’s illustrations for it similar preoccupations prevail. The dialogue between Hope and Fear in the text dwells alternately on the necessity of surrendering the body to achieve spiritual peace and the agonizing fear of death and the grave. Fear seems ultimately to prevail and the emotions expressed are those depicted on the face of the Columbus illustration cited above (fig. b). (“Todesangst . . . Mein letztes Lager will mich schrecken . . . Das offene Grab sieht greulich aus.”)

In The Burning Briarbrush of 1911, written at the outset of Kokoschka’s relationship with Alma, his sense of the tragic dilemma posed by man’s confrontation with woman is perhaps expressed in its clearest form. The dialogue reveals the woman first wooing the man, winning him, becoming dependent upon him, and then being abandoned by him. In bitter revenge she wounds him, destroys his strength as he destroyed hers, and they are reunited only in death. Images of a shining knight (a “metal man”), the animal nature of woman, and the destructive interrelationship between them evoke many of the same themes expressed again and again in the works of the following years. The Knight Errant, painted as this painful liaison approached its end, may perhaps represent a final statement of the universal dilemma. In this sense the Knight, clearly suspended above the landscape (and not, as some commentators have insisted, lying prostrate and wounded upon it), evokes the notion of a being suspended between heaven and earth. Unlike the figure of Fear in the Bach Cantata, or its counterpart in the Der gefesselte Kolumbus who looks down to the grave in terror, the knight here looks up in apparent peace and evokes therefore the figure of Hope. (“Ich lege diesen Leib vor Gott zum Opfer nieder . . . Ich fahr ins Himmelshaus, Ich fahre sicher hin mit Frieden.” [“I lay this body down as an offering to God . . . I am going to the House of God, and I am going there in peace.”]) Within the context of Kokoschka’s immediately preceding works and the references throughout these to his relationship with Alma or to the more general issue of man’s relationship with woman, the imagery of Knight Errant reveals itself clearly and coherently as yet another comment on this theme. Whether the picture may also be seen—as it most often has been—as a premonition of war and man’s helplessness in the face of it is more difficult to establish.
EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:

2. The picture was lent anonymously, on the instructions of Hilla Rebay; she felt that the work (recently acquired with the Nierendorf Estate) was not worthy of the Guggenheim collection (letter from Hilla Rebay to James Plaut, May 3, 1948). It was not shown again until after her retirement.
František Kupka

Born September 1871, Opočno, Bohemia.
Died June 1957, Puteaux.
(Plans par couleurs, grand nu).

68.1860
Oil on canvas, 59 1/4 x 71 1/8 (150.1 x 180.8)
Signed and dated l.r.: Kupka / 1909.

PROVENANCE:
Madame Eugénie Kupka, 1957–58; purchased from Eugénie Kupka by Richard L. Feigen, New York, 1958; purchased from Feigen by Mr. and Mrs. Andrew P. Fuller, New York, 1961; Gift of Mrs. Andrew P. Fuller, 1968.

CONDITION:
At some time prior to acquisition by the Museum the painting was lined with wax resin. Some minor inpainting at the upper corners and along the top and left edges probably dates from this time.

There is considerable wear at the edges, and there are some scattered cracks in the paint film, mainly in the upper half of the canvas. The condition is otherwise good. (Dec. 1973.)

Kupka’s work on the Large Nude extended over a period of several years during which he produced at least eighteen studies for the picture and probably six after it. The figure represented is his wife, Eugénie (Félix in conversation with Rowell, June 1974).

Rowell has convincingly argued that an earlier large-scale oil version of the composition was almost certainly completed by 1906. Her hypothesis is based upon the discovery of a photograph of the artist in his studio in which the lower left section of this framed and hence probably completed oil is clearly visible (fig. e). The position and treatment of the two legs in this painting differ slightly from that of the Guggenheim version; careful examination of the latter has uncovered no pentimenti and it is clear, therefore, that another version is involved.

Several items in the photograph serve to establish that it was taken no later than early in 1906. Pinned to the easel is a study for Autumn Sun, probably painted in 1905–06. The lower of the two paintings standing to the artist’s right in the photograph is signed and dated 1904. (The upper work is The Judgment of Paris, but its precise date is not known.) Finally, the photograph itself clearly served as model for Kupka’s Self-Portrait, which has hitherto been dated 1905 (Vachtova, repr. p. 104), but which Rowell dates 1906. It is clear, therefore, that an oil version of the nude was finished by 1906. The sequence within the large group of studies is extremely difficult to establish, but several of them may possibly have been made in preparation for this earlier version. The problem is further complicated by Rowell’s recent discovery of a slide, owned by Lillian Lonngren Anders, of an otherwise unknown 1904 painting of the subject (Rowell, 1975, p. 132).

1. The signature and date were added in pencil over cracks in the original paint layer, thus suggesting a considerable lapse in time between the completion of the picture and the application of the signature.
Kupka, study for *Large Nude*, black and white chalk on tracing paper, 13 x 18 in., 33 x 45.7 cm., Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Gift Richard Feigen Gallery, Inc.

Kupka, study for *Large Nude*, reverse of fig. a, black chalk on tracing paper rubbed with blue and yellow pastel, 13 x 18 in., 33 x 45.7 cm., Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Gift Richard Feigen Gallery, Inc.

Kupka, study for *Large Nude*, pastel, 14 x 18¾ in., 35.6 x 47.6 cm., Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Gift Richard Feigen Gallery, Inc.

Kupka, study for *Large Nude*, black chalk on tracing paper, 17 ½ x 12 ¾ in., 44.5 x 31.1 cm., Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Gift Richard Feigen Gallery, Inc.
The first study—and possibly the only one drawn after the model—may have been that in which the figure faces from left to right (fig. a). This drawing was until recently unknown, as it was mounted face-down and has suffered considerable damage especially at its upper edge. It is characterized by a rapid, fluent, sketchy style, the outlines frequently reworked; the sitter’s left arm is shown in two different positions. The drawing was made on tracing paper, and Kupka subsequently traced it through to the verso of the sheet, thereby reversing the image (fig. b). All of the lines of the verso figure, deliberately and rather mechanically traced through, correspond to lines of the much more spontaneous recto figure; only the line defining the bottom of the left foot is omitted from the verso study; the corresponding line from the recto, faintly visible through the tracing paper, serves in its stead. Both of these drawings show traces of a grid drawn along at least two edges. Kupka’s fascination with the notion of figures twisting, turning, and revolving in space, figures seen from one side and then another is documented in several other contexts (see, for example, Rowell, 1975, pp. 62-67, 70-72); it is interesting to note, therefore, that the innumerable studies for the Large Nude, all of which show the figure facing from right to left, may have derived originally from a figure posed in the opposite direction.

One further drawing probably belongs to the 1904-06 series (fig. c). In this study, which is almost identical in pose to figs. a and b, the left arm is curled around the end of the couch and bent forward at the elbow—a position which was thus probably carried through to the first oil version. In all three studies, the relationship between the two legs of the sitter is extremely close to that of the early oil visible in the photograph; the heel of the right foot is placed much closer to the left knee in these early versions than it is in the Guggenheim painting. In addition, the rather heavy-set quality of the two legs is common to all four works. The head and torso (fig. d), in which the left arm is once again

fig. e.
Photograph of Kupka in his studio, 1905-06 (?), Courtesy of Madame Martinel-Kupka, Paris.
bent forward at the elbow, may also belong to the early phase, although this is more open to question. The Blue Nude (fig. f), which is known to the author only from a black and white photograph, may perhaps be a transitional work.

Whether Kupka continued to work on the subject periodically during the next four to five years, as seems most likely, or whether he took it up again sometime in 1908 or 1909 is not clear. In all of the other studies, the left arm hangs straight down behind the couch as it does in the Guggenheim painting. The sequence is difficult to establish, but the first four studies in the new series were probably those in which the artist appears to be experimenting with new positions for the figure (figs. g [top and bottom], h, and i). One of these studies (fig. i) is on the reverse of a horse and rider. These two drawings and the study fig. h are close in style to the drawings for Lysistrata which Kupka may have started as early as 1905-06. (For a discussion of the idea of sequential movement as represented in fig. h, see Rowell, 1975, pp. 49 ff.) This would suggest
fig. g.
Kupka, two studies for Large Nude, charcoal on white paper, 57.8 x 47.6 cm., Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Gift Richard Feigen Gallery, Inc.

fig. h.
Kupka, study for Large Nude, pencil, 11.4 x 17.2 cm., Private Collection.

fig. i.
Kupka, study for Large Nude, pencil on board, 16.2 x 27.9 cm., Private Collection.

fig. j.
Kupka, study for Large Nude, National Gallery, Prague.
fig. k.
Kupka, study for *Large Nude*, pastel on white paper, 19 3/4 x 23 in., 50.2 x 58.4 cm., Joseph H. Hazen Collection.

fig. l.
that Kupka was working on the studies for the second version for at least two to three years. In the next group Kupka was concerned with general questions of tone and atmosphere, as well as with the integration of the nude into the structured background (figs. k, l, m, n). In the final group he undertook the more


Kupka, study for *Large Nude*, pastel on white paper, 19 3/8 x 23 3/8 in., 50 x 60 cm., Private Collection, Paris.
fig. s.
Kupka, study for *Large Nude*, pastel, 18⅛ x 15¾ in., 46 x 40 cm., Collection Mr. and Mrs. Herman Elkon.

detailed delineation of the colored planes within the nude's head and body (figs. 0-s). The conception for the highly linear quality of the background planes in the final painting may well postdate all of the studies and have been evolved in part while Kupka was actually working on the canvas itself.

Kupka's 1909 signature and date were, as has been noted above, added substantially after the completion of the work, when the artist probably no longer remembered precisely when it was finished. A label on the reverse for the 1946 Budapest exhibition carries the date 1905-10 in Kupka's handwriting. These dates, which would encompass Kupka's early conception of the nude and his final painted version, are compatible with other evidence which suggests a 1910 date for the painting's completion. The division of the body into rather starkly differentiated color zones is closely related to *Family Portrait* probably completed about the same time (Vachtova, 1968, color pl. iii; Siblík places the Guggenheim painting shortly after the *Family Portrait*). Moreover, according to Rowell, a pastel study for *Family Portrait* presents the head of the woman in a series of brightly colored juxtaposed planes almost identical to those of the Guggenheim *Large Nude*. The presence on the sketchbook page (fig. 0) of a study for one of the late gigolettes, similar in style to *Gallien's Taste, The Cabaret Actress*, which dates from ca. 1909, would also tend to support the notion that the *Large Nude*’s final studies date from late in 1909 or early the following year.
After the painting was completed, Kupka apparently planned to develop it
still further in the direction of the *Planes by Colors* (Musée National d’Art
Moderne, Paris) or the *Portrait of Follot* (The Museum of Modern Art, New
York). The drawings after the painting (figs. t-w) clearly represent this later
phase, which was, however, apparently never realized. An extremely
detailed ink and gouache version of the Guggenheim painting (fig. x) was
obviously intended to serve as the basis for a woodcut—a medium which
Kupka began to explore after World War I—but this too was apparently
never executed.

For a brief comment on Kupka’s use of the term “plans par couleurs” to
define the element of structure in painting, see Rowell, 1975, cat. no. 42.

---

**EXHIBITIONS:**
Paris, Salon d’Automne, Oct. 1-Nov. 8, 1911, no. 811 (Plans par couleurs, peinture);2 [Paris,
Salon des Indépendants, Mar. 20-May 16, 1912, no. 1833, 1834, or 1835 (Plans par
couleurs)];3 Paris, Jeu de Paume, Kupka-Mucha, June 1936, no. 16, repr. (“Plans par
couleurs, 1910”); Prague, Galerie S.V.U. Manes, Kupka, Nov 14-Dec. 8, 1946, no. 9 (“Plochy
podle barev, 1910. 150 x 180 [Plans par couleurs]”); Paris, Salon des Indépendants, Apr. 14-
May 9, 1954, no. 1630 (“Plans par couleurs, 1909”); São Paulo, Brazil, IV Bienal, Sept.-Dec.
1957, no. 45 (France); Paris, Musée National d’Art Moderne, Kupka, May 27-July 13, 1958,
no. 5; New York, SRGM 216, 221 (no cats.); 232, 241, p. 254, repr. color p. 255 (dated 1909);
260, 266 (no cats.); 289, no. 42, repr.

**REFERENCES:**
*Aventinum*, 1929, p. 11; G. Turpin, “Kupka,” *Dictionnaire biographique des artistes con-
1952, p. 55 (dated 1905-10), repr. p. 56; D. Fédit, *L’Oeuvre de Kupka*, Inventaire des collections
1909-10); [M. Rowell], *SRGM Handbook*, 1970, p. 254, repr. color p. 255 (dated 1909); Idem,

---

2. The reviewers (see REFERENCES), with the notable exception of Kahn, reacted extremely
negatively to Kupka’s painting.
3. The Large Nude has often been identified with Kupka’s 3 entries in the 1912 Salon des Indépendants, nos. 1833, 1834, 1835 (all Plans par couleurs). However, a set of exhibition records with identifying sketches, recently discovered by Rowell among the artist’s papers, identifies two of the 1913 entries as Plans by Colors (Musée National d’Art Moderne, Paris, AM 3549-P) and The Oval Mirror (The Museum of Modern Art, New York). Although there is no sketch for the 3rd work, R. Allard’s description of the series as “fantaisies post-cubistes” (Revue de France, Mar. 1912, p. 72) would suggest that the Portrait of G. Follot (The Museum of Modern Art, New York) is a more likely candidate than is the Guggenheim Large Nude.

4. I am indebted to V. Spate for bringing this reference to my attention.
The Colored One. ca. 1919-1920(?).
(“La Colorée”)

Oil on canvas, 25 3/8 x 21 1/4 (65 x 54)

PROVENANCE:
Madame Eugénie Kupka, 1957-58; purchased from Eugénie Kupka by Richard L. Feigen, New York, 1958; purchased from Feigen by Mr. and Mrs. Andrew P. Fuller, New York, 1961; Gift of Mrs. Andrew P. Fuller, 1966.

CONDITION:
The picture has received no treatment since its acquisition, but appears to have been cleaned at an earlier date; some extremely minor losses were inpainted.

There is slight wear at the edges with some abrasion and losses. The upper center of the canvas shows scattered irregular cracks in the paint layer, but there is no evidence of cleavage. Apart from a minor stains, some small paint losses, and minor abrasions, the condition is good. (Sept. 1973.)
The painting represents a nude female with legs extended, as if in the act of offering her body to the brilliant golden sun which fills the upper quarter of the canvas. In a general sense it may be said, therefore, to evoke Kupka’s lifelong preoccupation with the notion of man’s integration with nature, or with the more cosmic interrelationship of man, the earth, and the wider universe. Whether it is more specifically interpretable as expressive of a sun-cult is much less clear. Although Kupka is said to have attributed extraordinary generative powers to the sun and to have himself indulged in some form of sun-cult, there is no specific evidence to document the point.

The painting is extremely difficult to date with any precision, since it is an unusually isolated example which is not readily related to any of Kupka’s securely datable works. Both its theme and its style, however, are perhaps most suggestive of Robust Brushstroke and A Tale of Pistils and Stamens I (both in the Musée National d’Art Moderne, Paris, Inv. AM4179P and 4181P). The brilliance of color, the black outlining, and the preoccupation with cosmic and germinating themes characteristic of these works of ca. 1919-20 would suggest that the Guggenheim painting probably dates from approximately the same time.

An undated pastel study for the work is in a private collection (fig. a).

fig. a.
Kupka, study for The Colored One, pastel on paper, 10 x 9 in., 25.4 x 22.9 cm., signed ll.: “Kupka,” Private Collection.

EXHIBITIONS:
New York, SRGM 187 (checklist, dated ca. 1919-20); 195 (no cat.); 196 (checklist, dated 1919-20); New York, Spencer Samuels, Frank Kupka, Mar.-Apr. 1968, no. 40, repr. (dated 1919-20); New York, SRGM 227 (no cat.); 232, 241, p. 257, repr. (dated 1919-20); 266 (no cat.); 289, no. 116, repr.

REFERENCES:
Mikhail Larionov

Born May 1881, Tiraspol, Russia.
Glass. 1912.
(Steklo, Steklo; Le Verre; Glasses).

53.1362
Oil on canvas, 41 x 38 1/4 (104.1 x 97.1)
Трехпрудный пер. № 2/7 / (Тверская ул.)
("Steklo / M. Larionov / Moskva / Pala-
шевский пр. угол' Тrehпрудnyi per. № 2/7 /
[Tverskaia ul.]"); on stretcher: M. Lario-
nov 43 rue de Seine Paris 6e.

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist, 1933.

CONDITION:
At some point prior to its acquisition by the Museum the picture was restretched, presumably by the artist, so that along 13 in. of the right edge, the frayed ends of the canvas threads were visible, and the edge—which is under considerable stress—was nailed to the stretcher with tacks hammered through the visible painted surface (see photo).
The support is generally fragile. In certain areas, especially in those sectors where there is some impasto, a fine crackle has developed in the pigment and there is some danger of flaking. Since the paint is in places applied extremely thinly, and since many areas of the canvas were left unpainted, it is often difficult to determine exactly where flaking has occurred. A slight indication of a margin 2 1/8 in. from the bottom edge and 2 in. from the top is due to the proximity of the stretcher. 2 abrasions in the paint film are visible: 1 in the lower right corner, 2 1/4 in. long, 1 close to the upper right corner, 6 in. long. (Mar. 1973.)

The title of this work has been the subject of considerable uncertainty. Larionov's own title, Steklo (glass), was later translated into French as Le Verre. The painting has also been known as Il Bicchiere (the drinking glass), The Glass, and more frequently as Les Verres or Glasses (drinking glasses).
The painting actually contains five tumblers in the foreground, a goblet on the left, and two bottles. The title Il Bicchiere or The Glass (in the singular) clearly applies only to the drinking glasses in the foreground and takes no account of the goblet or bottles. The fact that the singular form is used seems to imply that these drinking glasses are to be seen in Futurist terms as a single glass in motion. Les Verres or Glasses, on the other hand, while acknowledging the fact that there are many glasses rather than one, fails to take into account the additional glass objects (goblet and bottles) represented in the painting.
Larionov's own title, Steklo or Le Verre, is clearly intended as a generic noun referring to the actual substance glass, rather than to any individual object made of that substance, and indeed the Russian term is only applicable in this sense. E. Eganbyuri's book on Larionov and Goncharova published in 1913 bears out this interpretation: "In his Rayonist works, Larionov renounces painting still lifes, street movement, descriptive objects, but paints simply 'glass' as a universal condition of glass with all its manifestations and properties—fragility, ease in breaking, sharpness, transparency, brittleness, ability to make sounds, i.e. the sum of all the sensations, obtainable from glass . . ." (pp. 38-39, trans. S. Bodine).
The chronology of Larionov’s early work and of the development of Rayonism—his own major stylistic innovation—presents several problems. Few of his pictures were dated at the time of execution, and although he sometimes added dates later these were often inaccurate. (For a discussion of some of the issues involved, see Burlington Magazine, July, September, October, and December 1972. For a related discussion see above Goncharova, cat. no. 61.)

The earliest published date for Glass is 1912, a date provided in 1913 by Larionov himself for the Target exhibition catalogue. Eganbyuri also dated the picture 1912 (p. xxi; see above Goncharova, cat. no. 61 regarding the general reliability of this publication).

In 1914, however, when Glass was brought to Paris for an exhibition at the Galerie Paul Guillaume, Larionov for the first time dated the picture 1909 (see below Exhibitions). The 1909 date inscribed on the surface of the canvas was probably added at this time. Subsequently, Larionov apparently claimed to Seuphor and others that Glass had been shown at an exhibition at the Society of Free Esthetics in Moscow in 1909. However, no catalogue, review, or discussion of this event has ever come to light, and it is therefore difficult to accept the accuracy of the artist’s recollection. Nonetheless his statement on the subject, presumably reinforced by the inscribed date on the canvas itself, has repeatedly led authors since 1914 to date the picture 1909 (see below Exhibitions; also Seuphor, 1950 and 1955; Degand; Chamat, 1955; SRGM Handbook, 1959; Dorival; Carrieri; George; Daulaire; Loguine).

Larionov also claimed that the picture had been shown in the one-day exhibition held at the Society of Free Esthetics on December 8, 1911. This event undoubtedly did take place—a catalogue and reviews exist—but neither Glass nor any other Rayonist work is mentioned, and it is therefore difficult to imagine that they were represented. Nonetheless, the appearance of Glass in this exhibition has become a widely accepted fact, and December 1911 has often been cited as another terminus ante quem for the existence of Rayonist paintings (see, for example, C. Gray, 1962 [though in her exhibition catalogue of 1961, she dates Glass 1912]; also Schafar; Vergo).

Since Larionov regarded Glass as his first fully Rayonist work (Seuphor, 1950), the origin and development of his Rayonist style as a whole is intimately bound up with the establishment of a correct date for this painting. In this connection it is important to bear in mind the artistic climate in Moscow and St. Petersburg during the years up to 1914, a climate of experimentation, innovation, and self-conscious preoccupation with the avant-garde. Larionov, Goncharova, and their associates were deeply involved with the innovative nature

---

1. This may have been a study for the present work, but more probably it was the picture itself with a more tentative title.
of this era, and the constant and rapid developments in their styles and theories were instantly reflected in the many exhibitions which they organized to bring their work to the attention of the public. In any attempt to establish a chronology for the works of this era, therefore, the exhibition catalogues and the reviews (which were often vocal responses to the appearance of a new style) must provide the essential documentary evidence.

Since the 1909 Society of Free Esthetics exhibition seems not to have taken place at all, and since neither Glass nor any other Rayonist work was apparently shown in the December 1911 Society of Free Esthetics show, the earliest exhibition in which explicitly Rayonist works are known to have appeared was the World of Art, which opened in Moscow in November 1912. This exhibition contained not only “Glass, rayonist method,” but also Rayonist Study. Moreover, Glass is specifically referred to in Essem’s review of the show in Apollon.

The second exhibition known to have included Rayonist works was the Union of Youth, which opened in Moscow in December 1912, a month after the World of Art. Confusion about the dates of this show—it has from time to time been erroneously cited as having opened in December 1911—has led to confusion about the origins of Rayonism itself, but the reviews of the exhibition conclusively prove that the 1912 date is correct. (For a discussion of this problem see Rudenstine.) This exhibition included two further Rayonist works—Rayonist Sausage and Mackerel and Portrait of a Fool which were reproduced, respectively, in Larionov, Лучизм (Luchizm, Rayonism), Moscow, 1913, n.p., and Eganbyuri, p. 61.

The third exhibition in which Rayonist works appeared was Target, which opened in Moscow in March 1913 and included three such works, all of which had already been exhibited within the previous five months, and all of which were dated 1912 in the Target catalogue. The three were Glass, Rayonist Sausage and Mackerel, and Portrait of a Fool. V. Parkin’s review of the show (published in Donkey’s Tail and Target, ed. Myunster, Moscow, 1913, pp. 67-69) not only refers specifically to Portrait of a Fool and Rayonist Sausage and Mackerel, reproducing the latter with the date 1912, but, more importantly, draws particular attention to these works as being examples of a “new style advocated by Larionov, Rayonism.” The novelty of the style was in itself worthy of comment. Eganbyuri’s book, which—as has already been mentioned—also appeared in 1913, lists no Rayonist works before 1912.

On the basis of this evidence, it seems likely that Rayonism emerged as a style during the course of 1912. The publication date of Larionov’s own manifesto on the subject would tend to support this thesis. It appeared in two forms. One, entitled Лучизм (Luchizm, Rayonism), appeared as an independent pamphlet and was published in Moscow in April 1913. The essay itself is undated; the title page carries the date 1913. (I am indebted to Bowlt, University of Texas at Austin, who owns a copy of this rare document, for supplying the above information.) A revised version, Лучистая живопись (Luchistaia zhivopis, Rayonist Painting), was published in the anthology Donkey’s Tail
and Target of July 1913. In this latter edition, the manifesto is signed and dated “June 1912.”

Whether the manifesto was in fact written as early as June 1912 cannot be definitely established. Contemporary Russian sources tend to be contradictory on the issue of when the theory was first discussed. For example, an eminent (unnamed) Soviet specialist on the period cited by Gray definitely remembers that the theory of Rayonism was already being discussed in 1911 (1961, no. 33). Eganbyuri, in an article on the Western European connections of Larionov and Goncharova published in 1922, suggests in passing that Rayonism dates from 1911 (яр птица, Zhar ptitsa, Firebird, no. 7, 1922, p. 39). N. Punin, on the other hand, in a 1928 article on Larionov, states that the theory of Rayonism was first presented in 1912-13 (Материалы по русскому искусств, Materialy po russkomu iskusstvu, Materials on Russian Art, Leningrad, 1928, pp. 287-291). It is certainly possible that Larionov’s ideas for the essay were being formulated during the spring and summer of 1912, as he began to experiment with the style itself. Early signs of a movement towards Rayonism can be seen, as Gray has suggested (1961, no. 30), in works such as Head of a Soldier (first exhibited at the Blaue Reiter exhibition of March-April 1912), which probably dates from the very end of 1911 or the beginning of 1912. But it is not until well into 1912 that the style is fully established with the creation of works such as Glass, Rayonist Sausage and Mackerel, and Portrait of a Fool.

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:
2. A Der Sturm label removed from the back of the painting probably dates from this time. At the close of the exhibition the paintings were shipped back to Russia, but war broke out before they all arrived. Herwarth Walden claimed them as his property and thus preserved them from destruction at the hands of the German authorities. After the war he returned the works to the 2 artists.

3. The catalogue of this exhibition gives no city, and it has not been possible to verify whether the “Galerie L’Epoque” is in Paris or not. Nor is it certain that the picture listed as no. 32 is Glass. It is likely, however, that the present picture is the one listed.
Fernand Léger

Born February 1881, Argentan (Orne).
Died August 1955, Gif-sur-Yvette.

The Smokers.
ca. December 1911-January 1912.
(Le Fumeurs; The Smoker).

38.521
Oil on canvas, 51 x 38 (121.4 x 96.5)
Not signed or dated.

PROVENANCE:

CONDITION:
In 1953 the picture was lined with wax resin and the surface cleaned. In 1970 active cleavage of paint along approximately 4 inches of the lower right margin was arrested by infusion of wax resin. Some inpainting of unspecified date has occurred along the lower third of the right margin, along the entire top margin, and in the lower left corner. Apart from considerable wear in the upper corners, and some general areas of traction cracks, the condition is good. (Aug. 1972.)

The work has generally been dated 1911 (see below Exhibitions and References). Kahnweiler dated the work 1911 in his article of 1920, although his own photographic archives give the date as 1912 (the year he acquired the work, see fn. 1), and in his 1950 publication he also dated the picture 1912. Ozenfant and Jeanneret, writing on Cubism in the early 1920's, also dated the picture 1912. Léger himself, in a letter to the Guggenheim Museum dated April 25, 1945, referred to the picture as "Les Fumeurs, 1912;" on the other hand, his own signature and date on the reverse of the canvas apparently gave the date as 1911 (see fn. 4).

The question of the date is in one important respect related to the identification of the subject of the work and the evaluation of the influence of Futurist theories and paintings on its execution. Golding and others have associated the picture with the entry no. 3498: Composition avec personnages, in the Salon des Indépendants of March 1912 (see, for example, Golding, p. 153; Apollinaire, Les Peintres cubistes, ed. L. C. Breunig and J.-Cl. Chevalier, Paris, 1965, pp. 85, 115, fn. 4; SRGM Handbook, 1970, p. 263). Spate, however, has argued (pp. 212-216) that the picture represents not two smokers but one—the double head expressing the notion of one figure in motion—and that there can thus be

1. The work appears in the Kahnweiler photographic archives in Paris dated 1912 and was acquired in that year. It was seized with the rest of Kahnweiler's collection as enemy property at the outbreak of the war. The collection was sold at auction in 4 sales between 1921 and 1923.
2. The picture appears in the Rosenberg photographic archives, Paris, as no. 434. He published the picture in Bulletin de l'Effort Moderne, no. 9, Nov. 1924 ("Les Fumeurs 1911").
no question of "personnages" in the plural (p. 212, fn. 24). She cites Apollinaire's 1912 reference to the work as Le Fumeur (Breunig and Chevalier, p. 85) - usually regarded as an error for Les Fumeurs - as one piece of supporting evidence for her interpretation. She suggests further that Léger's response to the Futurist exhibition of February 1912 and to the ideas expressed in its catalogue is to some extent responsible for the painting's conception, although she stresses that Futurist theories - many of which had been published earlier - probably exerted the greater influence. She sees the double head of the smoker
as an attempt to reproduce the "movement of perception which could encompass the different 'simultaneous' views" of the figure and his ambience (p. 213).

In thus placing the picture after February 1912, she also states that it must postdate The Wedding (Musée National d'Art Moderne, Paris), which she convincingly identifies as Composition avec personnages shown in the March Indépendants (p. 208).

Whereas Spate is undoubtedly correct in suggesting that The Wedding rather than The Smokers appeared in the March exhibition (see fn. 3), it is unlikely that the picture represents one smoker rather than two, or that the style of the work is dependent upon any direct influence of Futurist paintings. From a purely visual standpoint it is perhaps possible to describe the configuration either as one figure or as two. If it were seen as one, this might reflect not so much the influence of Futurist works as an exploration on Léger's part of the issues which were also preoccupying Duchamp at the end of 1911—figures seen simultaneously from several viewpoints (as in Yvonne and Magdaleine Torn in Tatters, September 1911, Philadelphia Museum of Art), or figures in motion (Nude Descending a Staircase, I, December 1911, Philadelphia Museum of Art). However, there is no evidence elsewhere in Léger's works of this period to suggest such preoccupations, and the fact that Léger himself (in his letter of April 1914, and in the inscribed title formerly on the reverse), as well as Kahnweiler and Rosenberg, identified the work as Les Fumeurs, argues for the existence of two figures rather than one.

Since the picture does not appear to reflect the influence of the February 1912 Futurist exhibition, its place within the development of Léger's style in 1911-12 remains to be established. M. Richet and Cl. Langier, like Spate, place The Smokers chronologically after The Wedding, although they date both works earlier—1910-11 for The Wedding, and 1911 for The Smokers (Fernand Léger, exhibition catalogue, Paris, 1971, nos. 5-7). C. Green has argued convincingly (in conversation with the author, November 1972, publication in preparation) that the Guggenheim picture follows the Three Portraits (Milwaukee Art Center), shown in the Salon d'Automne of 1911, and is approximately contemporary with the oil study for The Wedding (Private Collection, Paris, M. Raynal, From Picasso to Surrealism, Geneva, 1950, repr. color p. 74). Smokers is stylistically very much in tune with this study, and both works precede The Wedding itself, which Green, like Spate, identifies with the March Salon entry "Composition avec personnages," and which must therefore have been completed by early March. (Green does accept Spate's interpretation of the subject of the picture as one smoker rather than two.) The scale and much more ambitious nature of The Wedding (which leads directly to The Woman in Blue of late 1912, Kunstmuseum Basel) suggests that it must have taken some months to complete, and it would seem likely, therefore, that The Smokers was painted between the end of 1911 and January 1912. Its creation at the turn of the year would explain Kahnweiler's and Léger's own uncertainties of recollection as to whether the picture was painted in 1911 or 1912, and indeed the picture was probably in process from late 1911 until some time early in 1912.
EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:

3. The entries in the catalogue include the notation “IND” for those works that had appeared in previous exhibitions of the *Salon des Indépendants*. There is no such reference in the present case, strongly suggesting that the picture did not, as has been generally supposed, appear in the 1912 *Salon des Indépendants*. Moreover, *The Wedding* is, according to the 1933 Kunsthau Zürich exhibition catalogue (no. 56), inscribed on the reverse "Composition avec personnages. *Salon des Indépendants 1911-12.*" It is thus most probably the latter work that appeared in the 1912 *Salon*.

4. According to the catalogue of the Zurich exhibition, the picture is inscribed on the reverse: "F. LÉGER. *LES Fumeurs* (1911)")." This bears out the information in the Kahnweiler sale catalogue (see above PROVENANCE). However, it has been impossible to verify this fact since no such inscription was recorded when the work was acquired by the Guggenheim in 1938, and the picture has since been lined.
Nude Model in the Studio. 1912-1913.
(Le Modèle nu dans l’atelier; Nude model).

PROVENANCE:

CONDITION:
In 1971 the work was removed from its strainer, the back scraped, and the edges coated with BEVA to prevent raveling. It was noted that approximately ¾ in. of the upper margin had been tacked over the previous stretcher and heavily damaged. The surface of the work was cleaned with 5% Soilax, except for the red and blue areas which were soluble and cleaned only with dry cotton. Only the most discolored portions of the unevenly applied varnish were removed. The work was lined on fiberglass with ABCG adhesive and restretched on a new stretcher. The tack holes were filled with gesso and the losses inpainted. These were especially heavy in the ¾ in. margin along the upper edge. Other minor losses in the large black area left of center, the large white area left of center 14 in. from the left and 21 in. from the top, and the gray-white area at the lower right were also inpainted.

At some point between the 1913 Berlin exhibition and the 1946 acquisition of the work by Carré, Léger made some minor changes in the composition. (A photograph of the work supplied by Carré is the earliest located to date in which the changes are visible). The most notable of these changes are the puzzling addition of the letters EF at the center left and of some of the prominent lines immediately above these letters; several other scattered small lines, presumably added at the same time, are much less prominent and do not significantly alter the original conception. (For reproductions of the work prior to changes see below REFERENCES, all publications up to and including Zervos, 1952. Since the changes had definitely been made before 1946, Zervos must have been using an old photograph.) When he returned from the war in 1918, Léger began to include letters in his work and it is possible that he made the changes at approximately this time.

There are several studies of nudes in the studio which date from 1912-13. Two charcoal drawings and a gouache show the figure facing front or slightly

1. The picture did not belong to Kahnweiler, and it does not appear among the Rosenberg photographic archives in Paris, but these are incomplete. Teriade’s publication of the work in 1928 without collection credit suggests that Léger still owned the work at that time.
left with one arm across the chest and the hand resting on the opposite shoulder. These are a Seated Nude in a private collection in Stuttgart (formerly Galerie Beyeler, Basel, charcoal on paper, 19¾ x 12¾ in., 49 x 32 cm., signed and dated “FL 13,” but probably datable 1912); a Seated Nude formerly in the Marie Cuttoli Collection, Paris (Galerie Beyeler, Basel, Collection Marie Cuttoli, Henry Langier, October-November 1970, no. 55, charcoal on paper, 25¼ x 19¼ in., 64 x 49 cm., signed and dated “F.L 12”); and a Nude in the Studio in a private collection in Paris (charcoal, ink, and gouache, 24 x 19¾ in., 61 x 50 cm., signed and dated “F.LEGER 12,” Galerie Louise Leiris, Paris, Leger: dessins et gouaches, February-March 1958, no. 4, repr.). Two further studies, one in ink and one in gouache, show the figure facing front, but in a much more abstract form than the above works, and clearly closer in time of execution to the painting itself (Nude, Galerie Louise Leiris, photo no. 30659, ink on paper, 12¾ x 9¾ in., 32.7 x 24.8 cm., inscribed “Ad.Basler,” known as Study for the Woman in Blue; and Nude, formerly Silberman Galleries, Sale Sotheby Parke Bernet, New York, April 17, 1969, repr. no. 124, india ink, charcoal, and gouache on paper, 25 x 18½ in., 63.5 x 47 cm., signed and dated “FL 12,” known as Contrastes de Formes). Although these five works are clearly part of Léger’s exploration of the subject depicted in the Guggenheim’s Nude Model, they cannot be specifically described as studies for the work itself.
Several directly related studies do exist however. The earliest of these (fig. a) is a pencil and ink drawing which is signed and dated “F.L.13 / Dessin pour le modèle nu,” but which must surely date from 1912. Three gouaches, two of which are extremely close to the finished work, are also known. One (fig. b) was reproduced by Apollinaire in his March 18 Montjoie! review of the 1913 Salon (see fn. 2). A second is in the Sprengel Collection, Hanover (fig. c, Städtische Kunsthalle Düsseldorf, Léger, December 16, 1969-February 8, 1970, no. 2, erroneously captioned “no. 3. Les toits”). The third (fig. d, present whereabouts unknown) is among the photographic archives of Léonce Rosenberg in Paris (no. 1058).

In addition to the gouache reproduced by Apollinaire, several of the studies listed here may well have been included in the group exhibited in the 1913 Salon (see fn. 2). It is difficult to establish with certainty the exact sequence of the various studies, as well as the time the painting itself was started. The picture has been dated 1912, 1912-13, or early 1913 (see below REFERENCES). With the exception of Delevoy, authors have agreed that the picture was painted after Woman in Blue and before 1913 Contrasts of Forms, and that work on the picture must thus have begun in the last quarter of 1912. Apollinaire’s March 18 review would suggest that Léger was at that point still not entirely happy with the painting, although it must by then have been close enough to completion to allow for its exhibition in that month, and it was apparently finished by March 25.
EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:

2. The inscription on the reverse suggests that the picture did indeed appear in the *Salon des Indépendants*, and there is other evidence which helps to substantiate this point. Although Léger does not appear at all in the catalogue for that year, his entries are mentioned in two reviews of the exhibition by Apollinaire. In *Montjoie!* of Mar. 18, 1913, the critic refers to Léger’s “studies” in Salle 45 as examples of the current Orphic tendencies of his style; in connection with the review Apollinaire reproduces a late gouache study for the *Nude Model in the Studio* (fig. b). He praises Léger’s artistic conscience which led him to withhold the “large canvas” from the exhibition since it did not yet quite fulfill his aims, implying that he sent the studies for the picture instead. (“La lumière est ici dans toute sa vérité. C’est la nouvelle tendance du cubisme et nous retrouverons cette tendance à l’orphisme dans la salle suivante, dans presque toutes les toiles, mais surtout dans les études de Fernand Léger dont il faut louer la grande conscience artistique puisque, n’ayant pas encore atteint le but qu’il poursuivait, il n’a pas voulu envoyer sa grande toile.”)

In the review published on Mar. 25 in *L’Intransigeant*, however, Apollinaire implies that the picture itself was included after all. (“... Cette nouvelle tendance se retrouve dans presque toutes les toiles de la salle suivante, notamment la toile de Fernand Léger. Il faut louer ce peintre, il expose pour la première fois un ‘tableau.’ C’est un très grand et très sérieux effort.”)

The exhibition opened March 19; in order to publish a lengthy review on March 18, Apollinaire would have had to view the show at least three or four days before. It would seem, therefore, that some time between about March 14 (when Apollinaire saw the studies exhibited) and the following week (when he wrote his review for *L’Intransigeant*), Léger changed his mind and decided that the large picture was ready to be exhibited after all. Apollinaire, having first praised the conscience of the artist for withholding the work, now praises him for the quality of the work itself. It is difficult to know what he means by the statement that Léger is exhibiting “un tableau” for the first time, since he had shown major pictures in the *Salon des Indépendants* of 1911 and 1912. It does seem likely, however, that the “tableau” in question can be none other than the *Nude Model in the Studio*.
Contrast of Forms. 1913.
(Contraste de formes; Variation de formes).

38.345
Oil on burlap, 38⅞ x 49⅛ (98.8 x 125)
Signed ll.: F. Léger; signed and dated on reverse (transcribed but not photographed before relining): F. Léger. 1913.

PROVENANCE:

CONDITION:
At an unspecified date (probably ca. 1953) the canvas was lined with wax resin.
Wax has penetrated the burlap in many places and darkened the ground to some extent. There is substantial wear along the 4 edges, and 2 losses of paint and ground, ½ and ¾ in. respectively. There are scattered cracks in the paint layer, especially in the heavy impasto, but this condition is not general. There are a few scattered minor abrasions, but the condition in general is good. (Sept. 1973.)

This work and another formerly in the SRGM Collection (fig. a) belong to a group of more than nine oil *Contrasts of Forms*, all of which were painted in 1913 and all of which contain at the upper center what Green has called a "kite motif" (1973; an additional publication by Green specifically on this series is in preparation). Major examples in the group are as follows, though the listing is not intended to reflect a chronological sequence, the development within the group being difficult to establish:

fig. a.
Léger, *Contrast of Forms*, 1913, oil on burlap, 18 x 24 in., 45.7 x 61 cm., Perls Gallery, New York.

No. 1, a small horizontal canvas closely related to the present work and to fig. a (fig. b, Kahnweiler photo archives, Paris, no. 6014).

No. 2, a much larger horizontal canvas in the collection of S. Rosengart, Lucerne (fig. d). This version is closely related to the present work, but even more closely to the Philadelphia picture (No. 6 below).

A series of four vertical canvases in which the compositional elements of the present work are further developed:

No. 3, *Contrast of Forms*, 31 7/8 x 25 7/8 in., 81 x 65 cm., Galerie Beyeler, Basel, Beyeler, Léger, May-June 1964 (repr. color, no. 4);

No. 4, *Contrast of Forms*, 36 1/4 x 28 3/4 in., 92 x 73 cm., Collection Louis Carré, Paris (C. Zervos, Léger, Paris, 1952, color frontispiece);

No. 5, *Contrast of Forms*, 39 1/2 x 32 in., 100 x 81 cm., The Museum of Modern Art, New York (Cooper, Cubist Epoch, 1970, color pl. 92);


A vertical and a horizontal canvas in which the "kite motif" is much less prominent, and which are in other respects less closely related to the other six works:
fig. b.
Léger, *Contrast of Forms*, 1913, oil on canvas, 15 x 18¼ in., 38.1 x 46 cm., present whereabouts unknown.

fig. c.
Léger, *Contrast of Forms*, 1913, gouache on paper, 17¾ x 21⅜ in., 44.8 x 54.2 cm., Collection S. Rosengart, Lucerne.

fig. d.
Léger, *Contrast of Forms*, 1913, oil on canvas, 66¾ x 69⅞ in., 169.5 x 175.5 cm., Collection S. Rosengart, Lucerne.

No. 7, *Contrast of Forms*, 21¾ x 18⅜ in., 55 x 46 cm., Private Collection (Galerie Berggruen, Paris, Léger, 1962, repr. color [no. 8]);
No. 8, *Contrast of Forms*, 23¾ x 28¾ in., 60 x 73 cm., Collection Louis Carré, Paris (Ibid., repr. color [no. 9]).

In addition Léger made several gouaches of the subject, some of which can be directly related to finished paintings but most of which are independent. Two are especially important within the development of the present group. A gouache in the collection of S. Rosengart, Lucerne (fig. c), is closely related to
the present work, to fig. a, and to fig. b, although it cannot be described as a direct study for any of the three. A highly colored gouache in the collection of H. Berggruen (Galerie Berggruen, Paris, Léger, 1962, repr. color cover) is closely related to the series of vertical compositions nos. 2-4 above, but must be considered an independent composition within that group.

Green has argued convincingly (1973, pp. 96-101) that the Contrasts of Forms, Léger’s most cogent and direct statement in the realm of peinture pure, emerge directly from and are clearly linked to the immediately preceding landscapes, such as Houses under the Trees (Museum Folkwang, Essen). The forms in the Contrasts are arranged to make their “origins in nature . . . almost unrecognizable as such” (p. 97), but the syntax or arrangement of elements is nonetheless basically the same. Green further suggests that the structure and organization of even the most “pure” Contrasts have a strong “figurative flavor” (p. 101) and he cogently analyzes the connection between works such as the Philadelphia Contrast (No. 6, above) and the gouache study (also in Philadelphia) for the 1914 Woman in Red and Green. While pointing out the demonstrable connections on the one hand to landscape and on the other to figuration, Green strongly emphasizes the quality of “pure pictorial contrasts” which Léger achieved in these Contrasts of Forms and gives a detailed analysis of the intellectual and visual stimuli which lay behind this development in the artist’s work (pp. 102-134).

EXHIBITIONS:
New York, SRGM 74, no. 136; 78 (checklist); Toronto, SRGM 85-T, no. 47; New York, SRGM 87 (checklist); 89 (no cat.); Montreal, SRGM 93-T, no. 51; London, SRGM 104-T, no. 40; Boston, SRGM 119-T, no. 37; New York, SRGM 129 (checklist); 144, 151, 153 (checklists); 173, no. 31, repr.; 202, p. 39, repr. p. 38; 266, 276 (no cats).

REFERENCES:
The Clock. March 1918.
(L’Horloge).

38.522
Oil on burlap, 19 7/8 x 24 3/4 (50.5 x 61.6)
Signed l.r.: F. Leger; inscribed by the artist on reverse (photographed before lining):
L’Horloge / Mars—18 / F. Leger.

PROVENANCE:
Galerie l’Effort Moderne (Léonce Rosenberg), Paris, 1918-after 1926; Rose Valland, Paris, by 1938; purchased from Valland by Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1938; Gift of Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1938.

CONDITION:
In 1954 the canvas was lined with wax resin and the strainer replaced with a new stretcher. The surface was superficially cleaned (varnish not removed); 2 small areas of paint loss (top right corner, and upper margin near right corner) were filled and inpainted. The canvas was surfaced with clear synthetic varnish.
Some chips of paint have been lost along the edges; the signature is worn and partially lost. The condition otherwise is good. (Feb. 1972.)

1. Rosenberg photographic archives, Paris, no. 865. Léger’s contract with Rosenberg is dated July 15, 1918, and it is probable that this was among the works acquired by Rosenberg immediately afterwards. The picture is published by Rosenberg in his 1926 Bulletin de l’Effort Moderne (see below REFERENCES).
EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:

2. This exhibition was organized by Rosenberg.

---

The Stove. April 1918.
(Le Poele).

38.525
Oil on canvas, 24 x 19 3/4 (61 x 50.1)
Inscribed by the artist on reverse (photographed before lining): Le Poele / Avril. 18 / F. Léger.

PROVENANCE:
Early history unknown; Galerie Pierre (Pierre Loeb), Paris, by 1938; purchased from Loeb by Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1938; Gift of Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1938.

CONDITION:
In 1954 the canvas was lined with wax resin and placed on a new stretcher. The surface was superficially cleaned (varnish not removed); areas of paint loss in the top left and top right corners, and right margin 1 in. from the top were filled and inpainted. There are 8 other scattered tiny touches of inpainting. The canvas was surfaced with clear synthetic varnish.

There is considerable wear in the 4 corners, and there are some other minor cracks in the paint film, but the condition in general is good. (Feb. 1972.)

1. The picture does not appear among the Rosenberg photographic archives in Paris, but these are incomplete. It was also not included, as many of Léger's 1918 works were, in Rosenberg's 1920 exhibition at the Galerie Moos in Geneva. It is possible, therefore, that Léger himself kept the picture for some time instead of selling it to Rosenberg.
The Clock and The Stove were both probably painted while Léger was recuperating in the hospital after being exposed to gas at the front in 1917. The dates and locations of his convalescence have yet to be completely documented, but some facts are known. A “billet d'hôpital” records his stay in a Paris hospital from March 16, 1918, to May 31, 1918 (Fernand Léger, sa vie, son œuvre, sa rêve, Milan, 1972, repr. n.p.). In addition, two drawings inscribed “Hôp. Villepinte” were published in the April 1918 issue of Nord-Sud. (This latter fact was brought to my attention by C. Green.) It seems likely, therefore, that Léger started his recuperation period in Villepinte and was later moved to Paris. He was apparently completely discharged by July 1918, when he signed a contract with Rosenberg in Paris.
A preparatory drawing for *The Stove* (fig. a) contains hospital details such as a patient in bed at the right side. The cylindrical form diagonally placed in the center is clearly the stove pipe. The drawing thus probably dates from late in 1917 or early 1918. Various other works from this hospital period are closely related to the two Guggenheim pictures. Two versions of *The Barge-man* (one now in The Museum of Modern Art, Sidney Janis Collection, one sold at Christie’s, July 2, 1974, lot 105) were both painted in March 1918.

The *Pot of Herbal Tea* (Private Collection Paris, Grand Palais, Paris, Léger, exhibition catalogue, 1971-72, repr. no. 32) is inscribed on the reverse “avril 18” and was identified by Léger himself as having been painted in the hospital. A pencil and ink drawing for it in The Art Institute of Chicago is dated 1917 and is close in style to the preparatory study for *The Stove* (fig. a). A painting formerly in the Léonce Rosenberg Collection (Rosenberg photographic archives, Paris, no. 880, A. Salmon, *Cabiers d’Art*, vol. 8, no. 3-4, 1933, repr. n.p.) must be almost exactly contemporary with *The Stove*; the composition is almost identical in reverse, but it is less fragmented in its forms than the Guggenheim version and probably precedes it. Very shortly afterwards Léger must have painted *Factories* (Collection Robin D. Judah, London, *Léger and Purist Paris*, London, 1970-71, no. 5, repr. p. 46), the Cologne Tugboat (Ibid., no. 9, repr. p. 43), and the Paris Tugboat (Grand Palais, Paris, *Léger*, 1971-72, no. 40, p. 64), which is inscribed “Etat définitif, juin 1918.”

![Image of a drawing of a hospital interior](image)

*fig. a.*

Léger, *Interior of a Hospital, 1917-18(?)*, ink on paper, 6⅔ x 5 in., 16.3 x 12.8 cm., present whereabouts unknown, reproduced courtesy Douglas Cooper and Heinz Berggruen.

**EXHIBITIONS:**


**REFERENCE:**

Mural Painting. 1924-1925.
(Peinture murale).

PROVENANCE:

CONDITION:
The work has received no treatment since its acquisition. At an unspecified date, inpainting of minor losses along the edges, in the corners, and along the left edge of the central dark red rectangle was performed. Pentimenti are clearly visible along the left sides of the lower red form and the right-hand blue form, as well as along the left edge of the central dark red rectangle. Some ground cracks have caused cracks in the paint film; these are in isolated areas and the overall condition of the paint film is good, though potentially fragile. (Mar. 1973.)

In October 1923 Léonce Rosenberg’s Galerie l’Effort Moderne exhibited a group of three De Stijl architectural projects. In each building the individual walls, floors, and ceilings were colored in one of the three primaries or white. Léger’s immediate and enthusiastic response to the potentialities inherent in such a “polychromatic architecture” is recorded by Le Corbusier in L’Esprit Nouveau, no. 19, where Léger is placed in conversation with “X” and praises the notion of a red, blue, or yellow wall, a black, blue, red, or yellow floor, as “a total transformation of interior design.” Léger’s own first article on the subject appeared in L’Architecture vivante, Autumn / Winter 1924 (pp. 21-22). In this piece, and in innumerable theoretical writings of the 1930’s, 1940’s, and 1950’s, he expounded his developing notions of the role of color in architecture and of the relationship between the work of the painter and that of the architect. (See, for example, “Le Mur, l’architecte, le peintre,” 1933, first published in Fonctions de la peinture, Paris, 1965, pp. 110-112; “Modern Architecture and Color,” American Abstract Artists, New York, 1946; “Un Nouvel espace en architecture,” Art d’Aujourd’hui, no. 3, Paris, 1949; “De la peinture murale,” 1952, Derrière le miroir, no. 107-109, 1958; “La Couleur dans l’architecture,” Problèmes de la couleur, Paris, 1954.)

