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Introduction

Here are a few details about myself: born in Madrid on 23rd March, 1887. Studied for a while physics and mathematics. Did not go to the Academy of Fine Arts but spent a very short time - less than two years - in the studio of an old official artist, who rapidly gave me a distaste for good painting. Arrived in Paris in 1906 and fell straight into the studio of Picasso, where I quickly met the gang of Apollinaire, Salmon, Max, etc. Sold the first things to Sagot in 1911; exhibited at the Indépendants in 1912 and also at the ‘Section d’Or’ in the same year...1

-Juan Gris, 1920

Over a century has now passed since a twenty-five-year-old Madrid-born José Victoriano Carmelo Carlos González Pérez, by his chosen name of Juan Gris, sold his first paintings at Clovis Sagot’s Paris gallery in 1911.2 From the beginning, Gris’s particular cubism was distinct from that of Braque or Picasso, and it has earned him a place as one of the major cubist artists. John Golding underscored Gris’s individuality in his seminal Cubism: A History and an Analysis:

[Gris’s] approach to Cubism, however, was fundamentally different from [Braque and Picasso’s]. More cerebral and with a much more coldly analytical mind than either Picasso or Braque, Gris was more interested in the implications of the discoveries they had made than in the appearance of their paintings. And his methodical, more purely intellectual interpretation of Cubism formed in many ways the necessary complement to the more instinctive Cubism of Picasso and Braque.3

---

2 The 1904 drawings for the magazine Papel de Estraza appear to be the earliest known examples of the artist signing his name this way. Most historians attribute the name change to Gris’s 1906 move to Paris and consider it another sign of his dedication to his career in art. From Daniel-Henry Kahnweiler’s account, the alter-ego functioned as a way of separating his serious painting from other commercial activity. He wrote, “It pleased him and there is, I think, a connection between the name and his work. Whether it has to do with the colour reference or with the suggestion of modesty in the name I cannot tell.” (See Kahnweiler, Juan Gris, his life and work. (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1969), 6). According to Gaya Nuño, Gris’s family name, Victoriano, suggests rusticity, or perhaps a lack of sophistication, and the name change was a way to distance himself from this association. Kenneth Silver notes that the adoption of a nickname was a tradition among witty illustrators for satirical magazines. Many have noted the associations with color, poetry, and wordplay, “Gris” meaning the same in both French and Spanish.
Gris’s cerebral approach, as this thesis argues, owes much to his rich use of drawing. His reliance on the medium is surprising in the context of cubism, and in and of itself is another contributing factor for the singularity of Gris’s cubism. As Christian Derouet put it, “For any artist wishing to break away from the stifling academicism of the turn of the twentieth century, drawing, with its associations with the antiquated teaching methods of French fine arts schools where it was part of the daily drill, could not be anything other than repellent.” While Picasso’s drawn oeuvre was certainly a major component of his expansive practice, Braque and Léger both made relatively few drawings by comparison. For Gris, as this thesis will show, drawing was a consistent, necessary, and motivating element of his artistic activity.

The starting point for this study was an aggregation of over 280 of Gris’s drawings from published catalogues, journals, public collections, and auction results. While I do not claim to have assembled a comprehensive list, there is not yet a catalogue raisonné of Gris’s drawings, and my research thus provided the basis for a representative compilation of Gris’s drawn oeuvre - one that aided in isolating the main motifs and concerns discussed in the following chapters. This total notably does not include Gris’s 1904-1912 commercial work, which was included in Raymond Bachollet’s 2003 catalogue raisonné of the artist’s commercial illustrations. I also only briefly mention Gris’s groundbreaking, almost universally praised series of approximately forty collages from 1914, as these painting-drawing hybrids are included in Douglas Cooper’s catalogue raisonné of Gris’s paintings.

---

5 I did not approach, for example, the Kahnweiler archive or Galerie Louise Leiris, instead limiting my focus to the published works.
6 Christian Derouet does mention that “work has been underway for several years now on a catalogue raisonné of Gris’s works on paper,” which will include sketchbooks, drawings, watercolors and gouaches and journal commissions. In *Leal, Juan Gris*, 115.
7 See also James Thrall Soby: “At any rate, from 1914 date some of the finest pictures of the latter’s career - those breathtakingly inspired collages which are assuredly among the most perfect works of art of our time.” In Soby,
In surveying Gris’s collective graphic oeuvre, several generalizations can be made about his practice and relationship to these works on paper. Early on, he worked primarily in charcoal, chalk, and graphite - all very direct, often bold or even painterly mediums. The artist’s later drawings (post 1916) tend to be more linear, made in graphite or occasionally ink. Several drawings are colored with gouache, watercolor, or colored pencil, though the majority tend to be black or gray on neutral fine art paper. For the most part, Gris’s drawings are small (except during a short period of larger format works in 1913); many in fact are of a fairly consistent size of approximately 19 x 12 inches or less. The intimate scale suggests an ease and portability and its consistency over the years is notable especially as the role of his drawings changed. His works on paper tend to be fully realized compositions made with a slow, deliberate line. They rarely contain a hasty sketch or improvised stroke. Many of Gris’s drawings are signed and dated, and they were often inscribed and dedicated to friends or acquaintances. Few were sold during the artist’s lifetime, and those that were not given away predominantly remained in his personal possession and subsequent estate. The titles of Gris’s drawings are descriptive, and both the title and date information for this thesis is taken from either the current museum or collection, or the most recently published reference to the work.

According to Kahnweiler’s account, Gris began drawing at the age of six or seven. He studied at the Escuela de Artes e Industrias in Madrid, and it is unlikely that he ever received a degree or certificate for his technical training. Few details are known from these years, but later historians still frequently cite this mathematically inclined beginning as a source for Gris’s signature, exacting approach, and he would have been exposed to forms of drafting or industrial

Juan Gris (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, in collaboration with the Minneapolis Institute of Arts, San Francisco Museum of Art, Los Angeles County Museum, 1958), 35. Or Douglas Cooper who refers to, “The group of papier collés, which Gris executed in 1914, constitute one of his most important personal contributions to the development of Cubist painting.” In Douglas Cooper, with Margaret Potter, Juan Gris: catalogue raisonné de l’oeuvre peint; updated by Alan Hyman and Elizabeth Snowden (San Francisco: Alan Wofsy Fine Arts, 2014), xv.
design, which certainly came into play in his analytic early cubism.\footnote{See Christopher Green, \textit{Juan Gris} (London: Whitechapel Art Gallery; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 22. Cooper notes that Gris “trained as a precision draughtsman for two years and this early experience was to have a long-term influence on his understanding of forms and his way of representing them. He also found his acquired knowledge of sectional views, isometric projection and perspective was useful to him while working out his conceptual method of representing objects.” Cooper, \textit{Juan Gris: catalogue raisonné}, xi.} Gris left the school in 1904 after only two years to pursue lessons in drawing and painting from José Moreno Carbonero, the Spanish academic painter who “rapidly gave [Gris] a distaste for good painting.” Following his schooling, Gris earned a living drawing as an illustrator and caricaturist for popular publications such as \textit{L’Assiette au Beurre, Le Charivari, Le Temoin}, or \textit{Le Cri de Paris} from 1904 through 1912. By 1906 he dropped his given name, moved to Paris, and dedicated himself wholeheartedly to his artistic career.

Despite his privileged place amongst the early developers of cubism at the Bateau-Lavoir, Gris’s first painting did not come until 1910,\footnote{Gris’s earliest surviving painting, and the first listed in Douglas Cooper’s catalogue raisonné, is \textit{Siphon et Bouteilles} of 1910. It is possible, however, that earlier works were made and destroyed, as we know that Gris destroyed works he was not satisfied with, and asked his wife and estate to do the same. As Christian Derouet writes, Kahnweiler’s advice to Gris was to, “destroy anything that might damage his reputation as an artist. On entering into association with Kahnweiler on 20 February 1913, Gris was asked to weed out all his fumbling early work. Fernand Léger submitted to a similarly regrettable purge.” In Leal, \textit{Juan Gris}, 116.} and he would not exhibit his work publicly until 1912. Instead, these early years served as a period of private, independent study for the largely self-trained artist as he experimented with techniques of representation and visited Parisian galleries and museums for education. With experimentation and self-education followed a flurry of early drawings: over forty made between 1909-1911, compared to ten painted oils, marking early on the meaningful role his works on paper would play in his development as an artist. Gris’s dependency on drawing in his creative process, his use of the medium as a source for ideas, and the thrill and pleasure it brought him throughout his twenty-year career make the case for the centrality of these works on paper to his oeuvre. His drawing practice, as this thesis
demonstrates, was inseparable from his identity as Juan Gris, the singular cubist artist we know today.

