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ABSTRACT OF THESIS

The beginnings of Abstraction in the United States were concentrated from 1908 to 1917 among the artists and critics who gathered at Alfred Stieglitz's small New York gallery, The Little Galleries of the Photo-Secession, known as "291". In studying the art and theoretical developments in the circle, it has been my intention to show that a number of American artists developed a definite art form and a supporting aesthetic.

Between 1911 and 1915, the art evolving within the group was the result of an aesthetic formed mainly by the critics Charles Caffin and Marius de Zayas. Caffin, as early as 1906, believed that modern artists had in common with Eastern artists the basic aim of recording their ideas and sensations in the face of visible nature; a procedure he termed "abstract expression." Fragments of philosophical doctrines, particularly Bergson's ideas about the value of intuition and empathy, apparently strengthened Caffin's aesthetic, and it was concluded that the modern artist aspired to achieve abstract expression; a conclusion that in time the Stieglitz group took for granted. Those of the circle who selected European art for exhibition at "291" particularly favoured the work of Cézanne, Matisse and Picasso, and it was interpreted in accordance with the concept of "abstract expression." Picasso's first essentially abstract works, in which linear networks are dominant, were first shown in New York in 1911; they were explained in terms of this concept as being expressionist and symbolic. Between 1911 and 1913,
Marius de Zayas kept to and yet somewhat refined the group's aesthetic by stressing in particular the importance of analytic thought in making instinctive knowledge communicable, and in time, from about 1913 on, there arose among members of the group a new consciousness of more conceptual art forms, and the character of new art evolving in the circle changed to some extent.

Each of Stieglitz's artists painted in accordance with the group's basic aesthetic: Arthur Dove, John Marin and Marsden Hartley, in particular, early developed expressionist and symbolist art forms; somewhat later, others of the group—Georgia O'Keeffe, Oscar Bluemner and Abraham Walkowitz—also evolved personal art forms in keeping with the group's ideas. All Stieglitz's artists believed in an empathic identification with their subject matter; a position which prevented the development of non-objective abstraction. Indeed, members of the group believed non-objective abstraction was unacceptable as true art because it was the result of intellectual processes.

Stieglitz's artists moved through two distinct periods in the evolution of their art: an international phase during which by an eclectic process each sought to create an individual style guided by the group's aesthetic, and then a more nationally conscious phase in which much that had been achieved earlier was reaffirmed and developed after the First World War. Throughout, by placing reason second to intuition, the critics opened the way to new art forms in which logic is employed differently than it is in everyday life. In 1915, proto-Dada art originated in
Stieglitz's group, and after the war, Georgia O'Keeffe, Oscar Bluemner and Arthur Dove developed almost surrealistic, dream-like interpretations of the world.
INTRODUCTION

There were a number of painters working in the United States in the second decade of the twentieth century who produced abstract work of significance. Marsden Hartley, Max Weber, Arthur Dove and John Marin have generally been acknowledged as being among the most prominent. They belong to what J.I.H. Baur has termed the first phase of abstract art in the United States, which lasted from about 1911 to just after the First World War. Invariably, however, their work has been somewhat unfavourably compared to that of their European counterparts, and it has been concluded that first and foremost American forms of abstraction are offshoots of European developments. As H. Geldzahler has written: "Dove, Hartley and Marin . . . culled eclectically from European painting."^2

Without denying the dependence American artists felt in relation to European innovation, it is apparent that a lack of detailed studies of the period has meant that much of the soul-searching American artists went through together in an effort to develop an art and aesthetic felt to be their own has been neglected. In addition, although a number of valuable monographs have been published as well as more general texts, yet heretofore, very little has been done to place the artists in relation to each other; a situation which is puzzling in view
of the fact that in the second decade of the century there was only one centre where the avant-garde could meet and exhibit in New York; Alfred Stieglitz's small gallery at 291, Fifth Avenue, which became known familiarly as "291".

Stieglitz himself was an extremely influential figure who appears to have viewed his enterprises much in the same light as Walt Whitman had viewed his poetry. In the same way that "Leaves of Grass", originally a slim volume of twelve poems, grew through several editions so that in the seventh edition of 1881 Whitman incorporated all his life's work arranged to form an organic whole, Stieglitz similarly had the capacity to mould the disparate traits of the artists he sponsored and the writers attracted to the circle into a cohesive whole, preserving the products of their creativity—their art and their writings—in order to present a composite picture of their achievements. As early as 1909 he recognized this capacity in himself. He wrote to his friend Edward Steichen that most people "can impossibly see the whole until it is finished. But I do and can see it—that is my advantage."

Those artists who remained with Stieglitz after the small gallery closed in 1917, and whose work he subsequently exhibited at his successive galleries—The Intimate Gallery (1925 to 1929), and An American Place (1929 to 1946)—most probably kept to his circle because they found themselves in sympathy with Stieglitz's particular beliefs and ideology. A similar sympathy must have attracted a number of writers—Waldo Frank, Paul Rosenfeld, Lewis Mumford, Herbert Seligmann
and Sherwood Anderson—who during the twenties formed close friendships with Stieglitz and his artists. Through their several interpretations of the work of the Stieglitz group they tended to reinforce the direction in which the artists in the "291" years had been moving.

My aim, therefore, has not been to examine in detail the various forms of abstraction which appeared in America during the period 1911 to 1917, since I believe the varied nature of the different styles has been overly stressed. Rather I have attempted to point out features of the writing and painting of this period in order to argue that the group who gathered round Stieglitz had much in common, and gradually fashioned an art and aesthetic of their own. They synthetized certain aspects of European art with a distinctly fresh appreciation of specific features, and they looked also to Eastern art theory and practice. As a result, they developed a theory of Expressionism in which art was thought to be the result of a subjective response to one's surroundings, whether urban or rural. And the outcome of their aesthetic is a semi-abstract kind of art, which developed during the twenties into a distinctive style shared by Arthur Dove, Georgia O'Keeffe and Oscar Bluemner in particular. A number of their later paintings are empathic interpretations of nature or man-made objects; works which are almost Surrealist in appearance. Another outcome of the group's aesthetic was that non-objective art was dismissed as being lifeless because it was thought to be the result of intellectual processes.
The group did not believe in art manifestos, or indeed in codifying their views at all. They were wary of systems of any kind, believing that an artist's conformity with the results of intellectual analysis stifles innovation and quickly becomes a form of academicism. Further they were opposed to intellectual analysis per se, because deliberate thought seemed diametrically opposed to the creative instinct which depended on intuition. True knowledge, it was believed, depended on intuition. Nevertheless, in spite of this stated position, members of the group set down their credos most positively. One is able to construct their aesthetic from the numerous records that Stieglitz amassed: gallery publications and a voluminous correspondence with the artists and writers with whom he felt himself to be most in sympathy; there is also his large art collection which illustrates the evolution of the most prolific of his artists--Georgia O'Keeffe, John Marin, Arthur Dove and Marsden Hartley.

Since what one might call the group characteristics of Stieglitz's artists have not been examined, the fact that a definite art form apparently resulted from the group aesthetic has not to my knowledge been shown heretofore; possibly for the reason that the most comprehensive early accounts and interpretations we have of Stieglitz's career as an influential figure and of the art his painters produced come from the writers who joined the group in the twenties. Such interpretations in turn have influenced later accounts. The writers sympathetic to the group in the twenties tended to interpret
the pictures in terms of an indigenous culture which, in fact, they themselves were in the process of discovering. As a result, much has been obscured from the twenties onwards because of the idealized cast of their critical writings. There has, for example, been a good deal of stress on the isolated state of the American artist, who unlike his European counterpart lacked a definite art centre and was not appreciated by his fellow countrymen. It was the artist's task, they thought, to resign himself to a lonely existence in his own country. Subsequently, the romantic image of the lone creator who follows Thoreau's example by welcoming isolation was perhaps too glibly applied to Stieglitz's artists.

Biographies of O'Keeffe, Dove, Hartley and Marin show that indeed these artists were geographically isolated much of the time. Dove often lived in somewhat inaccessible places—a boat, a yacht club, and an abandoned post office; Marin each summer lived in the country, usually on the coast of Maine; O'Keeffe found inspiration in the vast deserts of New Mexico; and Hartley spent almost a lifetime wandering in Europe and the United States before he became reconciled to his native Maine. These facts, however, seem to have been overemphasized. Indeed, Stieglitz's artists were all nature painters during most of their careers and they all felt the need to be in contact with nature. Yet all of them felt too that they were members of a community of artists. They were aware of each other's daily lives and work; if not as a result of direct contact, then through Stieglitz's news-filled letters. And all of them
remained members of the group for the reason that they shared the same beliefs. Thus in effect, they could not have failed to be touched by each other's development.

There was another consequence of the group's preoccupation with establishing an American culture; not only did its proponents adhere to the view that each artist functioned in virtual isolation, independently of his fellows, but also in the twenties it led to a conscious exclusion of foreign influences. Perhaps it is some measure of the success they had in focusing on their Americanness that the later work of members of the group has not been much studied in relation to foreign influences, even though European influences continued to be felt in the United States after the First World War. In fact, paradoxically, the group's determined effort to be independent of Europe often presupposed a knowledge of developments in European art, and a selection of that which was to be ignored. Therefore, in spite of their emphasis of Americanness, members of the circle were open to influences from Europe. We find that throughout their careers Stieglitz's artists continued to weigh European styles against considerations which they felt were pertinent to their own culture.

But possibly yet another reason for the neglect of the Stieglitz group as a group is that in general each artist fashioned his own personal style. It was a cohesiveness of artistic aims which kept the Stieglitz group together rather than obvious correspondences in style. Thus a study of the work of members of Stieglitz's circle ultimately is a study of the work of a
number of individuals whose common interests made stylistic correspondences possible only at times. Indeed it is inappropriate to speak of the artists as members of a school because such a classification would conflict with one of the group's basic suppositions: it was believed that an artist must fashion an art which would be personal to him alone, and which no one else had a right to adopt. Thus there arose a criterion for "earning" an exhibition at "291": an artist's work must be new, and it must be the product of unflinching integrity. Roland Rood, writing in 1905 for Stieglitz's publication, Camera Work, early set the pattern of such beliefs when he said that in art there are general truths which are the property of all, but that an individual's personal vision and methods were his own.

One other point which should be mentioned in considering the reasons for the neglect of the group, is that Stieglitz as a promoter of abstract art and as an aesthatician became a somewhat less fashionable figure in the art world after the First World War. Many other small art galleries were opened, and in addition there was an influx of immigrant European artists, a number of whom formed their own circle under the patronage of the art collector Walter Arensberg, and of the painter and art collector Katherine Dreier whose Société Anonyme, founded in 1920, became the new centre of avant-garde currents. Subsequently, too, a widespread sense of nationalism, which in part resulted from America's turning in on herself during the war years, brought a general movement towards a socially conscious art which was figurative and regional. Thus all in all, attention was deflected from the Stieglitz group, and the work its members were doing was eclipsed.
In considering afresh the history of the group, therefore, it has been necessary to keep in mind some of the exaggerations that have been perpetuated: on the one hand, later accounts by members of the circle tend to underestimate the essentially international outlook of the "291" phase of the group's evolution by overly stressing Americanism; recent writers, on the other hand, have emphasized the pioneering abstractionists' dependence on European innovation while at the same time stressing each artist's isolation from his colleagues in America. Both points of view ignore the initially collective nature of the group's efforts and thus ignore the existence of the Stieglitz group as a group.

As a way of reconstructing the history of the group and in order to reinterpret it, I have mainly looked to Stieglitz's large correspondence for specific information. But since I have seen only a part of the correspondence my account, in chapters one, four and five, is by no means complete. Perhaps as a result I may have too much stressed the importance of those figures who appear to have been influential in guiding policies at the gallery at the expense of other significant contributors. Much of the second and third chapters consists of a discussion of the evolution of the group's aesthetic, and there is a concentrated study of aspects of the work of Blumner, Dove, Marin, and Hartley, in order to illustrate how theories developed at "291" became significant in practice. In the final chapter, I have examined the post-war work of O'Keaffe, Blumner and Dove.
Although brief accounts of the stylistic developments of most of Stieglitz's artists have been included, more detailed analysis has been accorded the work of some, depending on the amount of published material available, and so the comparative amounts of space given to tracing individual styles and histories should not be regarded as the results of critical judgements about the quality of an artist's work. Of all Stieglitz's artists, John Marin has received the most attention in the past, and so his stylistic evolution is little discussed in the following account. Oscar Bluemner, on the other hand, has suffered neglect, and therefore I have examined most of his development. The period Marsden Hartley spent in Europe up to 1915 has also been examined in some detail.
CHAPTER I

THE HISTORY OF THE PHOTO-SECESSION:

1905-1913

Alfred Stieglitz and Edward Steichen

When Edward Steichen was vacating his studio, a room in the attic of a brownstone office building at 291 Fifth Avenue, between Thirtieth and Thirty-first Streets, New York, he suggested to the photographer Alfred Stieglitz that it, together with another small room next to it, might make a suitable small gallery for showing the work of the members of the Photo-Secession. Stieglitz agreed, and The Little Galleries of the Photo-Secession were opened on November 24, 1905; a sequence of events had been set in motion which were to result in the gradual establishment of a new American art.

At first, Stieglitz did not think that there was enough photography to justify opening a gallery. But Steichen argued that photography could be supplemented from time to time with art exhibitions. He thought that Rodin, whom he had photographed during the two years he had been in France—from 1900 to 1902—would be willing to lend some of his drawings. Other Europeans in all probability would like to exhibit in America. And thus there could be set up a kind of Salon de Refusés in
New York. Stieglitz who at that time knew little about contemporary art, his tastes having been formed in his student days in Munich, admired the work of the Secessionists such as that of Franz Stuck and Arnold Böcklin, and therefore initially he relied on Steichen's judgment in choosing art for exhibition.1 To a large extent Stieglitz's interest in showing new kinds of art was prompted by his wish to educate both himself and those of the public who found their way to the attic rooms. Similar aims had been behind his willingness to exhibit new kinds of photography and to bring into being the "Photo-Secession." Indeed, his restless curiosity aroused by any new form of expression, and possibly too a need for challenge through opposition, apparently dictated the course of his career.

Stieglitz had returned to New York in 1890 after having spent nine years in Munich.2 His father had moved his family abroad temporarily so that his children might receive a German education. It was intended that Stieglitz be trained as an engineer. However he developed an interest in photography, finding challenging the fact that many technical innovations still had to be made and that there was much to be done in adapting the mechanical processes of the medium to personal ends. When he returned to America he gained a reputation as an avant-garde photographer, counting among his early experiments a number of pictures of New York City, photographed with a hand-held camera under difficult climatic conditions. But apart from his pioneering work as a photographer, he soon proved himself a capable leader in resuscitating the New York Society of Amateur
Photographers which was receiving little support because of a general lack of interest in photography. Stieglitz offered to help to rebuild the club; he organized many of its exhibitions both at home and abroad, and he edited the magazine Camera Notes for seven years until disagreements over some of his policies decided him to resign.

In the meantime it had been felt by a number of photographers that it would be of value to form a new organization. Stieglitz, in speaking of some of the most advanced trends in photography on exhibition at the National Arts Club of New York had, according to an account by Steichen, first used the term "Photo-Secession"; a term originally suggested by the name of the modern art movement in Munich, and which became the accepted name of the new organization to be composed of the more forward-looking photographers. Several informal meetings were held during which it was decided to have an association made up of associate fellows elected because of their interest in photography, and fellows who were elected on the merits of their work. A governing body was selected from among the fellows and Stieglitz was nominated the director. The organization of the Photo-Secession was officially founded on February 17, 1902. The term "Photo-Secession" was later defined as "seceding from the accepted idea of what constitutes a photograph." A new magazine, Camera Work, was published and edited quarterly by Stieglitz, as a way of setting out the aims and interests of the organization. Prominent photographers, Joseph T. Keiley, Dallatt Fuguet and John Francis Strauss, were associate editors, and Edward Steichen
designed the cover. Attention to layout, the type of paper used, and the excellence of the photographic prints which were made directly from the photogravure plates, made the magazine a first-class publication, and it is now a unique collectors' item.

In the editorial of the first issue, which appeared in January 1903, Stieglitz wrote that the magazine existed in order to further the Secessionists' aims of having their work accepted "as a medium of individual expression." More details were given in the third issue: the Photo-Secession aimed "to advance photography as applied to pictorial expression "and" to draw together those Americans practising or otherwise interested in the art." It was also stated that in order to be elected to fellowship in the organization "the photographic work of a possible candidate [for fellowship] must be individual and distinctive, and it goes without saying that the applicant must be in thorough sympathy with our aims and principles." These requirements were also to apply to the circle when art gradually ousted photography as the major concern of the group. On basic issues, it was to be expected that members of the group should be in agreement. In explaining the criteria for choosing art exhibitions for the Photo-Secession Gallery, it was stated in 1910 that the Photo-Secession supported "those artists who secede from the photographic attitude toward representation of form." Since it had been proven that "along certain lines, pre-eminently [sic] in portraiture, the camera had the advantage over the best trained eye and hand," it was therefore logical that "the other arts could only prove themselves superior to
photography by making their aim dependent on other qualities than accurate reproduction.⁶

Steichen was ideally situated to keep Stieglitz informed of developments in the Paris art world. He went with his family to live in France early in 1906, moving in July 1908 to Voulangis just outside of Paris. He found little difficulty in obtaining work for exhibitions in New York, since many painters wished to exhibit there. He also had the help of the Stein family; Mrs. Michael Stein who bought work by Matisse introduced Steichen to the artist, and Gertrude Stein was also to prove a helpful friend.⁷ When at times Steichen returned to spend some of the winters in New York he would take exhibitions with him; otherwise he shipped them. Indeed, although Stieglitz made a number of trips to Europe in the summers up to 1911, and thereby broadened his knowledge of contemporary art, Steichen was largely responsible for securing most of the exhibitions for "291".

The small size of the galleries restricted the size of the exhibits and thus during the first years of the art exhibitions, drawings, watercolours, lithographs and colour reproductions were most favoured. Later, even though contact had been established with Kandinsky and Marc, the two were never represented at the gallery. It was felt that their paintings were too large for the small rooms. Klee's art was considered, however, but war intervened before an exhibition could be arranged.⁸ An exception was allowed in the case of Picabia's work when in 1915 three large paintings each approximately 8' x 9' took up three of the gallery walls.⁹ But since the sketches which
formed the basis of Picabia's large paintings had originally been done in New York in 1913 at the time Picabia went there for the Armory Show, and they had been exhibited at "291", it is understandable that the members of the group would have been interested in seeing the results of the sketches.

As he had hoped, Steichen obtained an exhibition of Rodin's drawings which were shown in January 1908. This was followed in April by an exhibition of drawings, etchings, watercolours and oil paintings by Henri Matisse, which showed Matisse's evolution up to 1908. Stieglitz had not heard of Matisse before. To Steichen he was "the most modern of the moderns" whose work was "abstract to the limit." Second Rodin and Matisse exhibitions were to follow in April 1910 and March 1912, respectively.

Stieglitz was exhilarated by the reaction to the new art on the part of the public, and especially by the critical reaction of the official art world. Matisse rather than Rodin became the most prominent target for criticism. Although Rodin's drawings were regarded as unfit for exhibition since they were in the order of a sculptor's notes as it were, they were granted a grudging admiration. Matisse on the other hand was considered to be unforgivably offensive. As Stieglitz remarked: "The exhibition led to many heated controversies; it proved stimulating. The New York 'art world' was sorely in need of an irritant and Matisse proved a timely one." Stieglitz in 1905 had begun to include press comments in Camera Work so that other opinions about the quality of exhibitions of photography could be known in addition to his own judgements. He continued this practice up to 1917,
when publication of the magazine ceased, and thus he captured for posterity the general sense of bewilderment felt in the face of contemporary art. Most objections to work by Matisse were laid down on the grounds that the human figure had been distorted, and that forms and colours no longer conformed to natural appearances. Modern artists were propagating ugliness, it was concluded. J. E. Chamberlain, writing for the New York Evening Mail found a "few broadly simple sketches" to be "strangely beautiful, perhaps." But there were "some female figures that are of an ugliness that is most appalling and haunting." The writer for the Scrip thought that Matisse's figures were "loathsome and abnormal" and the fact that technically his work was excellent filled the reporter "with a distaste for art and life." Royal Cortissoz, the reviewer for the New York Tribune, and among the most conservative of the New York critics, later summed up the crux of the matter when he said: "I disbelieve in modernism because it seems to me to flout fundamental laws and to repudiate what I take to be the function of art, the creation of beauty." Many critics understandably were disturbed by an art which apparently was overturning all traditional criteria and they argued for the desirability of an art of moderation. In the wake of the Armory Show, Arthur J. Eddy, a Chicago lawyer and art collector, wistfully expressed the view that in America an art of moderation would emerge. He wrote one of the earliest histories of twentieth century art, Cubists and Post Impressionists, published in 1914. But while he was arguing for the
new art, he judged it to have "eccentricities," "exaggerations" and "morbid enthusiasms." He thought that Americans differed from Europeans in that they were "essentially sane and healthful—say quite practical." At times, however, the country might be given to a "youthful habit of exaggeration"; nevertheless it is not guilty of "eccentricities and morbidness." Americans would in time discover their own art forms, he forecast. And even though their art would have to grow out of European art, certain American qualities of character would enable them to sift the foreign styles: they "will absorb all that is good in the extreme modern movement and reject what is bad," he wrote. They will not become "Cubists, Orphists, or Futurists, but they will absorb all that is good in Cubism, Orphism, Futurism—and other 'isms'."15

Stieglitz, on the contrary, was by no means alarmed by the nature of the new European movements. His policy at "291" was one of open-minded inquiry and thus a diversity of art was shown up to the time the gallery was closed in 1917. Speaking in 1910 of his venture in showing new European art in America he wrote:

We are in somewhat the same condition as they were in the early days of the Renaissance... seeking for the unknown. I don't know when it will be reached, but I do see that these men are alive and vital, and my object is to show Americans who have not the opportunity of going abroad, what vitality in art exists there...16

On the other hand, in spite of avowed open-mindedness, Stieglitz and a number of the writers who contributed to Camera
Work tended to support expressionist trends in art above all else. Furthermore, they early showed a predilection for symbolist art: the first art exhibition put on at "291" was not the Rodin exhibition, as it so happened, but an exhibition in January 1907 of symbolist drawings by an unknown woman, Pamela Coleman Smith. She had taken a number of her drawings to the gallery and they had greatly appealed to Stieglitz; one especially, titled Death in the House, which he added to his art collection, reflected, he said, his "own state at the time."17

Other members of Stieglitz's circle endorsed Stieglitz's opinion of Pamela Coleman Smith's work. Benjamin de Casseres, who began to contribute critical essays to Camera Work in 1909, was influenced by Schopenhauer's dictum that: "The world is my idea." "My truth is the only truth. My world is the only world. That should be the great artist's creed." He judged Coleman Smith's work to be close to that of Beardsley and Blake and thought it of value because her drawings seemed "not merely art; they are poems, ideas, life-values as cosmic values..." Some of the drawings were "pictures that music gives her mind"; or, as the critic Paul Haviland explained in the same issue of the magazine, they were "visions evoked by music, sketched during the concert or opera." Casseres found that "into all her work has passed her soul, drunk with the wonder and the mystery of things."18

No doubt the drawings appealed to the critics of the group on two counts. They embodied ideas, as did the much emulated work of Beardsley and Blake; and further, Coleman Smith, having been inspired by music, was fulfilling one of the theoretical preoccupations of the day since the idea of correspon-
dences between the various art forms was of especial interest to writers at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries. Indeed, an essay on the subject by an anonymous author, most probably Stieglitz, was included in the January 1908 issue of Camera Work.19

At the end of the 1908 season, after the Matisse exhibition had closed, Stieglitz transferred the Little Galleries of the Photo-Secession to new premises across the hall from "291". The new address was 293 Fifth Avenue.20 But because the gallery had become well known as "291" it continued to be so named.

As the exhibitions at "291" began to get under way, two men in 1908 came to be closely associated with Stieglitz in arranging exhibitions; Paul Haviland, a wealthy young man interested in photography, and the Mexican born caricaturist, Marius de Zayas. Both became critics for Camera Work. Haviland wrote brief reviews of the shows up to about 1914, when he left to join the French army at the beginning of the war. De Zayas proved to have a powerfully analytic mind, and became a successful interpreter of Cubism. He became particularly influential at "291" from 1912 on; in 1915 he was instrumental in beginning the new proto-dadaist magazine 291. By October 1915, with the help and financial backing of others of the "291" helpers, including Mrs. Agnes Ernst Meyer and Paul Haviland, he had started a gallery of his own called The Modern Gallery. The intention was that the new gallery would be a business venture whereas "291" would continue to show experimental art.21
In spite of the fact that de Zayas had less to do with "291" after the gallery had been opened, he and Stieglitz remained on good terms until about 1917, when differences in ideology ended their friendship.

Stieglitz, who had a private income, insisted that "291" was not a business, and that he was not a dealer. Rather, the gallery was seen to "afford relief from the stiflingly laden commercial atmosphere of New York in general," in "days of business depression and gloom." It was reiterated time and again:

It is well to remember that the exhibitions held at "291" are looked upon by those who arrange them as nothing more than a series of mere demonstrations, each demonstration being of unusual value in itself, but of greater value in its relationship to the underlying idea which has brought forth "291".

The "underlying idea" of "291" was that the gallery should be a place where new art forms might be shown without any regard to their commercial value or popular success.

Contact with the art movements of Paris was imperative if Stieglitz and his group were to keep abreast of new developments. Stieglitz's own visits to Europe in the summers of 1909 and 1911 were particularly beneficial. He joined Steichen in Paris for some weeks in 1909 and Steichen introduced him to the Steins, and to the art dealers Vollard and Durand-Ruel. At the Bernheim Jeune Galeries they saw for the first time an exhibition of Cézanne's watercolours which they found strange and amusing, seeing little except blotches of colour on paper. Yet Steichen arranged for a number of the watercolours to be
shown in New York the following year, by which time both men had widened their experience of contemporary art. As Stieglitz later reported, on second acquaintance the watercolours seemed to be quite realistic.24

Steichen's critical judgements about French art must have been extremely influential in determining both the pattern of the "291" exhibitions, and also in moulding the taste of Stieglitz and of those who in time began to congregate at the small gallery. The same might be said of Marius de Zayas who from October 1910, spent a year in Europe. De Zayas' influence, though, did not become apparent until somewhat later, from about 1912, whereas Steichen collaborated with Stieglitz in arranging the exhibitions up to the end of the 1910 to 1911 season.25

De Zayas, however, was the first to tell Stieglitz about Picasso's work which he saw when he visited the Salon d'Automne soon after he arrived in Paris in 1910. Of Metzinger's work, he wrote that he "sees everything geometrically." But de Zayas was told: "the real article is a Spaniard, whose name I don't recall, but Haviland knows it, because he is a friend of his brother."26

De Zayas was referring to Paul Haviland's brother, Frank Haviland. Indeed, it was Frank Haviland who was able to persuade Picasso, who disliked exhibiting his work, that he should exhibit in America. The selection was made by Frank Haviland and de Zayas, in accordance with Steichen's advice that it would be valuable if the work they chose gave some idea of Picasso's
Stylistic evolution. The final choice, as Steichen reported to Stieglitz showed "his early work and his 'latest'—certainly 'abstract', nothing but angles and lines." The exhibition took place in April 1911, and according to the description Stieglitz submitted for inclusion in Eddy's book, it consisted of "drawings, lithographs, watercolours, etc. A series of eighty showing the complete evolution of Picasso. The first introduction of Picasso to America and the first exhibition anywhere of Picasso held in this sense." Stieglitz purchased for his collection the drawing which proved to be the most controversial: Nude, 1910, (Ill. 1), was the most advanced example of Cubism shown in the United States and it was said to have "created relatively the same sensation as did Marcel Duchamp's 'Nude Descending the Stairs' two years later at the Armory Show." Writing of Picasso's art, Hoeber of the New York Globe thought it extravagant and absurd. Tyrell of the New York Evening World appreciated the early work, but found incomprehensible the "childish wooden images, Alaskan totem-poles and gargoyles smeared with green paint, or weird geometrical jumbles ..." It would seem that such adverse reactions fed Stieglitz's enthusiasm and his resolution to continue exhibiting the new work. Indeed his interest in European art and the repercussions it was having in New York overwhelmed his desire to show the work of the Photo-Secessionists. Spokesmen for "291" were anxious to point out, though, that even if there had been a change of emphasis photography would continue to be championed both in the gallery and in Camera Work, but that it had its place as one art
form among many. It was argued:

If the position of photography among the arts is to be firmly and permanently established, this can be accomplished by proving it capable of standing the test of comparison with the best work in other media and not by isolating it.\(^{31}\)

With the Picasso exhibition, Stieglitz recognized that much had been accomplished in the three years of art exhibitions at "291." Through a number of especially significant exhibitions the work of Rodin, Cézanne, Matisse and Picasso had been introduced at the small gallery, and it was thought that in future it was improbable that "the Photo-Secession will ... exemplify any decided advance along the lines which had been followed for three years." And furthermore it was pointed out that the sequence of the series of exhibitions had been logical:

It must have been plain to anyone ... that their somewhat surprising sequence was not the result of chance, but that every move was made with some definite purpose in view; was indeed part of a logical development; and was made at the psychological moment.\(^{32}\)

Modern art to the Stieglitz group was seen to be part of an evolving process; theirs was an organic view of creativity that was to have repercussions for the Americans who developed in the orbit of "291."

**Alfred Maurer and John Marin**

Many of the American artists who were to join the circle were known to each other in Paris; they tended to stay together because of the difficulties most of them had in conversing in French for any length of time.\(^{33}\) Steichen was well acquainted with most of them. He and the painter Arthur Carles were to-
gather at the 1908 Salon d'Automne when Steichen first saw the
work of John Marin to which he was immediately attracted. Carles,
who had been a fellow student of Marin’s in Philadelphia, took
Steichen to meet the artist at his studio and the outcome of this
meeting was that Steichen decided to exhibit a number of Marin’s
watercolours in America. As he wrote to Stieglitz, it seemed to
him that they were “the real article” and were “about as good as
anything in that line that has been done.” Steichen later explained
that “the real Marin had not yet developed. His watercolours were
then more or less realistic and a little reminiscent of Whistler.
But I immediately booked Marin for an exhibition at 291.”

Steichen sent twenty-four of Marin’s watercolours, and
fifteen 8” x 10” oil sketches by Alfred Maurer to the United
States in the autumn of 1909. He believed that the work repre-
sented “the best American things” being done in Paris. Of Maurer’s
work, he wrote that everyone had been shocked by his new style;
but Maurer was “convinced he is on the right road and is going
after it hard.” Steichen believed that in the small paintings
he was sending “he has realized his aims more successfully than
in his more important work.” He added:

One might say there was something of Whistler
in Marin and Matisse in Maurer, but that is
really a superficial resemblance—Marin has
a more abstract sense than Whistler and his
tone and color has more expression as such;
whereas Maurer brings his skilled technique
to his work that gives him a luminosity of
pigments that even Matisse does not get.

Alfred Maurer (1868 to 1932), was probably the first
of the Americans working in Paris to be inspired by the Fauves.
As a teenager he had worked as a lithographer and a commercial
artist, and had studied part-time at the National Academy of
Design, New York. He went to Europe in 1897 and left in 1914 at the beginning of the war. As early as 1902 he had become familiar with the work of the Fauves in the Salon d'Automne of 1905; the impact of what he saw prevented him from painting for a short time. Afterwards, he moved from low-toned, loosely-painted pictures in the tradition of Singer Sargent, to Impressionist work on a small scale. The fifteen paintings Stieglitz exhibited were all called "Sketch in Oil", and according to Elizabeth McCausland, they probably consisted of night scenes, street scenes and café scenes, as well as a number of landscapes.37

When Maurer returned to America in 1914, the contents of his studio were left behind and were subsequently lost. Therefore there are few examples of Maurer's early work now in existence. During the next few years he spent much time in the company of his friend Arthur Dove in Westport, Connecticut. He and Dove had become good friends during Dove's trip to Europe between 1907 and 1909; they had sketched together in the South of France. Maurer's subsequent work done in the States was somewhat halting at first, but by 1917 he had developed sufficiently for Stieglitz to plan a second exhibition at "291" so that the artist would have "a chance to see his work on the walls."38 "291" was closed, however, before the exhibition was hung. It was announced in the last issue of Camera Work that it, together with new photographs by Paul Strand and Alfred Stieglitz, had been planned but were being held over.39 Subsequently, perhaps for the reason that Maurer became interested in colour theories and in Jay Hambridge's system of dynamic symmetry, he was not given an exhibition at either of Stieglitz's two later galleries. His theoretical preoccupations may have caused Stieglitz to lose interest.
John Marin's official career as a painter did not begin until he was twenty-nine years old. He had worked in a series of architect's offices for about four years; then, between 1899 and 1901, he went to the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Art in Philadelphia. His instructors were Thomas Anschutz and Hugh Breckinridge. Next, he went to the Art Students League in New York for one year, where Frank Vincent Damond was his instructor. He reached Paris in 1905; in December 1909 he returned for a short visit to the United States, and finally he went back home in 1911.  

As an artist Marin proved to be extraordinarily prolific; he produced enough excellent work for Stieglitz to give him annual exhibitions. Stieglitz in turn was deeply interested in Marin's development and guaranteed him financial support. When he was in Paris in 1909, Stieglitz was first introduced to Marin, after the joint Marin and Maurer exhibition. A lifelong friendship grew up which was to be mutually inspiring: Marin's published letters to Stieglitz have been seen as a valuable addition to American literature; whereas for Stieglitz, as Herbert Seligmann has stated: "Marin, as he grew, became more and more a symbol. In himself, Marin was the true, free, joyous, and simple human being, whom it became a necessity to enable to live, as a flower is cared for, or a tree bearing fruit . . ."  

Critical reaction to the joint Marin and Maurer exhibition, which took place in March 1909, was mixed. Maurer's work was not too well received, while Marin's was enthusiastically welcomed. Huneker, writing for the Sun described Maurer as:
"The Knight of the Burning Pestle." Marin was dubbed "the master of mists." Chamberlain, the reporter for the *Evening Mail*, thought that Maurer's paintings could not be understood, but Marin's could: "Mr. Marin deals sometimes with mere indications, but his color arrangements, his touch, are all beautiful and distinguished."42 Perhaps Marin's work was so readily accepted because it may have been seen to continue the concerns of the late nineteenth century; indeed, it would have fitted in with Royal Cortissoz's definition of great art. Cortissoz who had little patience with those painters of the middle nineteenth century who bothered with "the patient notation of ponderable details", admired "the generalizing instinct" of a great painter such as George Inness who "saw his scene as a whole, saw it emotionally; saw it too, as a colorist . . ."; "... What he lived and painted for was the artless beauty of the fields and woods, the fascination of a sky torn by a storm . . . The glory would be there if he got the soul of a storm . . ." An ideal art was that which was "eloquent of nature, yes, but also of the artist's mind." The aim was to achieve the desirable end of portraying beauty.43

Between 1905 and 1907, Marin worked in a fairly realistic manner. He built up his watercolours by means of a series of tonal washes; his style was somewhat Impressionistic, especially from 1907 the year he went to Venice. He studied patterns of reflections on water, and suggested the effects of weather. He interpreted intricate details—such as lace-like traceries of palace and house facades—as dissolving in light and shade. After returning to Paris from Venice, Marin brought to Parisian
scenes such as *A Rolling Sky - Paris After Storm*, 1908, (Ill.2), a heightened sense of excitement. The watercolors of 1908 are full of busy figures, billowing clouds, moving water and dancing lights. Marin’s awareness of lively movement and states of weather brought him almost to Expressionism; a tendency which was to develop fully in an unexpected direction once he had returned to the United States in 1911.