The abstract “murals” of 1924-26 developed directly out of Léger’s earliest thinking on the subject and constituted a step beyond the notion of the colored wall. They are conceived not as easel paintings but as complements to architecture, and it was in relation to the work of Le Corbusier in particular that he evolved his theory of a specifically abstract mural art. In 1950 he wrote, “I believe and I maintain that abstract art is in trouble when it tries to do easel paint-

1. The picture was probably purchased directly from Léger, although no proof of this fact, or of Zervos’ date of acquisition, has hitherto been found. The picture was never owned by Kahnweiler. It does not appear among the Rosenberg photographic archives in Paris, but these are incomplete.
Léger's theory of the function of abstract mural painting as a complement to architecture, the painter in a subservient role to that of the architect, is amply and clearly expressed in his writings, and Le Corbusier's corresponding theories suggest considerable exchange of ideas between the two. However, no evidence apparently survives to illustrate the actual results of Léger's collaboration with architects of the period. Two projects are widely cited in the literature as illustrative of this collaboration. The first is R. Mallet-Stevens' embassy for the 1925 Exposition des arts décoratifs. In this instance Léger and Delaunay provided paintings which were hung in the entrance hall (W. George, L'Amour de l'art, no. 8, August 1925, p. 289). Léger's "mural," present whereabouts unknown, is reproduced by George in its architectural context (p. 291). It belongs to the series of abstract paintings under discussion, but its origin as a commissioned work specifically conceived for the architectural setting in which it was hung is in doubt. Léger's name does not appear on the published list of artists who collaborated with Mallet-Stevens on the building (Catalogue général officiel: exposition internationale des arts décoratifs et industriels modernes, Paris, October 1925, p. 96, "Hall composé par Mallet-Stevens . . . réalisé avec la collaboration de . . ."). Moreover, though Léger in later years sometimes spoke of Mallet-Stevens' request that he produce a painting for the building (see, for example, "De la peinture murale," 1952), he elsewhere stated that the painting was already finished when Mallet-Stevens saw it for the first time and requested it for the building.

"Je me souviens qu'à l'Exposition de 1925 j'avais travaillé à des choses abstraites en couleur pure, extrêmement rectangulaires, et Mallet-Stevens . . . venu chez moi, avait vu une grande peinture assez haute et large, absolument abstraite, en couleur assez forte, rectangulaire . . . il m'avait dit: "J'aimerais beaucoup avoir cela chez moi (dans l'ambassade)." J'ai donc mis chez lui cette chose qui n'était pas du tout appropriée, mais quand même cela constituait une attaque, une présence (1954, first published in Fonctions de la peinture, Paris, 1965, p. 105; see also "Un Nouvel espace en architecture," pp. 123-124, first published 1949)."
The second project which is generally cited as the prime example of Léger as mural painter working in collaboration with an architect is Le Corbusier’s Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau also constructed for the 1925 Exposition. Léger himself stated on more than one occasion that his first murals were painted for Le Corbusier, implying thereby either that they were actually ordered by the architect to function within existing or projected structures, or that they were at least conceived in relation to such buildings. Surviving photographs of the interior spaces of the Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau do not, however, include any of Léger’s abstract murals. The only paintings by him clearly visible in the interior are a 1924 Composition, present whereabouts unknown, which is closely related to works such as The City of 1919 or The Large Tugboat of 1923 (P. Selmersheim, Le Village moderne, les constructions régionalistes et quelques autres pavillons, Paris, 1925, pl. 40) and the 1925 The Baluster, The Museum of Modern Art, New York. The modeling and perspective in these works bring them into much closer relationship with Léger’s contemporary still-lifes, and hence with his notion of easel painting, than with his expressed idea of an abstract mural art. (For an illuminating discussion of The Baluster and related works of this period see C. Green, Léger and Purist Paris, exhibition catalogue, London, 1970, p. 79.) Moreover, various pieces of additional evidence demonstrate that the Pavillon was apparently not the context for which Léger’s first murals were designed. For example, in his own essay on the building, Le Corbusier specifically states that the works which hung on the walls were easel paintings, independently created, and not commissioned for the project. (“Nous avons mis au mur des tableaux de Picasso, Braque, Léger, Gris, Ozenfant . . . des tableaux de chevalet dans des cadres . . . Il est mieux que l’oeuvre peinte ou sculptée soit pas une ‘commande’ mais un produit direct de l’imagination.” Almanach d’architecture moderne, Paris [1925 or 1926?], pp. 145-146.) Likewise, Ozenfant’s reminiscences about the project specifically rule out the notion that any murals were painted for it. (“Personne ne fit aucune peinture murale pour ce pavillon. Le Tableau Léger—comme le mien d’ailleurs qui lui faisait face . . .—étaient des tableaux de chevalet, peint avant la construction du pavillon qui furent simplement prêtés pour y être accrochés.” Mémoires 1886-1962, Paris, 1968, p. 141. I am indebted to J. C. Di Meo for drawing this passage to my attention.)

Thus, although it is possible that some of the 1924-25 “murals” such as the Guggenheim painting were specifically conceived in relation to architectural contexts, either in collaboration with Le Corbusier or with other architects of the period, documentary records of such collaborative efforts have hitherto not come to light. The way any one of these pictures functioned within its architectural context, and the extent to which it reflected Léger’s or Le Corbusier’s theories of the relationship between painting and architecture remains, therefore, largely unresolved. Further research on the theory and practice of both must be undertaken before a satisfactory elucidation can be presented. Nonetheless, Léger’s so-called mural paintings represent, as D. Cooper has suggested, his crucial exploration of the question of “whether or not art should
have some representational content.” For a discussion of this issue and of Léger’s ultimate conclusion that for him a representational mural art was the only possible solution, see Cooper, *Fernand Léger et le nouvel espace*, Geneva-Paris-London, 1949, chapters iii, iv.

**EXHIBITIONS:**


**REFERENCE:**

A. Verdet, *Fernand Léger, le dynamisme pictural*, Geneva, 1955, pl. 22.²

² Verdet reproduces the Guggenheim painting together with a 1925 mural now in the collection of J. Müller, Solothurn (center), and a 1924 mural now in the collection of the Musée Fernand Léger, Biot (right). The group of 3 carries the caption “*Etude pour adaptation architecturale*” and the incongruous date “1922-23.” The ensemble, which appears to be simply an installation photograph from the 1952 Bern exhibition (where the 3 works appeared as nos. 31, 32, and 30 respectively), would appear to have been arbitrarily designated by Verdet as a study for an architectural plan. There is hitherto no evidence to suggest that Léger himself was responsible for the combination of the 3 works under a single heading nor that he at any time conceived of them as a group destined for a particular architectural setting.
Composition (Definitive). 1925.
(Composition [Définitif]).

37.348
Oil on canvas, 51 1/4 x 38 7/8 (130 x 97.4)
Signed and dated l.r.: F. Léger. 25; inscribed by the artist on reverse: Composition / F. Leger. 25 / Definitif.

PROVENANCE:
Early history and source of acquisition unknown; purchased by Solomon R. Guggenheim by 1934 (Renaissance Society exhibition catalogue); Gift of Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1937.

CONDITION:
In 1953 the picture was cleaned. Retouchings of an unrecorded date have been made along the top and bottom edges and to a lesser extent along the right and left edges. There are also repaints in several abrasions in the gray upper left and upper right; there are a few scattered small repaints in other areas of the composition. In 1970, while the picture was on loan to the Tate Gallery, a small loss in the black near the lower left corner was secured with wax and retouched. There are some ground and paint cracks in the white and gray areas, and cleavage appears to be developing in 1 or 2 of these. There is some wear along the edges caused by the rabbet of the previous frame. Under UV several pentimenti, barely visible under daylight, emerge clearly: the white-black-white diagonal at the left originally extended to the top edge, curving parallel to the diagonal at the right; the other vertical elements which now stop short of the top and bottom also originally extended to the edges. Several other pentimenti are visible under natural light. (Apr. 1972.)

At least two other versions of this composition exist, both of which probably precede it and both of which show the central figure in reverse. The first version contains three central diagonals instead of two (Collection J. Müller, Solothurn, formerly Collection Léonce Rosenberg, photographic archives no. 727, Oskar Moll, Cahiers d'Art, vol. 8, no. 3-4, 1933, n.p., lower of two illustrations). The second version, present whereabouts unknown (Ibid., upper of two illustrations; and in Bulletin de l'Effort Moderne, no. 25, May 1926, repr. n.p.), is close to a mirror image of the Guggenheim composition prior to the latter's pentimenti. The only difference is the substitution in the Guggenheim picture of the wire “sculpture” in the lower right for the less prominent row of white dots in the earlier version. All three works date from 1925.

Green convincingly suggests that Léger's composition was inspired by Lissitzky's Machinery lithograph from Victory over the Sun. The whole Lissitzky portfolio was on view at the Kiesler exhibition in Vienna which Léger visited in September 1924.

EXHIBITIONS:
Chicago, Renaissance Society at the University of Chicago, Summer Exhibition: A Selection of Works by 20th Century Artists, June 20-Aug. 20, 1934, no. 18 ("Collection Mr. and Mrs. S. R. Guggenheim;" the references given in the cat. entry refer to another version of the composition); Charleston, S.C., SRGM 1-T, no. 96, repr. p. 57; Philadelphia, SRGM 3-T, no. 120; Charleston, S.C., SRGM 4-T, no. 154, repr. p. 121; New York, SRGM 74, no. 137; 78 (checklist; withdrawn Mar. 16); The Art Institute of Chicago, Léger, Apr. 2-May 17, 1953, traveled to San Francisco Museum of Art, June 13-Aug. 23, 1953, New York, The Museum of Modern Art, Oct. 6, 1953-Jan. 3, 1954, repr. p. 41; Toronto, SRGM 85-T, no. 54; New York,

REFERENCES:
Woman Holding a Vase. 1927.
(Femme tenant une Vase).

PROVENANCE:
Probably purchased directly from the artist by Baron Napoléon Gourgaud (d. 1944), Paris, late 1920's (information supplied by M. Jardot, correspondence with the author, August 1971); Baroness Gourgaud, Yerre, 1944-57; purchased from Baroness Gourgaud, Yerre, by Sidney Janis Gallery, New York; purchased from Janis, 1958.

CONDITION:
At an unspecified date prior to acquisition by the Museum, a repair, approximately 2½ x 1 in., was made in the hair adjacent to the woman's right cheek; a patch was placed on the reverse and the area was filled and inpainted. In 1967 the surface was cleaned and the natural varnish was partially removed. This process was continued in 1970 but not completed.

The canvas has suffered some stress along the bottom margin and has pulled apart in some places; but the condition is in general very good. Pentimenti are visible in several parts of the figure, suggesting that the outer limits of the hair line and of both arms were originally intended to be somewhat narrower and the breast somewhat smaller. (July 1972.)

There are several versions of this composition, the earliest oil being a painting in the Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen (36¾ x 25½ in., 92.3 x 64.7 cm., signed and dated "F. Léger. 24." C. Zervos, Léger, Paris, 1952, repr. p. 59). Extremely close to this and to the Guggenheim version is a painting formerly in the Collection Léonce Rosenberg, now in the Kunstmuseum Basel (51¾ x 35½ in., 131 x 89.5 cm., dated "24-27," Bulletin de l'Effort Moderne, no. 37, June 1927, repr. n.p.; E. Tériade, Léger, Paris, 1928, p. 85, attributed to Collection Vicomte de Noailles). Léger's inscription on the reverse of the Guggenheim picture describes it as the final version.

Three other works are related in subject matter, though not in style, to the three works mentioned above. One is an undated pencil sketch on brown paper, formerly Collection Helena Rubinstein (sold at Sotheby Parke Bernet, New York, April 28, 1966, lot 789, to E. V. Thaw & Co., Inc.; I am indebted to Z. Felix for drawing this work to my attention). The second, a gouache in the collection of the Musée Fernand Léger, Biot (Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris, Léger, 1956, no. 189, repr.), is dated 1920 and is probably the earliest work of the series. A closely related oil was formerly in the Collection Léonce Rosenberg (present whereabouts unknown, photographic archives no. 701) and is signed and dated "F. Leger. 25." All three works depict the same woman holding a comparable vase shown against a background of broken framing devices, instead of a unified ground; all also lack the striking contrasts and dramatic shading of the above three oils, as well as the latter's polished surfaces.

Villon engraved this composition for the Chalcographie du Louvre (colored aquatint, 18¾ x 12¾ in., 47.5 x 31.3 cm.). The edition of two hundred was made in 1928 from the Guggenheim version of the composition (J. Auberty and C. Péruaux, Jacques Villon: catalogue de son oeuvre gravé, Paris, 1950, no. 523).
Composition with Aloes, No. 4.
1934-1935.
(Composition à l'aloe).

41.877
Oil on canvas, 44 3/4 x 57 1/2 (113.3 x 146)
Signed l.r.: F. Léger, 34-35; inscribed by the artist on reverse (photographed before lining): Composition à l'Aloés No. 4 / F. Leger-35; on stretcher: Composition à l'Aloés No. 4.

CONDITION:
In 1955 the work was lined with wax resin and restretched on a new stretcher. The surface was cleaned with Soilax and benzine; some losses in the 4 corners and along the top, bottom, and left edges were inpainted, as was a 1 in. area 14 in. from the left side and 19 in. from the top.

Pentimenti are visible in the black forms, which have been enlarged somewhat. There is occasional scattered crackle over the surface, and there are some traction cracks at the edges of the black forms especially in those areas where pentimenti occur. There are 3 diagonal scratches in the pigment (1 in., 2 in., and 3 in. in length), but the condition is otherwise good. (Dec. 1973.)

The aloe (Aloe Vera) is a plant with basal leaves which grows in the Mediterranean basin as well as in Southern Africa.

There are five other known oil versions of this theme. Composition with Aloes, No. 1, 1935, present whereabouts unknown (35 x 51 1/8 in., 89 x 130 cm., P. Descargues, Léger, Paris, 1955, repr. p. 110), apparently postdates No. 2 (1934), as well as possibly the Guggenheim’s No. 4 (1934-35), thus suggesting that the numerical designations are arbitrary.

Composition with Aloes, No. 2, 1934 (also known as Composition with Two Profiles), was in the Collection Louis Clayeux and appeared in the Léger ex-
hibition at the Musée des Arts Décoratifs in 1956, where F. Mathey described it as being the second version of a theme which Léger worked on between 1933 and 1937 (repr., no. 87, 38¼ x 51¼ in., 97 x 130 cm.).

Composition with Aloes, No. 4, 1956, Galerie Louis Carré, Paris, appeared in the same exhibition (repr., no. 88, 38¼ x 51¼ in., 97 x 130 cm.). Since neither of these bears a numerical designation on its reverse, it is not clear how they have been identified as Nos. 2 and 3.

A fourth version is in the Collection José Luis Sert, Cambridge, Massachusetts, promised gift to the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (oil on board, 15 x 18 in., 38.1 x 45.7 cm.). This version is dated 1935 but bears no numerical designation.

A fifth version (35 x 51½ in., 89 x 130 cm.), virtually but not quite identical to the Guggenheim picture, was published in 1949 by D. Cooper (Léger et le nouvel espace, Geneva-Paris-London, 1949, repr. p. 126). The picture belonged at that time to the artist himself. Since these two versions are so extraordinarily close, one might speculate that Léger made a copy for himself before selling his picture to Rebay.

EXHIBITIONS:

Kazimir Severinovich Malevich

Born February 1878, Kiev.
Died May 1935, Leningrad.
Morning in the Village after Snowstorm. 1912. 
(Утро после вьюги в деревне, Утро посle v'yugi v derevne; Morning in the Country after Rain).

52:1327
Oil on canvas, 31\(\frac{3}{4}\) x 31\(\frac{1}{8}\) (80.7 x 80.8)
Signed l.r.: KM; inscribed on reverse, not in the artist's hand: "K. Malevitch / Le matin à la campagne d'après l'orage."; inscribed on reverse, possibly by the artist (barely visible through lining): "(—) Пейзаж / зимой" (Peizazh zimoj, Landscape in Winter). (According to Andersen [p. 88, no. 32], a further inscription in the artist's hand was faintly visible when he examined the painting in 1969. This is now lost. Andersen transcribed it as: "Утро посle v'yugi" [Morning after snowfall].)

PROVENANCE:
Owned by the artist until 1927; acquired from an unknown source by Rose Fried Gallery, New York, by 1952; purchased from Fried, 1953.

CONDITION:
In 1953 the picture was placed on a new stretcher and given a surface cleaning. Minor inpainting was done at this time in the yellow and gray smoke upper left corner, in the blue upper left corner, and in the red sky upper center. In 1954 a label adhered to the reverse with glue was removed, the glue having caused blistering of paint in a light blue triangular area left of center, below and to the right of the base of the tree trunk. In 1966 the canvas was lined with wax resin, placed on a new stretcher, and the surface sprayed with PVA. Certain areas of the surface were specifically left unpainted by the artist; in addition the canvas is visible in scattered areas where paint loss has obviously occurred. This condition is not active and there is no current danger of flaking. There are some abrasions in the grays and whites at the bottom of the canvas, and considerable wear with loss in the corners and along the edges. (Mar. 1972.)

The original Russian title used in the early exhibition catalogues (and often erroneously translated as Morning in the Village [Country] after Rain) specifically refers to snow rather than rain. The Russian word "derevne," on the other hand, is translatable either as "village" or "country."

The earliest evidence for the dating of Morning in the Village after Snowstorm is the Union of Youth exhibition of 1913-14, where the painting is dated 1912. Since its rediscovery in 1952, the picture has, for no apparent reason, us-

1. The picture appears in photographs of the 1927 Warsaw-Berlin exhibition published in the Avantgarde Osteuropas, 1910-1930, exhibition catalogue, Akademie der bildenden Künste, Berlin, Oct.-Nov. 1967, p. 22 (cited by Andersen, 1970, pp. 57-58). Andersen gives a detailed description of the circumstances of this exhibition and of the available data regarding the complete dispersal of the approximately 70 paintings after it closed. The Guggenheim picture was probably 1 of 12 pictures that were inexplicably lost some time between 1927 (when the paintings were left by Malevich in the hands of the architect Hugo Häring and stored by him with the forwarding agent Gustav Knauer) and 1935, when Häring retrieved the by then incomplete shipment. What became of these 12 pictures is not known.

2. The papers of Rose Fried were left to the Archives of American Art but are not yet available for study. It is possible that some clue to her source for the picture, and hence its intervening history, may emerge from them.
ually been dated 1911 (see below exhibitions and references). Gray and Calvesi without discussion date it 1912-13; Andersen dates it 1912.

Andersen’s carefully documented chronology of Malevich’s work convincingly places this picture in 1912. It has been frequently suggested in the literature that Malevich’s 1912 style (as exemplified by the present work) was influenced by the Léger of 1910-11 and in particular by the Nudes in a Landscape. (See for example, G. Habasque, “Malevitch,” L’Oeil, no. 71, November 1960, pp. 46, 88; Andersen, Moderne Russisk Kunst 1910-25, Copenhagen, 1967, pp. 60-61.) The Nudes was exhibited in Paris at the April 1911 Salon des Indépendants which Malevich did not see, and although it is well possible that Malevich saw a reproduction of the work by late in 1911 (as these and other authors have hypothesized), no definite proof of this has yet come to light. The earliest documented instance of Malevich’s contact with Léger’s work is February 1912, when Léger exhibited his 1911 Three Portraits (Milwaukee Art Center) at the Jack of Diamonds in Moscow. The four other works shown by Léger in that exhibition have so far not been identified.

There is, however, another possible source of contact with photographs or reproductions of Léger’s work. Alexandra Exter was, between 1909 and 1914, as A. Nakov has pointed out, living half the year in Paris and half in Kiev and Moscow (Alexandra Exter, Paris, Galerie Jean Chauvelin, May-June 1972, p. 13; I am indebted to S. Compton for drawing this passage to my attention). According to Nakov, Exter regularly carried photographs and reproductions of works seen in Paris with her when she returned home. Since Nudes in a Landscape had caused a considerable stir when it was shown in Paris in April 1911, it seems likely that this would have been among the pictures Exter chose to show her Russian colleagues. Until further evidence on this point comes to light, however, one cannot be certain which Légers other than Three Portraits Malevich had seen by the time he painted Morning in the Village after Snowstorm.

Andersen’s and Habasque’s contention that works such as Morning in the Village after Snowstorm do betray the influence of Léger’s 1910-11 style is compelling. The 1912 date for the present picture is thus entirely acceptable.

EXHIBITIONS:

Moscow, Мышень (Mishen, Target), Mar. 24-Apr. 7, 1913, no. 90; St. Petersburg, Союз молодежи (Soiz Molodezhi, Union of Youth), Nov. 10, 1913-Jan. 10, 1914, no. 64 (dated 1912); Paris, Salon des Indépendants, Mar. 1-Apr. 30, 1914, no. 2156; Moscow, Sixteenth State Exhibition, К. С. Malevich, separate exhibition. His way from Impressionism to Suprematism, 1919-20 (no cat. available); Warsaw, Hotel Polonia, Malevich, Mar. 8-28, 1927, traveled to Berlin, Grosser Berliner Ausstellung, Sonderausstellung Kasimir Malewitsch, May 7-Sept. 30, 1927 (no cat.); New York, Rose Fried Gallery, Group Exhibition, Dec. 15, 1932-Jan. 1933, no. 9; New York, SRGM 79 (checklist, “Morning in the Country after Rain, 1911,” the title and date by which the picture was known in all subsequent SRGM publications until 1970, SRGM 232, where it is dated ca. 1912; withdrawn Oct. 20); Toronto, SRGM 85-T, no. 55; New York, SRGM 87; Boston, SRGM 90-T (no cat.); Montreal, SRGM 95-T, no. 36; New York, SRGM 95 (checklist); London, SRGM 104-T, no. 44; New York, SRGM 118 (checklist); Philadelphia, SRGM 134-T, no. 101; New York, SRGM 144, 151 (checklists);
Malevich  

Morning in the Village after Snowstorm


REFERENCES:

3. A Salon label formerly on the stretcher now preserved in the Museum files inexplicably carries the number “2145.”

4. For information on this exhibition see Andersen, pp. 62-63, 163; the present painting appears in an installation photograph reproduced on p. 62, fig. d.

5. For information on this exhibition see above fn. 1 and Andersen, 1970, pp. 57-58.
Franz Marc

Born February 1880, Munich.
Died March 1916, Verdun.

NOTE: K. Lankheit's catalogue raisonné (herein Lankheit, 1970) is the main source of accurate information on the work of Franz Marc. In addition to his own wide-ranging research into the artist's work, he was—as he states in his introduction—also aided by the research papers of A. Schardt, which were made available to him by the latter's son. Among those papers were the detailed questionnaires which Schardt had sent out to owners of pictures by Marc; many of these questionnaires were filled out by Maria Marc, the artist's widow. In addition, there were quotations in Schardt's hand from Franz Marc's Merkbüchlein (or house catalogue), which Lankheit had consulted in 1948-49, but which has since been lost (Lankheit, 1970, p. xi). Lankheit kindly allowed the author to consult Schardt's questionnaires and the quotations (where available) from the Merkbüchlein. Information from these sources in the following entries is specifically identified as such.

171 Sketch of Horses III. 1906. (Pferdskizze III).
71.1936R 104
Oil on paper mounted on board; painted surface, 3 ¼ x 2 ¼ (15 x 25); board sub-support, 6 ¼ x 10 (15.8 x 25.4)
Not signed or dated. Inscribed in black crayon on reverse by Maria Marc: *Aus dem Nachlass Franz Marc / bestätigt / Maria Marc*; in pencil, possibly by Maria Marc: *Pferdskizze II 1905. Under the II is a III in red pencil. The word skizze is written in above the word studie, which has been deleted.

PROVENANCE:

CONDITION:
At some point prior to 1936 (Schardt questionnaire) the top corners and the bottom right corner were torn off; the extent of the damage may be seen in Lankheit, 1970, p. 16, no. 43. Some time after 1950, probably after 1955, the corners were restored. (Lankheit, in conversation with the author, October 1972, felt that the picture was probably restored after Rebay acquired it, or possibly at her request while it was still with Stangl. Stangl was not in the habit of restoring works and would not have done so unless she specifically requested it.) The work was apparently first mounted on board; pieces of paper corresponding to the missing areas were added; these were then inpainted and the edges squared off with a blade (there are incisions in the board). The work was then coated with natural varnish. The paper has been torn in 2 places (both clearly visible in the photograph): the first tear extends from the bottom margin about 2 in. upwards; the second from the right edge about 2 in. diagonally down to the left. Both have been repaired and retouched. The work was apparently placed in a frame before the pigment was dry, causing distortion of the paint film on all 4 sides, especially the bottom. When the frame was removed, some white paper remained adhering to the paint film (visible in photo). Examination under UV indicates that minor retouching was performed in the rabbeted areas. There is a ¾ in. loss in the center of the lower margin.

There is a slight convex warp of the sub-support along the horizontal axis. Apart from 3 small punctures (left corner, center of left margin, and center of top margin), the condition of the paint film is good. (Sept. 1972.)
The three sketches of horses (Lankheit, nos. 41-43) were numbered either by Maria Marc or by Schardt for purposes of identification and not to suggest their sequence. They appear in Schardt’s notebook, each accompanied by a photograph and a description of the subject. The questionnaire for the present work, completed by Maria Marc, contains the information: “3 Ecken abgebogen. Pferdeskizze III. Kochel. 1906. 5 Pferde etwas in Walddunkel verschwindend 1/3 des Bildes. Vordergrund stark besonnt in der grösste Teil des vordersten Pferdes stärkerer Sonnenfleck. Stimmung starke Sonnenschweres Waldesdunkel.” (“3 corners broken off. Sketch of horses III. Kochel. 1906. 5 horses disappearing somewhat into the darkness of the forest 1/3 of the picture. Foreground in strong sunlight; greater part of the foreground horse more strongly highlighted. Tone strong sunlight and forest darkness.”) Both Schardt and Lankheit have accepted the date of summer 1906 when the Marcas spent the summer in Kochel.

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:

1. In consultation with the author, Oct. 1972, Lankheit compared the inscription with several examples of Maria Marc’s handwriting and concluded that it was possibly, but not certainly, her hand.
Young Boy with a Lamb. 1911.
(Knabe mit Lamm; Der Hirte; Der gute Hirte; The Good Shepherd).

48.1172 x 503
Oil on canvas, 34 3/8 x 33 (88 x 83.8)
Not signed or dated.

PROVENANCE:

CONDITION:
The work has received no treatment.
The edges show considerable wear in some places, especially at the corners. There is a slightly curved scratch in the paint, ca. 6 in. long, extending from the lamb’s ear to the top of the shepherd’s thigh. There are also visible traction cracks in various parts of the surface, the most noticeable being those in the dark areas near the bottom. The canvas is rather slackly stretchered on the original strainer. The condition in general is good. (Sept. 1972.)

The picture is stylistically closely related to Wood Carrier (Private Collection, Krefeld, Lankheit, repr. no. 140); both were probably executed early in 1911.

EXHIBITIONS:3
Munich, Moderne Galerie Heinrich Thannhauser, Kollektion Franz Marc, May 1911 (no cat.);4 Berlin, Nationalgalerie, Franz Marc, Mar.-Apr. 1922 (no cat.);5 Oslo, Kunsthernes Hus, Nyere Tysk Kunst, Jan. 1932, no. 113; New York, Buchholz Gallery, Franz Marc, Nov. 11-12 Dec. 7, 1940, no. 8; New York, SRGM 276 (no cat.).

REFERENCES:

1. Schardt’s notes contain the following quotation from Marc’s Merkbüchlein: “Knabe mit Lamm. A. Flechtheim Düsseldorf. 400.”
2. According to Hans Hess (correspondence with the author, July 1972) his father Alfred purchased the picture in about 1920, possibly from Galerie Goldschmidt-Wallenstein; it seems likely that Flechtheim was the source involved, although it is possible that the picture went to Goldschmidt-Wallenstein in between. In 1938 Hans Hess took the picture to London with him, and lent it for a time to the Free German League of Culture. The following year he sent it to New York for sale.
3. The picture is reproduced in Der Querschnitt, 1921, p. 183, with the caption “Leihgabe des Erfurter Sammlers Hess auf der Baseler Ausstellung,” referring to an exhibition Moderne Deutsche Malerei held in Basel in Oct. 1921. The picture was not, however, in the catalogue, and according to the records of the Kunsthalle it definitely did not appear in the show (correspondence with the author, June 1972).
4. Lankheit’s typewritten list of the works that appeared in the show was based on Schardt’s notes from the Merkbüchlein.
5. Correspondence files for this exhibition still exist in Berlin, and Lankheit was able through these to put together a list of lenders and works lent. I am indebted to him for all information regarding it.
White Bull. 1911.
(Stier).

51.1312
Oil on canvas, 39½ x 53¼ (100 x 135.2) -.
Inscribed by the artist on reverse: Fe. Marc ii / ..Stier."

PROVENANCE:

CONDITION:
In 1954 the canvas was given a light surface cleaning; a few minor losses along the left and top edges were retouched, and one 1⅞ x ⅛ in. area to the left of the bull's eye. The picture was surfaced with PBM. There are some traction cracks near the left edge and beneath the bull's hooves; a few minor cracks down the center of the painting may have been caused by a stretcher impression. Apart from some slight wear along the edges, the condition is excellent. (Oct. 1972.)
Schardt's questionnaire (which appears to be in his own handwriting, suggesting that he went to Koehler's house to obtain the information on the large number of Marc's in the latter's collection) states that Marc was in England until the middle of June 1911 and that the picture was painted shortly after his return to Sindelsdorf. It must have been completed by August, when Marc mentioned it in a letter to Macke (see below fn. 2).

Lankheit lists two studies for the present painting. The first is a pencil study from sketchbook xxiv (fig. a). The second is a chalk drawing from sketchbook xxv (fig. b). Fig. b is also described by Lankheit as a study in reverse for *Reclining Red Bull* (Lankheit, no. 426). Fig. a probably served as a study not only for the present painting but also for a tempera painting (present whereabouts unknown, Lankheit, no. 425), which shows the bull in an identical pose in reverse.

**EXHIBITIONS:**


1. When the picture was published in *Der Blaue Reiter Almanach* in 1912, it apparently did not yet belong to Koehler since it is not attributed to his collection in the list of illustrations, whereas Delaunay's *Eiffel Tower*, for example, is. Some time between late 1912 and May 1913 Koehler purchased the picture from Marc, since Macke lists it among the works he saw on a May visit to Koehler's house (*Briefwechsel*, 1964, p. 161, May 19, 1913). A label on the reverse bears Koehler's name.

2. Schardt's notes on this picture contain the following quotation from the *Merkbühlein*:

"Stier (Juli 1911) im Herbst bei D u K Vereinigung in Weimar." Further reference to this Weimar exhibition is contained in a letter from Marc to Macke of Aug. 13, 1911: "Von den Bildern die ich nach Weimar schicke, hätte ich Dir so gerne vor allem das eine (Stier) gezeigt." *Briefwechsel*, 1964, p. 69. ("Of the pictures I am sending to Weimar, I would have especially liked to have shown you one [Bull."]) Further information about this exhibition has not yet come to light.
PROVENANCE:
Purchased from Marc or Maria Marc by Herwarth Walden, Berlin, during World War I; E. Klu xen, Berlin, 1916-ca. 1918 (Nell Walden, in conversation with the author, summer 1973, stated that Klu xen resold the picture to her approximately two years after he purchased it); Nell Walden, Berlin and Ascona, Switzerland, ca. 1918-49; purchased from Nell Walden, 1949.

CONDITION:
In 1953 the canvas was cleaned with 1% Soilax solution. A tiny area of cleavage in the green area at the lower center was set down with wax resin and retouched. In-painting was also performed in scattered touches in the area of the cow's shoulder where the paint had been rubbed (an area approximately 2 x 4 in.). The canvas was placed on a new stretcher and portions of the left and right margins were inpainted (visible to the naked eye), since the original painted surface had been cut out of square. The painting was surfaced with PBM.

There are traction cracks visible in a few places, especially noticeable in the areas of the cow's udder and underbelly, the green plant lower center, and the blue/white of the mountain. There are 2 abrasions in the upper part of the far right black tree trunk. The condition in general is excellent. (July 1972.)
1. Schardt’s questionnaire, in Maria Marc’s handwriting, includes the sentence: "im Krieg für 900 von Walden gekauft." Marc, in a letter from the front dated Apr. 18, 1915, tells Maria that he has written to someone (presumably Walden) giving the net price he wants for the picture if a buyer can be found (Franz Marc Briefe, Aufzeichnungen und Aphorismen, Berlin, 1920, vol. 1, p. 55). The picture probably belonged to Walden by the time of the 1916 Der Sturm exhibition.
Like *White Bull*, cat. no. 173, this picture was painted in Sindelsdorf shortly after Marc’s return from England in June 1911 (Schardt’s notes, and questionnaire completed by Maria Marc).

Two studies for the work are known. One is a pencil study, formerly in sketchbook xxiii (fig. a). The second is a detailed oil study (fig. b).

A closely related work of the following year is *Cows Red, Green, Yellow* (Städtische Galerie, Munich, Inv. No. G13140, H. K. Röthel, *Sammlungskatalog, Der Blaue Reiter*, 3rd ed., Munich, 1970, color pl. 76). The yellow cow of the present picture is repeated almost exactly in the foreground of the Munich painting, which contains in addition a red and a green cow in the background.

The striking colors in both of these works inevitably bring to mind the correspondence between Macke and Marc in December 1910 on the subject of color. Marc’s lengthy analysis of the effects of blue, yellow, and red is especially relevant in this context:

Blau ist das männliche Prinzip, sanft, herb und geistig.
Gelb das weibliche Prinzip, sanft, heiter und sinnlich.
Rot die Materie, brutal und schwer und stets die Farbe, die von den anderen beiden bekämpft und überwunden werden muss! Mischt Du z.B. das ernste, geistige Blau mit Rot, dann steigerst Du das Blau bis zur unerträglichen Trauer, und das versöhnende Gelb, die Komplementärfarbe zu Violett, wird unerläßlich.

---

fig. a.
Marc, study for *Yellow Cow*, pencil on paper, from sketchbook xxiii, dimensions and present whereabouts unknown.

fig. b.
Marc, study for *Yellow Cow*, oil on wood, 24 3/8 x 34 1/2 in., 62.5 x 87.5 cm., Private Collection.
(Das Weib als Trösterin, nicht als Liebende!)
Mischt Du Rot und Gelb zu Orange, so gibst Du dem passiven und weiblichen Gelb eine ‘megärenhafte,’ sinnliche Gewalt, dass das kühl, geistige Blau wiederum unerlässlich wird, der Mann, und zwar stellt sich das Blau sofort und automatisch neben Orange, die Farben lieben sich. Blau und Orange, ein durchaus festlicher Klang.

Mischt Du nun aber Blau und Gelb zu Grün, so weckt Du Rot, die Materie, die ‘Erde,’ zum Leben, aber hier fühle ich als Maler immer einen Unterschied: Mit Grün bringst Du das ewig materielle, brutale Rot nie ganz zur Ruhe, wie bei den vorigen Farbklängen. (Stelle Dir nur z.B. kunstgewerbliche Gegenstände vor, grün und rot!) Dem Grün müssen stets noch einmal Blau (der Himmel) und Gelb (die Sonne) zu Hilfe kommen, um die Materie zum Schweigen zu bringen (Briefwechsel, 1964, p. 28).

(“Blue is the male principle, severe, bitter, spiritual and intellectual.” [For a discussion of the meaning of the word geistig, which in German suggests a combination of both spiritual and intellectual, see Weiss, 1973, pp. 475 ff.]
“Yellow is the female principle, gentle, cheerful, and sensual. Red is matter, brutal and heavy, the color which must be fought and overcome by the other two! For example, if you mix serious, intellectual-spiritual blue with red, you intensify the blue to a point of unbearable sadness, and comforting yellow, the complementary of violet, becomes indispensable. [Woman as comforter, not as lover!] If you mix red and yellow to make orange, you give the passive female yellow a ‘turbulent’ sensual power, so that the cool, spiritual and intellectual blue—the male principle—once again becomes indispensable; and blue immediately and automatically falls into place next to orange—these two being so drawn to one another. Blue and orange: a thoroughly festive resonance. If you then mix blue and yellow to make green, you bring red—matter, the ‘Earth’—to life; but here, as painter, I always feel a difference. With green you never quite still the brutality and materiality of red, as was the case with the other color harmonies. [Just think, for example, how green and red are used in craft objects.] Green always requires the aid of blue [the sky] and yellow [the sun] to reduce matter to silence.”)

Yellow Cow is a vibrant illustration of Marc’s notion of the symbolic effects of color. The brilliant yellow cow with its two blue spots may be seen as the gentle, cheerful, sensual female principle, carrying within her an element of the male spiritual-intellectual. The earth (matter) under her feet is blue and orange (the festive resonance), violet and yellow (sadness and comfort), but most of all red (the essential color of matter) and green (which brings that matter to life). The Munich painting presents the same colors in different but equally brilliant juxtapositions; together the two works are an eloquent dramatization of Marc’s theory.
EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:

2. Schardt’s notes include the sentence: “München-Köln-Sturm-Hagen.” It is not clear whether this was a single exhibition which traveled, or whether it refers in part to the Blaue Reiter exhibition of 1911, and to one of the Sturm exhibitions listed here. Exhibitions at Cologne and Hagen in which this picture appeared have not hitherto been traced. Schardt’s questionnaire also contains a reference in Maria Marc’s handwriting to the “Palais des Beaux Arts.” This is substantiated by a fragmentary label on the stretcher of the picture which reads “10 rue Royale / Franz Marc / La Vache jaune / collection Mme Walden-Heimann, Berlin,” and indicates that the picture appeared in Brussels sometime between 1924 and 1940. However, it has so far proved impossible to find any record of the picture’s appearance in an exhibition in Brussels (information supplied by S. Bertouille, correspondence with the author, Oct. 1972).

3. The entry reads “Die gelbe Kub” but the reproduction is of the Munich picture Kuh, Rot, Grün, Gelb (Cows, Red, Green, Yellow), 1912. It has not been possible to establish which of the works actually appeared.

4. See above cat. no. 172, fn. 5. The correspondence inexplicably indicates that the picture was lent by Niestl, Sindelsdorf. Neither the present picture, nor the Munich Cows, Red, Green, Yellow ever belonged to Niestl as far as is known. The oil sketch was already in a private collection in Krefeld by 1922 and was indeed also lent to the 1922 exhibition. This problem of identification remains unsolved.

5. See above cat. no. 173, fn. 4.
Bos Orbis Mundi. 1913.
(Die Weltenkuh).

46.1039
Oil on canvas, 27 3/4 x 55 1/2 (70.5 x 141)
Signed l.r.: M; inscribed by the artist on reverse, partially obscured by stretcher: „Die Weltenkuh“ / Marc 13.

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist by W. Beffie, Amsterdam and Brussels, before 1916;1 purchased from Beffie by Karl Nierendorf, New York, after 1940 (Buchholz Gallery exhibition catalogue); purchased from Nierendorf, 1946.

CONDITION:
At some point prior to acquisition by the Museum, portions of the top, right, and bottom edges were inpainted. In 1954 surface dirt was removed with 3% Soilax solution and the surface coated with PBM. There are noticeable traction cracks in various parts of the canvas but these are concentrated especially along the lower quarter of the surface and along the left margin. Apart from some general surface soil, the condition is good. (Oct. 1972.)

1. Schardt’s notes from the Merkbüchlein read: “Die Weltenkuh W. Beffie verkauft 800.”
On a postcard to Erich Heckel, dated April 4, 1913, Marc did a rather detailed study for the present work (fig. a). The painting itself was completed by May 22 (letter to Macke).

The colors in this work, like those in Yellow Cow, inevitably bring to mind Marc's analysis of color in his December 1910 letter to Macke. For the relevant passage from this letter, see above Yellow Cow, cat. no. 174. For a further discussion of this painting, see K. Lankheit, Franz Marc (in press).

fig. a.
Marc, study for Bos Orbis Mundi, ink over pencil, watercolor, and chalk on postcard, 4½ x 5½ in., 10.5 x 14.5 cm., Altonaer Museum, Hamburg.

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:
The Unfortunate Land of Tyrol. 1913.
(Das arme Land Tirol).

46.1040
Oil on canvas 51⅜ x 78¾ (131.1 x 200)
Inscribed I.I.: M. / das arme Land Tirol.
Not dated.

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist by W. Beffie, Amsterdam and Brussels, before 1916; purchased from Beffie by Karl Nierendorf, New York, after 1940 (Buchholz Gallery exhibition catalogue); purchased from Nierendorf, 1946.

CONDITION:
In 1953 the painting was cleaned with 2% Soilax solution, and 2 small losses at the lower center were inpainted; the canvas was surfaced with PBM and placed on a new stretcher. In 1963 the reverse was cleaned and the canvas lined with wax resin.

There are traction cracks in a number of areas, mainly in the more thickly painted blacks, blues, grays, and greens. There are some abrasions in the black and blue paint near the center of the left edge, and a 5 in. vertical stain extending downwards from the M. The condition is in general good. (Oct. 1972.)

1. Schardt’s notes from the Merkbüchlein read: “Das arme Land Tirol W. Beffie verkauft 1500.”
On March 20, 1913, the Marc's, who were spending a few days in the Tyrol, wrote to Lisbeth Macke: "... wir schicken Euch herzliche Grüsse von einer herrlichen Tour durch d. Vintschgau in Tirol. Neben Burg Montani ist eine Kapelle mit den herrlichsten Fresken—wir wandern von Burg zu Burg und haben viele schöne Kunst gesehen" (Briefwechsel, p. 155). ("We send you our best wishes from a wonderful journey through Vintschgau in the Tyrol. Close to Castle Montani is a chapel with the most beautiful frescoes—we are walking from one castle to the next and have seen many beautiful works of art.")

Two pencil sketches survive which must have been made on this journey (figs. a and b). Although they have not hitherto been associated with The Unfortunate Land of Tyrol, they must have formed the general basis for it. When he returned to Sindelsdorf, Marc then proceeded to the preparatory watercolor (fig. c), which has already been published by Lankheit as a study for the painting. The watercolor corresponds closely to the final conception although it lacks the prominently placed border markers. The oil was completed by the end of May, when Marc mentioned it in a letter to the Mackes (Briefwechsel, p. 156).

The presence of the Austro-Hungarian border sign, the rainbow, and the heraldic eagle perched beneath it, together with the title, provide possible clues to the painting’s meaning, although ambiguities remain.

The history of the Tyrol in the nineteenth century is one of constant victimization by its neighboring powers. After Austria’s defeat by Napoleon in 1805 the Tyrol was annexed by Bavaria. When the new Austro-French war broke out in 1809 the Tyrolean peasants under Andreas Hofer rose in a hopeless struggle against the Bavarians and the French, but were predictably crushed, and Hofer executed by the French. In 1814 the Tyrol was again united with...
Austria, but peace did not follow. Border disputes continued to erupt throughout the century. At the beginning of the twentieth century, tensions throughout Europe were building up again. In 1912 the First Balkan War and in 1913 the Second threatened to involve not Austria, but all of Europe. Thoughts and fears of impending war are expressed throughout the writings of the period leading up to 1914. The particularly vulnerable situation of the Tyrol (which the Marcs had recently visited) and the generally threatening atmosphere in Europe as a whole, were, thus, probably in Marc’s mind as he developed the composition. The ominous graveyard, the clear reference to a geographical border zone, and the explicitly evocative nature of the title would support the notion that this was his essential theme. The presence of the heraldic (German?) eagle perched just beyond the border and crowned by a rainbow may thus suggest the potential unification of Europe, the destruction of borders, through the purifying power of the impending war. On October 24, 1914, he wrote to Kandinsky: “... das gute Europäertum liegt m. Herzen näher als das Deutschum; ... Ich sehe [in diesem Krieg] sogar den heilsamen, wenn auch grausamen Durchgang zu unsern Zielen; er wird die Menschen nicht zurückwerfen, sondern Europa reinigen, bereit machen ... Europa thut heute dasselbe an seinem Leibe, wie Frankreich in der grossen Revolution an sich that” (preserved in the Gabriele Münter und Johannes Eichner Stiftung, Munich, Städtische Galerie, Munich; published by H. K. Röthel, Franz Marc, exhibition catalogue, Munich, 1963). (“The sense of being a good European is closer to my heart than is the sense of being a German; ... I even see in this war the healing, if also gruesome, path to our goals; it will not set humanity back, but on the contrary will purify Europe, and make it ready ... Europe is doing the same things to her body that France did to hers during the Revolution.”)
The letters written to Maria Marc from the front touch from time to time upon the potentially healing nature of war, upon the naturalness of war, and upon its spiritually regenerative aspects. It is not unlikely, therefore, that Marc already in 1913 was giving expression to some of these thoughts through the unusually explicit iconography and title of this painting.

(For a detailed discussion of the iconography and symbolism of Marc's immediately following paintings, see F. S. Levine, The Apocalyptic Vision: An Analysis of the Art of Franz Marc within the Context of German Expressionism, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Washington University, St. Louis, 1975. See also K. Lankheit, Franz Marc [in press].)

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:

Stables, 1913.
(Stallungen).

46.1037
Oil on canvas, 29 x 62 (73.6 x 157.5)

CONDITION:
At an unrecorded date some inpainting was performed along most of the top edge (1/4-1/2 in. in width), the upper third of the left edge (1/4-1/2 in. in width), and in a diagonal area 5/8 x 31/2 in. just below the center; in addition some scattered pinpoint losses were inpainted. In 1954 some cleaving paint lower left of center was set down with wax resin and the repaint in that area was probably performed at that time. In 1955 the canvas was lined with wax resin on natural linen and placed on a new stretcher. The paint film is stained with a brownish substance (possibly varnish) in 3 places on the left side. The edges are somewhat worn, with some transfer material. Apart from some traction cracks in the impasto areas, the condition is good. (Oct. 1972.)

PROVENANCE:
Estate of the artist, 1916, until at least 1936;1 Karl Nierendorf, New York, by 1939; purchased from Nierendorf, 1946.
Schardt’s notes² indicate that the picture was completed and sent to Dresden by the end of December 1913, in time for the opening of the January exhibition.

Lankheit drew attention to the pencil and ink study for the central section of the composition (fig. b). A pencil sketch from sketchbook xxix (fig. a) probably represents a preliminary study for the composition, with the vertical dividers already indicated, but the positions of the horses not yet finally established.

fig. a.
Marc, pencil on paper, from sketchbook xxix, ca. 1913, 4 3/8 x 5 3/8 in., 12.1 x 14.9 cm., formerly Estate of the Artist, no. 196.

fig. b.
Marc, pencil and ink on paper, from sketchbook xxx, 6 1/8 x 8 5/8 in., 16.9 x 21.9 cm., formerly Estate of the Artist, no. 205.

1. Maria Marc is listed as the owner in Schardt as well as in the Hanover exhibition catalogue. Nierendorf had acquired the picture by 1939 and probably purchased it directly from Maria Marc, but no confirming evidence has hitherto come to light.
EXHIBITIONS:


REFERENCES:


2. Schardt's notes from the Merkbüchlein read in part: "Stallungen ... xii 13 Reiche—Arnold Coll. Dresden." Richard Reiche was the director of the Kunstverein in Barmen and apparently the organizer of the Dresden exhibition, which has hitherto not been identified, but must be the Jan. 1914 one cited here. Further evidence for this is provided by Maria Marc's Dec. 2, 1913, letter to Lisbeth Macke which says: "Franz hat viel gearbeitet und beteiligt sich an Dr. Reiche's Dresdner Ausstellung." Briefwechsel, 1964, p. 175. ("Franz has been working hard and is taking part in Dr. Reiche's Dresden exhibition.")

3. See above cat. no. 172, fn. 5.
Broken Forms. 1914.
(Zerbrochene Formen).

50.1240
Oil on canvas, 44 x 33½ (111.8 x 88.4)
Not signed or dated.

PROVENANCE:
Maria Marc, Ried, 1916-50; purchased from
Maria Marc through Otto Stangl, Munich, 1950.

CONDITION:
In 1953 the surface was cleaned with 1%
Soilax solution, cleaving paint in 2 small
areas was re-adhered with PVA emulsion,
and the surface coated with PBM. In 1956
the canvas was impregnated from the re-
verse with wax resin (but not lined), and
2 tiny losses near the upper left corner were
inpainted.
Traction cracks are visible in some areas
and there are a few scattered pinpoint paint
losses, but the condition is otherwise
excellent. (Oct. 1972.)
fig. a.
Marc, pencil and ink on paper, from sketchbook xxx, 8 3/8 x 6 3/8 in., 22 x 16.7 cm., formerly Estate of the Artist, no. 208.

fig. b.
Marc, tempera on paper, from sketchbook xxix, 6 x 4 3/4 in., 15.2 x 12.2 cm., formerly Estate of the Artist, no. 198.
Early in 1914 the Marc's moved to Ried near the monastery of Benediktbeuren. He painted about twelve pictures there before he left for the front in August. Several of them, including the present one, are described by Schardt (presumably on the basis of Maria Marc's information) as unfinished and are accepted as such by Schmidt (1957), H. K. Röthel, and H. Platte (catalogues of 1963 Munich and Hamburg exhibitions). The fact that the work is neither signed nor dated might support their view. (Of the six "unfinished" works in Schardt, two are, however, signed.)

Lankheit has argued convincingly (in conversation with the author, October 1972) that the present work and some others from 1914 seem from an aesthetic standpoint complete. He suggests that Maria Marc might have had some anxieties about the quality of these late works. Marc himself had apparently described them as Versuche (experiments), possibly implying thereby that the whole venture into abstraction was, in a sense, unfinished. In this context, Lankheit suggests Maria Marc's description of the works as unfinished might be attributable to her own tentative feelings about them rather than to Marc's stated view. A reviewer of the 1917 Weisbaden exhibition (Wiesbadener Tageblatt, March 10, 1917, reprinted by Lankheit, Franz Marc im Urteil seiner Zeit, Cologne, 1960, p. 103) had said that Marc's last pictures represented the wanderings of a lost mind. Perhaps she was herself afraid that this might be so, and hence her cautious suggestion that they be judged as unfinished works.

The picture has been described as totally abstract by Lankheit (1960), P. Selz (German Expressionist Painting, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1957, p. 307), and Röthel (Modern German Painting, New York, 1957, p. 47). While its effect is certainly abstract, it seems possible that it represents a transformation of the "house and garden" motif depicted in the 1913-14 sketchbooks (figs. a and b). Marc's ventures into abstraction were necessarily few since his life was cut short so soon after he began to work in this mode. His process of composition in these late works, and particularly the degree to which they may be evolved from representational sources, remains to be established.

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:
Man in a Tower. 1924.
*(Homme dans une tour; Homme tenant une corde)*.

48.1172 x 222
Oil on canvas, 37 3/8 x 24 (95 x 60.8)
Signed on reverse (transcribed but not photographed before lining, partially visible in transmitted light): André Masson. Not dated.