A drawing illustrated the invitation for the first retrospective of Gris’s work in 1919 at the Galerie l’Effort Moderne, but otherwise it cannot be determined which drawings were exhibited during Gris’s lifetime.\(^\text{10}\) Gris’s drawings were shown on several occasions from 1919-1923 at the Galerie l’Effort Moderne. A posthumous drawing-specific exhibition, *Juan Gris. Dessins et gouaches 1910-1927*, followed and was first shown in 1965 at the Galerie Louise Leiris, Paris, and subsequently in New York at the Saidenberg Gallery (1967) and Milan at the Galleria del Milione (1968). Some years later a rare drawing-specific exhibition, *Juan Gris. Cartas, dibujos 1915-1921*, was held in 1990-91 at the Valencia, IVAM Centre Julio Gonzalez and at the Centre George Pompidou in Paris, focusing on his later classical pencil drawings. More recently in 2001-2002 Galerie Louise Leiris organized another show focused on his works on paper. Drawings, however, consistently appeared alongside paintings in important monographic exhibitions from Kunstmuseum, Bern (October 1955) and The Museum of Modern Art, New York (April 1958); to the Orangerie des Tuileries, Paris (March 1974) and the Staatliche Kunsthalle, Baden-Baden (July 1974); and more recently in Berkeley (1983), Madrid (1985), London (1992), Marseilles (1998), Madrid (2005), and Sète (2011).

Curator James Thrall Soby wrote in 1958, “if [Gris’s] admirers were few compared to Braque’s and, above all, Picasso’s, his champions were effective.”\(^\text{11}\) While few authors have written exclusively on Gris’s drawings, much can be gleaned from these “champions”. During his lifetime, those supporters included Apollinaire, Maurice Raynal, Gertrude Stein, and

\(^\text{10}\) We know he exhibited drawings at the *Section d’Or*, also a 1916 show with Mme Bongard, a 1919 group show dedicated to drawings organized by Rosenberg, and another 1919 show by Rosenberg of Gris’s paintings and some drawings. See also Christian Derouet, “Experimentation with a Return to Representation in Gris’s Drawings,” in Leal, *Juan Gris*, 124.

\(^\text{11}\) Soby, *Juan Gris*, 35.
Waldemar George, among others. Daniel-Henry Kahnweiler first met Gris in 1907 and subsequently signed the artist to his small rue Vignon gallery in February 1913. The two remained lifelong friends, and in 1946 Kahnweiler published the first significant monograph and biography on the artist titled _Juan Gris: His Life and Work_. Stein wrote at the time of Gris’s death that, “no one can say that Henry Kahnweiler can be left out of [Gris].” Still today most of what we know about the artist comes from Kahnweiler’s personal and impassioned text.

Subsequent advocates include Douglas Cooper, whose 1947 translation of Kahnweiler’s biography was the first book about Gris published in English. In 1977 he completed, with Margaret Potter, the catalogue raisonné of Gris’s painting, reproducing over 600 works and providing another much needed point of access to the artist and his paintings. Cooper’s text reproduces drawings that relate to paintings, but by no means offers a comprehensive review of his graphic oeuvre.

Another standard source for Gris and cubism more broadly is John Golding, whose seminal 1959 _Cubism: A History and an Analysis, 1907–1914_ provided a foundational analysis of some of Gris’s later preparatory drawings and positioned Gris, with Picasso and Braque, as one of the three leaders of Cubism from 1912-1914. Recognition must also be given to Christopher Green, whose 1992 catalogue (which includes many drawings) for the monographic exhibition organized by Whitechapel Gallery, London, attempted to challenge and reconsider previous narratives of Gris, and is perhaps the most ambitious text on Gris since Kahnweiler’s biography.

Fewer authors have focused solely on Gris’s drawing practice. Ann Temkin’s 1985 essay for Gary Tinterow’s exhibition at the Salas Pablo Ruiz Picasso del Ministerio de Cultura, Madrid

---

12 Douglas Cooper’s 1947 translation of the text was the first book about Gris in English.
offered a rare and useful overview of this corpus. Christine Poggi’s influential study of pre-war collage, *In Defiance of Painting* of 1993, marked the significance of Gris’s 1914 experiments and contributions to the revolutionary medium. More recently, Raymond Bachollet’s 2003 catalogue raisonné of Gris’s magazine illustrations made a case for the commercial work being considered among the artist’s earliest drawings. Kenneth Silver’s ongoing contributions to French wartime art and “neotraditional wartime draftsmanship” have helped to reposition Gris’s work, especially his drawings, in this changing classicizing context.\(^{14}\) Christian Derouet’s contributions to the 1991 catalogue for *Juan Gris Dessins 1915-1921* and more recent essays for the Museo Nacional Centro de Arte Reina Sofia’s *Juan Gris: Paintings and Drawings 1910 - 1927* in 2005 focus on Gris’s years under the representation of Léonce Rosenberg after 1915, coinciding again with his increasingly classical line drawing.

In an attempt to “champion” this significant artist again, the following study highlights the primacy of Gris’s drawn oeuvre and its fundamental role as a driving force within his artistic identity. Beginning with an overview, the first chapter explores the drawn still life as an embodiment of Gris’s ongoing prioritization of pure form. From there, I make a closer analysis of Gris’s 1911-13 preparatory drawings, their relationship to his paintings, and how they contribute to his budding cubist legacy. By chapter three, seen through a series of 1916 copies after master paintings, I examine how Gris’s drawings develop into investigatory tools that push his paintings in a new direction. Finally, by way of the portrait drawings in chapter four, Gris’s drawn practice begins to break from that of his painting as he reintroduces the human figure into his post 1916 works. Throughout his career, Gris’s analytic style relied on what I see to be a distinctly graphic - i.e. drawn, designed, linear, diagrammatic - mode. While the role and

function of Gris’s drawing changed over time, it continued to be at the heart of his inherently logical and investigative method and approach to vision, process, and representation.
Chapter 1: Still life drawings

Here I go on working. I am trying my hand at landscape, which doesn’t seem to come off, and so I console myself by doing an occasional still-life which satisfies me.15

-Juan Gris, 1918

In his mocking 1918 critique of the cubists at Léonce Rosenberg’s newly founded Galerie de L’Effort Moderne, critic André Salmon spotlighted the prominence of still lifes in Juan Gris’s work:

These gentlemen...license only restricted themes. They banish the nude because it is impure...Among the themes allowed the still-life comes first, but reduced to a limited selection of objects: the newspaper, the packet of tobacco, the glass, the pipe, the mandolin and the siphon. It is to Juan Gris that is due the enthronement of the siphon in cubism, and this audacity was not accepted without discussion.16

Despite Salmon’s sarcastic tone, Gris’s still lifes and his obsessive fascination with familiar forms have earned him praise for his “reverence for the object.”17 Friend and patron Gertrude Stein wrote that for Gris, “still life was not a seduction it was a religion.”18 Throughout his career, Gris consistently privileged process and idea over product and outcome, in a sort of Neoplatonic search for an ideal representation. For the artist, the study of inanimate non-organic objects was the study of pure form, and embodied the quintessence of his representational pursuits. Gris’s still life drawings, as investigatory tools themselves, typify this privileged role within his oeuvre. The still life genre belongs at the heart of Gris’s practice, and a study of his still life drawings and evolving use of the medium to resolve, challenge, and inspire, provides an

15 Letter to André Level, July 4 1918, Letters of Juan Gris, 56.
apt opening survey to the progressing styles and representational concerns within his works on paper.

From his earliest works to those made at the end of his life, Gris created still lifes continuously throughout his career. The following chapter traces the artist’s still life drawings chronologically by way of several isolated series and periods of dynamic repeated investigations on paper: his first charcoals of 1910; his 1910-1912 studies in pencil and charcoal of a repeated object; the 1913 series of vertically composed and visually affiliated early collages; his bold and increasingly poetic 1917 charcoals; and finally a grouping of line drawings created toward the end of his career which arguably mark a break between his drawn and painted practice. Both as direct studies of familiar objects that would equally dominate his painted oeuvre, and as vehicles for broader experimentation, these affiliated groupings of still life drawings epitomize Gris’s investigations of spatial relationships, plays on perspective, and the study of form. With well over half his known works on paper classified under this genre, Gris’s drawn still lifes hold a notable place.

Typically stationary, interior arrangements of three-dimensional objects, the still life as a genre presented an opportunity for the cubists to examine and reexamine familiar shapes, sample techniques in handling and representation, and to focus on spatial relationships and composition. Especially in contrast to the ephemeral, atmospheric canvases of the impressionists, the object-based cubist scenes convey a static, almost eternal solidity. The subjects of Gris’s still lifes are often highly volumetric, round, and relatively symmetrical - selected for their geometric structure over their symbolic or personal significance. Scholars have remarked on their humble contents - his lowly subject matter, “bargain-basement” bowls and platters and spare table settings.\(^{19}\) The

neutrality of the genre and its mundane subjects appealed to Gris and his contemporaries, allowing them to maintain a grounding in reality, while at the same time providing a freedom to test methods of construction and representation.