**Arthur Dove and Marsden Hartley**

In Paris, Steichen thought it would be of value if the young American artists there should form a definite organization. Although there was a Society of American Painters in Paris, its members were conservative painters who excluded the younger, more adventurous men from their exhibitions. After a series of meetings in Steichen’s studio in February 1908 it was announced in both the Paris and New York editions of the *New York Herald* that a new society known as "The Society of Younger American Painters" had been formed. Steichen, Maurer, Weber, Brinley and MacLaughlin were the governors; others of the group were Jo Davidson, Dutty, Kunz, Marin, Bruce, Carles, Sparks and Fischer. Works by a number of these artists—Brinley, Carles, Fellowes, Marin, Maurer, Steichen and Weber—were exhibited at "291" in March 1910. Stieglitz added Arthur Dove and Marsden Hartley to the list of exhibitors.

Dove had returned from Europe the preceding year in 1909. While abroad he had been friendly with Alfred Maurer, Arthur Carles and Jo Davidson. Before he went to Europe in 1907 Dove had been a successful illustrator in New York. Once abroad, he
visited Italy; most probably he went to Rome and Florence to see the museums. Mainly though, he spent his time painting in the south of France together with his good friend Alfred Maurer. Dove did not have much contact with the Paris art world, and he did not become interested in the work of Matisse and other French artists until he returned to America. The pictures he did in Europe, such as Landscape at Cannes, 1907, (Ill.3), are in a late impressionist style. His sole exhibit in the exhibition Younger American Painters at "291" in 1910, The Lobster, 1906, indicates that he had been looking to Cézanne.

After he was first introduced by Maurer, Dove was in close contact with Stieglitz and with others of the circle. He was given a one-man show in February, 1912, and he exhibited at the Forum Exhibition, held at the Anderson Galleries in 1916, together with sixteen other American artists selected by a six-man committee which included Stieglitz. Dove did not begin to be prolific until the early twenties, however, when he developed rapidly; from 1925 Stieglitz exhibited his work annually.

Hartley had yet to go to Europe. A friend, Shamus O'Sheal, had introduced him to Stieglitz. Hartley in turn took O'Sheal to visit the painter Albert Ryder who, Hartley was convinced, was the greatest living painter in America. Indeed, by the time Hartley joined Stieglitz's circle he had developed a sound and individual judgement, and his work was fairly mature. He had first studied at the Cleveland School of Art. In 1898 he went to New York and enrolled at the Chase School and in 1900 he attended the National Academy of Design where he made studies
from antique casts and from the nude. By 1909, he had been painting for eight years in his native Maine. Included among the works of these years are a number of small loosely-painted landscapes. Reproductions of Segantini's work next induced him to experiment with an impressionist style. A number of decorative landscape studies and paintings of blizzards resulted, and these were exhibited in a one-man show at "291" in May 1909, shortly after Hartley and Stieglitz met. Stieglitz retained for his collection Winter Chaos—Blizzard, (Ill.4) which may have been one of three paintings grouped in the catalogue under the title Blizzard Impressionals. Subsequently, the influence of Albert Ryder is apparent in a group of paintings which were exhibited in February, 1912, in Hartley's second one-man show: these are known as his "Black-Mountain" series of paintings. They are images of loneliness and melancholy in which angular, broken trees are silhouetted against mountains and valleys. Hartley used a dark-toned palette for this expressionist group of paintings.

John Marin, Arthur Dove and Marsden Hartley became members of Stieglitz's circle more or less at the beginning of the period when Stieglitz turned his attention away from the pictorial photographers and towards modern art. Their subsequent development should therefore be considered against the background of the group's emerging aesthetic and tastes. Oscar Bluemner, Abraham Walkowitz and Max Weber

In the meantime, other American artists gravitated to the small gallery. Charles Demuth first visited it in 1913
and found that talks with Stieglitz could be stimulating. In grateful acknowledgement of Stieglitz’s encouragement Demuth later presented him with a small landscape drawing which Stieglitz had inspired in 1914. Yet Demuth did not begin to produce high quality work until about 1917, and thus he never exhibited at "291." Later he was given the opportunity to show at The Intimate Gallery. Stieglitz, however, did not consider him to be a permanent exhibitor, probably for the reason that Demuth was by no means a prolific artist. Nevertheless, he remained on good terms with Stieglitz, and the two corresponded almost up to 1935, the year of Demuth’s death.

Max Weber, Abraham Walkowitz and Oscar Bluemner also joined the circle after they returned from visiting Europe. Oscar Bluemner who was born in Hanover, Germany, in 1864, emigrated to America in 1892. He first lived in Chicago and then from 1901 in New York City where he established himself as a successful architect. He became interested in painting in 1908, and left in 1912 for Europe in order to study art. He corresponded with Stieglitz while he was abroad, and when he came back to New York in time for the Armory Show he was able to add his voice to those of the Camera Work critics. He revealed himself as one of the most articulate contributors at a time when members of the group were concerned with explaining principles of modern art.

Stieglitz showed Bluemner’s paintings twice: in 1915 at "291" he was given a "first one-man show anywhere," consisting of twelve landscapes, and in 1928 a group of recent watercolours
were shown at The Intimate Gallery. Apparently Stieglitz did not feel at all responsible for fostering Blumemner's reputation further, perhaps because he felt loyalty only to those painters who were in full agreement with his ideas, and who were prepared not to exhibit with other dealers. Yet he fully recognized Blumemner's value as an artist. In 1919, during the period between the closing of "291" and the opening of The Intimate Gallery, Stieglitz wrote that he had enjoyed seeing a room of Blumemner's paintings at Bourgeois' Gallery, and that he wished he had money enough to purchase something.50

Abraham Walkowitz's art earned the admiration of many of those in Stieglitz's circle. His early figure drawings and figure compositions in water-colour were in a primitive manner which the group liked. Further, Walkowitz did a large number of drawings and watercolours of new subject—New York City, and the dancer, Isadora Duncan—which in themselves were of especial interest to the group.

Walkowitz was born in Siberia in March 1880, and during his childhood his family emigrated to the United States. He went to the National Academy of Design, New York, and to the Académie Julian, Paris. He returned to New York about July 1907.51 He probably joined Stieglitz's circle in 1910 when his friend Max Weber was living at the gallery and was helping with hanging the exhibitions. His first one-man show at "291" occurred in December 1912, followed by others in 1913, 1915, and 1916. A group of his early drawings and later one of his abstractions, were published in Camera Work.52
In retrospect, Walkowitz seems to have been unable to emerge from the eclecticism which marks a good proportion of the work of Stieglitz's artists during the "291" years. Thus his figure compositions are reminiscent of Matisse, and a number of his drawings are in a naive manner which may have been prompted by Henri Rousseau. Walkowitz's friend, Max Weber, had a small collection of Rousseau's work; this was put on exhibition at "291" in November, 1910. Even if Walkowitz did not see it at the gallery, he would almost certainly have seen it at his friend's home. Picasso's Cubism brought about Walkowitz's move to an abstract style, and one finds in many of his drawings reminiscences of Picasso's Nude, 1910, in Stieglitz's collection. He employed a similar linear grid in his drawings and lithographs on the theme of the city until it became little more than a dry convention. Perhaps it was Walkowitz's city series that Stieglitz had in mind when he wrote in 1916 that some of the earlier work had a "disagreeably contracted" quality about it. However, Stieglitz's earlier confidence in Walkowitz seems to have been restored; in 1917 he reported to Haviland on the success of the artist's last exhibition at "291." People flocked to the galleries; his art seemed to be "one outburst of joy. The room looked like a flower garden." Walkowitz's reputation seemed assured. With the closing of the gallery, however, he was in time forgotten, and Stieglitz apparently lost interest in his subsequent development.

Today, Walkowitz perhaps seems to have been most innovative in developing a calligraphic style in which flexible forms mark out a three-dimensional space; much as do the forms
Jackson Pollock was to employ from the mid-forties onwards. The somewhat rigid two-dimensional grid that Walkowitz derived from Picasso's *Nude, 1910*, gradually was replaced by a loosely-drawn structure which establishes an illusory space, and which seems to be in motion, as in *New York, 1917*.55

Max Weber was a member of the group for only a short time, from 1910 to 1911, and yet he appears to have been influential both in encouraging Stieglitz's developing taste for the work of European artists, and in bringing to the attention of his colleagues at "291" new art forms in their own country which they could consider as models in developing their own work. Weber was the first artist to look to Mexican and Pre-Columbian art, having discovered it in the American Museum of Natural History, New York, on his return from his European trip.56 In an essay contributed to *Camera Work*, he remarked on the beautiful colour of "Chinese dolls, Hopi Katchinas images, and also Indian quilts and baskets, and other works of savages . . ."57 He incorporated Mexican pottery in a number of his still life paintings of about 1910, and it is possible that some of the decorative motifs he used in a series of flat, imaginative compositions of 1912 to about 1913 came from North American Indian art. Barbara Rose has suggested that Weber probably borrowed from Indian art the abstract motifs and colour schemes appearing in his well-known painting *Chinese Restaurant, 1915*.58 Subsequently, Hartley, Dove, Marin and O'Keeffe all at some time painted Indian themes.59
Like Marin, Weber had developed as an artist relatively late in life. He was not able to become a serious student of painting until he reached Europe; prior to that, his training at Pratt Institute, New York, where he had been taught by Arthur Wesley Dow, had been for the purpose of fitting him to teaching. When he went to Europe he considered himself to be a student, terming his paintings "studies" and his drawings "notes." His paintings were broadly-handled landscapes, still lifes and studies from the nude model, in which he tussled with elementary problems such as learning to handle bright colours in accordance with new principles he observed in the work of Gaugin, Matisse and Cézanne. He believed that an artist develops by studying the work of the established masters and by studying nature; a belief which his teacher Dow most probably helped to foster. And so Weber built up his knowledge of art history with thoroughness by returning to the same museum or seeing the same architecture repeatedly until he could remember vividly what he had seen. He travelled to Italy where he visited Florence, Naples, Rome, Pisa, and Venice; to Spain, where he remained chiefly in Madrid; and finally, before leaving Europe at the end of 1908, he visited Brussels, Antwerp, Bruges, Rotterdam, and Amsterdam; he returned to the United States via London. The advice he gave to his friend Walkowitz who was also travelling in Europe at that time reveals his own aims. He counselled him to make "studies and not—the so-called pictures" and to study in Venice "the beautiful changes of light" and "the moving masses of people." He should look "for values
color, big lines—strong impressive drawing—with character. Experiment, search . . ." He should try to say something in his own way while keeping in mind the achievements of the old masters, "the greatest who have done great things."60

Weber did not believe that he had begun to paint particularly well while he was in Europe. Nevertheless he thought he had educated himself sufficiently to recognize quality in art when he saw it. He told Walkowitz that he was joining a number of other foreigners—including Leo Stein, Mrs. Michael Stein, Hans Purmann, who was a German student from the Académie Julian, and Patrick Henry Bruce from Virginia—in forming a class which would meet in Matisse's studio at the beginning of 1908.61 He confessed that he valued the opportunity to work with intelligent people who were able to appreciate good art. He felt himself to be in the same position "even", he added, "if I cannot do anything yet."62 Once he was back in America Weber began to experiment with a number of styles. He painted, for the first time, imaginative compositions reminiscent of Cézanne's paintings of bathers which he had seen at the Cézanne retrospective of 1906. Next, he painted from 1912 to 1914 the flat and somewhat decorative paintings in which he included motifs taken from American Indian art, and in which there is a similar kind of simplification of space as in Matisse's Bathers with a Turtle, 1908.63 It is possible too, that the Douanier Rousseau's stylistic naivete also helped to determine this particular phase of Weber's development. While working in this
somewhat flat manner, he also examined the possibilities of a cubist style. In Paris he had visited Picasso's studio; yet, he had left before Cubism had reached the analytic stage in which forms are fragmented, planes interpenetrate and images are repeated from many different views, and therefore these particular features did not begin to appear in his work until after the Picasso exhibition at "291" in 1911, and the Armory Show of 1913. Finally, in about 1915, Weber evolved a style based on synthetic Cubism before abandoning in the twenties all modes of abstraction in favour of a realistic and expressionist art on Jewish themes.

Perhaps Weber's apparently discontinuous pattern of development during these years, made up of many different styles, exemplifies the dilemma young American artists found themselves facing at the beginning of the twentieth century as they tried to keep abreast of the latest discoveries in art, whilst trying to find personal styles of their own. Further, Weber's own methods of study involved eclectic gleaning of art principles evolved by others, as he well realized. The greatest difficulty, he found, was the struggle to stamp one's work "with even the slightest amount of personality or individuality." While speaking of Courbet, Manet, Cézanne, Renoir, Pisarro, Van Gogh, and Gauguin, he described them as "a great body of men" and thought it a duty "to emulate them and if possible to add something to that which they have given." It was assumed that stylistic evolution is an organic process. Tradition was continued by the modern artist; it was not put aside.
Weber's stay in Paris must have reinforced such ideas since it coincided with a period of conscious eclecticism when new models were being sought. He later described how "progressive young artists fluttered like bees from one authentic source in art to another, plucking as it were a little honey here and a little nourishment there, quite often to the neglect of their own innate gifts." Not only was it thought that an artist might develop by studying the work of established masters, but other models were sought: primitive art, Ancient art and Classical art were evaluated afresh. Indeed, art objects then thought hardly to merit the term "art" were regarded as models from which the artist might learn. The scope of Picasso's perusal of traditional and new models was of unprecedented breadth, as John Golding indicates in his analysis of the painting \textit{Les Demoiselles d'Avignon}, 1907. Therefore it is not surprising that Weber, when he returned to America, was firmly convinced for the rest of his career that modern art had evolved organically by synthesizing a wide variety of influences from the art of many different cultures.

Others of Stieglitz's group of artists were saved from the consequences of thinking that contemporary art had evolved eclectically. Even though Dove, Hartley and Blumner all believed in the value of museum study, they developed in addition other positive ideas about the nature of their art. Dove and Hartley, for example, developed with Stieglitz a distaste for intellectual analysis, as did Blumner in the twenties. Finally, however, Blumner's particular fondness of museum study again was apparent
towards the end of his career, and indeed, it may have been a reason for his estrangement from the group in 1930.67

Though Weber's contributions to Camera Work were not too extensive, it is known that he was one of the most vocal critics of the group during the time he was at "291". He was adversely critical of the work of both Steichen and Hartley. But Steichen did not mind, since he thought such criticism was "essentially legitimate and thoroughly in accord with Secession principles."68 Indeed, when de Zayas and Haviland first saw Weber's work in early 1910, they were asked to criticise it and they had judged that it was the result of clever copying; an opinion which in time all the members of the group came to share.69 However, even if Weber's work was not held in high regard at "291" in 1910, his opinions were respected by Stieglitz who believed him to have the best knowledge of contemporary art of anyone he knew. According to Stieglitz, Weber particularly supported the art of Henri Rousseau and Cézanne.70 He had known Rousseau well in Paris, and had brought back to America a number of the elderly artist's works. Apparently he convinced Stieglitz of Rousseau's worth since Weber's small collection was put on view, together with lithographs by Cézanne, Renoir, Manet and Toulouse-Lautrec, in November 1910. This was the first time that naive art was exhibited in America. Subsequently, in 1912, Stieglitz also exhibited children's art. Thus it would seem that in the first place it was Weber who convinced Stieglitz of the value of naive painting. Perhaps it is not unreasonable to regard such pioneering exhibitions as having initially helped to foster an
attitude whereby artists and collectors began to realize the intrinsic value of the great quantity of American folk art which could be found in almost any antique shop in the country. By about 1920, many people had large collections of paintings by unknown nineteenth-century painters.

De Zayas, too, helped in large measure to propagate the critical function of "291." He was particularly anxious in 1910 that modern art should be explained as much as possible. As he wrote to Stieglitz during his 1910 to 1911 stay in Europe, the new work being shown "needs explanation, especially in America, and . . . the exhibitions you are making . . . wouldn't have their full value, if some one doesn't take the trouble." In time, as his understanding of contemporary art grew, de Zayas took it upon himself to write explanatory essays, especially about Cubism; the onset of which he witnessed at the Salon d'Automne of 1910, and the Salon des Independants of 1911.

The developing spirit of inquiry at the gallery, coupled with an evolutionary view of modern art—the view that art could be seen as having advanced from Cézanne to Picasso, for example, and the view that the exhibitions at "291" had been selected in order to show a definite progression—brought about a criterion in selecting art for future exhibition at the gallery. It was necessary for an artist to have a fresh and personal point of view visible in his art; his work might then become part of what Stieglitz saw as a working whole: a contribution of new and individual work to which Stieglitz, his circle at "291", the official art world, and the public might react. If an artist
continued to produce work, it would then become part of a "demonstration" of his development by bringing up for both viewer and artist alike the question of personal evolution. It was hoped that to the viewer such a demonstration might make him aware that art was a continuing, and therefore a living activity. For the artist, it could be an invaluable method of stimulating him to further intensive development. Without doubt, such was Stieglitz's aim; as he wrote to Hartley, "the chief thing that interests me in any individual . . . is to see the perfectly natural unfolding of the so-called innerself."72

Probably such emphasis on evolution was the greatest practical service—outside of assuring artists an income—that Stieglitz was to perform for his small group.
CHAPTER II

THE PHOTO-SECESSION CRITICS

Never before the present time has the theory of art taken such an important place in the thought of man . . .


The Scope of Critical Concern

When the claim was made that Camera Work was devoted "to the interests of pictorial photography," the implication was that the magazine was more than just a photographic journal; rather it existed to support the view that photography was an art form worthy of consideration on the same level as other art forms. Thus one finds that discussions about the nature of art in general appear in the pages of Camera Work, and the magazine may therefore be considered as a record of the aesthetic position of the Stieglitz group.

Before proceeding with publication, Stieglitz had enlisted the support of many writers, including the literary critic J. B. Kerfoot; A. Horasly Hinton, the editor of The Amateur Photographer, London; Ernst Juhl, editor of Jahrbuch der Kunstphotographie, Germany; and Charles Caffin who had been an art critic for Harper's Weekly. At the time of publication
Caffin was the editor of the American section of International Studio. Later, he reported for The New York Sun. Another important contributor was Sydney Allen, who wrote under the name of Sadakichi Hartmann. He had published a history of American art in 1902, and in 1904 he brought out a book on Japanese art. His wide knowledge of contemporary art, as well as his particular interest in Japanese art were reflected in his Camera Work contributions. Roland Rood, the son of Ogden Rood who had become famous through his book Modern Chromatics, with Applications to Art and Industry published in 1881, also contributed a number of interesting articles on art and photography. Although some of them exhibit an analytic approach to art perhaps learnt from his father, others are conjectural essays advocating new systems of aesthetics. In time, Stieglitz's helpers at "291", as well as one or two of his artists, also contributed to the magazine, and showed themselves to be often in agreement with ideas previously set out by the Photo-Secession critics.

Taken as a whole, in the essays in Camera Work, concern is shown for three questions: how does the American artist stand—socially, economically and culturally—in comparison with his confrères in Europe; what are his methods of working; and what is the subject matter and the content of his art?

A number of intellectuals in the United States at the beginning of the twentieth century were resentful that Europe offered to the writer or painter a more congenial climate than their own in which to work. Those who were able to study in
Europe found it necessary to make the choice of whether to stay in Europe where there was the companionship of colleagues and opportunities for exhibiting art, or whether to return to the United States and face a much bleaker situation. The issue was discussed by a number of writers who contributed to *Camera Work*. Sydney Allen (Sakakichi Hartmann), for example, pointed out that Americans "are always twenty years behind the rest of the world in all artistic and literary matters," and that everyone felt himself to be intellectually isolated; salons did not exist in America, and there was a lack of *esprit de corps* among the artists themselves. Charles Caffin brought up another point: it was thought in America that the artistic temperament was "a wee bit daftie" unless there was some urge to contribute towards the most admired preoccupation of the day—that of making money. Many other writers developed the theme that America was basically materialistic in outlook and was therefore indifferent to the arts. The resulting consensus was that the artist's life was diametrically opposite to the businessman's way of life.

Admittedly, the concept of an opposition between a creative life and a practical life was a widely-held one which followed in the wake of the Industrial Revolution. But amongst a small group of intellectuals in the United States it became an obsession. Sherwood Anderson, who later became a close friend of Stieglitz's, recounted in many different versions the story of how one day in 1912 he left his family and his successful business in favour of fulfilling his true vocation as a writer. Van Wyck Brooks, having decided to live in his own country rather
than in Europe, set about, from 1508 to 1522, to analyse the conditions which are beneficial or detrimental to the growth of the arts in Europe and in the United States, and helped to foster the distinction between "the cultivated public and the business public." Alfred Stieglitz wholeheartedly believed in the truth of these distinctions and once his gallery was established he regarded it as a stronghold of the arts, and a force in opposition to the materialistic elements in society. Indeed, each gallery in turn was seen as a force with which to combat commercialism. Herbert Saligmann has written of the positive role Stieglitz assumed in that his view of society moved him to become an educator:

Talks continued for hours and days, people came and went during volcanic outpourings to a silent and fascinated audience of from one to twenty or more.

Here, in a sustained flow of narration, assimilating into its unbroken course whatever questions, discussions, or self-revelation might come from the participants, Stieglitz developed his main themes. The chief objective before him always was the fight for the true, sensitive and selfless worker [artist], particularly in America. The foe was commercialism and its accompanying indifference to quality; its snobbism, its hypocrisy, and its disregard for the spirit, sacrificed to the predominance of mass production criteria.

Stieglitz was arguing for individualism, and he was arguing that the products of individuality were a cure for society's ills. But as well as finding in Camera Work discussions of the artist's place in society, one finds that in early issues of the magazine assumptions are made about the practical nature of art which later were to influence the direction of the "291" artists. It was assumed that the historic development of styles may be
regarded as an organic process; therefore, it was concluded, the artist cannot help but be an eclectic to some extent in order to be able to perpetuate artistic traditions in his time. Secondly, it was assumed that an artist reacts subjectively to his surroundings and that his task is to record those reactions. This last assumption was eventually to lead to the conclusion that art must be related to visual reality in some manner, and that a non-objective, completely abstract kind of art was therefore unacceptable.

Sydney Allen was one of the first to point out that art must be the product of eclecticism. In 1904, he wrote that "art is not an affair of spontaneous generation. The artist is, as all of us, a creature of evolution." He thought: "The methods of art are synthetical, not empirical; it is itself in a great measure acquired, and not wholly intuitive. And this synthesis of knowledge means, and can only mean, the studying of life, of art, and the experience of others." Roland Rood pointed out that the botega tradition had made copying an essential method of art training. In the early twentieth century, however, it had been taken for granted that the artist should be independent of all influence. The idea that genius existed had made it necessary for borrowing, if practiced at all, to take place surreptitiously. Yet, Rood maintained, borrowing was in fact indispensable. But he cautioned:

In thus advocating plagiarism I do not wish . . .
to endorse copying of anybody and everybody's thoughts and methods; on the contrary, the
limits to which we may go and to which the old masters did go, are clearly defined by their practice as well as a socio-psychological law, and this law says that general types of truth and beauty are the common property of all, but a specialized type belongs solely to the artist who specialized it.  

Perhaps Allen and Rood were summing up the trend of the times. Emulation of established masters traditionally had been part of an art student's education. At the beginning of the century, the most daring of the American moderns widened the range of instructive models. The painter, Robert Henri, an instructor at the New York School of Art (The Chase School), who in 1909 opened an art school of his own, took his students to the Metropolitan Museum of Art to study paintings by Manet. Another teacher, Arthur Wesley Dow (1857 to 1922), with whom Max Weber and later Georgia O'Keeffe studied, also took his students to museums, and lectured on the history of art. Dow had studied in Paris in the 1880's, where he had won awards. In 1887, he had joined the group of experimental painters at Pont Avon, and had known Gauguin. In Boston, in 1889, he had worked at the Boston Museum of Fine Art with Ernest Fenollosa, the specialist in Oriental art. And subsequently, in his teaching, Dow had devised a series of exercises which in part depended on his knowledge of Eastern art. Masterpieces recommended for study in the classroom were "the textile and the Japanese print," by which could be demonstrated Eastern principles of composition involving the use of areas of light or dark tone, or notan, and the use of expressive line. Such models also helped the student to an understanding of colour harmony.
In time, the fresh evaluation of art history came to be regarded as the most up to date method of evolving a new and personal style. It was for example, such intensive reassessment on the part of the Fauves that led towards Cubism. But if in France the discovery of Cubism by Picasso and Braque marked a new phase in the history of art in that subsequently artists no longer relied to the same degree on the eclectic procedures of the Fauvist period, in America there was a continuing belief that modern art was eclectic. In Stieglitz's circle this idea was fostered by Max Weber during the short time he was a member of the group. And even afterwards, the belief persisted; Marius de Zayas characterized the mood of the age as being one of eclecticism in which "individualism is being replaced by the principle of fraternity." Present art relied primarily on art history, he felt, and as a result, the various art movements lacked vitality. But although he found such an atmosphere of eclecticism disagreeable, he realized that there was no alternative: inasmuch as the art which resulted truly reflected the tenor of the times, than he believed that such art was valid. He wrote that: "The modern artist is the prototype of consciousness. He works premeditatedly, he dislocates, disharmonizes, exaggerates premeditatedly. He is eclectic in spirit and an iconoclast in action."12

There was another result of a growing concern in America with regarding the work of established masters as possible models from which modern painters might learn: there arose a desire to discover in the United States a new and indigenous subject matter. Henri and his colleagues, known as "The Ashcan School,"
began from about 1904 to paint aspects of the life they saw about them in New York City, and portrayed realistically the inhabitants of slum tenement buildings. Slightly earlier, however, a few of the pictorial photographers, and then the art critics in Stieglitz's circle, began to discover in the city's buildings and bridges a new potential source of interest. John Francis Strauss, one of the founders of the Photo-Secession, had his photograph, The Bridge, reproduced in the July 1903 issue of Camera Work. It was a daring photograph. It had been taken at dusk and showed a view of the modern Brooklyn Bridge seen from a distance over a series of rooftops in the foreground. In the next number of the magazine appeared Stieglitz's photograph of the Flat Iron Building; a three-sided construction designed to fit an A-shaped site on Broadway at Twenty-third Street. Sydney Allen wrote that the building is "typically American in conception as well as execution. It is a curiosity of modern architecture, solely built for utilitarian purposes, and at the same time a masterpiece of iron-construction." He found architecture such as this and the Brooklyn Bridge, examples of a kind of construction which might give rise to a future aesthetic.

Allen saw as original to America "our huge palatial hotels, our colossal storage-houses looking at night like mediaeval castles, the barrack-like appearance of long rows of houses made after one pattern, our towering office-buildings with narrow frontage, and certain business structures made largely of glass and iron." He saw among "all these peculiarities of form" the
beginnings of a new style which one day "will give as true an expression of our modern civilization as do the temples and statuary of Greece." Iron construction "by its very absence of everything unnecessary" would be the source of "new laws of beauty which have not yet been explored, which are perhaps not even conscious to their originators." Speaking of America's architectural "polyglot style" he wrote that he found it strange that Americans should not have "been able to evolve a single American pattern out of the manifold products of the country, or its historical associations." He suggested that an American form of decoration might perhaps be evolved from "the tomahawk or the Indian corn." The Eiffel Tower and the Brooklyn Bridge might in time, he thought, come to "be compared to the architectural masterpieces of any age or clime." Both buildings have "a beauty of lines and curves, simple as in the pyramids, bold as in the cathedral spires of flamboyant churches." In addition, he thought that New York's skyline, when seen from the harbour, had great beauty. Speaking of the numerous city buildings, he felt that even though they had been constructed for practical purposes in order to further the cause of industry, there is still "an infinitude of art and beauty in all this mad, useless materiality which, if artists, blinded by achievement of former ages can not see it, will at least give rise to a new style of architecture, rising boldly and nonchalantly from the ruins of the past."16

Roland Rood who began to write for Camera Work in 1904 thought that "the streets of New York possibly present general types of beauty as yet unexploited..."17 It remained for
John Marin, Max Weber, Abraham Walkowitz, and outside Stieglitz's group, Joseph Stella, to choose the theme of the city as a subject for new kinds of interpretation.

While a number of the members of the Photo-Secession were finding New York to be of visual interest and a source for a future aesthetic, others were advocating "escape from the cities, [and] from the morbid influences of overwrought civilization." Contact with nature, it was thought, could help one "to adjust one's view on life to what is broad and healthful and true." We find that many of the pictorial photographers discovered that landscape was a stimulating subject. Possibly for Alvin Langdon Coburn of Boston, a summer spent with the landscape painter, Arthur W. Dow, at the latter's studio in the country confirmed his interest in landscape. Coburn, in his turn, influenced the English photographer Will A. Cadby to photograph in the woods. Cadby discovered that there one finds an "atmosphere that one is conscious of in no other surroundings, except, perhaps, in a church:" "Stillness is essential to the spirit of the wood." Joseph T. Keiley, writing of another fellow photographer, Eva Watson-Schutze, observed that Watson-Schutze "deeply loves nature, but seems to endeavor less to express what it seems than what it means."

Moving from considerations of photography to the question of the pathetic fallacy in art in general, Roland Rood, in a later issue of Camera Work concluded that: "We all know that a picture is a combination of nature with the artist's personality," and that we attribute "personality to landscape. We are very
apt to feel that there is something human in nature when its forms or motions to any extent imitate those of either men or animals... often clouds and trees look like grotesque monsters.” He thought that observations such as these are definite “psychological laws” which the photographer should learn to apply in order to produce pictures. Dallett Fuguet, in the same issue of the magazine, touched on the crux of the matter when he wrote that “in no form are renderings or representations of natural facts truly art.” The purpose of art is “to communicate the sentiment” that the artist felt about what he saw.

In some respects, these assertions reiterate nineteenth-century Romanticist concepts about the relation of the artist to nature. Transcendentalist writers had found embodied in nature unseen and powerful forces which reflected deity. It is pertinent that at the turn of the century the young Marsden Hartley was avidly reading Ralph Waldo Emerson’s writings, and he wrote in 1900 to his friend Richard Tweedy, a fellow student at the Chase School, New York: “There is nothing that sets all things at peace with me as a communion with Nature. She seems to have a balm for every pain and a cheerful song for every sorrowing heart. I can always find rest of soul when I go out to nature...” He added: “Beauty is my one aim in life, beauty in character, in thought, in word, in deed, and in expression on canvas of Nature divine, and the glorification of the God of all, who provided us with these beauties.”
Charles Caffin sounded a new note in 1906 when he made a distinction between the Western artist's aim to "embody himself, his emotions, sentiments, and preferences, in his picture," with "the Oriental idea-motive" which embodies "a little of the Universal." Caffin wished to make clear the differences between the arts of the East and the West because he believed that Eastern art was affecting modern art; "the Oriental idea has revolved round to us again," he observed. He thought that previously the artist in the Western world had been "too exclusively concerned with visible appearances;" on the other hand, the Japanese artist had perhaps been too devoted to the expression of that which is embodied in the material appearance—in Japanese phraseology, the 'Kokoro.' He explained that the term Kokoro meant:

that portion of the universal life or spirit manifested in the material. Thus, inherent in a spray of plum-blossom, is a fragment of the universal life that has been the principle of its growth and has determined its outward difference from other embodiments of the life-spirit. To imitate the merely outward appearance of the spray would be a slavish, childish feat, to interpret by means of its perfection the indwelling Kokoro, an act of religion.

In 1906, he described this process as "abstract expression": the aim of the Oriental artist was "to extract from form its essential qualities and to use them for the abstract purpose of producing a beautiful decoration." He remarked that "if painting is to recover for itself something of that needfulness to the modern intelligence which music has developed it must be ... in the direction of abstract expression."
But as well as thinking that modern artists could learn much from the East, and could achieve a similar "abstract expression," Caffin recognized that the word "abstract" may have another meaning. To some extent, all paintings are abstract because of "the appeal, made severally by line, color, chiaroscuro, and tone, being in its nature purely abstract." He thought it likely that "the superior impressiveness of the works of the great masters is due to the preponderance of this appeal over the mere concrete facts of the picture." Speaking of the work of Giotto and Cimabue he thought it had "an abstract appeal" and in addition "the abstract nature of the appeal is heightened by the further fact that the method of their painting was based upon abstract principles." He found too in Giotto's work a "survival of the old Oriental habit of regarding the world in the abstract." Nature was seen "not as a thing to be imitated, but as a visible embodiment of unseen forces, seeable only through their temporary material habitation." Giotto's aim was to "help the imagination to look beyond the concrete to the spiritual."28 In speaking of the "abstract," therefore, Caffin wished to make a distinction between the abstract elements of a picture--its lines, colours and tones--and abstract ideas about nature. Thus when he wrote of "abstract expression," it was often the latter meaning of "abstract" that he had in mind.

Having formulated such ideas, at the time Stieglitz began to show European modern art Caffin interpreted it in accordance with the view that modern artists were moving towards abstract expression; or like the Japanese painters, modern artists now aimed to express the Kokoro in nature. This, he explained could
be achieved by simplifying natural forms to shapes which best expressed "essential qualities." Speaking of Matisse's studies from the nude, which Stieglitz showed in April 1908, Caffin explained that first of all Matisse drew "what exists" . . . Then others follow in which he has sought for further and further 'simplification'. Matisse's "simplification is not for the purpose of rendering more vividly the actuality of form; it is to secure a unity of expression in the interpretation of an abstract idea."29 Writing of Cézanne in the July 1910 issue of Camera Work and suggesting a "general principle of the modern movement"—that Cézanne, and not Matisse, was the most important innovator of the twentieth century—Caffin reasserted that modern art evolved from a consciousness of Eastern art which resulted in a picture being "regarded as a decorative unit; form was treated less for its actuality than as a symbol of expression." Whistler worked in accordance with this idea; Cézanne continued by "simplification and expression of both form and color."

Caffin described Cézanne as:

an out and out realist; in the philosophical sense of the term . . . he extracted his vision of the subject from the actual appearances, clearly seen in open light. The process by which he extracted it was an exhaustive application of analysis, designed to strip the vision of all superfluities and accidents and reduce it to its simplest statement of expressional form and color. The abstraction, at which he arrives, has not been superimposed upon the facts by his temperament or imagination, but actually extracted from the facts themselves . . . The final aim in Cézanne's simplification is to reach an organic unity, in order that the expression may be a single and harmonious one . . .
A consequence of Caffin's explanation of modern art, I believe, was that a number of artists close to Stieglitz developed personal art forms in accordance with their interpretations of the above view. As I hope to show later, John Marin, Georgia O'Keeffe and Arthur Dove relied greatly on visual reality from which they extracted the essential qualities which they felt expressed specific character, and which in turn evoked a sense of life. This is not to suggest that these artists deliberately looked to Caffin's aesthetic. It is more likely that his interpretation of modern art was simply taken for granted by the group.

Caffin's interest in Oriental art was in keeping with contemporary tastes; yet it may have been further aroused by Sydney Allen who had contributed to Camera Work from 1903 a few articles in which he described in detail aspects of Japanese art practice. Allen thought that Japanese influence was pervasive enough to have affected commercial design, and that it was superseding William Morris' influence. He pointed out too, however, that although some of the principles he outlined were being used by designers, they had not been adopted by painters to any significant extent.31 Eva Watson-Schutze observed that perhaps pictorial photographers could learn a great deal about design by studying Japanese prints; a belief which Dow had put into practice in a more general way by teaching according to his idea that painters benefited from careful study of Eastern art.32

The interest Stieglitz's circle had in the subject of Oriental art in the early years of the century is indicated further by the fact that in May 1909, Stieglitz exhibited
eighteenth-century Japanese prints. Work by Sharaku, Utamaro and Hokusai was included. Outside the circle, in order to meet the growing interest of the general public, Henry P. Bowie, in 1911, published a book, On the Laws of Japanese Painting. Bowie had spent nine years in Japan studying Japanese art; on his return he lectured on the West Coast, and later he set out the lectures in his book. Arthur J. Eddy quoted extensively from Bowie’s publication in his own book, Cubists and Post Impressionists, 1914. Among the principles cited as important was the theory of living movement, or Sei do, or Kokoro machi. Interpreted, this meant: “the transfusion into the work of the felt nature of the thing to be painted by the artist. Whatever the subject to be translated—whether river or tree, rock or mountain, bird or flower, fish or animal—the artist at the moment of painting it must feel its very nature.” Members of Stieglitz’s group may well have been familiar with Bowie’s book when it was published in 1911, but even if they were not, they were certainly aware of Eddy’s publication in which their own work is mentioned.