PROVENANCE:
Galerie Simon, Paris, 1924 (information supplied by M. Jardot, conversation with the author, August 1972); purchased from Galerie Simon by Gertrude Stein, 1924 (information supplied by Masson, conversation with the author, October 1971 and Jardot, August 1972); acquired from an unknown source by Karl Nierendorf, New York, by 1948; acquired with the Estate of Karl Nierendorf, 1948.

CONDITION:
In 1953 the work was cleaned with 1 1/2% Soilax and benzine and surfaced with PBM. In 1959 it was lined with wax resin and squared on a new stretcher. 6 in. of the top edge and 4 in. of the bottom edge were inpainted at this time.
The edges show slight wear but the condition in general is excellent. (Dec. 1973.)

*Man in a Tower* belongs to a group of works painted in 1923-25 in which a single male figure in a tower or dungeon is surrounded by a group of clearly symbolic objects. These are among the earliest works in which the artist—as he himself expressed it—attempted to bring “philosophical ideas into a painting” (Leiris, “La Terre,” *André Masson and his Universe*, p. 101).

André Masson, in conversation with the author (October 1971), gave probing thought to the symbolic nature of these works and offered an interpretation of many of their essential ingredients. A summary of his comments follows:

The location of these men in underground, tower, or dungeon settings was highly significant; they had, in effect, something of the prisoner in them. The recurring rope suggests a way of escape, as do the steps at the right. The flame, which in the Guggenheim picture is at the center of the composition, and—significantly—over the heart of the man, represents the life which must not be extinguished. The knife, which appears again and again, is an expression of will power. The circular form at the upper left is the boule de feu—a reference to the astrological forces which so preoccupied all of us at the time; the large and small balls at the center left, on the other hand, are a totally frivolous addition—a “bilboquet” (cup and ball) which was in my studio and which I introduced into the scenery of many of my paintings. The dice are a reference to chance in general and, more specifically, to Mallarmé’s poem “Un coup de dés n’abolira jamais le hasard.”

I regarded Mallarmé as one of the greatest of all poets, and I had done a series of illustrations for “Un coup de dés” in 1914. The notions of chance (“hasard”), luck (“chance”), and the absurd (“l’absurd”) had preoccupied me and my war-time contemporaries constantly—they were, perforce, the three gods of every soldier.
The man portrayed in the Guggenheim picture is not a direct portrait (in the sense that Man in an Interior [Portrait of Michel Leiris] and Man with an Orange [Self-Portrait] are). Rather it is a composite portrait of the three more or less regular inhabitants of my studio at that time—Leiris, Georges Limbour, and Roland Tual. We four were close friends; the picture represents an imaginary man with the memory of each of them contained in him. The female silhouette behind the man’s head is the ever-present allusion to woman which is a more or less explicit element in all of these apparently masculine paintings. The fish is perhaps the only enigma: it may represent, like the knife, a further suggestion of will power; or perhaps it is water. (Birds—air, and horses—earth, appeared in many of my paintings of this period.) Or perhaps freedom ("la liberté"). But I cannot be sure.
(The context in which the fish is most explicitly and clearly used by Masson to symbolize water is in *Les quatre éléments*, also of 1924, where a bird, a fish, a sphere, and a flame clearly represent air, water, earth, and fire [Leiris and Limbour, repr. p. 106].)

In a subsequent conversation with Rowell (June 1972), Masson raised the possibility that the notion of the prisoner, which is a factor in each of these paintings, may have been related to his own four years of military service, a time when he was "not free." Alternatively it might have been related to his post-war "incarceration" in a psychiatric hospital, where he was placed under temporary observation and surrounded by mad men ("des fous"). This preoccupation with imprisonment and with the rope as a means of escape reappears almost twenty years later in *Anatomie de mon univers* (1940-42, pl. xiii), *Tentative d'évasion*, where a man, clapping to a rope, tries to climb out of a seemingly endless tower. Masson has suggested that the prominence of this prisoner motif throughout his oeuvre is traceable to the influence of Piranesi's *Carceri*, to which he felt strongly drawn in the years 1923-25, and which provided a major source of inspiration in the gradual formulation of his own "personal mythology" ("Piranesé et ses Prisons ... Il a été une des portes d'initiation de ma mythologie personelle," interview with Georges Bernier, *L'Oeil*, no. 5, May 1955, pp. 12-17). His characterization of the imprisoned figure in *Man in a Tower* as a composite memory of his three close friends, and hence more the embodiment of an idea than a physical likeness, clarifies the relationship of this figure to the very similar ones in the related paintings of the period (*Man with an Orange*, 1923, Leiris and Limbour, repr. p. 13; *Man in an Interior*, 1924, Ibid., repr. p. 202; *Figure in a Dungeon*, 1924, Kahnweiler photo no. 10602; *Man surrounded by Birds*, 1924, Kahnweiler photo no. 10573). As Leiris has penetratingly argued, Masson's aim in all these so-called "portraits" is not simple description, but rather the expression of much deeper universal characteristics (pp. 195-199).

Masson's reference to the female form as a leitmotif hovering in the background of these male-dominated scenes throws new light on their content, since they have traditionally been regarded as exclusively male domains. (See, for example, Limbour, p. 116, or H. Juin, *André Masson*, Paris, 1963, p. 70.) The full symbolic implications of this female presence remain to be explored, although Masson's own expressed preoccupation with a potent sexual life and the developing Surrealist notions of sexual content are clearly involved.

Limbour has drawn attention to the fact that the large, angular kitchen knife which appears in most of these compositions prefigures those in so many of the later massacres and sacrifices, and he suggests that the formal juxtaposition of curved and angular forms underlines the strong sense of discord which pervades these works (pp. 116-117).

**REFERENCE:**
Jean Metzinger

Born June 1883, Nantes.
Woman with a Fan. 1912 (-1913?).  
(Femme à l'éventail).

38,531
Oil on canvas, 35½ x 25¼ (90.7 x 64.2) cm.
Signed ll.: Metzinger. Not dated.

PROVENANCE:
Galerie l'Effort Moderne (Léonce Rosenberg), Paris, by 1937 (Petit Palais exhibition catalogue);¹ Galerie Garnier des Garets, Paris, 1937-38;² purchased from Garets by Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1938; Gift of Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1938.

CONDITION:
In 1953 the work was cleaned with 2% Solilax and inpainted with PVA; in 1967 it was glue lined, placed on a new stretcher, and the edges taped. With the exception of some minor losses in the lower corners, the condition is excellent. (May 1974.)

A satisfactory chronology for Metzinger's work has not been established. Few of his works are dated and the difficulties are compounded by his conservative and academic tendencies which blur the lines of his stylistic development. In the case of Woman with a Fan, however, two related and documented works do exist to clarify the issue.

The first of these, The Yellow Plume, is signed and dated 1912 and was shown in the October 1912 Section d'Or exhibition (no. 119; Painters of the Section d'Or, exhibition catalogue, Buffalo, 1967, repr. color no. 35, Collection Mr. and Mrs. S. E. Johnson, Chicago). The second, Dancer in a Café (Albright-Knox Art Gallery, Buffalo), was convincingly associated by J. Golding with an entry in the 1912 Salon d'Automne (Cubism, 1968, p. 160) and it was probably painted shortly before The Yellow Plume in the summer of that year (Salon d'Automne, no. 1195, Danseuse; Cooper, Cubist Epoch, 1970, repr. color p. 78).

These two paintings and a second version of The Yellow Plume which was purchased by John Quinn in 1916 (later Collection R. Sturgis Ingersoll, Sotheby Parke Bernet, New York, sale catalogue, May 3, 1974, repr. color lot 373) are strikingly similar in style and conception to Woman with a Fan. The similarities are strongest among the two versions of The Yellow Plume and the Guggenheim painting. In these three portraits, all of which depict women wearing similar hats, the treatment of the figure and its relationship to the surrounding space are virtually identical. They and the slightly earlier Dancer in a Café demonstrate the extent to which Metzinger absorbed the example presented by Gris, whose recent work had been publicly exhibited for the first time at the Salon des Indépendants just a few months before. (See, for example,

---

¹ The picture appears among the Rosenberg photographic archives in Paris, but there is no indication of when he acquired it. A Rosenberg label on the reverse bears only the information “No. 25112 J. Metzinger, 1913.” Rosenberg was buying paintings by Metzinger by 1918 and may have acquired the picture soon afterwards.

² Mlle. Garnier des Garets probably acquired the picture after the 1937 exhibition, possibly on behalf of Guggenheim.

D. Cooper, who also comments on the decorative character of this phase in Metzinger’s oeuvre, pointedly cites the artist’s own warnings which were published at precisely the same period, but apparently ignored, on the dangers of such stylistic mannerisms: “Toute préoccupation dérivant en art de la matière employée, nous devons tenir la préoccupation décorative, si nous la rencontrons chez un peintre, pour un artifice bon à cacher une impuissance.” (“As all preoccupation in art arises from the material employed, we ought to regard the decorative preoccupation, if we find it in a painter, as an anachronistic artifice, useful only to conceal impotence.” Du Cubisme, Paris, 1912, English translation of 1913 quoted by Cooper, Cubist Epoch, 1970, p. 78.)

Metzinger’s paintings of 1912 and later seem to demonstrate a fairly consistent and immediate response to the most recent work of Gris, which thus provides important guideposts for the dating of the former’s work. The second version of The Yellow Plume and Woman with a Fan were both probably painted not long after the first version of The Yellow Plume and would thus date from late in 1912, or possibly early in 1913.

**EXHIBITIONS:**


**REFERENCES:**

Landscape. ca. 1913-1914.

40.841
Oil on canvas, 36⅛ x 28⅞ (91.7 x 73 cm)
Signed l.r.: Metzinger; on reverse (photographed before lining): Metzinger. Not dated.

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from Carroll Galleries, New York by John Quinn (1870-1924), by 1920; purchased from the Quinn Collection by J. B. Neumann, New York, 1927 (Sale, American Art Galleries, New York, The Renowned Collection of Modern and Ultra-Modern Art formed by the late John Quinn, February 9-12, 1927, no. 509A); purchased from the J. B. Neumann Collection (Sale, Plaza Art Galleries, Inc., New York, A Selection of Modern Art... from J. B. Neumann and others, May 8, 1940, no. 60, repr.).

CONDITION:
In 1956 the work was lined with wax resin and placed on a new stretcher; 7 losses (from ⅛ in. to 2 in. in width) were inpainted, and the canvas was surfaced with PBM. The edges and corners were chipped in places with some loss of paint and ground. There are some minor areas of crackle and drying cracks, but no evidence of incipient cleavage. The present painting was almost certainly painted over an earlier work, but since the artist applied an intervening ground, it is impossible to determine what this composition was. UV, X-ray, and transmitted light have revealed extremely little beyond confirming the fact that a composition of some kind was present beneath the second ground layer. The condition in general is excellent. (May 1974.)

Metzinger's enclosure of the landscape within diagonally placed rectangular forms and his use of a high viewpoint characterize his direct dependence upon the work of Gris. Gris' 1913 paintings, such as the two landscapes at Céret (Private Collection, Paris, Golding, Cubism, 1968, pl. 54; and Moderna Museet, Stockholm, D.H. Kahnweiler, Juan Gris, London, 1969, repr. p. 247), are, in fact, more uncompromising than the Metzinger in their suppression of spatial recession. Metzinger, in retaining some clearly modeled three-dimensional forms, betrays his essentially more conservative adherence to traditional modes of representation. Nonetheless, the overall structure of the landscape is un-

1. On Mar. 23, 1920, W. Pach, Director of the Carroll Galleries since 1917, wrote to Quinn: "I am glad you got the Metzingers, as they are surely of the best of his work and will, I believe, rank very high in the art of their decade. Perhaps I should give you a temporary memorandum that they cost—for the Landscape—$300, The Head of a Woman 150. These are the prices that Gleizes put on them in 1913 or '16." Quinn owned 2 landscapes by Metzinger, the other having been purchased in Feb. 1916 (letter from Metzinger to Mrs. Bryant, Feb. 25, 1916, copy in Carroll Galleries Folder, Box 1 [Art Dealers], John Quinn Memorial Collection, Manuscripts and Archives Division, The New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox and Tilden Foundations).

It is impossible to say for certain which of the 2 is referred to in the Mar. 1920 letter. However, it is almost certain that Quinn must have owned both by Sept. 1920, when he wrote to Léonce Rosenberg, Sept. 24, 1920, "I have several examples of the work of Metzinger and would not be interested, I think, in any more of that." (See John Quinn Memorial Collection for correspondence cited.) He had purchased 4 other Metzingers from the Carroll Galleries in 1916 (see Quinn correspondence, New York Public Library), and owned 9 works by the artist in all.
mistakably indebted to Gris’ example. A date of ca. 1913-14 for the present landscape is plausible, although it is possible that the picture was painted slightly later.

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCE:
The John Quinn Collection of Paintings, Watercolors, Drawings and Sculpture, New York, 1926, p. 11 (“Landscape, 28 x 36 in.”).

Coffee Grinder, Coffee Pot, Cigarettes, and Glass. ca. 1913-1916. (Still Life; Nature Morte).

59.1520

Oil on canvas, 27 3/8 x 20 7/8 (70.3 x 52.4)

Signed l.r.: Metzinger. Not dated.

PROVENANCE:

Probably purchased directly from the artist by Walter Pach (1883-1958), New York, by 1924 (repr. Masters of Modern Art); purchased from the Estate of Walter Pach, 1948, by Peridot Gallery (Louis Pollack), New York; purchased from Peridot Gallery, 1959.

CONDITION:

At some time prior to acquisition by the Museum, the picture was glue lined and the edges taped. 4 areas of inpaint may have been done from this time: a 1 in. area at the lower left and upper right corners; a 1 in. area near the bottom edge; a 3 in. line 8 in. from the bottom and 9 in. from the left.

There are scattered irregular cracks in the heavy impasto and a severe vertical crack with some cupping in the white triangle at the upper left, but the condition is otherwise excellent. (May 1974.)

Although this work has been dated 1916 since its acquisition by the Museum, conclusive evidence for the date has not yet been established. The pervasive influence of Gris on Metzinger's post-1914 evolution provides clues for the establishment of terminus ante quem dates, but the precise sequence of works inspired by Gris' own development is not always easy to trace. The compositional structure of Metzinger's painting, which places the still-life within a diamond-shaped framing device, clearly owes something to a work such as Gris' The Watch, 1912 (Collection Hans Crether, Switzerland), which was shown at the Section d'Or in October 1912. The division of the surface into a series of vertical planes is reminiscent of Gris' 1912-13 pictures like The Book, 1913 (formerly Collection G. Henry, now Caisse Nationale des Monuments Historiques et des Sites, Paris), whereas the treatment of forms might be more clearly identified with Gris' coffee pots and coffee grinders in works such as Breakfast of 1915 (Musée National d'Art Moderne, Paris) or The Coffee Grinder of 1916 (Private Collection, Paris, Juan Gris, exhibition catalogue, Paris, 1974, repr. no. 51).

Until further evidence for a construction of Metzinger's chronology emerges, a date of ca. 1913-16 is the most plausible.

1. Both in his capacity as director of the Carroll Galleries and before, Pach had direct dealings with Metzinger. (See, for example, the John Quinn Memorial Collection, Manuscripts and Archives Division, The New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox and Tilden Foundations, letters dated Oct. 26, 1918, and Mar. 23, 1920.)
EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:
Joan Miró

Born April 1893, Barcelona.
Lives in Palma, Majorca.

Prades, the Village. Summer 1917.
(Prades, el poble; View of Montroig).

69.1894
Oil on canvas, 25 3/4 x 28 3/8 (65 x 72.6)

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from Galeries Dalmau, Barcelona
by Pedro Mañach, 1918; 2 purchased from
Madame Mañach in 1951 by Pierre Matisse
Gallery, New York; purchased from Matisse
by Robert Elkon, New York, jointly with
Albert Loeb and Krugier Gallery, 1969;
purchased from Elkon, 1969.

CONDITION:
At some time prior to acquisition by the
Museum, the canvas was glue lined; the
edges of the original canvas were trimmed
on all sides and taped. 3 areas of inpaint
may date from this time: a 13 in. horizontal
strip, 2 in. wide and 2 in. from the top edge;
a 2 in. square area 5 in. from the top and
1 1/2 in. from the right; a 1 in. area 3 in. from
the top and 3 in. from the left.

The corners and edges show moderate wear
with some loss of paint and ground, and
there are some minor traction cracks in 2 or
3 areas, especially in the roofs below the
spire. The lining process appears to have
flattened the pigment to some extent, but
the overall condition is good. (Dec. 1973.)

Although the scene has repeatedly been identified as Montroig (see below
EXHIBITIONS and REFERENCES), the church is clearly that of Prades (fig. a).
Miró himself has confirmed (in conversation with Rowell, May 1974) that during
the summer of 1917, which he spent at Montroig, he went for several weeks
to stay in an inn at Prades for a change of scene; every day during this period he
made studies after nature. The clarity and objectivity with which Miró por-
trayed architectural forms at this stage in his development contrasts strongly,

fig. a.
Prades (photograph taken in 1974).

1. In May 1974 M. Rowell, Curator of Special Exhibitions at the Guggenheim Museum, inter-
viewed Miró in Paris and on the author’s behalf posed to him a series of detailed questions
concerning his works in the SRGM Collection. Information supplied by Miró on this
occasion is specifically cited in the individual entries which follow.

2. Pedro Mañach was a banker, as well as a friend and first dealer of Picasso. According to
Miró (conversation with Rowell, May 1974), Mañach purchased the present painting out of
the “disastrously unsuccessful” 1918 exhibition in order to help José Dalmau, who had
presumably purchased the pictures from Miró.
as Dupin has pointed out, with the lyrical and decorative patterning of the landscape settings in which these structures are placed. The geometric regularity of the furrows in the foreground field occurs again and again in the subsequent landscapes, up to and including The Farm, 1921-22 (where it is barely visible on the extreme right edge), and The Tilled Field, 1923-24, in both of which the earlier vibrant Fauve colors have been transformed into a monochromatic brown.

Miró recently identified the colorful horizontal foreground bands as a field ploughed and ready for planting, and the wavy lines as string bean plants climbing up stakes. Moreover, he distinctly remembers having considerable difficulty resolving the problem of how to portray the latter (May 1974). Prades, approximately ten miles north of Miró’s family farm at Montroig, was one of a group of villages (including Cornudella, Cambrils, and Ciurana) which Miró depicted in the paintings of this period.
Prades, the Village, which has always been dated 1917, is extremely close in style to The Path, Ciurana, which is signed and dated 1917 (Dupin, 1962, repr. color, p. 67) and must indeed have been painted the same year. (Miró himself recalls that he worked on it during his military service. As Dupin states [p. 62], this service began in 1915 and totaled ten months, but was fulfilled in short periods of duty extending over several years. This chronology would be consistent with the stylistic evidence which argues for a date of 1917.)

The use of juxtaposed stripes of bright color in these landscapes, and even more strikingly in the 1917 picture North-South, strongly suggests the influence of Robert Delaunay’s paintings of 1916 such as Portuguese Women, where stripes similar in palette and mode of juxtaposition occur (Vriesen and Imdahl, 1969, color pl. 15). Delaunay spent the year 1916 in Spain and Portugal, and although it has hitherto not been possible to document a meeting between the two artists during that year, an exhibition of Delaunay’s work did take place in Barcelona, and Miró must certainly have seen it. (See Delaunay’s notes written ca. 1918-19 in Du Cubisme à l’art abstrait, Paris, 1957, p. 108, where he refers to the exhibition in Barcelona. Although he gives no date for it, the only possible occasion would have been his 1916-17 visit to that city. For the dating of the ca. 1918-19 notes see above cat. no. 36, fn. 3.) Which paintings Delaunay showed in this exhibition is not known. But the close relationship between his works of 1916 and aspects of Miró’s 1917 style would suggest that pictures such as Portuguese Women must have been included.

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:

3. Miró recalls that the picture was included in this exhibition (conversation with Rowell, May 1974). The only entry which might correspond to it is no. 10.
Personage. Summer 1925.1
(Personnage; Composition; Abstraction).

48.1172 x504

Oil and egg tempera (?) on canvas, 51/4 x 37 1/8 (130 x 96.2). Miró, in correspondence with the SRGM, 1967, specifically described the medium of the blue background as egg tempera. Tests conducted by O. H. Riley, October 1974, have been unsuccessful in confirming this. The medium appears rather to be cobalt blue oil applied with a turpentine wash over a zinc ground.

Signed and dated l.l.: Miró. / 1925.; on reverse: Joan Miró. / 1925.

PROVENANCE:

CONDITION:
In 1959, while the painting was on extended loan to the Hackley Art Gallery, Muskegon, Mich., it was accidentally sprayed in the lower center and lower right with fire extinguishing fluid, causing scattered bleaching of the blue pigment. The chemicals remaining on the surface were neutralized and the tiny bleached spots inpainted with watercolor and gouache in PBM. 2 areas of old repaint in the upper left were removed at this time and the tiny losses inpainted. These inpainted areas are mostly discolored and visible to the naked eye; they have not substantially effected the appearance of the blue background.

All the edges and corners show some slight wear. A strong stretcher impression is clearly visible on all 4 sides and horizontally across the center. This may be partly due to the effect on the wood, and hence on the canvas, of the turpentine thinner mixed with the pigment. Apart from this, the condition in general is good. (Nov. 1973.)

This painting, like many works of 1925-27, has most often been known as Painting or Composition (see below Exhibitions and References). Dupin, who published it with the title Painting, drew attention to the fact that very few of the works of this period were titled by Miró, and he specifically warned

1. Dupin (p. 157) describes the 1925 “dream paintings,” of which this is one, as having been painted in Paris. Miró specifically remembers, however, that the present work was painted during the summer at Montroig (correspondence with SRGM, Feb. 1967). See W. Rubin, Miró in The Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1973, p. 116, fn. 1, for a similar note on The Birth of the World, which was also painted at Montroig in the summer of 1925.
2. Miró remembers that Loeb (who had by then acquired exclusive rights to his work) acquired the picture shortly after it was painted while the artist was living at rue Tourlaque (conversation with Rowell, May 1974). This lends some support to R. T. Doepel’s contention that Miró’s move to rue Tourlaque, usually dated 1927, may have taken place in late 1925 or early 1926 (Aspects of Miró’s Stylistic Development, 1920-25, unpublished M.A. thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London, 1967, p. 33).
3. The 1946 Parke Bernet sale catalogue erroneously lists the previous owner as Lefèvre-Foinet, presumably on the basis of a Lefèvre-Foinet shipping label on the reverse. Lefèvre-Foinet’s records show that they shipped the painting to the United States in 1938, although they have hitherto not been able to establish to whom it was sent (correspondence with the author, July 1974). Chrysler, who had purchased other works from the Galerie Beaune, was almost certainly the recipient, although this has not yet been confirmed.
against giving titles to those which lacked them. Moreover, he reported Miró's own strenuous objection to the misleading (and sometimes vulgarizing) titles currently attached to some of these works (pp. 166, 168). Even in those instances where titles do exist, or when Miró has provided the most explicit diagrams identifying every individual image (W. Rubin, *Miró in the Collection of The Museum of Modern Art*, New York, 1973, pp. 22, 28), the possibilities for multiple interpretations still exist. Miró's own perception of the original stimuli, sources, and ultimate meanings of his imagery has often grown more complex in the face of probing questions, and—as Rowell has suggested—the poetic nature of his enterprise is "a hieroglyph of infinite connotations" (*Art News*, vol. 73, January 1974, p. 96).

In spite of the openness and ambiguities of Miró's iconography, however, recent literature has contributed considerably to a clearer understanding of the multiplicity of sources from which the imagery is derived. (See especially Doepel, Rowell and Krauss, Rubin; M. Rowell, January 1974, pp. 94-96.) In particular it has been shown that enriching interpretations of the imagery can emerge if based as far as possible upon the clues offered by Miró himself—the painter's own comments, the titles of the pictures, inscriptions, recurring iconographic motifs, and, wherever possible, preparatory drawings for the works. Most of the drawings remain hitherto unpublished in the artist's collection, but those which have become available demonstrate their rich potential for elucidation of the finished work. (See, for example, Rubin pp. 40-50; also J. J. Sweeney's publication of an extremely revealing 1940's drawing from Miró's private sketchbook. The drawing is inscribed in part as follows: "This cloud is too realistic; interpret the clouds with the poetic symbols of 1940 . . . this figure is too realistic, make use of symbols [signs] to interpret it . . ." ['"Miró," *Theatre Arts*, vol. xxxiii, March 1949, p. 40].) Clearly these notes suggest the extent to which Miró's drawings embody his gradual transformation of relatively realistic images into the symbolic sign language of the finished works. When drawings for other paintings from this 1924 to 1927 period become available they will almost certainly throw light on the origins of the often mysterious figures which inhabit them.

In the case of the present work, clues to an interpretation do exist, but they are ambiguous and inconclusive. The anthropomorphic designation "Personnage" is Miró's own. In correspondence with the Museum (February 1967), he specifically rejected the vagueness of *Composition* and substituted the more suggestive "Personnage." ("Le titre marqué de Composition me semble gratuit, j'aimerais que vous mettiez Personnage.") Attempts to probe further with Miró into the significance or background of this mysterious image have hitherto failed; he wished only to establish clearly that the figure was not an abstraction, but rather had some basis in the notion of person. In this sense the picture, and Miró's attitude to it, illustrates his well-known 1948 statement to Sweeney, "For me a form is never something abstract; it is always a sign of something" ('"Joan Miró: Comment and Interview," *Partisan Review*, vol. xv, February 1948, p. 208). The amorphous "personage" suspended in a blue
atmosphere is characteristic of a whole group of 1925 figures which Dupin has described as “devoid of all materiality, all corporeal density . . . They ignore the laws of gravitation; they hover in the clouds or glide through liquid or viscous matter. They are the very substance of dreams and hallucinations” (p. 164. For discussions of hallucinations in these paintings see Dupin, pp. 157ff.; also Doepel, pp. 3-4, 50-66, and Krauss, pp. 11-15, who focus upon the interrelated problems of automatism, so-called hallucinatory stimuli, and the clearly controlled quality of Miró’s art in this period; for an illuminating analysis of the role of automatism in the creation of The Birth of the World, 1925, see Rubin, pp. 30-33).

Rowell has suggested that the blue backgrounds of these 1925 paintings are in themselves suggestive of Miró’s break with physical reality: “the blue of the sky, namely, light, space, ether, infinity. Free from all associations with the earth, gravity, and form, blue appeared to be the most appropriate hue for the suspension and the diffusion of images which were Miró’s poetic concern” (1972, pp. 61, 63). Rowell’s illuminating discussion of the richly associative meanings of the color blue in Miró’s 1925 paintings centers principally on its use in “Photo: ceci est la couleur de mes rêves” but is clearly applicable to the blue ground works such as Personage.

While it is clear that many of Miró’s images carry similar meanings and associations in a number of paintings, his continual variation and modification of these motifs make any simple or mechanical interpretation of them impossible. While explication by analogy can throw light on their meanings, the images often remain open, ambiguous, or in some cases simply impenetrable. The iconography of the present painting, for example, is certainly susceptible of some elucidation, but it ultimately eludes detailed, explicit interpretation. Rowell and Krauss have stated: “The form is obviously meant to be an anthropomorphic figure, with an outsized head with teeth, and a large foot. The star-shaped sign on the head is usually a sign for the female genitals; here displaced to the head, it could be that, or an eye. The dotted circle around a spot radiating spokes also has two readings in keeping with Miró’s private sign language: the male genitals or an eye projecting lines of vision. These unresolved ambiguities hold the viewer in a state of conceptual suspension” (p. 101).

The identification of the mouth and teeth is apparent, and indeed the motif bears a striking resemblance to the corresponding motif in Picasso’s 1915 Harlequin, which Miró might well have known (The Museum of Modern Art, New York; the similarity was pointed out by L. Shearer, but it has hitherto not been possible to establish with certainty whether Harlequin was still in Picasso’s collection in 1925). The other images referred to by Rowell and Krauss pose more complicated problems. Although the tail-like appendage at the base of the figure does not compare with the much more explicit feet of many of these imaginary figures (see, for example, Person Throwing a Stone at a Bird, or Lovers [Dupin, nos. 172, 117]), it clearly does correspond to those of other anthropomorphic images, where the emphasis on the foot is inten-
tionally reduced. (See, for example, *The Siesta, Figure and Horse*, or *Nude, [Dupin, nos. 119, 121, 178].*) The “star-shaped sign” appears in a variety of contexts in Miró’s work of the 1920’s, though never demonstrably as an eye. Its identification as female genitals is, however, clearly documented in the 1924 *Woman and Insects* (Rowell and Krauss, repr. p. 114; as Rowell and Krauss have suggested, it appears here as a variation on Miró’s more common usage of the spider as female genitals). Its appearance in the upper portion of the composition in *The Siesta, Painting*, and “48” (Dupin, nos. 119, 143, 216) is in each case highly ambiguous, although conceivably readable as an erotic symbol. If this symbol is indeed generally to be read as the female genitals, its presence prominently placed near the top edge of *Dutch Interior 1 of 1928* (Rubin, p. 41) would presumably suggest the feminine and erotic nature of the diving bird for which it seems to serve as parachute.

Similar problems arise in connection with the dotted circle around a spot radiating spokes, in contrast to the star-shaped sign. The image appears in this particular form only rarely in Miró’s work, and never demonstrably as male genitals. The latter are in fact represented in *The Hunter*, and elsewhere, as distinctly egg-shaped forms radiating arc-shaped lines. Furthermore, the reproductive overtones of the explicit egg shape have been emphasized by Rowell and Krauss as well as by Rubin (Rowell and Krauss, p. 114; Rubin, p. 24). It is therefore difficult to accept the notion, without further evidence, that the image of a simple dot radiating straight spokes carries the same sexual meaning. The use of this latter symbol to denote an eye, the spokes being sight-lines indicating “the cone of vision as it intersects with the portion of the external world seen from a given point” (Rowell and Krauss, p. 77), is clearly articulated as such in *The Hunter* (Rubin, p. 22, no. 34 in the diagram), in *Head of a Catalan Peasant* (Rowell and Krauss, p. 85), and elsewhere. This would seem, therefore, to be a more plausible explanation for its presence in the Guggenheim painting. A further meaning may be indicated by the disembodied eye: this image was, as Rowell and Krauss have demonstrated, a classic symbol in the vocabulary of Surrealism for the artist himself (p. 77). In this sense the eye here, or possibly the *Personage* in its entirety, may be intended as a metaphor for the persona of the artist. (For additional comments on the background to Miró’s use of the disembodied eye, see Rubin, pp. 23-24.) (A dot with radiating spokes, but without a surrounding circle appears, among other places, in *The Birth of the World*, and it is seen by Rubin as “a spider-like little black star” [p. 33]; this is by analogy with the similar star, identified by Miró himself, in the upper left corner of *The Hunter* [p. 22, no. 6 in the diagram]. This image, which carries cosmic connotations, appears distinctly different in intention from that in the Guggenheim painting, where a circle surrounds the dot.)

The ambiguities presented by the imagery of *Personage* remain. Existing analogies would suggest that the most plausible origins for the two displaced motifs are the female genitals and the eye. The figure thus emerges as one defined primarily by its erotic aspect on the one hand, and its perceptual—
perhaps visionary—aspect on the other. Even if one allows for additional meanings to the two main symbols, the major iconographic significance of the *Personage* resides in its combination of the erotic and the visionary.

**EXHIBITIONS:**

Paris, Musée du Jeu de Paume, *Origines et développement de l'art international indépendant*, July 30-Oct. 31, 1937, no. 117 ("Personage, 1925"); Richmond, The Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, *Collection of Walter P. Chrysler, Jr.*, Jan. 16-Mar. 4, 1941, no. 140 (Abstraction), traveled to Philadelphia Museum of Art, Mar. 29-May 11, 1941; New York, SRGM 79 (checklist; Composition, the title by which the picture was known until SRGM 196, 1967, when it was changed to Personage); Toronto, SRGM 85-T, no. 59; Boston, SRGM 119-T, no. 41; New York, SRGM 144 (checklists); 187, *Gauguin and the Decorative Style* (checklist); 195 (no cat.); 196 (checklist); 205, *Rousseau, Redon, and Fantasy* (checklist); 227 (no cat.); 232, 241, p. 300, repr. p. 301; 257, Joan Miró: *Magnetic Fields*, no. 17, repr. (Painting [Personage]); 266 (no cat.).

**REFERENCES:**

Landscape (The Hare). Autumn 1927.1 (Paysage [le lièvre]; Landscape; The Hare; Scène; Peinture).

57.1459
Oil on canvas, 51 x 76¾ (129.6 x 194.6)
Signed and dated l.r.: Miró / 1927; inscribed by the artist on reverse: Joan Miró. / “Paysage” / 1927.

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist by Galerie Pierre (Pierre Loeb), Paris, 1927;2 purchased from Loeb by Max Pellequer, Paris, after 1933 (lent by Galerie Pierre to 1933 exhibition, Rockefeller Center, New York); purchased from Pellequer by Galerie Maeght, Paris, ca. 1950 (information supplied by Maeght, correspondence with the author, May 1974); purchased from Maeght, 1957.

CONDITION:
At an unrecorded date, probably prior to acquisition by the Museum, some scattered inpainting was carried out in the margin areas; this is discolored and readily visible to the naked eye.
The edges and corners show wear, abrasion, and some scattered chipping of the paint layer. The orange paint, which was applied to the entire surface, shows through the maroon in some places, causing the canvas to appear abraded. The upper left half of the orange area shows scattered stains and drips; these, and the unevenly applied, discolored varnish, are almost impossible to remove since the paint is dangerously susceptible to solvents. The overall condition is fair. (Dec. 1973.)

As W. Rubin has stated, the landscapes of 1926 and 1927 are clearly more anecdotal and “terrestrial” in nature than the ethereal conceptions of 1925 (Miró in the Collection of The Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1973, p. 37). The amorphous, intentionally indeterminate blue or bistre space of the 1925 works (see above cat. no. 184) gives way to a landscape space explicitly defined as such by the prominent horizon line which occurs in almost all of these later paintings (Dupin, nos. 172, 173, 175-177, 179-183, and others). It is interesting to note that Miró himself saw this clearly defined horizon as deriving from the influence of his teacher, Modesto Urgell: “I remember two paintings by Urgell in particular, both characterised by long straight twilit horizons which cut the picture in halves…” (Partisan Review, vol. xv, February 1948, p. 209).

Dupin, who emphasizes that these landscapes had no titles, describes the present painting as follows:

... there is nothing but a single odd creature, meticulously painted in several colors, apparently fascinated by the spiral path of a comet. All the rest

1. Miró (in correspondence with the SRGM, Nov. 1966) dated the work “Autumn 1927, Montroig,” suggesting that it was one of the very last of the 14 large “landscapes” executed during the summers of 1926 and 1927.

2. Loeb had exclusive rights to Miró’s work in 1927, and he purchased the picture soon after it was painted (conversation with Rowell, May 1974). It has hitherto not been possible to establish when Pellequer purchased the picture from Loeb.
is sky or earth, the purplish red of the latter and the orange of the former presenting an especially intense contrast. The animal has been particularized by both the drawing and the color; Miró’s point of departure was an elementary form, in a sense ‘biological’... Like nature herself, he works from the embryo, from the mother cells which grow and develop, split up, take on various fixed forms, but always according to a continuous process, in obedience to laws of organic development.

Rowell (1970) defines the image more explicitly and attributes to it more cosmic implications: “The hare is a simple organic shape, symbolic of primal being. A falling comet with its fiery tail provides a pretext for the familiar dynamic (often circular or spiral) dotted line. The juxtaposition of hare and comet as well as the equality assigned to both earth and heavens express a reconciliation between earthly and cosmic forces, reality and dreams.”

Rowell and Krauss relate the formal qualities of the painting and its imagery to Landscape with Rabbit and Flower, 1927, and suggest that both works share the erotic overtones of a “strange isolated animal transfixed by an apparition of female sexuality.” The spiral form is read here as possibly representative of the “dazzle of evanescent fantasy.”

Miró himself has recently testified (conversation with Rowell, May 1974) to the actual circumstances which surrounded the creation of this picture: while spending the summer at Montroig he was one evening looking across an unplanted brown field; as the sun was setting, a hare streaked across the scene before his eyes. The dotted spiral was intended to suggest the sun. Miró emphasizes that his title for the work is Landscape (The Hare).

The fact that the original stimulus for the painting was an actual event which Miró can recall does not, of course, preclude the possibility that the image had poetic implications beyond the merely anecdotal. There are not, however, clear analogies elsewhere in Miró’s oeuvre which might justify the reading of the dotted spiral as “an apparition of female sexuality.” Rather it would seem that Dupin’s emphasis on the essentially biological character of the creature corresponds more closely to Miró’s own sense of having wanted to convey the impression of a specific animal’s impact on his consciousness as he surveyed a deserted scene. The hare appears to be motionless, while the sun “streaks” through the sky; the dotted spiral of the sun’s path seems thus to have become a metaphor for the hare’s speed and links these two principal actors in the scene. The anecdotal aspect of the work is clearly secondary to the pictorial, which is conveyed by the juxtaposition of intense purple-red (the earth) and brilliant orange (the sky)—a dramatic effect which makes the picture closely comparable to the exactly contemporary Landscape with Rabbit and Flower, where an intense blue and red are similarly juxtaposed. (Rubin, p. 38, has given a striking analysis of precisely these pictorial aspects of the latter work; see also Krauss, p. 37, who, however, describes the rabbit as white instead of its actual yellow.)
EXHIBITIONS:
Paris, Galerie Georges Bernheim & Cie, Miró, May 1-15, 1928 (no cat.);
Brussels, Galerie Le Centaure, Joan Miró, May 11-22, 1929 (no cat.; repr. in exhibition review by W. George);
Krefeld, Kaiser Wilhelm Museum, Joan Miró, Jan. 10-Feb. 14, 1954, no. 3 ("Der Hase, 1927"), traveled to Stuttgart, Württembergische Staatsgalerie, Feb. 21-Mar. 28, 1954, Berlin, Haus am Waldsee, Apr. 18-May 2, 1954; Palais des Beaux-Arts de Bruxelles, Joan Miró, Jan. 6-Feb. 7, 1956, no. 32, repr. (Le Lièvre); Rome, SRGM 104-T (not in cat.; joined exhibition Dec. 26, 1957); Cologne, SRGM 104-T, no. 52, repr. (Landschaft; the picture is known as Landscape in all subsequent SRGM publications until SRGM 257, 1973, when the title was changed to Landscape (The Hare));

REFERENCES:
W. George, "Miró et le Miracle ressuscité," Le Centaure, 3e année, May 1, 1929, repr. p. 205 (Peinture); Cabiers de Belgique, 2e année, Miró issue, June 1929, repr. p. 207 (Paysage);

3. Miró (in correspondence with the SRGM, Nov. 1966, and in conversation with Rowell, May 1974) confirmed the identification of this work as one of the 14 pictures exhibited at Georges Bernheim's gallery in 1928 under the auspices of Loeb. For further information on this exhibition, see Dupin, pp. 180, 189.

Amedeo Modigliani

Born July 1884, Leghorn.
MODIGLIANI

186

Nude, 1917.
(Nu; Nu couché; Dormeuse aux mains
derrière la nuque; Nudo dagli occhi chiusi,
con collana; La dormeuse).

41-535
Oil on canvas, 28 3/4 x 45 3/8 (73 x 116.7)
Signed u.r.: modigliani; inscribed on re-
verse, probably by the artist (transcribed
but not photographed before lining):
Modigliani / 3 Joseph Bara / Paris / 1917.1

PROVENANCE:
Leopold Zborowski, Paris (Pfannstiel, 1929,
p. 23, no dates of ownership given); Louis
Libaude, Paris (Ibid., p. 23, no dates of
ownership given).2 Galerie Bing et Cie,
Paris, by 1925 (Galerie Bing exhibition cata-
logue);3 Félix Fénéon, Paris, by 1926
(Société des Indépendants catalogue); pur-
chased from Fénéon by Solomon R. Gug-
genheim, 1938; Gift of Solomon R. Guggen-
heim, 1941.

CONDITION:
In 1955 the work was mounted on a new
stretcher; in 1966 it was lined with wax resin
and some superficial soil was removed.
The corners are badly worn with loss of
paint and ground and the edges also show
some losses. The condition is otherwise
elegant. (Sept. 1973.)

Although dated 1918 by Salmon (and in the 1928 Drawing and Design, prob-
ably dependent upon the latter), the picture has otherwise consistently been
dated 1917, which is corroborated by the inscription formerly visible on the
reverse (see above).

Jeanne Modigliani characterized the final three years of the artist’s life as
ones in which various styles and techniques coexisted and overlapped, making
the establishment of a reliable chronology almost impossible (pp. 82-83); and
indeed the sequence and precise dating of the approximately twenty-six nudes
which Modigliani painted during the years 1916 to 1919 remains problematic.
F. Russoli, in an article published in 1958, also discussed the extensive prob-
lems that have been faced by all Modigliani scholars who have attempted to
present a chronology of the artist’s oeuvre (“Modigliani e la critica,” La Bien-
nale di Venezia, no. 33, October-November 1958, pp. 7-15). The recent pub-
lications by Ceroni (1970) and Lanthemann offer neither documentary evidence
nor stylistic discussion to support their considerably different dating of these
works, and other publications have similarly failed to cite documentary or
stylistic evidence to support their presentations of the artist’s late style. The
artist’s occasional practice of inscribing a work with the name of the place in
which it was executed has provided one of the few reliable sources of documen-

1. 3, rue Joseph Bara was the address of Leopold Zborowski, whose apartment Modigliani
used as his studio during 1917.
2. B. Weill (Pant dans l’Oeil!, Paris, 1933, pp. 229-230) states that Libaude purchased a num-
er of Modigliani paintings in 1920 when he heard the artist was dying, but that he had
bought none before that. P. Sicel (Modigliani, New York, 1967, p. 402) records that
Libaude came to Zborowski’s apartment after the Weill exhibition of late 1917 to look at
and to buy works by the artist; neither account can be verified. Part of the Libaude col-
collection was sold at Hôtel Drouot, Paris, May 18, 1920, but the present picture was not in
that sale.
3. No lenders are listed in the catalogue and the works apparently all belonged to Bing. See
REFERENCES for additional evidence of Bing’s ownership.
tation, and the inscription carried by the present work should, therefore, be
treated as an important piece of corroborating evidence.

Since the Zborowskis only moved into their apartment in the rue Joseph
Bara in the winter of 1916-17, and since Modigliani is known to have used
space there as his studio during that winter (Ceroni, 1958, p. 25; F. Carco,
L’Ami des peintres, Paris, 1953, p. 36; Sichel, p. 333), the inscription would
support the 1917 date usually ascribed to the painting.

Two other oil portraits of the same unidentified model must have been
painted at approximately the same time: Seated Nude with Necklace (Collect-
tion Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Colin, New York, 36½ x 23½ in., 92.1 x 60 cm.,
Ceroni, 1970, repr. no. 187); and Reclining Nude with Necklace (Allen Me-
memorial Art Museum, Oberlin, Ohio, 25½ x 39½ in., 65.1 x 100 cm., Ceroni,
1970, repr. no. 185). The Colin picture apparently is not inscribed, but the
Oberlin version bears an inscription identical with that of the Guggenheim
painting. Russell, who first suggested that these three works represented the
same model, characterized her nature as “relatively withdrawn and inward,”
and as such distinct from all Modigliani’s other late nudes (p. 19, no. 36). This
characterization is especially true of the Guggenheim and Colin pictures, less
so of the Oberlin version.

Both the Guggenheim and the Oberlin Nudes show to an unusual degree the
influence of Titian, first noted in general terms by Jeanne Modigliani in rela-
tion to the entire group of 1917-19 Nudes (p. 83). The Oberlin Nude is very
close to the Uffizi’s ca. 1538 Venus of Urbino, not only in its similar pose, its
diagonal placement, and its relationship to the pillows and drapery upon
which it leans, but even more significantly in its almost identically conceived
relationship to the viewer. The Guggenheim picture is similarly related—if
somewhat less strikingly so—to the Dresden Sleeping Venus (probably begun
by Giorgione and finished by Titian in about 1508).

While Modigliani is known to have studied the works in the Uffizi during
his pre-1906 student days in Florence and to have been deeply impressed by
Venetian art (Sichel, pp. 47, 56, 60), it is not known whether he was specifi-
cally drawn to the works of Titian. P. Alexandre recalls, however, from his many
visits to Modigliani’s studio, that the walls were covered with postcard repro-
ductions of the old masters (C. Roy, Modigliani, Geneva, 1958, p. 30; see also
Sichel, p. 124). Neither these reproductions, nor the books which Modigliani
may have owned at the time appear to have been preserved. It is therefore
impossible to establish with certainty whether the two Titians were among
Modigliani’s immediately available sources of inspiration, but the visual evi-
dence offered by the Nudes themselves would strongly suggest that they were.
pp. 2-12, has offered some suggestive observations on the influence of Klimt
and the Vienna Secessionist group on the development of Modigliani’s linear
style. Modigliani’s access to these works, and others discussed by Salvini,
would also have been dependent on reproductions—which were by then avail-
able—rather than on the works themselves.)
EXHIBITIONS:


REFERENCES:


4. There is no way of establishing which Nudes by Modigliani were included in the exhibition, but it is possible that the present picture was among them. I am indebted to F. S. Wight for a copy of the checklist on which the dates are Dec. 3-30, 1917. According to Weill, however, the exhibition was closed for obscenity on Dec. 3rd by the police, whose attention was drawn to it by the display of a Nude in the window (op.cit.). No reports of the closing of the exhibition have hitherto been located in the French newspapers or periodicals of the period.

5. The Guggenheim Nude is visible in 2 installation photographs of this exhibition published by A. Ceroni (1965, pp. 18, 19). It is impossible to say which of the checklist entries corresponds to it.
Boy in Blue Jacket. 1918.

(Garçon à la veste bleue; Le Gosse du concierge).

37:532

Oil on canvas, 36⅞ x 24 (92.2 x 61)

Signed u.r.: modigliani. Not dated.

Provenance:


Condition:

In 1957 the surface was cleaned with Soilax, rinsed with petroleum benzine, and coated with PBM. In 1958 the canvas was lined with wax resin and the stretcher replaced. In 1962 superficial soil was removed and worn areas along the 4 margins were inpainted with colors in PBM.

There are a number of vertical paint cracks in the blue jacket and in the light-colored background on the right. The upper right margins, the lower left and lower right corners, are severely abraded with losses and some damage to the support. The condition is otherwise good. (Nov. 1972.)

This portrait, as well as a closely related one of the same sitter now in the John Herron Art Museum, Indianapolis (not in Pfannstiel; Ceroni, 1970, repr. no. 297), dates from Modigliani’s stay in the South of France between March or April 1918 and May 31, 1919. The Indianapolis picture is inscribed “Cagnes” and there is little doubt that both pictures were painted there. Jeanne Modigliani (Modigliani: Man and Myth, New York, 1958, pp. 88, 92, 93, 95) documents various addresses at which her father lived and worked in the Nice-Cagnes area, but gives no specific dates for the Cagnes visit. Sichel (pp. 404-405, 408-409, 414-415) documents the Cagnes period as dating specifically from April to July 1918, when the family moved to Nice. Since the two towns are so close, it is possible that Modigliani went back to Cagnes again after he had moved to Nice; given his most precarious state of health, however, it seems unlikely that he would have done much unnecessary traveling. The probability that both pictures date from the spring or early summer of 1918 is thus considerable. (The present portrait has been consistently dated 1918 except by Lantheumann, who dates it 1919 without documentation or discussion. The Indianapolis portrait is dated 1919 by both Ceroni and Lantheumann, in both cases without discussion.)

The identity of the sitter has not been established. Its designation in the 1925 and 1927 exhibitions as Le Gosse du concierge relates it directly to a portrait

¹. The dates of Netter’s ownership have not been finally established, but he had sold the picture to Bing by 1925. Since he began to buy works by Modigliani in 1918, he may well have purchased the picture soon after it was painted. (He still owned a large group of 1917-19 pictures in 1934, when he lent 21 of them to the Modigliani exhibiton at the Kunsthalle in Basel. For further information on Netter’s support of Modigliani see P. Sichel, Modigliani, New York, 1967, pp. 402-403, 420, and F. Carco, L’Ami des peintres, Paris, 1953, p. 38-39.)
with the same title in the collection of Jean Masurel (Pfannstiel, 1929, pp. 38-39 of catalogue présumé; 1956, no. 243; Ceroni, 1970, no. 239). Like the Indianapolis picture, this portrait is inscribed "Cagnes," but the face is clearly that of another child. It is conceivable, thus, that the Masurel picture portrays one son, the Guggenheim and Indianapolis pictures a second son of the concierge at Modigliani's Cagnes address. According to Sichel, he stayed for part of that spring at Anders Osterlind's villa La Rianté, Chemin des Colletes in Cagnes. For part of the time at least he also apparently stayed in a farmhouse located between Les Trois Soeurs and the Hotel Des Colonies. The boy in the Masurel portrait and the one in the Indianapolis picture sit on identical chairs.
and may perhaps be posing in the same room. However, it has hitherto not been possible to establish either the location of this room or the identity of the two boys. (Jeffrey Robinson of St. Laurent-du-Var has kindly explored the area on behalf of the author and attempted to establish these facts. While several details have been clarified in the process, the precise evidence is still lacking.)

**EXHIBITIONS:**


**REFERENCES:**


\(^2\) The picture appears in the installation photographs published by Ceroni (1965, pp. 18-19).

\(^3\) An early photograph of the work preserved in the SRGM archives carries on the reverse, in Fénéon’s hand, exhibition history and references for the picture; the Zurich exhibition and catalogue number are included. The work was returned to Bing after the exhibition (information supplied by Dr. A. Schlatter, correspondence with the author, Dec. 1972), and Fénéon probably purchased it shortly afterwards.

\(^4\) The wrong dimensions given by Pfannstiel (92 x 73 cm.), and thereafter repeatedly published elsewhere, were apparently inadvertently supplied by Fénéon, whose photograph of the work (see fn. 3) carries them.
Portrait of a Student. ca. 1918-1919. (L’Étudiant).

45.997
Oil on canvas, 24 x 18½ (60.9 x 46)
Signed u.r.: modigliani. Not dated.

PROVENANCE:
Dr. O. Sabouraud, Paris, by 1933 (Palais des Beaux-Arts exhibition catalogue)—at least 1934 (Kunsthalle Basel exhibition catalogue); Jacques Dubourg, Paris, by 1942; purchased from Dubourg by H. S. Southam, Ottawa, by 1942 (information supplied by Dominion Gallery, Montreal, correspondence with the author, January 1973); purchased from Southam by Dominion Gallery, Montreal, June 1945; purchased from Dominion by Fine Arts Associates, New York, 1945 (information supplied by Mrs. Otto Gerson, correspondence with the author, January 1972); Karl Nierendorf, New York, 1945; purchased from Nierendorf, 1945.