At the root of Gris’s attraction to the still life genre was an interest in the purity of forms and the affiliations between them. As James Thrall Soby observed, “Almost every critic who has written about Gris has mentioned his meticulous control of relationships between commonplace objects.” Gris’s seemingly simple scenes became muddled and challenged when he overlapped, layered, and intentionally brought his objects into conversation with one another. One element of consistency throughout his short career was the experimentation with the effects of transparency, which was achieved through a complex strategy of layering and creating dialogues between objects. Maurice Raynal observed a wider cubist interest in transparency in 1913:

The cubists always try to know why they do what they do. We know, they say, that colour is a pure sensation and does not exist. For, strangely enough, when you think of one or more objects, you invariably conceive them without colour. A little reflection, and one can easily verify this curious phenomenon. But how does one conceive of an object without colour? As absolutely transparent! And the fact is that if I conceive - that is, if I represent in my own mind - a young woman at her dressing table, I find that I am seeing the objects concerned - body, mirror, bottles, etc. - charmingly blended together, as though there were no opacity to interpose itself and trouble their marvelous grouping.

Cubist objects, even the opaque, often were depicted as transparent in an effort to both analyze and complicate forms. Gris’s transparency though was typically more literal. As his works show, Gris subtly (and arguably deliberately) positioned transparent objects in conversation with opaque, as if adding another lens, layer, or point of obscurity through which to direct the viewer to perceive these seemingly banal objects. Rather than pure unobstructed observations from nature, each still life with a bottle, cup, pitcher, or siphon was clearly selected by Gris for these

---

20 Soby, Juan Gris, 28.
permeable qualities. In his Memoires, Gris’s contemporary Amédée Ozenfant too cited his “weakness” for glass in a dazzling account of glass shops around Paris at this time, writing of the many “jars, bistro glasses, jam jars…paperweights with or without flowers inside…The transparent candor of the glasses of the stores and aquariums, which seem to be made of water or air fixed in eternity…” Perhaps glass represented a sort of modernity for the artists. Gris’s interrelated forms and layers challenged the notion of “transparency” itself, however, suggesting clarity while simultaneously obscuring a straightforward interpretation of the image. He also experimented with the materiality of his objects by literally stacking layers within his collages and topping them with shadow-like transparent drawn versions. Later, more metaphorically, Gris created a series of open-window still lifes, essentially making transparent the wall through the pane of window glass, and opening his spaces to the infinite outside world. Examples continue throughout his almost twenty-year career, and Gris’s still life drawings, through their raw, largely colorless handling of objects provide unique insight into the artist’s formal preoccupations.

Gris’s still life drawings also bring attention to the related compositional method of pictorial “rhyming,” again a consistent element of his scenes beginning as early as 1911. In both drawings and paintings, Gris situated the objects of his still lifes in such a way that they fused to each other, highlighting spatial relationships between otherwise unrelated forms. Not unlike the

22 “Les gros verres sans façon des bouteilles, bocaux, verres de bistrots, pots à confitures, cloches à melon, vases à piles, enciers, presse-papiers avec ou sans fleurs dedans, touries et bonbonnes; les transparentes candeurs des glaces des magasins et des aquariums, qui semblent être faites d’eau ou d’air figé dans l’éternité; et, suprême aristocratie, ces verres d’Iéna et ceux aux terres rares, fondus pour réaliser les interminables calculs des savantes optiques modernes, et j’aimais penser que certaines plaquettes de verre à calibres sont si merveilleusement plates que deux de ces perfection, une fois pressées l’une contre l’autre, se soudent dans un amour total, indissolublement; je suivais des yeux les courbes pures et simples des ballons, fioles, barboteurs à bulles de Liebig, cornues, pissettes, entonnoirs avec ou sans robinets, appareils complexes aux transparentes tuyauteries archi-compliquées au travers desquelles on voit se transformer en changeant de couleur les liquides et les gaz…et, du côté soi-disant opposé à la science, les fantasmagories insensées des lustres de Venise et les perles de Murano, fourrées d’étincelles d’or et d’argent; et j’allais oublier les verres naturels: les basaltes et obsidiennes des Verreries du Bon Dieu.” from Amédée Ozenfant, “Études 1905-1913”, in Mémoires, 1886-1962 (Paris, Seghers, 1968), 47-48.
broken contours of his early still lifes, this rhyming strategy resulted in a complicated perception of depth and a level of ambiguity. Raynal in 1923 used the term “metaphor” to describe this phenomenon in Gris’s work:

The metaphor does not merely compare, but draws out of the affinity in the relations between certain objects an essentially new object endowed with its own existence….On this basis, comparison is the work of the dictionary, but the metaphor is the work of creation; the first is a heap of stones, the second is a house constructed.23

Christopher Green later observed, “so complete is the similarity drawn out between one thing and another that they become one and the same, a new composite thing.”24 Water lines in glasses spill into horizontal edges of tables, implying a sort of interconnectivity and a basis for an entire scene. Ozenfant, in his memoirs, remembered a 1920 studio visit with Gris:

In his drawing he accentuated the squareness of the shoulders of the wine bottle, making them into right angles; to make fit these snugly with the roundness of the carafe, he changed its convex bottom and round opening into two triangles, thereby creating a common factor which he repeated three times. And so the two became one. One entity made up of two forces merged together through consonance. But poor carafe!25

Through these “rhymes,” affinity becomes emphasized and exaggerated to the point that it arguably becomes the subject of the composition, i.e. Raynal’s “creation”. The method simultaneously feels constructed and manipulated, but is also highly rooted in Gris’s own observation and his translation of a specific scene to the pencil and paper. From his early “analysis” of forms to his more conceptually driven “synthesis” of information, Gris continued to challenge and complicate the perception of objects, creating something novel out of the everyday. Still life drawing in this sense, I argue, essentially functioned as a system of research, note taking, or investigation for Gris as he pursued the inherent possibilities of form.
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23 Raynal in Feuilles libres, no. 31 (April 1923), quoted in Green, Juan Gris, 64.
24 Green, Juan Gris, 154.
25 Ozenfant, Memoires, 133. Translated in Leal, Juan Gris, 126.
Gris’s earliest works happen to be both drawings and intimate still lifes. The genre marked an arguably intentional break from the subjects of Gris’s commercial magazine illustrations - people, contemporary life, airplanes, cinemas, scenes of war - which he produced for income from 1904-1912. In his early “fine art” drawings, by contrast, Gris selected what was familiar and close to him - dishes set upon furniture from his home - describing their forms through traditional modeling and perspective. The vertical Still Life with Mirror (1910) [Fig. 1], for example, features a scene of objects apparently in use: a bowl with a spoon, a coffee grinder that almost appears to be spinning, and a large mirror (whose glass here is not transparent but reflective) revealing a faint double of the grinder and suggesting a glimpse of Gris and his home.

The majority of the 1910 drawings demonstrate a bold use of charcoal with a clear light source and tonal contrasts, on a consistent 19 x 12 inch format paper. As Gris would not exhibit his work publicly until almost three years later, these early works were likely not intended to ever be shown, and remained, for the most part, in the artist’s collection and subsequent estate. Markedly private in nature, the everyday scenes in Gris’s studio concede an intimacy, a studiousness, and even a reclusiveness. Douglas Cooper wrote that they show, “a naturalistic idiom (derived largely from Spanish old masters) with firmness and simplicity. His use of chiaroscuro is emphatic and he grasps the essential form of an object as though he saw there a concise expression of the object’s individuality.”26 Few are signed, and at least one still bears the “Victoriano González” signature of his given name before the artist fully assumed the identity of Juan Gris.

Against the carefully defined modeling of 1910, Gris’s 1911-1912 drawings affirm the artist’s “graduation” of sorts and decided move to cubism. One of the most apparent changes in this cubist transition is Gris’s use of line to articulate his forms. Moving away from the
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26 Cooper, Juan Gris: Catalogue raisonné, xii.
chiaroscuro of his early charcoals, Gris began to work with pencil line as he decreased the depth of his compositions, resulting in what may best be described as a non-hierarchical interplay between lines, shadows, curves, and planes. The lines become straightened, and eventually break apart, developing into a diagonal grid-like substructure that dominated Gris’s compositions through 1912. The effect - not unlike that of a prism or lens distorting a view - allowed Gris to distance himself from the linear contour of academic draftsmanship, while maintaining a degree of observed naturalism. He continued to sign some 1911 drawings with his given name (and one, interestingly, with both), though he stopped after this year, implying that his stylistic evolution accompanied a personal one.27

And what better a place to comprehend this progression than through a series of sorts: of at least four still life drawings from 1910-12 [Figs. 2-5], all depicting the same pitcher (sometimes identified a kettle). In Pichet, Bouteille et Bol (1911) [Fig. 2, private collection], Gris maintained traces of the modeling and dark charcoal chiaroscuro from the previous year in the deliberately staggered bowl, pitcher and bottle of wine. He experimented with multiple viewpoints and perspectives, and distorted contour lines learned from Cézanne, resulting in a strangely elongated pitcher and off-kilter bowl, bending the objects as if made of paper themselves.