Not surprisingly, early interest in principles of Eastern art led the group to accept fragments of philosophical systems which were akin to such principles. Bergson’s view that art is the result of intuition seems particularly to have attracted much attention. In the October 1911 issue of Camera Work, an excerpt from Bergson’s Creative Evolution was published. The passage selected included the observation:

intelligence and instinct are turned in opposite directions, the former towards inert matter, the
latter towards life . . . it is to the very inwardness of life that intuition leads us--by intuition I mean instinct that has become disinterested, self-conscious, capable of reflecting upon its object and enlarging it.  

Further, Bergson distinguished between how one normally perceives an object, and how the artist must perceive it in order to express it. Normally, he wrote, one misses "the intention of life, the simple movement that runs through the lines that bind them together and gives them significance." The artist, however, tries to express life by "placing himself back within the object by a kind of sympathy, in breaking down, by an effort of intuition, the barrier that space puts up between him and his model."  

By accepting Bergson's views the group opened the way to a visionary kind of art which allowed the imagination dominance. Hartley especially found Bergson's ideas attractive. He wrote to Stieglitz from Europe in 1912: "I am convinced of the Bergson argument in philosophy, that the intuition is the only vehicle for art expression and it is on this basis that I am proceeding." Subsequently, he developed a personal kind of visionary art.  

But in addition, other art forms which seemed to have been guided mainly by intuition were found to be of interest. Stieglitz included two essays by Gertrude Stein on the work of Matisse and Picasso in the August 1912 issue of Camera Work, because, as he told her: "You have undoubtedly succeeded in expressing Matisse and Picasso in words, for me at least. It is for that reason that I am desirous of sharing my pleasure with others." Stein's writing was also particularly
well received by Stieglitz's artists, one or two of whom tended at times to adopt in their own writing traces of her spontaneous style. Mabel Dodge Luhan, who held a weekly salon for avant-garde writers and painters in her downtown apartment, and who was an habitué of "291", contributed to Camera Work an article about her friend Stein's writing methods. Her procedure, according to Dodge Luhan, is a living example of the "Bergson theory of intuition. She does not go after words—she waits—and lets them come to her, and they do." Words, or groups of words "rise from her sub-consciousness to the surface of her mind"; then she brings "her reason to bear upon them, examining weighing, and gauging their ability to express her impression."

Weber, Walkowitz and Charles Caffin admired the dancer Isadora Duncan perhaps because she too relied on spontaneous emotion reaction as the basis of her dancing. She danced according to the emotions aroused in her by music and poetry, or a combination of both. She was much emulated internationally by poets, sculptors, musicians, actors and writers who found inspiration in her intuitive dancing. Charles Caffin thought it "one of the loveliest expressions of beauty one has ever experienced," and it seemed to him that her figure "became a symbol of the abstract conception of rhythm and melody." It has been said that for Duncan the "dance was expressive of the human being, the person in his emotional, philosophic, psychological natures."

Sydney Allen in 1911 must have found himself in tune with Bergson's demand for an intuitive kind of art; a position one would expect of a critic who championed Oriental art. He found
modern art "too conscious, too scientific and legitimate; too persistent and self-important." He felt that an artist "needs must dive into some world of shadows where material facts dissolve; and images, without losing their spiritual motive, whirl and stretch into the infinite." He defined all great art as:

extraction, typifications, symbolizations of general laws and apparitions, composite expressions of such concentration and breadth that they reflect unconsciously our nookest emotions about man and his relation to the world. It is this vagueness of thought endeavoring to sound the foundation of all things, this want of definition, hinting at idées that cannot be precisely expressed, that give to art its ultimate and final significance.

He looked to Mallarmé as one who teaches the value of fragmented thoughts and the use of typographical designs in order to produce greater emotional impact. He thought painters too might achieve a more visionary kind of art by a corresponding form of fragmentation:

... by a wilful archaism by analysis of form to its fundamental shapes by atmospheric suggestiveness by dissonance of color and contrast and by manifold touches of unreality which open up purely visionary places.

The critic Benjamin de Casseres, who began writing for Camera Work in 1909, was also particularly aware of Bergson's views. In 1913 he pointed out that the philosopher Heraclitus of Ephesus, in 500 B. C., was "a philosopher more modern than Bergson. His doctrine was the Eternal Becoming. All things are in a perpetual state of flux. Nothing exists; things only seem. The Absolute is change." Heraclitus should be considered "the first great Western Irrationalist... He was the father of Hegel." De Casseres recommended that free reign should be
given to irrationality: "the Irrational has become a faith," he proclaimed, and the "Intelect is bankrupt." He dramatized his point by insisting that the "brain is rational, but the brain is the antithesis of life. Thought is mathematical, organized, but Life is unmathematical, unorganized, Two and two make four in the world of logic, but two and two do not make four in the subconscious or in the superconscious." He cited the American writers Emerson, Thoreau and Whitman as being "the three Supreme Irrationalists of the age," and as "fathers of the cubists and the futurists, for they reported what they felt, not what they saw." They were "Orientals, whether they know it or not. From Emerson to Picasso the march has been Asia-ward. We are carrying our candles to the Buddhas."

De Casseres, it would seem, was convinced that all great men had been guided by intuition, and in this respect they came close to the East.

But if de Casseres and Sydney Allen thought that unbridled instinct should be allowed dominance, Marius de Zayas in 1912 perhaps kept closer to Bergson in that he allowed that rational analysis was an essential ingredient of art if it was to be meaningful. Apparently de Zayas regarded art as a twofold process, much in accordance with Dodge's description of Stein's working methods, in which the artist proceeds instinctively, and then analyses the results so obtained. De Zayas tended to condemn most modern art as lacking in individuality and being the product of eclecticism. He thought, as did his colleagues at "291", that there was too much conscious imitation of the
work of others; whereas true art, he maintained, should be much like the knowledgeless art of children. But in addition, it should be the result of the application of reason in order to have meaning. As he wrote in 1913, "modern art is analytical"; the modern artist's aim was "to discover the primary cause of the plastic significance of the physical world, the concrete."

"It wants to know the essence of things" and "through reasoning and induction the modern artist arrives at a philosophical system; at a theory which explains his idea of the subjective truth, which, like all subjective truths is universal and absolute."47

It would appear at first sight that de Zayas had somewhat developed Charles Caffin's earlier aesthetic. In defining his concept of "abstract expression," Caffin had stressed the importance of interpreting the character of nature's individual objects, or, of extracting from nature the Kokoro or essential qualities of its various components. In other words, Caffin was primarily concerned with the content of art. De Zayas, on the other hand, seems to have taken Caffin's ideas about content for granted and he apparently accepted that the artist is concerned with interpreting that which is intangible; rather, de Zayas was more concerned with the question of how in fact this could be done. And his answer was that the intangibles, or "universal truths" of nature, or Caffin's "essential qualities", corresponded to the artist's portrayed perceptions of them. One finds, therefore, that de Zayas in his writing tended to stress the artist's sensations or emotions—over and above what it was in nature that the artist sought.
Contact with Cubism in Paris must have been decisive in forming de Zayas' views. When Caffin had adapted his concept of "abstract expression" to fit the art of Matisse and Cézanne at the time it was shown at "291", he had believed that contemporary art such as theirs was the result of extracting expressive qualities by a process of simplification and analysis from the visible world. Picasso, however, for the first time, was employing abstract shapes which did not correspond to forms perceived visually, and therefore Caffin's earlier explanations would have required modification. Guided by a statement by de Zayas which he sent to New York to accompany the 1911 Picasso exhibition, members of the group decided that Picasso's abstract forms embodied his subjective reactions to his subject, and that contemplation of the work of art could in turn induce the artist's reactions in the spectator. At the time of the 1911 exhibition, A. P. Stephenson of the New York Evening Post remarked on having heard "two of Picasso's interpreters" enthuse about "the sensation" Picasso's art induced. "They feel sensations too", he added, "over a crayon drawing that looks to anybody who does not understand 'emotional geometry' like a design for a fire escape." Apparently members of the group had decided that invented abstract forms such as those in Nude, 1910, were the visual equivalents of emotion. As de Zayas had explained: "he (Picasso) receives a direct impression from external nature; he analyzes, develops, and translates it, and afterwards executes it in his own particular style, with the intention that the picture should be the pictorial equivalent of the emotion produced by nature."
addition, however, de Zayas believed that invented forms corresponded not only to emotion, but also to an "idea" generated by nature. He continued: "In presenting his work he wants the spectator to look for the emotion or idea generated from the spectacle and not the spectacle itself." 49

One might stress that Caffin's early definition of art as "abstract expression" or extraction from nature of specific qualities, lay behind de Zayas' later interpretations of art; as de Zayas and other members of the group were confronted with examples of abstraction, Caffin's original definition apparently was found to be still applicable, with, however, added emphasis on the artist's subjective reactions. Furthermore, it may be shown that later Caffin himself readily conceded that invented abstract forms could be explained as being the equivalents of the artist's reactions to his subject, and that these reactions corresponded to abstract ideas about nature; or, in other words, new forms of abstraction could be seen as "abstract expression."

One may cite Caffin's interpretation of Abraham Walkowitz's abstract work of 1913 as an illustration of how his concept of "abstract expression" could embrace new forms of abstraction. Walkowitz had been influenced by Picasso's early Cubism, exemplified by Nude, 1910, to make simple line drawings of the dancer Isadora Duncan in order to express form and movement. In addition, he embarked on an exploration of abstraction by drawing parts of the female nude as disconnected linear and tonal elements, described as a "collection of curves or bending lines now and then taking the form of breasts or other parts of
the human body."\textsuperscript{50} Caffin saw the new work as an attempt to "take the abstract idea of flesh, detached from particular reference to the accident of the individual, and use it, in the way a musician uses a theme, as a motive by means of which he may stimulate in others the abstract sensations and emotions of which he himself is conscious."\textsuperscript{51} Thus he regarded Walkowitz's abstractions as complexly symbolic, perhaps incorporating the Kokoro of which he wrote in 1906, in that they were conceptual and yet were vehicles for communicating specific feelings about subjects. Basically, therefore, Caffin's ideas remained the same.

The particular wording of Caffin's explanation of Walkowitz's intentions, however, was somewhat new. It would seem that Caffin in turn was influenced to some extent by de Zayas' explanations of Picasso's Cubism. At the same time, Caffin's language is also reminiscent of, and was perhaps coloured by vocabulary Picabia had employed earlier in 1913 in speaking about his own art. Picabia who had arrived in New York at the beginning of 1913 in time for the Armory Show, apparently endorsed the group's ideas about the nature of abstraction. As W. A. Camfield points out, Picabia aimed to synthesize nature's visible forms and his emotional and mental response to them. Both the artist and his wife were especially interested in the idea that art could parallel music, and together with members of the Puteaux group of artists to which he belonged, Picabia had been particularly interested in the philosophies of Nietzsche and Bergson, and the concept of synesthesia. Further a friendship
with Apollinaire in the spring and summer of 1912 had helped in the formation of Apollinaire's ideas about "pure painting." Subsequently, talks with members of the New York group revealed, not surprisingly, that Picabia's ideas were close to theirs; indeed, how far mutual views may have been strengthened and clarified in New York at that time is, I believe, still a conjectural point.

As Maurice Aisen explained in an issue of Camera Work, Picabia was trying to express his emotions in much the same way as were Picasso, Duchamp and Arthur Dove. He added that "Picabia has left the plane of the five senses in art which he calls 'matière pensée'. He concerns himself solely with the psychic perception, or as he names it, 'pensée pure'.” He paints "the concept of a religious procession and of other emotions, derived out of it;" he arrives at "a harmony, which he produces through arrangement of color and form, different from anything before . . ." Aisen explained that Picasso was the pioneer of this "school of painting de l'émotion de la pensée pure". According to Aisen, therefore, Picabia was no longer painting just his emotional reactions to a subject, but he was also painting his ideas about it and emotional reactions to his ideas; in other words, his abstract paintings were conceptual, or symbolic works. Picabia himself, in the statement he made at the time of his one-man show at "291"--an exhibition which followed the Armory Show—to some extent almost echoed ideas already expressed by members of the group when he wrote that in, for example, the case of contemplating
a tree, an artist should not be conscious of "outside appearance" only, but he must be aware of the tree's "properties, its qualities, and its evolution." This statement, one might say, almost repeats Caffin's ideas about the practice of modern art paralleling that of Eastern art in that empathic identification with aspects of nature is common to both. Yet, in addition, Picabia went to great lengths to explain further his ideas about a conceptual type of abstraction when he wrote:

The qualitative conception of reality can no longer be expressed in a purely visual or optical manner; and in consequence pictorial expression has had to eliminate more and more objective formulae from its convention in order to relate to the qualitative conception.

The resulting manifestations of this state of mind which is more and more approaching abstraction, can themselves not be anything but abstraction. They separate themselves from the sensorial pleasure which man may derive from man or nature (impressionism) to enter the domain of the pure joy of the idea and consciousness.

But expression means objectivity otherwise contact between human beings would become impossible, language would lose all meaning.

Picabia, therefore, tended to stress the especial importance of abstract shapes as equivalents for ideas, and for emotions connected with such ideas.

Steichen, later in 1913, began to appreciate this point to some extent when he distinguished between the essentially realistic basis of Picasso's art and Picabia's more conceptual kind of abstraction. In considering the spread of abstraction, Steichen in a letter to Stieglitz mentioned that abstraction did not exist except in theory. "By the 'theory'," he wrote,
"I moan of course the movement which breaks away radically from representation." He classed Picasso with Cézanne and Van Gogh in that "all painted 'representation'." But he granted that Picabia on the basis of the new work he was doing might be considered an exception. Steichen described the latest work as being the result of enlarging the sketches done in New York—the subject of Picabia's one-man show at "291" in March 1913—"to the size of a house" and labelling the resulting paintings with "mysterious names." He judged the work "colossally rotten", however, because he did not believe that Picabia was achieving true self-expression.56 Da Zayas and Stieglitz shared Steichen's adverse opinion of Picabia's art, and yet de Zayas, inadvertently developing the point that Steichen had made, judged that comparatively speaking Picabia and Picasso were working quite differently, and he was anxious that the dichotomy should be illustrated at "291" by exhibiting in succession the work of both. While Picabia's work is the expression of pure thought," he explained, the result of having expressed "maybe the memory of something that has happened," Picasso's art is "the expression of pure sensibility, the action of matter on the senses and also the senses on matter." "To me, it is very interesting this [sic] two cases of plastic expression," he wrote, "and I believe that exhibiting them at "291" this point could be brought out clearly."57 Certainly de Zayas' comments about Picasso's art somewhat obscure, yet it would appear that in 1914 he was able to appreciate that even though Picasso worked from a visual model, he amalgamated his visual impressions of
it with knowledge of a conceptual kind, whereas Picabia depended entirely on memory and knowledge. And by articulating for the group such differences in working procedure, he made clear that art might be a record of emotions stimulated directly by outside reality, or it may be comparatively more conceptual; a point, one assumes, that would have been explained at "291" at the time of the Picasso and Braque exhibition of December 1914, and the Picabia exhibition which followed in January 1915.

The ground covered by the Photo-Secession critics in ten years was expansive indeed: they had moved from Romanticist ideas of the late nineteenth century, in which art was seen to be symbolic and emotive; to a conscious emulation of the East, and an explanation of those Eastern art principles on which modern artists were thought to be dependent in their aim to achieve a similar "abstract expression." Even though it might appear at first sight that there had been at "291" a succession of theories about art, it seems to me that Charles Caffin's early formulation of the concept of "abstract expression" remained central to the group's thinking. It was believed that modern artists paralleled Eastern artists by aiming to paint those of nature's properties or essences which add up to an abstract idea of nature, and which convey a sense of life. Subsequently, European art selected for exhibition at "291"—that of Matisse, Cézanne, Picasso and Picabia—was interpreted in expressionist and symbolist terms, according to the concept of "abstract expression." Nature was seen to have been reduced by Matisse and Cézanne to a schema of simplified forms expressive
of definite qualities in nature; Picasso and Picabia were seen to have invented forms as symbols for ideas and emotions generated by nature; thus by simplification of existing forms, or by inventing new forms artists achieved "abstract expression."

By considering the art produced concomitantly with the developments of these ideas at "291", one may see how Stieglitz's artists depended on the group's aesthetic. Admittedly, the numerous theoretical subtleties initiated by the critics would not have held much meaning in practice. Indeed, it is perhaps pertinent that Steichen in 1904 had little patience with what he called the "theoretical twaddle" of Sydney Allen and Roland Rood. Yet the larger outlines of the critics' ideas undoubtedly dictated the direction the American artists were to take.
CHAPTER III
THEORY AND PRACTICE

Having a flourishing art centre as a background where both artists and critics could exchange their views, a number of Stieglitz's artists discovered personal forms of art. When Max Weber returned to America from Europe, he synthesized much of what he had learned abroad, and he painted imaginative figure compositions for the first time. Yet much of the new art was in accord with aesthetic principles developed in the circle. Oscar Bluemner tended to follow Cézanne in exploring the visible world in an analytic way; John Marin and Arthur Dove interpreted their surroundings emphatically; Marsden Hartley favoured a more conceptual form of expression.

Max Weber: 1909-1911

In spite of the fact that the Stieglitz group tended to regard Weber's art as being too obviously the work of an eclectic, Weber's idea that a personal style might be reached by studying nature and by being familiar with the art of established masters enabled him to achieve some individual results.

The first paintings Weber did when he reached New York after his trip to Europe were a series of compositions on the theme of bathers. In Europe, his work had been in the form of sketches in oil made in front of his subjects, as is, for example,
The Apollo in Matisse's Studio (Ill. 5). Once in America, however, for the first time he began to work without the benefit of a model, and he examined principles of composition. Thus his work became somewhat more imaginative than previously, and it was marked by a distinct naïveté which perhaps resulted from his emulation of the Quanier Rousseau's work, and from his observation of directions Matisse was taking. Weber told Lloyd Goodrich that Summer Frolic (Ill. 6) was started in Europe and finished in America. The composition bears some resemblance to Cézanne's large painting of bathers which Weber saw in 1907 in the Cézanne retrospective exhibition in Paris. As in Cézanne's painting, he set nude figures in front of trees which are inclined slightly towards the centre of the picture. He again explored the same theme in The Bathers, 1909, and in Group of Figures, 1911. In all these paintings there are correspondences not only with figures in Cézanne's painting, but with those in Matisse's Joie de Vivre, 1905, and with Picasso's Les Demoiselles d'Avignon, 1906, paintings which Weber would almost certainly have seen since he visited the studios of both Matisse and Picasso. Weber, like Matisse, was particularly concerned with interesting and complex poses similar to those found in the Classical bacchanal. The attractive position in which one or both arms are tucked behind the head, used by both Matisse and Picasso, appears in several paintings. Also the figure picking flowers in Matisse's composition is duplicated in Weber's picture The Bathers, 1909. There are many such correspondences of pose.
Yet certain compositional characteristics seem to have been suggested by models other than pictures by Cézanne, Matisse and Picasso. One might consider, for example, Weber's tendency to separate a single figure or a group of figures from the background by means of some kind of screen. The figures to either side of The Bathers, 1909, are outlined by shapes representing hills. In Mother and Child (Ill. 7) a similar device, in this case a mountain with a cave entrance, silhouettes the figures. The same feature recurs in later work, as in, for example, The Geranium, 1911, and in The Gesture, 1929. It acts rather like a stage flat; it suggests spaciousness by being drawn in perspective, and yet it also closes off space by preventing sudden transitions into depth. Thus, in effect, the picture space is rather shallow.

In developing this feature, Weber was perhaps looking to El Greco, whose work he discovered during a visit to Spain. Another source which apparently impressed him considerably was Botticelli's Mars and Venus, a picture he would almost certainly have seen during his visit to London. The poses of Botticelli's two foreground figures appear many times in Weber's work. The female nude second from the left in Summer Frolic resembles Venus; the pose of the nude on the right in the watercolor, Study—Two Female Figures (Ill. 8), is not unlike that of Mars; the draped figure to the right in The Gesture also bears a resemblance to Mars, as does the right foreground figure in Group of Figures, 1911. Finally there is a reminiscence of this same pose in the reclining figure in Tranquility, 1928.
But in addition to taking over the attitudes of Botticelli's Mars and Venus, Weber in The Gesture also made use of a similar sculptural, frieze-like presentation, in which large figures loom in the proximity of the viewer, and are screened behind. In the centre there is a similar view of a distant landscape.

In many of these paintings, Weber has suggested spatial depth as in a Chinese landscape painting by placing a series of shapes one behind the other. Another composition belonging to his bathers series, Summer (Ill. 9), illustrates this point well. A plane to suggest the ground is not visible; rather the figures and the foliage overlap each other almost as if they are paper cut-outs. Since Arthur Dove seems to have adopted this method of composition in the series of abstract paintings known to belong originally to a set of ten called The Ten Commandments, he may certainly have learnt from Weber in this respect.

As a consideration of a number of Weber's paintings indicates, he was interested in using his large vocabulary of motifs and compositional devices in order to solve in his own way one of the technical problems of the twentieth century which was of particular concern to both Picasso and Matisse in 1907 and 1909; namely, the creation of a flattened or shallow kind of space. By 1910-11, he resolved the problem fairly successfully with a series of paintings he called "Crystal Paintings." (Ill. 10).

Arthur Dove: 1910 - 1912

Not too much is known about Arthur Garfield Dove's early development after he returned from Europe and was introduced by Maurer to Stieglitz, for the reason that he regarded his work
as experimental, and he destroyed much of what he did. Extant early work consists mainly of two sets of paintings: a series of six small oils 5" x 10", titled Abstractions No. 1 to 6 and dated 1910 on a file card in a card catalogue which Dove put together in 1932; and a number of pastels which he called The Ten Commandments. The pastels were exhibited in his first one-man show at "291" in March 1912. And they were then shown in Chicago at the Thurber Gallery immediately after the New York exhibition. A number of other pastels and charcoal drawings are of uncertain date. Yet the work Arthur Dove did from 1910 onwards is a subject of much interest, because in painting The Ten Commandments he developed an abstract idiom of an unprecedented kind. Further, dating a number of the paintings is in itself problematical and yet an important question since his first abstract works are among the first to have been done anywhere. Thus an examination of the question of dating, as well as a consideration of factors in the formation of Dove's style is in order. Fortunately, since there are a number of records, his ideas may be reconstructed to some extent. In response to a request from Arthur J. Eddy for a statement for his book about one of The Ten Commandments, called Based on Leaf Forms and Spaces,—which Eddy had purchased out of the one-man show when it was put on in Chicago immediately after the "291" exhibition—Dove wrote about how he came to paint the pastels. This statement, together with a colour reproduction of Eddy's pastel, was included in Cubists and Post Impressionists. Later, Dove wrote at greater length about the series in a statement.
for the book *Modern American Painters* by Samuel Kootz, published in 1930. Furthermore, the 1912 exhibition was well covered by the press, and the press comment is helpful in identifying some of the pastels making up the series, as F. Wight has pointed out. In addition the press reviews provide a record of Dove’s own explanations of his art given in both New York and Chicago at the time of the one-man show, and they are also of interest as a record of how new art such as Dove’s was first interpreted.

The question over which there has been controversy is, when exactly did Dove first paint *The Ten Commandments*? He told Kootz that he took them to Stieglitz in 1910 and that Stieglitz “made room for them”; the implication being that Stieglitz either exhibited them at that date—we know that he did not—or, a more likely possibility is that Stieglitz stored them until he was able to give Dove a one-man show in March 1912. Both Mullatt Smith in her thesis of 1944, and F. Wight in his monograph, assumed that Dove had been mistaken in writing 1910. Mullatt Smith inserted 1912 in brackets as the probable date, and Wight substituted 1912 for 1910 in quoting Dove’s statement from Kootz’s book. Mr. William Dove, the artist’s son, brought to my attention an undated letter Dove wrote in the forties to his friends and patrons Duncan and Marjorie Phillips, in which he dated the series of pastels 1910, adding a question mark in brackets. By the forties, therefore, the artist was by no means sure of when he painted the series. According to Wight’s description of those cards in Dove’s card catalogue which refer to specific pastels probably belonging to the set, a number of the
Commandments were assigned to either 1911 or 1912, and one or two were dated 1914. There is one card for the series which although it does not bear a date at least it gives the size of the pastels as 18" x 23". Mr. William Dove thinks that the pastels could not have been done as early as 1910 because Dove had many commitments that year; there would not have been time to reach the considerable development they show in comparison to the work done in France. Therefore, one may assume that they probably were begun in 1911 rather than in 1910; an assumption that seems reasonable when aspects of their style are considered.

When Dove returned to the United States in 1909, he spent the summer in the Connecticut woods before going to New York to work as an illustrator, a profession he had pursued before his trip to Europe. His son was born in hospital in the city in 1910, and then the family moved into a new house.6 Subsequently, Dove bought a farm in Westport Connecticut, and until 1920 he led a busy life working as a farmer, illustrating in order to supplement his income, and trying to find time to paint. Stieglitz, in a letter to his friend Herbert Saligmann, mentioned in 1920 the difficulties Dove was having in finding time for his painting and he wondered if his problems would ever be solved.7 That same year, however, in 1920, Dove left Westport and his family in favour of a life aboard a houseboat with a fellow artist, Helen Torr Weed who became his second wife. Although financial necessity forced him to continue until 1930 as an illustrator for well-known magazines, and in spite of the many daily tasks connected with running a boat, he was able to give more of his
attention to his painting. It developed considerably from 1920 up to the time of his death in 1946. From 1925 onwards one is able to follow the record of his stylistic evolution through the catalogues of his annual exhibitions at Stieglitz's two successive galleries.

The first known work that Dove did in America, the six small Abstractions, 1910, each 9" x 10", consists of a number of landscapes which are interpreted in such a way that they appear to be almost abstract. Houses, hills, trees and ground are woven into rhythmic formations, and are painted broadly. A comparison of one of these small oils, Abstraction No. 1 (Ill. 11), with one of the earlier impressionist pictures painted in the south of France, Landscape at Cannes (Ill. 3), illustrates the change in style that occurred shortly after he joined the Stieglitz group. The cohesiveness of the various parts of the later painting, such as the bending church which seems to repeat the undulating landscape and thereby becomes an integral part of it, was a new feature in Dove's work, and places him near to Kandinsky. Apparently, however, the group was not aware of Kandinsky's work, even in reproduction, until the autumn of 1912, when Marsden Hartley obtained a copy of the almanac Der Blaue Reiter in Paris and sent it to Stieglitz; Katherine Rhodes, an American art student who became one of the "291" helpers took it with her on her return to the United States. The following year, members of the group had a chance to see an original painting by Kandinsky when Stieglitz purchased Improvisation No. 27, 1912, when it was shown at the Armory Show. It may be concluded
therefore, that the similarity between Dove's work of 1910, and
Kandinsky's paintings of about the same time is fortuitous.
Possibly the small oil studies should be seen as Dove's continua-
tion of the goal towards which he and Maurer worked in France;
they wished to "simplify impressionism." But as well, new in-
fluences in the orbit of "291" may have been responsible for
certain of the features which appear in 1910. Max Weber, for
example, was treating the human figure and elements of landscape
decoratively, as in the composition called Summer (Ill. 9).
Further, Dove's fundamental conceptions about landscape painting
may have been radically revised by contact with the art of Henri
Rousseau. J. Edgar Chamberlain, writing for the New York Mail,
described one of the small paintings by the Douanier Rousseau
from Max Weber's collection which was exhibited at "291" in
November 1910: "a city landscape in which the telegraph poles
are considerably bent by the wind." Chamberlain observed that
telegraph poles "do not ordinarily bend in the wind, but it some-
how warms and comforts the imagination to see them doing it in a
picture." This particular aspect of Rousseau's work—his naively
applied logic in interpreting his surroundings—initially may have
prompted members of Stieglitz's circle to develop a similar
child-like awe in the face of the visible world: from about
1911 Marin interpreted New York City according to his view that
it was "alive"; Georgia O'Keeffe began to see man-made objects
in similar terms in 1924; Oscar Bluemner followed her example in
1927, and painted a series of watercolours of telegraph poles
and buildings all in ecstatic rhythmic motion; Dove too, in
paintings of 1929 onwards, developed the step he apparently first
took in 1910, by animating man-made and natural objects: for all these artists in time the world became a mysterious, magical place.

The subjects of The Ten Commandments ranged from recognizable landscapes and a seascape to abstract compositions. George Cram Cook in the Chicago Evening Post: Literary Review, speaks of a picture of a steeple with a tree behind it, whose dominating shapes are a cone and a polygon respectively. Apparently this picture must have been unusual because of the simplicity and geometric nature of the forms used. As Wight has pointed out, the small size of Abstraction No. 1 which conforms to Cook's description to some extent, eliminates the possibility that this could have been one of the Commandments. Wight believes that the pastel Connecticut River, a development of Abstraction No. 1, is possibly the composition Cook described, although it could be a repetition at a slightly later date of the same subject. Another pastel, Sails, made up of overlapping rounded and spiked forms, has been identified by three references to it in two New York newspapers and one Chicago newspaper respectively. In addition there are a number of abstractions described by Cook as consisting of two on wind themes "whose thematic form works like a comma," and two based on a circle and right angle: one of these last was a "design of a circle and a right angle in the color chord of green, dark yellow and light yellow"; the other suggested roofs and factory chimneys. One of the two pastels depicting the wind may be identified as Nature Symbolized No. 2 (Ill. 12), which Stieglitz kept for his collection. It was reproduced in the January, 1923, issue of The Ladies Home Journal,
to illustrate an article by Oliver Hereford, an illustrator acquaintance of Dove's. Hereford had mistakenly identified the photograph as Cow, and the painting had also been reproduced upside down. Dove noted on the cutting in his scrap-book that the pastel was "Wind on a Hillside." The same pastel was also exhibited in the Forum exhibition as Nature Symbolized No. 2, and it was reproduced in the catalogue.

Wight reports that in Dove's card catalogue Wind on a Hillside is also named Nature Symbolized No. 2, and further, that Nature Symbolized No. 1 had the title Factory Chimneys and was most probably the pastel exhibited as one of The Ten Commandments in 1912. He points out that at the time of the Forum Exhibition the pastels were all titled Nature Symbolized, possibly because Stieglitz found the title more apt, and because the series need no longer be restricted to ten.

A pastel known without doubt to have belonged to the original ten is the one called Based on Leaf Forms and Spaces (Ill. 13), which Eddy bought and reproduced in his book. Team of Horses, it has been argued, is the pastel originally titled Horse and Cart on one of Dove's file cards. Other pastels which may have belonged to the series are listed by Wight as including Movement No. 1 (Ill. 14) and Pagan Philosophy. Both are completely abstract, however, and when they are tested against Cook's description of the abstract paintings shown in Chicago--two having comma-like forms, and two being based on a circle and a right-angle--Pagan Philosophy does not fit. Its dominating colour is beige, whereas Cook describes the more
abstract of the two compositions based on a circle and a right angle as being green, bright yellow, and dark yellow, whereas the other was more naturalistic, being based on chimneys seen through an open window. Cook's description also eliminates Movement No. 1 from the circle and rectangle category, leaving the possibility that it might be the other pastel on the theme of the comma; the twin, as it were, to Nature Symbolized No. 2. Although, one might add, that in both subject and in the type of forms used, the pastel Sails could be the other picture on the theme of the comma.

When critics began to interpret Dove's achievements of 1911, they were faced with the problem of writing about the subject matter and about the new style of his work. The Chicago critic, Cram Cook, thought that the Commandments warranted new terminology. He objected to the Thurber Gallery's exhibition announcement which had indicated that the "paintings are examples of that new thought in modern art known as the Matisse movement, Post-Impressionism or the more defining term of 'expressionism'", arguing that the term Post-Impressionism was meaningless when applied to work such as Dove's since his was not "representative" painting but, he suggested, perhaps it might be called "presentative". By his ensuing comments he made it clear that by "presentative" he meant "abstract". He also pointed out that some paintings were more "presentative" than others. On the whole, however, Cram Cook was considering the formal aspects of Dove's pastels rather than their content. Somewhat anticipating Clive Bell's adoption of the term
"significant form," Cook wrote that the forms in Dove's pictures were "self-significant" and he believed that painting such as Dove's was going to affect future art: "It is going to train the eyes of all of us to see the lines and colors of a painting as self-significant.—That's the word—the self-significance of color and line—regardless of what the colors and lines represent, or whether they represent anything." But having made the point that representation was not really essential to art he retreated from such an idea because, he argued, if a painting should be completely free of representation, then it would be design. Therefore, he concluded, modern painting should "be representative and must contain design." 14

Other writers also realized that art such as Dove's needed to be described in somewhat different terms than did figurative art; Elizabeth Luther Cary, writing for The New York Times, mentioned Dove's "rich russets and greens and silvery blues" which formed pleasing shapes and colors. 15 Within the Stieglitz group, however, Paul Haviland, apparently pondering similar ideas to those of Cook's, described the pictures as "experiments in pastel of decorative design." 16 By labelling them "design," one might add, Haviland was using the vocabulary of the day as exemplified in Denman Ross' handbook, A Theory of Design which had been published in 1907. Ross wrote that there are "two modes of Drawing and Painting, the mode of Pure Design and the mode of Representation," explaining that: "By Pure Design I mean simply Order, that is to say, Harmony, Balance and Rhythm, in lines and spots of paint, in tones, measures, and shapes. Pure Design
appeals to the eye just as Absolute Music appeals to the ear.
In the practice of Pure Design we aim at Order and hope for Beauty." To a number of Dove's contemporaries, including Haviland, the new emphasis on the formal elements of a picture must have seemed to belong to the field of design rather than to painting. Even the artist's own explanations must have seemed at times to be more applicable to the field of design. According to the reporter for The Chicago Tribune:

The artist says his work is based on mathematical laws; his pictures are essays in the rhythm and harmony of colors and forms, taking their motives only remotely from nature ... all this after the manner of modern music. Modern minds, he thinks, are reaching out toward an art of pure color and form dissociated from 'representation' and the men he represents are pioneers in this movement.¹⁸

The critics evidently faced difficulties when they tried to explain exactly what Dove had achieved with his pastels. And it is not even at all certain whether or not his achievements were fully understood in Stieglitz's circle. Haviland's rather stark introduction of the Commandments in Camera Work as their being "experiments in decorative design" was hardly explicit. Others of the group, though, apparently tended to speak of Dove's new art in the terms first applied to Picasso's work in 1911. As the reviewer for the American Art News reported somewhat derisively, at the time of Dove's one-man show there was "much talk of emotion, sensation, harmony, impression, feeling," and the claim was made that his art was "'art real art' expressing individual emotion."¹⁹ Thus it would appear that although Haviland tended to view Dove's art in formal terms, others of the group saw it as a form of expressionism.
One other Chicago critic, however, touched directly on the initially non-visual nature of Dove's subjects. Putting his impressions of the exhibition into verse form under the title "Simultaneity of the Ambient," a phrase borrowed from the futurists' vocabulary, the Chicago writer Bert Leston Taylor commented on the pastel _Team of Horses:_

```
Now Mr. Dove has too much art
To show the horse or show the cart;
Instead he paints the creak and strain
It's all as simple as can be;
He paints the things you cannot see.
```

In retrospect it is obvious from the title of the rhymes alone that Leston Taylor was identifying Dove's work with that of the Futurists, which although unknown in the United States in 1912, received a good deal of publicity in March 1912, at the time the large Futurist Exhibition, travelling from Paris to London and to Berlin, was in London.