CONDITION:
At some point prior to 1954 (possibly prior to acquisition), a tear near the lower left corner was repaired by the application of a patch to the reverse with glue. In 1954 this patch was removed as it apparently caused blistering of the paint film in that area. In 1957 the glue residue in the area was removed, the canvas lined with wax resin and the area of loss (approximately 1 in. x 3/8 in.) filled and inpainted. The surface was then coated with PBM.

Apart from 2 small losses, and some fine horizontal cracks in the paint film, the condition is excellent. (Dec. 1972.)
The same sitter, who has not been identified, may be represented in a larger portrait, Young Man with Red Hair, now in the Cummings collection, Beverly Hills, although this is not certain (Pfannstiel, 1956, no. 345; Ceroni, no. 301; Lanthemann, no. 406). Lanthemann suggests that the Cummings picture (dated 1919 in all the sources), and the present portrait, may possibly represent a woman. However, the facial type and the barest indication of a moustache would suggest that the figure is male.

The problem of dating this work is similar in nature to that of Jeanne Hébuterne with Yellow Sweater (cat. no. 189). Whether Portrait of a Student and the Cummings portrait were painted in the South of France, or possibly after the return to Paris, is unclear. A date of ca. 1918-19, though inconclusive, is for the time being the most plausible.

EXHIBITIONS:
Palais des Beaux-Arts de Bruxelles, Modigliani, Nov. 1933, no. 39 ("L'Etudiant, dated 1917, Collection Sabouraud"); Kunsthalle Basel, Modigliani, Jan. 7-Feb. 4, 1934, no. 31 (dated 1917, Collection Sabouraud); Ottawa, National Gallery of Canada, Paintings from the Collection of H. S. Southam of Ottawa, May 27-July 2, 1944, no. 22 (not dated), traveled to Art Associates of Montreal, Aug. 27-Sept. 27, 1944; New York, SRGM 79 (checklist; withdrawn Nov.); Toronto, SRGM 85-T, no. 60, repr.; Vancouver, SRGM 88-T, no. 63, repr.; Boston, SRGM 90-T (no cat.); Montreal, SRGM 93-T, no. 44; New York, SRGM 97 (checklist); London, SRGM 104-T, no. 53, pl. 9; Boston, SRGM 119-T, no. 43 (dated 1917?; so dated in all subsequent SRGM publications); Lexington, Ky., SRGM 122-T, no. 22, repr.; New York, SRGM 129, 132, 144 (checklists); 173, no. 45, repr.; 196 (checklist); 202, p. 89, repr.; 227 (no cat.); 232, 241, p. 317, repr. p. 316; 251, 266 (no cats.).

REFERENCES:
Jeanne Hébuterne with Yellow Sweater. 1918-1919.
(Le Sweater jaune; The Yellow Sweater).

37:533
Oil on canvas, 39⅜ x 25⅜ (100 x 64.7)
Signed u.r.: modigliani; inscribed on stretcher, possibly, but not certainly by the artist (transcribed but not photographed before replacement of stretcher): le sweater jaune Ebuterne Amedeo Modigliani. Not dated.

PROVENANCE:

CONDITION:
In 1953 the work was cleaned with 2% Soilax and benzine and coated with Ozenfant’s wax. Some small losses were inpainted and the surface coated with PBM. Apart from wear at the edges and corners, and some minor stains and paint losses, the condition is good. (Dec. 1972.)

This picture belongs to a group of portraits of Jeanne Hébuterne which have been variously dated 1918, 1919, and 1920. However, no convincing evidence has been presented for the sequence or dating of the more than twenty portraits that Modigliani painted of Hébuterne between 1917 and 1920 (not one of which was dated by the artist). The Guggenheim portrait does seem to belong to that group of pictures painted in Nice and Cagnes between March or April of 1918 and the end of May 1919; but it has as yet not been possible to establish a firm date for it within this period. (For details about this year-long sojourn in the South of France, see above cat. no. 187.)

An examination of the literature on Modigliani illustrates the lack of consensus on this issue. Pfannstiel’s 1956 catalogue contains nineteen portraits of Hébuterne, three of which he assigns to 1917, nine to 1918, four to 1919, three to 1920. Ceroni’s 1970 catalogue contains twenty-six; four are placed in 1917, ten in 1918, twelve in 1919. Lantheumann’s 1970 catalogue contains twenty-five; four are placed in 1917, two in 1918, eighteen in 1919, and one in 1920. Lantheumann’s and Ceroni’s actual lists do not differ significantly from one another, but neither they nor Pfannstiel have attempted to define or justify their view of the artist’s stylistic development during these years. It is not clear, therefore, why Lantheumann has assigned almost all of the portraits to 1919, whereas Ceroni has made a much more equal distribution of them over the years 1918 and 1919.

1. Zborowski’s ownership is recorded in Pfannstiel’s 1956 catalogue, but not in the 1929 edition. It has hitherto not been possible to verify it from any other source.
2. Bing’s ownership is recorded in Pfannstiel’s 1929 and 1956 editions. It has hitherto not been possible to establish whether Bing owned the work by the time of the 1925 Paris exhibition. The painting is not visible in the installation photographs published by Ceroni (Modigliani, Milan, 1965, pp. 18-19), but only 27 of the 36 exhibited works are reproduced there. It is possible, therefore, that the present picture was included.
Both J. Modigliani and P. Sichel have gone far towards establishing the chronology of Modigliani’s various addresses during the Nice-Cagnes year (see above cat. no. 187). But both have acknowledged that uncertainties remain; indeed Jeanne Modigliani suggested that many of the dating problems posed by her father’s oeuvre might only be solved when details of furnishings and backgrounds in the individual paintings could be correlated with interiors in which the artist is known to have worked (Modigliani: Man and Myth, New York, p. 67). No research along the lines proposed has yet been published. Lanthemann states, without elaboration, in dating his no. 419, that the interior in which Jeanne is portrayed, and her pregnant state, prove that the picture was painted in January 1920. However, since the couple were living at rue de la Grande-Chaumière from the end of June 1919 until Modigliani’s final departure for the hospital on January 18, 1920, and since Jeanne would certainly have been visibly pregnant by about October or November of 1919, it is difficult to know why January 1920 is a more certain date than, for example, any month between October 1919 and January 1920. Lanthemann’s further claim that his catalogue raisonné finally establishes firm dates for the entire Modigliani oeuvre is similarly unsupported by evidence and is therefore difficult to evaluate.

In a study of the chronology of the Hébuterne portraits, six are especially close in style to the present version and should be taken into account in any attempt to establish a sequence. They are Pfannstiel, 1956, nos. 289, 290, 325, 337, 355, and Ceroni, 1970, no. 260 (not in Pfannstiel). All six are published by both Ceroni (nos. 218, 219, 260, 326, 328, 335) and Lanthemann (nos. 259, 339, 347, 355, 388, 419), and the dates for even this small group are the subject of considerable dispute. Until further research such as that proposed by Jeanne Modigliani has been carried out, a date of 1918-19 for all of these portraits remains the most plausible.

Jeanne Hébuterne was born in 1898 to Achille Casimir Hébuterne and Endoxie Anais Teller, natives of Meaux (Seine-et-Marne). When she met Modigliani in 1917, she lived with her parents at 8 bis, rue Amyot, in Paris; her father was chief cashier at a perfume shop, her brother was a painter, and she herself was a student at the Académie Colarossi where Modigliani had also studied in 1906. In July of 1917 Jeanne and Amedeo rented a joint studio at 8, rue de la Grande-Chaumière, and she remained his devoted companion until the day of his death. Their first child, Jeanne Modigliani, was born in the maternity hospital, Nice, November 29, 1918; she became pregnant for the second time in about May 1919. In a document dated June 7, 1919, Modigliani pledged that he would marry Jeanne as soon as the papers arrived, but the marriage never took place. Modigliani died on January 24, 1920, and the following morning Jeanne, in the ninth month of her pregnancy, jumped to her death from her parent’s fifth floor apartment (biographical facts provided by Jeanne Modigliani, pp. 87-89, 95, 97-99; P. Sichel, Modigliani, New York, 1967, pp. 347-349, 357-358, 449, 493-507).
EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:

3. Portraits of Jeanne Hébuterne were shown in several early exhibitions of Modigliani's work, and it is impossible to establish whether the present picture was involved. For example: Geneva, Exposition internationale d'art moderne, Dec. 26, 1920-Jan. 25, 1921, no. 95 (Portait de la femme de l'artiste); Paris, Bernheim-Jeune, Modigliani, Feb. 7-21, 1922, no. 9 (Hébuterne); Venice, Biennale, 1922, p. 57 (Hébuterne); etc.

4. Pfannstiel records the picture's appearance in the Zurich exhibition (although in his 1929 edition he erroneously gives it the catalogue no. 106 [Sitzender Akt]); the Kunsthaus records show that the picture was returned to Bing afterwards. Fénéon probably purchased both this painting and Boy in Blue Jacket on the same occasion shortly after the Zurich exhibition.
László Moholy-Nagy

Born July 1895, Borsod, Hungary.
Died November 1946, Chicago.

NOTE: Moholy-Nagy’s Work on Plastic

Moholy-Nagy began to paint on transparent plastic materials in the early 1920’s.¹ These “early celluloid and gallalith pictures before 1925 had been attempts to render lighted pigment, to give to the known color values a new radiance expressing the joy of perceiving an infinite variety of hues. But the media were unsatisfactory. Celluloid cracked and yellowed, gallalith warped easily, and the commercial dyes were too crude to blend with the carefully mixed oil paints.”²

Moholy temporarily discontinued his experiments with transparent plastics around 1925, but wrote that this work was not only instrumental in changing his painting technique, but “... had inevitable repercussions on my thinking concerning light problems.”³ He found that “by producing real radiant light effects through transparent dyes on plastic, and through other means, one has no need for translating light into color by painting with pigment.”⁴

In 1926 the patent on the American plastic Bakelite expired and its production under the name of Trolitan began in Germany.⁵ Moholy, who was working at the Dessau Bauhaus from 1923-28, executed a number of works on this new opaque plastic.

After living for a few years in Berlin and Amsterdam, Moholy moved to London in 1935. Later in that year he began to experiment with transparent plastics once again.⁶ His first “light modulator” was completed early in 1936 on a material called Rhodoid. (This picture, titled Rho Transparent 51, present whereabouts unknown, is illustrated by S. Moholy-Nagy, Moholy-Nagy, Experiment in Totality, New York, 1950, pl. 48.) Moholy is quite specific about his aims in these “light modulators”:

There has been in the past a period of light painting, that of stained-glass windows. There, direct and reflected light and the shadow of the framing combined with projected colored light into a fascinating visual unity. Our technology offers new possibilities, no less impressive, and without imitating the old techniques. At present the central problem of painting on transparent sheets is the reality of direct light effects. In my first experiments I learned that I must have a screen upon which the light effects of the painting could be

² Ibid.
³ Ibid., p. 199.
⁴ Ibid.
projected. So I mounted the painted sheet several inches in front of plain white or light gray backgrounds. There I observed that solid shapes on transparent sheets cast solid shadows. To dissolve and articulate the heavy shadows one has to employ various means. There is a possibility of scratching the surface with fine lines of different density which throw shadows of varied gray values on the screen, similar to the fine gradations of grays in the photogram. To paint stripes similar to grill- or lattice-work, or to perforate solid surfaces, is another possibility. Such elements, if lighted, cast alternating shadows and light patterns on the background behind the painted surface. Upon these patterns the original painting is superimposed. If lighted from the side, the shapes of the original and its shadows appear shifted, creating a new relationship between the colors and their gray shadows. This intensifies considerably the effect of the usual shadowless paintings. It produces automatically a "light texture," especially if transparent dyes are used instead of pigments. The results, although very pleasing, bring some danger with them. The smooth perfection of the plastics, their light-flooded, sparkling planes, could easily lure one into an effective but decorative performance. I attempted to avoid this, especially when remembering my Louvre and Vatican visits, where I observed the "masterpieces" of late Roman sculptors who tried to outdo each other by using expensive polished marbles, colored bronzes, precious stones, ebony and gold.  

Moholy was pleased with the new plastic materials, but was aware of the difficulties in working with them:

Though plastics are new materials, not thoroughly tested, I had the feeling that one has to work with them, in spite of the danger of pretty effects. It may take decades until we will really know the material, and before we can develop a genuine technique to handle them. Even technical problems of painting on these new materials are yet unsolved. After doubtful experiments with industrial lacquers, which were not fast, I tried to paint with oil pigments on transparent sheets. In order to avoid the danger of the colors peeling off, I scratched hundreds and thousands of very fine lines into the plastic to be painted, hoping they would hold the pigment. I covered these engraved lines with oil paint which was held in and between the little crevices. I often painted on the front and back of the sheets too, so that my attempts to create space articulation by the relationships of receding and advancing colors were enhanced by the thickness of the sheet; that is, the real distance between the colors applied in front and in back. In addition I achieved differentiations in the appearance of the same color showing through or seen on the polished surfaces. The new material also needed a specific brush technique, which led to rather unexpected textures. Later, instead of covering and filling the fine engraved lines with a homogeneous color layer, I sometimes only rubbed color into them. By certain combinations of colored hair lines and their fine

shadows, intensified, vibrating color effects appeared, an iridescence which I had admired so much in thin glass vessels buried thousands of years. Translated into oil pigment, Renoir was a great master of such effects. I felt happy to achieve a similar refinement in the handling of colors by simpler means. These new effects with their emotional content and spiritual aspirations can only be grasped, however, after their “novelty” aspect has been overcome by serious consideration of the problem involved.8

Moholy even went to the length of suggesting that “... the use of flaws and bubbles in the plastics, may lead to even more startling results.”9 (Space Modulator, cat. no. 196, in the Guggenheim Museum Collection may be an example of the artist’s exploitation of such flaws in his material.) So pleased was Moholy with the new synthetic materials that he wrote that had he not been afraid that the plastics were not permanent, he would never have painted on canvas again.10

In 1936 the production of a new transparent plastic sheet, Plexiglas, was begun in America by Rohm and Haas, Inc.;11 Moholy began to use it immediately. The new material was smoother than Rhodoid, but less flexible and did not require so firm a support.12 The smoothness of the medium raised problems of paint adhesion, but the toughness, stability, and greater availability of Plexiglas ultimately recommended it to Moholy over all others.13

8. Ibid., p. 84.
9. Ibid., p. 84.
10. Ibid., p. 83.
13. Ibid.
Plastic Materials Used by Moholy-Nagy

CELLULOID:

Celluloid is the trade name of the Celanese Corporation of America for a plastic composed essentially of cellulose nitrate and camphor. Celluloid was among the first plastic materials to be invented and was first produced in 1869 by the American chemist John Hyatt (1827-1920).

Properties:
1. Sheets of celluloid are clear, tough, and flexible.
2. Celluloid is easily pigmented.
3. Celluloid is easily soluble in alcohol, ketones, and esters and is decomposed by concentrated acids. The material is also affected by alkali.
4. Celluloid is dangerously flammable and has fallen from general use chiefly for this reason.
5. Celluloid quickly discolors in sunlight and, thus, does not weather well.

BAKELITE:

Bakelite is a trade name currently owned by the Union Carbide Corporation for a phenol-formaldehyde resin. Bakelite was the first thermosetting plastic to be manufactured. The original Bakelite (the name now applies to a wide range of products) was first produced by the chemist L. H. Baekeland (1863-1944). He patented his discovery in 1907 and began commercial production three years later. The trade name was acquired by Union Carbide at a later date.

Properties:
1. Sheets of Bakelite are hard, opaque, and infusible.
2. Bakelite is black and cannot be pigmented easily.
3. Bakelite is highly resistant to moisture and to most solvents, both organic and acid. The material is decomposed only by concentrated oxidizing acids or hot alkali.
4. Bakelite is dimensionally stable and will resist high heat; to 400-600°F.
5. The material is virtually unaffected by weathering and sunlight.

TROLITAN:

Trolitan is the trade name of the Dynamit Nobel Corporation of West Germany for a phenol-formaldehyde resin virtually identical to Bakelite in its appearance and properties.

Production of Trolitan in Germany began in 1926 with the expiration of Baekeland’s patent on his formula for Bakelite.

GALALITH:

Galalith (artificial horn) is a trade name for a casein-formaldehyde thermoplastic. Invention of Galalith was made in Germany around 1885; commercial production began shortly thereafter.

Properties:
1. Sheets of Galalith are tough, horny, and may be either translucent or opaque.
2. Sheets of Galalith can be pigmented.
3. Galalith is not resistant to moisture, swelling and softening when wet.
4. Galalith is relatively unaffected by most organic liquids, but is decomposed by concentrated acids and alkali.
5. Heat causes Galalith to swell and ultimately char.

RHODOID:

Rhodoid is a trade name for a cellulose acetate polymer.

4. Ibid., pp. 197, 202.
5. Ibid., p. 149.
Properties:
1. Sheets of Rhodoid are clear, tough, and flexible.
2. Rhodoid may be easily pigmented.
3. Rhodoid is soluble in only a very limited range of organic liquids, chiefly ketones. Concentrated acid will decompose Rhodoid.
4. Rhodoid does not burn or distort readily with heat.
5. Rhodoid is relatively unaffected by either weathering or sunlight.

PLEXIGLAS:

Plexiglas is the trade name of the Rohm and Haas Company for its poly-methyl-methacrylate plastic sheet. Plexiglas was the first so-called acrylic resin to be produced. First synthesized in Germany in 1910 by the chemist, Röhm, the material was not produced commercially in sheet form until 1936 in America.

Properties:
1. Sheets of Plexiglas are light in weight, tough, flexible, and clear.
2. Plexiglas is easily pigmented.
3. Plexiglas is soluble in organic liquids such as ketones, esters, and aromatic hydrocarbons, but is resistant to most acids and alkali.
4. Plexiglas is slow to burn, but distorts at ca. 180°F.
5. Plexiglas is resistant to weathering and virtually unaffected by sunlight.
6. Plexiglas has unique optical properties which allow it to be used for making lenses. Sheets and rods of this material are also capable of transmitting light through the interior of the plastic from edge to edge.

CELON:

Celon is the trade name of the Dynamit Nobel Corporation of West Germany for its polycaproamide (essentially Nylon) plastic.

Properties:
1. Celon is tough and horn-like; usually slightly yellow in color and translucent to opaque.
2. Celon is not easily pigmented.
3. Celon is relatively unaffected by organic solvents and alkalies. It is decomposed by concentrated acids.
4. Celon will oxidize and discolor after prolonged exposure to heat and sunlight.

Information given above for all plastics is for their sheet form. Each, however, is available in other forms (liquid, molding compound, etc.).

Moholy used other plastics, now out of production, in his work. Among these are Zellon, Neolith, and Coulou.

6. Ibid., p. 87; Plexiglas Design and Fabrication Data, Rohm and Haas Company Brochure, 1967.
7. Scott and Roff, p. 209.
A II. 1924.

43,900

Oil on canvas, $43\frac{3}{8} \times 53\frac{3}{8}$ (115.8 x 136.5)

Inscribed by the artist on reverse: Moholy-Nagy / A II (1924) Moholy = Nagy (the latter covered by stretcher).

provenance:
Purchased from the artist, 1943.

condition:
The work has received no treatment since its acquisition.

The geometric composition is painted directly onto a sized but unpainted brownish canvas; there are several stains in the lower right-hand quarter of this unpainted surface. There is a very fine crackle pattern in the upper yellow area and in the red section of the large circle. There are several abrasions, the most serious of which are: a $5\frac{1}{2}$ in. diagonal abrasion, $\frac{1}{2}$ in. wide in the large circle; a 24 in. abrasion (partially inpainted) running vertically 26 in. from the right starting 12 in. from the top; 2 diagonal 2 in. lines in the lower black area; a 2 in. and a 3 in. line in the gray area. The canvas has not been varnished and there is some soil both in the painted and unpainted areas. The overall condition is fair. (Oct. 1973.)
It was in 1923 that Moholy painted his first transparent painting—a work on a Galalith sheet (see above “Moholy-Nagy’s Work on Plastic”). As he explored the possibilities of overlapping forms, transparency, and light in this new medium, he also continued to deal with them in his canvases. S. Moholy-Nagy has described the experience of seeing one of these canvases (A17, 1923) for the first time (Experiment in Totality, New York, 1950, pp. 69-70). As Moholy-Nagy himself moved a light back and forth across its surface a disc in the center of the painting appeared to move out from the surface of the canvas and to recede into it. The canvas thus provided a dramatic illustration of Moholy’s concept of “light-chronology”—a notion which preoccupied him continuously in the following years.

Moholy-Nagy’s own writings contain innumerable references to the significance of transparency, which he felt was “one of the most spectacular features of our time” (“Space-Time Problems in Art,” American Abstract Artists, 1946, Yearbook reprint, New York, 1969, p. 186). For further comments on this subject, see below cat. no. 196.

At an unknown date Moholy-Nagy made a small black-and-white woodcut of this composition (fig. a). Two colored drawings of 1945, although more loosely structured than the 1924 painting, are clearly reminiscent of it and illustrate Moholy’s continuing preoccupation with a similar range of compositional issues (Collection Bauhaus-Archiv, Berlin, negative no. F6242; Private Collection, Berlin, Bauhaus-Archiv negative no. F6243).

**REFERENCES:**


---

TI. 1926.

37:354

Oil on Trolitan, 55 x 24 3/4 (139.8 x 61.8)

Inscribed by the artist on reverse: *Moholy / Ti (26)*; stenciled twice: *L. Moholy-Nagy.*

**PROVENANCE:**

Purchased from the artist by Solomon R. Guggenheim before 1936; Gift of Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1937.

**CONDITION:**

The picture has received no treatment.

All edges show a 1/2 in. rabbet mark from former frame and are rubbed and scratched. There are fine scratches scattered over the entire surface, but these are barely visible. There is some soil in the large white circle, and there are some abrasions elsewhere, but the condition in general is good. (Jan. 1974.)

*Ti* and other works of this period were clearly influenced, as S. Moholy-Nagy has suggested (*Experiment in Totality*, New York, 1950, p. 29), by Moholy's own experiments with photography and especially with the making of photograms. The treatment of surface, light, and form in these paintings closely approximates the effects created in the photograms of the same period. One ca. 1926 photogram (present whereabouts unknown) is so strikingly similar in de-

---

1. See above "Plastic Materials Used by Moholy-Nagy."
sign to the present painting as to suggest a direct relationship between the two (Experiment in Totality, 2nd ed., Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1968, fig. 29).

EXHIBITIONS:
Axl II. 1927.

64.1754
Oil on canvas, 37 x 29¾ (94.1 x 73.9)
Inscribed by the artist on reverse: Axl II
(obscured by stretcher) / Moholy- / Nagy / 1927.

PROVENANCE:
Sibyl Moholy-Nagy, 1946-60; purchased from S. Moholy-Nagy by Galerie Chalette, New York, 1960; purchased from Galerie Chalette by Mr. and Mrs. Andrew P. Fuller, New York, 1961; Gift of Mrs. Andrew P. Fuller, 1964.

CONDITION:
No treatment is recorded but the canvas was at some point restretched and a patch placed in the reverse 8 in. from the bottom and 13 in. from the left side. A ½ in. area of inpaint on the front of the canvas corresponds to this patch.

The black circle shows overall drying cracks and there is a very fine crackle scattered in other impasto areas. Apart from some general soil, and some minor abrasions, the condition is good. (Jan. 1974.)

A watercolor in the collection of the Stedelijk van Abbemuseum, Eindhoven, signed and dated 1922, is closely related to the present work and probably served as a preparatory study for it (fig. a). It is a characteristic example of Moholy’s 1921-22 experiments with superimposed planes and spatial definition which were inspired by the example of Lissitzky and Malevich. Moholy-Nagy describes the problem he set for himself in the years 1921-22 as stemming from “severe simplification of form in two-dimensional space, to the creation of visual depth through color transparencies” (S. Moholy-Nagy, Experiment in Totality, New York, 1950, p. 18). He suggested that his choice of purely geometric forms during these years was part of his desire to achieve total “objectivity” (The New Vision and Abstract of an Artist, New York, 1946, p. 75). This preoccupation continued into the mid and late 1920’s as is demonstrated by the close relationship between the 1922 watercolor and the present painting.
EXHIBITIONS:
Kunsthaus Zürich, Abstrakte und Surrealistische Malerei und Plastik, Oct. 6-Nov. 3, 1929, no. 90; New York, SRGM 57, Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, no. 47; 176, 195 (no cats.); 196 (check-list; listed as ACL II); Chicago, SRGM 218, Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, no. 25, repr. p. 29; Venice, 35 Biennale internazionale d’arte, June 24-Oct. 25, 1970, no. 26; New York, SRGM 260, 266 (no cats.).

REFERENCE:
Tp 2, 1930.

37-357
Oil and incised lines on blue Trolitan,1
24¼ x 56½ (61.5 x 144.3)
Inscribed by the artist on reverse:
Moholy = Nagy / Tp 2 (1930) / m = n.

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist by Solomon R.
Guggenheim by 1936; Gift of Solomon R.
Guggenheim, 1937.

CONDITION:
In 1969 the work was cleaned with distilled
water.
The support is slightly warped, and there
are many tiny scratches and abrasions
scattered over the surface; there are 4 major
scratches (varying in length from ½ in. to
5 in.). The painted areas are in good condi-
tion, and the overall condition is fair to
good. (Jan. 1974.)

EXHIBITIONS:
p. 43; Charleston, S.C., SRGM 4-T, no. 162, repr. p. 104; New York, SRGM 57, Laszlo
Moholy-Nagy, no. 55; New York, The Museum of Modern Art, Moholy-Nagy (traveling
exhibition), Feb. 1964-May 1965 (checklist); Chicago, SRGM 218, Laszlo Moholy-Nagy,
no. 26.

REFERENCES:
Telebor [international review], Brno, 1936, Moholy-Nagy issue with text by the artist, repr.

1. See above "Plastic Materials Used by Moholy-Nagy."
Oil and incised lines on silverit,\(^1\) 19\(\frac{3}{8}\) x 23\(\frac{3}{8}\) (50.1 x 60.1)

Inscribed by the artist on reverse (incised, barely visible): Moholy = Nagy / 1933 / Sil 1; in paint (partially obscured by clamp): L. Moholy = Nagy / Sil 2; in crayon (barely visible): Moholy = Nagy / 1933.

PROVENANCE:
Estate of the artist, 1946-48; purchased from the Estate, 1948.

CONDITION:
In 1963 the work was superficially cleaned. The polished surface of the work shows a large number of fine scratches and a few more serious ones. Apart from some minor chips lost from the black areas, the overall condition is good. (Sept. 1973.)

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCE:
Telebor [international review], Brno, 1936, Moholy-Nagy issue with text by the artist, repr. p. 72 (dated 1933).

---

1. The nature of this support (which Moholy described as “silverit”) has not been definitely established, although it appears to be a highly polished aluminum. There is no trace of a plastic or metallic film on top of the polished surface.
Ch Beata 1. 1939.

Oil on canvas, 46 1/4 x 47 1/8 (118.9 x 119.8)

Inscribed by the artist on reverse (photographed before lining): L. Moholy = Nagy / Ch Beata I / (39); on stretcher: L. Moholy = Nagy (39).

PROVENANCE:
Estate of the artist, 1946-48; purchased from the Estate, 1948.

CONDITION:
In 1954 the work, which had not been previously varnished and was very dirty, was cleaned and surfaced with synthetic varnish. In 1972 it was removed from the stretcher, and a patch removed from the back. Cleavage was developing in the black areas, and the condition was fragile. The varnish was removed, cleavage set down, and the work was lined with fiberglass with BEVA using no penetration. The small losses in the black area were filled with gesso and inpainted; and the work was then varnished.

There are 8 tack holes in a diagonal line along the right edge extending 20 in. down from the top. The canvas was apparently at some point stretched considerably out of square and a rabbet mark in this area is clearly visible. The edges are in general in good condition, but there are some abrasions with losses, chiefly at the lower left and upper right corners. Compass-point holes are visible in the center of each of the small circles. The artist apparently applied a second coat of paint to the red areas to achieve a more crimson tone. Apart from some scattered minor losses, the condition in general is good. (Sept. 1973.)

fig. a
Moholy-Nagy, Ch xiv, 1939, oil on canvas, 36 1/4 x 47 1/8 in., 92 x 119.5 cm., Collection Hattula Moholy-Nagy Hug, Courtesy Galerie Klihm, Munich.

Many of the canvases produced by Moholy in Chicago in 1939 are variations on the structural vocabulary, textures, and transparencies of Ch Beata 1. See, for example, Ch xiv (fig. a).
EXHIBITIONS:
Space Modulator. 1939-1945.

47.1064

Oil on incised Plexiglas, mounted in 2 wood rails 1 in. from white plywood background. Plexiglas: 24 ¼ (63.0) x bottom 25 ¾ (65.9); top, 26 ½ (66.6)

Signed and dated l.r. (incised): L. Moholy = Nagy 39-45; inscribed by the artist on reverse: L. Moholy = Nagy / L. Moholy = Nagy / Space modulator 1939-45 / (this painting requires a strong spotlight).

Moholy-Nagy’s preoccupation with the notion of shadow as a necessary element in the creation of a living work of art was reflected strongly in his filmmaking and photography experiments of the early 1930’s. S. Moholy-Nagy quotes from the artist on this subject as follows: “All human life has its shadow. Without it, it stops being human. But the typical studio lighting—this insane cross fire of illumination—creates a shadowless world that is without appeal because it is unfamiliar” (Experiment in Totality, New York, 1950, p. 83).

In 1923 Moholy produced his first painting on transparent plastic; forms were painted on the surface and their shadows were actually painted on the underside of the plastic and on the wood substructure to which the plastic was attached (Ibid., p. 69). In 1935 he painted his first “light modulator”—an oil painting on a Rhodoid sheet, mounted two inches from a white plywood background, to produce a mobile shadow play. Variations on these early ideas were produced throughout the next twenty years. Moholy saw the potential of plastic materials in two main areas: transparency and sensitivity to light. “In working with these materials—uniformly colored, opaque or transparent plastics—I made discoveries which were instrumental in changing my painting technique. This had inevitable repercussions on my thinking concerning light problems” (The New Vision and Abstract of an Artist, New York, 1946, p. 83).

Moholy’s own detailed explanation for his use of these plastic materials, and for their invaluable capacity to cast real shadows is cited above (“Moholy-Nagy’s Work on Plastic”). His technique in Space Modulator included incising and painting on both sides of the sheet in order, as he put it, “to create space articulation by the relationships of receding and advancing colors . . . enhanced by the thickness of the sheet; that is the real distance between the colors applied in the front and in the back.” In addition, his specific directions on the reverse of this and other paintings (“this painting requires a strong spotlight”) must be
seen as an integral part of the work itself. The lighting—as he makes clear—is a crucial ingredient in his use of the medium: “Such elements, if lighted, cast alternating shadows and light patterns on the background behind the painted surface . . .”; and again: “If lighted from the side, the shapes of the original and its shadows appear shifted, creating a new relationship between the colors and their grey shadows. This intensifies considerably the effect of the usual shadowless paintings . . .” (see above “Moholy-Nagy’s Work on Plastic”).

A pen and ink drawing dated 1945 (fig. a) represents an elaboration of the present work, rather than a study for it, and bears witness to his continuing preoccupation over a period of six years with the same theme.

fig. a.
Moholy-Nagy, pen and ink on paper, 8 1/2 x 11 in., 21.5 x 28 cm., Collection Dr. Hans Klihm, Munich.

EXHIBITIONS:
New York, SRGM 64 (no cat.); Tulsa, Okla., SRGM 159-T, Richmond, Va., SRGM 188-T (no cats.); Chicago, SRGM 218, Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, no. 42, repr. color (described as “oil on incised plaster”); Venice, 35 Biennale internazionale d’arte, June 24-Oct. 25, 1970, no. 29.
Mills 1. 1940.

44.958

Oil on incised Plexiglas, mounted in 4 wood rails, 1 in. from white plywood background. Plexiglas (sight only): 34% x 25% (87.4 x 65.4)

Inscribed by the artist u.r. (incised): Moholy = Nagy 40 / Mills 1; formerly on reverse in pencil (transcribed but not photographed before discarding of back): L. Moholy = Nagy 1940 / Mills No. 1.

PROVENANCE:

Purchased from the artist, 1944.

CONDITION:

In 1963 and 1969 the work was superficially cleaned with water and Soilax. There is a 1/2 in. loss in the support near the lower right corner. There are some scattered minor abrasions of the Plexiglas, and some scattered pinpoint losses in the black area. The condition is otherwise very good. (Jan. 1974.)

The title of this work refers to Moholy-Nagy’s residence during the summer of 1940 at Mills College in Oakland, California, where, at the invitation of A. Neumeyer, he conducted an intensive summer school course in the Bauhaus curriculum (S. Moholy-Nagy, Experiment in Totality, New York, 1950, p. 180). The ambiguous spatial relationship between the two arcs is similar to that of two arcs in another 1940 Space Modulator of which Moholy-Nagy wrote: “This painting introduces a psychologically determined motion if one tries to define whether the black or the white arc is in front of the other. There is a feeling of a definite movement of the arcs forward and backward” (Vision in Motion, Chicago, 1947, p. 150). As in Space Modulator, above cat. no. 196, Moholy has further complicated the interrelationships by alternating his application of paint and his incising of the surface on the obverse or the reverse of the Plexiglas. The upper portion of the larger arc is painted on the obverse, the lower portion on the reverse; the lower half of the smaller arc is incised on the obverse, the upper half of the reverse. The spatial effects are clearly intended to be visually provocative and ambiguous.

EXHIBITIONS:

Oil on incised Plexiglas, mounted with chromium clamps on white plywood background. Plexiglas: 35⅞ x 35⅞ (91.2 x 91.1) Signed and dated l.l. (incised): L. Moholy = Nagy 41.

PROVENANCE:
Estate of the artist, 1946-48; purchased from the Estate, 1948.

CONDITION:
The work has received no treatment. Apart from some minor scratches and abrasions throughout the Plexiglas, and some slight soil in the white painted area, the condition is excellent. (Nov. 1972.)
Moholy-Nagy’s own photograph of *Ch 4* (fig. b) captured the light cast on the work and the resulting series of shadows in such a way as to illustrate his notion of “vision in motion,” which he defined in part as “a new kinetic concept of spatial articulation” (p. 153).

In an unpublished letter to Hilla Rebay, dated March 11, 1942, he urged her to show this photograph (a copy of which he enclosed) to the Museum photographer so that the latter might attempt to introduce the same lighting effects into his reproductions of Moholy-Nagy’s work (letter preserved in the SRGM archives).

A pen, ink, and pencil drawing in the collection of Hattula Moholy-Nagy Hug (fig. a), dated October 26, 1941, is closely related to the present work, but it is unclear whether it is preparatory to it or a subsequent variation.

**Exhibitions:**

**Reference:**
The title of the work has been alternatively given by Moholy as Ch 7 (on the reverse) and Chicago Space 7 (The New Vision and Abstract of an Artist).
initial stage to suggest the variety of possible textural and spatial interrelationships, which are later incorporated into the final work.

In 1945 Moholy-Nagy produced a variation on this composition in the form of a free-standing Plexiglas sheet which had been painted with oil paint, molded while hot, and mounted on a Formica base (fig. b). The movement of forms in space, so clearly demonstrated in this molded work, had already been anticipated to a considerable extent in the present painting on canvas, which was completed four years earlier. It is interesting to note that Moholy himself, in “Abstract of an Artist,” specifically explains how he had tried to create on canvas the same complex effects he was achieving with molded plastics (see below cat. no. 200).

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCE:
B-10 Space Modulator. 1942.

47.1063

Oil on incised and molded Plexiglas, mounted with chromium clamps 2 in. from white plywood backing. Plexiglas: 17 3/4 x 12 (45.1 x 30.5). The Plexiglas has been molded by the artist up to 3 in. out of plane.

Signed and dated l.l. (incised): L. Moholy-Nagy 42; inscribed by the artist on reverse mount: L. Moholy-Nagy / 1942 / B-10 Space Modulator.

PROVENANCE:

CONDITION:
The work has received no treatment.

There are some scattered scratches on the surface, and a major 1 in. scratch 3 1/2 in. from the top, 5 in. from the right side. Apart from considerable soil, the work is otherwise in good condition. (Jan. 1974.)
In his 1944 essay “Abstract of an Artist,” Moholy-Nagy describes his use of plastics in some detail, dwelling in particular on the advantages to be derived from their transparency (see above “Moholy-Nagy’s Work on Plastic,” and cat. no. 196). In the final section of the essay, he describes both his technique for working with molded plastic and the motives that led him to this development:

*Thermoplastics, when heated, can be easily shaped. One day it occurred to me that by painting on flat plastic sheets, I neglected this essential property of the material. Thus I heated, bent, and twisted a transparent sheet after painting on it. With this manipulation I arrived at complex concave and convex shapes, rich compound curvatures which created a constantly changing relationship between the painted and engraved transparent planes and the background, resulting in a new type of “related” distortions. The bends and curves made the plastics structurally more resistant to breakage. At the same time, the bends caught high lights. They could be made a part of the light compositions themselves. These could hardly be called paintings or sculpture. . . . For me they were “space modulators.” The distorted shapes of my “modulators” produced spatial effects, not only through the curved surfaces which were either protruding or receding, but also through the lines flowing in all directions of the weather cock, formed by the thickness of the sheets themselves. . . . I tried to achieve similar effects with painting on canvas. There the free ‘motion’ forward and backward of color prepared a new type of spatial perception. This was in clear opposition to the renaissance method of producing illusionistic space by the illusionistic relationships of volumes. In this way my experiments seemed to become a part of the general tendencies of contemporary painters. Many of us have departed from the old canons and obsolete conventions, to a new space articulation, trying to define intuitively and to satisfy more adequately the specific need of our time for a vision in motion.*

The problems encountered by Moholy in applying paint to the smooth Plexiglas surface, and the measures he took to counteract these problems are described in some detail by him and S. Moholy-Nagy (see above “Moholy-Nagy’s Work on Plastic”). The paint and incised lines were, in this as in other instances, applied to both sides of the Plexiglas.

**EXHIBITIONS:**
New York, SRGM 57, *Laszlo Moholy-Nagy*, no. 104 (with incorrect dimensions); 64 (no cat.).

**REFERENCE:**
Leuk 4, 1945.

Oil and watercolor on canvas, 49 1/4 x 49 1/4
(124.7 x 124.7)
Inscribed by the artist on reverse: L. Moholy = Nagy / Leuk 4 (45) / Moholy.

PROVENANCE:
Estate of the artist, 1946-48; purchased from the Estate, 1948.

The title refers to the disease which was ultimately fatal to Moholy: the leukemia was diagnosed in November 1945 and the painting followed shortly thereafter.

A colored chalk drawing in the collection of Hattula Moholy-Nagy Hug (fig. a), dated 1945, almost certainly represents the artist’s preliminary ideas for the picture. The composition is also closely related to a painting dated 1939 (present whereabouts unknown, S. Moholy-Nagy, Experiment in Totality, New York, 1950, repr. p. 197).

CONDITION:
In 1954 the white and yellow areas were cleaned with 1/2% Soilax solution; the other areas, which are water soluble, were dusted with a dry brush.

White paint transfer is visible on all edges about 1/8 in. in width, apparently the result of attempts to paint the former frame while it was still in place. There are virtually invisible hairline cracks in a few places, and some general soil, but the condition is otherwise good. (Feb. 1974.)
Piet Mondrian

Born March 1872, Amersfoort.
Died February 1944, New York.

Composition VII, 1913.

49.1228
Oil on canvas, 41⅛ x 44⅜ (104.4 x 113.6)
Signed l.l.: Mondrian; on reverse: Mondrian; inscribed by the artist, later deleted by him: Tableau / N:2; on stretcher: Composition. N:VII. Mondrian.Haut. Not dated.

PROVENANCE:

CONDITION:
In 1953 some surface dirt was removed with 2% Solalx solution. Some inpainting along

2¼ in. of the bottom edge, left of center, is of unrecorded date, but may have been done at this time.

A dark greenish-brown line, which frames the composition along much of all 4 sides ca. ¼ in. from the edge of the canvas, apparently derives from a bronze gilding powder used to color an early frame. Owing to the fragility of the paint layer beneath, no attempt has hitherto been made to remove this. Whether the frame was still wet when the picture was placed in it, or whether the frame was painted with the picture already in place is not known. There is minor cracking of the paint film along most of the bottom edge, and some scattered small losses along all 4 edges. Some other areas of very fine crackle are visible in a raking light. In certain places where the paint was thinly applied, or where it has become more transparent with age, underdrawing in two shades of blue is visible, revealing extensive pentimenti. The overall condition is excellent. (Jan. 1973.)

The picture's appearance in the November 1913 Moderne Kunstkring gives it a firm terminus ante quem. Terpstra dates it, together with Tableau I (Seuphor, 1956, repr. cc 266) and Oval Composition with Trees (Ibid., repr. cc 200),

1. Mondrian's use of numerical designations as titles for his paintings was usually directly related to exhibitions of his work. He numbered his entries to a given exhibition consecutively, irrespective of any titles they might have carried previously. Thus, the present work was entitled Tableau N: 2 when it appeared in the Nov. 1913 Kunstkring. Half a year later when he sent 16 paintings from Paris to The Hague for the 1914 Walrecht exhibition he numbered them I-XVI (inscribed in roman numerals on the stretchers), and it was at this time that he deleted the Tableau N: 2 on the reverse of the present work, substituting the Composition VII on the stretcher. There was no catalogue of the Walrecht exhibition, but the list of works exhibited has been reconstructed by Joosten on the basis of the roman numerals (Centennial Catalogue, 1971, p. 62; also correspondence with the author, Mar. 1973).

2. Joosten has convincingly established (correspondence with the author, Mar. 1973) that Composition VII was 1 of 3 works purchased by van Assendelft from the 1914 Walrecht exhibition.

3. Mrs. van Assendelft-Hoos inherited the collection upon her husband's death.

4. Information supplied by Mrs. E. J. Schijvens-van Assendelft, Zeist, correspondence with the author, Mar. 1973. Streep apparently purchased this and some other works by Mondrian (see below cat. nos. 203 and 204) after the Nov.-Dec. 1946 Stedelijk Museum exhibition.
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both of which also appeared in that exhibition, to the second half of 1913. Welsh allows for the possibility that *Oval Composition with Trees* and *Composition VII* were completed by the spring of that year (1966, p. 140).

The fact that all three paintings cited above derive from Mondrian’s tree studies of the immediately preceding period has been widely acknowledged (Terpstra, p. 161; Welsh, 1966, p. 138; Joosten, p. 59; Welsh, 1973). Moreover, it seems clear that Mondrian himself attached some importance to the representational origins of the 1913-14 pictures. In at least two instances he specifically identified the tree sources (Terpstra, fn. 3; Welsh, 1966), suggesting thereby the extent to which the connections were present in his own mind. N. H. Wolf’s report of a 1913 conversation with Mondrian in which the artist seemed to suggest that the subjects of his paintings did not as such interest him, but rather awakened “his interest because of line and color relationships” (*De Kunst*, vol. 7, February 20, 1915, pp. 251-252, cited by Welsh, 1966) does not preclude the notion that he nonetheless felt the importance of the relationship between that subject, once chosen, and his pictorial conception of it.

The specific sources for *Composition VII* have been convincingly identified by Welsh as *Study: Trees I* (fig. a) and *Study: Trees II* (fig. b). He dates both during the 1912-13 Paris period, most likely during early 1913, a date accepted by C. Blok (GM, 1968, 131).

Although the dating of Mondrian’s two published sketchbooks does not bear directly on the development or dating of *Composition VII*, the presence in *Sketchbook I* of tree studies closely related in style to some of the 1912-13 drawings and paintings of this subject does raise the issue of how long Mondrian continued to be preoccupied with the tree motif, and how consistent his development towards increasingly abstract renderings of the motif was. Welsh has argued convincingly that the drawings in this first sketchbook date from 1912-13, but the argument has been contested by J. Baljeu, who suggests that the drawings and texts in *Sketchbook I* probably date from as late as 1916 (Welsh and Joosten, *Two Mondrian Sketchbooks: 1912-1914*, Amsterdam, 1969, pp. 9-14; correspondence by J. Baljeu and R. P. Welsh in *Museumjournaal*, no. 6, December 1971, pp. 315-319, 320-323; no. 4, August 1972, pp. 180-181, 182-183).

If Baljeu were correct, Mondrian would have been producing sketches of trees, related in style to 1912-13 drawings such as figs. a and b, when he had otherwise long abandoned the tree motif, examples of which are not found among the paintings beyond 1913. As Welsh has pointed out, it is difficult to imagine (as Baljeu would have it) that there is no functional relationship at all between the sketchbook drawings and the paintings of the period, and that the sketches were illustrations of the philosophical ideas contained in the text, but at the same time rapid reminders *a posteriori* of what Mondrian had been doing several years before. Rather it seems more likely that the tree drawings in the sketchbook are intimately tied to Mondrian’s developing Cubist style of the years immediately preceding the First World War. (For more detailed discussion of the development of the tree motif in Mondrian’s oeuvre as it was pro-
gressively influenced by Cubist works, see Joosten, 1971, pp. 58-60; also Wilmon-Vervaert, 1913, p. 86, who describes Schelfhout as “toute intellec-
tualité,” Mondrian as “tout sentiment. Son art ne raisonne pas, ni ne compose; il rêve dans l’abstraction. Avec abandon et laisser-aller il distribue les genti-
lesses charmantes de ses sentiments vagues dans des harmonies de gris et de jaunes. . . .”)

EXHIBITIONS:
Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum, Moderne Kunstkring, Nov. 7-Dec. 8, 1913, no. 167, repr. (Tableau II); The Hague, Galerie Walrecht, Mondrian, ca. June-July 31, 1914 (no cat.);1
Rotterdam, Rotterdamsche Kunstkring, Alma, Le Fauconnier, Mondriaan, Jan. 31-Feb. 28, 1915, no. 58 (Compositie E, private collection);5 Rotterdam, Museum Boymans-van-Beuningen, Kersttentoonstelling, Dec. 23, 1931-Jan. 18, 1932, no. 43 (Compositie VII; information supplied
by W. van Dam, The Hague, correspondence with the author, Mar. 1973); New York, SRGM 64 (no cat.); New York, Sidney Janis Gallery, 

REFERENCES:


5. I am indebted to Joosten for the information that this and all of the other works in the Walrecht exhibition (except for 2 purchased by Mrs. Kröller-Müller) traveled to Rotterdam. Some items, but not the works owned by van Assendelft, then went on to Groningen. (See review of the Rotterdam exhibition in *De Kunst*, vol. 7, Feb. 20, 1915, and *De Kunst*, vol. 7, Feb. 27, 1915, p. 264.) Joosten convincingly identified the Guggenheim *Composition VII* as no. 58 in the Rotterdam catalogue on the basis of combined information from Rotterdam museum records, reviews, and the catalogue itself. Once again the title of the work has been changed (*Composition E*) to fit in with the sequence of entries for this specific exhibition.
Composition No. 8. 1914.

49.1227

Oil on canvas, 37 1/8 x 21 7/8 (94.4 x 55.6)

Signed and dated l.l.: Mondrian. 1914;
inscribed on reverse, probably by the artist:
Composition / 8 / P. Mondrian.¹

PROVENANCE:

CONDITION:
In 1953 the canvas was placed on a new stretcher. The surface was cleaned with 1% Soilax and benzine and coated with Ozenfant’s wax.

There is considerable wear along all 4 edges with some losses, especially at the corners. Extensive crackle throughout the surface, probably due to the artist’s repeated reworking of the surface, is stable, although there are a few areas of possible incipient cleavage. Pentimenti are visible in several places. The gray pigment used along 13 1/2 in. of the bottom of the painting is darker in tone than the gray used elsewhere in the painting. This area was apparently retouched by the artist soon after the completion of the picture. Apart from some light surface soil, the overall condition is good. (Sept. 1973.)

Welsh first convincingly suggested that Composition No. 6 (Gemeentemuseum, The Hague, GM 134A), to which the present work is extremely closely related, was based upon an architectural source (TM, 1966, p. 150). Although Composition No. 6 is squarer in format and retains a more articulated oval framework for its composition, the two pictures clearly relate to the same source and are executed in a similar technique and range of colors. It has hitherto not been possible to identify the particular building involved or even to point to drawings which might help to trace the development of the composition. It is not impossible, however, that both paintings derive in part from a drawing such as Paris Façade of ca. 1912 from Mondrian’s third, presently unlocated sketchbook (R. P. Welsh and J. M. Joosten, Two Mondrian Sketchbooks, Amster-

1. J. M. Joosten has established that nine of the paintings exhibited at the Walrecht exhibition and the Rotterdamsche Kunstkring (see fn. 3) were subsequently sent to a 1915 exhibition in Amsterdam. The “Compositie 8” inscribed on the reverse of the canvas is the picture’s title for the Amsterdam exhibition; roman numerals were used in the catalogue but arabic numerals on the works themselves and on Mondrian’s list sent to L. Schelthout, the organizer of the exhibition. (I am indebted to Joosten for this information and for a copy of the list, the original of which is preserved in the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie in The Hague.) The handwriting on the reverse of these paintings is difficult to identify with certainty, but is probably Mondrian’s own.

2. Huszár’s ownership of the work has been established by Mrs. E. J. Schijvens-van Assendelft, Zeist (correspondence with the author, Mar. 1973), and he was the lender to the 1946 exhibition in Amsterdam. In 1947 the work was hanging in her house, on loan from Huszár, when J. Streep saw and subsequently purchased it. Mrs. Schijvens-van Assendelft was unable to say how long Huszár had owned it; however, it is probable that he acquired it from Mondrian (possibly in exchange for one of his own pictures) during the period of their close association in the De Stijl years.
The vertical format of the sketch, its emphasis on specific horizontals and verticals which are strongly echoed in Composition No. 6 and No. 8, and the curved bases of several of its windows, suggest a possible source for the Guggenheim and Gemeentemuseum pictures, in both of which the composition has been transformed into an abstract grid. The drawings in Sketchbook 1 and 2 do not provide any clues to the origin of Composition No. 8, but it is possible that others in Sketchbook 3 might throw some light on the development of
both paintings, further substantiating, or disproving their association with Paris Façade. For the time being one can merely affirm that both Composition No. 6 and Composition No. 8 belong to the group of Paris façades which Mondrian produced late in 1913 and early in 1914. Other examples are Composition No. 7 (Seuphor, cc 271), Composition with Color Planes (Ibid., cc 284), and Oval Composition (Ibid., cc 283), all of which predate Composition No. 6 and Composition No. 8. In the first three works cited, diagonals and slanting lines are still present to a greater or lesser degree. In the latter two, although pentimenti reveal that such lines were part of the original conception, they have been painted out in the final realization. As Welsh has pointed out, Composition No. 6 represents "a slightly greater suppression of subject matter" than its immediate predecessors, and the literal elements of the building are thus somewhat less readily identifiable; but the architectural background for the composition is still apparent.

A drawing formerly in the collection of V. Huszár (who also owned the present painting) has recently been published by A. de Jongh, who suggested that it might be a sketch by Mondrian for Composition No. 8, or perhaps more likely a sketch by Huszár after the present painting (Museumjournaal, no. 6, December 1972, p. 265). Although it is more plausible to attribute this drawing to Huszár than to Mondrian, as de Jongh suggests, the relationship between it and the painting seems too tenuous to allow for any specific connection.