In Gris’s Bottle and Pitcher (1910-11) [Fig. 3, private collection], the perspective is more or less fixed and unified from a single viewpoint, with an eye-level view of the tabletop. A line (as opposed to tonal contrast) defines the table, bottle, and pitcher. There are hints of a shadow, as if from a single light source, though the shading is implied through linear modeling rather than chiaroscuro. Gris’s lines are still curved, but the predominance of verticals and horizontals gives
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27 Portrait of Maurice Raynal, 1911 is signed “To Maurice Raynal / his friend / Juan Gris / 1911” and on the verso, “Victoriano González. Paris 11”.
the impression of an imposed compositional order. The back line of the table, in fact, meets the waterline in the bottle, which then continues through a midline of the pitcher. Parallels of vertical and horizontal lines continue through additional stripes in the pitcher, the rim at its base, the front tabletop, to the body and neck of the bottle, the pitcher handle, and the edge of the paper to the wall. While approaching a geometrically ordered scene, each line still swells and curves, and an element of naturalism continues to dominate the composition.

The drawing *Kettle and Bottle of Milk* (1910-11) [Fig. 4], in turn, shows a view from a similar head-on angle, here with a more complicated faceted glass bottle and a small pedestal cup in the foreground. Only a fragmented horizontal line designates the table, and Gris has stepped away almost entirely from curvature. The round objects are composed instead through a sequence of discontinuous linear segments, while incrementally eliminating chiaroscuro and evidence of a light source. His solid objects appear refracted, as if made of light themselves. Gris’s deliberate layering and even his choice of subject (opaque milk) signifies his ongoing proclivity for transparency and his experimentation with its effects.

By 1912 Gris’s straight lines and broken contours developed into the complex, abstracted system of grids that defined his analytical cubist phase. In the Art Institute of Chicago’s drawing *Glass, Pitcher, Fruit-Dish* [Fig. 5], Gris set three familiar round objects one in front of the other in a uniform perspective. The broken, disconnected, straight edges fracture the space into a segmented matrix of flat geometric pieces. Cutting diagonal lines from the handle of the pitcher through the base of the bowl and the left rim of the glass through the left base of the bowl establish the internal grid-like structure of the composition. The resulting severed elements co-mingle and blend, as if transformed into transparent or fluid matter.
From the tilted chiaroscuro moving toward the fractured prism, the depiction of this pitcher over several years demonstrates Gris’s use of drawing for the exploratory study of form. In his catalogue raisonné of Gris’s paintings, Douglas Cooper related the 1912 drawing *Glass, Pitcher, Fruit-Dish* to an early painting of 1912, *Bottle and Pitcher* [Fig. 6]. He referred to it as a “drawing after nature of a group of the same objects pictured in [Bottle and Pitcher].”28 (More accurately, only one object is the same - the pitcher.) Continuing the pitcher’s progression through to a finished painting though, several important disparities between Gris’s canvasses and works on paper become apparent. Firstly, the color of the painting removes much of the ambiguity inherent in the black and white drawing. At this time, Braque and Picasso had largely abandoned color in their compositions, moving toward an increasingly monochromatic palette. Gris, by contrast, was noted for his continued use of bright and expressive colors. His colorless drawings, however, remove this element of expression and clarity. Secondly, there are also fewer lines of construction visible in the 1912 painting, serving to simplify the composition, while also removing an element of obscurity and interconnectivity that is more pronounced in his drawings. His drawings counterintuitively contain a heightened ambiguity, rather than clarity, and could in this sense be considered more pure examples of the cubist goals.

By 1912, the gridded substructure of Gris’s compositions becomes more apparent. As argued in the following chapter, the majority of drawings from this year relate directly to Gris’s paintings, as he moved from sketches from life toward a priori plotted compositional arrangements. This is also the year that Gris introduced non-art materials to make his first collages for the October *Salon de la Section d’Or*. The implications of the new technique begun by Picasso and Braque were broad, but included a drastic rethinking of representation. Gris in his

early collages incorporated found objects such as a piece of mirror or an engraving in a very literal use of the collage technique, wherein the thing added stood for itself (the physical mirror instead of an artistic rendering of a mirror, and a real print hung on a painted wall in a painted frame). With time, his collages and papier collés became more integrated and integral to the overall composition, and as John Golding wrote, “his use of the medium is a great deal more complex than that of either Picasso or Braque; indeed it almost constitutes a completely new technique.”

A decidedly new and groundbreaking process, collage and the act of blocking, layering, and rearranging a composition had profound effects on Gris’s subsequent drawn and painted work. Gris explored the potential in an early series of at least five related still lifes from 1912-1913 composed of vertical sections [Figs. 7-11]. Each drawing is again on Gris’s preferred 19 x 12 inch format paper, some incorporating cut-and-pasted paper collage, while others simply mimicking the effects through blocks of opaque gouache, chalk, or colored pencil. These drawings are some of Gris’s most experimental, combining techniques of collage, geometric abstraction, linear renderings, and naturalistic chiaroscuro with a range of mediums and a rare use of color. As if taking scissors to the composition itself, Gris used the strip technique to present multiple views and representations simultaneously in one compact sheet. The five share palettes, materials, and subjects such as the same book shown open [Fig. 7] and closed [Fig. 8] - and we could imagine the individual drawings themselves cut from an imaginary whole. Unlike his 1910-11 drawings, light can no longer be traced to one natural source, and the segmented format itself resists a relationship to a real scene. Each drawing fills the entire sheet and incorporates colored pencil and gouache, implying a certain level of finish. But Gris’s process

30 Golding, *Cubism*, 113.
shows through, as in *Glass and Bottle* (1913) at The Museum of Modern Art, New York, for example, in which the rounded edges of the cups and bottles extend to full circles (with holes left in the sheet from the compass needles), and edges of the book and table overlap and intersect at regular angles. The entire still life, it seems, could have been composed not of observed objects but of interlocking geometric shapes. The straight lines from a ruler and curves from a compass create symmetrical, simple designs that, like the printed papers or non-art materials of collage, remove the hand and emotion of the artist. It would not be surprising if Gris included details such as the text and star on the rum bottle in *Bottle of Rum* (1913) [Fig. 11] simply for their geometry and machine-like qualities.³¹

The experimental complexity of these 1912-13 drawings continued through Gris’s year of collage in 1914, when he combined his drawing and painting practices into a hybrid technique (creating no traditional pencil or charcoal drawings or oil paintings at this time). The group of approximately forty collages from 1914 expresses a flurry of experimentation and a diverse range of techniques: from pasted found papers to hand-painted ones, over-drawing and layering of forms.³² He applied these mediums both with brush and hand, from gouache and oil to charcoal and crayon, and while the base of the work is often a sheet of paper, Gris mounted his collages to canvas, further complicating the technique.³³ Contributing to the investigatory nature of this series, Gris not only restricted this year to the practice of collage, but limited his subject matter, avoiding portraits or landscapes entirely in favor of experimental still lifes.

³¹ The proportion between a diagonal and a side of a regular pentagon (the shape within the star) in fact uses the golden section ratio (see chapter 2). See also Cécile Debray and Françoise Luebert, *La Section d’or, 1912-1920-1925*, (Paris: Cercle d’art, 2000).
³² For a more in-depth analysis of Gris’s collage, see Poggi, *In Defiance of Painting.*
³³ Daniel-Henry Kahnweiler states that, unlike Braque and Picasso, Gris uniquely only uses the collaged paper technique in his paintings. Douglas Cooper includes the 1914 collages in his catalogue raisonné of Gris’s paintings. Later interpretations (see Temkin, “Los Dibujos de Juan Gris,” 309), refer to Gris’s collage works as specifically drawings. The confusion may stem from the fact that Gris’s collages were pasted upon canvases, though with an underlying layer of a large piece of paper (often newspaper).
After his intense year of collage, and also coinciding with the advent of World War I, a noticeable shift occurred in Gris’s work (discussed further in chapter three and four). 1915 also marked the year of Gris’s first ‘open-window’ still life, the 1915 oil Still Life before an Open Window, Place Ravignan. Interpretations vary as to whether Gris’s still lifes in general share the metaphysical qualities of the bodegóns of his Spanish predecessors, though recent scholarship suggests a more symbolic complexity to his weighted, deliberate objects. The metaphorical structure of a framed window view opening into infinite space certainly invites an argument for a psychological reading of Gris’s works. Besides a series of ten gouaches for Pierre Reverdy’s Au Soleil du Plafond, few drawings by Gris date to 1915. The transitional year however marked the beginning of an invigorated new approach to his practice, including a transformed role for his drawing.

By 1917, imbued with a newfound confidence likely inspired by the 1916 studies discussed in chapter three, Gris’s still life drawings gain a jumbled complexity, and a freer, more curvilinear study of forms and tones. In one group from the summer of 1917 (Figs. 12-16) (all again sharing a 19 x 12 inch format paper) Gris ceased the use of outline or essentially lines of any form, choosing instead to work with layers of soft charcoal and conté crayon in a flattened, bold study of tonal contrasts. He returned to the simplified tabletop scenes of his pre-collage
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34 Paloma Esteban Leal writes that Gris has a predilection for still life, though on a whole his were, “without the slightest hint of symbolism.” In Leal, Juan Gris, 20. Daniel-Henry Kahnweiler writes, “The signs which Gris uses are ‘emblems’. They are a knife or a glass. They are never symbols, for they never have a dual identity...They are the objects which they represent, with all the emotive value attaching to them, but they never signify anything outside of these objects.” In Kahnweiler, Juan Gris, 99-100. And Douglas Cooper writes further, “In Gris’s paintings, no matter of what date, there is never turbulence or exaggeration, neither violence nor an open display of passion, no obtrusive display of the artist’s private emotions, no hidden meanings or message.” In Cooper, Juan Gris: catalogue raisonné, xxviii.