Press reports made at the time of Dove's one-man show indicate that Dove himself spoke in terms similar to those de Zayas had used in 1911 in speaking of Picasso's work. As the reviewer of the _Record Herald_ wrote, in describing his work the artist made it clear that his paintings "present no attempt at representation of form but of the abstract idea of form . . . or of some . . . sensation or emotion." He explained his pastels as being "symbols . . . of life's experiences reduced to a two-dimensional basis of line and color." When we turn to the statement Dove made the following year, in 1913, for Eddy's book, we find that he tended to take for granted the nature of his
actual perceptions of his subject, and wrote mainly about how he had arrived at his particular style. He said that he had thoroughly studied nature and works of art, including Eastern art, and had reached the conclusion that "there were a few principles existent in all good art from the earliest examples we have, through the masters to the present." One of these principles, he thought, "was the choice of the simple motif . . . a few forms and a few colors sufficed for the creation of an object." He also mentioned, however, that he was not painting objects alone but his memories of them as well: "I no longer observed in the old way, and, not only began to think subjectively but also to remember certain sensations purely through their forms and color." Dove was therefore also painting certain remembered sensations. His explanations to the reporter for *The Chicago Examiner*, made at the time of his exhibition, were perhaps the most explicit in showing his somewhat conceptual approach to nature, or, in other words, his wish to paint experiences of nature. The reporter wrote that Dove's geometrical forms were "'sensed' in nature." But the artist had also said that if he painted a storm he would not depict it in the usual way with "sweeps of gray wind over the earth, trees bending and a furious sky above;" he would "paint the mighty folds of the wind in comprehensive colors;" he would "show the repetitions and convolutions of the rage of the tempest." He would paint the wind itself rather than the effects of the wind on the landscape.22
It was a particularly interesting explanation at the time. Marin in his watercolours of 1908 had painted breezy scenes with billowing grey clouds, and then had moved to a more abstract method of working by including imaginary shapes in one or two of the watercolours of 1909 in order best to express what he felt in the face of nature. As reviewers pointed out in 1910, the blue blobs of paint with which he dottet the clouds in the watercolour _Movement, Seine, Paris, 1909_, (Ill. 15), which Stieglitz kept for his collection, make the clouds seem to move.

Hartley too had painted impressionist studies of storms about 1909. But on the whole both Marin and Hartley in 1909 tended to show how weather affected a landscape, whereas Dove wished to paint the experience of weather itself. In this distinction lies the difference between what the group would consider to be an essentially representational mode of vision and an abstract one through which abstract expression might be achieved.

When Dove later described _The Ten Commandments_, he gave a full and detailed account of his aims and procedures in painting the series. In writing about how he painted the first pastel of the series, _Wind on a Hillside_ (Nature Symbolized No. 2), he said:

> Then one day I made a drawing of a hillside. The wind was blowing. I chose three forms from the planes on the sides of the trees, and three colors, and black and white. From these was made a rhythmic painting which expressed the spirit of the whole thing. The colors were chosen to express the substances of those objects and the sky. There was the earth color, the green of the trees, and cyan blue of the sky. These colors were made into pastels carefully weighed out and graded with black and white into an instrument to be used in making that certain painting.
The admission that he wished to express "the spirit of the whole thing" may be interpreted as a desire to paint the total experience of the wind blowing in its particular locale; so that his composition was not restricted to a depiction of what had been seen, but in addition it had been necessary to invent symbols for the wind. The same may be said of a composition painted at about the time Dove wrote his statement for Kootz's book: Fog Horns, 1929, (Ill. 16), for example, is a painting in which symbols of sound reminiscent of a deep-voiced musical instrument such as a tuba are placed in the context of a definite environment of waves and sea mists; Dove's later work was basically similar to work of 1911.

But at the time of making his statement, however, rather than being concerned about the abstract symbols he invented, Dove in 1930 seems to have been particularly anxious to explain and emphasize that The Ten Commandments had been painted in accordance with a definite idea about objects in nature having what he termed a "condition of light"; a definition through which he stressed that his forms and colours were firmly based on nature. He explained that: "There was a long period of searching for something in color which I then called 'a condition of light'. It applied to all objects in nature, flowers, trees, people, apples, cows." He explained that his purpose in choosing "a condition of light" was that it was a means of expressing "the character of the life going on" in nature's individual entities. He thought that a condition of light best expressed an object's substance, or its essential properties or qualities.
And he also thought that since every object is unique, every object has its own identifying condition of light. In practice, once a colour which Dove believed best expressed an object’s condition of light had been selected from nature, he used black or white mixed in with it to obtain tonal changes. Perhaps he found it necessary to use the non-colours black and white, in order to obtain a tonal range, as a way of maintaining a chosen colour’s symbolic purity, which would be tainted if tonal changes were achieved by the addition of other colours having nothing to do with an object’s identity, or condition of light.

Dove also believed that every object had a characteristic shape which could best express it when that shape had been extracted. He later wrote: "Perhaps art is just taking out what you don’t like and putting in what you do. There is no such thing as abstraction. It is extraction, gravitation toward a certain direction."  

It can be argued, I think, that Dove’s explanation of "condition of light" closely parallels Caffin’s earlier views about art, especially his ideas about Matisse and Cézanne’s art in particular. Indeed, it would seem that the artist in 1911 had discovered a working method of achieving Caffin’s "abstract expression", or of extracting "from form its essential qualities"; a method involving the synthesis of simplified idealized shapes and certain colours obtained from nature. The pastels thought to have belonged to the series of Commandments--Sails, Nature Symbolized No. 2, Based on Leaf Forms and Spaces, Team of Horses, perhaps Movement No. 1, and Connecticut River or a pastel like
it—may, I suggest, for convenience in speaking about them, be grouped in two categories. On the one hand there are those which are related to visible nature, such as Based on Leaf Forms and Spaces; and on the other hand, there are those in which Dove has in addition added invented forms to correspond to some particular experience dependent on other than visual senses, as in Nature Symbolized No. 2, where there are forms to depict the wind. In the first set of pastels, forms have been abstracted from natural appearances by a process of simplification of what is seen, in accordance with Charles Caffin’s views about what were Matisse’s aims: namely, the extraction from nature of simplified shapes which best express the essential character or Kokoro of nature’s forms. The second group, however, conform to ideas about art put forward at “291” in 1911 by Picasso’s interpreters, according to whom abstract forms which are invented and have no relation to the visible world are equivalents of certain experiences of nature. Thus Arthur Dove’s work appears to have been inspired by the aesthetic of Charles Caffin and Marius de Zayas whose ideas must have been taken for granted in 1911, at the time Dove began his pastels. Dove may also be said to have realized Sydney Allen’s view of art; Allen thought that paintings should be “extractions, typifications, symbolizations of general laws and apparitions.”

Possibly because most critics outside Stieglitz’s circle placed emphasis mainly on the formal aspects of Dove’s work in 1912, one or two later interpreters have assumed that Dove’s early pastels were primarily Cubist in nature. Yet in spite
of the fact that Picasso's work had been shown at "291" in 1911, Dove did not take over any specific features of Picasso's style. Indeed, in discussing the question of which influences helped to form the work of all Stieglitz's artists it is necessary to bear in mind that each artist worked in accordance with the circle's ideal that true art was of an individual nature, and thus there was rarely any question of adopting definite features of another's style. Picasso's work apparently had significance for Dove, as it did for Hartley and Marin, only in so far as it showed that abstract forms need not necessarily correspond to visible reality. Furthermore, Dove, unlike Picasso, was primarily a landscape painter, and seems to have been concerned with different questions than was Picasso. Personally, I believe that especially influential in the formation of one or two features of Dove's style was Max Weber's work of about 1909. As I have suggested, Weber's influence may in part have been instrumental in prompting innovations in 1910, in the series of paintings known as Abstraction 1-6; it seems even more apparent in 1911, as a comparison of Weber's composition Summer, 1909, with Nature Symbolized No. 2, would indicate: in both paintings, compositional elements overlap one behind the other suggesting a progression of forms into depth without actually allowing the plane of the ground to be seen; so that space appears to be fairly shallow.

When Dove began to paint forms to symbolize definite experiences, such as the rotating wheels of a cart or the movement of the wind, it would seem that rather than having adopted elements of Picasso's style, he made use of Art Nouveau forms
then in vogue. Certain of the forms in Nature Symbolized No. 2 and Team of Horses, such as the curving forms and the saw-toothed motif respectively, had a precedent in Ross' handbook on design. And further, not only did Dove make use of similar forms, but he seems to have followed a number of Ross' principles of movement.

Ross noticed that a curving hooked form imagined in relation to a base line appears unstable (Ill. 17a, b); and that the eye is drawn to areas where tones are darkest (Ill. 17c), and to the point where two lines converge (Ill. 17c). In accordance with such principles, one finds that in the painting Nature Symbolized No. 2, the forms described by Chamberlain as the "large blue comma" and the "great purple comma" seem unstable; and the "upward pointing horns in light blue, dark blue and other colors" have dark toned tips.

In addition, Ross discovered that if a series of shapes—saw-toothed forms, arrows, and zigzags (Ill. 18a, b, c)—are drawn so that there is a diminution of the size of each shape and of the spaces in between, the eye is drawn to the area where the forms are in greatest concentration and there will be a sense of movement. Dove also appears to have followed this particular principle closely in using a series of saw-toothed forms in the foreground and background of Team of Horses. Such correspondences between Dove's forms and the way they were used, with the diagrams and principles set out in Ross' book would indicate that even if he did not set out deliberately to follow Ross' ideas the artist was familiar with Ross' publication. Thus it would seem that not only was Dove
dependent on the aesthetic milieu of "291" in the development of his new art, but he also absorbed a vocabulary of forms then current in America.

A further possibility that should be considered is whether or not Dove may have been influenced by Italian Futurism. In one description of his painting Nature Symbolized No. 2, he wrote that he aimed to "express the spirit of the whole thing"; a position which is comparable to that of the Futurists who wished to express "simultaneity" or the sum total of a number of experiences. But even though later Dove may to some extent have borrowed his vocabulary from the Futurists, in 1911 his pastels were painted before the Futurists' ideas were known in the United States. Indeed, in spite of the fact that Dove's 1912 one-man exhibition happened to coincide with much publicity given to the large travelling exhibition of Futurist art when it was shown in London, the movement does not seem to have been known to the Stieglitz group until this date. Marsden Hartley arrived in Paris in April 1912, and just missed seeing the large exhibition. However, Oscar Bluemner saw it in Berlin. He wrote to Stieglitz that the concept of universal dynamism did not impress him; he believed it applied only to urban subjects and he thought that there was much to be gained in studying the countryside. "They propose," he wrote, "to 'sing of motion, energy, rapidity, dynamic, modern life' etc., but forget that outside of the crazy big cities a whole world goes on peacefully." Furthermore, it is to be expected that the circle would have been somewhat critical of the Futurist movement on the grounds that
since it was backed by a manifesto then it could not be true art; it was too theoretical. As Harriet Monroe, the reporter for The Chicano Sunday Tribune remarked: "Mr. Dove and others of his particular group have little use for the 'futurists' a band of revolutionaries from Italy who are now exhibiting in Paris."36

All in all one must look for the origin of Dove's ideas about art and of the forms he used within Stieglitz's circle.

**John Marin: 1911-1913**

If Arthur Dove found his footing through interpreting nature according to the group's aesthetic, John Marin when he returned to the United States at the beginning of the summer of 1911, discovered that the city could be similarly interpreted. He first attempted the urban theme during a short visit to the States in 1910, but came upon some difficulties. He wrote to Stieglitz: "As you have no doubt been told by Haviland, the sky-scrapers struck a snag, for the present at least; so we had to push in a new direction. Haviland, Steichen and Carles saw the new direction, and it may be a step forward. Let us hope so."

It is an informative comment. Not only does it indicate when Marin first began to paint city building, but it also shows that his work was almost certainly discussed by members of the group. Even though later Marin was opposed to analytic attitudes towards art, during the early years of "291", his friends who were examining critically new trends in European art must have commented freely on what was being done in the orbit of the
gallery. In writing in *Camera Work*, in 1911, about Marin's third one-man show, Haviland mentioned that the new work "whetted our curiosity for a more comprehensive reflection of the attitude of this master of water-color towards this wonderful product of commercial and industrial giants." Thus one might conclude that Marin's friends must have been particularly helpful and encouraging at the time a significant change in style occurred in about 1912 when he turned to a distinctive form of Expressionism.

There are two schools of thought about the origin of Marin's Expressionism: some critics have thought him to have been untouched by any kind of influence, either from at home or abroad; others have pointed to correspondences with European art, and have felt that it would have been impossible for Marin to have single-handedly invented "modern art." Marin himself tended to promote the former view, possibly because he claimed to have been unaware of contemporary styles while he was in Paris:

>I didn't look at paintings much in Paris. I guess I took a couple of trips to the Louvre. But mainly I played billiards, walked about, took trips to the country.

I didn't know anything about the Impressionists at the time—although I must have seen some of their work in windows when I'd go walking, without knowing it.

The critics associated with Stieglitz and his artists from the twenties on stressed both Marin's geographical isolation and the autonomous nature of his work, and thus promoted Marin's claim. Nevertheless it has been argued that he was most likely to have been touched by foreign influence on his return to the U. S. when he became a member of Stieglitz's circle. Possibly the
few months spent in New York at the end of 1910 may have been a period when his curiosity about modern art in general was first aroused, so that on his return to Europe in 1911 he may have been somewhat more inquiring.

The watercolours and etchings on the theme of the city were done between 1912 and 1913. Marin interpreted New York in dynamic terms. Such dynamism was paralleled only in the work of the Futurists and in that of Delaunay. Furthermore, the statement Marin made in 1913, when a portion of his new work was shown for the first time, is strikingly close to Boccioni's statement in the catalogue of the 1912 travelling Futurist exhibition. The Futurists' ideas had been widely publicized by the New York press when newspapers such as The New York Sun and The Literary Digest devoted much space to them. Sheldon Reich has listed particularly telling correspondences. As he points out, one might compare Marin's declared aim to express the various forces he saw "pushing, pulling, sideways, downwards, upwards", with the Futurists' desire to paint "the dynamic sensation, that is to say, the particular rhythm of each object, its inclination, its movement, or, to put it more exactly, its interior force"; or Marin's claim: "I see great forces at work; great movements; the large buildings and the small; influences of one mass on another greater or smaller mass" with that of the Futurists: "Every object reveals itself by its lines how it would resolve itself were it to follow the tendencies of its forces ... Furthermore, every object influences its neighbors ... by a real competition of lines and by real conflict of planes,
following the emotional law which governs the picture.® Certain¬
ly, it cannot be denied that the two sets of statements have
much in common.

At the same time, one might note that in addition to being
close to the Futurists Marin said a good deal about his work
which perhaps brings his statement nearer to home. He said:

Shall we consider the life of a great city as confined
simply to the people and animals on its streets and in
its buildings? Are the buildings themselves dead? We
have been told somewhere that a work of art is a thing
alive. You cannot create a work of art unless the
things you behold respond to something within you.
Therefore if these buildings move me they too must
have life. Thus the whole city is alive; buildings,
people, all are alive; and the more they move me the
more I feel them to be alive.®

Marin's interpretation of the city in dynamic terms, therefore,
was at base an empathic identification with it. Admittedly,
Bergson's and Nietzsche's concepts of dynamism, simultaneity,
and empathic identification, were the stated intentions of the
Futurists. But there is some indication that the Futurists'
applications of such principles were not completely understood
by the group in 1912. Even though their interpretation of the
concept of universal dynamism seems to have had definite con-
notations in that Bluemner, for example, understood it to
refer to the products of modern technology alone, the idea of
simultaneity, however, does not seem to have been understood
until 1915, when Marius de Zayas as a result of his friendship
the previous year with Apollinaire, was able to define Simultan-
ism as it applied to art and literature.® Even when one comes
to consider Marin's empathic position, it seems that he interpreted
the idea of empathy somewhat differently than did the Futurists.
Whereas they wished to bring the spectator into the picture in order for him to experience fully its content, Marin wished the picture to reflect the emotion he felt in the face of the city considered to be alive: "It is this 'moving of me' that I try to express," he wrote, "so that I may recall the spell I have been under and behold the expression of the different emotions that have been called into being." It would therefore seem that even if the language of the Futurists' statement of 1912 coloured Marin's vocabulary to some extent, the nature of his aesthetic was somewhat different.

One might argue that in his earlier work, as it has been pointed out, Marin had steadily been moving towards an expressionist position. A consideration of A Rolling Sky Paris, After Storm, 1908 (Ill. 2), for example, shows his early interest in expressing the effects of weather. The following year his subjective approach was even more apparent in paintings such as Movement Seine, Paris, 1909 (Ill. 15), which became the controversial painting of his one-man show at "291" in 1910. He explained to the reporter for the Evening Mail that he had to include in his picture the large blue spots on the clouds: "they were not there," he said, "but to express my feeling they had to be there." The writer for the Newark Evening News realized that without the spots of colour the painting would be commonplace, but that "with them, the clouds move." Marin, therefore, in 1909, adopted abstract methods in order to evoke a sense of life or potential movement in his paintings.
The same may be said of the 1912 paintings; the distortions in natural appearance occurring in *The Bridge, 1912* (Ill. 19), seem in the main to have been dictated by Marin's experience of effects of weather. Indeed, the reviewer for the *New York Press* described the painting as a "view of the Brooklyn Bridge that shows the tower and roadway struck by a ninety-eight mile an hour gale from the southwest and leaning over under the blast." One is aware that the sky is as agitated as a choppy sea, and that the bridge, built up with veils of colour, appears to sway as if buffeted by the elements. Thus in this instance Marin's earlier preoccupation with effects of weather remains the dominant "subject" of the watercolour.

The swaying motion that one can discern in *The Bridge*, became even more apparent that year in a series of watercolours of downtown New York, and later, in 1913, in a series of etchings: in *Woolworth Building (The Dance)* (Ill. 20), for example, the tower-like building, foreground tenement houses, and jagged trees, seem possessed of a frantic kind of energy to the extent that Marin's newly-found dynamic world threatens to explode. Stylistically, the linear short-hand used to indicate parts of the buildings and the sky, is similar to the convention Picasso evolved in *Nude, 1910*; the drawing in Stieglitz's collection. It has been pointed out, however, that Marin's style comes close to that of Delauney: his interpretation of the Brooklyn Bridge has much in common with Delaunay's paintings of the interior of St. Severin; further Marin's interpretation of the Woolworth Building seems related to Delaunay's pictures of the Eiffel Tower.
Indeed, it is possible that even if Marin did not see any of Delaunay's paintings in Paris, he may have seen some in reproduction. One source is the almanac Der Blaue Reiter in which a version of the Eiffel Tower is reproduced; an illustration Marin may have seen since Hartley sent a copy of the almanac to Stieglitz towards the end of 1912. Yet Marin's image of a tall building in Woolworth Building (The Dance), differs from that of Delaunay, however, in that it appears to swell and sway as if blown by the wind, and it thus appears to be part of nature. Basically, Marin's is a naive interpretation of the visible world, comparable to Dove's view of nature in his Abstractions 1-6. It is conceivable that both Marin and Dove may initially have been inspired by Henri Rousseau who painted the telegraph poles in a city landscape, exhibited at "291" in 1910, as if they were being blown about by the wind. Therefore, it would seem that Marin, unlike Delaunay, was not interested in formal properties per se, but rather he distorted and sometimes somewhat dislocated buildings for the specific purpose of expressing the life with which he imagined them possessed and he rhythmically animated them in tune with the effects of weather.

In view of the theoretical concerns of Stieglitz's group at the time, it is not surprising that Marin should have developed this almost pantheistic aspect of his art. Perhaps one might say that in 1912 and 1913 the content of Marin's art was much the same as in 1909, but that in the meantime he had developed a more effective way of expressing that content. An acquaintance with Picasso's work and perhaps with Delaunay's, may have helped
him to develop his style, while aspects of Futurist statements may also have reinforced his ideas. At the same time, the group's acceptance of Bergson's empathic position, of Eastern art, and of the implications of such ideas—that the artist should seek the essential character of the objects of the visible world—as well as the group's emulation of irrational interpretations of reality, must have been perhaps the most significant influences of all in directing Marin's imaginative treatment of his subject, and in reinforcing his earlier propensity to paint his reactions to his surroundings. As a result, Marin achieved the "abstract expression" advocated by his colleagues at "291".

Marsden Hartley: 1911-1913

While Dove and Marin were evolving their own art forms at home, Marsden Hartley's discovery of a personal style of abstraction occurred after he went abroad in April 1912. Before leaving the United States, he had reached a degree of maturity as an artist when he interpreted nature empathically in a group of paintings which recall Ryder, an artist whom Hartley discovered and admired. Once he came in contact with European art at "291", and then in the art capitals of Europe, his paintings changed considerably.

Undoubtedly, during the first part of his stay in Europe he became somewhat eclectic. Yet his aesthetic position was strong enough for him to form an individual style from the influences he absorbed, rather than that such influences dictated the content of his painting. He was in full agreement with the
theoretical position of Stieglitz's circle; indeed, the group's beliefs made him selective in the European art he admired because he found himself to be in sympathy with only a handful of his contemporaries. Hartley admitted that he was particularly attracted by Bergson's theory of intuition which had been especially popular with the circle. Encouraged by this theory he proceeded to develop a visionary kind of art, and he became adversely critical of many of his European contemporaries whom he thought too cerebral in their methods. His detailed observations in his letters to Stieglitz on the art he saw in Paris and in Germany both reflect and reinforce those ideas held in common by members of the circle. Hartley especially upheld de Casseres' and Allen's view that intellect and intuition are in opposition. One result of keeping to this position was that he tended to underestimate the work of Kandinsky whose knowledge and analytic way of thinking, Hartley believed, excluded the possibility that such a fine theorist could also be a good painter. He also tended to dismiss Kupka's art which he saw in the 1912 Salon d'Automne as being the result of theory. As he told Stieglitz, he thought both Kupka and Kandinsky relied more on philosophy than on experience. His opinions about Delaunay's work, however, fluctuated between admiration and thinking it "like a demonstration for chemistry or the technical relations of colors and sound." Nevertheless, in spite of such judgements, he apparently learned much from all three painters: freely drawn linear abstract shapes, much like those of Kandinsky, and discs of brightly coloured
concentric rings which Delaunay and Kupka first used in 1912 appear in his work from about 1913. The two artists from whom he benefited most, though, were Picasso and Franz Marc respectively: through seeing Picasso's work Hartley first moved to abstraction, and later, after coming in contact with paintings by Marc, the content of subsequent pictures became noticeably more profound.

Before Hartley went to Europe, the European artists whose work he admired above all, and who initially influenced him, were Cézanne and Picasso. Stieglitz had shown Cézanne's work for the first time in an exhibition of lithographs in November 1910, together with work by Renoir, Manet, Toulouse-Lautrec, and drawings and paintings by Henri Rousseau from Max Weber's collection. Cézanne's watercolours were exhibited from March 1 to 25, 1911, and were followed in April by the first exhibition in the United States of Picasso's work. Hartley recorded that Cézanne's paintings suggested to him the value of doing "nothing but still life." He decided to try and "put down with a sense of authority" various aspects of the still life, searching "some days for form only" and exploring colour on other days. He thought it "good to get at this problem of expressing the impersonal—things without mood—things existing for themselves only as shapes and forms with color." "Cézanne seems to have shown", he wrote, "how personal we can become through striving to express the impersonal." 54

As well as seeing the "291" exhibitions, Hartley, before he left for France, looked at reproductions in Meyer Graefe's
book on Cézanne, and also Arthur B. Davies took him to see nine of Cézanne's paintings in a private collection. But apparently it was the Picasso exhibition of 1911 which reinforced his decision to work in a new way. He wrote to Stieglitz: "I am setting aside entirely the mood of nature and interesting myself wholly in the problem and its rendering... Picasso taught me much on this point—the pure beauty of the problem itself... I do not find him as edifying however—in his viewpoint as Cézanne."

According to Stieglitz, however, Hartley's first acquaintance with Picasso's work had impressed him so much that he "sat daily for hours" in front of the exhibits. Stieglitz inscribed on the back of the small watercolour Landscape No. 32: "First painting he made after the Picasso exhibition at '291' in 1911." This small landscape with a house in the background is made up of a linear network of spiky shapes, mostly trapezoids and triangles. It would appear that at the time it was made it was an isolated experiment, yet it would seem that in painting it Hartley faced for the first time the possibility of an abstract art, which he further examined in Europe after seeing Picasso's next move to an even more apparent form of abstraction.

Hartley had arrived in Paris by April 13, 1912, and he sought out American friends—Steichen, Maurer, Carles and Jo Davidson—who already were working there. He visited Steichen frequently at his home in Voulangis. Another friend, Lee Simonson, offered the use of his studio in Paris until such time as the newcomer could rent one himself. In the meantime, as well as seeing American friends, Hartley made a number of new friendships;
a "small German Coterie" which included the sculptor Arnold Ronnebeck, and Ronnebeck's cousin Karl von Freybourg who was an officer in the German army. Hartley's affection for von Freybourg resulted in some of his finest symbolic portraits of his friend after the young man was killed on October 7, 1914, at the beginning of the war. Gertrude Stein also proved to be a helpful friend. The artist frequented her Saturday evening soirees and he thought that Stein's home was the one place in Paris which bore comparison with "291". She admired the early abstract paintings, and Hartley, in turn, was inspired by her writing; he thought she had achieved "a new sense of depth" in the use of language, through which she was able to reach "new places of consciousness." He told Stein that he aimed to achieve similar results in his paintings by expressing "a fresh consciousness as to what I see and feel around me—taken directly out of life and from no theories or formulas as prevails so much today."^59

Through Hartley's letters to Stieglitz, the sequence of his development in 1912 and 1913 may be followed, although the letters indicate only the broad outlines of stylistic change. Indeed, the difficulties of assigning definite dates to known works are indicated in Elizabeth McCausland's research papers: many paintings which had been classified in the photographic record, initially assembled by the American Art Research Council and to which McCausland added, are assigned to either 1912 or 1913, and sometimes to both years.

Hartley wrote that he began work from about July 1912 on the problems of still life; in other words he was continuing to
work on the subject he was concerned with before leaving for Europe. Then, in about October, he turned to a form of abstraction, examining, he told Stieglitz, "an issue out of Picasso." The new paintings were termed "intuitive abstractions," and he thought the work unlike anything that had been done before: "It is not like Picasso—it is not like Kandinsky, not like any 'cubism'—it is what I call for want of a better name subliminal or cosmic cubism."  

A major difficulty today lies in determining to which paintings Hartley was referring when he spoke of his intuitive abstractions. Since the term "abstract" may not necessarily have implied that his work was unrelated to perceivable forms, he could have been speaking of either of two groups of work: a number of purely imaginary compositions which exhibit varying degrees of complexity as he apparently added different kinds of calligraphic motifs, and different and more complex shapes, as the series progressed (Ill. 21); or, he could have meant a group of paintings which seem abstract because the still life subject has been interpreted in symbolic terms (Ill. 22). Indeed, it seems likely that he was referring to both sets of work, which one could describe respectively as being formally and conceptually abstract. According to Hartley, most of these paintings were 40" x 30"; a description which applies to a number of primarily formal abstractions recorded by McCauland, as well as to a number of the symbolic still lifes.  

Hartley moved to abstraction by progressing from the still life subject to a "purely spiritual rendering of forms
in space." A visit to the Trocadero was decisive in inspiring him to work in a new way, and he reported to Stieglitz that in addition he found growing in him a recurrence of former religious aspirations. Mainly however, changes were brought about "out of the heat of the reading" which for years he had meant to do; especially "James pragmatism—slight touches of Bergson—and directly through . . . fragments of mysticism . . . of [Jacob] Bohme—Eckardt, Tauler, Silesius—and Ruysbroek and the Bhagavad Gita." He found helpful a book on cosmic consciousness by Maurice Bucke and he also looked to Novalis. But his first inspiration "came from the mere suggestion of Kandinsky's book the Spiritual in Art."64

Hartley mentioned his interest in both Über das Geistige in der Kunst and the almanac Der Blaue Reiter in September 1912, and he promised to send both to Stieglitz so that the group at "291" would feel in touch with developments in Europe. He wrote that the almanac was particularly helpful in connection with his visit to the Trocadero in that the book, coupled with his visit to the museum, prompted him to work in a new direction. His imperfect grasp of German prevented him from reading Kandinsky's book, but he found that "the mere title opened up the sensation" for him. "What I have to express", he wrote, "coincides perfectly with his notion of Das Geistige in der Kunst."65

The almanac would also have served as an introduction to Kandinsky's work; perhaps it was the reproductions of a number of Kandinsky's paintings, as well as the little he was able to
read in the book that led him to conclude that Kandinsky was attempting to paint music. He wrote to his niece, Norma Berger, that his own new work was "the equivalent of sound in color" and that only one other artist in Europe was working on similar themes; however, Hartley felt that he was a pure theorist.66 By the time the English translation—The Spiritual in Art—was published in 1914, and Hartley was able to appreciate more fully Kandinsky's ideas, he felt confirmed in his opinion that Kandinsky was a theorist and therefore not an artist, and his enthusiasm for the book abated:

It reads well—though I think it is really more for an untutored public than for the more or less sophisticated in matters relating to the subject. I think some things a little over done on the side of the spiritual—It is what one might say in one's house or privately but in a book it savours too much of creeds that have nothing to do with art proper—Hawryar—It will have its effect somewhere . . . 67

In considering this view of Kandinsky's writing, however, one should bear in mind that in 1914 Hartley perhaps undervalued it partly because he was anxious to be thought free of Kandinsky's influence. As McCausland has pointed out, Hartley denied that he had been influenced by Kandinsky, despite the fact that he may be seen to have explored in a number of his abstract paintings points Kandinsky made about the existence of ideal forms such as the triangle, the circle and the rectangle, and the relation of painting to music;68 indeed, a number of Kandinsky's ideal forms appear in, for example, Painting No. 2 (Ill. 21). Stieglitz also tended to support the idea that Hartley was free of Kandinsky's influence by claiming that he purchased Improvisation No. 27 so
that the artists at "291" might become familiar with it, but also because he wanted to show that Hartley had not been influenced by the European. 59

We know that apart from being stimulated by his current reading, Hartley looked to Picasso soon after he arrived in Paris. In July 1912, he described some of Picasso's new work on exhibition:

Just now he is doing things that have running over and across these net work designs—names of people and words like "jolies" or "bien" and numbers like 75 . . . Usually vary small often in oval frames . . . Sometimes I think it gets closer to the futurists' idea and then again I don't know. 70

Hartley's reference to the "futurists' idea" reminds one that he would have come in contact with the Futurists' policies in March 1912, when their various statements were published by the American press at the time of the travelling Futurist exhibition.

The stylistic impact of Picasso's new work may be seen in both Hartley's abstract paintings and the symbolic still lifes which were the immediate successors to the naturalistic still lifes he painted before and shortly after he arrived in Europe. Both sets of work contain network designs and words respectively. A still life such as Handsome Drinks (Iil. 23) is composed of simplified naturalistic objects, imagined forms, and words. The simplest of the abstractions, however, are perhaps closer to the type of paintings Picasso was doing in 1911, in that they consist of mainly rectangular forms lapped one behind the other. When Hartley included other shapes in his paintings, as in Painting No. 2 (Iil. 21), he embellished them with calligraphic motifs—
such as sickle shapes, S curves, interlocking circles, and eight-pointed stars—motifs with which he most probably came in contact in various museums. In November, shortly after beginning his abstract works, he visited Britain, and was especially attracted to Assyrian and Egyptian art in the British Museum; such art may have been a possible source of many of the motifs he used.

In January 1913, he visited Berlin and Munich on the suggestion of his German friends in Paris—the sculptor Ronnebeck and his cousin Karl von Freybour. In Munich he spent an hour with Kandinsky, Gabrielle Munter and Franz Marc; he also saw and admired Marc's work at the Tannhauser Gallery. He told Stieglitz in February, after he had returned to Paris that he found himself moving in a similar direction to that of the leaders of the Blaue Reiter group:

No one has presented just this aspect of the modern tendency—Kandinsky is theosophic—Marc is extremely psychic in his rendering of the Soul life of animals—it is this which constitutes the most modern tendency which without knowing until I have been to Munich—I find myself directly associated."

It would seem that in remarking about the psychic nature of his art, Hartley was following a line of thought marked out by de Zayas who had been in Paris in 1910 to 1911 when the Cubist movement first came into prominence. De Zayas was one of the earliest interpreters of Cubism; as it has been suggested, his statement of 1911, which accompanied the first Picasso one-man show at "291", was both in keeping with Caffin's earlier definition of the modern artist's intentions, and it was also a refinement of it in that de Zayas attempted an explanation of
Picasso's abstraction. De Zayas wrote that Picasso's Cubist works of 1910 were the visual equivalents of mental and emotional reactions to subject matter. And further, one might note, de Zayas suggested that such mental and emotional reactions were psychic, or spiritual. Thus when Hartley speaks of his paintings as expressions of psychic states, or externalizations of the spiritual, one should bear in mind that the term "psychic" at the time Hartley was writing had definite connotations; apparently it did not connote—as perhaps it does today—an otherworldly, mysterious state of mind. Rather, it referred to a predominantly emotional view of reality. Hartley's point of view was an expressionist position that had sprung up almost simultaneously in a number of centres, being common to the Blaue Reiter group, to a few of the Cubists, to the Futurists, and to Stieglitz's group in New York.

Until April 1913, when he went to live in Berlin, Hartley continued the mystic themes he had begun before travelling to London and Germany, and he added five more canvases to the fifteen he had told Stieglitz were completed before his trip. He visited Delaunay's studio in March and saw L'Equipe de Cardiff in the process of being painted. When he left Paris for Germany in April, he stored four of the twenty new canvases with Gertrude Stein, who admired greatly Hartley's new work, thinking it quite original in that he had not referred to outside reality at all, but had created a purely visionary art.
Berlin: April to November, 1913

The first time Hartley saw Germany in January, 1913, he was immediately drawn to the country. He found the people friendly, the cities clean, and he enjoyed different gatherings of artists and literati. He especially liked "the spirit of natural gaiety in German life itself." With financial help from Paul Strand, he was able in April to transfer his belongings to Berlin, and to stay there until November. En route to Berlin, he established a friendship with Franz Marc, staying at his home in Sédelsdorf, a small town in upper Bavaria. Once in Berlin, he found that military parades were almost daily events. These were in honour of a forthcoming royal wedding, and Hartley found them to be visually most stimulating. By August, he told Stieglitz that Berlin is "full of mystical ideas and colors and I have begun to paint them." He wrote to Gertrude Stein: "There is an interesting source of material here—numbers and shapes and colors ... It is essentially mural this German war of living—big lines and large masses—always a sense of the pageantry of living." He sent her two postcards of the parades he admired, one of which was a photograph of the Kaiser and Crown Prince mounted on horses among members of their guard. Hartley remarked on the beauty of the flags, adding that the parade stimulated his early love of the pageant.