EXHIBITIONS:
The Hague, Galerie Walrecht, Mondrian, ca. June-July 31, 1914 (no cat.);3 Rotterdam, Rotterdamse Kunstkring, Alma, Le Fouconnier, Mondriaan, Jan. 31-Feb. 28, 1915, no. 53, 63 or 64;1 Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum, Schelphout, Mondriaan, Shuyters, Gestel, Le Fouconnier, van Epen, Oct. 3-25, 1915, no. 114 (Composition VIII);1 Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum, Piet Mondrian, Nov.-Dec. 1946, no. 76, traveled to Kunsthalle Basel, Feb. 6-Mar. 2, 1947; New York, Sidney Janis Gallery, Mondrian, Oct. 10-Nov. 12, 1949, no. 11; New York, SRGM 64 (no cat.); 74, no. 161; 78 (checklist); Vancouver, SRGM 88-T, no. 65; San Francisco Museum of Art, Art in the Twentieth Century, June 17-July 10, 1955, p. 15; New York, SRGM 95, 97, 98 (checklists); Boston, SRGM 129-T, no. 45; New York, SRGM 295 (checklist); Philadelphia, SRGM 134-T, no. 118; New York, SRGM 144, 151, 153 (checklists);

3. Joosten reconstructed the Walrecht Gallery exhibition of 16 paintings on the basis of the roman numerals inscribed on the stretchers (see above cat. no. 202, fn. 1). Stretchers bearing the numbers III, IV, and XIII have not been found, suggesting that—as in the present case—these numbers were inscribed on stretchers which have since been replaced. It is impossible to state with certainty that the present Composition No. 8 originally bore such an inscription, but Joosten's hypothesis that it did is a plausible one.

4. See cat. no. 202, fn. 5. Joosten (in correspondence with the author, Jan. 1973) identifies Composition No. 8 as no. 53, 63, or 64 in the Rotterdam catalogue on the basis of a review which alludes to the dominant colors in various pictures: "... no. 53 in een gamma van blauw, bruin, rose en grijs... Sommige werken zijn overwegend rose: no. 63 en no. 64" (De Kunst, vol. 7, Feb. 20, 1915, p. 252). ("... no. 53 is painted in a scale of blue, brown, pink, and gray... Some works are mainly pink: no. 63 and no. 64.") Since 53 and 63 both belonged to private collections by this time, the entry for no. 64 probably applies.
Composition 1916. 1916.

49.1229

Oil on canvas, with wood strip nailed to bottom edge, 46 7/8 x 29 5/8 (119 x 75.1), including 7/16 (1.2) wood strip

Signed and dated on wood strip l.l. (apostrophe and "6" extending onto canvas): P. Mondriaan. '16.

PROVENANCE:


CONDITION:
The work has received no treatment since its acquisition. Examination under UV reveals a small area of inpainting, ca. 7/8 x 1 3/8 in., located near the bottom edge, 10 in. from the left edge.

A brownish substance has stained the surface in the upper right corner. Considerable cracking of the paint film in scattered locations is due to the repeated reworkings of the composition by the artist. These areas are stable and show no present danger of cleavage. There are 19 tiny punctures through the paint and support scattered along the left and top margins. These may have been made by miniature nails used to solidify the painting's adherence to the frame. Pentimenti are visible throughout; these are especially noticeable in the black bands, many of which have been widened or narrowed in the course of the painting's development. The overall condition is good. (Jan. 1973.)

Blok first drew attention to the fact that the Guggenheim's Composition 1916 was derived from a series of studies of the Domburg church façade, beginning with the 1914 ink drawing in the collection of the Haags Gemeentemuseum (GM, 1964, 135). This initial study was followed, according to Blok's note, by three others (Seuphor, repr. cc 253, 255, and 257), an argument which Welsh also accepted.

1. Although Mondrian dropped the second 'a' from his name upon his arrival in Paris in 1912, it was not unusual for him to revert to the Dutch spelling when he was signing a picture for a Dutch client or sending it to a Dutch exhibition.

2. Joosten, on the basis of unpublished correspondence between van Assendelft and Mondrian, has established that this work was probably purchased soon after van Assendelft saw it at the Mar.-Apr. 1916 Stedelijk exhibition.

The four drawings cited by Blok illustrate Mondrian's gradual elimination of the specific architectural details of the building, as well as his developing emphasis upon the strong horizontals at the upper center of the composition. *Plus and Minns: Study for Composition 1916* (fig. a), which surely followed the drawings, further demonstrates his continuing conviction, so clearly expressed in the final painting, that the powerful horizontal emphasis near but not at the top of the picture was of central importance. Furthermore, the existence of this unfinished study establishes the fact that Mondrian worked out the composition from the top downwards. The study has usually been reproduced upside down, thereby obscuring its relationship to the present painting. But a comparison of the distinctive configuration of horizontals and verticals at the upper edge of the study with those of the painting clearly demonstrates their interdependence.

Related to the question of Mondrian's process of composition in this work is his construction for it of a specific frame. The artist's original frame has been lost, but a photograph of it was discovered and recently published by Joosten, who noted that it probably represented the earliest documented use of a strip frame (1973, p. 55). Joosten also published some comments on the effects of the frame, extracted from the review of a 1916 exhibition in which the picture had been prominently displayed. The reviewer noted that "Er is een schoon overstroomen van toon in, waarvan het effect nog verhoogd wordt, doordat het doek op de lijst gezet is, inplaats van er in. Mondriaan toont door deze manier van omlijsten, dat het hem wel degelijk om een decoratief geheel te doen is, hetgeen men langen tijd heeft moeten betwijfelen." Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant, March 22, 1916, p. 11. ("There is a beautiful overflow of tones in the picture, the effect of which is enhanced because the canvas is placed upon the frame rather than within it. With this framing device, Mondrian..."
proves that he is concerned with the decorative whole—something which has been in doubt for some time.

Mondrian himself must surely have been referring to this same framing device (although ascribing to it a very different effect) when he stated to J. J. Sweeney: "A ma connaissance, j'ai été le premier à faire décoller un tableau de son cadre, plutôt que de le laisser enserré dans celui-ci. J'avais remarqué qu'un tableau sans cadre a un effet plus pur qu'un tableau encadré et que l'encadrement semble ajouter une troisième dimension. Le cadre donne une
illusion de profondeur. J'ai donc pris un cadre de bois naturel et j'ai monté mon tableau dessus. De cette façon, j'ai donné au tableau une existence plus réelle.” Transcript of original interview, as recalled by J. J. Sweeney, partially preserved in files of SRGM. (“So far as I know, I was the first painter to bring a picture forward from its frame, as opposed to setting it within one. I had noticed that a picture without a frame has a purer effect than a framed one, and that framing seems to add a third dimension. The frame gives an illusion of depth. So I took a plain wooden frame and mounted my picture upon it. By doing this I gave the picture a more real existence.”)

Mondrian’s discussion of his strip frame, and the degree to which he felt it drew attention to the picture’s surface (and hence away from the three-dimensional quality of a “decorative whole”), becomes even more revealing if one examines his method of attaching the canvas to it. As has been noted above, there is a narrow wooden strip attached to the lower edge of the stretcher. This strip is fully integrated into the composition and carries the artist’s signature and date, which extend in part onto the canvas above it. Examination of Joosten’s early photograph (fig. b) reveals that there was originally a similar strip of wood attached to the top edge, but that this was not incorporated into the composition. It seems likely, therefore, that Mondrian may have initially fixed both strips to the canvas in order to facilitate the mounting of the painting upon the frame. After having nailed the two strips firmly to the recessed plain wooden frame, he apparently decided that the composition needed additional weight at the lower edge. Thus, he extended the gray background onto the lower wooden strip and—more importantly—added two black horizontals near the center of it, thus firmly closing off the composition at its base and reinforcing the barely suggested oval shape of the
painting. The top edge, by contrast, remains more open (as it had in all of the earlier studies), and the strong verticals bisecting the edge extend by implication into the space beyond. Since Mondrian worked out the composition from the top downwards, his decision to include the wooden strip, endowing it with the particularly important role of anchoring the picture at its base, becomes comprehensible as a final, significant step in completing the composition.

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:

4. J. M. Joosten has identified this picture as the subject of comments made by two reviewers of the exhibition. See his “Abstraction and Compositional Innovation,” *Artforum*, vol. xi, Apr. 1973. It must have been cat. no. 42, 43, 44, or 45.
Composition 2. 1922.  
(Tableau 2).

51.1309

Oil on canvas, 21 1/8 x 21 1/8 (55.6 x 53.4)
Signed with monogram and dated l.r.: PM 22; inscribed by the artist on reverse: Tableau 2.

**PROVENANCE:**
Private collection, Germany;1 Galerie Springer (Rudolf Springer), Berlin, 1947; purchased from Springer by Jon Nicholas Streep, New York, 1947; purchased from Streep, 1951.

**CONDITION:**
In 1956 the surface was lightly cleaned with benzine and surfaced with PBM. Some minor losses were retouched in the blue edge area, the corner red area, the yellow area, and the gray/white edges and corners. Older discolored retouchings in the gray/white area to the left of center were retouched. The yellowish tone of the background was very slightly reduced, and the frame was retouched with watercolor. It was noted that the work needed lining, and that other discolored inpaints remained.

All edges show considerable wear and heavily inpainted losses extending 3/4 in. into the painting in places. Numerous horizontal cracks in the paint film cover most of the surface; these are due to repeated reworking of the surface and also possibly in part to the presence on the reverse of an earlier composition. Crackle in the yellow is especially severe; it is not present in the blacks, except in the black line immediately below the yellow (where yellow had been applied underneath). There are several old repairs and retouched areas scattered over the surface. The condition in general is fair to good. (Sept. 1973.)

The gray background, which Mondrian did not entirely abandon until 1931, is characteristic of several closely related works of 1921-22, all of which are dominated by a central gray square or rectangle. (Seuphor [1956], p. 152, suggests that Mondrian used only white backgrounds from 1922 onwards.) In the Haags Gemeentemuseum’s Composition with Red, Yellow, and Blue, 1921 (GM 1968, repr. 154), for example, three different grays are used, and the composition—with minor variations in the proportions of the color planes—is an inversion of the Guggenheim picture. Another closely related work is Composition 1922 in the Rothschild Collection (Seuphor [1956], repr. color p. 169, where the colors are, however, inaccurate). Here, while the central square and the one above it are almost white, the two adjoining areas on the left are nearly identical in color to the gray of the Guggenheim picture. In Composition with Red, Yellow, and Blue, 1922 (Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam, Seuphor [1956], repr. cc 326), the large central square tends slightly more towards bluish-gray, but the remaining colors are identical to those of the Guggenheim and related paintings.

R. Welsh has drawn attention to the fact that Mondrian’s lines at this stage frequently stop short of the edge: “According to the late Georges Vantonger-

1. It has so far proved impossible to discover the identity of this collection, or the dates of ownership. The information conveyed by Springer was limited to the fact that the picture came to him from a private collection in Germany.
loo, the practice originated from a fear that the abstract composition would lose its organic compactness if all lines were carried through to the edge of the composition, bisecting it completely" (TM, 1966, p. 178). Mondrian did not adhere to this practice consistently, however, even during the De Stijl period, and by the late 1920's he had abandoned it.

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:
Composition. 1929.

53-1347
Oil on canvas, 17 3/4 x 17 3/4 (45.1 x 45.3)
Signed and dated l.r.: PM 29; inscribed by the artist on stretcher: Haut / Composition / P. Mondrian.

PROVENANCE:
Katherine S. Dreier, West Redding, Connecticut; Gift of the Estate of Katherine S. Dreier, 1953.

CONDITION:
In 1953 the edges of the canvas were retouched at the top left, top right of center, and right center.

There are approximately 11 more or less vertical cracks and 1 horizontal crack in the white areas; these appear stable, although there is some indication of possible incipient cleavage. Some drying cracks are visible in the black area at the bottom edge near the right corner. There is some soil throughout, especially in the upper white area. The paint on all 4 frame miters is chipped and cracked, and there is additional cracking with paint loss on the lower edge of the frame. The overall condition is good. (Sept. 1973.)

The enclosed gray square which dominates this composition is characteristic of the paintings produced between 1921 and 1928, but has almost disappeared by 1929, when the dominant square has usually been pushed into the corner and enclosed on two adjacent sides instead of four (e.g., Seuphor [1956], repr. cc 341-344; for a brief note on this development see Welsh, TM, 1966, pp. 192-194). The present picture and Foxtrot B (Yale University Art Gallery, Seuphor [1956], repr. cc 337) are the final examples of this earlier compositional type and are the only ones painted in 1929 known to the present author.

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCE:

1. The date of Dreier's acquisition of this work is unknown. She had purchased works directly from the artist by 1929 and may have acquired this soon after it was painted, but no records of her purchase have yet come to light.

2. No additional data that would confirm the present painting's appearance in the Zurich exhibition has hitherto come to light.
Composition A. 1930.

71.1936R. 96
Oil on canvas (lozenge), 29 3/4 x 29 3/4 in. (75.2 x 75.2)

PROVENANCE:

CONDITION:
The picture was lined with wax resin on natural linen at an unrecorded date. There is a considerable amount of old inpainting along all edges and in scattered locations throughout the surface, the majority over cracks in the pigment.

Long irregular pigment cracks, some with cupping, are scattered over the surface. These are the result of the artist's practice of applying the pigment in successive layers. It is interesting to note that Mondrian looked upon the successive layers of paint—its thickness—as a potential source of resistance to damage. 2 There is some slight chipping and wear at all edges, especially in the blacks. The condition in general is fair but stable. (Apr. 1974.)

1. It is not clear whether this title (first used in print in the 1946 exhibition catalogue) is Mondrian's own, or whether it was given to the picture by Hilla Rebay.

2. A letter from Mondrian to Rebay, expressing delight at her purchase of the painting, is dated Oct. 10, 1930. In it Mondrian tells Rebay that he has brought the picture to Fénelon's house, where several other paintings were awaiting shipment to her. He continues: "J'espère que le tableau vous parvienne en bon état, mais si on le salit quand-même vous pouvez toujours avec un peu d'eau et du savon blanc le nettoyer. La peinture est assez épaisse pour supporter cela." The Hilla von Rebay Foundation Archive. ("I hope that the picture will arrive in good condition, but if it does get dirty you can always clean it with a little water and white soap. The paint is sufficiently thick to withstand this.")
Mondrian’s reference to the lozenge-shaped canvas as an illustration of his explicit rejection of van Doesburg’s 1925 reintroduction of the diagonal into his work has often been cited. He said to J. J. Sweeney:

Doesburg, in his late work, tried to destroy static expression by a diagonal arrangement of the lines of his compositions. But through such an emphasis the feeling of physical equilibrium which is necessary for the enjoyment of the work of art is lost. The relationship with architecture and its vertical and horizontal dominants is broken. If a square picture, however, is hung diagonally, as I have frequently planned my pictures to be hung, this effect does not result. Only the borders of the canvas are on 45° angles, not the picture. The advantage of such a procedure is that longer horizontal and vertical lines may be employed in the composition (“Eleven Europeans in America,” The Museum of Modern Art Bulletin, vol. xiii, no. 4-5, 1946).

Both statements imply that the viewer’s tendency to see the lines as continuing beyond the limits of the canvas edge is not only unavoidable but desirable (although R. P. Welsh has correctly drawn attention to the fact that Mondrian probably regarded this as a secondary phenomenon and never explicitly mentioned it in his published writings; TM, 1966, p. 198).

M. Bill was unaware of these statements by Mondrian when he suggested in his essay on the 1925 Composition I with Blue and Yellow that the crucial quality of the lozenge-shaped pictures was the inevitable extension into the surrounding space of their horizontals, their verticals, and even of their colored planes. Precisely because their horizontals and verticals did not correspond to the edges of the canvas, Bill implied, they acquired an added independent momentum which allowed them infinite possibilities for extension beyond the framing edge (Zürcher Kunstgesellschaft, Jahresbericht, 1956, trans. M. Wolf, Centennial Catalogue, 1971, pp. 74-76).

The fact that most of Mondrian’s approximately twenty lozenge-shaped canvases were produced in the years 1925-26, when his break with van Doesburg over the issue of the diagonal and his own renewed emphasis on the primary importance of the vertical and horizontal were foremost in his mind, cannot be insignificant.

Composition I A is the earlier of only two paintings by Mondrian in which none of the verticals and horizontals intersect within the confines of the canvas: two of them touch at the center of the lower right edge, but they intersect only outside it. This particular element takes even more extreme form in the Haags Gemeentemuseum’s Composition with Yellow Lines of 1933 (GM 155, Seuphor [1956], repr. cc 410), where none of the four colored bars touch at all.

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCE:
Seuphor [1956], repr. cc 408.
Amédée Ozenfant

Born April 1886, Saint-Quentin, Picardy.
Died May 1966, Cannes.

208

Still Life. 1920.
(Nature morte; "L'Esprit Nouveau [2]").

55.1423
Oil on canvas, 31 3/4 x 39 3/4 (80.9 x 100.0)
Signed l.r.: ozenfant. Not dated.

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist, 1955.

CONDITION:
In 1964 the work was restrretched on a new stretcher. Surface dirt was removed in 1973, but the work was not varnished due to the danger of possible cross-linking with varnish already mixed with the pigment. Minor inpainting was mostly confined to the extreme left edge with scattered minor touches on the other edges.
Apart from some scattered minor chips at the edges and corners, scattered ground cracks at the left side of the picture, and moderate scratches and abrasion in the lower margin, the condition is good. (Apr. 1974.)

1. The picture appears with this title in the “Suggestion for purchase” memorandum submitted to the trustees of the SRGM in 1955. Although no document in Ozenfant’s hand has hitherto come to light in which the picture is so designated, it seems certain that the title originated with him. The inclusion of the 1940 Chicago show in the present exhibition history is based upon this title.
The 1920 date for this work appears in the 1921 *L’Esprit Nouveau* illustration caption and is entirely consistent with the stylistic evidence.

At least two other versions of the composition exist, both also painted in 1920. One, now in the collection of Peggy Guggenheim in Venice, is identical in size to the present work and is signed and dated (N. and E. Calas, *The Peggy Guggenheim Collection of Modern Art*, New York, 1966, repr. p. 43). The table top in this latter version is divided into dark and light areas, and the molding in the upper left corner is a single rounded form. Certain areas of light and dark are reversed in this painting, and the value relationships are altered in some places, but the compositions are otherwise identical.

In the third version (present whereabouts unknown, *L’Esprit Nouveau*, no. 7, 1921, repr. p. 827) the molding at the upper left corner takes yet another slightly modified form, but the table top is, like that of the present painting, uniform. Although the colors in this work are unknown, the value relationships appear to be closer to those of cat. no. 208 than to those of the Peggy Guggenheim picture.

A comparison among these three works and representative related works of 1919 corroborates Golding’s point that Purism reached its maturity in 1920 (p. 12). A 1919 still-life illustrated in *L’Esprit Nouveau* (no. 7, 1921, p. 819), though incorporating many of the same elements as cat. no. 208, is not yet characterized by the economy, simplicity, and lucidity of the latter.

Ozenfant’s designation of the Guggenheim painting as *Esprit Nouveau* (2) (the “2” apparently describing its relationship to another picture of 1920 included in the Chicago exhibition as *Still Life Esprit Nouveau*, but hitherto otherwise unidentified) suggests the extent to which this painting epitomized for him the important developments of 1920. In that year the first issues of his periodical *L’Esprit Nouveau* appeared (jointly edited with Jeanneret), and the new style which they had both been gradually refining became fully established and articulated in the pages of their journal.

**EXHIBITIONS:**


**REFERENCES:**

François Marie Martinez Picabia

Portrait of Mistinguett (?).
c. 1908-1911.

66.1801
Oil on canvas, 23⅛ x 19⅛ (60 x 49.2)
Signed and dated l.c. Francis Picabia 1907.

PROVENANCE:

CONDITION:
The painting was lined and cleaned prior to its acquisition by Granville (conversation between Granville and Rowell, Paris, 1970).

Cracks in the paint film are considerable in the right background, and there is a prominent vertical crack slightly left of center; both of these areas have been partially filled and inpainted. Minor paint losses and cracks are visible elsewhere. Examination under high magnification revealed that the signature and date were applied over cracks in the original paint film, establishing that they were added after the completion of the canvas. Since the artist's handwriting did not alter significantly over the years, it is impossible to determine with any precision when this addition might have taken place. The condition is in general good. (Dec. 1971.)

Although the 1907 date was added in the artist's hand, it must be treated with some caution (see above CONDITION). The style of the painting tends to indicate a slightly later date, since the majority of the paintings securely dated 1907 reveal a much greater dependence on Impressionism. By late 1908 and early 1909, and perhaps to an even greater extent in the first part of 1911, the influence of Fauvism and Japonisme—so clearly present in the Portrait of Mistinguett—had become prominent in Picabia's style. Works such as Woman with Mimosas of 1908 (Galleries Maurice Sternberg, Chicago), or Adam and Eve of 1911 (Collection Simone Collinet, Paris) are examples of this development that would lend support to a later date for the Mistinguett. At the same time it is important to note, as Camfield has, that Picabia's paintings of 1908-11 were marked by a somewhat quixotic experimentation with various styles, making it difficult to pinpoint the dates of individual pictures exactly. Furthermore, since the date of the Guggenheim painting was inscribed substantially after the completion of the canvas, it is possible that other signed and dated paintings of this period might pose similar problems. Until further evidence on this point emerges, a date of c. 1908-11 would seem most convincing.

The identification of the sitter as Mistinguett cannot be established with certainty, but various factors contribute to its plausibility. Simone Collinet, who included the portrait in an exhibition of Picabia's work at her Galerie Furstenberg in 1956, suggested at that time that it might represent Mistinguett; Gabrielle Buffet-Picabia, who had married the artist in 1909, agreed that the identification was plausible (conversation between Rowell and Simone Col-

1. Conversation between M. Rowell and Granville, Paris, 1970. Granville specified that he purchased the painting from a Mr. Axel, who had the painting on consignment from a foreign collector. He did not know anything further about Mr. Axel or about the earlier history of the painting.
Gabrielle Buffet-Picabia subsequently indicated in a letter to Granville (April 7, 1962, copy in the SRGM files) that Picabia knew Mistinguett very well at the time this picture was painted, and she added that the portrait seemed to her to be a good likeness. Denise de Lima, daughter-in-law of Mistinguett, also offered confirmation of the identification (letter to Granville, March 15, 1962, copy in the SRGM files). Olga Picabia, who married the artist in 1940, was not able to identify the sitter from personal acquaintance, but stated (in conversation with T. M. Messer, New York, September 1970) that Picabia had several times spoken of his portrait of Mistinguett and wondered what had become of it.

Comparison of the profile with photographs of the actress are suggestive but inconclusive. Since the painting is clearly an evocative likeness, however, rather than a portrait painted from a posed model, the representation is necessarily somewhat generalized. Gabrielle Buffet-Picabia (in conversation with Rowell, Paris, 1971) stated in relation to the picture that the artist’s portraits were almost always painted from memory and not based on sittings. While this would seem unlikely in relation to works such as the portraits of Soupault and Breton (Les Champs magnétiques, Paris, 1920, frontispiece) or the portrait of Ernest Walsh (This Quarter, Monte Carlo, no. 3, 1927, p. 2), it is convincing in relation to the present portrait.

Mistinguett (née Jeanne Marie Bourgeois) was born at La Pointe Raquet in 1875 and made her first music hall appearances in the 1890’s. In 1907 she began to appear in straight comedy, but shortly thereafter moved to the Moulin Rouge, of which she become part proprietor. Her later appearances at the Folies-Bergère and the Casino de Paris, usually with Maurice Chevalier as her dancing partner, were world famous. She appeared in the United States (1923-24) and on the London stage (1947 and later), and she made eight films between 1910 and 1936. Her early successes derived largely from the originality of her comedy style; afterward she became the undisputed queen of revue artists. Her writings include her own memoirs (Mistinguett and her Confessions, ed. and trans. H. Griffith, London, 1938) and a short piece in the spring 1922 issue of The Little Review, an issue devoted entirely to Picabia. This last piece is additional evidence for the connection of Mistinguett with Picabia’s literary and artistic circle. She died in January 1956.

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCE:
The Child Carburetor. 1919.
(L'Enfant carburateur).

55.1426
Oil, enamel and metallic paint, gold leaf, pencil, and crayon on stained plywood, 49\(\frac{1}{4}\) x 39\(\frac{3}{4}\) \((126.3 \times 101.3)\)
Signed l.r.: Francis Picabia; inscribed u.l.: L'Enfant Carburateur; elsewhere on surface (left to right and top to bottom): méthode crocodile; dissolution de prolongation; flux et reflux des résolutions; sphère de la migraine; détruire le futur; valse en jaquette (barely visible l.c., hitherto published as Value en Jaquette).

PROVENANCE:
Gabrielle Buffet-Picabia, 1919-40; [Lucien Lefebvre-Foinet, Paris];\(^2\) Peggy Guggenheim, New York, 1940-43;\(^3\) purchased from Art of this Century (Peggy Guggenheim), by Patricia Matta (later Patricia Matisse), New York, 1943;\(^4\) purchased from Patricia Matta by Rose Fried, New York, by 1954;\(^5\) purchased from Fried, 1955.

CONDITION:
The black enamel areas have been re-touched with matte black paint, the gold-painted areas with slightly different color gold. It is impossible to say when these re-workings took place and whether they are by the artist; examination under UV indicates only that they were made at some date after the original paint application.
The plywood support is slightly warped at the top and bottom edges, resulting in a separation of the top layer of plywood from those below. There is considerable vertical cracking in the panel, especially at the top and bottom edges. The gold leaf is wrinkled throughout and there is some flaking. (Mar. 1972.)

The painting has been variously dated 1915 (Rose Fried exhibition catalogue); 1916 (P. Guggenheim); 1917 (Barr, 1946); 1918 (Barr, 1936); and ca. 1919 (Camfield, 1966, 1970; Hultén; SRGM Handbook, 1970). The two earliest exhibition catalogues (1919 and 1920), as well as the earliest known repro-

---

1. Gabrielle Buffet-Picabia, in correspondence with the author, Dec. 1970, revealed that she had been given the painting by Picabia in 1919 and that she had sold it to Peggy Guggenheim in 1921. Peggy Guggenheim, in correspondence with the author, Dec. 1970, stated that she had purchased the picture from Gabrielle in 1940. Since she was not in fact buying modern art until the late 1930's, it seems most likely that Mrs. Guggenheim's memory of the date is the correct one. Germaine Everling-Picabia believes that the picture hung in the dining room at Mougins, the château built by Picabia in 1925 (letter dated Nov. 24, 1970, SRGM files). It is possible that she intended to refer to the dining room of the apartment on rue Emile Augier, where the picture was actually painted; or alternatively, that Picabia at some point between 1925 and 1940 borrowed the picture back from Gabrielle and brought it to Mougins.

2. Lucien Lefebvre-Foinet is listed as the lender in the catalogue of the 1936 Museum of Modern Art exhibition, and letters addressed to him as lender exist in The Museum of Modern Art files. He, however, denies ever having owned the picture, although he has clear records of having shipped it (correspondence with the author, Feb.-Apr., 1971). It seems possible that at some time in the 1930's Gabrielle deposited the painting with Lefebvre-Foinet (who stored many of Picabia's other pictures), either as a loan, or in payment for some services rendered, and that he subsequently returned it to her.


5. Letter from Pierre Matisse Gallery cited in fn. 4. See also Rose Fried's exhibition catalogue of 1954.
duction of the work (The Little Review, 1922), provide no information on the date.

Only Camfield (1970, p. 107) discusses the date, suggesting that although the style is reminiscent of works of 1915 such as This Thing is Made to Perpetuate My Memory (The Arts Club of Chicago; Camfield, 1970, repr. no. 44) or Paroxysm of Sadness (Collection Simone Collinet, Paris; Camfield, 1970, repr. no. 46), its asymmetrical composition indicates a later date. He also refers to the testimony of Germaine Everling-Picabia (1955) and to the fact that the picture was exhibited for the first time at the Salon d'Automne in November 1919.

Very few of Picabia's machine paintings—most of which were produced between 1915 and 1922—are securely dated, so it is difficult to establish a firm date on stylistic grounds alone. External evidence, however, strongly supports Camfield's 1919 date. Everling-Picabia describes Picabia's work on the picture at her apartment on rue Emile Augier, into which he did not move until the fall of 1919 (Camfield, 1970, p. 27, fn. 39). In addition, the symbolic significance of the painting's title and iconography, and the relationship of these to certain biographical facts lend support to the theory that the picture was painted shortly before the opening of the November 1919 Salon (see below).

Picabia's machine paintings were in many instances directly dependent upon engineering diagrams or other technical sources (see Camfield, 1966, p. 314 et passim; also Everling-Picabia, 1955 and Idem, L'Anneau de saturse, Paris, 1970, p. 90). Camfield first suggested that this particular painting was based on a diagram of an actual carburetor and cited a 1920 illustration as a possible model (1966, p. 320). Although Camfield's suggestion was undoubtedly correct in principle, the model he illustrated indicated that Picabia's adaptation had been a fairly free one. Comparison of the painting with the diagram of a 1918 Racing Claudel carburetor (fig. a), however, reveals that Picabia's dependence on his technical source was actually far closer.

fig. a.
The significance of the painting's title and inscriptions is difficult to establish, but several factors should be taken into account in a consideration of the iconography. Both Camfield and Hultén have argued convincingly that Picabia's expressed attitude towards his titles must play a role in the examination of his iconography and symbolism. Two statements by the artist are important in this connection: "I have been profoundly impressed by the vast mechanical development in America. The machine has become more than a mere adjunct of human life. It is really a part of human life—perhaps the very soul. In seeking forms through which to interpret ideas or by which to expose human characteristics I have come at length upon the form which appears most brilliantly plastic and fraught with symbolism. I have enlisted the machinery of the modern world, and introduced it into my studio" ("French Artists Spur on American Art," New York Tribune, October 24, 1915, pt. iv, p. 2, cited by Camfield, 1966, p. 313). And: "In my work the subjective expression is the title, the painting the object. But this object is nevertheless somewhat subjective, because it is the pantomime—the appearance of the title" (statement in 291, no. 12, February 1916, quoted by Camfield, 1966, pp. 314-315; Hultén, p. 85).

W. Rubin has argued that the relationship between title and image in the anti-art of Picabia is usually obvious and the "symbols themselves are so exaggeratedly prosaic as to suggest that it was Picabia's intention to telescope the process of association which might give them richness, and thus arrive at the greatest commonplace" (Dada and Surrealist Art, New York, 1968, p. 56). Furthermore, Camfield, while not discussing The Child Carburator, has argued for the relationship in some of the other paintings between iconographical features and events in Picabia's own life (1966, pp. 313 ff.).

The present painting is on one level immediately comprehensible in the terms suggested by Rubin's analysis: the machine parts of the carburator readily lend themselves to interpretation in sexual terms, with the male organ so obviously poised above the female. On another level, the painting's meaning is more elusive. The inscriptions within the painting remain something of a mystery even though they suggest the macabre ability of the machine to act in human ways, and conversely the potential for humans to take on the qualities of machines. The title, however, can be interpreted on yet another level.

Picabia's passion for automobiles is well-known. During 1919 alone he owned in succession a Peugeot, an English Singer (for which he paid by selling Germaine Everling's pearl necklace), and an American Mercer. Furthermore, the Singer, which he still owned in the early fall of 1919 (Sanouillet, 1966, p. 97), almost certainly contained the type of Racing Claudel carburator on which the design of the present painting is based (information supplied by Chrysler, United Kingdom, Ltd., correspondence with the author, December 1971). As has already been suggested above, the machine parts in the painting have explicit sexual analogies which are both visually and intellectually obvious. Related biographical facts which most probably have a bearing on the interpretation of the painting concern Picabia's simultaneous involvement at this time with two women, Gabrielle Buffet and Germaine Everling. In September 1919
his wife Gabrielle gave birth to a son, Vincente; three months later his mistress Germaine gave birth to a son, Lorenzo.

In the light of these biographical facts, the title of the painting lends to the prosaic sexual imagery a more complex significance: what is presented, in essence, is a comment upon the involved human relationships between the artist and the two women. It suggests that in the autumn of 1919, while his wife and mistress were giving birth to human children, he was preoccupied with another kind of child—his automobile, a child conceived in machine terms. Through the symbolism of the machine, and his relationship to it, he was giving expression to the infinite complexities of his own emotional and sexual life.

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:

Pablo Ruiz Picasso

Born October 1881, Malaga.
Died April 1973, Mougins.
Carafe, Jug, and Fruit Bowl.
Summer 1909.
(Carafe; Pot et Compotier; Compotier).

37.536
Oil on canvas, 28 1/4 x 25 3/8 (71.6 x 64.6)
Not signed or dated.

PROVENANCE:
Probably purchased directly from the artist by G. F. Reber, Lausanne, sometime after 1918; purchased from Reber by Zwemmer Gallery (A. Zwemmer), London, 1935 (information supplied by Zwemmer, correspondence with the author, May 1971); purchased from Zwemmer by Solomon R. Guggenheim, September 1936; Gift of Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1937.

CONDITION:
Prior to its acquisition by the Museum, the painting was placed on a new stretcher and the edges were taped, apparently to hide unpainted and tacked margins that became visible in the restretching process. In 1953 there was a surface cleaning, but the varnish was not removed.
The overall condition is excellent.
(Jan. 1972.)

The earliest known publication of the picture is Zwemmer’s exhibition catalogue of 1936, where it is dated 1908; Barr concurred with this date. Zervos placed the picture in the spring of 1909 as do G. Aust (SRGM 104-T, 1957, Cologne catalogue) and F. Mathey (Ibid., Paris catalogue). Until 1968 the Museum accepted the 1908 date, but evidence provided subsequently by Sabartés argued for redating the picture to 1909: in his book of documents relating to Picasso’s life and work Sabartés reproduces a photograph of Picasso’s summer 1909 studio at Horta de San Juan; the left side of the present painting is clearly visible hanging on the wall.

Stylistically the painting belongs to the late spring and early summer of 1909. It clearly follows by at least some months the Vase, Gourd, and Fruit on a Table in the John Hay Whitney Collection (Zervos, 2°, repr. no. 126), dated by Zervos spring 1909, but more convincingly dated by M. Jardot to the winter of 1908-09, or the first months of 1909 (Picasso, exhibition catalogue, Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris, 1955, repr. no. 17). It also clearly follows the Moscow Fruit Bowl, Fruit, and Glass (Zervos, 2°, repr. no. 124, dated there spring 1909), which cannot be later than the earliest months of 1909, and The Museum of Modern Art Fruit Dish (Zervos, 2°, no. 12, dated there winter 1908). Kahnweiler and Barr push the latter forward into the spring of 1909 (Barr, 1946, p. 65); J. Golding convincingly dates it “probably early spring 1909” (Cubism, 1959, revised ed., 1968, p. 71), as does W. Rubin, although he does not rule out the possibility that it might be a few months earlier (Picasso in the Collection of The Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1972, p. 201). Whether or not the Whitney, Moscow, and The Museum of

1. The picture was never owned by Kahnweiler; it appears neither in his own photo archive in Paris nor in any of the 4 Kahnweiler Sales. Léonce Rosenberg’s photographic archives in Paris do not include it either, but these are incomplete and it cannot be altogether ruled out that the picture once belonged to him. Daix feels that the picture is more likely to have been purchased by Reber directly from Picasso (correspondence with the author, June 1972). In any event, it is clear that Picasso himself kept the picture in his own collection for at least 9 years after he painted it and perhaps considerably longer.
Modern Art still-lifes fall in the later part of the winter, or as late as February-March of 1909, they are clearly distinct from the developments that occurred in Picasso's work starting in May, when he moved to Horta for over four months. The present picture is in certain respects clearly reminiscent of the earlier group: the treatment of the rounded fruits in the bowl, the bowl simultaneously shown from various viewpoints, and the tilting forward of the table top are reminiscent of The Museum of Modern Art still-life (see Golding, p. 72, for a discussion of these elements). But in the carafe, and even more strongly in the draperies, the angular faceting brings the work much closer to the developed Cubism of Woman with Pears (on extended loan to The Museum of Modern Art), which dates from some time well into the summer (Rubin, 1972, p. 61). Nothing in the present picture is quite so broken down into complex fragmentary planes as the head in this latter painting; but a comparison of the background drapery in the two pictures, as well as the arrangement of tablecloth and napkins in the present picture with the tablecloth and even with Fernande's forehead in The Museum of Modern Art work, tends to indicate that the Guggenheim painting was in process not very long before the other, and after the first of the Horta landscapes. Daix has stated (in correspondence with the author, June 1972) that Picasso remembered painting the Guggenheim still-life some time after he arrived at Horta. His recollection is borne out by the stylistic evidence, which would place the painting after the landscapes (Zervos, 2*, repr. nos. 157, 158, 161), shortly before the Woman with Pears, and rather more substantially before The Museum of Modern Art Still Life with Liqueur Bottle painted in the late summer (Rubin, 1972, p. 62).

Daix places the picture late in the Horta series and draws attention to the fact that the carafe, which does not appear in any of the Paris still-lifes, is visible in truncated form in the upper right corner of Portrait of Fernande (Zervos, 6, repr. no. 1071), which he also places in this period.

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:
Accordionist. Summer 1911.
(Homme assis; Pierrot; Harlequin).

37-537
Oil on canvas, 51 1/4 x 35 1/4 (130.2 x 89.5)
Signed l.l.: Picasso; inscribed by the artist on reverse: Picasso / Ceret. The signature on the face must have been added at a later date, probably in the 1920's or 1930's when the picture was sold. (See Jardot, 1955, p. 46, for a discussion of the fact that Picasso and Braque rarely signed their pictures on the obverse between the years 1907 and 1914.)

PROVENANCE:
Possibly purchased directly from the artist

The picture was painted during the summer of 1911 when Picasso and Braque were working in close collaboration at Ceret in the Pyrenees. As has often been noted, their work during these months was strikingly similar. (See, for example, Braque's Man with a Guitar, The Museum of Modern Art, Golding, Cubism, 1968, pl. 37B, which is extremely close in vocabulary and style to the present painting.) During the years 1911-12 the two painters came closer to total abstraction than at any other time, and the images, though still containing elusive references to recognizable forms and objects, are increasingly difficult to decipher. Paintings such as Glasses, Violin, and Fan (Zervos, 2°, no. 263), Man with a Pipe (Zervos, 2°, repr. no. 280), The Poet (Zervos, 2°, no. 285), all painted in the summer of 1911, pose problems of legibility similar to those of the Accordionist. (For discussion of this particular development in Picasso's work see Rubin, Picasso in the Collection of The Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1972, pp. 68-70; R. Rosenblum, "Picasso," Bulletin, Philadelphia Museum of Art, vol. lxii, January-March 1967, pp. 175-178.) Daix places the present painting at the very end of the summer in Ceret.

The identification of the subject of the present painting as Pierrot (Dudensing, letter to S. R. Guggenheim, November 1936; SRGM exhibition catalogues by Paul Guillaume, Paris, ca. 1920; purchased from Guillaume by Valentine Gallery (Valentine Dudensing), New York, before 1936; purchased from Dudensing by Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1936; Gift of Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1937.

CONDITION:
The work has received no treatment since its acquisition. There is some paint loss along the left margin which was inpainted before 1936, and a few small areas of loss elsewhere on the canvas.
The edges are worn and soiled from contact with the rabbet of a previous frame, and the support, which is thin and fragile, shows some tears and losses in the corners. The overall condition of the paint film is excellent. (Jan. 1971.)

1. A label formerly on the stretcher (transcription only preserved) reads "Dudensing Paul Guillaume." D. Cooper confirmed (in correspondence with the author, July 1971) that Guillaume purchased pictures of this sort from Picasso in the 1920's and sold them to Dudensing in the 1930's. Daix (in correspondence with the author, June 1972) concurred with this hypothesis.
PICASSO  Accordionist
of 1937 and 1938; *Art of Tomorrow*, 1939, no. 537; Barr, 1939) is unconvincing, since the figure wears no hat. Zervos (2°, no. 277) first identified the figure as an accordionist, an identification that had been suggested as an alternative by Barr in 1939 and was fully accepted by him by 1946. As Barr describes the figure, he faces front, head slightly tilted to the right, his left arm clearly bent at the elbow, his fingers and the keys of the instrument visible just below the center, and the curled volutes of the armchair in which he is seated emerging near the bottom of the canvas. In addition to the three keys, one can also discern the folds of the instrument’s concertina-like bellows.

**EXHIBITIONS:**


**REFERENCES:**

Landscape at Céret. Summer 1911.  
(Paysage de Céret).

37.538
Oil on canvas, 25 3/4 x 19 3/4 (65.1 x 50.3)
Signed Ll.: Picasso; inscribed by the artist on reverse (visible through lining); Picasso / Céret. The signature on the face was added at a later date, probably in the 1930’s (see above Accordionist).

PROVENANCE:
Possibly purchased directly from the artist by Pierre Loeb or Pierre Colle, ca. 1930 (hypothesis suggested by D. Cooper in correspondence with the author, July 1971); purchased from Loeb or Colle by Valentine Gallery (Valentine Dudensing), New York, before 1936; purchased from Dudensing by Solomon R. Guggenheim, November 1936; Gift of Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1937.

CONDITION:
In 1960 the picture was superficially cleaned, lined with wax resin, and placed on a new stretcher; it was surfaced with synthetic varnish and had apparently not been varnished previously.
The edges are worn and soiled from contact with previous frame and there is some retouching in these areas. In the upper left quarter of the painting there are five areas in which dark green is used in conjunction with black. These appear to have been applied by the artist some time after the original completion of the canvas. Apart from a few extremely small abrasions with paint loss, the condition is excellent. (Dec. 1971.)

Although Barr dated the picture 1914, a date accepted for some years by the Guggenheim (see below EXHIBITIONS, and Art of Tomorrow, 1939, no. 538), it undoubtedly belongs to the most abstract phase of the 1911 summer at Céret. Elliptical suggestions of curtained windows in the upper center, a flight of steps below, several archways on the left, and some roofs are the only clues to deciphering the landscape represented. Braque’s Rooftops at Céret (Collection Ralph Colin, New York, R. Rosenblum, Cubism and Twentieth-Century Art, New York, 1960, fig. 31), with its somewhat clearer references to architectural forms, provides some further indications of the architectural sources for Picasso’s much more shadowy rendering. Daix places the Picasso landscape early in the summer of 1911, before Braque’s arrival at Céret in mid-August, implying thereby that Braque was strongly influenced by Picasso’s already completed work when he painted the Colin picture.

EXHIBITIONS:
New York, Valentine Gallery, Picasso, Oct.-Nov. 1936, no. 33 or 35 (“Paysage à Céret—1911” or “Paysage—1911”; information that the picture appeared in this exhibition supplied by Cooper); Philadelphia, SRGM 3-T, no. 186 (“Landscape Seret [sic], 1914”); Charleston, S.C.,

1. The picture was not owned by Kahnweiler. It does not appear in the Rosenberg photographic archives in Paris, but these are incomplete. The picture must have remained in Picasso’s hands until at least 1918, but in conversation with Daix, the artist gave the impression that he owned the picture for a good deal longer than this (information supplied by Daix, correspondence with the author, June 1972). Cooper’s hypothesis is based upon the fact that Valentine Dudensing was buying pictures from both Loeb and Colle in the 1930’s and that both bought Cubist works from Picasso in those years.
REFERENCES:
Bottles and Glasses. Winter 1911-1912.  
(Bouteilles et Verres; Le Percolateur).

38.539
Oil on paper mounted on canvas,  
25 5/8 x 19 1/2 (64.4 x 49.5)

Signed l.r.: Picasso; inscribed on stretcher,  
not in the artist’s hand: Tableau signé en  
1937. Like Accordionist, Summer 1911, cat.  
no. 212, the picture would not have been  
signed when it was painted, and the style of  
the signature corresponds with those of the  
1930’s. Zervos (2*, no. 299) refers to the fact  
that the picture was signed in 1937.

PROVENANCE:
Gift of the artist to Max Pellequer, Paris,  
some time between 1920 and 1937;¹ Galerie  
Pierre (Pierre Loeb), Paris, 1937-38;² purchased  
from Loeb by Solomon R. Guggenheim, September 1938; Gift of Solomon R.  
Guggenheim, 1938.

CONDITION:
The picture was at an unrecorded date  
taped on all sides. It has not been cleaned.  
There is a light soil and some discoloration  
over the entire surface. The edges and  
corners are worn and some repairs have  
been made where the paper was torn. There  
are minor abrasions, and occasional minor  
cracking in the impasto areas resulting in  
very small paint losses, but the overall con-  
dition is good. (Dec. 1971.)

The picture dates from Picasso’s most hermetic period and is not easy to  
decipher. Loeb called it Le Percolateur (bill of sale to Guggenheim), but it is  
difficult to locate such an object. Two liqueur bottles appear at the top center  
and left of the canvas, and a glass on the left side, near the center. On the right  
is some kind of a poster or sign, possibly the name of a theater or shop. W.  
Rubin’s proposal (in conversation with the author, June 1972) that the second  
line of lettering reads “[f]er[m]eture an[nelle],” suggesting that it is indeed  
a shop sign, is convincing. The first line remains hitherto undeciphered. Daix  
suggests that the letters may derive from a newspaper; however, on the basis of  
conversations with Picasso regarding a similar picture, he feels that the  
letters were not intended to be deciphered (correspondence with the author,  
September 1973. Picasso apparently said, “... je ne voulais pas qu’on puisse  
lire les lettres. Il fallait que ce soit des lettres et rien d’autre”).  

Zervos’ date of winter 1911-12 is convincing. The vocabulary and style place  
the painting close to works such as The Carafe (Zervos, 2*, no. 286, dated by  
him winter 1911-12), which is a modified version of the upper left quarter of  
the present composition and probably just precedes it. The closeness in style  
between these pictures and works such as The Museum of Modern Art Still  
Life: The Torero (Zervos, 2*, repr. no. 266), painted at Céret in the summer  
of 1911, and “Ma Jolie” of winter 1911-12 (W. Rubin, Picasso in the Collection  
of The Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1972, pp. 68-70) illustrates

¹. Loeb apparently provided the information that the picture came from Pellequer, although  
no records currently exist to prove this point. Pellequer was Picasso’s banker, and, starting  
in 1920, the artist apparently occasionally gave him paintings (information supplied by  
D. Cooper, correspondence with the author, July 1971). Since the signature dates from  
1937 (see above), it was probably at this time that Pellequer decided to sell the painting,  
asking Picasso to sign it before he did so.

². It is not clear whether the transaction between Loeb and Pellequer was a sale or exchange.  
Cooper (July 1971) indicated that the 2 often exchanged pictures.
the continuity in Picasso's style from the summer of 1911 into the beginning of 1912 as well as the difficulty inherent in establishing a more detailed chronology for these months. (Zervos, 2ª, no. 244, unconvincingly dates "Ma Jolie" spring 1911; Golding, pl. 14, dates it 1912.)

In the summer of 1911 Braque for the first time introduced stenciled letters into his composition The Portuguese (Kunstmuseum Basel, Golding, pl. 39), a technique that Picasso began to use only in the winter of 1911-12. (Daix has pointed out in correspondence with the author, June 1972, that the oft-stated notion that Braque first introduced lettering into his pictures as early as 1910 has not been documented. Picasso's Torero and The Bottle of Rum were probably the earliest examples of the use of letters as such.) Braque himself analyzed the importance of the new development: the letters were forms which could not be distorted because, being flat, they existed outside space and their presence in the painting, by contrast, enabled one to distinguish between objects situated in space and those outside it (D. Vallier, "Braque, la peinture
and nous," "Cahiers d'Art," vol. xxix, no. 1, 1954, p. 16). The function and effect of this new element in the Cubist compositions of both Braque and Picasso have been widely discussed. (See especially C. Greenberg, "The Pasted Paper Revolution," Art News, vol. lvii, Sept. 1958, pp. 47 ff., reprinted in Art and Culture, Boston, 1961, pp. 72 ff.) In Braque's "Ma Jolie" the letters appear, as Greenberg says, to lie on top of the Cubist flatness, between the representation and the spectator. "Wherever this printing appears, it stops the eye at the literal plane, just as the artist's signature would" (1961, p. 73).

The lettering in the present painting (and to a lesser extent in some earlier ones) plays a slightly more complex role, for the letters are not stenciled and are not entirely outside the context of the painting. In the second line of printing, the end of the line is cut off by an apparently overlapping plane. Below are three illegible letters which bridge both planes. The larger letters above stand in an even more ambiguous relationship to the surrounding planes, as well as to the lines below. The "G" is partially hidden by the plane in which the "A" is embedded; the "W," larger in scale than the other letters, seems suspended alongside, or perhaps slightly behind the "A," but is cut off at the left by yet another plane. The interweaving of frontal letters with the composition itself thus creates the same kind of ambiguity of interrelationships that was to be fully explored in the collages of the coming months. In The Museum of Modern Art's Still Life with Chair Caning of no earlier than May 1912 "every part and plane of the picture keeps changing place in relative depth with every other part and plane; and it is as if the only stable relation left among the different parts of the picture is the ambivalent and ambiguous one that each has with the surface" (Greenberg, 1961, p. 76). Although it is extremely difficult to date with precision, the present picture with its painted rather than stenciled letters may precede the developments of the later winter. (I am indebted to Daix for having raised important questions regarding the dating of this work.)

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:
Glass and Pipe. 1918.
(Verre et Pipe; Nature Morte; Pipe; Composition).

37-379
Oil with sand on canvas, 13\(\frac{1}{4}\) x 10\(\frac{3}{4}\)
(35 x 27)
Signed and dated u.r.: Picasso / 18.

PROVENANCE:
Galerie l'Effort Moderne (Léonce Rosenberg), Paris, by 1921 (L'Esprit Nouveau, no. 9, frontispiece “Nature morte, Coll Léonce Rosenberg:"! a photograph of the work appears in the Rosenberg photographic archives, Paris); G. F. Reber, Lausanne, probably mid-1920's-1936; purchased from Reber by Zwemmer Gallery (A. Zwemmer), London, 1936 (information supplied by Zwemmer, correspondence with the author, 1971); purchased from Zwemmer by Solomon R. Guggenheim, September 1936; Gift of Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1937.

CONDITION:
In 1953 the picture was superficially cleaned without removal of the varnish, and the strainer was replaced. An old 1/2 in. tear in the upper left corner (approximately 2 1/2 in. from the left, 3 1/4 in. from the top) was repaired and the area inpainted.

There is extensive cracking in the paint film of the white areas. Tiny hair cracks in the black areas are probably drying cracks since they were already visible in Rosenberg’s photograph, presumably of about 1920 (fig. a, no. 0141-205). The latter also reveals that there was originally a stronger differentiation in value between the rectangle within which the hexagon is placed and the framing areas surrounding it. Examination under UV suggests that the artist applied a heavier coat of varnish to the inner rectangle and thus created a clear separation between the 2 areas. General discoloration of the varnish has blurred this distinction. (Dec. 1971.)

fig. a.
Early photograph of Glass and Pipe.