35 See also Rosenthal, Juan Gris. More recently, my research for Emily Braun’s course “Research Methods: Cubism” was included in her essay for the catalogue Cubism: The Leonard A. Lauder Collection. (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014), 311, identifying the ‘Gris’ Scaferlati tobacco wrapper frequently used in Gris’s collages and its use as a play on words or signature.

36 In fact I know of only one other, Still Life, 1915. Charcoal on paper. Location unknown, reproduced in Kahnweiler, Juan Gris, 73.
years, each still life typically containing two to three increasingly anonymous objects. The resulting method of composition – bolder, less constructed – on the one hand clarifies the subjects for the viewer, while on the other complicates and poeticizes the relationships in a very intentional way. In contrast to his 1911 drawings of similar objects composed of fractured, straight lines and a compositional grid, these 1917 drawings lack almost any straight lines and convey a deliberate looseness as the bottles and bowls lose specificity and morph together. Several do contain a grid, however now though in the form of an actual checkerboard. Whereas the compositional grid of his 1911 drawings served as a representational tool, this grid motif (here as a game) rather crudely drawn with overlapping, uneven patches of light and dark seems an almost tongue-and-cheek reference to his previous methods and a deliberate change in approach.

By 1918, as the following chapters will illustrate, the role of Gris’s drawing shifts and the majority of his later works on paper contain swelling organic pencil and naturalistically observed chiaroscuro. These expressive, voluminous, and yet delicate drawings are the furthest from their contemporary paintings than at any other point during his career. In a 1918 letter to Paul Dermée, Gris alluded to his separation of practices: “Work goes ahead and I paint for eight or nine hours each day, except for two hours which I spend drawing from nature.” Gris selected a hard pencil to achieve his observed specificity (a dramatic contrast to the bold 1917 charcoal drawings discussed previously). These 1918 drawings are of a different sort of precision, however, than his calculated and gridded cubist works, now drawn from nature and following a wartime trend of classicism and austerity.

---

37 Letter to Paul Dermée, May 13, 1918, Letters of Juan Gris, 54.
38 See also chapter 3 and 4.
While Gris produced skillful portrait drawings during this time (as discussed in chapter four), the majority of his drawings were still lifes. In another “series” of concentrated study, a body of more than a dozen drawings from this time share a common subject matter: intimate breakfast scenes, complete with coffee as in the Metropolitan Museum of Art’s The Tobacco Pouch [Fig. 17], newspapers [Fig. 18] (significantly, “Le Matin” or “the morning”), fruits [Fig. 19], and later eggs and croissants. Many were signed, dated, and often dedicated and given to friends. Within the group, Gris favored compositions in triplets of objects, allowing himself to continue his experimentations of observed layering and transparency. Through these simple, naturalistic pencil drawings such as Still Life (1918) at the Kröller-Müller Museum, Otterlo, The Netherlands [Fig. 20] and Bottle, Bowl and Glass (1918) at the Staatsgalerie Stuttgart [Fig. 21], Gris skewed and twisted perspective, nearly shifting to birds-eye view. The deceptive simplicity of his scenes allowed him to challenge and subtly complicate these forms as never before.

In the midst of bowls, cups, bottles, peaches, grapes, and other largely rounded objects, a new form appeared as early as 1917: the knife. Employed in at least nine of these still life drawings from 1917-1920 [Figs. 22-25], the knife drawings arguably play a role similar to the 1917 checkerboards - both seemingly natural observed scenes whose metaphorical objects reference their own construction. Putting aside any implied violent associations, the knife, in contrast to his typically rounded, symmetrical objects, is explicitly straight and linear, and becomes an excuse to introduce a geometry to these otherwise organic scenes. In relation to the exaggerated perspectival views of these 1918 drawings, the knife functions also as a sort of projected line or rule, making explicit the receding angle and “cutting” through the space. In

39 Others have commented upon the violent associations of the knife, including Derouet who wrote of Gris’s practice of gifting drawings to friends, “It might be more accurate to consider these as periodic peace offerings in a relationship marked by stormy passages, as hinted at in the still life with a lemon which Gris also inscribed to Rosenberg- the blade of the knife is too sharp to be entirely without trust. The dealer was bitterly against the desertion of cubist principles and return to docile figuration demanded by cantankerous and quarrelsome critics in 1918.” In Leal Juan Gris, 123.
contrast to his flattened synthetic cubist planes, these breakfast still lifes are open and expanded spaces.

Gris fell ill in May of 1920 and was hospitalized over the summer. Unable to make many canvases during his recovery, he spent his time instead drawing. “Until now I have been drawing every day,” he wrote to Kahnweiler, “and have filled about twelve pages of my sketch-book.”

He continued to draw breakfast scenes, now with far less shading and a much bolder line, swelling and receding in a dynamic expression of form [Figs. 26-28]. It is a style, in fact, quite close to his linear portraits of the same time (discussed further in chapter four), leading Kahnweiler to describe the still lifes as sort of “portrait” drawings, separate from his painted work. By 1924, Gris’s paintings gain a new energy in the form of an organic quality that I believe owes much to this freer approach to drawing.

As the following chapters demonstrate, Gris’s entire practice was grounded in a graphic study of shape and the interactions between objects. Still life drawings especially, as the most pure investigation of form, were at the root of his formal and conceptual exploration. From his earliest modeled charcoals to his repeated cubist pencil studies; his first experimental exercises in collage to the confidence of his wartime charcoals and the development of a post-war practice quite apart from painting, the exploratory practice of still life drawings allowed for Gris to develop his own unique approach to representation. Seen through these series - short bursts of related ideas - Gris’s still life drawings epitomize his artistic interests generally and speak to the preeminence of drawing within his process. The immediacy and experimental freedom of the drawing format allowed Gris to test and work through his subjects, and his works on paper reveal the degree to which he relied on this aspect of his practice to prepare, guide, and even contrast his more highly scrutinized painted work.

40 Kahnweiler, Juan Gris, 16.
Chapter 2: Preparatory drawings, 1911-1913

Juan Gris’ drawings are never sketches, but finished works.\(^41\) -Daniel-Henry Kahnweiler, 1967

Daniel-Henry Kahnweiler rightfully advocated for the elevated status of Juan Gris’s drawings, and as seen in the previous chapter’s survey of the artist’s still lifes on paper, many were highly composed, fully realized works. During a distinct period from 1911 through 1913, however, Gris distorted the notion of a finished work on paper through his use of preparatory drawings for related paintings. Nearly half of his drawings from this important cubist period fall into this category, either as preliminary stages, plotted diagrams, or even in some cases drawings made after the paintings.\(^42\) In his catalogue raisonné, Douglas Cooper identified some fifty drawings that relate in some way to the artist’s paintings over his career, yet he explicitly classified these particular 1911-1913 drawings as “preparatory.”\(^43\) This categorization implies not only their distinct role within his oeuvre but also a conceptual link to his painting practice at that time. Gris’s drawings from this time share both the subject of their related oils, and the precise compositional layout. They are not sketches from life, but rather templates for, or diagrams of, a final product. Beginning with the direct pre-planned drawings which prepared for Gris’s 1911 canvasses, moving to the complex segmented multi-part analyses created for the 1912 Salon de la Section d’Or, and finally to the expanded collage-inspired preparatory drawings...


\(^42\) From Kahnweiler’s 1967 introduction: “Consequently, the drawings of Gris that resemble certain paintings, present the same problems as these paintings, while at the same time, they do not aim to prepare for these paintings, except on very rare occasions. Moreover, they were often executed later than the paintings in question.” Kahnweiler, Saidenberg Gallery, np.

\(^43\) The 2014 edition of Cooper’s catalogue raisonné includes about 30 additional related drawings.
of 1913, we are able to witness the uniquely supporting role that drawing played during Gris’s cubist years as it propelled his distinct cubism. His drawn and painted practices were closer at this time than at any other in his career, demonstrating a particular dependence upon drawing during these formative analytic years.

Preparatory drawings arguably give privileged insight to an artist’s creative process whereas a finished painting may conceal it. At the same time, however, they can be valued as ancillary or supporting material, their status preconceived as secondary. Be it a quick initial sketch, a study or preparatory *modello*, a full scale cartoon or technical guide for the final work, or even a presentation drawing created to convey the finished product to a patron - a preparatory drawing historically also partakes of a trained academic process, one that the cubists would have intentionally avoided. Gris’s gallerist, Kahnweiler, wrote in his introduction to Gris’s posthumous exhibition of drawings in 1965, “Juan Gris always thought, as did his friends, that the academic method which consists in building up a picture through a number of preliminary studies, drained the emotion which they wanted to pour into a work that was unique.”