He began to incorporate some of the motifs he saw in his new paintings. Portrait of Berlin (Ill. 24), for example, although compositionally akin to earlier abstractions such as Painting No. 2, 1913, in the way large abstract forms overlap each other,
thereby forming a shallow pictorial space, takes on a new significance because of naturalistic motifs also included in the picture—the Imperial horse guardsman in the roundel in the right foreground, the shadowy forms of warriors at the top of the picture, and the central image of Buddha. In this painting, too, Hartley worked on a much larger scale than previously. By the time he left for the United States in November, he had seventeen large-scale paintings ready for exhibition.78

The combination of conceptual abstract images, such as the triangle and circle, with figurative motives such as the Imperial horse guardsman and the Buddha, indicates that Hartley was reaching towards a literary kind of symbolic art, somewhat akin to Marc's, in order to communicate definite ideas. Nevertheless, it is doubtful that his paintings had precise meanings at this stage of his development. As he told Stieglitz:

What I have to express is not handled with words—It must "come" to the observer—It must carry its influence over the mind of the individual into that region of him which is more than mind. The pictures must reach inward into the deeper experiences of the beholders—and . . . they are in no sense religious tracts—there is no story to them, no literature—no morals— they are merely artistic expressions of mystical states—those in themselves being my own personal emotions, as drawn from either special experiences or aggregate ones . . . I am simply painting vivid sensations of finite and tangible things.79

Speaking of his capacity to visualize abstract shapes and concepts, he wrote: "when the thought 'golden triangle' comes into mind—I see that triangle—I have a real vision of it—and so with the other shapes." As he worked he felt as if he were painting in accordance with "a kind of dictation from somewhere."80
The fact that Hartley was now amalgamating visualized abstract forms, which had first appeared in 1912 in his abstract series of paintings, with forms he had actually seen, is a significant step in his development in that eventually it resulted in a distinctive kind of symbolic art in which complex ideas are embodied in commonplace, everyday objects.

The painting *Raptus*, is an example of Hartley's capacity to visualize forms; it is made up of a cruciform structure set in front of concentric rings, with at the bottom circular forms and the word "raptus"; the colours are "a lightish Persian blue, vermilion and pale yellows and whites." In an autobiography, Hartley mentioned at a later date that this was a picture of the word "Rapture": "I had for years always wanted to do it over", he wrote, "as I had learned the meaning of the word better... but it was an attempt at a portrait of a word."\(^1\)

Soon after he arrived in Berlin, Hartley received a visit from Kandinsky, Munter, Block and Marc. They praised his work highly, but felt that he needed more experience. Marc told him that in time much more could be achieved with form and colour; he felt that in particular his colour was too simple. Kandinsky pointed out technical indiscretions which Hartley chose to discount. As he told Stieglitz: "Kandinsky volunteered a discourse on the law of form—that of the individual as applied to the universal—mainly a discourse on technical indiscretions which however left me unmoved."\(^2\)

Marc's influence apparently resulted in Hartley's turning to the subject of the spiritual state of inanimate objects.
In late May he mentioned to Stieglitz:

I have one canvas "Extare d’aeroplane" ... It is my notion of the possible extasy [sic] or soul state of an aeroplane if it could have one—likewise that same soul quality of an automobile—These are of necessity symmetrical in design because the objects themselves are such—In the pictures which are in the nature of individual interior states—the forms are naturally varied.83

The paintings referred to seem to have been lost. Although one composition called The Aero, may have been a version of one of the compositions.84

In June, Hartley was also preoccupied with the visual and conceptual significance of numbers, and subsequently numbers were included in the new paintings. It seems probable that Hartley's interest in mysticism led him to consider numerology to some extent since he wrote to Gertrude Stein: "I wish we had some wireless all our own so I could send down a shaft from 4 and you could send up some from 27 [Rue de Fleurus] --4 is my house number --I must learn what 4 means"; in August he also wrote: "I like what your Spanish waiter said about the numbers—I have seen some wonderful ones here, especially a green three."85 Probably Hartley was referring to numbers he saw in the military parades, or he may have been visualizing them. That same month he wrote to Stieglitz: "I am finishing a large mystical presentation of the number 8 as I get it from everywhere in Berlin ... one sees the eight pointed star—all the kings wear it over their heart—the soldiers on the forehead."85 It would seem that in this instance Hartley had in mind the metal decorations worn by the Kaiser, and also present on soldiers' helmets. But the significant point is that he seems to have singled out the figure eight
and the eight-pointed star as symbols possessed of special significance; he mentioned to Stein:

I was told before I came to Berlin to look for 8-pointed stars—and I am seeing them everywhere—on the foreheads of hundreds of people—in the breasts of some and on two I have seen them on the crown of the head—the Kaiser wears it always—Frederick the Great did also—over the heart—the occults say it has a deep symbolism—but I don’t know so far as that—I only know that it is a much prettier star than the American five-point—much more radiant and life giving—and in the sunlight on all the hundreds of foreheads it looks like real fire—yellow and white fire—not red even. . .

Although Hartley in June 1913 was not too concerned with the meanings of the eight-pointed star, he tended to think of it as being “radiant and life giving.” As he most probably realized, the eight-pointed star was a symbol of the cross. But in addition numerologists apparently ascribe definite meanings to the number eight thinking it to be the most powerful of all numbers, symbolizing strength, success, war and destruction. Hartley wrote that “there is a real reason for all these signs but it remains mystical—and explanations are not necessary.”

The puzzling nature of Hartley’s iconography in general of 1912 and 1913 is perhaps well exemplified in the painting entitled One Portrait of One Woman (Ill. 21). McCausland thought that it may be an abstract portrait of Gertrude Stein because the repetition of the word “one” in the title is a repetitive device employed by Stein in her short essays on Picasso and Matisse in Camera Work. Another possibility, it seems to me, is that Hartley was painting a symbolic portrait of the Madonna, as well. Perhaps he was drawing an analogy between Stein and the Madonna, as seen by artist friends; the “Moi” of the painting being Hartley himself, who worshipped at her feet.
One Portrait of One Woman is almost Surrealist in the way familiar still life objects appear because of their juxtapositions to be other than they are. The arrangement of a teacup and apparently an inverted teaspoon inside it, standing centrally placed on a checkerboard cloth, with candles to either side of it and a textile with a motif which resembles an enlarged Indian tepee design behind it, may also be read as a Madonna, silhouetted against a mandorla, and standing between columns. It is tempting to suggest that Kandinsky's ideas such as those in a translated excerpt from Über das Geistige in der Kunst, published in Camera Work, in which Kandinsky writes of Cézanne, may have been helpful at the time Hartley was interested in interpreting the still life symbolically:

Cézanne knew how to put a soul into a tea cup, or, to speak more correctly, he treated the cup as if it were a living thing. He raised 'nature morte' (still-life) to that height where the outer dead things become essentially living. He treated things as he treated human beings, because he was gifted with the power of seeing the inner life of everything . . .

One might note that Stieglitz probably had included this excerpt in Camera Work in the first instance because it reinforced similar views about the inner life of nature's objects articulated for the group originally by Charles Caffin. Hartley almost repeated Kandinsky's sentiments in the catalogue statement for the Forum Exhibition of 1916, when One Portrait of One Woman was shown. "Objects are incidents," he wrote, or they can have meaning, "an apple does not long remain an apple if one has the concept"; an idea which would indicate that Hartley thought still life elements might be given symbolic significance. Indeed, in his
later work, on German themes, still life objects, together with numbers, are in a number of canvasses used with a consistency which strongly indicates they were meant as a set of symbols having definite meanings.

The significance of both *One Portrait of One Woman* and *Raptus* becomes noticeably more complex when their resemblance to votive paintings is observed. The same may be said of the painting *Berlin Ante War* (Ill. 25), the colour scheme of which repeats that of *Raptus* and thus suggests that it was painted at about the same time. But whereas *One Portrait of One Woman* and *Raptus* may be said to be paintings of imaginary altars, *Berlin Ante War* in its format bears a close resemblance to an actual altar-piece, in having a large image in the upper part, and small predella scenes, so to speak, below. A consideration of the iconography of this picture, as I hope to show later, further confirms one's impression that *Berlin Ante War* was intended as a form of votive painting. In October 1912, Hartley, one might note, informed Stieglitz that he found growing in him "a recurrence of former religious aspirations—taking a fine form in personal expression." When he wrote this, it may have been the earliest of this series of symbolic paintings that he had in mind.

In future paintings, Hartley was to reach a greater clarity in the presentation of his subject; a development which new interests at "291" seem to have helped precipitate. In the short space of two years he had developed rapidly; moving from a Cézanne-like interpretation of the still life to different kinds of abstraction.
Thus ultimately Hartley, as did Dove and Marin, looked to the forms of the visible world in order to express ideas about reality. Yet unlike his colleagues, Hartley employed realistic elements to point beyond themselves; he regarded them as vehicles of a literary kind of symbolic expression, and it is apparent that at times the significance with which they were endowed was often of his own making. One is reminded that Hartley, as did others of the group, much admired the poet Maurice Maeterlinck's brand of fantasy. As he was to write to Stieglitz in June 1914, he particularly liked an essay by Maeterlinck on horses "who tell their owners by self-invented signs what they wish to say."

In time, Hartley used his invented vocabulary as a way of commenting on man's situation in the face of war. Perhaps it was his way of restoring to man his dignity. Of war he wrote:

I find it personally the most unspeakable humiliation ever offered to a sincere human being. I find myself wanting to be an Indian—to paint my face with the symbols of that race I adore; go to the West and face the sun forever—that would seem the true expression of human dignity.93

Oscar Bluemner: 1913-1914

In one of the essays that Bluemner contributed to Camera Work, entitled "Some Plain Sense on the Modern Art Movement", and written in the wake of the Armory Show, he summarized the history of late nineteenth and early twentieth-century European art, stressing in particular the importance of Cézanne. The first part of his article is a diatribe against the official art establishment's reaction to the international exhibition, but in the second part he demonstrates his comprehensive, if
perhaps somewhat blinkered view of the stylistic trends of the time. Van Gogh and Cézanne, he wrote, represent two different points of view: the former "analysed emotional impression and the possibilities of its pictorial equivalents" and he painted flat, decorative forms inspired by Japanese art; whereas Cézanne "reduced form to simple geometrical variations, color to contrasts of hues, light to gradations of tone" and he acquired "depth of space." Matisse and Picasso, Bluemner believed, were continuing these two diverging trends and yet they attached more value to the "technical elements" of art—that is to form, colour and tone—than had been the case before, because these elements were expressive in themselves: "Picasso, Matisse and their followers go another step further toward abstract expression, in so far as they simplify the still natural complexity of Cézanne's and Van Gogh's impressions by enlarging the units of line, color and tone. This implies simpler compositions and larger harmonies."

When one considers Bluemner's statement, it seems apparent that his use of Caffin's term "abstract expression" in itself indicates that Bluemner was accepting Caffin's aesthetic; further, it would seem that in general the artist was synthesizing Caffin's ideas about the nature of art. In particular, as a comparison of his statement with Caffin's would show, he was reiterating Caffin's interpretation of Cézanne's aims, as well as the belief that Matisse had simplified natural forms in order "to free and widen the power of art by abstracting ... pure artistic expression from concrete imitation." And the result was thought to be "abstract." Yet, unlike Caffin, Bluemner apparently did not
understand fully the meaning of abstract expression as Caffin had defined it; rather he saw abstract expression as being primarily a simplification of visible nature. If Dove and Marin had assumed Caffin's position in believing that the modern artist sought definite qualities in nature comparable to, and perhaps much the same as, the Oriental artist's aim to express the Kokoro of the components of the visible world, Bluemner, however, tended to concentrate on the purely formal aspects of painting—tone, line and colour—thinking them expressive in themselves. Perhaps it is significant that when subsequently in the twenties he became interested in Eastern art his interpretation of subject matter became of greater importance to him, and only then did his art have much in common with that of other members of Stieglitz's group. Even though as early as 1914 he believed that man must project "his soul, his ideas, thoughts and sentiments" into reality, "and thus combining personality with the impersonal he has a vision and this vision recreated" is art, only later does he seem to have wished to create a visionary kind of art by giving new kinds of meanings to material objects.

One might also note that in 1913 Bluemner did not discuss the fact that Picasso in his Cubist work had moved beyond what Bluemner then took to be the crux of modernism, the simplification of natural form, and that Picasso was inventing new forms. Rather, modern artists, he believed, were "concerned in realizing a new pictorial precision of form (Cubists) or a new arrangement of the imitative elements (Futurists)." Apparently, it was Cézanne's work, which he saw Picasso continuing, that held
more interest for him in 1913 than did Picasso's. Indeed the kind of work Blumner himself was doing at about that time seems to have been inspired precisely by those technical principles which he believed Cézanne had initiated.

One might consider the painting *Form and Light Motif, West New Jersey* (Ill. 26), which is one among a group of eight paintings all about 30" x 40" in size, a number of which were included in Blumner's one-man show at "291" in 1915 and in the Forum Exhibition at the Anderson Galleries in 1916. Between about 1912 and 1915, Blumner used a fairly thick impasto so that the brush strokes are visible, and he signed his paintings of this period "Oscar Blumner" in script, but he did not date them.

The composition of trees, a waterfall, foreground hills, part of a house in profile which acts as a border, a pond, distant hills and clouds, is painted with almost a machine-like precision. There is a disturbing sense of unreality and stillness expressed through the uncompromising analysis of spatial relations and forms; shapes are offset crisply against each other by means of maximum tonal contrasts, bringing edges into sharp relief. Blumner's training as an architect perhaps was responsible for his essentially analytic approach to his subjects. At the same time, one might bear in mind that Marius de Zayas was advocating that the artist analyse his reactions to nature in order to make such reactions communicable. As Blumner wrote in 1914, one receives a complicated set of impressions from nature which involve all the senses. And if the understanding which results from such perception is to be communicated one should do "as
the architect does, plan, project, dissect, crossect, measure, color, and describe a body in a number of pictorial statements.\(^{100}\)

One might point out that in developing his style during these years, Bluemner may have benefited to some extent from seeing the work of Dove and Hartley at "291" where Stieglitz stored paintings. The way the clouds follow the line of the hills in *Form and Light Motif, West New Jersey*, is a feature Hartley invented in his impressionist landscapes of about 1909. Too, the placement of similar, simplified forms one behind the other, in order to create spatial recession is found in Dove's work of 1911. Originally, however, both Dove and Bluemner may have looked to Max Weber's paintings, since Weber was the first of the American artists to use this particular method of composition. One might compare, for example, *Red Farm at Pochuk* (Ill. 27) with Weber's composition *Summer, 1909* (Ill. 9); the repetitive forms in *Summer* which are somewhat flat and have the appearance of cardboard cut-outs, as well as the simple yet chunky forms of the foliage, may also be found in Bluemner's picture. Even though Weber left the group in 1911, he had a one-man show at the Newark Museum in 1913 which Bluemner may have seen.

There are paintings which on stylistic grounds appear to have been painted after *Form and Light Motif, West New Jersey*—such as *An Expression of a Silktown in New Jersey, 1914*,\(^{101}\) and *Red Farm at Pochuck*—in which Bluemner used simpler shapes. In *An Expression of a Silktown in New Jersey*, the water is made up of a series of triangles and ellipses, and there are a series of
bands in the sky which outline chimneys and roofs. The same kind of banding appears in Red Farm at Pochuck, as does an even more apparent reduction of forms to more abstract shapes. It would seem that in 1914 Bluemner was achieving an expressionist form of art by means of simplification and by repetition of nature’s forms.

In practice, the application of theoretical premises allows for a wide variety of interpretations, as an examination of the work of a number of Stieglitz’s artists indicates. Arthur Dove, in 1911, simplified visible natural forms, and he invented symbolic forms to represent experiences dependent on senses other than sight; John Marin interpreted empathically the then new subject of New York City, in order to make it seem “alive”; Marsden Hartley invented a personal form of symbolism; Oscar Bluemner analysed and simplified natural and man-made objects; all these forms of art were each artist’s interpretation of “abstract expression.” As other interests came to the attention of members of the group at the time Marius de Zayas and Francis Picabia were developing an art of primarily a conceptual nature, the work of Hartley, Marin and Dove gradually became somewhat different.
CHAPTER IV
"291": ITS LATER EVOLUTION

The Changing Face of "291"

In March, 1913, at the time of the Armory Show in New York, Stieglitz reported to Hartley that "291 is still the storm center in spite of the Big Show."1 Avant-garde art continued to be shown at the small gallery: Marin's watercolours on the theme of New York were exhibited in January; and two days after the Armory Show closed, Picabia was given a one-man show, from March 17 to April 5, of work that had been inspired by New York. Apparently the city had helped Picabia to create an original style which tended to fit his notions of pure art.2

The two large paintings that Picabia exhibited in the Armory Show, Dancers at the Spring, and Procession Seville, were compositions made up of complex, faceted forms based on visual reality. Soon after reaching New York, however, Picabia's work changed noticeably as he reached a degree of abstraction which must have appeared startlingly new to the members of the Stieglitz group with whom Picabia became friendly. In the sketch New York (Ill. 28), for example, triangular and curved forms abound, and flat paper-like shapes float arbitrarily in space, often overlapping each other and thereby evoking a sense of depth. It is quite possible that Picabia's closeness to the New York group may
have helped to bring about the change in style: the greater breadth and clarity he achieved in the sketches may in part have arisen because the group helped the European to clarify his ideas about art, which, as it has been pointed out, were particularly close to ideas already current at "291": the group may also have helped him to find practical means of realizing such ideas. Many of the new features of his style—a consciousness of depth, and flattened two-dimensional shapes—perhaps were prompted by contact with Arthur Dove's art which Picabia is recorded to have admired. Dove's pastels, *The Ten Commandments*, were stored at the gallery; when the two men compared their ideas they found that they agreed as to the significance of certain forms and colours, and that they had been working along strikingly similar lines.

A development, too, in de Zayas' work may have resulted directly from contact with Picabia, or it may have occurred just before Picabia arrived in the United States: de Zayas, no doubt initially inspired by Picasso, made a series of abstract portraits which were combinations of algebraic formulae and abstract shapes, and were meant to be symbolic representations of all aspects of appearance and character (Ill. 29). Steiglitz in 1913 believed the drawings to be "the most modern expression of the human portrait." In a short essay in an issue of *Camera Work* in which some of the drawings were reproduced, Paul Haviland wrote that through his "Absolute Caricatures" de Zayas could represent "the person in his relation to the outside world, his place in the evolution, and his individual characteristics." De Zayas himself explained:
The technique of my procedure consists in representing:

(1) The spirit of man by algebraic formulas; (2) His material self by geometrical equivalents; (3) and his initial force by trajectories, within the rectangle that encloses the plastic expression and represents life.7

Although the actual results of de Zayas' experiments in retrospect do not seem too successful, being little more than manipulations of current abstract shapes, and having no particular meaning until one reads the accompanying explanations in Camera Work, they seem to have had important repercussions in the Stieglitz group. Both Marsden Hartley and Picabia in 1915 each evolved highly successful and personal forms of abstract portraiture. Later, in the early twenties, when Arthur Dove was able to devote more time to his art, he too explored the theme of the abstract portrait. Perhaps the originality of each artist's interpretation of the theme heretofore has masked the underlying correspondences of intention. But without doubt de Zayas' original psychological portraits should be considered the pioneering examples of this particularly complex, conceptual art form.

The following year, when de Zayas went to Paris in May 1914 where he stayed until the outbreak of war, Picabia met him and the two visited many exhibitions together. Picabia was anxious to be of help to de Zayas in obtaining further exhibitions of European art for the New York gallery, although he believed that there was nothing really new to be seen in Paris. De Zayas apparently agreed; as he reported to Stieglitz, Matisse's latest work seemed "very moderate both in color and form." Indeed, de Zayas tended to be more interested in developments in the literary world than in seeking new trends in the visual arts. He met
Gertrude Stein for the first time, and immensely enjoyed her company. Especially beneficial was a meeting with Apollinaire and writers who contributed to the magazine, Soirées de Paris. "I am working hard," he told Stieglitz, "in making these people understand the convenience of a commerce of ideas with America. And I want to observe the spirit of what they are doing, to bring it to '291.' We need a closer contact with Paris, there is no question about it." Apollinaire, with whom de Zayas became friendly, gave him "some of the originals of his new poems" which, he reported, "are creating among the modernists a real sensation." As he explained to Stieglitz the latest literary movement in Paris was known as "Simultanism", a movement which Apollinaire had brought about with his poems. De Zayas believed that Apollinaire "is doing in poetry what Picasso is doing in painting. He uses actual forms made up with letters. All these show a tendency towards the fusion of the so-called arts. I am sure this mode of expression will interest you." Simultanism captured de Zayas' imagination to such an extent that the following year in 1915 he developed further ideas on the subject in New York in a new magazine called 291.8

But in addition to forming a friendship with Apollinaire, which in turn was to result in a new publication, de Zayas approached Picasso about the possibility of holding a second exhibition of his work in America. Picasso, however, referred him to Kahnweiler, his dealer. But Kahnweiler was unable to arrange anything because he had conceded to the dealer Brauer of New York the exclusive rights in showing Picasso's art.
Instead, Picabia kindly offered to lend his collection of eighteen works by Picasso, eight of which were in his latest style, and his collection of work by Braque. De Zayas believed that "Braque would have never existed without Picasso, but Picasso owes very many things to Braque." And so he thought it only right that they should be shown together because they "really complete one expression."^9

De Zayas' friendship with Apollinaire also opened up the possibility of giving Marie Laurencin an exhibition at "291". But de Zayas decided against it because he thought she was expressing a seventeenth-century point of view that would not be at all meaningful for the group. However, he followed up a suggestion he had made to Stieglitz during his previous trip to Paris from 1910 to 1911 by borrowing from the dealer Guillaume, to whom he had been introduced by Apollinaire, a number of African sculptures. As he had pointed out to Stieglitz in 1911, an exhibition of so-called primitive art would have been apt since it was quite apparent that African art was of great importance as an influence in the development of twentieth-century art. When he left Paris, he carried with him the African sculptures and the Braque and Picasso exhibition.10

It seems apparent in retrospect that Steichen's influence at "291" steadily diminished after about 1912, and that of de Zayas became prominent. Steichen confessed to Stieglitz that apart from Rodin he preferred not to see too many people. He no longer desired to take part in the endless talks about art which went on in Paris; he was tired of them.11 Indeed, in 1914,
Steichen gave up painting completely in order to devote all his time to photography and to his garden in Voulangis.  

At the beginning of the war, Haviland joined the French army, and de Zayas went back to France for a few months and joined the French General Staff. On the other hand, Steichen returned with his family to the United States where he stayed until 1917; Picabia also arrived in New York in the spring of 1915. Steichen later wrote that he found on his return in 1914 that the gallery was somewhat empty; the exhibition of African sculpture arranged by de Zayas was on show and yet there "was a dust-covered atmosphere about the whole place; no one came but the few 291-ers."

I asked Stieglitz to let me brighten up that fine exhibition, and he agreed. I bought several reams of yellow, orange, and black sheets of paper. I took all the sculptures down and made an abstract geometrical pattern on the walls with the gay-colored papers, then put the sculptures back in place.

According to Steichen the war changed considerably the character of "291." Fewer people felt inclined to patronize the arts; and, he pointed out that immigrant European artists, including Picabia and Duchamp, had an impact on the kind of shows put on. He was not interested in Picabia's new kind of art; he felt that "it was not time for mockery and discouragement." He wanted "291" to be a "civilizing force in the world," and he thought that it would be helpful in achieving this end if the writers and musicians who were regular visitors to the gallery were officially enrolled as fellows of the Photo-Secesssion. He thought, however, that "the Photo-Secesssion was really dead" and
that there should be a new organization. But Stieglitz did not agree, and so Steichen tended subsequently to have less to do with the gallery.\textsuperscript{16}

Stieglitz was in no mood to press forward. Rather he welcomed the lapse in enthusiasm for new art on the part of the New York public, as a chance to take stock of what progress his championship of modern art had made in terms of its acceptance in America. As he wrote to Hartley:

In thinking over what "291" has been, and still is; what it has done, actually done; and what it has meant to others; and in view of the fact that it is ten years since we are housed in the little place, I have been thinking that it might be a good idea of publishing \textit{sic} a Special Number of "Camera Work", which would be devoted to twenty-five or thirty short essays on "As I see it '291'" (or something like that).\textsuperscript{17}

He wanted "twenty to thirty people with real feeling and not too much theory" to write about what "291" meant to them; he felt that a composite picture of the small gallery would be the best kind of record of what had happened there.\textsuperscript{18}

There was further reason for Stieglitz's reminiscent mood: notice had been given that the building which housed the gallery was to be demolished, and that Stieglitz would have to move before April 30, 1915.\textsuperscript{19} In fact, as it so happened, the war gave the building more years of life, and Stieglitz was able to stay until May 1917.

But apart from Stieglitz's desire to recollect past achievements and to have them recorded, he had no interest in making of "291" a commercial success; and thus the absence of visitors to the gallery did not concern him. He wrote to Charles Sheeler in 1916: "I fear success for 291 more than anything else in the
world. It has often been dangerously close to being a success. Its 'friends' want it to be a success. That is why I so often lose friends..."

Perhaps his position is best indicated in a report about an exhibition at the Montross Gallery which appeared in an issue of 291. Commenting on the work by "Americans Moderns" at the Montross Gallery the writer, perhaps Stieglitz, pointed out that "it is safe to announce that cubism or futurism; or whatever else these men call their work, is not only beginning to pay its way, but is undergoing the trying ordeal of being the fashion." He wondered further if:

American cubism, or futurism, is so sincere an expression that the speedy conversion of the public to its serious consideration was inevitable, or did the public interest, aroused by 291 and the big Armory Exhibition of French Moderns, create a demand which our men are trying consciously or unconsciously to supply? Judging from results in the Montross exhibition, both kinds of influence are present...

The creative instinct was smothered, it was believed, once the artist became at all concerned about the commercial success of his art.

By 1915, a number of commercial galleries were showing both European and American work. In February, 1915, Stieglitz wrote to Hartley that at the Montross Gallery "Matisse holds court. At the Caroll Galleries there is a show of Redon and some other French Moderns." Altogether, he felt that "Modern art" is being exploited in so many impure forms over here, that it is disgusting and even disheartening."
But the growing popularity of European art which to some extent turned Stieglitz against it, as well as the lack of helpers in Europe to arrange for new exhibitions, caused Stieglitz to turn his attention more to the work of the American artists of his group. Speaking of the coming 1915 to 1916 season of prospective exhibitions at "291", Stieglitz promised Hartley, who was then in Germany, that he should have an exhibition on his return to New York. In addition there would be work by Walkowitz and de Zayas to be shown: "So between you, de Zayas and Walkowitz, it looks as if '291' would be devoted chiefly to the work of the 291-ers. And that is as I should like it best."23

In 1915, de Zayas was eager to try out new ideas about art inspired by Apollinaire. He persuaded Stieglitz to collaborate in a new publication, 291, which as Stieglitz wrote was to be "a means to give de Zayas, Mrs. Meyer, Katherine Rhoades and some of the others a chance to experiment."24 The magazine, a folding card, measuring approximately 24" x 12", was an anthology of short critical comments about the state of the arts in New York, philosophical points made by recounting dreams, irony, poetry and drawings. The magazine was backed financially by Stieglitz, Eugene Meyer and Paul Haviland, and de Zayas was responsible for its layout. It was published from March to December, 1915, in twelve numbers. Its subscription list remained small, with about one hundred names, and Eugene Meyer subsequently judged that the experiment had been a failure.25
In retrospect, the magazine may be seen to have passed through two stages: in the first, de Zayas explored further the possibilities of simultaneity; in the second, Picabia's contributions to two issues—Number Four, and Number Five and Six—brought to the forefront a proto-dadaist attitude in which man is conceived of in terms of the machine.

One of Apollinaire's ideograms, and an explanation of the term "Simultanism" appeared in the first issue of the magazine. It was stated that in Cubism the term referred to the existence of many views of the same object at once; whereas in literature:

the idea is expressed by the polyphony of simultaneous notes which say different things . . . that the idea of simultanainsm is essentially naturalistic is obvious; that the polyphony of interwoven sounds and meanings has a decided effect upon our senses is unquestionable, and that we can get at the spirit of things through this system is demonstrable. . . .

Further issues contained ideograms invented by combinations of words and images supplied by Agnes Ernst Meyer and de Zayas. No doubt de Zayas had initially been attracted to Simultanism because it developed ideas he had touched on when he experimented with abstract portraiture in 1913. Common to abstract portraiture and to Simultanism was the idea that a composite number of experiences expressed in words, or in a combination of words and images, best adds up to an approximation of reality.

In Number Four appeared a drawing by Picabia, which is related to the mechanistic and yet still organic paintings he and Duchamp were doing before coming to the United States in the spring of 1915. In the next issue, however, were drawings of
machines which were portraits of Picabia's friends at "291". In writing an explanation of the drawings, de Zayas pointed out that Picabia's grasp of the isolated state America imposes on man moved him to present the portraits in the way he did:

He does not protect himself with any shield. He has married America like a man who is not afraid of the consequences. He has obtained results. And he has brought these to '291' which accepts them as experience, and publishes them with the conviction that they have the positive value which all striving toward objective truth possess. 

In the next number, Paul Haviland pointed out the implications of Picabia's drawings:

We are living in the age of the machine. Man made the machine in his own image. She has limbs which act; lungs which breathe; a heart which beats; a nervous system through which runs electricity. The phonograph is the image of his voice; the camera the image of his eye; the machine is his 'daughter born without a mother'. That is why he loves her. He has made the machine superior to himself . . .

If de Zayas was stressing the fact that Picabia was commenting on man's lonely state in America, Haviland wished to point out how man could identify himself empathically with the machine. Picabia himself explained that he had chosen to show the machine because he thought it of great symbolic value:

The machine has become more than a mere adjunct of 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.

. . . I mean . . . to work on and on until I attain the pinnacle of mechanical symbolism.

Picabia, therefore, may be seen to be continuing the essentially humanist concerns which were dominant at "291".
Number Twelve brought the publication 291 to an end. Stieglitz and Haviland could no longer support it financially; the subscription list had remained small. Besides which, Stieglitz believed that nothing further could be achieved with the magazine. And furthermore, claims were being made on de Zayas' attention; he and Picabia had found ideal premises for a gallery, which in October 1915 was opened as The Modern Gallery. Haviland, who left again for France at the end of 1915 to work in a munitions factory, helped to back the new venture; Eugene Meyer, however, undertook most of the financial responsibility. De Zayas' new interest in his gallery, which was run on a commercial basis, caused an ideological rift in his friendship with Stieglitz, and the two men had little contact after 1917. 31

The new forms of expression which de Zayas in particular had been instrumental in bringing about in 1915 undoubtedly changed to some extent the concerns of the "291" group. Steichen later interpreted the last years of "291" as being a period of mockery and discouragement. 32 Nevertheless perhaps it should rather be judged as a period when conceptual art was thoroughly explored. De Zayas' maxim that art, although initially irrational, becomes meaningful when subjected to processes of reasoning was a crucial concept in the evolution of his own work, and possibly in the evolution of Picabia's. It would seem in addition that it had repercussions in the art of other members of the group. Bluemner already was predisposed to an analytic approach to art; Hartley apparently was touched indirectly through the "291" publications—Camera Work and 291—that Stieglitz regularly
forwarded, to achieve a new kind of clarity in the development of his ideas; Marin's work too, in 1915, underwent a considerable change as he became more self-consciously analytic in his approach to his subject matter. Finally, as far as one may judge from the few pastels of the period which survive, Dove too regarded his subjects somewhat differently.

Marsden Hartley: 1914-1915

Hartley returned to the United States briefly at the end of 1913 so that he could be on hand for his third one-man show at "291" in January, 1914; by May, he was back again in Berlin, having travelled via London and Paris. He had hoped to see a large Blake retrospective exhibition in London, but he had arrived to find that it had been taken to Manchester. He much regretted missing it, because he particularly admired both Blake's painting and writing. In Paris, he saw at the Salon des Independants, a large Synchromist canvas by Morgan Russell, and more work by Dalaunay which he felt was highly superior to Russell's painting. And Gertrude Stein had arranged that during the short time he was in Paris, he should visit Picasso at his studio. Thus by the time Hartley returned to Berlin he was conversant with the latest developments in art in Paris, London and in New York.

His travels, and perhaps the renewed contact with the work of his contemporaries, momentarily disrupted his capacity for work and he produced little prior to the war. He wrote to Steiglitz that when the war began he had completed four paintings on "the idea of Amerika"; these were primarily decorative paintings
made up of many motifs taken over from the art of the North American Indian. The series was not continued until later, probably towards the end of 1915. Although the onset of war turned his attention to different subjects, it is possible that painting the first of the Indian canvases helped to clarify his personal form of symbolism. The central tapee in Indian Symbols (Ill. 30), perhaps one of the four paintings which Hartley mentioned in his letter to Stieglitz, appears in Berlin Ante War (Ill. 25). Also the crouching horse with the figure eight on its flank, situated in a roundel at the top of Berlin Ante War, is a motif which apparently he developed first in Painting No. 4: Black Horse. Unlike paintings of the year before, such as Portrait of Berlin (Ill. 24), the new ones are flatly and decoratively painted. It is possible, however, that he may have first worked in the flat manner in 1913. Forms Abstracted, for example, a painting of a sign of the zodiac, bears on the stretcher the pencilled notation "Forms Abstracted/Europe 1913." Berlin Ante War may also belong to 1913 since aspects of its iconography would indicate this. On the other hand, it fits well Hartley's ideas at the beginning of the war.

He described to Stieglitz the excitement and "psychic tension" in the air immediately prior to the war, and the corresponding stillness and sense of dignity it evoked on the part of the German people. He found this a stimulating atmosphere in which to work. Military parades still continued to be a source of visual interest, and yet, as war broke out, thoughts of death began to occupy him:
That which is truly heart rending is to see Germany's marvellous youth going off to a horrible death—this has been the dreadful vision... going too with a real ecstasy [sic] for war. War is the only modern religious ecstasy—the only means of displaying the old time martyrdom—One shall not forget these handsome smiling faces going by... if there is a real heroism instinct—It is certainly prevalent here... Two paintings, Berlin Ante War (Ill. 25), and The Warriors (Ill. 13 31) are, I suggest the visual equivalents of such ideas. Berlin Ante War seems the embodiment of war as "the only religious ecstasy." An Imperial horse guardsman, dressed in white, and seated on a light blue horse, dominates the upper part of the picture. Behind him, a crouching white horse with a figure eight on its flank occupies the top half of a roundel; the lower half is taken up with an undulating band which possibly represents water. The rider and mandorla are placed within swirling white clouds and appear against a vermillion background. Small roundels each set with a small cross act as stars in the sky. Below, a central tepee form, enclosing perhaps an altar, has two landscapes in tiers to either side. The effect of the whole is that of an altarpiece, depicting a deified equestrian soldier, with, underneath, a predella of landscapes. One is reminded of a crusading knight who sets out to fight holy wars; or of Galahad's quest for the holy grail; or of a symbolic image of the power of an empire symbolized in the person of an equestrian conqueror. However, the rider is not overlooked by a benevolent deity as in Early Christian depictions, but by a heraldic image; by a horse with the figure eight on its back which seems to have been Hartley's own invention. Perhaps Hartley's symbol is meant to represent man's
future destiny, or that which is unknowable. Since the figure eight was later employed in the context of death in *Eight Bells Folly*, 1933, it is also possible that it represented death in 1914.39

The motif of the horseman had been made popular by its frequent use in the work of the Blaue Reiter group. Also, it often appears in illustrations, in their 1912 almanac, of mediaeval illuminations and woodcuts. As we know, Hartley possessed a copy of the book and so he would have been quite familiar with the illustrations. Kenneth Lindsay has suggested that the Blaue Reiter group probably saw the rider motif as representing "inspired human endeavour."40 It seems reasonable to suppose that Hartley's similar image may also be interpreted in these terms, and thus the subject of his composition may be seen to be optimistic war fervour, which he believed had become the new religion.41 Even though he found war to be barbaric and unthinkable in modern times, he admired the true heroism of those who were forced to take part, and his painting is therefore a testimony of that admiration.