1. I am indebted to D. Cooper for bringing this reference to my attention. The picture still belonged to Rosenberg in 1924 when it was reproduced in color in La Peinture moderne.
2. Cooper suggested (in correspondence with the author, July 1971) that Reber purchased the picture either from Léonce or Paul Rosenberg as early as 1920 or 1921. However, it is reproduced in Léonce Rosenberg’s journal Bulletin de l’Effort Moderne, no. 8, Oct. 1924, without indication of collection, suggesting that at that time Rosenberg himself still owned it. Cooper said, however, that Reber started in the early 1920's exchanging Cézannes and Impressionist works for more modern pictures in the Rosenberg collection, so it would seem possible that the Glass and Pipe was one of the latter, and that Reber acquired it soon after 1924.
Although Léonce Rosenberg's earliest publication of the picture identified it only as a *Nature morte* (*L'Esprit Nouveau*, no. 9 [1921?]), he had by 1924 more precisely described it as *Verre et Pipe* (*Bulletin de l'Effort Moderne*, no 8). Guggenheim clearly accepted Zwemmer's designation of the work as a more abstract *Composition*, as have most subsequent publications (see below Exhibitions). Notable exceptions are Zervos, who called the picture *Pipe*, and Fry, who correctly identified it as *Still Life with Pipe and Glass*.

The particular compositional and textural concerns of the Guggenheim *Glass and Pipe* are the subject of a whole series of 1918 canvases (Zervos, 3, nos. 143-146, 120, 121, 138, 140; a further example in the Huber Collection, Glarus [Zervos, 6, no. 1408], dated there 1920, must surely also be of 1918). In all of these, a still-life is placed on an asymmetrical ground and seen against either a vertically divided background with one or two rectangular framing edges, or within a series of receding framing rectangles. In each one highly textured areas of oil mixed with sand are juxtaposed with smoother areas of pure paint, heavily varnished areas with unvarnished ones, striped areas with plain ones, and so on. The *trompe l'œil* “frames” in these pictures and the variety of textural qualities used as if in imitation of collage are particularly characteristic of the 1918 series, although certain of the ingredients are to be found in both earlier and later works.

Exhibitions:


References:


3. The exhibition consisted of works lent by Léonce Rosenberg, who wrote the catalogue introduction. Since the Guggenheim picture was entitled *Nature morte* when it was lent to the Paul Rosenberg exhibition the following year, it is possible that it was also included in the Geneva exhibition with this title. There is, however, no conclusive evidence to further substantiate the hypothesis.

4. In *L'Esprit Nouveau*, no. 9, the picture is published in connection with an article by M. Raynal on the Paul Rosenberg Picasso exhibition.
Mandolin and Guitar. 1924.
(Chambre à Juan-les-Pins; Nature morte devant la fenêtre; Guitares et Compotier).

53.1358

Oil with sand on canvas, 55 ⅞ x 78 ⅞
(140.6 x 200.4)

Signed and dated l.l.: Picasso / 24. The signature and date were added some time after 1927, since the picture is reproduced without signature in O. Schürer's 1927 monograph.

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist by Paul Rosenberg, Paris, 1924; purchased from Rosenberg by G. F. Reber by 1927 (Schürer [p. 67]); purchased from Reber by Jon Nicholas Streep, New York, 1953; purchased from Streep, 1953.

CONDITION:
Prior to its acquisition by the Museum, the canvas was lined with glue and the edges were taped with brown paper tape. In 1953 the painting was superficially cleaned, but the varnish was not removed. In 1957 the canvas was placed on a new stretcher. In 1960 cleavage between the 2 canvases (approximately 24 in. along lower right margin) was repaired with wax resin, and the corresponding area on the face lightly inpainted. There is evidence of considerable filling and inpainting along the top and bottom margins, probably dating from the lining and restretching of the canvas. Minor retouchings in 2 or 3 other areas probably date from the same time.
The overall condition of the paint film is excellent. (Jan. 1971.)

Picasso’s earliest paintings on the theme of a still-life on a table in front of an open window date, as Jardot has stated, from the summer of 1919, when he spent his first summer on the Côte d’Azur (1955, nos. 48, 58, 60, 61, 62, 64). The theme recurs again and again during the subsequent summers, up to, but not beyond, 1925. Jardot has drawn attention to the fact that the majority of those painted in 1919 are small verticals, whereas the later ones are almost all horizontal and much larger. During the summers of 1924 and 1925, both of which were spent at Juan-les-Pins, Picasso produced at least nine large oils of this subject (Zervos, 5, nos. 224, 225, 252, 268 (vertical), 376, 377, 380, 445—all 38⅛ x 51⅞ in., 97 x 130 cm.—and no. 228—39 ⅜ x 62⅜ in., 101 x 158 cm.). The Guggenheim picture is considerably larger than any of the others. There are also at least eight watercolors and gouaches dating from these years, but none of them is specifically related to the present painting.

Léonce Rosenberg’s 1925 publication of the picture carries the date “1925.” This is improbable in view of the fact that Picasso would have been in Juan-les-Pins just at the time the magazine was going to press, and had the picture been painted that summer, rather than the previous one, it would not have been available to be photographed until some months later. Zervos’ date of summer 1924, borne out by Picasso’s own, is undoubtedly correct.

1. Information supplied by A. Rosenberg (correspondence with the author, Feb. 1973.) The picture was probably acquired soon after it was painted as part of the contract Rosenberg signed with the artist in 1918. It appears in the Paul Rosenberg photo archives among the works of 1924 and with the title Chambre à Juan-les-Pins.
EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:

2. This entry cannot with certainty be associated with the present picture, but its appearance in the exhibition is plausible. Reber might have seen and purchased it on that occasion.
Hilla Rebay
Born May 1890, Strasbourg, Alsace.

Composition. ca. 1915.
(Komposition 1).
71.380
Oil on canvas, 52 x 39 1/2 (131.9 x 99.8)
Signed l.r.: v Rebay; on stretcher: Hillav. Rebay / 1915.

PROVENANCE:

CONDITION:
At an unknown date the picture was lined with wax resin. Some minor touches of repaint may date from this time.
The edges and corners are worn and chipped with scattered losses of paint and ground. There are scattered drying cracks and some more serious pigment cracks, as well as some scattered abrasions. The canvas is separating from the lining in several places. The condition in general is fair. (July 1974.)

The chronology of Rebay’s early development is difficult to establish. Few dated paintings from before 1920 survive and those, almost always dated on the stretchers, may have been inscribed at a much later time when the artist no longer remembered the exact date of execution. The ca. 1915 date of the present work is thus tentative.
EXHIBITIONS:
Berlin, Der Sturm, Hugo Hänel, Hilla von Rebay, opened Apr. 6, 1919, no. 19 (Komposition 1); Grenoble, Musée de Peinture et de Sculpture, Hilla Rebay, 1948 (no cat.); New York, SRGM 67, no. 49 (Composition, not dated); 74, no. 180 ("Composition 1915").

1. A Der Sturm label on the reverse corroborates the information contained in the exhibition catalogue.

2. The museum in Grenoble has been unable to locate records of this exhibition. However, the Registrar’s files at the SRGM indicate the picture was sent to such an exhibition.

---

Animato. 1941-1942.

49.1315
Oil on canvas, 37 x 50 (94.0 x 127.0)
Signed l.r.: Rebay; inscribed by the artist on reverse: Rebay / 1941-42 Animato.

PROVENANCE:

CONDITION:
The central black area has been repaired and inpainted, probably by the artist.
There are a few scattered drying cracks and abrasions, but the condition is otherwise very good. (July 1974.)

EXHIBITIONS:
New York, SRGM 30 (no cat.); Fort Worth, Tex., SRGM 42-T, no. 2; New York, SRGM 202, p. 129.

REFERENCE:
Yellow Lines. ca. 1942-1943.
(Vibration).

71.1936R M189
Oil on canvas, 50 x 39 (126.8 x 99.1)
Signed l.r.: Rebay; inscribed by the artist on reverse: Hilla Rebay / Yellow Lines / 1942; on stretcher: To: Maresia 1 Hilla Rebay.

PROVENANCE:

CONDITION:
The painting has received no treatment.
The condition is very good. (July 1974.)

EXHIBITIONS:
New York, SRGM 36, no. 71 ("Vibration, 1943"); 64 (no cat.; "Yellow Lines, 1942"); Munich, Art Group Zen, untitled exhibition, opened Mar. 15, 1950 (no cat.); 73, no. 72 (Vibration); 74, no. 187 ("Yellow Lines, 1943").

REFERENCES:

1. Maresia von Rebay is the artist's German niece.
2. Museum records indicate that the works were returned from Munich in May 1951.
Crosses. 1944
71.1936R M267
Oil on canvas, 59 x 79 (149.7 x 203.0)
Signed l.r.: Rebay; inscribed by the artist on stretcher: Hilla Rebay Crosses. Not dated.

PROVENANCE:
Hilla Rebay, Greens Farms, Connecticut-


CONDITION:
Many of the blue areas were apparently reworked by the artist.
There are scattered minor drying cracks, some abrasions, and losses. The condition in general is good. (July 1974.)

EXHIBITIONS:
New York, SRGM 39, no. 110 ("Crosses, 1944"); Scranton, Pa., SRGM 45-T, no. 32; Zurich, SRGM 60-T, no. 29, repr. ("Crosses, 1944").

REFERENCES:
Henri Rousseau

Born May 1844, Laval, France.
Died September 1910, Paris.
Artillerymen. c. 1893-1895. 
(Le...
Rich first suggested that the formal group arrangement of the artillerymen with their cannon was probably derived from a photograph. Comparison of the picture with group photographs of the late nineteenth century certainly supports this notion. Although Rich's hypothesis has been widely accepted, no actual photograph has so far come to light.

Rousseau's own military experience was with the infantry rather than the artillery; he served from 1863-70 as a private in the fifty-first regiment (H. Certigny, *La Vérité sur le Douanier Rousseau*, Paris, 1961, pp. 59 ff. Certigny has scrupulously traced every piece of documentary information about all aspects of Rousseau's military service and established, among other things, that he did not, as is generally stated, travel to Mexico in 1862 with Emperor Maximilian's army). The artist's only known connection with the artillery was through his friendship with an artillery officer, Frumence Biche, of whom he painted two portraits (*Certigny, Le Douanier Rousseau et Frumence Biche*, Paris, 1973, where a complete study of the life of Biche, his friendship with Rousseau, and the discovery of the two portraits in the collection of Biche's daughter is to be found).

The first of these portraits, executed about 1891, shows Biche in civilian dress, and Certigny argues convincingly that it might have been a wedding present. Biche was married to Rousseau's friend, Marie Foucher, on March 3, 1891. A daughter, Cécile, was born to them December 31, 1891; and on May 10, 1892, Biche died suddenly at the early age of thirty-seven. Rousseau's second painting of his friend was a full-length military portrait dated 1893 and exhibited at the *Salon des Indépendants* that year (now Collection Joachim J. Aberbach, Sands Point, Long Island). Certigny has suggested that this work was painted from a photograph and was clearly intended as a memorial. It was not for sale at the *Salon*, and it remained in the collection of Biche's family until its discovery by Certigny.

It seems possible that the present picture is also a memorial tribute to Biche's military career. The photograph from which Rousseau derived his composition might have been given to the artist by the widow together with the more formal individual photograph which must have been the basis for the 1893 portrait. Although it is known that Biche was a sergeant in the thirty-fifth artillery regiment, the military records do not specify which battery he commanded. The inscription "4ème Batterie 3ème Pièce," so clearly legible on the cannon in the present picture, does not, therefore, provide any substantiating evidence of a connection with Biche. Indeed, there is no record of who commanded this battery. Biche did, it should be noted, also serve some time as an instructor teaching military exercises, and it is possible that the photograph and the painting date from this phase of his career.

One further fact should be taken into account: Frumence Biche was, for a man of this period, unusually tall—1.82 m. (almost 6 feet). M. Chamla, in a statistical study of the stature of French soldiers, has shown that the height of Frenchmen in the Paris area in 1890 was 1.48 m. minimum to 1.81 maximum ("L'accroissement de la stature en France 1880-1960," *Bulletins et mémoires*
de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris, vol. vi, April-June, 1964, p. 266 [Seine], Tableau A. This fact might identify Biche as the prominently placed figure in white on the far right of the Artillerymen. Comparison of this man’s features with those of Biche suggests that the figure may well represent Biche but until further evidence is found, the identification of this soldier in the Guggenheim picture must remain conjectural.

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:

6. In the issue of Der Querschnitt cited above, there is an advertisement for the Galerie Flechtheim exhibition which is separated by 50 pages from the reproduction of the Artillerymen. However, since there is no reference to Rousseau in the entire issue except for this advertisement, it seems likely that the reproduction is to be directly associated with the forthcoming exhibition, for which no catalogue has been located.
The Football Players. 1908.
(LES Joueurs de football).

60.1583
Oil on canvas, 39 1/2 x 31 3/8 (100.5 x 80.3)
Signed and dated l.r.: Henri Rousseau / 1908.

PROVENANCE:
Justin K. Thannhauser, Munich, 1912-17; purchased from Thannhauser through Wilhelm Uhde by Edwin Suermontd (d. 1923), Burg Drove, Die Eifel, Germany, 1917; Mrs. Edwin Suermontd, 1923-26; Galerie Flechtheim, Berlin and Dusseldorf, 1926 (?)-28; purchased from Flechtheim by Paul Rosenberg, Paris, 1928; purchased from Rosenberg by Mrs. Henry D. Sharpe, Providence, Rhode Island, May 1943; purchased at Sotheby and Co., London (Paintings, Drawings and Sculpture by Modern and Impressionist Masters, lot 70, November 23, 1960).

CONDITION:
The painting was lined prior to its acquisition by the Guggenheim, and cleavage between the original canvas and the lining has since occurred. 2 repairs, one on the left of the figure tossing the ball, the other in the sky and trees right of center, were also made prior to the painting’s acquisition. A puncture in the left sky (approximately 1 in. by 3/8 in.) was repaired in 1967.
The varnish, which has not been removed, is considerably discolored. The overall condition is good, although extensive cracks in the paint film exist, notably in the sky and in the lower right-hand portion of the canvas. (June 1971.)

fig. 3.

1. Thannhauser (in conversation with D. C. Rich, New York, June 1971) stated that he bought the picture in 1912 from B. Weill. In 1917, on the occasion of his marriage, he needed money and was forced to sell it. Uhde arranged the sale to Suermontd for him. See also Uhde, Henri Rousseau, Dusseldorf, 1914 [pl. 15], where the picture is reproduced as “coll. Thannhauser.”


3. After Suermontd’s death his widow presumably inherited the collection, and she is listed as one of the lenders to the Mar. 1926 exhibition at Galerie Flechtheim in which this picture appeared. However, in A. Basler’s 1927 article on Rousseau (The Arts, vol. 11, Jan.-June 1927, p. 315), the picture is reproduced “Courtesy of the Galerie Flechtheim, Berlin and Dusseldorf.” Suermontd’s widow married A. Vömel, Co-Director of the Galerie Flechtheim, in 1926, and it is difficult to know exactly when the picture passed from her personal collection into the possession of the gallery.

The question of whether Rousseau’s four athletes are engaged in a game of Rugby football, of Soccer (Football Association, as it was commonly called in France at this time), or possibly even just a game of handball has been the subject of some dispute in the literature on Rousseau. In fact the evidence clearly identifies the sport as Rugby. Not only is the ball an oval one, but the players are most explicitly using their hands, something which only the goalie is permitted to do in Soccer.

Whether Rousseau was inspired by any specific event (such as England’s first Rugby match against France held in Paris in the spring of 1908), or whether he was responding more generally to the enormous rise in popularity of this sport in the early part of this century in France is not clear. His conception of the players is not far removed from that of a newspaper cartoonist of January 1907 who was recording his impressions of the previous year’s match between France and England played at Richmond (fig. a; I am indebted to U. A. Titley for per-
mission to reprint this cartoon which he published in Country Life, October 1970, p. 842. Titley also provided me with the dates of various international Rugby events of the years 1908-13).

Gleizes’ Football Players of 1912-13, and Robert Delaunay’s Cardiff Team of 1913, where once again the ball is oval and the hands are being used, are equally clearly identifiable as depictions of Rugby games, although here again the identification with Soccer has commonly been made. In the case of the Gleizes it is possible that the 1912 match of England and Ireland against France was the inspiration; in the Delaunay it was certainly the 1913 match between Wales and France held in Paris. (A newspaper photograph of this event, published by Vriesen and Imdahl [1969, Documents, p. 108], although erroneously identified in the caption as of a Soccer game, definitely records the 1913 Rugby match cited above. The newspaper clipping belonged to Delaunay and clearly served as the basis for his painting.)

What is more important than the specific identification of the events which served to inspire these three paintings is the reflection in each of them of the general popularity of Rugby during the early years of the century. More significant still is the fact that sport as such, and Rugby in particular, was felt by these and other artists to be a suitable subject for major works of art. (For a fuller discussion of the comparative popularity of Rugby and Soccer see E. Weber, “Gymnastics and Sports in Fin de Siècle France,” American Historical Review, vol. 76, February 1971, pp. 82-90; on the subject of sport in the art and literature of this period see Pär Bergman, “Modernolatria” et “Simultaneita,” Studia Litterarum Upsaliensis, II, ed. Gunnar Tideström, Uppsala, 1962.)

Rousseau’s depiction of the scene, which has been aptly described by Rich as more reminiscent of a ballet than a game of football, is perhaps the quintessential illustration of G. de Saint-Clair’s claim that “when played by young, well-bred men, Rugby football is not dangerous” (Football [Rugby], Paris, 1894, p. 20).

**EXHIBITIONS:**


REFERENCES:


Egon Schiele

Born June 1890, Tulln, Austria.
Died October 1918, Vienna.
Johann Harms was born December 23, 1843, in Rullsdorf, Hanover. He became a well-to-do master locksmith in Vienna, and in 1884 he married Josefine Bürzner (1850-1939). They had three children: Adolf (d. 1938); Adele (d. 1968); Edith (1893-1918). The family Harms lived at 114 Hietzinger Hauptstrasse in Vienna, directly opposite Schiele’s studio, which was at no. 101. In spite of opposition from her parents, who did not want their daughter to become the wife of a mere artist, Edith married Schiele on June 17, 1915. Subsequently Schiele appears to have developed a good relationship with his father-in-law, who sat for this portrait and its various preparatory drawings. The old man died on January 5, 1917, just nine months after the completion of the painting. A few days later Schiele, in reporting the death to his brother-in-law Anton Peschka, made a brief reference to the improved relations between the two men: “ich hatte ihn sehr gerne.” A. Roessler, 1921, p. 116. (“I liked him very much.”)

Schiele was drafted into the Austrian army in June 1915, and remained on active duty until January 1917. As his war diaries make clear, however, he spent most of his time in the immediate vicinity of Vienna in Liesing, Atzgersdorf, Mauer, and Mödling, and was able to spend his weekends and many of his afternoons and evenings with his wife “Did.” at home. (See Comini, 1966, pp. 86-102; the diaries are preserved in the Egon Schiele Archiv, Albertina, Vienna.) It was during these off-duty visits to his own home that he apparently worked on the portrait of his father-in-law, to which there are three references in the diaries. The first is dated April 17, 1916: “ich kam um 11h nach Liesing, - Wachabteilen war schon um ½h ich hatte keinen Dienst. —nachmittags war ich bei Did.— das Wetter war etwas besser.— ich zeichnete klein und gross auf Leinwand meinen Schwiegervater.” (“I arrived at Liesing at 11 a.m.,—Guard assignments were already at 1:30 p.m. I had no duty.—I spent the afternoon

1. The format of this signature, in which the name and date are ornamentally inscribed within a frame, was intermittently used by Schiele between 1913 and 1918 (Kallir, 1966, p. 505).
2. When Roessler published the picture in 1918, he listed it as “Privatbesitz.” The art dealer Grünwald, who was a friend of Schiele’s and whose portrait had been painted by the artist in 1917, must have owned it by this time, but it has not been possible to verify the exact date of acquisition.
with Did.—the weather was somewhat better.—I drew on canvas the details and overall conception of my father-in-law.”) The meaning of this last sentence is unclear. Leopold’s translator, A. Lieven, has suggested that it should read: “I drew my father-in-law in outline and detail” (Leopold, p. 593). Another possible reading, which would require inserting a comma after “klein,” would be: “I made a small drawing (or small drawings?) and then a large one on canvas of my father-in-law.” The interpretation of the sentence has thus considerable bearing on Schiele’s method of composition and on the relationship between the drawing and painting phases.

On April 22 he continues: “Ich bekam für Ostersonntag dienstfrei. um 1/2 Uhr war ich bei Did.—ich malte an dem Porträt meines Schwiegervaters.—” (“I was off-duty for Easter Sunday. At 9:30 a.m. I was with Did.—I worked on the painting of my father-in-law.”) On April 24 he mentions the portrait for the last time: “Ich fuhr nach Liesing bei einem elenden Regenwetter.—ich hatte keinen Dienst, folglich war ich schnellstens wieder bei Did.—ich malte an dem Porträt meines Schwiegervaters den dunklen Grund.” (“I drove to Liesing in the rain.—I was not on duty, so as quickly as possible I was back with Did.—I painted the dark background of the portrait of my father-in-law.”)

These three letters (April 17, April 22, April 24) are the only known references to Schiele’s progress on the picture. Whether they indicate that he actually completed the work between April 17 and April 24 cannot be said with certainty, but seems probable. Close examination of the background reveals that the dark gray paint is applied over a considerably lighter greenish gray, and that the darker gray was in part at least applied after the completion of the
figure. It is possible, therefore, that Schiele's decision to place the figure against a very dark background came after the figure was essentially complete, and that the diary entry for April 24 thus represents the final stage of his work on the picture. The fact that his entry for April 17 refers to drawing rather than painting would indicate that he was at that date still involved with preliminaries, and it is possible, therefore, that the entire portrait was indeed completed within that one week.

Seven drawings of Johann Harms have so far come to light. Two of these (Leopold, no. 270, studies 2 and 6) have not been published and were unavailable for study; they are therefore excluded from discussion. Of the remaining five, three are fully developed finished drawings of a man seated firmly upright, formally attired with wing collar, tie, vest, and coat (figs. a-c). In the first, a bust-length charcoal study, the figure faces three-quarters left, and both thoughtfully focused eyes are clearly visible. In the second, a half-length charcoal and gouache study, the head is turned slightly further left and only one eye is distinct. In the last of the three, a half-length pencil study, the head is turned in almost complete profile and the left eye is barely indicated. It is difficult to establish the sequence of these three drawings with certainty. The present sequence is based upon the fact that the first two drawings are dated 1915, the third 1916; and furthermore upon the premise that Schiele would almost certainly have started with a charcoal study and only then proceeded to a more elaborate gouache version. Neither of these arguments is conclusive, however, and a further study of this group of drawings remains to be made.

All three of the above are described by Leopold as studies for the Guggenheim portrait (no. 270, studies 1, 3, 4). The drawing in the Albertina (fig. c) had already been identified as a portrait of Harms by 1965 (SRGM 170, exhibition catalogue, no. 34). The drawing in a private collection (fig. b) was identified in the 1965 exhibition catalogue merely as Portrait of an Old Man (Ibid.,
no. 33), but it too had by then been recognized by some scholars as a Harms portrait. Although these drawings are surely preparatory in nature, they represent a totally different conception of the sitter from that of the Guggenheim painting, in which the old man is shown as frail and aged, slumped in his chair, and possibly even asleep. Thus by the time Schiele embarked upon the actual painting of his father-in-law, probably in April 1916, his conception was utterly different from that expressed in the three drawings.

Two further sketches which are clearly associated with the Guggenheim portrait may possibly have additional implications. Both are on sketchbook pages. One has only recently come to light (fig. d) and is hitherto unpublished, although Leopold includes a note on its existence in his Addenda (p. 687) and describes its three figures, two of which overlap, as preliminary studies for the Guggenheim portrait. This identification had been previously made by Dr. F. Gerstel, New York, in whose collection the sheet was at the time. The other drawing (fig. e) has been known for some time and is reproduced on the lower half of page 112 of the facsimile edition of A Sketchbook by Egon Schiele (edited by Otto Kallir, Johannes Press, New York, 1967). In this publication Kallir convincingly suggested that the drawing represented an early idea for the Guggenheim portrait (p. 10 of his accompanying commentary), and Leopold has since concurred with this view (no. 270, study 5). The upper figure on this page (fig. e) has been variously described as anticipatory of Schiele’s poignant self-portrait in The Family of 1918 (Kallir, 1967, commentary, p. 10), or as possibly related to his early experiments with the composition of Mother with Two Children of 1915-17 (Leopold, 1973, p. 594). Although the pose of this figure with one arm awkwardly raised does occur in both these as well as other contexts, it corresponds most closely to the figure at the end of the table in the sketch here reproduced as fig. f. This latter drawing (the reverse of fig. d) is an early study for Schiele’s important late work Round the Table (The Friends), which provided the subject for the March 1918 Secession poster, as well as for two oils, one of which is reproduced here (fig. g). Thus, on the obverse and reverse of one sketchbook page (figs. d, f) and on the upper and lower portions of another (fig. e), sketches for the Harms portrait are juxtaposed with early ideas for Round the Table (The Friends).

Schiele’s first reference to Round the Table occurs in a January 13, 1917, letter to his brother-in-law, Peschka. The letter was written eight days after Harms’ death and conveys the sad news of that event. In the sentence immediately following Schiele writes: “ich hatte ihn [Harms] sehr gerne. . . . Ich habe vor, ein grosses Figurenbild zu malen, mit allen meinen Nächstbestehenden, lebensgross, bei einer Tafel sitzend.” A. Roessler, 1921, p. 116. (“I liked him very much. . . . I am planning to paint a large figure composition with all of my closest acquaintances seated life-size around a table.”) Here again an allusion to Harms is juxtaposed with one to Round the Table. Although it is perfectly possible that in both cases the juxtaposition of allusions was totally fortuitous, it cannot be ruled out that a tenuous relationship between the Harms sketches (figs. d, e) and Schiele’s early ideas for Round the Table does in fact exist.
fig. d.
Schiele, sketchbook page, 6 x 6¼ in., 15.2 x 17.2 cm., formerly Collection Dr. F. Gerstel, New York.

fig. f.
Schiele, sketch for Round the Table (The Friends), 1918, pencil on paper, 6 x 6¾ in., 15.2 x 17.2 cm., reverse of fig. d.

fig. e.
Schiele, sketchbook page from A Sketchbook by Egon Schiele, pencil on paper, 6½ x 4¾ in., 17.5 x 11 cm., Private Collection, New York.

fig. g.
Schiele, Round the Table (The Friends), 1917-18, oil on canvas, 39¼ x 47½ in., 99.5 x 119.5 cm., Private Collection, Switzerland.
The striking characteristic shared by these sketches of Harms is the treatment of the sitter's left arm and hand, which project rather forcefully out from the body at an upward angle, as if resting upon the arm of a chair, or upon a table. Comparison of these figures with the figure seated second from the front at the right side of the table in the sketch for Round the Table (fig. 1) would tend to support the notion that something of the Harms studies lingered in the artist's mind as he began to develop his conception for the large composition. Comini has suggested that the group of "Nächstbekannten" are artists, with Schiele at their head (1974, pp. 184-186, 250-251, fns. 96, 97), and although several questions about the identity of all of the participants remain unresolved, the basic premise is totally convincing. It is thus not as an actual member of the group that Harms' presence may be felt. Rather it is his physical outline, as recorded by Schiele on the very sketchbook pages he was using to explore ideas for the new composition, which appears to have injected itself into the artist's thoughts. This physical outline, perhaps imbued with new meaning in the light of Harms' recent death, may thus represent a tenuous link between the 1916 portrait and the important group composition begun almost a year later.

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:

3. Schiele showed 8 paintings in this exhibition and his entries were mentioned by K. Mittenzwey: "Recht stark ist diesmal Egon Schiele vertreten" (Deutsche Kunst und Dekoration, vol. xlii, Nov. 1917/18, pp. 108-109).
Kurt Schwitters

Born June 1887, Hanover.

Mountain Graveyard. 1919.
(Hochgebirgsfriedhof).

61.1617
Oil on board mounted on cork, 36 x 28 1/2
(91.6 x 72.4)
Signed and dated l.l.: KS / 19.

PROVENANCE:
Herwarth Walden, Berlin, by 1921; pur-
chased from Walden by Frederick M. Stern,
Berlin, 1921 (information supplied by Stern,
correspondence with the author, March
1974); Gift of Frederick M. Stern, New
York, 1962.

CONDITION:
All edges have been inpainted, as have some
small losses near the lower left corner.
These repairs pre-date acquisition by the
Museum. In 1964 a small green area at the
upper right was inpainted; in 1970 the top
center edge was inpainted; and in 1973 an
area of cleavage near the top center was set
down with AYAF.

There are extensive drying cracks scattered
over the entire surface, and some small paint
losses. All edges and corners are consider-
ably worn and chipped. There is a heavy
coop of unevenly applied natural varnish
which is somewhat discolored. The overall
condition is fair to good. (Mar. 1974.)

In the years 1918 and 1919 Schwitters was simultaneously producing his first abstract pictures, his first Merz collages, his first Merz poems, and works such as Mountain Graveyard. These last were essentially based on nature, though—as Schwitters himself put it—they were subjective expressions rather than direct impressions of natural forms. “The personal grasp of nature now seemed to me the most important thing. The picture became an intermediary between myself and the spectator. I had impressions, painted a picture in accordance with them; the picture had expression” (“Merz,” Der Ararat, 1921, written December 19, 1920, trans. R. Manheim, The Dada Painters and Poets, ed. R. Motherwell, New York, 1951, p. 59). While asserting the importance of consistently striving for “expression,” Schwitters clearly felt a contradictory drive to hold meaning in the conventional sense at arm’s length; the imagery of expression must, he asserted, be as inexplicable as life, indefinable and without purpose (ibid.). In this sense, the imagery of works such as Mountain Graveyard or Expression 2, Sun in the High Mountains (present whereabouts unknown, Schmalenbach, fig. 8) must be treated with some caution, and the temp-

1. A Der Sturm label on the reverse reads: “Kunstausstellung Der Sturm / Lietung Herwarth
Walden / Berlin W 9, Potsdamer Strasse 134 / Name Kurt Schwitters / Titel Hochgebirgs-
friedhof / Katalog nr. 25.” Inscribed on the stretcher in crayon is: “E 19 / Hochgebirgs-
friedhof / K. Schwitters / Januar 1919.”

Schwitters exhibited at Der Sturm for the first time in 1919 and had his first 1-man show
there in 1920; he participated in 3 other group exhibitions there between 1919 and 1922.
It has so far not been possible to establish whether any of these exhibitions other than that
of 1920 included the present painting, although Stern remembers buying the picture out of
a Der Sturm exhibition in about 1921.
tation to interpret it as evocative of the recently ended First World War, or of the artist’s ensuing sense of death or tragedy, must be resisted.

As early as 1919, C. Spengemann was issuing warnings along these lines: “Immer wiederkehrende Figuren werden ohne jede gedankliche Bedeutung benutzt. Es sind Dinge, die in des Künstlers Totalerlebnis insofern eine Rolle spielen, als sich ein bestimmtes Gefühl mit ihnen verbindet...” (Der Cicerone, 1919, p. 580). Thus, recognizable forms may appear in the paintings, but their “meaning” is probably pictorial rather than symbolic. In the Merz poetry of 1919, Schwitters incorporates many of the images which he used in pictures such as Mountain Graveyard (mountains, graveyards, sun, church), but here the conventional message of the imagery is totally obscured. (See, for example, “Welt voll Irrsinn,” first published in Der Zeitweg, November 1919, pp. 19-20; or “Erhabenheit,” Gedicht Nr. 8, first published in Anna Blume: Dichtungen, Hanover, 1919.) As Schwitters himself stated in relation to poems such as these: “Elements of poetry are letters, syllables, words, sentences. Poetry arises from the interaction of these elements. Meaning is important only if it is employed as one such factor. I play off sense against nonsense. I prefer nonsense...” (“Merz,” pp. 59-60).

Precisely because the imagery of Mountain Graveyard cannot be so clearly designated as lacking in conventional “meaning” or Expressionist content, it must be seen within the context of Schwitters’ exactly contemporary preoccupation with a developing abstraction and with his clearly Merz poetic style. As Schmalenbach has stated, objective painting had artistic relevance in Schwitters’ life only so long as the artist was moving towards abstraction (p. 76), and it is in this intermediate sense that the imagery and “Expressionist” quality of Mountain Graveyard should be seen.

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCE:
Kurt Seligmann

Born July 1900, Basel, Switzerland.
Portrait. 1932.

64.1697

Oil on plywood, 31 7/8 x 25 7/8 (80.9 x 65)


PROVENANCE:

Estate of the artist, 1962-64; purchased from the Estate through D'Arcy Galleries, New York by A. Chauncey Newlin as a gift to the Museum, 1964.

CONDITION:

Examination under UV reveals certain minor scattered areas of strengthening and some inpainting of dents in the support; these were probably the work of the artist. Pentimenti are clearly visible under UV: at the top of the picture there was originally a triangle, the base of which rested on the brownish vertical now serving as a flagpole; the green triangle at the lower edge was originally 1 1/2 in. wider on the left, 3/4 in. wider on the right. There are vertical cracks throughout the surface caused by the expansion and contraction of the support; these are especially severe along the lower edge. Traction cracks in the light background are visible to the right of the green triangle. Apart from some general soil, the condition is good. (Mar. 1973.)

EXHIBITIONS:


REFERENCES:


1. Catalogues or other records of Seligmann’s 1932 and 1935 Paris exhibitions, 1933 London exhibition, 1934 exhibitions in Milan and Rome have hitherto not been found.

2. Campbell’s review of the exhibition describes Portrait as the only picture in the exhibition which “comes to terms more or less successfully with the idea of a two-dimensional surface.” It has so far not been possible to verify whether the present picture, or another Portrait, was the work involved, although Mrs. Seligmann believes that the picture did appear in the exhibition (conversation with the author, Mar. 1974).
Peasant with Hoe, 1882.  
(Paysan à la houe; l’Homme à la houe).

41.716

Oil on canvas, 18 1/4 x 22 1/4 (46.3 x 56.1)

Not signed or dated.

PROVENANCE:
Emile Seurat (1846-ca. 1905), brother of the artist, 1891-?; 1 “Mme. J. D.” by 1908 (lender to Bernheim-Jeune exhibition); Mme. Camille Platteel (de Hauke, no. 103); Félix Fénéon, Paris, by 1934 (lender to Durand-Ruel exhibition); purchased from Fénéon by Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1938; Gift of Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1947.

CONDITION:
In 1954 surface dirt was removed, the painting was lined with wax resin on natural linen, stretched on a new stretcher, and surfaced with clear varnish. A coat of natural varnish, which was never used by Seurat himself, was applied at an unknown date. It has not been removed, and it has darkened to some extent. There are extremely minor repairs with inpainting, one in the lower left foreground, one close to the upper left corner, one in the upper right of the haystack; also some very minor cracks in the paint film in some areas.

The condition of the picture poses certain problems. Herbert suggested (in conversation with the author, July 1970) that it is one of the pictures retouched in the winter of 1885-86, when, at the suggestion of Pisarro, Seurat experimented with the unstable pigments of a certain “Maitre Edouard.” Seurat’s reworking of La Grande Jatte at this period resulted in a considerable darkening of the overall effect. (See, among others, Fénéon, Chat noir, April 2, 1892: “Le fait des couleurs dont Seurat se servait à la fin de 1885 et en 1886, ce tableau, d’importance historique, a perdu son charme lumineux: si les roses et les bleus se sont maintenus, les veronese est maintenant olivâtres, et les orangés qui représentaient la lumière ne représentent plus que des trous.” (“Because of the pigments which Seurat used at the end of 1885 and during 1886 this historic painting has lost its luminous charm: while the pinks and blues have survived, the veronese greens are now olives, and the orangés which represented light are now mere holes.”) Some of the other early canvases were probably subjected to the same treatment. (See E. Demolder, “Chronique artistique: exposition des XX à Bruxelles,” in J. Guillemin, L’Atelier du temps, Paris, 1964, p. 18: “Quelques toiles [de Seurat] ont poussé au noir, et on s’est permis de dire que la faute en était au procédé et à la facture. Affirmation absurde, c’est la couleur même qui a noirci. Le coupable c’est le fabricant de couleurs, rien que lui.” (“Some canvases have significantly darkened, and it has been suggested that it is due to the artist’s technique— an absurd suggestion. It is the pigment which has darkened. The manufacturer of the pigments is to blame— no one else.”) The overall effect of the present canvas is unusually somber and dulled. In particular, the presence of the dark olive strokes in sunlit areas (especially to the left of the tree trunk) are impossible to explain within the context of Seurat’s color practice, even in the early years. Had this color originally been a vivid orange it would have formed a logical part of the sunlight reflected from the grassy field. Examination under UV indicates that these olive brush strokes were added after the completion of the original picture. (Apr. 1972.)

1. De Hauke lists Emile Seurat as the first owner, but gives no date of acquisition or sale.

He also records that the picture was no. 22 in the posthumous inventory taken in the atelier on May 3, 1891, by Signac, Fénéon, and Luce. (See R. Rey, La Renaissance du sentiment classique, Paris, 1921, p. 144, for a general description of the contents.) No systematic list of the inventory was made, but each canvas, panel, and drawing was inscribed on the back with the name of Seurat, an inventory number, and the initials P. S., L., or F. F. Some notes
were also made in a notebook indicating the number of works in each category, and referring by name to some of the more important canvases. The SRGM’s files have no record of any such notation found on the back of the present picture prior to the relining of 1957, but according to de Hauke the crayon used did not survive well and would in most cases have worn away. His entry does not indicate whether the information establishing the present picture as no. 22 in the inventory derived from the notebook or from other notes given to him by Fénéon, on whose material de Hauke’s book is largely based. All the documentation is presumably to be found among de Hauke’s research materials which were placed in the Bibliothèque Doucet with a 25-year interdiction and will not be available for study until about 1990. It is thus for the time being impossible to confirm whether the picture was in the atelier at the time of Seurat’s death. However, since Emile undoubtedly acquired some of his brother’s works at this time (the paintings were all distributed by the artist’s mother, Ernestine Faivre Seurat, d. 1898), it is plausible to assume that it was among the artist’s effects and that his brother owned it from 1891.
The variety of dates proposed for this picture (see below Exhibitions and References) highlights the problem of establishing a chronology for Seurat’s early work. The approximately eighty-five small oils which Seurat painted before his first major work—La Baignade Asnières (National Gallery, London) of 1883-84—are, like the present canvas, all undated, and few were exhibited before 1900. Furthermore, the dates assigned to them by Fénéon in the catalogues of the exhibitions of 1900 and 1908-09 must, as Homer has pointed out (review of Dorra-Rewald, The Art Bulletin, vol. xlii, September 1960, p. 229), be treated with some caution since Fénéon did not meet Seurat until 1886, and it has not been determined whether the evidence he used came directly from the artist. The fact that Fénéon himself offered conflicting dates at various times for various canvases suggests that he may have been uncertain about this early period of Seurat’s work. Both Homer and Herbert have done much to pinpoint the influences absorbed by Seurat in his early years (Herbert, “Seurat in Chicago and New York,” Burlington Magazine, vol. c, May 1958, pp. 149-151; Homer, “Seurat’s Formative Period: 1880-84,” Connoisseur, vol. cxlii, September 1958, pp. 58-62, and Seurat and the Science of Painting, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1964). In addition, Herbert has made considerable progress towards the establishment of a specific chronology (1958, pp. 149-150; 1963; and in a longer study now in progress) and has concluded that the most convincing evidence derives from the dates of Seurat’s exposure to various theories of color and from his gradual incorporation of these theories into his own work.

In this regard, one crucial fact is Seurat’s own statement that he had seen Blanc’s and Chevreul’s writings, including the former’s essay on Delacroix, while he was still a schoolboy. From these materials and from a study of Delacroix’s paintings, he absorbed the theory of color contrasts, including the idea that one should strive to create a vibration rather than a fusion of color. In 1881 he read the French translation of Rood’s Modern Chromatics, with its analysis of divided color. (For a detailed analysis of these theoretical writings and their relationship to the works of Seurat see Homer, 1964, and Herbert, “Les Théories de Seurat et le néo-impressionnisme,” in J. Sutter, Les Néo-impressionnistes, Neuchâtel, 1970.) Herbert argues that the post-1881 pictures show not only an awareness of divided color theory, but also a gradually brightening palette and a gradually decreasing use of earth colors, which totally disappear by the end of 1884. The brushwork is characterized in the early work by “broomswept” (balayé) strokes, but becomes progressively tighter and finer, acquiring by the end of 1882 a fairly consistent “chopped straw” quality. Herbert also conjectures that while Seurat may well have seen the Impressionist exhibition of 1879, it did not at the time make the dramatic impact upon him often attributed to it (see L. Rosenthal, “Ernest Laurent,” Art et décoration, March 1971; and Dorra-Rewald, p. xxxv). Indeed, Impressionism did not emerge as the dominant influence in Seurat’s work until the spring of 1883, when he started the studies for the Baignade.

Within this framework it is possible to identify—at least tentatively—works that were painted prior to Seurat’s reading of Rood, and others that follow
closely thereafter. Still other paintings relate more clearly to the intense experiments in Impressionist styles that typify the early stages of the work on _La Baignade_.

According to Herbert’s analysis, several canvases can be confidently assigned to 1881. _Peasants at Monfermeil_ (Mellon Collection, Upperville, Virginia, de Hauke 34), with its flat centerground of pale olive green, slightly brighter green, and some darker green, its brown underpainting—especially in the clothes of the women—its use of tans and browns, and its broad crisscross brush stroke is typical of the early stage. Similarly, as Herbert points out (1958, p. 150), _The Diggers_ (Mellon Collection, de Hauke 62) is characterized by its use of tan-brown, darker brown, and muddy ochres; moreover, there is no trace of divided color. A _Peasant at Work_ (Mellon Collection, de Hauke 61), while less somber in its overall effect, shows the same dependence on browns and the same lack of divided color. Herbert also makes a detailed and convincing case (1968, no. 64) for dating the _Forest at Pontaubert_ (Collection Sir Kenneth Clark, London, de Hauke 14) in 1881, although this picture had previously posed a number of problems (see Homer, 1960, p. 230, and B. Nicolson, “Seurat’s _La Baignade_,” _Burlington Magazine_, vol. lxxix, November 1941, p. 146, fn. 29; Herbert’s point was later substantiated by Sutter’s discovery of the inn receipt, which records Seurat’s Pontaubert visit as October 1881).

A _Stonebreaker_ in the Mellon Collection (de Hauke 31) represents the beginning of the post-Rood development (1881-82). The earth colors are to some extent still present, but divided color—if not consistently applied—is evident. In the foreground, orange, orange-tan, brownish orange, and pink indicate the bright sunlight reflected from the stone; the pale blue of the trousers (the color opposite of the orange) heightens the latter’s intensity; the bushes in the background shadow are dark green (the local color which is not subjected to sunlight), blue (the quality of indirect light and again the color opposite of orange), with some touches of dark reddish-purple (the color opposite of the light green touches in the trousers). Two other pictures—which have a very similar palette and technique must date from approximately the same time—_Two Stonebreakers_ (Yale University Art Gallery, New Haven, de Hauke 35) and _Stonebreaker_ (Mellon Collection, de Hauke 30).

A _Stonebreaker_ in the Phillips Collection, Washington, D.C. (J. Russell, _Seurat_, London, 1965, repr. color no. 105, de Hauke 100), represents perhaps a slightly later phase. The cream-beige color of the stones is juxtaposed with its color opposite, a pale violet in the adjacent shadows; the sunlit orange of the man’s forearm is opposed to and intensifies the blue of his hat, belt, and sleeve-line; the dark green local color of the shaded bushes in the background and the grass in the left foreground, touched with blue and purple, indicate the indirect light, as well as the color opposite of the adjacent yellow-ochres. Browns, ochres, and a generally somber palette, however, are still strong here, as they are in the obviously contemporary Guggenheim painting _Peasant with Hoe_.

639
Although the condition of the present painting makes it difficult to judge the palette with accuracy, the general scheme is discernible. The patch of ground being hoed has a green undercoat but is predominantly brown, ochre, and orange (local color combined with pure sunlight and sunlight reflected from the surface). The adjacent shadow in the foreground contains a strong brown (the local color without sunlight) and ultramarine (the quality of indirect light as well as the color opposite of the adjacent orange). Similarly the blues in the shirt and trousers of the man serve as heightening contrasts to the sunlit orange of his arm. In the background the greens of the bushes and hedge contain touches of orange (sunlight), and the three horizontal shadow areas on the right are dark green with touches of blue and dark red. Like the Phillips picture, the overall impression is still somber and dull; earth colors are present, as are olive greens and rather muddy ochres. The brush stroke is still the “broomswept” one of the previous year, but the organization is tighter, and divided color is beginning to be more consistently applied. The picture probably dates from not long after Seurat’s absorption of Rood’s theories—early in 1882.

In relation to this and other works of the early 1880’s, Pissarro’s immediately preceding work was clearly of prime importance for Seurat. See, for example, Pissarro’s Father Melon Cutting Wood in Pontoise of 1879 (formerly Stoll Collection, Zurich, Venturi no. 499, repr.).

EXHIBITIONS:
Paris, Expositions de La Revue blanche: Seurat, Mar. 19-Apr. 5, 1900, no. 8 (dated 1884); Paris, Galerie Bernheim-Jeune, Georges Seurat, Dec. 14, 1908-Jan. 9, 1909, no. 29 (dated 1884; lent by “Mme. J. D.”); Paris, Galerie Durand-Ruel, Quelques oeuvres importantes de Corot à van Gogh, May 11-June 16, 1934, no. 56 (dated 1884; no lender listed, but lent by Fénéon); Paris, Galerie Paul Rosenberg, Georges Seurat, Feb. 3-29, 1936, no. 28 (dated 1884; no lender listed, but lent by Fénéon); New York, SRGM 79 (checklist; dated 1884; so dated in all subsequent SRGM publications until SRGM 198, 1968; withdrawn Oct. 20); 83 (no cat.); 84 (checklist); Vancouver, 88-T, no. 75, repr. 95 (checklist); London, SRGM 104-T, no. 70; The Art Institute of Chicago, Seurat: Paintings and Drawings, Jan. 16-Mar. 7, 1958, traveled to New York, The Museum of Modern Art, Mar. 24-May 11, 1958, no. 34, repr.; Lexington, Ky., SRGM 122-T, no. 24, repr.; New York, SRGM 129 (checklist); Philadelphia, SRGM 134-T, no. 14; New York, SRGM 144 (checklist); Kunstverein in Hamburg, Seurat, Cézanne, van Gogh, Gauguin, May 4-July 14, 1963, no. 99 repr.; New York, SRGM 160 (checklist); 173, no. 4, repr. p. 14; 186 (checklist); 199, Neo-Impressionism, no. 69, repr. color (dated c. 1882); 202, p. 73, repr. color p. 72; 221 (no cat.); 232, 241, p. 399, repr. p. 398; 251 (no cat.).

REFERENCES:
Farm Women at Work. ca. 1882. (Paysannes au travail).

41.713
Oil on canvas, 15½ x 18¼ (38.5 x 46.2)
Not signed or dated.

PROVENANCE:
Emile Seurat (1846-ca. 1905), brother of the artist (de Hauke, vol. 1, no. 60); Mme. Vve. Emile Seurat (ibid.); Félix Fénéon, Paris, by 1930 (lender to Stedelijk exhibition)-1938; purchased from Fénéon by Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1938; Gift of Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1941.

CONDITION:
In 1965 the surface dirt was removed, the painting was lined with wax resin on natural linen and restretched on a new stretcher. It was surfaced with clear varnish; it had not been varnished by Seurat. There are a few minor paint losses at the worn edges. The wax resin has penetrated and darkened the original canvas in places (visible in those areas where little or no paint was applied or where tiny paint losses have occurred), but the colors in general have remained unharmed. The overall condition is excellent and the pigments exceptionally fresh. (Apr. 1972.)

This picture (like the Peasant with Hoe, above cat. no. 226) has been variously dated between 1882 and 1884. (See below EXHIBITIONS and REFERENCES).

The palette is much brighter than that of the Peasant with Hoe and the handling of color contrast and divided color is almost entirely consistent with Rood’s theories. In the field, bands of bright pale green (local color) and orange and yellow (reflected and partly absorbed sunlight) alternate with the shaded areas of dark green (local color without sunlight), purple and blue (indirect light as well as the color opposites of the adjacent yellow and orange), and a few touches of dark magenta (complementary of the adjacent green). The addition of gray strokes in the sunlit areas recalls a sentence from Chevreul which Seurat is known to have copied: “if one puts gray next to a color it makes the latter more brilliant; at the same time the gray becomes tinted with the complementary of that adjacent color.” The fact that the gray seems indeed to be slightly tinged with pale violet is the effect created by the adjacent yellow. The shadows behind the two women are dark green, dark blue, and violet—entirely consistent with the neighboring sunlit areas. The overall impression here is one of bright vivid blues and greens—colors that lead directly to the Baignade.

The palette and handling of the Farm Women at Work is closely paralleled in the Gardener (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Bequest of Adelaide de Groot, 1967, de Hauke 101). In the latter the brush stroke is perhaps a little less tight, but the palette and organization of color are comparable. Both pictures probably date from late in 1882 or early in 1883.

As Herbert has pointed out (1958, p. 150), Millet’s The Gleaners provided the source for Seurat’s motif in Farm Women at Work. The picture was exhibited at the Salon of 1857 and at the Exposition Universelle of 1867, but was not actually given to the Louvre until 1890 (Bequest of Mme. Pommeroy). An

1. It has not been possible to verify this information from any other source.
etching was made of it in 1857 and must have been widely known by 1880 (Moreau-Nélaton, E. Millet raconté par lui-même, II, fig. 136); moreover, A. Sensier's book on Millet, in which the etching is reproduced, was published in 1881 (La Vie et l’oeuvre de J.-F. Millet, Paris, repr. p. 177). Seurat’s source was thus almost certainly the etching rather than the original oil.

EXHIBITIONS:


REFERENCES:


2. A Bernheim-Jeune label removed from the back of the painting during the 1957 lining carried the handwritten information: “Seurat / 1926.” The only exhibition of Seurat’s work held at the Gallery in that year contained 140 drawings, but no paintings. A list of 10 additional drawings, which arrived too late to be included in the printed catalogue, appears in Fénéon’s handwriting on the back of his own annotated copy of the catalogue (see de Hauke, p. 254). Fénéon habitually kept meticulous records of the works included in his exhibitions and resorted to *bors catalogue* lists on his own annotated copy if necessary (see de Hauke, p. 232 for a detailed list of this sort appended to the 1900 *Revue blanche* exhibition catalogue). It seems unlikely, therefore, that in this instance he would have omitted any paintings that did appear. The information on the label indicates only that the picture was brought into the Gallery in 1926 and does not relate it specifically to the exhibition. It is possible that Fénéon brought the picture to Bernheim-Jeune at the time of the exhibition with the intention of including it (and other paintings) but that it was ultimately omitted. Alternatively, since Fénéon was on the staff of Bernheim-Jeune at this time, it is more than likely that his own works came in and out of the gallery for various reasons and that they were sometimes recorded.
Seated Woman. 1883.
(Paysanne assise dans l’herbe; Femme assise; Paysanne assise).