Or earlier, in his 1946 biography of Gris, “Fear of repetition has always prevented Picasso, as much as Gris and Braque, from working out precise drawings in preparation for pictures; for, the lazy repetition which results from this habit and ends up in the Ecole des Beaux Arts practice of ‘squaring up’ always seemed to them to kill the enthusiasm which is the essence of fruitful work.” These 1911-1913 drawings, however, stand as an exception, as Gris used them to develop a deliberate precision and control to his painted compositions. It seems more than a coincidence that a majority of preparatory drawings survive from this particular stage of Gris’s career, at a time when Gris was creating his first cubist canvases and establishing his reputation.
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44 Kahnweiler, Saidenberg Gallery, np.
45 Kahnweiler, *Juan Gris*, 40.
as the cubist logician. Although he avoided academic drawing, his pre-planned works of this period allowed him to perfect the essence of form and make highly visible his organization of the two-dimensional plane.

Gris’s distinct preparatory drawings owe much to his early training at the Escuela de Artes e Industrias in Madrid. Though few details are known from his schooling, it is likely that he was exposed to technical drawing or drafting at this time - industrial methods for architects and engineers to convey ideas visually by way of diagrams, symbols, and notations. Standardized with the assistance of rulers and compasses, this industry-specific mode makes use of drawing to communicate details of an object’s construction to a manufacturer or builder. A true technical drawing essentially bears the idea of the finished work and contains the instructions for a manufactured or constructed finished product. That Gris often composed with compass and ruler and made use of isometric projections in conveying a three-dimensional object in a two dimensional plane implies that he was familiar with the industry-specific conventions. He incorporated this technical approach into his fine art practice, developing his signature style of composition and analysis that embraced an almost mechanical precision. His preparatory drawings specifically held the blueprints for his final paintings, essentially reading as technical drawings or carefully planned diagrams for the execution of his ideas. With the increase in manufacturing and production of industrial objects beginning in the nineteenth century, artists and artisans traditionally preferred to distance themselves from the anonymous machine. As the following works show, Gris’s use of the technical drawing in preparing for his paintings embraced the distanced, industrial approach and allowed him to create intentionally cold, logical,
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46 Molly Nesbit discusses the artisan and technical drawing in her essay, “What Was an Author,” *Yale French Studies*, no. 73 (1987), 229-257.
and objective compositions, different from the studied aestheticism that marked academic preparatory drawing and the tradition that cubism no longer found viable.

At least three of Gris’s earliest cubist paintings are accompanied by preparatory drawings: two portraits of Maurice Raynal and Juan Legua, both in private collections, and Jug and Bottle (Pot et Bouteille) at the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, all from 1911 [Figs. 29-34]. As a rule, Gris’s paintings are generally softer than the related drawings, with slightly more curved lines and rounded edges by virtue of the oil medium and play of highlights and shadow. This disparity is especially clear in the Raynal portrait, whose sharp ruled pencil lines of the drawing each gain a curve and swell in the final work. The lenient oil and brush mask the hard line of Gris’s pencil, and the ambiguous broken contours of the black and white drawings gain a depth and connectivity through the addition of paint. The three early drawings however remain markedly close to their corresponding paintings, both compositionally, and by scale. The Legua and Raynal drawings for example even proportionally share an almost one-to-one relationship with their corresponding canvases, as if Gris could have physically traced over his drawings to create the paintings (and quite feasibly did). Not unlike the full-scale cartoons of old masters, this technique implies an intended precision as Gris left nothing to chance. While the less polished Legua drawing remained unsigned and retained by the artist, Gris not only dated and dedicated the Raynal portrait to its sitter, like he would a completed painting, but also signed it twice: on the recto and verso, both as “Juan Gris” and “Victoriano González,” as if declaring what was clearly a preparatory stage to be an independent work.

By 1912, as Gris’s painted production increased, so did his preparatory drawings. Approximately ten of the almost twenty known drawings from 1912 correspond to paintings. This year marked an increase in Gris’s output, coinciding with an end to his commercial
illustrations, and the beginning of his public exhibitions. He showed at the spring *Salon des Indépendants*, and again at the *Salon de la Section d’Or* at the Galerie de la Boétie in October 1912, an exhibition considered by many to be one of the most significant cubist displays to that point. Over thirty-two artists participated, including the brothers Marcel Duchamp, Raymond Duchamp-Villon and Jacques Villon; Albert Gleizes, Jean Metzinger, Fernand Léger, Francis Picabia, André Lhote, František Kupka, Roger de La Fresnay, and Gris, with over two hundred works shown in total. Originating through meetings organized by the Duchamp brothers at Jacques Villon’s studio in Puteaux, the exhibition brought together a varied group of artists who called for a rebranding of the cubist movement as defined by Braque and Picasso (neither of whom exhibited at the *Salon de la Section d’Or*). As Douglas Cooper wrote:

> The idea behind this exhibition was to ‘present the Cubists, no matter of what tendency...as the most serious and most interesting artists of this epoch’ (Apollinaire). To this end, each artist was invited to send not only his most recent works but a group illustrating his development over the past three years. Thus this exhibition represented yet another attempt to clarify the situation and was important for establishing the prestige of the Cubists.

“The term ‘cubism’,“ Maurice Raynal (a close friend and like-minded critic) wrote in the review published at the time of the exhibition, “is day by day losing its significance, if it ever had any very definite one.” The exhibitors were diverse but shared, in his words, the rejection of “oldmaidish child’s-play” of traditional painting, and a desire to depict the “true” reality through “pure” painting, devoid of illusionistic tricks and ulterior goals. “Painting,” he wrote, “in fact,

47 Edward Fry, for example, referred to it as, “the most important of all cubist manifestations in France,” in Fry, *Cubism*, 100.
49 Maurice Raynal, ‘L’Exposition de La Section d’Or’ in *Section d’Or*, (Paris: October 9, 1912), 2-5, quoted in Fry, *Cubism*, 97. Raynal’s own writing, paralleling Gris’s style was markedly austere and scientific, and the two became close at this time (as seen in his 1911 portrait, the 1912 portrait of Germaine Raynal, and the study for *Man in a Café* (1912) which was dedicated to Raynal).
must be nothing but an art derived from a disinterested study of forms.” In Gris’s case, the distanced, mathematical, unemotional analysis was propelled by his technical use of pre-planned drawing, giving insight into his intended deliberate and preconceived understanding of forms. Gris’s drawings as an intermediary step precisely removed the emotion that Kahnweiler warned against, to Gris’s benefit.

The complete list of Gris’s contributions to the Salon de la Section d’Or is not known, due in part to the fact that he chose to title his works with numbers rather than words. But he exhibited nine oils and three drawings, of which four paintings have been identified: Houses in Paris, Place Ravignan (1911, possibly 1912), Man in a Café (August-September 1912), The Watch (September 1912), and The Washstand (September 1912). Preparatory drawings survive for three of the four.

Houses in Paris, Place Ravignan in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, a drawing created slightly prior to the Salon de la Section d’Or in 1911, depicts a view from Gris’s studio at the Bateau Lavoir, overlooking Place Ravignan. The chalk and gouache drawing [Fig. 35] and finished oil [Fig. 36] are again of comparable size, suggesting, like the 1911 portrait drawings, the possibility of a directly plotted cartoon. But here Gris made many changes in the final painting. Notably, he removed or painted over the gridded under drawing. Christopher Green wrote of Gris’s drawings that he, “studied drawing and he made studies for his paintings. With the clarity and definition this encouraged went an immaculacy of

50 Ibid., 99.
51 The exhibition catalogue, found at http://www.aaa.si.edu/collections/viewer/exhibit-catalog-salon-de-la-section-dor-15197, lists only “Toile no. 18, 19, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and three “dessins”.
52 Emily Braun and Rebecca Rabinow, in their essay “The Backs of Things,” in their Cubism: The Leonard A. Lauder Collection, study the verso and related Houses in Paris of 1912 as arguments for a 1912 date (see page 229). See also Harry Cooper’s essay “The Matrix of Juan Gris’s Cubism” in Braun and Rabinow, eds. Cubism: The Leonard A. Lauder Collection, which proposes an additional study for the painting, in the form of a drawing for a journal illustration published in the April 26, 1912 issue of L’Esquella de la Torratxa.
oil technique that masked utterly the traces of process.”

Perhaps in an attempt to further remove the inherent grid, Gris’s painted lines also gain a more pronounced curve. An analogous “masking” is evident within the drawing itself through the additions of white gouache. The white areas largely follow those of the finished painting and can be understood as an added highlight, a sort of preview of the final work. In certain areas such as the lower left of the sheet, the gouache explicitly follows the penciled line of the gridded under drawing, a sort of pentimenti or erasure. In others still, Gris appears to have added a layer of black chalk on top of the white gouache, as if providing a cleaned up version.