Further, there is every indication that as well as suggesting the rider motif, a number of other almanac illustrations helped Hartley to form his symbolic vocabulary. Specifically, four Bavarian votive pictures from a Munich church, scenes of everyday life over which hovers the Madonna in a bank of stylized clouds, may have helped to suggest Hartley's painting. Not only has he appropriated the idea of incorporating four scenes in his composition, but he comes close to his model in using similar
curvilinear forms as clouds. In addition, the crouching horse to the left of the interior scene is the prototype for Hartley's heraldic animal (Ill. 32).42

Herocism and war fervour are also the themes of the painting *The Warriors* (Ill. 31), in which a multitude of soldiers rides off into distant clouds and encompassing rays of light, representing possibly the unknowable future. Like crusaders the equestrian soldiers bear standards with crosses or stars set in the corners, and stars stud their arms and backs; clouds swirl at their feet and mandorlas outline them. Perhaps in developing his imagery in this instance, Hartley may have found apt a passage in an essay written by Benjamin Casseres in a 1913 issue of *Camera Work*: "The blazing constellations in the zodiacs of the irrational are calling us, and up the sun-shafts of the ages we go dancing the lascivious dance of the atoms; we go like gods sweating stars, chanting a Te Deum to Chance."43

The literary nature of these first paintings on German subjects is I think quite apparent; and indeed Hartley earlier had admitted that he was much influenced by all he read and that he had the capacity to visualize concepts and words. As he wrote in 1913: "when the thought 'golden triangle' comes into mind--I see that triangle--I have a real vision of it--and so with the other shapes."44 Shortly after the beginning of the war, however, the complex literary content of his work was no longer obvious, even though he continued to find his subjects in Germany's contemporary predicament, and though the death on October 7, 1914, of his good friend Lieutenant Karl von Freybourg provided him with yet another theme.
In November, 1914, he mentioned that he was "working out some war notions", and was perfecting what he believed to be "pure vision out of pure experience"; the themes he added, were Teutonic. Later, in the following April, 1915, he again mentioned his work, saying that he had a group of paintings on one theme and that the paintings complemented each other. The paintings in question appear at first sight to be decorative compositions of still life objects such as flags, epaulettes, military decorations and semi-abstract designs which are painted almost flatly. In short, they appear to have little meaning.

It is apparent in retrospect, however, that Hartley wished his imagery to remain largely enigmatic. He was especially pleased when people remarked on the lack of any literary subject matter in his new work of November 1914 onwards; a reaction which would indicate that even if one is able to read a definite meaning in a picture such as Berlin Ante War, one may assume that the later paintings are not so obviously open to interpretation. Further, one should perhaps bear in mind that many of the decorative motifs of the Berlin series were partly culled from North American Indian designs. And since it is known that in general, many of the abstract designs American Indian women embroidered on clothing or painted on pottery, had a multiplicity of meaning, and that the same design could mean different things to different tribes, and indeed could have different meanings for members of the same tribe, one must conclude that similarly Hartley's use of many motifs was mainly decorative. On the other hand, even among those paintings which appear to be more decorative than
others in that symbols used consistently in a number of paintings are absent, there still seems to be a definite subject. Thus in the painting E, for example,49 the juxtaposition of the flag of St. George against the German flag is surely no accident. Pomp, heroism and the conflict of war apparently continued to be the underlying themes of even the most decorative of the series.50

There is the further point that Hartley did not believe that paintings should ever be explained. He was particularly loath to return to America at the end of 1913 because he thought that Stieglitz wanted him to be on hand at the time of his one-man show in early 1914 in order to talk about his work;51 an assumption that seems perfectly understandable in view of the fact that Marius de Zayas had urged Stieglitz that new art at the gallery needed explanation. Dove, in 1912, went to great lengths to offer to the press comprehensive statements about his revolutionary pastels; and in 1913, Marin had obligingly written an explanation of the New York pictures considered to be his most advanced work at the time. However, as Hartley wrote when he returned to Germany after his third one-man show, he believed that "if you sing a thing you can't dance it—or if you write it you can't paint it";52 he felt that he was not painting ideas of the mind but "signs and symbols for ideas of the spirit or soul"; these, he thought, could not be explained.53

In the catalogue statement which accompanied the fourth one-man show of his late European work he stressed that his paintings were not ambiguously symbolic:
The forms are only those which I have observed casually from day to day. There is no hidden symbolism whatsoever in them; there is no slight intention of that anywhere. Things under observation, just pictures of any day, any hour. I have expressed only what I have seen. They are merely consultations of the eye—in no sense problem; my notion of the purely pictural.

This statement has often been quoted, and it has given rise to many misconceptions since it has been interpreted to mean that one should not search for meanings, and that indeed meanings are not present in Hartley's abstract art. Nevertheless, he did not say that his paintings were without meaning; he said that meanings were not hidden.

The titles of a number of pictures—Portrait of a German Officer, originally titled Portrait of My Friend, and Portrait (Ill. 33)—indicate the nature of some of the new paintings. E. McCausland has pointed out how, in Portrait of a German Officer, the artist wove together all the trappings of the military profession, such as historical German flags, regimental pennons, the decorative feathers which top the dress helmet, the Iron Cross, and polished black boots, as a memorial to his dead friend, Karl von Freybourg. Yet it seems to me that Portrait of a German Officer, Portrait, and other paintings in which Hartley has used similar symbols, as in, for example, Painting No. 47 (Ill. 34), are not just commemorative paintings as such, but in fact are abstract portraits of his friend.

As it has been pointed out, the abstract portrait was a topical subject that first had occupied Picasso who built up an image with abstract shapes, letters and numbers, as Hartley
had observed in 1912. Within the Stieglitz group, Marius de Zayas had developed a complex system of algebraic formulae, diagrams, and abstract shapes, through which he aimed to portray man's spiritual as well as his material characteristics. Hartley would certainly have seen the drawings in *Camera Work*, because Stieglitz regularly forwarded issues of the magazine as they were published. And further, in 1915 Stieglitz forwarded issues of *291* in which Picabia developed the symbolic portrait further. We also know that Hartley was particularly interested in the religious symbolism of Bavarian glass paintings, six of which he took to America at the end of 1913. He had even drawn Stieglitz's attention to the glass paintings illustrated in *Der Blaue Reiter*. Indeed, two of the illustrations in the almanac may instructively be compared with Hartley's new compositions (Ill. 35). Finally, he had already represented the "soul state" of the automobile and the aeroplane by means of abstract forms. Therefore, all in all, it would seem that the time was ripe for Hartley to take the next step of representing abstractly characteristic material and spiritual aspects of his friend whom he described to Stieglitz as being "physically—spiritually and mentally beautifully balanced." The artist had also mentioned to Stieglitz that the sculptor Ronnebeck, immediately before the war, had carved a bas-relief portrait of Von Freybourg which Hartley found so first-class "that one thinks the soul of this good boy is there always." Hartley too, it would seem, attempted in his personal versions of the abstract portrait to express not only the material characteristics of his friend but also some transcendental state, by selecting
definite symbols to which in his earlier paintings he had ascribed transcendental significance and definite still life objects associated with militarism.

Painting No. 47 and Portrait, for example, may be interpreted in terms of Hartley's earlier work. A centrally placed iconic image of military emblems perhaps represents the outside appearance of the young man, and the iron cross symbolizes his bravery. The numbers eight or nine, in these and in similar compositions, are invariably placed near the centre or the top of the painting. When other numbers, such as two or four appear they are associated with the soldier's uniform, and seem to refer to his regiment. But the numbers eight and nine are free-floating symbols having no material context and at times they are associated with an eight-pointed star. One must conclude, therefore, that if indeed Hartley was interested in numerology then the number nine held particular transcendental significance as, it seems, did the number eight. Perhaps one might say that Hartley apparently was still working in terms of Berlin Ante War but he had reached a form of abstraction by substituting for the equestrian warrior the attributes of the soldier's profession and by replacing the heraldic beast of fate by the figure eight.

Hartley sailed for the United States on December 11, 1915. His latest work was held up in transit from Europe, and it could not be shown at the Forum Exhibition of American Art of March 1916; it was shown at his fourth one-man exhibition at "291" in April that year.
Subsequently, Hartley's work changed considerably. He no
longer employed his particular kinds of symbols, except on rare
occasions when he wished to present a complexity of ideas, as in
*Eight Bells Folly, Memorial to Hart Crane, 1933;* The Transfer-
ence of Richard Rolfe, 1932-3; and *Tollani: Aztec Legend, 1933.*
In 1916, his new work, a number of small abstractions in pastel
shades, aroused by "some new sensations" he received in Provin-
town, Massachusetts, were paintings of yachts seen in terms of
simple planar forms; a change which was no doubt brought about
by the possibilities of interpretation set by new subject matter.
But perhaps too, the change may have occurred through Hartley's
renewed contact with members of the Stieglitz group, causing him
to be somewhat more objective in the presentation of mystical or
mental states. It may be significant that Marius de Zayas dis-
approved of most of Hartley's European work, but that he liked
the Provincetown series of abstractions which are free of numbers
and shapes of a highly personal nature. By February 1917, Hartley
wrote to Stieglitz from Bermuda where he was spending the winter:
"I think that I am rapidly outliving mysticism and hope one day
to extinguish it all together [sic]; that is from the aesthetic
point of view."  

**John Marin: 1915**

Marin's work of about 1915 underwent a significant stylistic change; a development which Oscar Bluemner analysed in his personal copy of the Forum Exhibition catalogue of 1916. Marin was judged to have two distinct styles at the time of the exhi-
bition: "his greater way" and a "second way." The "second way" was a flat decorative manner in which spots of pigment were used to build up a balanced composition; it led Bluemner to wonder: "What are the possibilities of spot, etc. explosive art?" The "greater way" involved the creation of "space . . . not fixed motif space" but "lines, dots, spots, wrinkles, krinkles [sic], washes, toothy, [illegible word] sympathetic planes in colors" which Bluemner found to be spiritual. Marin had apparently invented "space motifs" consisting of "planes which were able to balance each other 'dynamically'"; a "true creation of space filled with its own sort of 'things': nightmares, dreams, crystals, ghosts or 'dynamic feeling phenomena'." He does not disturb or change objective reality; the objects are not ignored but he does ignore their form and color, light and shadows. He creates quite new structures of his own which do not always succeed, and which have only their individual stability; fantasy structures of perception reminiscent of a real motif.

One might cite Landscape Abstracted, 1915 (Ill. 36), and Tree Forms, 1915 (Ill. 37), as possible examples of the two styles Bluemner distinguished in 1916: the first is a spontaneous study made in front of the subject; whereas the second seems to be an imaginative composition in which Marin has concentrated on the flat surface of the paper, and has built up a mosaic of calligraphic motifs and delicate washes in a decorative manner. In both paintings, forms are considerably simplified. The calligraphic nature of Tree Forms, and the stylized motifs such as the cross or crystal shapes making up the composite image of each tree, indicate that Marin perhaps had been
looking to Eastern art; indeed, he may have been following principles such as those laid down by Bowie who described the various traditional motifs Japanese artists used when they painted trees, clouds, or water.67 Admittedly, Marin did not adopt motifs which Bowie described and included in diagrammatic form in his book; rather, as Bluemner pointed out, Marin invented his own forms.

Sheldon Reich sees Marin's change in style as being the result of Cubist influence in Stieglitz's circle. As he points out, Marin's work of about this time has much in common with synthetic Cubism rather than with its analytic phase, and he concludes that the work of Picasso and Braque may have been especially influential. Marin all but eliminated space from a number of paintings. However, unlike the Cubists, he did not allow forms to overlap, but rather he made both forms and spatial relationships as simple as possible.63

A number of etchings of 1915 to 1917 in particular, indicate that Marin undoubtedly was influenced by Cubism. Included in a group of etchings on the theme of grain elevators at Weehawken, are a few in the dynamic style of the Woolworth Building series in which forms are dislocated and fragmented and yet are primarily naturalistic; others, however, are drawn completely in Cubist syntax, being composed of lines, rectangles, and tones, the forms of which were partially based on what had been seen, and yet are partially invented. In other versions of the subject, Marin manipulated a somewhat meagre network of lines and shadowy shapes; these particular etchings, however, were not published.69 They seem to be experimental works which stand at
the periphery of his prolific output, and, happily, they were not pursued further. Cubist influence was more significant in later work in furnishing him with a means of controlling naturalistic elements by enclosing them in interpenetrating linear frames.

Equally as important as the investigation of Cubism, it would seem, was the fact that Marin, perhaps impressed by the predominantly conceptual art of both de Zayas and Picabia, began to regard landscape elements in a more conceptual way; in part this resulted in analysing, for example, the components of trees, and obtaining the most simple and basic shapes as a way of representing trees, as in Tree Forms, 1915. It seems quite possible that the reason for working in this way may have been that Marin, like Walkowitz, wished to represent the "abstract idea" of his subject, in accordance with the group's ideas about the nature of abstract art. If Marin's Tree Forms is compared with Walkowitz's drawing From Life to Life, 1913, it may be seen that the two works have much in common. Caffin explained that Walkowitz wished to present the abstract idea of flash; similarly, one might conclude, Marin perhaps wished to present the abstract idea of a tree.

Arthur Dove, too, about the same time seems to have had similar concerns. Thus, the pastel, Sentimental Music, 1917, is a calligraphic study of branches of a tree and leaf forms, in which there is an overall woven pattern rather than a presentation of definite three-dimensional forms. The same may be
said of later work such as *Cocat*, 1935, or *Cub*, 1935. Thus it would seem that all three artists, Marin, Walkowitz and Dove, developed a calligraphic form of abstraction as a way of expressing a conceptual view of nature.

Since Marin adopted the anti-rational attitude of the "291" group, he rarely wrote about what he felt he had achieved. Also, he found it difficult to work in accordance with definite aims:

I have from time to time in a vague sort of way planned out work ahead. But I find this wayward temper of mine will not allow me to . . . I find things cropping up I never intentionally intended. Well, maybe this keeps me from a certain set mannerism, and this is something I detect and what forces a dislike . . . of most of the modern work I have seen.

It would seem, however, that in 1915 Marin was unusually unsure about what he was actually doing. As he wrote to Stieglitz in September, 1915, "the work goes on—not so fast at first—but now faster—I am not doing so much this year—there are periods when you don't know where you are at." But it is apparent that in spite of the changes in style of that year Marin's basic ideas about the nature of his art remained essentially the same; he continued to regard his work as an equivalent of emotional experiences generated by his surroundings:

The wind has increased to hurricane strength—how it shrieks—even the sea birds seem not to know what to do . . . there is something heroic astir in it all—the racing sea—the defiant wall of rock—the wind has the sound of millions of cats and mad witches—look at my work—very tame—pieces of paper blown to the winds.
Oscar Bluemner: 1916-1917

At the time of the Forum Exhibition, Bluemner, for the first time, became interested in aspects of Cubism; rather than having looked to Picasso and Braque, however, apparently it was the Cubism of Charles Sheeler which particularly held his attention.

Bluemner's reactions to the work of his fellow artists, revealed by an examination of his copy of the Forum Exhibition catalogue in which he made copious notes, are especially enlightening since they show his own particular concerns at the time.77 His observations about Synchronism are of interest in view of the fact that it has been suggested that his lifelong examination of colour principles owed much to the Synchronists.78 Morgan Russell was given little attention, and Macdonald Wright's colours were judged to be poor. Apparently Bluemner's interest in colour principles preceded his knowledge of the Synchronist movement. One significant point to emerge, however, is that Bluemner was especially critical of Wright's explanation of how he moved to an abstract position. Wright had decided that realistic elements are not compatible with the use of pure colour: "in order to function significantly," he wrote, colour "must be used as an abstract medium." Bluemner commented that Macdonald Wright must have been guilty of an "error of creating" to have reached such a conclusion.79 Therefore, it would seem that in 1916 Bluemner was not prepared to dispense with his and the group's basic premise that art was the result of man's reactions to the experienced world.
He went to comparatively greater lengths to study the work of Charles Sheeler and John Marin, and in analysing a number of their paintings, his observations made in the margins of the catalogue were profuse enough to spill over to separate sheets of paper. Sheeler's development is traced through nine paintings spanning the years 1912 to 1916. He wrote that Sheeler "goes from the real, nearly photographic appearance of forms" in 1912; "to a freer feeling for planes and objects in space" in 1913; "to planes which are set in shallow space and decorative, abstract, rhythmic and clean lines, and firmer, prettier contrasting pigments" in 1914 and 1915; in 1916, Sheeler returns to somewhat "freer, starker lines and analysis of the planes of things in space," as in Landscape No. 1, 1916 (Ill. 38).

Sheeler's analysis of "planes and things in space," apparently suggested a new problem to Blumner which he too explored in his subsequent paintings; however, Marin's paintings seem also to have been influential in that Blumner became subsequently more imaginative in his approach to his subjects, and like Marin he began to build his own kind of "fantasy structures" which though based on objective reality are only "reminiscent of a real motif."

Aspiration (Ill. 39) and Delaware River (Ill. 40), reveal Blumner's new interests. In both paintings he has incorporated a linear grid which helps to unify the composition. In Aspiration, the forms of houses and trees are controlled by the imposed framework made up of a series of circular images and interpenetrating planes, often outlined in vermillion, which appear
to recede in depth; a feature perhaps derived from Synchromism. An exploration of deep space was short-lived, however; in Delaware River, there is a greater emphasis on the actual surface of the canvas caused by the horizontal and vertical lines of the grid which rigidly controls the various parts of the landscape. Both these paintings may be considered to number among the most abstract of Bluemner's output.

With Jersey Silkmills, 1917 (Ill. 41), painted in bright, clear pigment, intense local colours are employed, and the total colour effect is much brighter than before. Planes parallel to the picture surface are particularly emphasized and forms are dislocated; the vertical planes of chimneys and horizontal planes of roofs penetrate wall planes. The combined effect is of strange, static, floating elements which present an unreal, dream-like landscape. Sheeler himself was not to reach a similar method of expression until the fifties.82

When "291" was closed in 1917, Bluemner's paintings were exhibited elsewhere; from 1917 to 1923 Stephan Bourgeois acted as his dealer, and a new set of influences gradually brought about a further change in his art.

Georgia O'Keeffe: 1916-1918

In May, 1916, the work of a new American artist was shown for the first time at "291": Stieglitz exhibited ten charcoal drawings by Georgia O'Keeffe. To Haviland he described her as "a young girl of unusual sensibility who has done some really personal abstractions."83 Her drawings had been brought to the
gallery by her friend Anita Pollizer to whom O'Keeffe, then a teacher in Texas, had sent them. Pollizer later wrote that Stieglitz had looked at the work penetratively: "Finally a woman on paper!" he exclaimed. The following year O'Keeffe's most recent work--watercolours, charcoal drawings and a number of oil paintings--became the subject of the last exhibition at "291".

O'Keeffe had been taught in 1905 by John Vanderpoel at the Art Institute of Chicago; from 1907 to 1908 she attended the Art Students League, New York, where her teachers were W. Merritt Chase, F. Luis Mora, and Kenyon Cox. She had won a medal in Chase's still-life class. Shortly afterwards she decided that since she was not painting in a particularly original way she would stop painting; instead she worked in Chicago as a commercial artist. Finally she returned to her family in Virginia. By chance, when she was persuaded to join her sister in attending summer classes at the University of Virginia, she met the teacher Alon Bement who was teaching in accordance with principles laid down by his own teacher, Arthur Wesley Dow; an approach which re-awakened O'Keeffe's interest in painting. Subsequently, Bement invited her to teach in the summer sessions at the University of Virginia. In the meantime, she gained teaching experience in Texas where she worked from 1912 to 1914 as a supervisor in art at the Public Schools of Amarillo; between 1916 and 1918 she headed the art department at the West Texas State Normal School at Canyon near Amarillo. But in addition, she attended Arthur
Wesley Dow's classes at Columbia University in the winter of 1914 and 1915, and again in 1916.\textsuperscript{85} Apparently it was the new development that Dow's influence inspired which won Stieglitz's sympathy, and brought her work close to that of other members of the group in spite of the fact that O'Keeffe had not shared in the spirit of inquiry of the "291" years. As O'Keeffe has acknowledged, Dow's influence initially helped her to find her own method of expression: "This man", she said, "had one dominating idea: to fill a space in a beautiful way."\textsuperscript{86}

Apparently Dow inculcated a love of design which marks the work of O'Keeffe's career; but more, he most probably relayed one of the primary principles of Eastern art which O'Keeffe, like Dove and Marin, unconsciously adopted; namely, the view that the artist is an interpreter of the visual world, and that he extracts those specific properties from his subject which enable it to appear possessed of qualities of life. Speaking in 1939 of her reasons for choosing to paint skulls and bones which she found in the desert, O'Keeffe wrote that they seemed to her to be more alive than the animals themselves: "The bones seem to cut sharply to the center of something that is keenly alive on the desert even tho' it is vast and empty and untouchable—and knows no kindness with all its beauty."\textsuperscript{87} Thus she took for granted, as did Dove and Marin, that nature had a character or life which it is the artist's task to reveal.

This essentially subjective position tended to lead O'Keeffe to ascribing character or life to objects in such a way that those objects appear as if transformed, becoming other than
how they normally are; it led her to invent personal forms of symbolism. At times, it even led her to adopt almost a Surrealist position. Yet, as Lewis Mumford later explained, her symbolism was not of a literary nature; she always used direct symbols, completely free of any literary reference. O’Keeffe herself maintained that she only painted what she saw; she did not intentionally create symbols. But since it would seem that she tended to take the nature of her art for granted, and that like others of the group she adopted an anti-rationalist point of view in which one worked according to intuition, then indeed her symbolism would not have been intentional.

In Texas she was particularly inspired by the large expanses of flatland, and she painted a number of watercolours of subjects such as sunsets which were simplified to a few spare forms. Such was the degree of simplification in her early watercolours that they tend to stand as completely abstract as, for example, does Portrait U. No. 2, 1917, possibly a study of a waterfall, or Evening Star, No. 6, 1917 (Ill. 42).

The first abstractions Stieglitz showed, however, were on the whole invented forms reminiscent of forms in nature from which they were derived. Drawing No. 13, 1915 (Ill. 43), a drawing in charcoal, in construction perhaps reminds one of Arthur Dove’s work; one finds a placement of organic forms one behind the other as in Dove’s Wind on the Hillside (Ill. 12), and in addition O’Keeffe made use of a similar jagged, saw-toothed form. However, it is not likely that she saw much of
Dove's work until the time of the Forum Show in March 1916. She told Muller Smith: "I discovered Dove and picked him out before I was picked out and discovered. Where did I see him? A reproduction in a book. The Eddy book I guess, a picture of Fall leaves. Then I trekked the streets looking for others. In the Forum Exhibition there were two or three . . ." 91

But as well as imaginary organic forms, O'Keeffe made studies of definite scenes in which objects are subjected to decorative stylizations. Drawing No. 9, 1915 (Ill. 44), is a bird's eye view of tree tops, perhaps overlaid with clouds, with, on the lower right, a small stream which runs alongside a dilapidated fence. No doubt through studying Oriental art in Dow's classes she adopted one of the main principles of Eastern art: that one should use a series of conventional motifs as equivalents for nature's forms. Bowie, one might note, illustrated a number of such conventions in his handbook; indeed O'Keeffe's foliage forms are close to diagrammatic representations of water in Bowie's book; even to the inclusion of small circles, which in O'Keeffe's drawing have the appearance of strange eye-like holes penetrating the main form. 92

A sketch such as Drawing No. 9 appears to have been the starting point for a subsequent abstraction such as Blue and Green Music, 1919 (Ill. 45), which is an arrangement of forms reminiscent of the streaming cloud or tree forms of the sketch, the stream, and perhaps one of the fence poles. Abstractions such as this were primarily arbitrary arrangements of motifs drawn from reality, as was the abstract work of Walkowitz or
of Dove. Without having witnessed the theoretical evolution which took place at “291”, O’Keeffe was fulfilling Caffin’s ideas; she was extracting her “vision of the subject from the actual appearances, clearly seen in open light,” and she aimed to present “an organic unity, in order that the expression may be a single and harmonious one.” Or, as Bluemner explained in 1913:

Art selects from life or nature and transforms the visible manifestations into corresponding effects—equivalents—such as the materials of art make possible. Further, art composes or rearranges, since it imitates for the purpose of expression.

In 1918, Stieglitz promised O’Keeffe a year of financial security so that she could devote all her time to painting; she left her teaching job in Texas, and worked in New York. Her subsequent development should therefore be examined against the background of the changing tastes of Stieglitz and his friends after “291” closed.

During the 1916 to 1917 season at “291” Stanton Macdonald Wright’s work was exhibited, and the first showing in America of the art of Gino Severini also took place. In the main, however, Stieglitz was content to witness what he believed to be the attainment of maturity in the work of Hartley and Walkowitz. As he wrote to Haviland: Marin’s reputation was secure. Walkowitz’s latest work had drawn over a thousand visitors to the gallery; his latest watercolours had at last won him recognition. Furthermore, Hartley’s last abstractions had caused him to be unhesitatingly recognized as an artist.
It must have seemed in 1917 that the mission Stieglitz purported to achieve through "291" had been accomplished in that a small number of American painters, given a congenial atmosphere, could evolve their own forms of art.
CHAPTER V
SEQUEL: THE STIEGLITZ GROUP
AFTER THE FIRST WORLD WAR

Are the pictures or their makers an integral part of the America of to-day?
That I am still endeavoring to know.
Because of that—the inevitability of this Exhibition—American.

Alfred Stieglitz

Stieglitz and American Writers

With the closing of "291," Stieglitz's New York hotel room and his restaurant table became places where he and his friends gathered to continue discussing the subjects which had been of concern at "291". ¹ O'Keeffe joined Stieglitz in New York, and spent the summers with him at his country home in New York State; she became his wife in December, 1924. During the period, 1917 to 1925, a number of new friendships were made with a group of writers who counted among the radical liberals of the day. Stieglitz began to correspond with Waldo Frank in 1917. Frank, an editor of the magazine Seven Arts, and a contributor to Dial, had agreed to publish in Seven Arts an article by Marsden Hartley on Albert Ryder, and Stieglitz's first letter to

¹ Stieglitz and American Writers refers to the exhibition "Seven Americans" held at The Anderson Galleries in New York in March 1925. This exhibition featured the works of seven American artists, including Marsden Hartley, whose article was published in Seven Arts in honor of the exhibition. Alfred Stieglitz, the founder of "291" gallery, continued to support and promote American artists and their work in the post-war era. The closing of "291" marked a significant shift in Stieglitz's career, as he moved towards a more commercial gallery setting at Anderson Galleries. During this period, Stieglitz's interactions with American writers like Waldo Frank became more frequent, reflecting the evolving cultural landscape of the time.
Frank was to express his appreciation for supporting Hartley.² Letters to Herbert Seligmann date from 1918;³ those to the music critic Paul Rosenfeld from 1920; and to Lewis Mumford, then an editor of Dial, from 1925.⁴ Stieglitz also had some contact with Van Wyck Brooks from 1921 onwards. He had much admired Brooks' book *Mark Twain*, published in 1920;⁵ possibly because Brooks' psychological study of the writer was an examination of the conflict between what Brooks saw as a creative way of life, and one based on material success. Brooks, one might note, was giving voice to ideas which were then in vogue, and which Stieglitz himself had assumed in setting up "291" as a force to combat materialism in America. In addition, a particularly close friendship grew up and was maintained for many years between Stieglitz and Sherwood Anderson, whose book *Winesburg, Ohio*, published in 1919, had established his reputation. Correspondence with Anderson began in 1922, although Stieglitz may have known him before that year through Arthur Dove who met Anderson socially in Westport, Connecticut. Writing of his life in Westport, Dove had remarked, two years after "291" was closed:

> There is quite a lot of "291" here too, so you see it [291] was not a place . . . We see Rosenfeld quite often and the Kanes. Strand [Paul Strand] and Seligman [sic] were here and guess who else one evening, Sunday, with a lady—Walkowitz . . . We had a very nice evening with Sherwood Anderson, Rosenfeld and Van Wyck Brooks at the Kanes . . . ⁶

A question which still needs examination is to what extent did the friendship which developed between Stieglitz and the writers—Waldo Frank, Herbert Seligmann, Paul Rosenfeld, Lewis Mumford and Sherwood Anderson—become mutually enriching; in
helping Stieglitz to develop his love of the countryside, and in forming the writers' ideas about features of American life beneficial to cultural growth? The concern with Americananness, which included the enumeration of those qualities thought to distinguish America from Europe, had always been a popular subject in the United States, and it was an especially dominant preoccupation in the first two decades of the century. In the twenties, however, Stieglitz's new friends brought him to the centre of their movement to assert America's cultural autonomy. It is still a moot point whether or not Stieglitz was a major leader in this particular movement. W. Wasserstrom in examining the period believes that Stieglitz greatly influenced many of the writers; an opinion which to some extent Stieglitz's correspondence tends to endorse. Apparently Anderson found Stieglitz to be an encouraging friend, and by 1923 he confessed that he was much indebted to him for his help. Paul Rosenfeld, too, felt that he owed a good deal to Stieglitz. Both Anderson and Frank each dedicated a book to him. Yet it seems evident that in the first place the young writers gravitated to Stieglitz's circle because they found themselves in sympathy with his views; they discovered that his beliefs about the state of the arts in America matched theirs. And thus perhaps the association which ensued—the joining of a literary movement with Stieglitz's established group of artists—should be seen as serving to consolidate a definite trend to cultural autonomy well under way, rather than as marking the beginning of a new movement.
One may assume, I think, that the sympathies all these men shared considerably reinforced a number of ideas held earlier about the American cultural environment. The gap felt to exist between a predominantly materialistic society and the elite few who were creative—and therefore, it was assumed, cultivated spiritual values—was felt to be as wide as ever. But it was generally conceded that American artists had a duty to remain and work in their own country, rather than adopt the easier alternative of choosing to live in Europe. And, as back-to-nature philosophies received renewed attention, a way of life which fed the senses was particularly extolled. The writers reached the conclusion that in rural life "the earth" or "the soil" had been a source of spiritual sustenance, and if there was to be hope of a definite culture in America, then ideally the writer and artist should try and combine a life of action, preferably in contact with "the soil", with creativity. For the present, they must accept as their lot a lonely struggle in their native land. Each man must accept that he would find little appreciation from his fellows outside of the initiated few who felt as he did.

Stieglitz had always regarded his Lake George home as a place of retreat where the summer months could be spent restfully, in recuperation from the effects of the constant demands made on him by his way of life in the city. In time, he came to dislike the city, and he saw the time spent at Lake George as having greater personal value. If in 1914 Stieglitz would have concurred with Hartley's indictment of New York as "an
inferno—miles of hard, hard face, and hard ambitions" where "gentleness is absurd," he also felt that although New York is "an unspeakable place . . . it is fascinating. It is like some giant machine, soulless, and without a trace of heart;" an idealized view of the city first articulated by the Photo-Secession critics, and then realized in visual terms by Marin and Picabia. But as Stieglitz in time saw commercial success engulf the European art he had sponsored so assiduously, he apparently became disheartened with the city, and he began to regard it as evil and cankerous. Picabia's depiction of Stieglitz in 1915 as a broken camera may be viewed as an appropriate comment on the frustration of the high ideals Stieglitz had set for himself, as William Camfield has pointed out. American commercialism was seen as a stifling atmosphere for the "faith and love" of the creative worker. Rural life, then, in contrast, must have appeared to be America's potential salvation.

A number of the artists had at an early date relied on the countryside for their subject matter. Marin had formed the habit of spending the summer months in the country; Dove in 1910 had established residence in Westport, Connecticut; and shortly after "291" closed, Bluemner reaffirmed his love of rural living. As he commented to Stieglitz: "I discover more life and individuality below the spade thrust than I have found along all the sidewalks of New York; and more painting amidst the shadows of the nights here and around the lakes than in all the isms and wiseheads of the New York Salons." Marin too, in 1915, had
remarked on how his present daily life seemed to him more absorbing than "Negro art, the Picassos, the Picabias, the De Zayas, the this, the that. Yes even too, 291, and all else."\(^{13}\)

The dissatisfaction with theoretical discussion both Bluemner and Marin were expressing should perhaps be seen as in part a symptom of a new phase in their development. It would appear that although the earlier stage in the history of "291" had been one in which new theories and art forms had helped to develop the art of a number of artists in the group, the painters came in time to welcome an environment free of theoretical speculation in which to work. Indeed, by 1914, the period of intensive examination of the nature of art was almost at an end, and subsequently there had been changes at "291" itself where members of the circle had in the magazine 291 turned to more literary concerns and were considering art forms of primarily a conceptual nature. As it has been suggested, new emphases at the gallery may have caused the changes in direction which one may discern in differing degrees from 1915 in the work of Marin, Dove and Hartley. At the same time, such emphases may have helped to precipitate a distaste for deliberate theorizing. Thereafter, it is apparent that each artist felt himself to be working more on his own; a lack of a tangible centre such as "291" where ideas could be exchanged, coupled with the fact of geographical isolation must have helped to foster each artist's sense of being by himself. By the time the group of writers from the twenties became spokesmen for Stieglitz's artists, they tended to stress such isolation.Apparently they viewed it
as both a virtue and a necessity. In living rurally, the artists had escaped urban living which, dominated by commercialism, could stifle the creative instincts; instead they had chosen an environment which fed the senses and thus helped spiritual growth. It would seem that the writers looked to Stieglitz's artists as living examples of men who had united the active and the creative life. And perhaps partly as a result of such appreciation and of the emphasis on their love of nature, the artists embodied in their art the awe they felt in the face of nature, and developed an art of ecstatic nature worship.

Undoubtedly, an upsurge of romanticism in the twenties and thirties, fed anew by anti-rationalist philosophies such as those of Bergson and Nietzsche, helped in forming this particular position. In Stieglitz's group, we may note, anti-rationalist doctrines were examined with an even greater devotion than before: Bluemner shared with Stieglitz a love of Nietzsche; Arthur Dove looked particularly to Bergson, Nietzsche, William Blake and Eastern philosophers; James Joyce, Goethe, and D. H. Lawrence also received the circle's admiration; and the new books which the writers themselves were producing were eagerly discussed.

Stieglitz was interested in the work of many different writers; so much so that it seems unlikely that he would have adhered to any one particular philosophy. He was too conscious of the necessity for continuous personal inquiry ever to settle for any one set of ideas; as well as perhaps being temperamentally unsuited to pursue the logical implications of philosophical
positions. Nevertheless, it is apparent that he tended to favor those writers who extolled the fully-rounded life involving the senses and emotions, as well as the intellect.

In time, many of the members of the group preferred to lead a rural type of existence held by all to be ideal. Escape from America's commercial atmosphere was recommended in favor of a life close to "the soil", in which daily tasks and creative work were confronted and performed with the same degree of devotion. Indeed, members of the group showed almost existentialist concern for tasks encountered from moment to moment; Stieglitz has recounted how O'Keeffe scrubbed a floor "in the same spirit" in which she painted; Seligmann tells of Stieglitz's having cleaned a carpet with the same thoroughness and intensity he brought to all his activities;\(^{16}\) John Marin and Arthur Dove, in their letters to Stieglitz, were as interested in writing of their daily tasks and of their acquaintances as they were in writing about their work. Marin, in 1921, after describing his everyday life, his fishing exploits, and the trouble he had with his boat, posed the question: "What's this all got to do with painting? More than you'd think. Yer can't do the things unless yer lead the life."\(^{17}\)

That the members of the group had such similar beliefs bears on the question of Stieglitz's role as an influential figure in shaping the development of the artists in his circle. Stieglitz himself did not believe that he was directly influential. Writing to Anderson about O'Keeffe he said: "I never try to influence her— that is take her away from her own development.
Real growth—unfolding—is often a very slow affair.\textsuperscript{18} Marin too felt that "Stieglitz never interfered with a man and his work"; by which he probably meant that Stieglitz never dictated to an artist the direction his work might take.\textsuperscript{19} Rather his artists felt that Stieglitz offered general encouragement. As Dove wrote in 1917: "you seem to know so well how to make one feel the opportunity for work. It is a gift which I know all the fellows have appreciated."\textsuperscript{20} Nevertheless, as a consideration of the history of "291" shows, Stieglitz effectively guided his friends: he gathered about him only those who were in complete sympathy with his aims and ideas; we know too that he had the habit of forwarding to his friends copies of books that particularly interested him; he often wrote to them about books he was currently reading, and thus in many instances his literary tastes became theirs. Indeed, when one speaks at all of Stieglitz as an influential figure one should speak of the ideas he felt he had to share with his colleagues. By articulating for his artists many of the basic ideas which would direct their lives, Stieglitz probably had a profounder influence in shaping his artists than Marin or any of the others ever realized.