37.714
Oil on canvas, 15 x 18 (38.1 x 46.2)
Not signed or dated.

PROVENANCE:
Léo Gausson (1860-1944), Paris, 1891(?)—2;¹

CONDITION:
The picture was lined with wax resin and put on a new stretcher in 1957. It had not been previously varnished, but a coat of synthetic varnish was applied at this time.
The condition is excellent. (Apr. 1972.)

Like the two preceding pictures, cat. nos. 226, 227, this work has been variously dated between 1882 and 1884 (see below EXHIBITIONS and REFERENCES), and, as in other instances, Fénéon proposed two different dates, the first 1882 (catalogues of the exhibitions at Bernheim-Jeune 1908-09 and 1920, and Prague, 1923), and the second ca. 1883 (if, as seems probable, he was the lender to the Brummer Gallery exhibition in 1924). Dorra accepts Fénéon’s original 1882 date for this and a group of other works but suggests that they may have been started even earlier. He does not analyze the chronological development of Seurat’s style within the years 1880-84.

Herbert’s association of the Seated Woman with the Baignade phase of Seurat’s development is convincing and makes it difficult to accept a date earlier than the spring of 1883, when work on the studies for the large composition began. Herbert has referred to the similarity in palette and technique between the two works (1968, p. 105). The “broomswept” (balayé) brush strokes in the field of the Seated Woman, as well as the smooth strokes used for the figures, are indeed almost identical to the technique of La Baignade. Both paintings also reveal a preoccupation with silhouettes shown in strict profile, and the present picture shares some of the monumentality of one of the major studies for the large work—the Yale Seated Boy with Straw Hat (de Hauke 595)—although the latter, like most of Seurat’s drawings from this period, is considerably subtler than the painting in its handling of light and shade.

Comparisons of the two palettes are most difficult to make because La Baignade has been recently cleaned (1971) and the present picture has not. Whereas the predominant background tone of the grass in La Baignade is a brilliant apple green, that of the Seated Woman is much more subdued. Certain

1. De Hauke records that the picture was no. 7 in the posthumous inventory. See above cat.
no. 226, for a discussion of this unpublished document. De Hauke is also the source for the ownership of Gausson, but gives no date of acquisition or sale. It is possible that the painting was a gift from Seurat’s mother, Ernestine Faire Seurat (d. 1898), who gave several of the small pictures from the atelier as mementos to friends of the artist.
important similarities in the use of color can, however, be pointed out. Fine orange strokes appear throughout the green areas in both paintings; the hair of the boy seated on the edge of the bank, and that of the *Seated Woman*, are painted with the same ranges of dark browns, orange, and blue; the dog in *La Baignade*, though lighter in tone, is painted in the same colors as the coat upon which the *Seated Woman* rests. The bluish garment of the latter is similar to the undershirt of the boy with straw hat, although slightly less violet in tone.
Both Herbert (1968, p. 105) and Homer (1958, pp. 59-60) have rightly discussed Pissarro’s influence at this stage in Seurat’s development. Evidence for this influence can also be found in a comparison of the Seated Woman with Pissarro’s Father Melon in Repose (Venturi no. 498, ca. 1879), which must have provided the compositional source for the Seurat motif. Seurat’s Young Boy Seated in a Field (City Art Collections, Glasgow, de Hauke 15) functioned as an intermediate step. In both the Pissarro and the Glasgow Seurat, the figure is placed diagonally against a field that is interrupted in the upper portion of the canvas by a hedge. In the Seated Woman the composition has been simplified, and the clear silhouette is seen against an unbroken background. The palette and technique still betray Pissarro’s influence, but the composition has become more clearly characteristic of Seurat’s own compositional notions at this stage.

EXHIBITIONS:


REFERENCES:


2. See above cat. no. 227, fn. 2.
**Horse.** 1884.
(Le Cheval attelé; Cheval dans un champ; La Charrette attelée).

**41.722**

Oil on canvas, 13¾ x 16½ (32.4 x 40.9)

Not signed or dated.

**PROVENANCE:**

**CONDITION:**

In 1953 the stretcher was replaced and the surface dirt was removed. A coat of natural varnish, which was applied at an unknown date and which has darkened to some extent, has not been removed.

The overall condition is good, with some minor paint cracks in the sky areas upper right and left, and some wear along the edges. (Apr. 1972.)

The painting has been variously dated (see below EXHIBITIONS and REFERENCES).

Herbert has made the convincing suggestion (in conversation with the author, July 1970) that the present picture is contemporary with those studies

---

1. De Hauke erroneously states that the picture appeared in a sale of the Turner Collection at the Hôtel Drouot, Paris, on Apr. 24, 1928, no. 39, and that it was sold for 41,000 fr. to Fénéon. No evidence for such a sale on this or any other date has come to light. Dorra and Rewald (1959, no. 31) reverse the provenance and state that Fénéon sold the picture to Turner, which is certainly incorrect since records at the SRGM show that Guggenheim purchased the picture directly from Fénéon. It is possible that Turner owned the picture at some point, but until further evidence comes to light it is impossible to say when this was.
for *La Grande Jatte* that were largely completed in the spring and summer of 1884, as well as with some totally independent works of that period. (See, for example, de Hauke 57, 65, 96, 104, 117, 126.)

Certain elements in the *Horse* distinguish its style clearly from that of *La Baignade* and earlier canvases. The brush strokes are finer and are applied in a denser weave, especially in the foliage where the "chopped straw" texture is evident. A greater number of hues are introduced, in particular a rather intense powdery blue which is characteristic of *La Grande Jatte* and many of its studies but does not appear earlier; contrasted with this blue is a brighter, purer orange than has been found before. A sketch for *La Grande Jatte* (Mellon Collection, Upperville, Virginia, J. Sutter, *Les Néo-impressionistes*, Neuchâtel, 1970, repr. color p. 33; not in de Hauke) provides cogent evidence for Herbert’s point. Although the brushwork here is much broader than that of the present picture, the difference is attributable to the fact that the former is a rapid sketch rather than a finished picture. The foreground in the Mellon picture is painted in greens, wine reds, and powder blues that are identical to a similar area in the *Horse*. The use of orange, yellow, and pale green is also similar in both, and the treatment of the tree in the Mellon sketch, with its pink, yellow, and tan, parallels that of the path in the *Horse*.

A sketch in the Collection of Lady Keynes, London (de Hauke 138), represents a slightly later phase in the development of *La Grande Jatte*, when the colors have become even brighter and purer than in the Mellon picture, and it is clear from a comparison between the two that the present painting belongs to the earlier phase.

**EXHIBITIONS:**


**REFERENCES:**


---

2. This is included by de Hauke, but the picture does not appear in any of the catalogues for this exhibition.
Gino Severini

Born April 1883, Cortona, Italy.

Red Cross Train Passing a Village.
Summer 1915.
(Train de la Croix Rouge traversant un village; Red Cross Train).

44.944
Oil on canvas, 35 x 45 ¼ (88.9 x 116.2)
Signed l.r.: G. Severini; inscribed elsewhere
on surface: 13 / \(\frac{15}{2317}\) / \(\frac{15}{122}\) / AC
[Ceinture AC 247; inscribed by the artist
on reverse: Gino Severini 2 / “Train de la
Croix Rouge / traversant un village,” / 1915.]

Provenance:
Purchased from the artist through Alfred
Stieglitz by John Quinn (1870-1924), New
York, 1917; purchased from the Quinn
Collection (American Art Association, New
York, The Renowned Collection of Modern
and Ultra-Modern Art formed by the late
John Quinn, February 9-12, 1927, no. 120)
by J. B. Neumann, New York; purchased
from Neumann, 1944.

Condition:
In 1957 a loss in the upper right sky area
was filled and inpainted. In 1966 some
small areas of cleavage were sealed with
wax resin; several small areas of retouching
may date from this time.

Underpainting is visible in the large blue
area at the lower right and the 2 blue signs
adjacent to it. In the case of the former, the
word “IGNY” is legible through the growing
transparency of the blue; in the case of
the latter, the left sign originally carried the
formula “\(\frac{15}{2317}\)” the right sign “\(\frac{15}{122}\)”

These same numbers were subsequently
dislodged and moved by Severini to the area
below, and the blue color added to obliterate
them on the signpost itself. There are
some cracks and losses along the edges, and
several long, widely spaced ground cracks
(visible only in raking light) in the lower
quarter of the painting. Apart from some
minor abrasions, the condition is good.
(Feb. 1972.)

1. Lukach (1971) has convincingly connected this inscription with a handwritten, numbered
list of works which Severini sent to Stieglitz in Oct. 1916 in preparation for his 1-man
exhibition to be held at Gallery “291.” The list (preserved in the Alfred Stieglitz Archive,
Yale Collection of American Literature, Yale University, New Haven, and reproduced by
Lukach, fig. 31) contains under Toiles the following entry: “2 [Train] de la croix rouge
traversant un village . . . fr. 1000.” No complete published catalogue has come to light, but
as Lukach noted (1971, pp. 204-205), there must have been one since quotations from the
preface are to be found in The Sun, Mar. 11, 1917, p. 12; the full text of this preface was
published in Critica d’Arte, anno xvii (xxxv), n.s., May-June 1970, pp. 50-53. A copy of
the printed checklist for the exhibition is preserved in the library at Yale University.

2. The picture was purchased by Quinn out of the 1917 Severini exhibition at Gallery “291.”
Stieglitz’s invoice, dated Mar. 19, 1917, was sent to Quinn on Apr. 11, 1917, and reads in
part: “No. 2 Train Red Cross Crossing a Village . . . 225” (John Quinn Memorial Collection,
Manuscripts and Archives Division, The New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox and
Tilden Foundations). Further confirmation of this purchase is contained in a printed
checklist of the works in the Gallery “291” exhibition, annotated with the names of the
buyers. Quinn is identified as the buyer of No. 2 “Train of the Red Cross Crossing a
Village” (Lukach, 1971, fig. 32). Lukach has been able to establish that Quinn purchased
6 oils from the exhibition, 3 pastels, and 1 drawing (1971, p. 199).

3. Neumann is listed as the buyer in “Sale of the Quinn Collection is Completed,” Art News,
A preparatory sketch (fig. a), which differs considerably from the final work but contains virtually all of the elements subsequently incorporated into it, was presented by the artist to the Dutch collector H. van Assendelft in November 1915. Although it is conceivable that the drawing was executed after the painting, this is unlikely. The differences between the two works are such as to suggest stages in the compositional process rather than the relationship between a painting and a later reprise.

Lukach's hypothesis (1971) that the picture dates from the summer of 1915, when Severini was staying with his family at Igny, is corroborated by the presence of the word “IGNY” (now overpainted) in the lower right of the picture. (See above CONDITION; Lukach did not know of the existence of this word when she wrote her article.) The composition is one of a group of war pictures which Severini produced during that summer as trains passed by his window day and night loaded with war materiel, with soldiers, or with the wounded. He continued the series in the autumn, when he was living on the rue Tombe-Issoire in Paris, once again overlooking a railway station (G. Severini, Tutta la vita di un pittore, Milan, 1946, pp. 236-237; other pictures in the war series which included trains are The Armored Train, Collection Richard S. Zeisler, New York; The Red Cross Train, Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam; there were also a number of drawings).

Marinetti had written to Severini on November 20, 1914, urging him to develop a new pictorial language for dealing with the challenge presented by
the war: "... immense novità artistiche siano possibili. ... Cerca di vivere pittoricamente la guerra, studiandola in tutte le sue meravigliose forme meccaniche (treni militari, fortificazioni, feriti, ambulanze, ospedali, cortei ecc.)." Archivi del futurismo, 1, Rome, 1958, p. 350, trans. R. Carrièri, Futurism, Milan, 1963, p. 158. ("... immense artistic innovations are possible. ... Try to live the war pictorially and to study it in all of its marvellous mechanical forms [military trains, fortifications, wounded, ambulances, hospitals, processions, etc.")."

Severini's response to this challenge is fully expressed in the 1915 train pictures, and the artistic and theoretical innovations he made during this period are reflected in his contemporary writings. In a January 1916 lecture on his war paintings, delivered at the Galerie Boutet de Monvel on the occasion of his exhibition and published in Mercure de France the following month, Severini explained the nature of his intentions. He was concerned first and foremost to express an idea—in this case the idea of war. The most effective way to achieve this was not through a depiction of the carnage of the battlefield, but rather through a synthesis of elements central to our notion of war. ("... Canon, Usine, Drapeau, Ordre de mobilisation, Aéroplane, Ancre. Selon notre conception de réalisme idéiste, aucune description plus ou moins naturaliste de champs de bataille ou de carnage ne pourra nous donner la synthèse de l'idée: guerre, mieux que ces objets, qui en sont le symbole vivant" ["Symbolisme plastique et symbolisme littéraire,” Mercure de France, February 1, 1916, p. 475, reprinted in Témoignages, Rome, 1963, p. 53].)

As Martin first cogently argued, Severini's concept as here expressed is an almost total reversal of the "plastic analogies" concept which had previously governed his thinking. "Instead of commencing with an object which evoked other objects and ultimately an idea, thus suggesting the continuity of objects through change, he now began with a specific idea and intensified it through a quite literal analogy suggested by relevant objects, thus effecting 'a kind of plastic ideography'" (p. 198).

It is interesting to note that the precedent cited by Severini in his establishment of this aesthetic principle is Mallarmé, the poet who had most fully succeeded in combining words and images to evoke the essence of an idea. ("Les mots, choisis par Mallarmé, selon leur qualité complémentaire, et employés par groupes ou séparés, constituent une technique pour exprimer une subdivision prismatique de l'idée, une compénétration simultanée d'images" [Mercure de France, Feb. 1, 1916, p. 468, reprinted in Témoignages, p. 42].)

In 1946, when Severini wrote again about these war paintings and the concept upon which they were based, he once more cited Mallarmé (La Vita, p. 236). The theoretical foundation upon which Severini built his concept is Mallarmé's famous essay "Crise de vers," and in particular the final section of it which was originally published as the "Avant-dire au traité du verbe de René Ghil" (Oeuvres complètes de Stephan Mallarmé, Paris, Pléiade, 1964, pp. 360-368; I am indebted to Albert Sonnenfeld, Professor of French Literature, Princeton University, for identifying the source of Severini's quotations from Mallarmé).
In the passages actually quoted by Severini, Mallarmé draws attention to the differences between the language of everyday speech and that of poetry and describes the miraculous capacity of poetic language to evoke the purest essence of an object. "Un désir indéniable à mon temps est de séparer comme en vue d’attributions différentes le double état de la parole, brut ou immédiat ici, là essentiel . . . A quoi bon la merveille de transposer un fait de nature en sa presque disparition vibratoire selon le jeu de la parole, cependant; si ce n’est pour qu’en émane, sans la gêne d’un proche ou concret rappel, la notion pure?" ("One of the undeniable ideals of our time is to divide words into two different categories: first, for vulgar or immediate, second, for essential purposes. . . . Why should we perform the miracle by which a natural object is almost made to disappear beneath the magic waving wand of the written word, if not to divorce that object from the direct and the palpable, and so conjure up its [idea] in all purity?" [trans. B. Cook, Mallarmé, Baltimore, 1956, p. 42; Cook translates "notion" as "essence"]). Mallarmé’s central concern in this essay, and the one which clearly attracted Severini’s attention, is the notion that the poet, conjuring up the idea of an object, does so by using a combination of fragmented words and images which are striking, new, unfamiliar in their combinations, and hence able to convey that same idea of an object in an especially powerful and pure form. "Les monuments, la mer, la face humaine, dans leur plénitude, natifs, conservant une vertu autrement attrayante que ne les voilera une description, évocation dites, allusion je sais, suggestion." ("It is not description which can unveil the efficacy and beauty of monuments, seas, or the human face in all their maturity and native state, but rather evocation, allusion, suggestion" [Cook, p. 40].) "... en littérature, cela se contente d’y faire une allusion ou de distraire leur qualité qu’incomporera quelque idée." ("In literature, allusion is sufficient: essences are distilled and then embodied in Idea" [Cook, p. 40].)

Severini’s adoption of Mallarmé’s ideas as the basis of his own newly developing style is explicitly acknowledged in the autobiography (La Vita, pp. 236-237) and is traceable in many of the theoretical writings of 1914-16. (See, for example, "Idéographie futuriste," ca. 1915, Témoignages, 1963, pp. 34-39; "Symbolisme plastique et symbolisme littéraire," Mercure de France, Feb. 1, 1916, pp. 466-476, Témoignages, pp. 40-54.) His explicit acknowledgement of Mallarmé’s importance is in notable contrast to the position taken by various of his Italian contemporaries, such as, for example, Onofri, whose close relationship to Mallarmé has been extensively documented by O. Ragusa (Mallarmé in Italy; Literary Influence and Critical Response, New York, 1957). While recognizing Mallarmé’s greatness, Onofri insisted that he was “in direct opposition to everything Mallarmé [stood] for” and denied any real relationship between his own ideas and those of the French poet (Ragusa, pp. 136-137). Severini’s writings have not been specifically studied from this point of view, but it seems clear that he was among the smaller group of Italian figures who fully acknowledged their debt to Mallarmé’s poetics and for whom the French poet provided an immensely important example. (For an illuminating discus-
sion of other aspects of the 1914-16 developments in Severini’s writings and paintings, see Lukach, 1974.)

The train paintings of the summer and autumn of 1915 are clearly an expression of these developing theories. As Severini himself said, the earliest examples were based to some extent upon the actual scenes which he observed before him; but gradually they became more “synthetic and symbolic” and the last examples were true “symbols of war” (La Vita, p. 256). The Red Cross Train almost certainly belongs to the earlier stage, when the landscape still provides a recognizable context; but the symbolic content of the work, the sense in which it expresses an idea of war, is already demonstrably present. The critic Caffin, who saw the picture at the Stieglitz exhibition in 1917, was obviously responding to this element in the painting when he wrote: “The red cross on a white ground is the centre of a shock that radiates from it, rocking the field into wedges and waves, staggering the cottages from their quiet foundations and tossing them sky-high. Some of the roofs appear as red stains on the smoke volumes and the distorted ground shows patches of red and purple. It is as if the horror that is concealed inside the cars had burst out and ravaged and defiled the countryside” (cited by Lukach, 1971, p. 205). The train with its red cross is, in Severini’s or in Mallarmé’s terms, an allusion to war, a suggestion of it, and an evocation of its essence. Pierre Albert-Birot, writing in the February 1916 issue of SIC (and undoubtedly drawing to some extent on Severini’s own theories expressed in the Boutet de Monvel lecture), responded, as did Caffin, to the essential meaning of these war paintings when he wrote that they epitomized “l’image complexe et fugitive qui apparait sur l’écran de votre cerveau lorsque vous appuyez sur le bouton: idée Guerre.” (“the complex and elusive image which appears on the screen of your brain when you press the button: idea of War.”)

Lukach has pointed out that Severini’s use of road and railroad signals in works such as this is a reflection of his own stated theory that these signs play important roles within the vocabulary of the modern world: they are synthetic expressions of entire actions, just as the painting as a whole is a synthetic expression of a complex idea. (“Nous avons également des signaux de route, d’automobile ou de chemin de fer, etc., exprimant synthétiquement toute une action” [Mercure de France, 1916, p. 475, Témoignages, 1963, p. 53].) The yellow stop sign would have warned cars that the grade crossing was thirteen meters ahead; the folded blue and black sign with its fractions would have probably carried information for the train driver about distances between towns and crossings (Lukach, 1975). The fact that in this instance Severini painted out the numbers on the road and railway signs, deciding rather to let them float freely in the landscape, might have been intended to heighten the sense of confusion and speed conveyed by the whole, or alternatively to convey something of the Futurist sense of time. His decision to paint out the “IGNY” at the lower right might have been motivated by a desire to reduce the literal—and hence potentially anecdotal—nature of the scene in favor of a more generalized, and hence more symbolic, representation.
EXHIBITIONS:


REFERENCES:

Dancer, 1915.  
(Danseuse; Dancers).

44:943
Oil on canvas, 39 1/2 x 32 (100.3 x 81.2)
Signed l.r.: G. Severini; inscribed by the artist on reverse (photographed before lining): Gino Severini / Danseuse / 4. Not dated.

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist through Alfred Stieglitz by John Quinn (1870-1924), New York, 1917;1 purchased from the Quinn Collection (American Art Galleries, New York, The Renowned Collection of Modern and Ultra-Modern Art formed by the late John Quinn, February 9-12, 1927, no. 259, repr.) by J. B. Neumann, New York, 1927;2 purchased from Neumann, 1944.

CONDITION:
In 1953 the work was cleaned with Soilax; a hole at the upper right was patched, and this and some other minor losses were filled and inpainted with PVA. The work was surfaced with PBM. In 1966 it was lined with wax resin.
Apart from some minor losses at the edges, the condition is excellent. (Jan. 1974.)

Severini's autobiography contains the information that while working on his war pictures during the summer and autumn of 1915 he also took up again the theme of the dancer which had so preoccupied him during the years 1911 to 1913 (Tutta la vita di un pittore, Milan, 1946, p. 238; for references to the dance, theater, cabaret, and Severini's strong interest in them, see also pp. 52, 58-59, 72, 73, 152-153). Few of the 1915-16 versions of this theme are dated, but Lukach has proposed a convincing chronology for many of them (1971, and in correspondence with the author, June 1974). A review of some of these helps to establish the 1915 date for the Guggenheim painting.

The Metropolitan Museum's 1915 Dancer-Helix-Sea, with its clear relationship to the artist's 1913-14 theory of analogie plastiche, provides the starting point. The pictures is dated 1915 on its reverse, and it was included in the 1917 Stieglitz exhibition in New York; in the introduction to the exhibition catalogue, Severini uses it as his illustration of the theory of plastic analogies, pointing out that in its complex forms "three sensations [are] united by their

1. Lukach (1971) has convincingly connected this inscription with a handwritten, numbered list of works which Severini sent to Stieglitz in Oct. 1916 in preparation for his 1-man exhibition to be held at Gallery "291." The list (preserved in the Alfred Stieglitz Archive, Yale Collection of American Literature, Yale University, New Haven, and reproduced by Lukach, fig. 31) contains under Toiles the following entry: "4 Danseuse ... fr. 800."

2. The picture was purchased by Quinn out of the 1917 Severini exhibition at Gallery "291." Stieglitz's invoice, dated Mar. 19, 1917, was sent to Quinn on Apr. 11, 1917, and reads in part: "No. 4 Dancer ... 195" (John Quinn Memorial Collection, Manuscripts and Archives Division, The New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox and Tilden Foundations). Further confirmation of this purchase is contained in a printed checklist of the works in the "291" exhibition, annotated with the names of the buyers: Quinn is identified as the buyer of No. 4 "Dancer" (Lukach, 1971, fig. 32). Lukach has been able to establish that Quinn purchased 6 oils from the exhibition, 3 pastels, and 1 drawing (Ibid., p. 199).

analogies," or a single emotive reality is expressed through three analogous ones (G. Severini, "Préface à l’exposition de New York," Critica d’Arte, anno xvii (xxxv), n.s., May-June 1970, p. 50; for an illuminating analysis of some of Severini’s analogie, see M. Martin, Futurist Art and Theory: 1909-1915, Oxford, 1968, pp. 144-146). The Guggenheim Dancer is more legible than Dancer-Helix-Sea, but as Lukach has pointed out, the two works throw light on one another, and many of the same elements are present in both. When Caffin discussed the present work in his 1917 review of the Stieglitz exhibition, he pointed out some of the similarities: "... the composition is constructed in color. The rose and yellow of the costume is prolonged into the surrounding space. The latter is felt as part of the movement of the figure. It is as if one saw the volumes of form, into which the total volume of lighted air had been carved by the sinuous direction of the moving arms and legs." The large triangular planes in both pictures serve partly to define the dancer’s skirt, the cen-
trifugal motion of her twirling figure, and the space in which she dances. In an article written in 1934, Severini seems to be describing the interpenetration of planes and figure in the Guggenheim and Metropolitan dancers when he writes: "... une danseuse emporte dans son rythme, dans les plis de sa robe, les tables parmi lesquelles elle danse. ... C'est ici l'origine de cette idée de la 'compénétration des plans'. ..." L'Amour de l'art, vol. xi, November 1934, p. 476. ("A dancer carries within her rhythm, within the folds of her dress, the tables among which she dances. ... Here lies the origin of the idea of the interpenetration of planes.") Here, as in the case of the Red Cross Train (see above cat. no. 250), Severini's theory and practice are reminiscent of his 1916 notes on Mallarmé: "Les mots, choisis par Mallarmé selon leur qualité complémentaire, et employés par groupe ou séparés, constituent une technique pour exprimer une subdivision prismatique de l'idée, une compénétration simultanée d'images" (Témoignages, Rome, 1963, p. 42). In the Metropolitan picture the idea of rippling motion is dominant, and the figure is obscured; in the present painting, where "analogy" is no longer the central issue, the dancer herself emerges as a more legible form.

Very close in style to the Guggenheim picture, and surely completed only shortly afterwards, is the drawing Spanish Guitarist and Dancer (The Art Institute of Chicago, Lukach, 1971, fig. 41, dated there ca. 1915). Here the forms are even more readable and the triangular planes have largely disappeared; but the twirling motion of the two figures in the drawing is similar to that of the Guggenheim dancer, and the rippling skirt as well as the definition of the limbs are closely related in conception and form. (The black lace epaulette with fringe worn by both this dancer and the Guggenheim figure has been identified by Lukach, in correspondence with the author, June 1974, as a distinctive part of the Spanish dancer's costume. It is worn by earlier Spanish dancers in Severini's repertoire such as, for example, the Spanish Dancers at the Monico of 1913, Maslon Collection.)

Two further paintings of dancers were sent by Severini to the Stieglitz exhibition in New York, and the distinct differences in style between these and the Guggenheim painting help to establish the artist's course of development between the summer of 1915 and the middle of 1916 (when, according to his autobiography, he again gave up the subject of the dance in order to concentrate on static objects; La Vita, pp. 251-252). In Dancer No. 5 (formerly B. C. Holland Gallery, Chicago, Sotheby & Co., sale catalogue, July 7, 1971, repr. color, lot 128) and Dancer No. 6 (formerly Spingarn Collection, New York, Sotheby Parke Bernet, sale catalogue, Apr. 26-27, 1972, repr. color, lot 92), as well as in two drawings closely related to the Spingarn picture (Lukach, 1971, figs. 42, 43), the fluid circular motion of the Guggenheim painting has given way to a much flatter, decorative, collage-like style—a style which was to be even more fully articulated in the 1916 Woman Seated in a Square. Lukach has argued that Dancer No. 6 in particular seems to be directly illustrative of Severini's theories of geometric composition which he developed late in 1915 and early in 1916 ("A Study of Gino Severini's Writings and Paintings
of 1916-1917, based on his 1917 exhibition in New York City,” Critica d’Arte, anno xx (xxxix), November-December 1974, pp. 59-80). Thus, while the Metropolitan picture is a reflection of his earlier theories of plastic analogies, and the Guggenheim’s occupies a middle ground, the Spingarn picture arises out of the newly developing notion of the role of geometry in the construction of a work of art. If, as seems likely, Dancer No. 5 and Dancer No. 6 are indeed among the very last examples of Severini’s treatment of the theme at this time (he returned to it once again in the 1950’s), they would represent the end of a stylistic phase which began about one year earlier with the Metropolitan and Guggenheim pictures, a phase which, as Lukach suggests, took him from a Futurist aesthetic to one which was more nearly Cubist (1975).

EXHIBITIONS:
Paris, Galerie Boutet de Monvel, 1re exposition futuriste d’art plastique de la guerre et d’autres œuvres antérieures, Jan. 15-Feb. 1, 1916, no. 14 or 15? (Danseuse); New York, Gallery “291” of the Photo-Secession, Severini, Mar. 6-17, 1917, no. 4 (checklist); New York, Art Center, Memorial Exhibition of Representative Works Selected from the John Quinn Collection, Jan. 7-30, 1926, no. 44; Rains Galleries, New York, Modern Paintings, Watercolors and Drawings from the Collection of J. B. Neumann and from the studio of H. Hiler, Jan. 24, 1936, no. 66 (auction; the picture was not sold); Ohio, The Toledo Museum of Art, Contemporary Movements in European Painting, Nov. 6-Dec. 11, 1938, no. 98 (lent by Neumann); Seattle Art Museum, 2500 Years of Italian Art and Civilization, Nov. 8-Dec. 8, 1957, no. 225, repr.; Tulsa, Okla., SRGM 159-T; Richmond, Va., SRGM 188-T (no cats.); [Paris, Musée National d’Art Moderne, Severini, July-Oct. 1967, no. 31, repr.]; New York, SRGM 202, p. 83, repr.; Columbus, Ohio, SRGM 207-T, p. 20, repr.

REFERENCES:

4. Lukach suggests that since neither of these 2 entries can be identified, 1 of them may have been the Guggenheim painting (correspondence with the author, June 1974).
5. Quinn owned several Dancers and it is impossible to establish which of them was shown in the present exhibition.
6. The picture was withdrawn from the exhibition at the last moment, but did appear in the catalogue.
Georges Valmier
Born April 1885, Angoulême.

Figure. 1919.

38.405
Oil on canvas, $45\frac{3}{4} \times 28\frac{3}{4}$ (116.1 x 73.1)
Signed and dated l.r.: G. Valmier. 1919.

PROVENANCE:
Galerie l'Erfort Moderne (Leonce Rosenberg), Paris (photo archives no. 014:N-1037); purchased from Galerie des Garets, Paris, 1938.

CONDITION:
In 1954 the surface was cleaned and the work placed on a new stretcher. Losses along the lower edge, the lower right edge, and the left half of the top edge were inpainted, and the work surfaced with synthetic varnish.

The edges and corners show slight wear. Scattered drips of white paint are visible in the top quarter of the picture and there are some drying cracks in the dark purple area with red dots. Some minor pentimenti are emerging as the paint film becomes more transparent (n.b., in particular, the large ochre rectangle in the upper right corner which was originally a dotted area). The overall condition is good. (Mar. 1974.)

EXHIBITIONS:
Brussels, Sélection, Oeuvres cubistes et néo-cubistes, Sept. 18-Oct. 8, 1920, no. 22? ("Figure, 1919");

REFERENCE:
Bulletin de "l'Effort Moderne," no. 40, Dec. 1927, repr. n.p. ("Figure 1919").

1. Several paintings with this title exist and it is not possible to establish which of them appeared in the exhibition.
Still-Life. 1925.

Oil on canvas, 23 3/4 x 28 3/4 (60 x 73.2)
Signed and dated l.r.: G. Valmier. / 1925.

PROVENANCE:
Early history unknown; Gift of Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1937. (There is no record of the source or date of purchase.)

CONDITION:
In 1953 the work was cleaned with 1% Soilax, the top margin reinforced with PVA emulsion, and the corners retacked. In 1956 it was removed from the stretcher and impregnated with wax resin from the reverse with heat and pressure. A dent at the bottom, left of center, was flattened; tacking margins were added, and the picture placed on a new stretcher. Some inpainting was done along all edges.

All edges, especially the lower one, are somewhat worn with minor loss of both paint and ground. There is a 6 1/2 in. line of serious crackle (caused by a scratch on the reverse) running vertically 6 in. from the left side and 8 in. from the bottom; also a 1 in. area of circular cracks 9 in. from the left side and 8 in. from the top. Apart from a very few minor abrasions and 3 small areas of transfer material, the condition is good. (Mar. 1974.)

An almost identical Still-Life, also of 1925, was reproduced in Bulletin de "l'Effort Moderne," no. 21, January 1926, n.p. (Léonce Rosenberg photographic archives, No. 014-N-774).

EXHIBITIONS:
Philadelphia, SRGM 3-T, no. 274; New York, SRGM 195 (no cat.); 196 (checklist).

1. The picture does not appear in the Léonce Rosenberg photographic archives in Paris, but these are incomplete.
Georges Vantongerloo

Born November 1886, Antwerp.

NOTE: Like Kandinsky and Klee, Vantongerloo maintained a record of his work in the form of an Oeuvre Catalogue (hereafter OC). This document is preserved by Max Bill, executor of the artist’s estate, and I am indebted to him for granting me permission to consult and quote from it. The entries include number, title, dimensions, date, and in some cases exhibitions or publications in which the work appeared, and the name of the collection to which it was sold; in addition there is usually a small sketch of the work, but these do not always correspond exactly to the finished picture.

The estate also contains a group of preparatory drawings by the artist many of which are, with Bill’s permission, reproduced here for the first time.

TECHNIQUE: The polished matte surface of many of Vantongerloo’s paintings on wood or Masonite was created in the following manner. Successive layers of paint were carefully rubbed down with very fine carborundum (?) paper as each one dried; the result was an extremely smooth, brushless finish. In a letter to Hilla Rebay (July 10, 1950), Vantongerloo described his method and its carefully calculated aesthetic effect as follows: “C’est en effet toute simplement de la peinture à l’huile mais appliquée avec le soin nécessaire et en vu de suprimer le côté pittoresque de la peinture naturaliste. Au fond, c’est de la peinture à l’huile ponsée. C’est un travail qui demande beaucoup de soin mais qui est récompensé par le résultat mat-brillant que le ponsage de l’huile donne.” Because of the extreme smoothness of the white surface, bonding between this layer and subsequent applications of color has sometimes been poor, and cracks in the color areas have developed (see, for example, cat. nos. 236, 237 below).

Composition in the Cone with Orange Color. 1929.

(Composition dans le cône avec couleur orangé; Composition dans le cône; Composition with Orange Color, No. 58).

OC No. 58, Composition dans le cône avec couleur orangé, Paris 1929. The sketch does not correspond to the present picture or to any presently identifiable work by the artist; the identification of the painting with the entry No. 58 is, however, the artist’s own, and all other details in the entry are accurate.

51.1298
Oil on canvas, 23 5/8 x 23 5/8 (60 x 60)
Signed with monogram lr.: GV.

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist, 1951.

CONDITION:
At an unrecorded date, possibly prior to acquisition, the painting was retouched along all edges, up to ¼ in. in width in places, and this repaint has discolored, especially in the gray and white areas. In 1955 the canvas was lined with wax resin and placed on a new stretcher. Fingerprints were removed from the margin areas.
There are 4 fine feather cracks in the white rectangle upper left, and 1 in each of the 2 gray rectangles upper right and lower left. There are also several long thin cracks in the paint film scattered throughout the 2 white rectangles.

Apart from 8 tiny stains ($\frac{1}{16}$-inch diameter) in the lower half of the canvas and some slight general soil, the condition is good. (Sept. 1972.)

Two preparatory drawings for the work are in the estate of the artist. Both are ink drawings, and one includes color notations; these correspond exactly to the colors in the final work.

**EXHIBITIONS:**

**REFERENCES:**
Composition Derived from the Equation $y = -ax^2 + bx + 18$
with Green, Orange, Violet (Black). 1930.

(Composition émanante de l'équation $y = -ax^2 + bx + 18$ avec accord de vert... orange... violet (noir); No. 62, Accord of Green, Orange, Violet.)

OC No. 62, Composition émanante de l'équation $y = -ax^2 + bx + 18$ avec accord de vert... orange... violet (noir).
Paris 1930. The sketch corresponds closely to the painting.

51.1299
Oil on canvas, 47 x 26¾ (119.4 x 68.2)

Signed with monogram l.r. (extremely faint; the canvas was signed by the artist underneath the final coat of paint): GV; on stretcher: G. Vantongerloo.

PROVENCANCE:
Purchased from the artist, 1951.

CONDITION:
At an unrecorded date the green square in the upper left corner was retouched in places along the top and left edges, along 2½ in. of the right edge, and in a small area 1¼ in. from the left 4¾ in. from the top. There are stress cracks over much of the surface, although these are mostly in the ground rather than the paint layer. There are a few losses at the turn of the canvas on all 4 sides. The condition in general is excellent. (Sept. 1972.)
Vantongerloo's preoccupation in 1930 with the equation of the present painting led to the creation at this time of two other closely related works. No. 60 in the OC is an ebonite sculpture with the title Construction $y = -ax^2 + bx + 18$ (fig. a). No. 61 in the OC is a painting entitled Composition émanante d'équation $y = -ax^2 + bx + 18$ avec accord d'orangé... R... vert... violet, 1930, OC 61, oil on canvas, 47¼ x 25½ in., 120 x 65.1 cm., Collection Silvia Neumann Pizitz, New York.

Several drawings in the artist's estate record his sophisticated and coherent mathematical calculations for the sculpture (figs. b, c; I am indebted to Mar-
guerite Frank, Princeton, New Jersey, who established the accuracy of Vantongerloo’s formulae, and the clear relationship between them and the profile elevation of the sculpture as represented in these two studies. The precise relationship of the parabola and hyperbola to the two paintings based on the same formula has not yet been established, owing to lack of precise mathematical data concerning the dimensions of the sculpture’s planes. Several other drawings in the artist’s estate indicate, however, that these paintings too are susceptible of mathematical explanation (see, for example, fig. e). Further study of this problem is necessary. Vantongerloo himself stated that the paintings of 1917-36 were characterized by a treatment of space and volume that was directly dependent upon geometrical analysis (unpublished manuscript, Conception-Activité, 1950, SRGM archives. The relevant sentence reads: De 1917 à 1936 (No. 1-93) ma conception de l’espace trouvait sa réalisation dans l’établissement des rapports des volumes que je vérifiais au moyen de la géométrie). The evidence so far provided by the drawings illustrated here would support this claim.

A small detailed preparatory watercolor for the Guggenheim painting and one for the Pizitz picture are in the estate of the artist.

EXHIBITIONS:
Paris, Abstraction-Création, 1934; Paris, Galerie Porza, 1936; Paris, Galerie Mache, 1949 (information from OC, but exhibitions not otherwise identified); New York, SRGM 67, no. 79; 78, 95 (checklists); 195 (no cat.); 196 (checklist).
Composition 13478. 1936 [47].
(Composition 1-34-78 [No. 101]).

OC No. 101 bis, 13478. 1936. détruite à la guerre de 1939-45. refaite en 1947. The sketch corresponds closely to the painting.

51.1300
Oil on plywood, 13 1/8 x 36 1/2 (33.3 x 92.6); plywood sub-support projecting beyond the edges of the support on all sides: 14 x 37 3/8 (35.6 x 94.8)

Inscribed by the artist on reverse: 101 bis / 13478 / Paris 1936 / G. Vantongerloo.

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist, 1951.

CONDITION:
The painting has received no treatment. There are traction cracks in the black squares revealing the white beneath. Poor bonding between the white paint and the wood of the sub-support has resulted in extensive cracking and paint loss along all edges, especially in the right angle where the support meets the sub-support. There are some abrasions with gray transfer material on a vertical line ca. 13 in. from the left edge. Apart from some soil in the white areas, the condition is good. (Sept. 1972.)

According to the OC, the original composition, which dated from 1936, was destroyed during the war. The present picture is a replacement which Vantongerloo made in 1947.
The formula describes the arrangement of squares in two lines on a module of eight divisions (fig. a). On the upper line the squares appear on the first, third, fourth, seventh, and eighth divisions; on the lower they appear on the first and fifth. A rough pencil sketch for the 1936 version (fig. b) indicates the method of division; an exact small-scale study for the picture followed (fig. c). A later pencil sketch is inscribed on the reverse "101 bis 1939." Although the black squares appear in this sketch as rectangles (fig. d), the sketch almost certainly relates to the present picture, rather than to the original, the "1939" being Vantongerloo's mistaken memory of the date of the earlier version.

EXHIBITIONS:
Kunsthaus Zürich, Antoine Pevsner, Georges Vantongerloo, Max Bill, Oct. 15-Nov. 13, 1949, no. 36; New York, SRGM 67, no. 74.

1. According to the OC, the original version was exhibited at Galerie Jeanne Bucher in 1937 and in the Indépendants of that same year.
Function of Lines: Green-Red; Red-Green-Blue; Blue-Yellow. 1937.
(Fonction de lignes; Verte-Rouge. Rouge-Verte-Bleu. Bleu-Jaune).

OC No. 103, fonction de lignes; verte-Rouge, Rouge, verte, Bleu, Bleu, jaune. 1937. The sketch corresponds closely to the painting.

71.1936R 189
Oil (triplex) on plywood, 28⅜ x 17⅝ (72.1 x 43.4)

Inscribed by the artist on reverse (partially obscured by diagonal stretcher bar):
Fonction de lignes / ... rte—rouge. / ... ge—verte—bleu / bl ...—jaune. /
G. Vantongerloo / Pari ... 937 / No 103.

PROVENANCE:

CONDITION:
At an unrecorded date, an area approximately 2¼ x 1½ in. in the lower left corner was built up with gesso and inpainted; some additional inpainting in the bottom right corner (ca. ⅛ in.) and the top right corner (ca. ½ in.) seems also to have been preceded by work in gesso. The condition which might have necessitated such restoration is not clear.

Some traction cracks in the colored areas are clearly visible, especially in the central red and green forms. Cleavage has developed in 2 small areas: 3⅛ in. from the right side, 5⅜ in. from the left side; and 2¼ in. from the left, 4½ in. from the bottom. There is general soil in the white areas. The condition is fair. (Sept. 1972.)

A small-scale detailed watercolor study, corresponding precisely to the finished work, is in the estate of the artist.
Composition Green-Blue-Violet-Black. 1937.
(Composition Vert-Bleu-Violet-Noir).

OC No. 105, Composition vert bleu violet noir. Paris, 1937. The sketch corresponds closely to the painting. The three bands of color are inscribed: vert, bleu, violet, and correspond to the colors of the finished work.

51.1301
Oil (triplex) on plywood, 25\(\frac{1}{4}\) x 39\(\frac{3}{4}\) (64.2 x 101)
Inscribed by the artist on reverse: Composition / vert...bleu-violet...noire / G. Vantongerloo / Paris 1937 / No 105.

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist, 1951.

CONDITION:
In 1953 the work was cleaned with petroleum benzine to remove finger marks and grease stains; inpaint on all edges may have been done at this time. In 1956 the work was cleaned again.
There is an overall fine crackle in the polished surface, and a few cracks have widened. There are large shrinkage cracks in the green area, and similar though less extreme ones in the violet and black areas; these are due to poor bonding between the white and colored areas (see above NOTE). There are some faint yellow stains at the bottom of the right edge, possibly the result of an early repair. The edges and corners are in generally good condition. The condition, apart from some slight soil, is good. (Dec. 1973.)

An exact watercolor study for this composition is in the estate of the artist.

EXHIBITIONS:
Kunsthaus Zürich, Antoine Pevsner, Georges Vantongerloo, Max Bill, Oct. 15-Nov. 13, 1949, no. 38; New York, SRGM 67, no. 76; 79 (checklist); Philadelphia, SRGM 134-T, no. 154; New York, SRGM 144, 151, 153 (checklists); 195 (no cat.); 196 (checklist); Dallas Museum of Fine Arts, Geometric Abstraction: 1926-1942, Oct. 7-Nov. 19, 1972, no. 52, repr.

REFERENCE:
D. Robbins, Painting Between the Wars, 1918-1940, New York [1966], repr. color slide.
Composition $\frac{13478}{15}$. 1937.

OC No. 110, $\frac{13478}{15}$, brun, Beige, verdâtre, rouge, vert, triplex. Paris 1937. The sketch does not correspond exactly to the painting.

51.1302
Oil (triplex) on plywood mounted on plywood sub-support, 23 7/8 x 39 3/4 (60.5 x 100.9)
Inscribed by the artist on reverse: 110 composition $\frac{13478}{15}$ Paris 1937 / G. Vantongerloo.

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist, 1951.

CONDITION:
At an unrecorded date, the painting was retouched along 2 1/4 in. of the right edge starting at the lower right corner and extending 3/16 of an inch into the painting.

In the lower right section of the painting extensive traction cracks reveal a yellow substance underneath, which is probably a residue from the oil in the white paint. This residue has been produced by the artist's technique of sanding successive layers of paint between applications (see above NOTE). The oxidized (dried) portion of a given layer of paint was removed and a successive layer applied before the newly exposed area was able to dry. The cracking has occurred in the areas where the white is especially matte—e.g., probably in areas which were heavily sanded, permitting especially quick drying and hence traction. The support was attached to the sub-support with nails hammered through the support. As the paint film has shrunk, the ca. 1/4 in. nail heads have become visible underneath. In several of the areas around the nail heads cracks in the paint layer have developed and there is some danger of cleavage. The surface shows some considerable soil; the condition is fair. (Sept. 1972.)
Three studies for this work are in the estate of the artist: an ink sketch with color notes (fig. a), and two small watercolors.

As in the case of cat. no. 236, the formula describes the division of the canvas into two lines of eight sections each.

fig. a.
Vantongerloo, study for Composition $\frac{13478}{15}$, ink
with color notations, Estate of the artist.

EXHIBITIONS:
Paris, Galerie Delcourt, 1937 (information from OC, but exhibition not otherwise identified); Kunsthaus Zürich, Antoine Pevsner, Georges Vantongerloo, Max Bill, Oct. 15-Nov. 13, 1949, no. 40; New York, SRGM 67, no. 71.

REFERENCE:
G. Vantongerloo, Paintings, Sculptures, Reflections, New York, 1948, repr. no. 22.
(Fonction: rouge, vert, beige, brun).


51.1303
Oil (triplex) on plywood mounted on plywood sub-support, 34¼ x 39¼ (86.8 x 100.9)

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist, 1951.

CONDITION:
4 small repairs of unrecorded date are visible to the naked eye; 2 of these have a rough finish which contrasts with the smoothly sanded down surface of the painting as a whole.
The support was attached to the sub-support by means of nails hammered through the support. As the paint film has shrunk, the ca. ½ in. nail heads have become visible underneath. In several of the areas around the nail heads cracks in the paint layer have developed. A few scattered minor cracks in the paint film are visible, and a few small losses at the edges. Apart from some slight soil along the margins, the condition is good. (Sept. 1972.)

Two watercolor studies for the picture are in the estate of the artist. A closely related work, smaller in size, is in the collection of Marguerite Arp-Hagenbach (OC No. 115, Fonction-Composition, 1937, 22 x 30¾ in., 55.9 x 78.1 cm.).

EXHIBITIONS:
Paris, Salon des Surindépendants, 1937, Galerie de L'Equipe, 1937, Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum, 1938, Museum d'Arle[s], 1938 (information from OC, but exhibitions not otherwise identified); Kunsthau Zürich, Antoine Pevsner, Georges Vantongerloo, Max Bill, Oct. 15-Nov. 13, 1949, no. 43; New York, SRGM 67, no. 77.
Composition. 1944.

OC No. 166, Composition. Paris 1944. The sketch corresponds to the painting, but the format is reversed, making the picture horizontal rather than vertical.

Oil on plywood, 36 1/8 x 20 1/8 (92.4 x 51);
plywood sub-support projecting beyond the edges of the support on all sides, 37 x 21
(94.1 x 53.4)

Inscribed by the artist on the reverse: 166 / composition / Paris 1944 / G. Vantongerloo.

A watercolor for this composition is in the estate of the artist.

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist, 1951.

CONDITION:
The work has received no treatment.
The support is warped at the upper left and along the entire bottom edge and has lifted from the sub-support in both areas. Apart from some general surface soil the condition is otherwise good. (Sept. 1972.)

EXHIBITIONS:
Maria Helena Vieira da Silva

Born June 1908, Lisbon.


37.399
Oil on canvas, 41½ x 63⅜ (105.3 x 161.5)
Signed and dated l.r.: Vieira da Silva 36.

PROVENANCE:

CONDITION:
In 1957 the work was placed on a new stretcher and the margins waxed. It was superficially cleaned with petroleum benzine and surfaced with PBM.
The condition is excellent. (May 1974.)

Vieira da Silva’s life-long preoccupation with problems of perspective was first explored in works of the mid 1930’s such as the present Composition and the slightly earlier The Studio of 1935—the artist’s first large-scale work (Private Collection, Paris, 45⅜ x 57⅜ in., 115 x 146.5 cm., repr. Vieira da Silva, exhibition catalogue, Galleria d’Arte Moderna, Turin, 1964). In The Studio the spatial definition is to a large extent clear, and although subtle ambiguities are already introduced, they play a subordinate role. By the time of Composition, however, while many of the same structural elements are used, ambiguity has become dominant. Shortly afterwards, Vieira da Silva embarked on a far more ambitious and complex version of the present composition—The Weavers, which she began in 1936 but did not complete until 1948 (Private...
Collection, Paris, fig. a). The structural basis of this work is identical, in reverse, to that of the present painting; but the perspectival ambiguities have been multiplied and the disturbing subtleties of interrelationships between planes increased.

The compositional links between these two works and the title of the second inevitably raise the question of their possible mutual source in the iconography of the loom. As G. Weelen, J. Rewald, and many others have noted, however, the titles of Vieira da Silva’s works are almost always added long after completion and usually by poets or other friends of the artist. They rarely represent even an ex post facto response of the artist to her work. These titles must, therefore, be treated with caution; at best they may serve to introduce an added—if unintended—ingredient to the viewer’s perception of the work, but they should not be taken as illumination of the artist’s own iconographical sources. She herself has consistently claimed in this connection that titles are incapable of even approximating the “inner dream” which is the subject of her painting. (See, for example, Weelen, Vieira da Silva, Paris, 1960 [p. 4].)

EXHIBITIONS:

1. Information from the artist’s own records, supplied by G. Weelen, correspondence with the author, May-June 1974.
Jacques Villon

Born July 1875, Dainville.
Died June 1963, Puteaux.

243

Color Perspective. 1921.

53.1356

Oil on canvas, 21 1/4 x 28 3/8 (54 x 72.7)

Signed l.r.: JV; on reverse: Jacques Villon / 21.

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist by Katherine S. Dreier (1877-1952), West Redding, Connecticut, probably 1922; Gift of the Estate of Katherine S. Dreier, 1953.

CONDITION:
In 1953 the surface was cleaned with Soilax solution, followed by benzine rinse. Minor losses along much of the right and bottom edges and scattered along the top and left edges were inpainted. In 1960 the canvas was taken off the stretcher, superficially cleaned, infused with wax resin, and restretched on a new stretcher.

Traction cracks are visible in scattered locations. There is some cracking and occasional flaking along the edges at the turn of the canvas. The condition is otherwise good. (Aug. 1974.)

1. Dreier purchased at least 2 other Color Perspectives from Villon in 1922 (Yale University Art Gallery, New Haven, Conn., 1941.744 and .745). For a note on the difficulty of establishing her personal ownership, see above cat. no. 68, fn. 2.
Faintly discernable with the naked eye, and rather more clearly visible under ultra-violet or transmitted light, are the traces of one or possibly two earlier painted compositions below the present one. Colors used in these include green and orange, in addition to those colors presently visible. All attempts to decipher these earlier compositions, and to relate them either to the painting now visible or to other works by the artist, have hitherto failed. The canvas is unresponsive to x-ray, and the underpainting remains illegible and largely incoherent.