The level of perfection of this preparatory drawing may signal its significance for Gris as a carefully constructed, signed and “finished” work. It may also point to a lingering influence from his commercial years as an illustrator. Gris used a similar layer of gouache in original drawings for illustrations, many of which are reproduced in Bachollet’s catalogue raisonné. An illustration for the magazine Le Frou-Frou, no. 560 from July 9, 1911 [Fig. 37], for example, depicts layers of pencil and painterly gouache, which, when printed ([Fig. 38]), translate to flat planes of white, with almost no trace of brushstrokes or layers. Here Gris’s use of white is driven by the reproduction process - not as a way to create highlighted tones, but to block out areas that would not print in a black and white reproduction. In such commercial works, the completed drawing used for reproduction was not a sketch, but a graphic final work with a carefully mapped set of instructions for the printer. It is conceivable that Gris carried this commercial approach to preparatory drawing through to contemporaneous drawings such as Houses in Paris, Rue Ravignan, using the gouache in a similar way to resolve the composition in advance of a subsequent stage.
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53 Green, Juan Gris, 18-19.
54 See also Cooper, “The Matrix of Juan Gris’s Cubism” for a discussion of this work and its relation to Gris’s journal illustrations.
Other canvasses that Gris created especially for the *Salon de la Section d'Or* share an increasing level of compositional complexity, which undoubtedly demanded a certain amount of planning on the part of the artist. No longer merely single objects or table settings, Gris at this time incorporated entire rooms and scenes. *Le Lavabo* or *La Montre*, for example, both depict views of full tables, walls, and curtains. Gris’s preparatory drawings for such works depict isolated details of the final compositions, allowing him to work out multiple elements in advance and reassemble them into a final painting. At no other point during his career did Gris’s drawings dissect and analyze his compositions in such a way.\(^{55}\) The charcoal drawing *Chypre (Parfum de Chypre)* in a private collection [Fig. 39], for example, relates to the lower right detail of a perfume bottle in *Le Lavabo* [Fig. 40]. There is a sense of almost architectural construction to his paintings at this time, as their increasingly geometric interlacing components combine to form a whole. The individual drawings, however, continue to stand alone as balanced compositions, complicating the notion of what constitutes a preparatory versus finished work.

The *Man in a Café* (1912) [Fig. 41] painting with a full figure, table setting, and exterior landscape, is accompanied by at least seven drawings and two related oils detailing various elements within the composition [Figs. 42-50]. *Still Life with Box of Cigars* (1912) [Fig. 42, private collection], for example, depicts a composition that was not used in the final painting, but is clearly comparable in subject, whereas *The Cigar Box* (1912) [Fig. 43, Galerie Louise Leiris, Paris], with the now hexagonal table, is much closer to the final table in *Man in a Café*. Two small related 1912 canvases can be considered preparatory paintings [Figs. 44-45]. The 2014 edition of Cooper’s catalogue raisonné of Gris’s paintings also identifies as related a standing figure [Fig. 46] (dated 1911-12) and head [Fig. 47] in the Philadelphia Museum of Art and the

Art Institute of Chicago, respectively - two drawings that were perhaps early rejected ideas for the subject and composition. The head is dated c. 1912 and is signed and dedicated to Maurice Raynal.\textsuperscript{56} Two additional studies (The Morgan Library, New York, and Basil Goulandris, Lausanne [Figs. 48-49]) correspond more closely to the final painted figure in \textit{Man in a Café}. The Lausanne version [Fig. 49], signed and dated August 1912, is nearly identical in composition to the final painting. The Morgan Library’s drawing [Fig. 48] shows areas such as the eyebrows and segmentation of the hat that differ from both the Lausanne version and the final painting, and likely precedes both.\textsuperscript{57} One additional drawing for \textit{Man in a Café} in a private collection [Fig. 50], slightly smaller than the other preparatory drawings, is a linear sketch of the full, finished composition. As Cooper posits, the proximity in composition suggests that this drawing was likely made after the painting. These various stages and visible signs of erasure and trial and error together highlight the precision that Gris sought in his compositions and the process and experimentation involved to achieve his ideal outcome.

Besides allowing for this new level of compositional complexity, Gris’s 1912 drawings for the \textit{Salon de la Section d’Or} share a rigidly pre-determined internal structure. As Guillaume Apollinaire observed in \textit{Les Peintres cubistes}, “The new artists have been violently attacked for their preoccupation with geometry. Yet geometrical figures are the essence of drawing. Geometry, the science of space, its dimensions and relations, has always determined the norms and rules of painting.”\textsuperscript{58} Gris at this time developed what I observe to be a compositional strategy of “quartering,” wherein he divided the full view or select elements within a composition into quadrants, as he imposed an unnatural geometric order upon his subjects.

\textsuperscript{56} The inscription is erased, as noted by the Art Institute of Chicago.
\textsuperscript{57} This is confirmed as well by the Morgan Library’s catalogue entry, which states “the Thaw drawing must have preceded the one in Lausanne, which is dated August 1912 and closely resembles the corresponding section of the painting.” See http://corsair.themorgan.org/cgi-bin/Pwebrecon.cgi?BBID=264936.
\textsuperscript{58} Guillaume Apollinaire, Chapter 3 [November 1911-April 1912], from \textit{Les Peintres cubistes} (Paris: 1913), quoted in Fry, \textit{Cubism}, 115.
Vertical and horizontal lines meeting at ninety-degree angles dominate Gris’s compositions at this time, creating a patchwork of geometric forms and causing the subjects to appear almost as afterthoughts. The technique is not restricted to his works on paper, though it is often more pronounced in his graphite and charcoal ruler lines that extend to reveal an underlying grid-like architecture. It is not uncommon even to perceive the laid lines of the paper echoing this grid, as Gris embraces the inherent structure of the drawing support to encourage a level of rigidity. The drawing format thus provided Gris with both the means and the stimulus for this rigid, abstracting analysis of form.

Gris’s use of drawing, and the idea of a composition based on a preconceived internal structure resonates quite literally with the theories of the Puteaux group and their ideals of proportion. The organizers of the *Salon de la Section d’Or* sought to emphasize cubism’s scientific, objective, and rational side. Raynal wrote:

> What is there to say of this rich flowering of new ideas, always very firmly based on the best and purest precepts of the ancients; this love of science, which is a criterion of our modern sensibility in all its refinement; this urge to weigh and measure everything properly, and to leave nothing to vague and absurd inspiration...What, in short, is there to say about these noble efforts, except to express the enthusiasm they inspire?⁵⁹

The title “*Section d’or*” or Golden Section refers to a commonly cited mathematical proportion wherein the proportion of a small quantity to a large quantity is equal to the proportion of the large quantity to the whole (or $A/B$ equals $B/AB$). Thought to be the most visually pleasing and harmonious ratios, the Golden Section proportion was used by artists throughout time, from the ancient Egyptians to Leonardo da Vinci, and Gris’s contemporaries were specifically interested
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⁵⁹ Maurice Raynal, ‘L’Exposition de *La Section d’Or*’ in *Section d’Or*, (Paris: October 9, 1912), 2-5, quoted in Fry, *Cubism*, 99.
in this blend of tradition and avant-garde. Gris, Villon, and Gleizes, however, were the only artists in the exhibition who made obvious use of the ratio in their works.60

Gris, in fact, was singled out early on for his especially rigorous application of these ideals. Raynal referred to the artist in his review of the 1912 exhibition as, “certainly the fiercest of the purists in the group.”61 Apollinaire too, in a lecture given at the Salon de la Section d’Or, classified Gris’s particular branch of cubism (along with Picasso, Braque, Gleizes, and Laurencin’s) as “scientific cubism,” with forms created, “not from the reality of sight, but from the reality of insight.”62 In his contribution to the revue published for the exhibition, Apollinaire characterized Gris in a mocking fictional dialogue of “chatter” between “a few elegant young women,” viewing the exhibition:

GERMAINE: I would really like to know the names of these painters whose work still astonishes me and bothe[r]s me a bit.
LOUISE: There’s Metzinger, whose art is so refined. There are Jean [sic] Gris, the demon of logic, Albert Gleizes, who has made great progress, Marcel Duchamp, who is disquieting…
MARCELLE: I do believe, my dear Louise, that you are making fun of us. All I see here is an absolutely incomprehensible chaos of forms and colors.63

Gris’s use of preparatory drawings, I believe, contributed to and encouraged the “scientific cubism” Apollinaire had observed. His pre-planning, trial and error of progressive studies, rigid, almost mechanical sub-structures - all of which become evident through his drawings - together enhanced this image of a “demon of logic” which would come to define his legacy.