Stieglitz perhaps was emboldened by the new interest of the writers to continue to champion American art. By 1924, a number of his artists had produced an impressive volume of new work. Arthur Dove, too, had begun to realize his potential and had a collection of works which Stieglitz found "most interesting, beautiful and novel";\textsuperscript{21} these included a number of collage paintings made up of a variety of found objects. O'Keeffe was
prolific, and already had had two exhibitions arranged for her by Stieglitz at the Anderson Galleries. All in all, Stieglitz thought that the time was ripe for yet another group exhibition, which would be publicized as being specifically American. Rooms at the Anderson Galleries were made available, and in March 1925 the exhibition *Seven Americans* opened with new paintings by O'Keeffe, Marin, Dove, Hartley, and Demuth; and photographs by Paul Strand and Stieglitz.

The show was regarded by Stieglitz as yet another challenge to the American public to show tolerance for, and acceptance of their own artists, rather than to look to Europe for all innovation. "A silent battle is raging", he commented to Anderson; much bewilderment and resentment was caused by the novelty of the exhibits. Even Paul Rosenfeld, Waldo Frank and Paul Strand found difficulty in orienting themselves to the new work. But the general consensus of the newly acquired friends of the group was that the quality of the art was first-class.22 Subsequently, Stieglitz's artists could count on the wholehearted support of the writers.

Sherwood Anderson had written for inclusion in the catalogue a poetic tribute to the seven whom he found bringing to the city-dwellers "their moments of life." For Anderson the show was "the distillation of the clean, emotional life of seven real American artists."23 The outspoken critic Henry McBride, writing for the *Dial*, remarked that while:

> the fate of abstract art is not deeply dependent upon anything that American artists have done . . . the post-office address of the giants has always been Paris . . . The really diverting point in regard to the Stieglitz Group is that it has made some new
friends in literary circles . . . No less a personage than Mr. Sherwood Anderson has fallen in love with the Stieglitz Group en masse.  

Paul Rosenfeld became one of the most sympathetic interpreters for the Artists in Dial, The Nation and in Creative Art, and one of his first articles on their work appeared in Dial in 1921. In 1925 he touched on an issue that had been raised in the first number of Seven Arts by Romain Rolland, who thought that America’s great strength in developing her culture lay in her lack of traditions which might prove binding. Rosenfeld reiterated how Europeans were tied to dogmas whereas Americans were not, and were thus free to experiment at will. He was convinced that in the twenties, American creativity in literature, music and art, held more interest than did European creativity. "No European," he wrote, "is using the abstract properties of paint as absolutely as Arthur Dove." And by 1931 he believed that "an advance in the plastic arts second to none in the contemporary world had been affected by the members of this solid New York group." Herbert Seligmann also saw in the Stieglitz group a body of distinctively American artists. He frequented The Intimate Gallery from 1926 shortly after it had been opened, and recorded many of the conversations which took place there. Another literary critic, Dorothy Norman, did the same at An American Place. These records allow one to glimpse Stieglitz’s ideas as they developed in those years, as does a joint tribute to Stieglitz; a book of essays, America and Alfred Stieglitz: A Collective Portrait, written by a number of writers, critics and artists. This was a composite picture
of the extent of Stieglitz's work and influence up to 1934; the editors included Rosenfeld, Frank, Mumford, and Norman.

After the exhibition, Seven Americans, Stieglitz thought about opening another gallery. In much the same way that public and critical reaction to European art shown at "291" had decided him to fight for its acceptance, so the opposition to American art convinced him of the necessity of the new venture. "There is so much feeling against 'my men'" he wrote to Anderson, "that I have no choice but to go on and fight for them." He foreseaw that the fight would be "lots of sport." In November 1925, Stieglitz cleared out a small room, about twelve by twenty feet, made available to him as storage space at the Anderson Galleries and it became the new premises for his gallery, which was opened on December 7, 1925. It was to be "another form of '291'—and still very different." The art to be shown there would be individual, and the result of spontaneous creation: "There is no trace of artness—no theories—no academy—not even that of modernism—." The Intimate Gallery, as it was made clear in introductory pamphlets, was a place where one might study the individual developments of a number of American artists.

New principles of art, questions of aesthetics, in short the internationally inclined character of "291", had been put aside in favour of an ideology which was felt to be American. The fact that Stieglitz's interests revolved exclusively round American art became even more publicly apparent when in 1929 he opened his next gallery, "An American Place." Oscar Bluemner who felt he had been excluded in 1930 from the group because he had not been born in America, remarked somewhat
bitterly in 1932 that Stieglitz's championship of native-born painters was becoming fashionable and was spreading in New York. 35

Georgia O'Keeffe

O'Keeffe's first large-scale oil paintings appear to date from the time she joined Stieglitz in 1918. 36 They include a number of abstractions, and still lifes among which are studies of single flowers. The subjects of other paintings invariably depended on where she was living. Thus there are canvases of New York City, Lake George, Nova Scotia and New Mexico. A number of the early Lake George paintings testify to the fact that inspired by her teacher, A. Weesley Dow, O'Keeffe had learned much from Eastern art; Lake George with Crows, c. 1921 (Ill. 46), for example, is a distant view of the lake and surrounding landscape, painted decoratively, with flattened simple shapes which are stylized natural forms.

In one of the rare statements O'Keeffe has made about her methods of working, she distinguishes between two aspects of her style. Speaking of her reliance on the visible world she has written: "I start in a very realistic fashion and as I go on from one painting to another of the same thing, it becomes simplified 'til it can be nothing but abstract, but for me it is my reason for painting it, I suppose." 37 Such a method of moving to abstraction, through a series of paintings, is, one might note, in accordance with Charles Caffin's description of how Matisse reached abstraction, and how eventually he was able by these means to extract what he saw as the essential qualities
of his subject. On the other hand, O'Keeffe admitted too that the forms she used were not always extracted from the visible world. She has written of her capacity to visualize particular shapes which correspond to various experiences. Writing of her painting From the Plains, 1919 (Ill. 47), she explained: "From the Plains was painted from something I heard very often—a very special rhythm that would go for hours and hours . . . From experiences of one kind or another shapes and colors come to me very clearly." O'Keeffe, therefore, was inspired not only by the visual world, but by "experiences of one kind or another"; in this instance, certain sounds had suggested the particular shapes she used. In this respect, she came close to Dove who in turn had wished to suggest the force of the wind by means of shapes and colors, as in Nature Symbolized No. 2 (Ill. 12). Thus, whether O'Keeffe gradually abstracted simplified forms from her subject, or whether she painted directly in a symbolic manner, by inventing shapes and colors as equivalents for definite experiences, she was primarily a symbolist and expressionist painter as were the other artists in Stieglitz's group, and the content of her work had much in common with theirs.

The direction she took in the period 1918 to about 1925 was especially individual, and yet essentially in sympathy with the group's theoretical position. Further, it proved to be influential in the subsequent developments of Blumner and Dove.

It has already been pointed out that O'Keeffe tended to place simplified naturalistic forms in completely new contexts, thereby composing original abstractions, such as for example,
Blue and Green Music, 1919 (Ill. 45). By combining various motifs in new ways, semi-naturalistic shapes take on new meanings, and at times, O'Keeffe reached almost a surrealist position. The painting, Spring, c. 1922 (Ill. 48), was perhaps an interpretation of a still life placed on a windowsill, with a landscape beyond; but because there is no clear distinction between indoors and outdoors, the result is a dream-like landscape in which apples, a tree, perhaps part of a house, and clouds, appear to float in space. It is somewhat disturbing to see apples having apparently the same size as a tree; there has been little concern with placing objects in clear, logical spatial settings which would explain size. Yet it is precisely the apparent lapse in logic which lends the painting its dream-like qualities; a feature of her work that apparently both Bluemner and Dove noticed and developed.

In a series of paintings called The Flagpole, painted at Lake George in 1924, not only is there a lapse in logic, but natural and man-made objects are endowed with life, and react to each other in accordance with the dictates of a new, naive kind of reasoning. In the two versions of The Flagpole (Ill. 49)—consisting of the end of a building with a weather-vane on top, a flagpole, telephone wires and curving ground—O'Keeffe included a number of extremely lively looking clouds which appear to gather excitedly about the top of the undulating, rubbery flagpole. Such animation of static objects was not new to the circle, one is reminded that, as Chamberlain commented in 1910, Stieglitz exhibited a painting by Henri Rousseau of a
city landscape "in which the telegraph poles are considerably bent by the wind," and although "telegraph poles do not ordinarily bend in the wind . . . it somehow warms and comforts the imagination to see them doing it in a picture." Or in 1912, and 1913, one might note, Marin painted the buildings in New York as if they too were being bent by the wind; Marin was thinking of the city in terms of its being alive. Thus all in all, what one might call O'Keeffe's proto-surrealist approach to her subject matter was a further practical realization of the group's anti-rationalist stance. She may be said to have fulfilled Sydney Allen's plea of 1911 that an artist "needs must dive into some world of shadows where material facts dissolve"; or de Casseres' demand for an irrational kind of art based on intuition: "Two and two make four in the world of logic, but two and two do not make four in the subconscious or in the superconscious." One might note further that in 1915, in the magazine Stieglitz had recounted his dreams as a way of revealing philosophical truths, and that de Zayas and Eugene Meyer thought that a greater degree of realism could be obtained by the chance juxtaposition of words and images. Furthermore, in the early twenties, Stieglitz and O'Keeffe were attracted to Sherwood Anderson's short stories, in which the characters are often beset with irrational yearnings, causing them to undergo momentary transformation whereby details of their everyday surroundings take on new dimensions: all of which Anderson regarded as a form of enlightenment. And so by examining the irrational in visual terms, O'Keeffe was acutely in tune with the concerns of her colleagues.
With the advent of Surrealism, O'Keeffe's work from 1936 onwards was recognized as having a definite surrealist character. In the painting *Summer Days*, 1936, a deer's skull and flowers hover over a meticulously detailed distant landscape. Mumford wrote that although "O'Keeffe uses themes no less unexpected than those of the Surrealists ... she uses them in a fashion that makes them seem inevitable and natural, grave and beautiful ..." Other critics viewed her work as derivative. As Royal Cortissoz remarked; "she seems to be deviating into the cul-de-sac of surrealism."  

Oscar Bluemner  

From 1918 to 1923, Stephan Bourgeois acted as Bluemner's dealer. The two had met in 1917. Bluemner later reported that he had previously "kept aloof from the 'Frenchman'" but then he had discovered that Bourgeois was a "good German" who had arrived in the United States in 1911. He and Bluemner became close friends.  

Little is known of the work Bluemner did in the period 1918 to 1923; indeed work has been wrongly ascribed to these years. From letters to Stieglitz, however, we learn that Bluemner was having some difficulties in his work, and that he was not prolific. In 1917, the war had unsettled him to such an extent that he was unable to paint, and he spent much of his time gardening. Further, he found himself in conflict with "the international nonsense of the Isms;" and he decided momentarily to stop "studying, writing, talking, taking sides."
He wrote that "Cézanne, Matisse, Monet, Leonardo and the rest are packed away. I am soaked with paint, with nature, with what I find is elementary in painting." His friendship with Bourgeois awakened his interest in Eastern art, and he told Stieglitz that Chinese paintings were among "the grandest things ever painted"; he was inspired to read in 1920 the "Wisdom of the East Series". In 1919, Bluemner reported that he had not worked for a year, but that again he was studying a good deal, writing and making colour analyses; the bulk of his work over this period was in the form of sketches. On the whole, Bluemner's disassociation from European art, his growing interest in Oriental painting, and his increasingly subjective attitude to his rural surroundings, all contrived to bring him to a new phase of development.

Bourgeois exhibited a number of Bluemner's "Yankee houses" in 1921, and a few paintings were submitted to a group show—the Salons of America—the following year. In 1922, Bluemner told Stieglitz that he had "painted only a few things but with deliberation." He felt that "if one tries to get too close to the real thing one cannot do much in quantity." One's aim should be: "to grow in consciousness of that which Nature does with us." The year before, he had remarked that "the secret of trees" still eluded him.

One painting belonging to this period is well documented: The Red Town (Ill. 50) was bought by Stieglitz in the late twenties. Although its exact date is not known, there is a small gouache sketch, Red Buildings, Montclair, dated in the margin, 1922, which corresponds to the oil painting. The finished picture is recorded in a list of paintings which were
taken to Stieglitz's gallery to be stored in April, 1926.\textsuperscript{52}
It was Bluemner's practice to work from his sketches, sometimes a number of years after the original sketch had been made. But since we have in this instance a terminal date for \textit{The Red Town}, we know it was painted between 1922 and 1926.

In style \textit{The Red Town} differs considerably from previous work. Bluemner, feeling somewhat embarrassed on receiving Stieglitz's cheque for it, wrote: "Can't you see that the red house is no house but a crazy quilt of 4 or 5 different reds I had just gotten, that the tree looks like a moth eaten feather duster, that the blue sky is a blank?"\textsuperscript{53} Compared to earlier work, the painting is much more decorative. More pronounced is the tendency to reduce forms to simple rhythmic patterns so that the foreground and background trees are a series of undulating ds. Bluemner throughout the twenties was to simplify natural forms, such as trees, clouds, and hills, to the extent of lending them a uniformity of appearance, and the resulting landscapes are strangely unreal and dream-like. They are comparable to a number of paintings by O'Keeffe; one might place side by side, for example, O'Keeffe's \textit{Birch and Pine Tree}, No. 1, 1925 (Ill. 51), with Bluemner's painting \textit{Last Evening of the Year}, c. 1928 (Ill. 52).

There is much in \textit{The Red Town}, however, to indicate that Bluemner had maintained his interest in Charles Sheeler's work: the flat shapes, hard edges, and simple geometry, bring the painting close to Sheeler's work of 1917 and 1918. At the time of the Forum Exhibition, Bluemner had been impressed by Sheeler's
exploration of Cubism, and it is possible that he followed the next stage in Sheeler's development represented by, for example, Barn Abstraction, 1917 (Ill. 53). Sheeler, a Philadelphian artist, often journeyed to New York where together with his friend Morton Schamberg, he was a member of a circle of artists, including Marcel Duchamp and Joseph Stella, who gathered at the home of the Walter Arensbergs, and who belonged to Katherine Dreier's Société Anonyme, formed in 1920. Sheeler in 1916 had become friendly with Stieglitz who had encouraged his photography, and he established a further connection with the Stieglitz group by exhibiting some of his paintings at Marius de Zayas' Modern Gallery. There would have been ample opportunity for Bluemner to be aware of Sheeler's development.

Another artist from the Arensberg circle from whom Bluemner may have learned, is Joseph Stella. Bourgeois exhibited in 1919 the studies Stella had made the previous year, of petroleum storage containers, and in 1920 there was a retrospective exhibition. Bluemner seems almost certainly to have been influenced by Stella's interpretation of industrial forms; as a comparison of Stella's small oil, Gas Tanks, 1920 (Ill. 55), with Bluemner's Port Elizabeth, New Jersey, 1925 (Ill. 55), indicates. In both paintings there is a similar interpretation of large looming industrial shapes silhouetted against a bright sky.

Bourgeois, in 1923, terminated his business relationship with Bluemner, and the painter in the meantime had met through
Stieglitz, the art dealer Israel Neumann who was newly arrived in the United States. Neumann's interest in Bluemner's work was immediate, and the dealer represented him intermittently until Bluemner's death in 1938. There are in existence catalogues and dealers' lists of the paintings exhibited in one-man shows from 1924 to 1935 through which one is able to follow the subsequent pattern of his development. Exhibitions were put on at Neumann's Print Gallery in 1924; at Mrs. Liebermann's Tea Room and Handwork Center in 1926; at Stieglitz's The Intimate Gallery in 1928; at the Whitney Museum Studio Gallery in 1929; and finally at the Marie Harriman Gallery in 1935. The last show received the most publicity.

In 1924, Bluemner took to Neumann's gallery thirty-five watercolours painted that year; of these thirty-five, over twenty were exhibited in the November one-man show. Henry McBride approved of the new work. He reminded his readers that the artist "used to live in New Jersey... and saw many factories" which he painted in red; earlier paintings, McBride concluded, were "the most violent protests against the modern system that I have ever encountered." The latest paintings in contrast, he thought, "are decorative, they have excellent color"; further, "they have soul. Something has given Mr. Bluemner soul." 

The decorative tendency McBride spoke of most probably resulted from Bluemner's adoption of stylistic conventions discovered in the Chinese landscape painting which he found so attractive. In addition, a new feature was to be found in the work of 1924; familiar aspects of the everyday world suddenly
took on new and unexpected dimensions. *Old Age*, 1924, for example, a street scene with an oak tree in the foreground, seems somewhat ominous when the hollow in the oak is seen to take the form of a bent old woman. In later paintings, Bluemner continued to personify forms in nature; in *June Night, Backyard*, c. 1929, a tree trunk doubles as a caryatid; in *Sleep*, 1936, the snow-covered ground has the contours of a reclining figure.\(^59\)

Of Stieglitz's other artists, Dove too was to ascribe human forms to man-made objects, as in *The Telegraph Pole*, 1929, in which the telegraph pole appears to shiver as a forceful wind drives leaves against it. Further, Dove's *Dancing Tree*, 1930, is seen as a dancing animal.\(^60\)

In the foreword Bluemner proposed to include in the catalogue to his November 1924 exhibition at Neumann's gallery—a statement which in fact was not used—he wrote: "I do not mean to state the physical aspects of what I see or as I see it, and I am unable to say what I feel. Or, can you fully explain what you feel and carry into Nature? Art is a matter of emotion."\(^61\)

Obviously Bluemner in 1924 was not willing to venture detailed explanations of his new direction. But it is quite possible that contrary to his former habits of painting in accordance with definite principles he had thoroughly worked out, he was now painting in a more intuitive manner. Perhaps too he was not even sure about the direction his work was taking. It is possible also, however, that his friendship with Stieglitz and the writer members of the group influenced him in his unwillingness to explain his art. The position of the members of
the group was anti-rational; even if it was not anti-intellectual, it was on the verge of being so, since the artist's spontaneous reactions to his surroundings were thought to be all important, and intellectual analysis was thought to be destructive of feeling and thus tended to be discouraged. In fact, Stieglitz in 1922 was expressing open dislike of intellectuals who, he said, knew so much "they experience nothing—so really know nothing."  

After the rather productive year of 1924, Bluemner's output lessened for a time. He saw 1926 as a somewhat sterile period: "I do feel that I am nowhere and do not care to go anywhere at all," he wrote. He attempted to refresh himself by visiting Canada; shortly afterwards he began to write of new subjects. In December, 1926, he described the "brilliant moon in a deep golden bottom of an infinite blue surrounded by a white enormous ring;" a spectacle he had observed on a boat trip along the New Jersey coast. The following month, he told Stieglitz that although New England where he lived had an atmosphere suitable for "old spinsters and stockfish," he felt that he should have moved there forty years earlier: "I should... sit in this very corner of the world, more alone with myself, at bottom, than the man in the moon! Hence I am painting moons." By February 1929, he reported to Stieglitz that he was preparing for exhibition, "12 novel things, moons and suns crashing through space." By August, he had ready "20 or 25 unshown watercolours, and five oils;" of these, eighteen of the watercolours were on the theme of the sun and the moon.
This group of paintings, including *The Eye of Fate; Sunset on the St. Lawrence; Sun Storm; House and Tree; Ascension;* and *Moonrise,* were shown at The Intimate Gallery in 1928. They testify to the ecstatic nature worship that overwhelmed members of Stieglitz's circle in the twenties. As McBride remarked Bluemner's "new studies rely more than before on symbolism and are more or less abstract . . . His 'Somber and Hard; his 'Serenade of Night' and the 'Lamp of Sleep' are all excellent."64 Murdoch Pemberton, writing for the *New Yorker,* remarked that "Bluemner has come out of the Massachusetts woods, where he lives as a hermit, bringing a trunk load of 'facts and fancies, strains and moods.'" He described how "the artist tells us that he spent the usual time in running about the land, seeking this interesting composition or that significant motif," deciding ultimately "that there was one backyard in America, one woodland vista, one moon, and one set of stars. He went into his hut and painted them . . ."65

If Pemberton's reference to Bluemner's "hut" rather inaccurately describes the wooden frame house in a suburban setting that Bluemner occupied in South Braintree, Massachusetts, it at least indicates that Bluemner was judged to belong to the movement in which the artist is regarded as a solitary seer whose inspiration is found in nature. And thus, Thoreau-like, he retreats from civilization to "his hut" in order to do his thinking.

Of the paintings which were exhibited, *Moonrise,* c. 1925 (Ill. 56), was probably one of the first of the series.
Bluemner's debt to O'Keeffe is apparent, I think, if one compares Moonrise to O'Keeffe's Lake George with Crous, or her Evening Star, No. 6. Further, Sun Storm has much in common with O'Keeffe's Petunia No. 2, 1924, which was exhibited at the Anderson Galleries in the show Seven Americans in 1925. O'Keeffe had placed two flower heads in space; one might note that in Sun Storm, the sun looks much like a flower head, and its rays look like leaves (Ill. 57). Dove, in Sun and Moon, 1935 (Ill. 58), also painted the sun as a large falling flower whose rays are leaves. Furthermore, in others of Dove's paintings such as Alfie's Delight, 1929, and Fog Horns, 1929 (Ill. 16), hovering circular forms again remind one of O'Keeffe's early disembodied flowers.

The painting Serenade of Night (Ill. 59), brings Bluemner particularly close to O'Keeffe, in that he too conceived of the buildings and telegraph poles as being alive, as in O'Keeffe's series called The Flagpole (Ill. 49). He wrote in 1929:

Let intense emotion fire your imagination, or memory of scenes (we live with) and the colors of things, . . . the lines and shapes of things will sway and twist as if they were human . . . Now let colors as psychological plasma create their own forms . . . Green can become a tree, a meadow, and so forth . . .

In the paintings called The Eye of Fate, 1927, and The Lamp of Sleep, enormous suns dominate man's world, and seem to set land, trees, and even houses in undulating motion. The subject of The Lamp of Sleep (Ill. 60) is a sun cavorting between a house and a tree; the sheer force of the energy emitted by the sun appears to depress the forms surrounding it. As Bluemner
Arthur Dove

From 1920 onwards, after Dove had left Westport, Connecticut, his art began to develop rapidly: in the next twenty-five years of his creative life, he explored the implications of the aesthetic stand he and his colleagues at "291" had adopted; at times coming close to O'Keeffe and Blumenner in developing a world of fantasy, and at times pursuing afresh the concerns of 1911 when the essence of nature's objects was sought. Finally, he adopted a spare style in which flattened shapes—perhaps somewhat reminiscent of those in Hartley's 1914 to 1915 paintings—are used in the context of Dove's personal subject matter.

There is a noticeable change from May 1920 in the style and content of Dove's letters to Stieglitz. There is much looser, freer way of writing; a lively interest shown in his surroundings, in work and in the necessary tasks aboard the boat which was his new home. Writing about his tasks, he said: "The beauty of it is . . . that it is all done out where we can be using our eyes and feelings on other things while we work." And later he
reiterated: "This manual labour outdoors gives one a chance to think things out." As he began work in 1920, he realized that his art was becoming more personal in nature: "Have five or six drawings for paintings that are almost self-portraits in spite of their having been done from outside things. They seem to me more real than anything yet. It is great to be at it again. Feel more like a person than I have in years ... ."

The fruits of the labours of the next five years were exhibited in the large group show, *Seven Americans*, held at the Anderson Galleries in March, 1925; among Dove's twenty-five exhibits were paintings of the experience of storms at sea, such as *Thunderstorm*, 1921 (Ill. 61), and there were in addition about eight constructions in which found objects—grasses, pebbles, metal, paper, worn wood and textiles—were incorporated in order to build up conceptual images. Whereas the storm paintings may be seen to be Dove's continued exploration of the subject of *Nature Symbolized No. 2* (Ill. 12), in which he found visual equivalents for the experience of the wind, some of the collage constructions perhaps should be regarded as his personal solution to the questions posed by the art of de Zayas and Picabia, both of whom examined the theme of the abstract portrait in 1913 and 1915 respectively.

Dove's collages have been studied in detail by Dorothy Rylander Johnson, whose explanation of the portrait of Alfred Stieglitz illustrates the subtlety of Dove's interpretation of his friend Johnson suggests that the photographic lens at the top of the construction is Stieglitz's head or keen eye; the photographic
plate forms his body; the watch spring symbolizes his precise mind; a clock spring is the equivalent of his energy; and in all probability a piece of steel wool represents the abrasive element in his personality. That Dove should have used a number of diverse elements to build up a composite portrait in this manner hardly seems surprising, in view of the developments at "291" in 1915. Rather, the question which presents itself is, how may one account for Dove's use of such new materials? It has been pointed out by Edith Gregor Halpert and Johnson that there possibly may be some relation between a number of the collages and Victorian constructions of, for example, flowers and lace under glass; perhaps, it has been suggested, the growing taste for collecting American Folk art which first became apparent in 1919 suggested Dove's own constructions. However, it would seem that there are closer parallels. Marsden Hartley, who probably was familiar with Duchamp's work on his "Big Glass", did ten paintings on glass in the summer of 1917 while working in Hamilton Easter Field's art community in Ogunquit, Maine. They were mainly decorative flower paintings with "silver and gold appliqué." Hartley had told Stieglitz that he had long wanted to do glass work; an idea which may have originated in Germany where Hartley, following Kandinsky's and Marc's example, had collected six Bavarian Glasbilder. Stieglitz apparently much admired Hartley's experiments since he kept a number of the glass paintings for his personal collection. In February 1924, Dove too noted: "Have been working on glass today—a most delightful medium with oil . . . the surface has the utmost flatness, and a speed that with pen or brush is unequalled."
Somewhat earlier, however, Dove was expressing his interest in the textures and colours of natural substances; in 1921, during a camping trip with his son William and Van Wyck Brooks' son Charles, he wrote: "It is quite peaceful here and almost too much on the side of beautiful scenery—but there are some stronger things. A sluice gate for instance of rusty used iron, warm grey weathered wood and a strip of blue grey water which I have been at this morning." As William Dove recalls, his father at that time was especially interested in the "things" in nature. Indeed, in December 1920, Dove mentioned in a letter to Stieglitz that "in the last two days I started what we think is the best 'thing painting' yet." William Dove suggests that it was primarily his father's love of natural objects which prompted him to include them in his pictures. One might add that given the precedent of the collage experiments being done in the Arensberg circle, as well as Hartley's inclusion of tinsel paper and metallic paint in his paintings on glass, Dove was continuing a line of experiment well under way in New York at that period. Yet the results he achieved were novel and beautiful, as Stieglitz readily appreciated when he kept Ralph Dusenberry, 1924, for his collection. By 1927, although Dove continued to experiment with new materials, particularly favouring metal on which to paint, the collage phase was over; the last batch of constructions were shown in Dove's one-man show at the end of the year. At the time of his next exhibition, in April, 1929, Murdoch Pemberton of the New Yorker pointed out that: "This year there are no doodads to confuse one."
All is pure painting," from which "something of his tense, cramped quality has flown out.

In 1928, Dove and Helen Torr moved to land, to the Pratt Islands, Noroton, Connecticut, and for the first time Dove had unlimited working space; a fact which Stieglitz thought partly explained the next change in style. But as the artist's remarks indicate, he felt that he was relying more than ever on his spontaneous reactions to his surroundings and that his work was more imaginative. Of one of the paintings exhibited, Distraction, 1929, Dove wrote in the preliminary list of exhibits sent to Stieglitz that Distraction "is I think further on than any yet. It is as free as anything I can imagine." In a statement published in S. Kootz's book, Modern American Painters, Dove wrote:

Feeling that the 'first flash' of an idea gives its most vivid sensation, I am at present in some of the paintings (See 'Distraction', here reproduced) trying to put down the spirit of the idea as it comes out... It is the form that the idea takes in the imagination rather than the form as it exists outside.

In the statement included in the 1929 catalogue, he also wrote:

Dec. 14. The line still holds and the contrasting sizes. Actual size all the time, and as much as you need of any size, so that all the things you feel are quite real... things can be of the same size and of different sizes at the same time. That is certainly true and covers both vision and feeling.

There is no right and wrong in aesthetics, there is only that thing of finding something that seems more true than the last something that you or someone else found that seemed quite true...

While Dove's comments are applicable to Distraction, a large flower apparently as large as a tree silhouetted against
a sunset, they also help to explain the painting *Alfie's Delight*, 1929.

When he moved to the Pratt Islands in October 1928, Dove began to investigate what he called "size contrast"; and, as he concluded in December, "things can be of the same size and of different sizes at the same time." Such observations may have been inspired by Blumner who had written for the catalogue to his 1928 show at The Intimate Gallery that "seen at a distance ... the moon, for instance, does appear as big as a house"; an explanation which fitted well Blumner's composition, *The Lamp of Sleep*, 1927 (Ill. 60), in which a giant moon appears in close proximity to a house. Similarly, in *Alfie's Delight*, 1929 (Ill. 62), behind a large centrally placed flower head, circular forms, perhaps a tree and a house tilted on its side, appear to spiral into space; the flower head and the house are about the same size.

Georgia O'Keeffe, one might note, tended to explore the same principle of "size contrast" in a number of paintings of the thirties, in which skulls or flowers appear to hover over a landscape. Apparently she was examining the idea which she had initiated in about 1922 with a painting such as *Spring*, that natural phenomena seen in unusual contexts take on new, supernatural dimensions; an idea which first Blumner and then Dove also examined each in his own way.

By October, 1929, Dove realized that paintings which were the results of intense subjectivity were of greater value than those more obviously related to the visible world.
He noticed that the more abstract ones were quite distinct:

The pure paintings seem to stand out from those related too closely to what the eye sees there. To choose between here and there—I should say here—The recent philosophy and fiction also tend to strengthen that idea—It seems to me to be the healthiest idea that has come from modern painting.

The "recent philosophy" which Dove felt substantiated his acceptance of the importance of subjectivity was mainly that of Nietzsche, whose ideas about the many aspects truth might assume, Dove, as did Stieglitz, found particularly apt. "Nietzsche and his circles is abstractly true," Dove commented, "but when we have a rubber circle and whirl it into forms, truth does not get so important as a whole." Favourite fiction writers, also held in high regard by both friends, were Joyce and Lawrence. 85

Dove found as his work progressed, that he often came back to ideas held previously about painting: "We keep on going to find often that we are passing a tree that we marked some years back. These moving circles in which we walk are what we call work and thought ..." 86 Indeed, with Ferryboat Wreck, Oyster Bay, 1932, although in some respects he was looking back to the mood of Fog Horns, 1929, since in both paintings the main forms—symbols of sound and rotting timbers—are set in the context of a mist-laden sea, yet, as he pointed out in the catalogue to the 1932 one-man show, his theory of "conditions of light" was still a basic premise. Particularly applicable to Ferryboat Wreck, Oyster Bay, are his remarks to the effect that he had been concerned with light, and with "the idea of
substances as pieces of feeling, each, in their own realm so that they may exist in light and space." 87

But as well as continuing to explore earlier ideas, Dove, by the early thirties, was employing dream-like imagery. Rosenfeld in 1932 remarked on the "many strange budding, dawning, unfolding movements, and drunken oscillations" in his art. 88

The sun came to be regarded as a vigorous, yet mystifying source of life. Dawn III (Ill. 63) is a fantasy of animated forms which appear to stretch towards the sun, disconnect from each other, and float towards the source of energy; complex cosmic events were being pictured in magical terms. Dove, as had Marin before him, was beginning to see natural and man-made objects as being vigorously alive.

O'Keeffe and Blausner may well have stimulated this new phase of Dove's development. At the same time since Klee was one of the few European artists Dove greatly admired, he also may have been inspired by Klee's child-like interpretation of the world. 89

Dove moved to Geneva, New York, in 1933, where he stayed until 1933, and there he reached even greater heights of expression as the proto-surrealist aspects of his work developed. At the same time he continued to develop earlier ideas. As he told Kootz in 1930, his working procedure "leaves the imagination free to work in all directions with all dimensions that are or may have been realized." 90 Before going to Geneva, he had told Stieglitz that he could probably work well there. And so it proved, in spite of numerous personal difficulties with relatives.
with whom Dove felt he had little in common. In August, 1933, he wrote: "The skies . . . are big with their fine stretches." By November, he reported: "Things are going a bit better here. I have a good lot of water colors anyway and they have plenty of vitality—they say more than ever—It may be that my attitude about the whole thing here has crept into the painting. If so it will be a good thing."91

Themes of the sun and moon continued to be developed with unexpected flights of the imagination. In Moon, 1935, a tree and a moon become an unearthly image, as the moon appears superimposed on the front of the tree; an effect Blumesner had touched on in Silver Moonlight, 1927 (Ill. 64).92 And in Cross in the Tree, (Ill. 65), and Cross and Weather-wane, 1935 (Ill. 66), man-made objects, as well as natural ones, are seen as disconnected, rubbery elements. As indicated by the sketch Weather-wane, 1934,93 the possible starting point for both paintings, Dove conceived of man-made things as having life; and in this respect he came close to O'Keeffe's interpretations of The flappole, 1924. Yet, the life with which things were seen to be possessed lent them an ethereal quality, enabling them to detach themselves from their earthly anchors, and be drawn towards the sun. In the series of paintings called Sunrise, 1937, strange organic forms float round, penetrate, and finally are enclosed by the sun.94

In the thirties, Dove's art received a greater amount of public attention than before; a fact Paul Rosenfeld judged a result of "the current propaganda for 'subconscious' expressions,
particularly for Surrealistic painting. It has the effect of helping to break down resistances to images of all for which there is as yet no conventional language . . . "Lewis Mumford judged that by 1935 Dove had "pushed further into the field of Expressionism and with more assurance than an other painter" in America.\textsuperscript{95}

Illness between 1938 and 1939 prevented Dove from working for about a year and so his 1939 one-man show at Stieglitz's gallery was mostly retrospective. Yet two paintings dated 1939 in the catalogue—\textit{Hardware Store Window} and \textit{Graphite and Blue}—reveal Dove's continued interest in free-floating forms, as does a painting of the forties, \textit{Green, Gold and Brown}, 1942.\textsuperscript{96}

\textbf{John Marin}

If O'Keeffe, Dove and Bluemner may be shown to have developed empathic, nature-based forms of art in which at times they came close to each other in seeing the world as a magical, dream-like place, Marin remained more firmly attached to known, visible reality. Nevertheless, he pondered the same concerns which earlier had occupied the group. And, in 1920, his questioning of whether art should be based primarily on subjective experience or on outside reality, much resembled Dove's similar questioning of 1929; but whereas Dove opted for an art based mainly on inner experience, Marin insisted on keeping in touch with outer appearances. He wondered which was better, to paint from nature directly, or to paint from memory; he decided that probably painting consisted of an amalgam of things both seen and remembered.
At times Marin chose not to work directly in front of his subject, but rather to work from memory in his studio. In 1919, he wrote that working outdoors tired him: "I don't get what I want anymore and seem to think I can do better visualizing what I have experienced through my eyes." Yet even when he was not working directly from his subject, in order to paint from memory he depended a great deal on what he had seen. Ultimately, though, he always went back to nature precisely because he relied so much on what could be seen. Although he was in agreement with the Photo-Secession critics in thinking that "reason and knowledge are the things we have to combat", yet he added that reason and knowledge "are always fighting sight." Appearances in themselves he found exciting because nothing ever quite remained the same from one moment to the next; a point he made in writing of the changing appearance of a schooner as it came towards him:

"It's a question as to whether the open sight vision—that is of things you see—isn't better than the inner, I mean, vision things. That, I guess, is a muted unanswered question... take today for example. I was laying off in my boat, and there was a schooner in full sail coming toward me. I made about 20 drawings, none near perfect, but the sight as she loomed up, a thing of life changing with every second, I couldn't begin to describe the wonder of it. After writing this, my answer now, to myself, is that you cannot divorce the two, they are inseparable [sic] they go together..."