Villon characterized his ca. 1919 move into abstraction as a “means of producing autonomous creations,” but he emphasized that he always felt compelled “to start from observation of nature, a nature perhaps enhanced by intuition” (F. Steegmuller, “Jacques Villon—an Appreciation,” Jacques Villon, Master Printmaker, exhibition catalogue, New York, 1964, n.p.). R. Massat, writing in 1951, similarly emphasized that the post-1919 abstractions were invariably derived from objective sources. (“Elles partaient d’une forme figurative pour aller vers la sévérité de l’abstraction” [Cabiers d’Art, vol. 26, 1951, p. 66].)

Although no source for the present composition has hitherto come to light, it is clearly possible that this—and other examples of the early 1920’s Color Perspective series—evolved from a figurative source in a manner similar to that of the 1924 Jockey (Collection Société Anonyme, Yale University, New Haven). Rosenblum has described Villon’s process of gradual abstraction in the latter case as a “taut distillation of matter and movement into the language of Synthetic Cubism” (“The Duchamp Family,” Arts, vol. 31, April 1957, p. 23). And indeed the eight surviving preparatory drawings for Jockey (Collection Société Anonyme, Yale University, New Haven) document, as G. H. Hamilton has demonstrated, Léonce Rosenberg’s 1920 description of Cubist method (“The Dialectic of Later Cubism: Villon’s Jockey,” Magazine of Art, vol. 41, November 1948, p. 269). The highly abstract pattern which constitutes the final painting Jockey, though legible in light of the drawings, would probably remain virtually undecipherable without them.

Isolated details of the green and orange underpainting on the present canvas, though illegible in their totality, are suggestive of details subsequently used in the Jockey and other compositions. In light of the evidence cited above, further study of the Guggenheim and other Color Perspective paintings in relation to pictures such as Jockey might help to finally resolve the question of whether these compositions—hitherto considered totally abstract—may in fact have had figurative origins.

**Exhibitions:**²
244 Portrait of the Artist’s Father. 1924.
55.1434
Oil on canvas, 21 1/4 x 18 1/8 (54.1 x 46)

PROVENANCE:

CONDITION:
In 1953 the painting was glue lined, placed on a new stretcher, and some minimal inpainting performed by Riportella Studios, New York (information supplied by Clara G. Binswanger, daughter of Ida Guggenheimer, and confirmed by Vincent Riportella, February 1974). The extensive retouching which is clearly revealed under UV (fig. a) is virtually undetectable with the naked eye, was not performed by Riportella, and probably dates from before Mrs. Guggenheimer’s acquisition of the work. It is extremely subtle and may have been performed by the artist himself. Analytic tests suggest that this inpainting contains the same natural varnish (probably damar) as was originally used to coat the work, although it has not been possible to establish this with certainty. The fact that some of the inpainting is applied over cracks in the earlier paint layer would suggest that some years elapsed between the 2 applications. Apart from scattered minor paint cracks, the condition is good. Traces of horizontal and vertical grid lines are visible in some places. (Mar. 1974.)

The artist’s father, Justin Isidore Duchamp, was born February 16, 1848, in Massiac, Cantal, and died February 3, 1925, in Rouen. He became a successful and distinguished lawyer and practiced throughout his career in Blainville and Rouen, where he led a quiet and private life, rarely leaving the city and never traveling abroad. He provided encouragement and financial support to all three of his sons, both at the outset of their artistic careers and long after they

1. The records of the Marie Harriman Gallery are presently not available for study and attempts to establish her date of acquisition have hitherto failed.
reached maturity. All three remained closely attached to him and paid frequent visits to Rouen up to the time of his death. All three also produced portraits of their father in various media at different stages of his life. The present portrait, painted shortly before the lawyer’s death, is reminiscent in particular of a full-length charcoal portrait by Villon dating from 1912 (City Art Museum of Saint Louis, 155:66, Bulletin, new series, vol. ii, Sept.-Oct. 1966, repr. p. 9).

EXHIBITIONS:
Paris, Grand Palais, Trente ans de l'art indépendant, Feb. 20-Mar. 21, 1926, no. 2629 ("Portrait-1924;" a label on the reverse identifies the picture with this exhibition); New York, Brummer Gallery, Villon, Oct. 20-Nov. 20, 1930, no. 9? (Head of a Man); New York, Marie Harriman Gallery, Jacques Villon, Jan. 8-27, 1934, no. 4; New York, Lucien Goldschmidt, Jacques Villon, Apr. 7-30, 1955, no. 3; New York, SRGM 97 (checklist); 101, Villon, Duchamp-Villon, Duchamp, repr. n.p.; 118 (checklist); Philadelphia, SRGM 134-T, no. 157; New York, SRGM 151, 153 (checklists); 195 (no cat.); 196 (checklist); 207, p. 26, repr. p. 27; 260 (no cat.).

REFERENCES:
Song, 1926.
*(Chanson; The Lovers)*.
53:1357
Oil (with ink?) on canvas, 23½ x 31¾ (59.7 x 80.7)
PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist by Katherine S. Dreier (1877-1952), West Redding, Connecticut, 1926; Gift of the Estate of Katherine S. Dreier, 1953.

CONDITION:
In 1955 the unvarnished surface was cleaned with petroleum benzine 265; a small hole in the center was filled and retouched, and the work surfaced with PBM. In 1955 the canvas was lined with wax resin on natural linen, placed on a new stretcher, and squared, necessitating inpainting approximately ⅜ in. in width along portions of all edges. In 1957 a 6 in. scratch below and to the right of center was inpainted.

Apart from some minor crackle in some of the blue and dark brown areas, and some minor paint losses at the edges, the condition is excellent. (Apr. 1974.)

TECHNIQUE: The black crosshatching over much of the surface appears to have been applied with a quill pen. It has hitherto not been established whether this is ink or oil paint, although examination under strong magnification reveals a crackle in the black lines similar to that present in other areas of the paint film. In a 1957 interview with D. Vallier, the artist alluded to his occasional practice of adding crosshatching in ink to an otherwise completed canvas: "Parfois, sur les couleurs, je reprends mon tableau à l'encre. C'est un accompagnement. La toile est déjà composée et l'accompagnement peut être libre sans nuire. Là je peux mettre un peu de mon cœur à moi" (Jacques Villon, Paris, 1957, p. 31).

1. There is no apparent explanation for the title *The Lovers* which was attached to the painting for the first time in the catalogue of the 1952-53 Katherine Dreier Memorial Exhibition. It is possible that a confusion arose between *Song* and Duchamp-Villon's relief *The Lovers* of 1913 (Kunstmuseum Basel Öffentliche Kunstsammlung), which inspired a 1924 painting by Villon.
The composition is derived directly from a sculpture by the artist's brother, Raymond Duchamp-Villon, also entitled *Song* (fig. a). The sculpture was first executed in plaster in 1908 (present whereabouts unknown), and the wood version dates from 1909. It has hitherto not been possible to establish whether Villon owned either or both versions in 1926, but he certainly had immediate access to the wood version since he included it in a group of works by Duchamp-Villon that he assembled for the February 1926 *Trente ans de l'art indépendant* (no. 2928).

W. C. Agee first made the convincing suggestion that Duchamp-Villon's fascination with the depiction of complicated human poses had been directly influenced by Muybridge's *The Human Figure in Motion*, published in 1887; Duchamp had confirmed that all three brothers were familiar with and fascinated by Muybridge's work (G. H. Hamilton and W. C. Agee, *Raymond Duchamp-Villon*, exhibition catalogue, New York, 1968, p. 41). Examination of some of the sequences in Muybridge lends cogent support to Agee's hypothesis (see fig. b).

The scale of the sculpture and the painting and the pose of the female figures in each are almost identical. Villon has merely slightly raised the head of the figure on the left and the left shoulder of the one on the right. In conception, however, the two works are dramatically different. Villon's rendering of the human form as a series of angular interlocking planes contrasts with Duchamp-
Villon’s smoothly rounded surfaces; and the clearly defined relationship in the sculpture between the figures and their surrounding space becomes in the painting deliberately ambiguous and complex.

The subject of the painting and of the sculpture that inspired it is obscure. It relates directly to a group of works executed by the three brothers during the years 1907 to 1910, all of which reveal a common preoccupation with apparently ritual subjects placed in outdoor, pastoral settings. (A. d’Harnoncourt first suggested, in correspondence with A. Vondermuhll, 1971, that the 1909 work of the three brothers seemed to be linked by this common subject matter.) In the case of Villon, this subject matter occurs in 1907 in prints such as The Graceful Helper (J. Auberty and C. Pérusseaux, Jacques Villon: catalogue de son oeuvre gravé, Paris, 1950, 117; hereafter A & P) and Women of Thrace

fig. b.
E. Muybridge, Animal Locomotion, Philadelphia, 1887, individual frames (left to right) from: vol. VI, pl. 265; vol. IV, pl. 245; vol. IV, pl. 266.
Villon, Song, photographed in original frame by Pierre Legrain, now lost.

(A & P 119); it may continue in 1908 with The Little Bathers (A & P 143) and in 1909 with In the Forest (A & P 162). Duchamp-Villon produced not only Song, but also the Young Girl Seated of 1909 (Hamilton and Agee, op. cit., repr. p. 43), which—with its rather more conventional theme—is less explicitly relatable to a ritual iconography, and Pastorale of 1910 (W. Pach, Raymond Duchamp-Villon, Paris, 1924, p. 45). Duchamp is perhaps expressing a similar preoccupation in his Two Nudes of 1910 (W. Schwarz, Marcel Duchamp, New York, 1969, repr. no. 22), in Baptism (Ibid., repr. no. 33), The Bush (Ibid., repr. no. 32), and Young Man and Girl in Spring (Ibid., repr. no. 37), all of 1911.

Although it is likely that a common iconographic or symbolic thread links these and other related works of this period, its significance has yet to be fully explained, and the sources for the iconography are as yet unclear.

Dreier’s publication of the picture in 1926 included an appreciation of an unusual frame especially created for it by the French bookbinder Pierre Legrain (fig. c): “... in its coating of light varnished wood and brilliant reflected silver blocks, the frame adds a new note to Villon’s picture.” The frame, which according to Hamilton, still existed at the time of the 1952 exhibition, has since been lost. (For a note on Legrain’s creation of frames for Picabia, see W. Camfield, Francis Picabia, exhibition catalogue, New York, 1970, p. 124.)

EXHIBITIONS:
Brooklyn Museum, An International Exhibition of Modern Art Assembled by the Société Anonyme, Nov. 19, 1926-Jan. 1, 1927, no. 61, repr. (Chanson); New Haven, Yale University Art Gallery, In Memory of Katherine S. Dreier, Dec. 15, 1952-Feb. 1, 1953, no. 70, repr. (The Lovers).1

REFERENCE:
Friedrich Vordemberge-Gildewart

Born November 1899, Osnabrück.
Died December 1962, Ulm.

Composition No. 96. 1935.

37.410
Oil on canvas, 31½ x 39¾ (79.9 x 100.1)
Inscribed by the artist on stretcher: Vordemberge-Gildewart / K. No. 96 / 1935.

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist by Rudolf Bauer on behalf of The Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation, 1937 (information that Bauer was instructed to buy the work by Solomon R. Guggenheim supplied by Ilse Vordemberge-Leda, the artist’s widow, December 1972); Gift of Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1937.

CONDITION:
The picture was cleaned in 1953.
There is considerable surface dirt, both in the white background and in the colored areas, but the condition is otherwise good. (Oct. 1972.)

The rough textural quality of the stippled areas (designated “rauh” by the artist in his unpublished notebook) was first introduced in works of 1933. Vordemberge-Gildewart’s earliest experiments with this texture involved the use of sand, a practice that he employed only occasionally in his later works. In
general, he came to rely upon a technique that included the use of a tiny brush and concentrated paint that he applied in layers (information supplied by Ilse Vordemberge-Leda in conversation with the author, November 1972; for a description of the artist's practice in this technique, see Jaffe, 1971, pp. 69-70).

An earlier version of Composition No. 96, with horizontal rather than vertical bars, is Composition No. 88, 1934-35 (23½ x 23½ in., 60 x 60 cm., Oeuvrekatalog, no. 92). In this square version, the design consists of three rather than four separate elements, and the two main bars are identical in length. Composition No. 111, 1939, represents a third variation (23½ x 23½ in., 60 x 60 cm., Oeuvrekatalog, no. 116); it is identical in size and format to No. 88 but has four vertical elements rather than three vertical and one diagonal.

Clearly the artist was intermittently concerned with the compositional problems posed by this configuration. In 1937, during a lengthy visit to Max Bill in Zurich, he produced a whole sheet of sketches with variations on the theme, none of which he ever used for paintings. An undated sheet of sketches in the collection of Ilse Vordemberge-Leda (fig. a) contains in the upper left-hand corner still another version that was never—as far as is known—converted into a painting. (Since this sheet of drawings includes compositional types from as early as 1927 and as late as 1946, as well as some that were never executed at all, its function and date are difficult to establish.)

EXHIBITIONS:
Charleston, S.C., SRGM 4-T, no. 189 (incorrect dimensions listed, dated 1936); New York, SRGM 62, no. 1; Nantucket Island, Mass., SRGM 68-T (no cat).

REFERENCES:
Composition No. 97. 1935.

Oil on canvas, 31\(\frac{1}{2}\) \(\times\) 39\(\frac{3}{8}\) (79.9 \(\times\) 100.1)


PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist by Rudolf Bauer on behalf of The Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation, 1937 (information that Bauer was instructed to buy the work by Solomon R. Guggenheim supplied by Ilse Vordemberge-Leda, the artist's widow, December 1972); Gift of Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1937.

CONDITION:
Although the picture was cleaned in 1954 and 1956, considerable soil remains ingrained in the paint, especially in the background, which is extremely thinly painted. The thinness of paint application poses considerable cleaning problems which have not been satisfactorily solved. (Oct. 1972.)

The compositional elements combined in the present picture—two equilateral but dissimilar triangles in the left of the field, a diagonally placed line with a small horizontal and a vertical bar on either side of it—are also explored in Composition No. 112, 1939 (Oeuvrekatalog no. 117), and in an undated draw-
ing in the collection of Ilse Vordemberge-Leda (fig. a). Comparison of the two drawings with the painting suggests something of the process by which Vordemberge-Gildewart shifted and altered elements in his design before arriving at an acceptable equilibrium.

Composition No. 108, 1938 (Oeuvrekatalog no. 112), is a more symmetrical version of the same composition: the two triangles are now equilateral and identical in size, they are joined together to form a square, and the floating diagonal bar is placed so that its top and bottom are equidistant from the top and bottom edges of the canvas.

fig. a.

Vordemberge-Gildewart, studies related to Composition No. 97, pencil on paper, 8 1/4 x 5 1/4 in., 21 x 13.3 cm., Collection Ilse Vordemberge-Leda, Rapperswil, Switzerland.

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:
Composition No. 140, 1942.

47.1136

Oil on canvas, 23 3/4 x 31 1/2 (60.3 x 80)


PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist, 1947.

CONDITION:
The picture was restretched on a new stretcher in 1954 and cleaned. In 1956 some cleavage of the paint film had developed and the canvas was impregnated with wax resin from the reverse to arrest it. Some retouching along the left and right margins may date from this time. A traction crack 3/8 in. long in the black triangle striped with green was retouched with watercolor in 1958. The condition is good. (Oct. 1972.)
A sheet of sketches in the collection of Ilse Vordemberge-Leda contains three studies for Composition No. 140 (fig. a, ii, iv, ix). In each the basic configuration is the same and corresponds to that of the painting, but the distribution of textures and designs within the individual triangles varies from sketch to sketch. Each of the three drawings also contains a stippled triangle, an element that was excluded from the final version. A fourth drawing on the same sheet (fig. a, vi) cannot be related definitively to the present painting, for while it contains some of its basic elements it is also sufficiently dissimilar in important details to make a definite connection uncertain.

EXHIBITIONS:
Kunsthalle Basel, Moderne Holländische Kunst 1885-1945, May 1946, no. 115 ("Komposition, 1942;" the identification of this entry with Composition No. 140 is derived from the artist's copy of the catalogue, now in the collection of his widow, Ilse Vordemberge-Leda); Lausanne, Musée Cantonal des Beaux-Arts, Art Hollandais moderne depuis Vincent van Gogh: 1885-1945, June, 1946, no. 110; Kunsthalle Bern, Art Hollandais Moderne, Aug. 3-25, 1946, no. 110; New York, SRGM 59 (checklist); 62, no. 6.

REFERENCES:
Composition No. 150. 1945.

48.1165
Oil on canvas, 29½ x 25½ (75 x 65)
Signed and dated on stretcher (transcribed but not photographed before replacement of stretcher): Vordemgeberge-Gildewart / Composition No. 150 / 1945.

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist, 1948.

CONDITION:
At an unrecorded date in the 1950's the canvas was lined with wax resin and the stretcher was replaced. At that time some minor inpainting on the right and bottom edges, in the lower right corner, and approximately in the center of the gray area took place.
Apart from some minor scattered abrasions in the paint film and some surface soil, the painting is in good condition. (Oct. 1972.)

This is the only one of Vordemgeberge-Gildewart’s works in which the ground is divided into four major sections. Moreover, a further subdivision of the ground—by means of a thin line cutting from top to bottom across the four sections—occurs in only one other work (Composition No. 149 of 1945 [Oeuvrekatatalog no. 154]).
Although no preparatory drawings for Composition No. 150 exist, several studies have survived in which the artist was clearly experimenting with motifs that were ultimately important for this painting. Two sheets of sketches in the collection of Ilse Vordemberge-Leda (figs. a and b) contain a series of triangles which have been internally subdivided to create smaller triangles, and several pairs of these triangles have been heavily shaded. Two of these paired triangles (fig. a, ii, iii, vi, ix; fig. b, i, v, vi) reappear without their connecting triangular

---

**fig. a.**
Vordemberge-Gildewart, studies related to Composition No. 150, pencil on paper, 8 3/4 x 11 1/2 in., 22.3 x 29 cm., Collection Ilse Vordemberge-Leda, Rapperswil, Switzerland.

**fig. b.**
Vordemberge-Gildewart, studies related to Composition No. 150, pencil on paper, 8 3/4 x 11 1/2 in., 22.3 x 29 cm., Collection Ilse Vordemberge-Leda, Rapperswil, Switzerland.
framework in the right-hand section of Composition No. 150. Vordemberge-Gildewart was already exploring the formal possibilities of subdivided triangles as early as 1942, in paintings such as Composition No. 137.

The “X” and “Y” motifs in the lower left portion of the present painting derive from patterns in the subdivided triangles of works such as Composition No. 138, 1942, and Composition No. 139, 1942-43 (Oeuvrekatalog nos. 143 and 144). Examples of the “Y” motif are also to be found in the drawing (fig. a, x). A further drawing (fig. c), which relates closely to Composition No. 140, also contains a strongly articulated “Y” motif, as well as a pair of juxtaposed triangles nearly identical to those in the upper right-hand section of the present painting.

The drawings reproduced in figs. a, b, and c cannot be specifically identified as studies for the present picture, or for any other existing work by the artist, but they clearly represent the process of experimentation pursued during the years 1943-45, a process that resulted in the execution of Composition 143, 145, 147-150 (Oeuvrekatalog nos. 148, 150, 152-155).

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:
Edouard Vuillard

Born November 1868, Cuiseaux.
Died June 1940, La Baule.
Félix Fénéon was born in 1861 in Turin. His father was French and his mother Swiss. In 1881 he moved to Paris where he won a position in the War Ministry. Within a short time he also embarked upon a distinguished literary career which he pursued simultaneously with his government responsibilities. In 1884 he founded his first periodical, La Revue indépendante, and he later became one of the principal writers for Gustave Kahn’s La Vogue. He contributed innumerable articles to the Revue exotique, Le Symboliste, Le Chat noir, Les Hommes d’aujourd’hui, La Libre revue, La Cravache, Art et critique, Entretiens politiques et littéraires, and L’Art moderne de Bruxelles. In addition he wrote for several anarchist publications (usually under a pseudonym). He published Mallarmé, Huysmans, Verlaine, Rimbaud, and many other Symbolist writers. In 1884 he saw and was deeply affected by Seurat’s La Baignade, Asnières; he met the artist in 1886 and a close friendship followed. Through Seurat he also came to know the whole “Neo-Impressionist” group—a term which he himself invented to differentiate the new generation from the old.

When his friend the poet Jules Laforgue died in 1887 at the age of twenty-seven, Fénéon became his literary executor and carefully published all of his remaining writings. When his dear friend Seurat died in 1891 at the age of thirty-one, Fénéon devotedly shouldered the responsibility for classifying his works and labored throughout the rest of his life to spread the artist’s fame.

In 1888 Gustave Kahn became the editor-in-chief of La Revue indépendante; Fénéon became a major and regular contributor of art, theater, and literary reviews, and he also organized exhibitions on the magazine’s premises.

Although Fénéon’s identification with the anarchist cause had been limited to writing art reviews for their periodicals, he was, together with many actual terrorists, arrested and thrown into prison in April 1894. Later that year he stood trial in the Procès des trente as a member of a terrorist group. The lawyer Thadée Natanson, who in 1891 had helped to publish the first Paris number of the Revue blanche, arranged for Fénéon to be represented by Demange, the lawyer who later defended Dreyfus. Natanson had not yet met Fénéon but he visited him in prison and offered to assist in any way he could. When Fénéon
was finally acquitted and released, he presented himself at the offices of the Revue blanche and was hired as editorial secretary. From that time until 1903, when the Revue blanche published its last issue, Fénéon was the driving intellectual and literary force behind its success. He was largely responsible for publishing in it every major writer of the day including Verlaine, Apollinaire, Mallarmé, Laforgue, and others. In addition, he organized exhibitions (notably a large Seurat retrospective in 1900) and published books. The enterprise absorbed him totally.

From 1903 to 1906, Fénéon worked for Le Figaro and in 1906 for Le Matin. That same year he began yet another career—that of art dealer with the Galerie Bernheim-Jeune. By 1908 he was their artistic director, and he promoted the work of Maillol, van Gogh, Matisse, Signac, Cross, Utrillo, Modigliani, Van Dongen, the Futurists, and, of course, Seurat. He retired in 1924, having established the Bernheim-Jeune gallery as one of the most successful in France. Meanwhile from 1919-26, he was the founder and chief inspiration of Bernheim-Jeune’s periodical Bulletin de la vie artistique.

From 1926-36 he worked on a complete catalogue of Seurat’s work, which was to be published by C. M. de Hauke, a French dealer. Fénéon died in February 1944. (The above information on Fénéon is drawn largely from the sensitive and illuminating biographical essay published by Rewald in Gazette des Beaux-Arts, sér. 6, vol. 32, July-August 1947, pp. 45-62, and vol. 33, February 1948, pp. 107-126, as well as from the exhaustive chronology published by J. U. Halperin in Félix Fénéon: les oeuvres plus que complètes, Geneva, 1970.)

Several other portraits of Fénéon at the Revue blanche exist. One, by Vallotton, 1896, shows Fénéon in the identical pose at his desk, absorbed by a manuscript, this time at night (formerly Collection J. Rodrigues-Henriques, Paris, Rewald, 1948, repr. p. 115). A drawing by Bonnard, depicting Regnier, Mirbeau, and the Natanson brothers in the office of the journal, also shows Fénéon at his desk (Ibid., repr. p. 119), as does a pastel by Van Dongen (present whereabouts unknown, Halperin, op. cit., vol. I, pl. VI).

The 1901 date inscribed on the reverse of the present work is stylistically plausible and was probably placed there by Fénéon himself, although the handwriting is difficult to identify with certainty.

Exhibitions:
Paris, Bernheim-Jeune & Cie, Portraits d’hommes, Dec. 16, 1907-Jan. 4, 1908, no. 139 (lent by “M.F.F.”); Paris, Galerie Les Cadres (chez Bolette Natanson), Les Peintres de La Revue blanche, June 12-30, 1936, no. 50; Paris, Galerie Bernheim-Jeune & Cie, Vuillard: oeuvres de 1890 à 1910, 1938 (cat. not located, but a label for the exhibition appears on the painting’s reverse); New York, SRGM 241 (addenda); 251 (no cat.); Cleveland, SRGM 258-T, pl. 4.

Reference:
Composition. 1930.

37.412

Tempera on wood panel, 25 x 30
(63.5 x 76.2)

Signed and dated l.r.: E Wadsworth 1930.

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from the artist by Solomon R. Guggenheim by 1936; Gift of Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1937.

EXHIBITIONS:

REFERENCES:

CONDITION:
The work has received no treatment since its acquisition.
The edges show rabbet marks from a previous frame and some chips and losses, especially at the corners. 4 nails embedded in the stretcher have worked their way through the paint film and are visible on the surface, with chipping and loss of the paint in all 4 areas. Apart from this condition, and some fine crackle in the vermilion areas, the condition is good. (May 1974.)
Composition. 1930.

37.413
Tempera on wood panel, 24¾ x 34¾
(62.7 x 87.9)
Signed and dated l.l.: E Wadsworth. 1930.

PROVENANCE:
Purchased from Arthur Tooth & Sons, Ltd.,
London, by Solomon R. Guggenheim,
August 1930; Gift of Solomon R. Guggenheim,
1937.

CONDITION:
The picture has received no treatment since
its acquisition, but there is a ½ in. repair
with inpaint 11 in. from the top and 3½ in.
from the left.
The vermilion areas show an overall very
fine crackle pattern with some slight in-
cipient cleavage. This crackle is visible in 1
or 2 other areas. There are some small
blisters in the whites, and a few scattered
minor losses. There is no varnish, and the
work shows moderate surface soil, but the
condition in general is good. (May 1974.)

EXHIBITIONS:
Charleston, S.C., SRGM 4-T, no. 192, repr.

REFERENCES:
Sélection chronique de la Vie Artistique XIII, Edward Wadsworth, contributions by W.
George, M. Sevier, O. Zadkine, Antwerp, 1933, repr. p. 62; H. Rebay, “A Definition of Non-
Objective Painting,” Design, vol. 38, June 1936, repr. p. 5; Art of Tomorrow, 1939, no. 413,
repr.
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CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF EXHIBITIONS ORGANIZED BY THE GUGGENHEIM MUSEUM


(6-T) Paris, Galerie Charpentier, Réalités Nouvelles (including selections from the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation): 1ère Exposition (1ère Série), Oeuvres des artistes français, June 15-28; 2ème Exposition, Oeuvres des artistes dont la tendance inobjective s’est volontairement arrêtée avant 1920; Oeuvres des artistes après 1920 (no catalogue; list of participating artists).


(9) New York, N.Y., Museum of Non-Objective Painting, Charles G. Shaw: Thirteen Recent Paintings, April 1-May 13 (no catalogue or checklist).


1941


Portland, Ore., Pacific Arts Association, Lincoln High School, *Fifteen Non-Objective Paintings from the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation*, April 7-23; traveled to Eugene, Ore., University of Oregon, April 28-May 11; Corvallis, Ore., Oregon State College, May 12-30 (held at Corvallis, June, at Foundation's request); Los Angeles, Cal., Chouinard Art Institute, July; San Diego, Cal., Fine Arts Gallery, August; Institute, W. Va., West Virginia State College, September; Massillon, Ohio, The Massillon Museum, October; Normal, Ill., Illinois State Normal University, November (held at Normal, December 1941-January 1942, at Foundation's request); Hazleton, Pa., Hazleton Undergraduate Center, The Pennsylvania State College, February 1942 (no catalogue or checklist).


Bennington, Vt., Bennington College, *Twenty-seven Non-Objective Paintings from the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation*, October; traveled to Iowa City, Iowa, The State University of Iowa, January 6-26, 1942; Birmingham, Ala., Birmingham Art Club, Public Library, February 1942; Minneapolis, Minn., The University Gallery, University of Minnesota, March 2-31, 1942 (no catalogue or checklist).


New York, N.Y., Museum of Non-Objective Painting, *Guest Exhibition: Drawings and Woodblock Prints by Mary Ryan, John Sennhauser, Charles Smith*, January 1-February 27 (no catalogue or checklist).


New York, N.Y., Museum of Non-Objective Painting, *Fifth Anniversary Exhibition*, June 25-October 31 (no catalogue or checklist).


Savannah, Ga., Telfair Academy of Arts and Sciences, *Non-Objective Art from the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation*, March 10-April 10 (no catalogue or checklist).


(39) New York, N.Y., Museum of Non-Objective Painting, Loan Exhibition, April 18-
closing date unknown (checklist).

(40) New York, N.Y., Museum of Non-Objective Painting, Loan Exhibition, October 15-
closing date unknown (checklist).

(41-T) Cazenovia, N.Y., Cazenovia Junior College, Selections from the Solomon R. Guggen-
heim Foundation, November 11, 1944-January 1945 (no catalogue or checklist).

1945 (42-T) Fort Worth, Tex., Fort Worth Association, Public Library, Selections from the
Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation, January 6-March 21 (no catalogue or
checklist).

(43) New York, N.Y., The Museum of Non-Objective Painting, In Memory of Wassily
Kandinsky, March 15-April 29 (catalogue).

(44) New York, N.Y., Museum of Non-Objective Painting, Loan Exhibition, June 6-
closing date unknown (checklist).

(45-T) Scranton, Pa., Everhart Museum, Art of Tomorrow, June 15-September 15 (checklist).

(46) New York, N.Y., Museum of Non-Objective Painting, Alice Mattern Memorial,
October-closing date unknown (checklist).

(47-T) Chicago, Ill., The Arts Club of Chicago, Wassily Kandinsky Memorial Exhibition,
November (checklist).

(48) New York, N.Y., Museum of Non-Objective Painting, Loan Exhibition, December 5-
closing date unknown (checklist).

(49-T) Milwaukee, Wisc., Milwaukee Art Institute, Wassily Kandinsky Memorial Exhibition,
December 1945-January 1946 (no catalogue or checklist).

1946 (50-T) Savannah, Ga., Telfair Academy of Arts and Sciences, Selections from the Solomon
R. Guggenheim Foundation, February 9-26; some of which traveled to Augusta, Ga.,
Augusta Art Club, March; Athens, Ga., Southern Art Association, April (no cata-
logue or checklist).

(51-T) Anniston, Ala., United Service Organizations, Inc. (USO), Seventeen Paintings from
the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation, April (no catalogue or checklist).

(52-T) Utica, N.Y., Munson-Williams-Proctor Institute, Thirty-five Non-Objective Paintings
from the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation, April 7-28 (no catalogue or checklist).

(53-T) Pittsburgh, Pa., Department of Fine Arts, Carnegie Institute, Memorial Exhibition of
Paintings by Wassily Kandinsky (1866-1944), April 11-May 12 (catalogue).

(54) New York, N.Y., Museum of Non-Objective Painting, Loan Exhibition, June 5-
October 14 (checklist).

(55) New York, N.Y., Museum of Non-Objective Painting, Loan Exhibition, October 15,
1946-February 10, 1947 (checklist).

1947 (56) New York, N.Y., Museum of Non-Objective Painting, Loan Exhibition, February 12-
closing date unknown (checklist).

(57) New York, N.Y., Museum of Non-Objective Painting, In Memoriam Laszlo Moholy-
Nagy, May 15-July 10 (catalogue).

(58) New York, N.Y., Museum of Non-Objective Painting, Loan Exhibition, July 15-
closing date unknown (checklist).

(59) New York, N.Y., Museum of Non-Objective Painting, Loan Exhibition, October 15-
closing date unknown (checklist).
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(60-T) Kunsthau Zürich, Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation: Zeitgenössische Kunst und Kunstpflege in U.S.A. (selections shown previously at the Deuxième Salon des Réalités Nouvelles, Palais des Beaux Arts, Paris, July 18-August 17), October 15-December 15 (catalogue); traveled to Karlsruhe, Kunsthalle, as Gegenstandlose Malerei in Amerika, March 18-April 18, 1948 (no catalogue or checklist); Munich, Kunstrunde, May-June 1948 (no catalogue or checklist); Städtische Kunsthalle Mannheim, July 1948 (catalogue); Frankfurt am Main, Kunstkabinett, August-September 1948 (henceforth no catalogue or checklist); Kassel, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, October 1948; Braunschweig, Galerie Otto Ralfs, November 1948; Hamburg, Kunstrunde, December 1948; Hanover, Landesmuseum, January 1949; Dusseldorf, Kunsthalle, 1949 (specific dates unknown); Essen, 1949 (institution and specific dates unknown); Karlsruhe, Kunsthalle, July 1949; Bremerhaven, Firma Nordkunst, November 1948-December 25, 1949; Munich, Amerika-Haus, 1950 (specific dates unknown); Bremerhaven, Amerika-Haus, June-August 1950; Hamburg, Amerika-Haus, September 1950; Bremen, Amerika-Haus, October 1950; Hamburg, Amerika-Haus, November 1950; Braunschweig, Amerika-Haus, December 1950.


1949 (64) New York, N.Y., Museum of Non-Objective Painting, Tenth Anniversary Exhibition, May 31-October 10 (no catalogue or checklist).


(67) New York, N.Y., Museum of Non-Objective Painting, Loan Exhibition, June 20-October 9 (checklist).


1951 (70) New York, N.Y., Museum of Non-Objective Painting, Loan Exhibition, April 3-June 17 (checklist).


(72-T) Cazenovia, N.Y., Cazenovia Junior College, Selections from the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation, October 1-14; traveled to Ithaca, N.Y., New York State College of Home Economics, Cornell University, October 22-November 9; Delaware, Ohio, Lyon Art Hall, Ohio Wesleyan University, November 15-December 9; Columbia,
Mo., University of Missouri, December 13, 1951-January 21, 1952; Tallahassee, Fla.,
The University Museum and Art Gallery, Florida State University, January 31-
February 22, 1952; Jacksonville, Ala., State Teachers College, March 4-26, 1952;
Troy, N.Y., Faculty Club, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, April 22-May 15, 1952
(selections shown also at the Emma Willard School and the Troy Public Library);
New Paltz, N.Y., State Teachers College, State University of New York, May 22-
June 22, 1952 (no catalogue or checklist).

(73)  New York, N.Y., Museum of Non-Objective Painting, Loan Exhibition, November
27, 1951-closing date unknown (checklist).

1952 (74)  New York, N.Y., Museum of Non-Objective Painting, Evolution to Non-Objectivity,
April 29-closing date unknown (checklist).

(75)  New York, N.Y., Museum of Non-Objective Painting, Group Exhibition: Gianni
Dova, Elinor Evans, Ben Joppolo, Alberto Martini, Dale McKinney, J. Jay McVicker,
Samuel Olkinetzky, Cesare Peverelli, Mauro Reggiani, Fall (no catalogue or checklist).

(76-T)  New Paltz, N.Y., State Teachers College, State University of New York, Eighteen
Non-Objective Paintings from the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation, October 10-
November 3; traveled to Garden City, N.Y., Adelphi College, November 7-December
1; Endicott, N.Y., Harpur College, December 5-23; Summit, N.J., January 16-
February 2, 1953 (no catalogue or checklist).

1953 (77-T)  Rome, Galleria Origine, mostra fondazione r. solomon guggenheim [sic] (selections
shown previously Paris, Palais des Beaux Arts de la Ville de Paris, Septième Salon des

(78)  New York, N.Y., The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, A Selection, February 4-
May 3 (checklist).

November 22 (checklist).

(80)  New York, N.Y., The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, Sixty Years of Living
Architecture: The Work of Frank Lloyd Wright, October 22-December 13 (catalogue).

(81)  New York, N.Y., The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, Interim Exhibition of
Museum Collection, December 2-13 (no catalogue or checklist).

(82)  New York, N.Y., The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, Younger European Paint-
ers: A Selection, December 3, 1953-May 2, 1954; traveled to Minneapolis, Minn.,
Walker Art Center, August 8-September 24, 1954; Portland, Ore., Portland Art Mu-
seum, October 8-November 14, 1954; San Francisco, Cal., San Francisco Museum of
Art, November 26, 1954-January 23, 1955; Dallas, Tex., Dallas Museum of Fine Arts,
February 1-27, 1955; Fayetteville, Ark., University of Arkansas, March 7-April
9, 1955; Dayton, Ohio, The Dayton Art Institute, April 15-May 13, 1955; Andover,
Hanover, N.H., Carpenter Art Galleries, Dartmouth College, November 5-December
18, 1955; South Hadley, Mass., Dwight Art Memorial, Mount Holyoke College,
January 3-31, 1956; Middletown, Conn., Davison Art Center, Wesleyan University,
February 7-March 31, 1956 (catalogue).

Museum Collection, January 5-March 21 (no catalogue or checklist).

(84)  New York, N.Y., The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, Selection III, March 31-
May 5 (checklist).


Boston, Mass., Institute of Contemporary Art, *Selected Paintings from the Guggenheim Museum*, March 9-April 17 (no catalogue or checklist).


Greensboro, N.C., Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, *Supplementary Exhibition of Drawings*, organized by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, April 1-15; traveled to Atlanta, Ga., Georgia Institute of Technology, April 21-May 5; University, Ala., University of Alabama, May 11-25; Dallas, Tex., The Dallas Museum of Fine Arts, June 1-30; Tulsa, Okla., Philbrook Art Center, July 8-August 5; Long Beach, Cal., Municipal Art Center, August 15-September 15; Reno, Nev., University of Nevada, September 23-October 7; Eugene, Ore., University of Oregon, October 18-November 1; Seattle, Wash., Henry Gallery, University of Washington, November 11-December 30; Missoula, Mont., Montana State University, January 9-21, 1956; remainder of tour cancelled (no catalogue or checklist).


Oberlin, Ohio, Allen Memorial Art Museum, *Supplementary Exhibition of Watercolors*, organized by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, March 1-21; traveled to Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Coe College, March 28-April 19; Albion, Mich., Albion College, April 28-May 12; Hanover, N.H., Carpenter Art Galleries, Dartmouth College, May 21-June 15; Brunswick, Me., Bowdoin College Museum of Fine Arts, June 24-July 22;
University Park, Pa., The Pennsylvania State University, November 1-21; Washington, D.C., Howard University, November 30-December 21; Savannah, Ga., Telfair Academy of Arts and Sciences, January 3-24, 1957; New Orleans, La., Newcomb College, Tulane University, February 2-23, 1957; University, Miss., Fine Arts Center, University of Mississippi, March 3-24, 1957; Lexington, Ky., University of Kentucky, April 2-23, 1957; Collegeville, Minn., St. John's University, May 3-24, 1957; Grand Rapids, Mich., Grand Rapids Art Gallery, June 1-23, 1957 (no catalogue or checklist).

1957 (100-T) Kalamazoo, Mich., Kalamazoo Institute of Arts, Supplementary Exhibition of Drawings, organized by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, February 3-24; traveled to Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Coe College, March 1-31; Beloit, Wisc., Beloit College, April 5-28; Duluth, Minn., College of St. Scholastica, May 5-31; Laramie, Wyo., The University of Wyoming, June 10-August 16; Bozeman, Mont., Montana State College, September 22-October 13; Caldwell, Idaho, The College of Idaho, October 20-November 10; Davis, Cal., University of California, November 17-December 15; Fayetteville, Ark., Arts Center Gallery, University of Arkansas, January 5-26, 1958; Notre Dame, Ind., Art Gallery, University of Notre Dame, February 2-23, 1958; South Hadley, Mass., Dwight Art Memorial, Mount Holyoke College, March 2-23, 1958 (no catalogue or checklist).


(110-T) Portland, Me., The Portland Museum of Art, *Supplementary Exhibition of Prints, 1958-1959*, organized by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum; traveled to Hamilton, N.Y., Colgate University; Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Coe College; Superior, Wisc., State Teachers College; University Park, Pa., The Pennsylvania State University; Scranton, Pa., Marywood College; Charlotte, N.C., Mint Museum of Art; Athens, Ga., The University of Georgia; Talladega, Ala., Talladega College; Ypsilanti, Mich., Eastern Michigan College; Saratoga Springs, N.Y., Skidmore College (no catalogue or checklist).


New York, N.Y., The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, *Six Painters and the Object*, March 14-June 2; traveled to Los Angeles, Cal., Los Angeles County Museum of Art,
July 24-August 20; Minneapolis, Minn., Minneapolis Institute of Art, September 3-29; Ann Arbor, Mich., University of Michigan Museum of Art, October 9-November 3; Waltham, Mass., Rose Art Museum, Brandeis University, November 18-December 29; Pittsburgh, Pa., January 17-February 23, 1964; Columbus, Ohio, The Columbus Gallery of Fine Arts, March 8-April 5, 1964; La Jolla, Cal., Art Center in La Jolla, April 20-May 17, 1964 (catalogue).
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(263-T) Rochester, N.Y., Memorial Art Gallery of the University of Rochester, Works from The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum Collection, January 19-July 30 (no catalogue or checklist).


(266) New York, N.Y., The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum (Selections from the Guggenheim Museum Collection) Recent Acquisitions 1972-73, August 9-September 3 (no catalogue or checklist).

(267-T) Danville, Ky., Centre College of Kentucky, Postwar Painting from The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, September 5-June 2 (no catalogue or checklist).


Chronological List of Exhibitions


1975 (275) New York, N.Y., The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, *Alberto Giacometti: A Retrospective Exhibition*, April 5-June 23 (catalogue); traveled in part to Minneapolis Minn., Walker Art Center, July 13-September 1; Cleveland, Ohio, Cleveland Museum of Art, September 24-October 28; Ottawa, National Gallery of Art, November 15, 1974-January 5, 1975; Des Moines, Iowa, Des Moines Art Center, January 27-March 2, 1975 (catalogue); Montreal, Musée d’Art Contemporain, March 27-May 4, 1975 (catalogue).


APPENDIX

PAINTINGS 1880-1945: WORKS ACQUIRED SINCE 1970*

MAX BECKMANN.

Oil on canvas, 43 x 69 (109.2 x 175.2).
Purchased from Catherine Viviano Gallery, New York, 1970. 70.1927.

MARCEL DUCHAMP.

Apropos of Little Sister
(A Propos de jeune soeur). 1911.
Oil on canvas, 28¼ x 23½ (73 x 60).
Purchased from Mary Sisler, New York, 1971. 71.1944.

*These works were acquired when research on the present volumes was too far advanced to allow for their inclusion. They will be incorporated in subsequent editions of the catalogue.
PAUL KLEE.

Night Feast, No. 176 (Nachtliches Fest, No. 176). 1921.
Oil on board, 19¾ x 23⅞ (48.9 x 60.3).
Purchased from Galerie Beyeler, Basel, 1973. 73.2054.

PAUL KLEE.

Oil on canvas, 37 x 26 (94 x 66).

Matta (Robert Matta Echaurren).

Years of Fear. 1942.
Oil on canvas, 44 x 56 (111.8 x 142.2).
JOAN MIRÓ.

*The Tilled Field (La Terre labourée).* 1923-1924.
Oil on canvas, 26 x 36½ (66 x 92.7).

PABLO PICASSO.

*The Fourteenth of July (Le Quatorze juillet).* Montmartre, 1901.
Oil on board mounted on canvas, 19 x 24 ¾ (48.3 x 63.2).
Gift of Justin K. Thannhauser, 1964. 64.1707.
Detailed information about this painting will be included in the forthcoming catalogue of the Thannhauser Foundation collection.
PHOTOGRAPHIC CREDITS

The photographs of SRGM collection works were made over a period of years by the following:


Works for which no photographers are listed are reproduced by courtesy of their owners.

Courtesy H. Berggruen, Paris: p. 308, fig. a

Courtesy Ida Chagall, Paris: p. 56, fig. a; p. 77, fig. d

Marcel Coen, Marseille: p. 162, figs. a, b; p. 163, fig. e

Robert David: p. 116, figs. a, b

Soňa Divišova, Prague: p. 437, fig. j; p. 439, fig. n

Walter Dreyer, Zurich: pp. 665-666, figs. a-e; p. 668, figs. b-d

Jean Dubout, Paris: p. 235, fig. f; p. 306, fig. a; p. 364, fig. a; p. 438, fig. k; p. 440, fig. r

Tor Eigeland: p. 516, fig. a

Etienne Hubert, Paris: pp. 81-82, figs. a-d

Jacqueline Hyde, Paris: p. 197, fig. a

Courtesy Paul Klee Stiftung, Kunstmuseum Bern, © 1975, Copyright by Cosmopress, Geneva: p. 410, fig. c

Courtesy M. Knoedler & Co., Inc., New York: p. 253, fig. c


Ems Magnus: p. 208, fig. a

Courtesy Marlborough Fine Art Ltd., London: p. 395, fig. a; p. 626, fig. a

Robert E. Mates and Mary Donlon, New York, from:

Verzameling Ella Winter, Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam, Dec. 22, 1961-Jan. 29, 1962, pl. 5: p. 58, fig. a


G. Schmidt, Chagall, Paris, 1952, pl. 4: p. 77, fig. c

Der Sturm, Berlin, Jahrgang IV, Aug. 1913, p. 81: p. 107, fig. i

Ozenfant and Jeanneret, La Peinture moderne, Paris, 1924, n.p.: p. 163, fig. g

Grohmann, 1933, pl. 33: p. 233, fig. b

Maîtres français, XIXe et XXe siècles, E. van Wisselingh and Co., Amsterdam, June-Aug. 1958, pl. 25: p. 258, fig. c

Grohmann, New York, 1958, no. 92, p. 265: p. 234, fig. e; no. 82, p. 356: p. 260, fig. h; no. 23, p. 95: p. 267, fig. c; no. 22, p. 94: p. 267, fig. f; p. 130: p. 270, fig. g; p. 176: p. 322, fig. a

XXe Siècle, vol. xxvii, Dec. 1966, p. 121: p. 376, fig. a
Paul Klee: A Retrospective Exhibition, Saidenberg Gallery, New York, Oct. 14-Nov. 29, 1969, pl. 20: p. 410, fig. a


Montjoie!, Paris, Mar. 18, 1913, p. 3: p. 418, fig. b

D. Cooper, Fernand Léger: dessins de guerre, 1915-16, Paris, 1956, pl. 31: p. 468, fig. a

H. Bünemann, Zeichnungen und Aquarellen von Franz Marc, Munich, 1948, pl. 26: p. 492, fig. a

S. Moholy-Nagy, Moholy-Nagy: Experiment in Totality, New York, 1950 and 1968, fig. 68: p. 563, fig. b

Robert E. Mates and Mary Donlon, New York: p. 629, fig. c; p. 683, fig. b

R. Nohr, Munich: p. 489, fig. a; p. 492, fig. b; p. 501, figs. a, b; p. 504, figs. a, b

John G. O’Connor, Shelton, Conn.: p. 248, fig. a

Eric Pollitzer, New York: p. 423, fig. a; p. 424, fig. a

Joseph Poser, New York: p. 61, fig. a

Rogi-André, Paris: p. 676, fig. a

Robert L. Scott, Boston: p. 84, fig. g

Courtesy Sotheby and Co., London: p. 629, fig. g

Courtesy The Kelly Springfield Tire Company, Cumberland, Maryland: p. 135, fig. a

Courtesy Museo Civico, Turin, Archivo Fotografico: p. 76, fig. b

Marc Vaux, Paris: p. 117, fig. c

Hans Wagner, Hanover: p. 459, fig. c

Courtesy Yale University Art Library, New Haven; from K. Dreier, Modern Art, New York, 1926, p. 17: p. 684, fig. c
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Abbaye de Créteil, 141
Aberbach, Joachim J., Collection, 618
Aberconway, Christabel Lady, 8
Adler, Mr. and Mrs. T. C, Collection, 26
Agee, W. C, 682, 684
Aksakov, A., 252
Albers, Josef (1-5), 16-26
b and p (1), 17-18
Bent Black (Hirshhorn), 24, 26
Bent Black A (Andover), 24, 26
Bent Dark Gray (5), 24-26
Biconjugates, 23, 26
BPOE, woodcut for 1934 poster, 17
Composure (Adler Collection), 26
Equal and Unequal, 22, 23
Formulation: articulation
II: 10, 23
II: 25, 26, 23
Commentary, I: 25, 26
Interaction of Color, 22, 26
Kombinationsschrift, 17
Memento (3), 21-22
Open (Hollins College), 19, 20
Open (A), 19
Open (B) (2), 19-20
Penetrating series, 23
Penetrating (B) (4), 22-24
Penetrating Gray, 22
Untitled, 22

Albert-Birot, Pierre, 654
Alexandre, P., 530
Allard, R., 92n, 93n, 443n
Alley, R., 8
Alloway, L., 182, 183
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Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum
Hollandsche Kunstenaaarskring (1916), 576, 579n
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Anders, Lillian Lonngren, 433
Andersen, T., 8, 481n, 482, 483n
Andersen, W., 52, 53
Apollinaire, Guillaume, 55n, 96, 99, 103, 110, 112, 452, 453, 459, 460n, 696
“Les Fenêtres,” 11, 81, 90, 98, 105, 112
Archipenko, Alexander, 2
Arensberg, Louise and Walter, Collection, 197
Arnason, H. Harvard, 3
Aronson, B., 76
Arp-Hagenbach, Marguerite, Collection, 121, 673
van Assendelft, Rev. Hendricus, 568, 568n, 571n, 575, 575n, 650
van Assendelft-Hoos, Mrs. Jacoba, 568, 568n, 575
Aubert, J., 476, 683, 684
Audou (architect, Paris, Palais de l’Air, 1937), 117
Aust, G., 597
Avnet, Joan and Lester, Collection, 187
“Axel, M.,” 589
Ažbè, Anton, 396

Bachrach, Mrs. Hilda, 208
Baekeland, L. H., 544
Baier, Dr. Otto, 338, 338n
Bakst, Léon Nikolaevich, 226
Bakwin, Harry, 8
Baláš, Roland, 617
Baljeu, J., 569
Barcelona, Galeries Dalmau, 516
Barmen, Kunstverein, 502n
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Caffin, C. H., 654, 657
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Calas, N., 587
Calder, Alexander, 2
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Museum, 131, 132
Feininger Archives, 135n
,—, Harvard University, Houghton Library,
Feininger Archives, 130
Camfield, W. A., 8, 589, 591, 592, 594, 595n, 684
Campbell, Edwin R., 281, 283, 284, 287, 289
Campion, Heinrich (23), 48-49, 49n, 126
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The Lovers, 49n
Russian Fairy Tale, 49n
Campankon, Herbert, 49n
Cantor, Joseph, 196
Carco, F., 530, 532n
Carpeaux, J. B., Three Graces, 120
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Certigny, H., 8, 617n, 618
Cézanne, Paul (24), 50-53, 81, 607n
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ink drawing after, 72, 73
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Music, 74, 76
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Ma Vie, 61, 74
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other versions related to, 63
Peasant Life (29), 68-69
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,—, Collection, 76
Chamla, M., 618, 619
Chamot, M., 8, 175, 176, 448
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Chevalier, J.-Cl., 452, 453
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