Perhaps facilitated by the watercolour medium which allowed a spontaneous manner of working, Marin was able to put into practice the group's belief in the importance of plumbing the significance of successive moments of experience; he was painting in accordance with Bergson's and Nietzsche's belief that change means life.
In 1927, Marin again wrote of his preoccupation with expressing a sense of life by capturing that which is seen as being perpetually in flux:

As I drive a good deal I am conscious of the road, the wonderful everlasting road, a leading onward, a dipping, a rising, a leading up over the hill to the sea beyond. To nail that, to express that, to find the means to clutch, so that there it is, that's what torments me, to show with startling conviction.

But even when Marin painted comparatively static objects, he insisted that all things should seem alive, or be convincingly functional:

I don't paint rocks, trees, houses and all things seen, I paint an inner vision. Rubbish. If you have an intense love and feeling towards these things, you'll try your damnedest to put on paper or canvas that thing. You can transpose, you can play with and on your material, but when you are finished that's got to have the roots of that thing in it and no other thing.

Thus basically, Marin, like Dove and O'Keeffe, aimed to express the unique character or quality through which natural elements appear to be endowed with life. As he wrote: "you have to love these, to be a part of these in sympathy. One doesn't get very far without this love"; "I would say (if I were asked) to a person who thinks he wishes to paint—or to do anything for that matter: Go look at the bird's flight—the man's walk—the sea's movement. They have a way—to keep their motion—nature's laws of motion have to be obeyed"; "water you paint the way water moves—Rocks and soil you paint the way they were worked in their formation—Trees you paint the way trees grow."
When he considered the work of his contemporaries he was critical if it did not exhibit those qualities of life which he thought it was the artist's task to express; thus, Stella's painting of the Brooklyn Bridge did not seem convincing. He wrote that it did not have "anything of the real bridge feeling in it--any more than if he had put up some street cables and things in his Studio--painted a rather beautiful thing and called it the 'Bridge' which again (to me at least) is just what he did." Further, he was critical of the results of apparent eclecticism; work by William Zorach and Bertram Hartman seemed to Marin to be a pastiche of "a sort of Pseudo Romantic Chaldean--Persian--Grecian--Roman--Italian--French German--Combination Vision." Rather, he preferred "some things made out of Mexican silver coins, made by the Hopi or Navajo tribe of Indians." He felt that in the Indian work "there was a symbolic expression, an abstract expression, a true expression of their personal sight of things existing about them, however abstractly treated, still gotten from those special things, from their own lives." In painting it is necessary to remember, he wrote, "that robins naturally hop about, they don't walk. Chickens walk, they don't hop. These are little things, yet fundamental to the beast. So it is with boats, so it is with all things." 103

In 1945, Marin still held to the position that paintings first and foremost should be expressive of life. Mondrian's work seemed completely empty. He painted "fine uprights and horizontals--as supports for things to grow--Yet nothing grows
thereon." "He has even neutralized his colour—doesn't the man come pretty close to neutralizing himself . . .?" The following year, in 1946, when Marin again exhibited a series of works on the theme of the city he somewhat reiterated his 1913 statement when he wrote for the catalogue: "These drawings are made in an effort to put down the different Street and City movements as I feel them in such a way that what appears on the paper shall have a life of its own akin to the movements felt." He added that: "There never was or never will be a non-objective art."104
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Letter to Stieglitz: March 13, 1913.

Letters to Stieglitz: February, 1913; April 29, 1913; August, 1913. Letter to Gertrude Stein: August 8, 1913; postcards: September 5, 1913; August 30, 1913.

Letter, Hartley to Stieglitz, October, 1913.

Letter, September 28, 1913.

Letter, May, 1913.

Information from the Elizabeth McCausland Papers.

Letters to Stieglitz, May, 1913.

Letter, Late May, 1913.
Illustrated in the catalogue Marsden Hartley: A Retrospective Exhibition (New York: Bernard Danenberg Galleries, Inc., 1969). It is an oil painting, 41 1/2" x 34", and it is owned privately. McCausland thought it belonged to the series of abstract paintings of 1914 (McCausland Papers).

Letters to Gertrude Stein: June, 1913; August 30, 1913 (postcard). Gertrude Stein Archives, Yale University Collection of American Literature.


Letter, Hartley to Stieglitz, August, 1913.


Letter, October 31, 1912.

Letter, Hartley to Stieglitz, late 1914.

Camera Work, Special Number, June, 1913. Bluemner also contributed to the issue of Camera Work, No. 47, July 1914, in which answers to the question "What is '291'?" were offered.

Camera Work, Special Number, June, 1913. For Caffin's views see p. 55 above.

"Modern Art", manuscript, Oscar Bluemner Papers (Graham Gallery Papers), on microfilm at the Archives of Modern Art.

Camera Work, Special Number, June, 1913, p. 37. Bluemner recognized that "future painting may discard all realistic symbols (imitation) for pure color-harmony" but thought that "great colorists . . . are very rare." At the time he was writing, he had seen Picabia's abstract sketches on the theme of New York, which he mentioned. Abstraction per se, however, did not interest him apparently, and he assumed that on the whole most other painters were not too interested in non-objective art.

Information from Bluemner's lists of paintings among Stieglitz's papers. Listed were Red Farm at Pochuck; Port of
Musconetcong—possibly this is Old Canal Port (Illustrated in Rose, American Art Since 1900, p. 36) and Silk Town on the Passaic, known subsequently as An Expression of a Silk Town; this was exhibited in the Forum Exhibition, 1916, and it is illustrated in the catalogue.

99 Although Bluemner in 1934 made a detailed record of his work in a book now in the possession of his son, much of the information was transferred and is therefore now available, from lists of paintings he sent to Stieglitz to Bourgeois and to Neumann (The Stieglitz Archive, Yale University Collection of American Literature; The Oscar Bluemner Papers, Graham Gallery Papers, and J. B. Neumann Papers on microfilm at the Archives of American Art). Some guide to dating is also provided by the way Bluemner signed his work: the group of oils, painted after his trip to Europe in 1912 are signed in black—"Bluemner"—in script; by about 1916 Bluemner was making use of a contracted version of his signature "O. Bluemner". Block capitals were used and the letter O and B, L and W, sometimes E and R overlaid each other, while the remaining letters were joined together sharing the vertical stems of the block capitals. Sometimes the O was omitted. By 1933 Bluemner adopted an alternative signature: he substituted the Latin word Florianus for Bluemner. One might note that in the chronology tabled in the catalogue Oscar Bluemner: American Colorist, the year 1933 is given as the one in which this signature was assumed. Certainly, after 1933 the signature "Florianus" appears frequently. The year before, however, (May 13, 1932) Bluemner had facetiously signed a letter to Neumann "Oscar Florianus Bluemner".

100 "Modern Art", manuscript, Oscar Bluemner Papers, Graham Gallery Papers, microfilm at the Archives of American Art.

101 Illustrated in the Forum Exhibition catalogue.

Chapter IV

1 Letter, Stieglitz to Hartley, March 4, 1913.

2 See pp. 65-66 above. 3 Ibid.

4 Reported in the Chicago Evening Post, undated newspaper clipping in Dove's scrap-book. Mullett Smith writes that the meeting was recorded in the New York Sun, March 18, 1913. (Unpublished M. A. thesis, pp. 44-45.)
He made this comment in the list of exhibitions at "291" he submitted for inclusion in Eddy's book, Cubists and Post Impressionists (p. 211). The drawings were exhibited at "291" immediately after Picabia's first New York one-man show in March, 1913. Since there is a portrait of Picabia in the series, it would seem that de Zayas' move to abstract portraiture occurred at the time Picabia was an habitué of the gallery.

"Marius de Zayas--Material, Relative and Absolute Caricatures." Camera Work, No. 46, April 1914. (Published at about the end of September, 1914, according to a letter from Stieglitz to de Zayas, July 7, 1914).

"Caricature: Absolute and Relative." Ibid.

Letters to Stieglitz: May 22, 1914; June 11, 1914; June 30, 1911; July 9, 1914; Undated letter, 1914.

Ibid. Ibid.

Letter, Steichen to Stieglitz, December, 1912.

Steichen, A Life in Photography. Stieglitz, in a letter to de Zayas (June 9, 1914), remarked that Steichen was "engrossed in his garden to the exclusion of everything else."

Letters, Stieglitz to Haviland, December 30, 1915; Stieglitz to Walkowitz, September 10, 1914.

Steichen, op. cit. Ibid. Ibid.

Letter, Stieglitz to Hartley, May 12, 1914.

Letter, Stieglitz to Steichen, July 6, 1914.


Letter, Stieglitz to Sheeler, December 1, 1916.

291, No. 2, April 1915.

Letters to Hartley, February 5, 1915; May 4, 1915.

Letter to Hartley, May 4, 1915. Ibid.
25 Letters; Stieglitz to Haviland, December 30, 1915; February 1, 1917.

26 291, No. 1, March, 1915.

27 Fille Née sans Mère (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Alfred Stieglitz Collection) was published in the June, 1915 issue of 291.

28 291, Nos. 5-6, July-August, 1915.

29 291, Nos. 7-8, September-October, 1915.


31 Letters: Stieglitz to Haviland, December 30, 1915; de Zayas to Stieglitz, September 1, 1915; August 23, 1915; August 27, 1915; September 1, 1915.

32 Steichen, A Life in Photography.

33 Information from letters to Stieglitz: October 18, 1913; November, 1913; May, 1914.

34 Letter to Stieglitz, November 3, 1914.

35 Painting No. 4: Black Horse. Oil, 39½" x 32". Philadelphia Museum of Art, Alfred Stieglitz Collection.

36 Information from Elizabeth McCawland's research papers, The Whitney Museum Papers, on microfilm at the Archives of American Art. This painting is in the collection of the Whitney Museum of American Art. It is illustrated in Rose, American Art Since 1900, p. 55.

37 Letter, Hartley to Stieglitz, July 29, 1914.

38 Letter, Hartley to Stieglitz, September 1, 1914.

39 See Note 50 below for a discussion of the symbolism of Eight Bells Folly.

It is possible too that Hartley saw his motif of the rider as in part being somewhat autobiographical. In February, 1914, he described himself as "a kind of rover in quest of celestial beauty" (letter to Stieglitz), and later (October 23, 1914) he mentioned to Stieglitz that the paintings were a "logical expression" of himself.


Letter, Hartley to Stieglitz, May, 1913.


Letter, Hartley to Stieglitz, April 6, 1915.

Letter, Hartley to Stieglitz, November 8, 1914.


A number of flags in Hartley's so-called decorative paintings remind one of nautical flags. Indeed, Hartley who had spent his youth near the Maine coast would no doubt have been familiar with the international nautical flag language and perhaps may have intended that some of his flags should be "read"; the meanings of motifs such as the blue and white checkerboard, a red spot on a white ground, and a red cross on a white ground are "no", "one" and "eight" respectively. (I am indebted to my husband, T. S. Szekely for bringing this point to my attention.) Later, in the painting Eight Bells Folly, Memorial for Hart Crane, 1933, there is yet another, and, in this instance, a more definite nautical reference. The painting may be seen as a commentary on the violent death of Hartley's friend, the American poet Hart Crane who committed suicide one
night in 1932 by jumping overboard from a ship bound for New York. In the sky, cloud forms enclose eight-pointed stars, and a large, free floating number eight, a sun, and a moon, hover over a turbulent sea from where red eyes stare upwards; a buoy with the number eight inscribed on it, floats among the eyes and the stylized waves; a large wave encloses an open-mouthed shark and a sailing ship is tossed about in the background—the numbers three and nine appear on the sail and the shark-bearing wave respectively: Hartley was using the personal symbols he developed in 1914 and 1915 as a way of picturing Crane's violent death. The number eight itself may perhaps be considered to be Hartley's symbol of man's destiny or of death. In this particular instance, however, perhaps the significance of the title, as well as the presence of the number eight, has an even more precise meaning if one remembers that nautical time is sounded by bells being rung each half hour. A ship's watch is changed every four hours, at which time eight bells sound; thus, translated to nautical terms, the meaning of the number eight could be that the watch is changing, and analogously, man's "watch" or life is at an end.

51 Letter, Hartley to Stieglitz, September 22, 1913. Stieglitz assured him: "You are not to come here to explain your pictures. What a horrible idea to even think of that." (Letter, October 2", 1913).

52 Letter, Hartley to Stieglitz, June, 1914.

53 Hartley's statement at the time of his third one-man show at "291", in January-February, 1913; reprinted in Camera Work, No. 45, January, 1914 (Published June, 1914).

54 Statement reprinted in Camera Work, No. 43, October 1916.

55 Information from the Elizabeth McCausland Papers, The Whitney Museum Papers, on microfilm at the Archives of American Art. Portrait of a German Officer is illustrated in Goldzahler's American Painting (p. 59), and Baur's Revolution and Tradition in Modern American Art (Ill. 66).

56 Information from the Elizabeth McCausland Papers.

57 The drawings were published in Camera Work, No. 46, April 1914. This issue of the magazine came out at about the end of September 1914, according to a letter from Stieglitz to de Zayas, July 7, 1914.

58 Letter, Hartley to Stieglitz, October 29, 1914.
Letter, Hartley to Stieglitz, Autumn, 1914.

Letter, Hartley to Stieglitz, November 8, 1915.

See note 50 above.


Letter, Stieglitz to Haviland, November 1, 1916.

Letter, Hartley to Stieglitz, February 8, 1917.

Oscar Bluemner Papers, Graham Gallery Papers, on microfilm at the Archives of American Art. Bluemner's comments are in English.

Ibid. Bluemner's comments have been translated from German.


Reich, John Marin, p. 5.


Sheldon Reich, in his unpublished Ph. D. thesis on John Marin, makes the point that 1915 was a difficult year for Marin, and suggests "he may have felt at sea as he moved through the strangely jaded intellectualism fostered at '291' by Marius de Zayas, Picabia, and Duchamp." (p. 109).

One might note that Caffin almost suggested that this might be the case when he reviewed Marin's work of 1914: "Much that hitherto had been only felt has been made plain to his understanding; that which he had instinctively groped after he has now captured and submitted to mental analysis . . . He has learned to discriminate the ultimate essentials of the concrete that must be retained as a foundation of actuality to support his fabric of abstract expressionism . . . he has attained to a more thorough organization." Reprinted from the New York American in Camera Work, No. 44, October, 1913 (published March, 1914).

Illustrated in Wight, Arthur G. *Dove*, pp. 46 and 44.


Ibid., letter to Stieglitz, September 19, 26, 1915, p. 25.

Ibid.

Oscar Bluemner Papers, Graham Gallery Papers, on microfilm at the Archives of American Art.

See the catalogue, *Oscar Bluemner: American Colorist*.

Oscar Bluemner Papers, Graham Gallery Papers, on microfilm at the Archives of American Art.

Ibid. Bluemner's comments have been translated from German.

See p. 148 above.


Letter, April 19, 1916.


Goodrich and Bry, op. cit., p. 3.

Statement for the catalogue to her one-man show at *An American Place*, 1939.
"O'Keeffe and Matisse." Mumford's article is the preface to the catalogue of O'Keeffe's one-man exhibition at The Intimate Gallery in January, 1928.

Information given to the American Art Research Council (set up under the curatorship of Lloyd Goodrich in 1944, at the Whitney Museum of American Art) by the College Art Association, 1946 (Whitney Museum Papers).

Illustrated in Ross, American Art Since 1900, p. 48


See Bouie, op. cit., plates 38 and 39.


"Some Plain Sense on the Modern Art Movement." Camera Work, Special Number, June, 1913, p. 33. See p. 120 above.

Letter, Stieglitz to Haviland, February 1, 1917.

Chapter V

1 Herbert Seligmann writes: "Writers, painters, photographers, people of all sorts still sought him out. Privacy in the ordinary sense seemed hardly to exist for Stieglitz. He was on call seemingly at any hour, any day, for anyone who chose to participate in the experience he was having." ("A Vision through Photography". America and Alfred Stieglitz, p. 113).

2 Letter, Stieglitz to Frank, February 23, 1917.

3 Stieglitz's first letter to Seligmann (October 31, 1918) was a reply to a request to meet Stieglitz again. Seligmann later wrote that he was first introduced to Stieglitz in 1917 by the photographer Paul Strand. At the time, Stieglitz was in the process of packing up his things at "291". ("A Vision Through Photography." America and Alfred Stieglitz, p. 113).

4 The first letter to Rosenfeld was written August 28, 1920; to Mumford, April 27, 1925. In his first letter to Mumford, Stieglitz was complimentary about Rosenfeld's article in
the Dial, which appeared in August, 1925. Rosenfeld had reviewed
the large group exhibition, "Seven Americans", arranged by Stieglitz at the Anderson Galleries in March, 1925.

Stieglitz apparently was not too friendly with Van Wyck Brooks, although he reported to Waldo Frank (letter, January 1, 1921) that Brooks had spent five hours in his company. Brooks' letters to Stieglitz are a number of short notes of thanks for communications from Stieglitz in connection with activities at his galleries. Stieglitz wrote to Herbert Seligmann (letter, July 29, 1920) that he had started to read Brooks' Mark Twain, and that he found it extremely interesting, and that he was looking forward to meeting Brooks shortly. There are short notes from Brooks to Stieglitz dating from 1921 to 1933.

Letter, Dove to Stieglitz, August 26, 1919.

William Wasserstrom writes in The Time of the Dial (Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1963, p. 37) that "a large group of writers—Sherwood Anderson and Waldo Frank, James Oppenheim, Henry McBride, Paul Rosenfeld—developed styles in accord with his taste. These are of course the leading figures of Resurgence, the men of art who responded to Brooks' demand that American intellectuals found a school which would lead and inspire the nation." He concludes that "Brooks shaped their theory and carried their banner, but Stieglitz, their teacher, was himself the chief source of inspiration." See also Wasserstrom, Van Wyck Brooks.

Letters: Stieglitz to Anderson, October 1, 1924; Stieglitz to Frank, July 20, 1920. Stieglitz wrote to Anderson (August 15, 1923): "If I have in any way aided you in realizing any part of you I'm more than glad. That's all we are here for—to aid each other in realizing Self. And not as theories or proofs—but merely as beings with potentials ..." One might note that as well as seeing his friends in New York, Stieglitz invited many of them to stay at his Lake George, New York, home. For example, the photographer Paul Strand was there in the summer of 1919; Paul Rosenfeld and Waldo Frank and his wife stayed there in 1920. Rosenfeld spent part of the summer of 1923 writing there. Such close contact with his friends seems to have encouraged Stieglitz to publish yet another magazine. He mentioned to Seligmann (letter, August 8, 1920) that as regards 291 and Camera Work: "There is much in that line I'd like to add ..." And he wrote to Rosenfeld (November 2, 1921) that it was unfortunate Camera Work no longer existed since there were a number of things being written that were not being given a chance, he felt, and they would "find an outlet there." The following year, Stieglitz and his friends financed and published the magazine Manuscripts, Nos. 1-5, February 1922-March 1923. O'Keeffe designed the cover.
In letters to his friends, written in the early twenties, he often made derogatory remarks about New York. To Rosenfeld, for example, he wrote of New York as "the City of Terribleness" (letter, August 28, 1920).


Letter, Bluemner to Stieglitz, June 16, 1917.

Norman, ed., The Selected Writings of John Marin, letter to Stieglitz, August 1, 1915.

One might note that Jennings Tofts regarded Stieglitz in this light; he wrote that in Stieglitz one finds "two extremes abide in one individual: the active and the contemplative man." ("A Portrait." America and Alfred Stieglitz, p. 247).

Among the letters which indicate the literary tastes of members of the group are: Bluemner to Stieglitz, August 11, 1920; July 3, 1922; November 1, 1927; Dove to Stieglitz, October 16, 1928; October 20, 1928; April 24, 1930; Stieglitz to Anderson June 22, 1923; November 1, 1923; November 28, 1923; March 19, 1924; June 15, 1924; October 11, 1924; November 17, 1924; November 24, 1924; June 10, 1925; July 5, 1925; September 12, 1925; December 9, 1925; Stieglitz to Rosenfeld, November 5, 1920; August 8, 1922; August 16, 1922; Stieglitz to Mumford, December 2, 1926; September 13, 1927; March 17, 1929; May 2, 1945; Stieglitz to Waldo Frank, October 30, 1919; October 18, 1920; Stieglitz to Seligmann, August 19, 1919; July 29, 1920; August 8, 1920; O'Keeffe to Stieglitz (letters published in the catalogue to her 1938 one-man exhibition at An American Place), August 20, 1937; August 25, 1937.

Seligmann, Stieglitz Talking, pp. 78, 5. In his essay "The Artist and the Great Transition" (America and Alfred Stieglitz, p. 197), Harold Rugg writes of the value of establishing a centre as an example of a way of life; a cultural milieu where: "The very basis of life... would be the integrity of each human act—the spoken sentence, the answer to another's question, the production of any craft goods, or a book, a verse, a house, a dramatic scene. Each human act would be accepted as an honest objectification of the self. Each person would be accepted as Man-as-Artist, striving constantly to speak, to write, to make, to live, what he is."

18 Letter, Stieglitz to Anderson, October 27, 1924.

19 Norman, ed., The Selected Writings of John Marin, p. xiii. Norman mentions that MacKinley Helm quotes Marin as having said: "Stieglitz has always left me alone when it came to my work." See also Helm's book, John Marin (Boston: Pellegrini & Cudahy, 1948).

20 Letter, Dove to Stieglitz, January 6, 1917.

21 Letter, Stieglitz to Anderson, December 7, 1924.

22 Letter, Stieglitz to Anderson, March 11, 1925; he wrote in his next letter to Anderson (March 23) that: "All I see is a spiritual fight—money as important as it may be is not even secondary."


24 Ibid.

25 "American Painting". Dial, V. 71, December, 1921, pp. 649-663. Rosenfeld writes of Albert Pinkham Ryder as having painted pictures which "speak to the American of what lies between him and his native soil" (p. 649).

26 "America and the Arts," (translated by Waldo Frank), Seven Arts, No. 1, November, 1916, p. 48.


29 See Alfred Stieglitz Talking.

30 See Twice a Year.

31 Letter, Stieglitz to Anderson, November 30, 1925.
Seligmann describes it as "a small corner room"; the address was Park Avenue and 59th Street ("A Vision Through Photography"). America and Alfred Stieglitz, p. 115.

Letters: Stieglitz to Anderson, December 2, 1925; December 28, 1925.

An American Place was housed on the seventeenth floor of an office building at 509, Madison Avenue (Seligmann, "A Vision Through Photography.") America and Alfred Stieglitz, p. 124).

Letters: Bluemner to Neumann, February 10, 1930; September 23, 1932 (J. B. Neumann Papers, on microfilm at the Archives of American Art.)

This conclusion is based on a study of the photographic record of O'Keeffe's work compiled by the American Art Research Council (Whitney Museum Papers, on microfilm at the Archives of American Art). The recent retrospective exhibition held at the Whitney Museum also seemed to support it (See the catalogue by Goodrich and Bry, Georgia O'Keeffe).

Statement in the catalogue Nature in Abstraction (New York: Whitney Museum of American Art, 1958). O'Keeffe's statement was quoted from a letter she sent in reply to John I. H. Baur's request for a statement about the painting From The Plains, 1919. (Letter, O'Keeffe to Baur, April 22, 1957). Subsequently Baur sent a questionnaire which O'Keeffe would not complete explaining that "words are like the wind . . . Circumstances make us not have many" (letter, May 8, 1957).

Statement, Nature in Abstraction.

Reprinted from the New York Mail in Camera Work, No. 33, January, 1911. See p. 79 above.


From about 1927 to 1935, there were in New York gallery and museum exhibitions of the work of the Europeans De Chirico, Miró, Klee, Dali, Masson, Giocometti and Arp, culminating in 1936 with the exhibition, Fantastic Art, Dada, Surrealism at the Museum of Modern Art: all these brought to the general public an increasing awareness of Surrealism. See Werner Haftmann, Painting in the Twentieth Century (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1965), p. 308; the catalogue, Dada, Surrealism, and their Heritage (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1958), pp. 209-211.

Illustrated in colour by Goodrich and Bry in the catalogue, Georgia O'Keefe, No. 85.

The New Yorker, January 18, 1936.

New York Herald Tribune, January 12, 1936. Cortissoz added that "she paints the horse and the sky so beautifully that the oddity of the composition passes virtually unnoticed."

Bluemner added this information on the back of an undated letter from Bourgeois. The dealer broke off his business relationship with Bluemner in 1923, but then he renewed their friendship later (Oscar Bluemner Papers, Graham Gallery Papers, on microfilm at the Archives of American Art).

See the catalogue, Oscar Bluemner: Paintings, Drawings, No. 25. Motive: A New Jersey Valley, for example, is dated in the catalogue 1918; the style and signature (See Ch. III, Note 99) indicate that it was painted before 1916. It may be the painting A New Jersey Valley, No. 165 in the Forum Exhibition catalogue.

Letters to Stieglitz: August 31, 1917; August 26, 1919; August 11, 1920; October 20, 1920.

Letters to Stieglitz: May 10, 1921; July 31, 1921; October 17, 1922.

No. 29 in the catalogue Oscar Bluemner: Paintings, Drawings.

Listed as "Red Town (snow) (Montclair N. J.) oil on board." See also the catalogue Oscar Bluemner: Paintings Drawings, where it is catalogued as No. 20 (it is also dated 1917, which is incorrect.)
53 Letter, Bluemner to Stieglitz, undated letter, c. 1928.

54 Information about Sheeler is from the catalogue Charles Sheeler, 1968.

55 Letter, Stieglitz to Sheeler, December 1, 1916.

56 Information about Stella is from Irma B. Jaffe's unpublished Ph. D. dissertation "Joseph Stella, An Analysis and Interpretation of his Art," Columbia University, 1966. See also Jaffe's book, Joseph Stella (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1969). Bluemner told Stieglitz (letter, July 31, 1921) that he thought Stella had the talent of three people but that "he permits it to be touched by the Société ignonyme [sic] insanities." (Letter to Stieglitz November 2, 1924.)

57 Information from the J. B. Neumann Papers and the Oscar Bluemner Papers (Graham Gallery Papers), on microfilm at the Archives of American Art.

58 The New York Sun, November 29, 1924.

59 See illustrations in the catalogue Oscar Bluemner, Paintings, Drawings (unpaginated).

60 These two paintings are illustrated by Wight in Arthur Dove, pp. 59, 63. The Telegraph Pole is also illustrated in Art and Mankind: Larousse Encyclopedia of Modern Art, from 1800 to the Present Day (New York: Prometheus Press, 1961), pl. 1134.

61 J. B. Neumann Papers, on microfilm at the Archives of American Art.

62 Letter, Stieglitz to Rosenfeld, August 16, 1922.

63 Letters to Stieglitz: June 25, 1926; December 2, 1926; January 26, 1927; February 21, 1927; August 24, 1927.

64 The New York Sun, March 3, 1928.

65 March 10, 1928.
Bluemner numbered his 9½" x 12½" watercolours; Nos. 1-35 were left with Neumann in 1924, and therefore one might conclude that No. 39, *Moonrise* was done the following year.

This was No. 122 in the exhibition "Seven Americans".


Statement for the catalogue from the handwritten list of paintings sent to Stieglitz February 10, 1928. The exhibition was held from February 28 to March 27, 1928.

Letters to Stieglitz: June 10, 1925; April 24, 1930; August 21, 1921.

Arthur Dove: The Years of College (College Park, Maryland: The University of Maryland, 1967).

Mrs. Edith Gregor Halpert first made this suggestion by juxtaposing a number of Dove's collages with nineteenth-century American collages in an exhibition at her Downtown Gallery in November, 1935. Laverne George, writing for the *Arts* (November, 1935, p. 53) pointed out that Halpert's exhibition had been arranged according to the belief that "Dove was perhaps prompted by interest in these antique objects." Mr. William Dove does not think that his father was particularly influenced by American folk art (Interview, New York, April 29, 1970). One might point out that William Zorach in his book *Art Is My Life*, The Autobiography of William Zorach (Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1967, p. 88, mentions that Halpert when she first opened her art gallery in about 1931, stocked it with American Antiques, and that she became an authority on American folk art: "All of us were picking up early American furniture and antiques. Not only were they more beautiful than the regular manufactured products but they were much cheaper, and a lot of us had acquired houses and had very little to furnish them with. Hunting antiques was great sport and lots of excitement. Edith got the idea of picking up antiques and opening a little shop in New York with Bea Goldsmith, a sister of Leon Kroll's."

Letters: Hartley to Stieglitz, November, 1913; September 7, 1917. The previous winter, December 1916 to Spring, 1917, Hartley lived in Bermuda where his friend Charles Demuth joined him in February until the end of March. Demuth was a close friend of Marcel Duchamp, and he particularly admired his "Big Glass", writing (letter to Stieglitz, February 5, 1929) that Duchamp is "a great painter. The big glass thing, I think is still the great picture of our time."
74 From Dove's diary, (February 12, 1924), in the collection of William Dove. Quoted from Mullett Smith's thesis, p. 52.

75 Letter, Dove to Stieglitz, August 26, 1921.

76 Interview, New York, April 29, 1970. Dove's letter to Stieglitz (December 8, 1920) was misquoted in the unpublished M. A. thesis by George R. Wulf, "Arthur Garfield Dove," Hunter College, New York, 1951, who quoted the passage thus: "... have started what we think is the 'best thing' painted yet." Johnson, who referred to Wulf's thesis where much of Dove's correspondence is quoted, apparently was unaware of Dove's wording of this passage; a point that is significant because she has based her dating of the beginning and ending of Dove's collage making on the correspondence, writing that Dove referred to his collages as "things" or "thing paintings." Indeed, in one letter (June 10, 1925) Dove speaks of his collages as "things"; he remarked: "I have only been working as a painter as of late--I have been more interested in the 'things' than in the paintings."

The reference to a "thing painting" in the 1920 letter, however, is most probably a reference to "a painting of a thing", as William Dove pointed out (Interview). One might cite the charcoal drawing Moving Machine, 1922 (illustrated in the Catalogue of the Alfred Stieglitz Collection for Fisk University, Nashville, Tennessee: Fisk University Press, 1943) as an example of the kind of object studies Dove was interested in the early twenties.

77 Illustrated by Wight, Arthur G. Dove, p. 52, and by Goldzehler, American Painting in the Twentieth Century, p. 55.

78 April 23, 1925. Although Johnson, in her catalogue Arthur Dove: The Years of College, writes that Dove's period of collage making was from 1924 to 1930, it seems to me that there is evidence to suggest that the terminal date was 1927. I have not found any mention of collages in Dove's letters of 1930, and it would seem that one reason for the decision to suggest the date 1930 in the first place was in all probability the existence of the painting Italian Christmas Tree, dated 1920 by both Halpert (catalogue, The Round Gallery, November, 1955) and Johnson. The painting is not mentioned in the 1933 catalogue of Dove's one-man exhibition at An American Place; there does not seem to be in existence a catalogue of the 1931 one-man exhibition; however, I found among Dove's letters to Stieglitz a list of paintings taken to the gallery in 1933 in which Italian Christmas Tree is number 20. Dove took work annually to the gallery, and therefore it has been usual to date his paintings according to the year they were exhibited, although some of them would in fact have been painted the year before. Italian Christmas Tree should therefore be dated 1933. Whether paintings such as Italian Christmas Tree and Clouds, 1927
(both pictures are illustrated in Johnson's catalogue) should be classed as collages at all. I think, a debatable point in itself. The Christmas wrapping paper on the first, and the sand in the second are relatively minor additions to the paint surface in comparison with the bric-a-brac included in examples such as Long Island and Colin Fitchin' of about 1925, in which there are shells and twigs, and bamboo cane and pieces of denim clothing. If these paintings are to be listed with the more obvious collages, or constructions, then Sand and Sea, 1944, must also be included because it too has patches of sand (letter, Peter Morris, Research Assistant, Washington University Gallery of Art, St. Louis, Missouri, to Szakely, February 12, 1969). On the whole, I do not think that the presence of isolated examples of semi-collage should alter the fact that the main collage period ended in about 1927.

79 List of paintings sent to Stieglitz, February 29, 1929. Distraction is illustrated in the catalogue Painting and Sculpture by Living Americans (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1930); it is also illustrated in Kootz's book, Modern American Painters.

80 The Intimate Gallery, April, 1929.

81 In the list of paintings sent to Stieglitz, February 29, 1929, Dove listed the paintings he did at the Pratt Islands; by the entry "Silver Sun" he noted "Introducing idea of size contrast", and by "Vermillion Tree" (titled Red Tree and Sun in the April, 1929 catalogue—the painting is in the Alfred Stieglitz Collection at Fisk University, Nashville, Tennessee) he noted "Again size contrast."

82 Catalogue statement, 1929, op. cit.

83 Dove mentioned in a letter to Stieglitz (February, 19, 1924): "Have had Blumer [sic] on my mind a lot lately and would like to get one of his next after this one [a painting by O'Keeffe] is paid for."

84 Letter, Dove to Stieglitz, October 2, 1929.

85 Ibid., October 16, 1928; October 20, 1928; April 24, 1930.

86 Letter, Dove to Stieglitz, October 13, 1930.

87 An American Place, March 1932.


Kootz, Modern American Painters.

Letters to Stieglitz: January 29, 1933; August 19, 1933; November 17, 1933.

Moon is illustrated by Wight in Arthur G. Dove, p. 67. Silver Moonlight is listed in the catalogue Oscar Bluemner: Paintings, Oceania as No. 87, of unknown date. In the catalogue to Bluemner's one-man show at The Intimate Gallery in February-March, 1923, it is No. 3; Bluemner wrote by it, on the original list, "rhythms of moonlight".

The watercolour Weather-vene is in the William H. Lane Foundation Collection, Fitchburg, Massachusetts, and is illustrated by Solomon in his catalogue Arthur G. Dove, 1880-1946: A Retrospective Exhibition.

Illustrated by Wight in Arthur G. Dove, pp. 68-69.


Hardware Store Window is illustrated by Wight, op. cit., p. 71. Graphite and Blue, and Green, Gold and Brown are illustrated in Solomon's catalogue, op. cit.


Ibid., September 20, 1919.

Ibid., October 7 to 12, 1920.

Ibid., August 21, 1927.

Ibid., August 14, 1923.

Ibid., August 23, 1928; letters to Stieglitz: September 23, 1937; July 20, 1931.
In speaking of Stella's painting (August 6, 1920), Marin must have been referring to the painting *Brooklyn Bridge*, 1919, which was shown for the first time at the Bourgeois Galleries in April, 1920 (See Irma B. Jaffe's article "Joseph Stella and Hart Crane: The Brooklyn Bridge." *The American Art Journal*, V. 1, No. 2, Fall 1969, pp. 98-107.
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