By 1913, Gris increasingly incorporated Braque and Picasso’s innovations in collage from the previous year, and his preparatory drawings began to function as structural guides over
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61 Maurice Raynal, ‘L’Exposition de La Section d’Or’ in Section d’Or, (Paris: October 9, 1912), 2-5, quoted in Fry, *Cubism*, 100.
which he placed cut paper or planes of pigment. Gris’s preparatory drawings from 1913 tend to be some of the largest drawings made throughout his career. John Golding has argued that their size and complexity allowed Gris to “find a means of explaining more fully and accurately the formal properties of his subjects.”64 As he developed his analysis through compass, ruler, geometric substructure, and the introduction of foreign materials and literal layers, his spaces became more and more abstract. The double-sided work The Guitar of 1913 in the Jasper Johns Collection [Fig. 51], for example contains two preparatory drawings for another work on paper: the watercolor Guitar and Glasses on a Table of 1913 [Fig. 52, Sandra Payson Collection]. In this composition, clearly experimenting with the layering techniques of collage, Gris first carefully plotted his forms in the Johns drawing (using rulers and compass), and subsequently blocked out areas with washes of the final watercolor. Shown from a variety of twisting and overlapping angles, the web of lines of the instrument in the pencil drawing become almost indecipherable. It is only in the watercolor, where Gris applied colored medium over his lines, that the three views of the guitar reveal themselves as distinct: the sketched curves of the guitar on the left; the angled strings in a sort of trompe-l’oeil modeling in the middle; and the graphic black and white silhouettes at the right. The addition of color, as seen in previous painting and drawing comparisons, serves to clarify an otherwise ambiguous framework.

The stylistic, even conceptual differences between drawing and painting are evident in another pair for the 1913 The Smoker (Frank Haviland) [Figs. 53-54]. According to the Metropolitan Museum of Art’s cataloguing, Gris made the drawing while in Céret for the summer of 1913 (visited by Picasso, sculptor Manolo Hugué, and American painter Frank Haviland who was likely the subject of the painting), Gris’s first trip outside of Paris since his arrival in 1906. The drawing shares traits with those made by Picasso at the same time (see for

64 Golding, Cubism, 137.
example *Head of a Man*, (1913) [Fig. 55]). Elements such as the beady eye, for example, appear to be inspired by Picasso’s contemporary practice and suggest an impressionable Gris. Unlike Picasso’s, Gris’s drawing is not composed of cut-and-pasted papers, though its fanned rectangles seem to refer to the planar, piecemeal construction of collage. Compared to the final painting whose flat planes of color begin to move towards a synthetic cubist style of later years, Gris’s drawing shares much more in common with Picasso’s contemporaneous collages. Gris’s 1913 preparatory drawings tend to lose the direct visual relationship with their paintings, acting less as compositional preparations and more as schematic diagrams that become masked when covered with flat planes of papier collé and paint. No longer simply one-to-one mock ups for the finished work, these 1913 drawings contain constructional guides of a sort, and instruct the viewer in a very different way than their final paintings.

It is significant that Gris’s preparatory drawings primarily survive from this early moment in his career when he was preparing his first paintings for public exhibition and making the transition from his professional technical training. As he developed new working methods and turned exclusively to collage in 1914, he seemingly ended the practice of preparatory drawings and his post-collage drawings will take on a more independent role. As demonstrated in Gris’s most closely related drawings and paintings in 1911, the use of preparatory drawing began as an indispensable tool. The larger, more complex paintings of 1912 were created with the assistance of small detailed preparatory drawings and reveal Gris’s increasingly logical, scientific, and mathematical analysis of form. Finally by 1913 his preparatory drawings, in relation to collage and changing modes of composition, began to play an increasingly independent role from his paintings. In 1914 Gris turned solely to collage, only to recommence his transformed drawing practice in full, during the war, in 1916. For Gris, an artist who arguably
valued the process over the end result, the role and status of these preparatory drawings was continuously put to question through added signatures, compositional framing, and degrees of “finish.” Even more than simply a tool or aid, these 1911-1913 drawings and the processes carried with them were at the root of Gris’s analytic cubism. Regardless of whether the practice of preparatory drawing was a result of his “demonic logic” or a driving factor in his complex canvases, Gris’s unique reliance on drawing as a constructional tool at this formative moment has undoubtedly contributed to his lasting legacy and particular identity as the analytic logician of the cubists.
Treat nature by the cylinder, the sphere and the cone, everything in proper perspective, so that each side of an object or plane tends towards a central point. Lines parallel to the horizon give breadth...Lines perpendicular to this horizon give depth. Now nature, for us men, is more depth than surface; hence the need to introduce into our vibrations of light, represented by reds and yellows, a sufficient number of blue tints to give the impression of air.  

-Paul Cézanne, 1904

Cézanne turns a bottle into a cylinder, but I begin with a cylinder and create an individual of a specific type: I make a bottle - a particular bottle - out of a cylinder. Cézanne tends towards architecture, I tend away from it.  

-Juan Gris, 1921

In 1916, in the midst of war, Juan Gris’s art took a new turn as he began a series of direct copies from the paintings of great masters, including Velázquez, Corot, Raphael, Manet, and Cézanne. At least a dozen drawings and two paintings (one unfinished) resulted from his focused investigation, which looked to history in response to contemporary neo-traditional trends. Appearing at a pivotal time both for Gris’s career and the country as a whole, these 1916 copies, rooted in an investigation of form, embodied both the conservative contemporary culture and simultaneously functioned as a form of self-education and reevaluation of his art to this point. The lessons learned from these masters, most significantly Cézanne, carried through to subsequent drawings and paintings as Gris embarked upon a second phase of his cubism that evolved during World War I and in reaction to it, when the movement as a whole was being attacked in some quarters as being “foreign,” “Germanic” and antithetical to the French tradition.
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65 Paul Cézanne, letter to Emile Bernard April 15, 1904, quoted in Kahnweiler, Juan Gris, 74.
66 Juan Gris, biography published in L’Esprit Nouveau no. 5, 1921, reproduced in Kahnweiler, Juan Gris, 138.
67 I have just learned of the Manet reference, supposedly in the form of sketches after Manet’s The Execution of Emperor Maximilian, found on the verso of Homme accoudé d’après Cézanne [Fig. 17].
Gris’s solution was a style that embraced both the modern and traditional, and he succeeded in reconciling the two by reducing form to its Neoplatonic essence through drawing.

The anxiety of war came in many forms for Gris, the young draft-dodger, who, unable to return to his home country of Spain was thereby forced to remain on the French home front as contemporaries and fellow artists went to war. His correspondence from the time concedes heartfelt concern for the safety of his friends, and apprehension for his own future. The war, too, necessitated a break with Daniel-Henry Kahnweiler who, as a German citizen, was unable to maintain his gallery after being forced into exile in Switzerland. In 1916 Gris signed a contract with collector Léonce Rosenberg, who became the leading cubist dealer during the war.

Despite the tumult of the time, it seems that Gris nevertheless approached 1916 with a new sense of energy, exploring his subjects with a newfound purpose. As early as March of 1915, for example, an optimistic Gris wrote to Kahnweiler of a burgeoning intellectual progress in his works, qualified by a need for practical and technical study:

I think I have really made progress recently and that my pictures begin to have a unity which they have lacked till now. They are no longer those inventories of objects which used to depress me so much, but I still have to make an enormous effort to achieve what I have in mind. For I realize that although my ideas are well enough developed, my means of expressing them plastically are not. In short, I have not got an aesthetic, and this I can only acquire by experience.

The artist made no traditional drawings in 1914, and very few in 1915. His return to the medium during the 1915-16 post-collage period thus coincided with a break from his analytic cubist mode and technical studies as he explored new approaches to form and composition. This “rebirth” was echoed in the nation as well, with the first major salon since the start of the war opening in
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68 Gris departed Spain without serving his military service or paying the required exemption tax, and would not return to his home country for fear of prosecution.
69 There were several revisions to this rather strict contract, though, as Christian Derouet argues, the category of Gris’s drawings remained a gray area. Gris’s revised 1917 contract contained a new clause to include the drawings, but with “wholesale” pricing (three drawings for ten francs). See Derouet, “Experimentation with a Return to Representation in Gris’s Drawings,” in Leal, Juan Gris.
spring 1916, encouraging artists and intellectuals to show their resilience in face of the conflict. Post 1916, Gris’s paintings and drawings developed into the bold, flattened style of what has been termed a second, synthetic, or as Maurice Raynal termed “crystal” cubism, and this early wartime moment marked the beginning of a new phase in Gris’s work.

It was within this context of the revision of cubism that Gris took toll of his current “means of expression” and embarked on his 1916 study of masters of art history. While he created two oils, one after Cézanne (Interprétation du Portrait de Madame Cézanne, c. 1917 [Fig. 14]) and another after Corot (Woman with a Mandolin, after Corot, 1916), it is the group of more than a dozen drawings that most pointedly represent the fruits of this period of deliberate study. Gris’s source material is thought to have been small black-and-white postcard reproductions in his possession. Several cards reproducing works of Chardin, Loches, Ingres, and Cézanne were found in the artist’s studio after his death, and personal accounts attest that his studio walls were filled with such reproductions. Some still in the collection of his son, Georges González Gris, include over-drawings made with pencil and ruler that analyze the structure and organizing lines of the reproduced paintings. Gris’s 1916 drawings made after these monochrome postcard images were themselves all executed in a sharp, grayscale pencil, resulting in an almost paradoxical contrast between his precise graphite rendering and the masters’ more fluid modeling in oil. Given Gris’s prior use of charcoal, watercolor, and other more “painterly” mediums, it is clear that the pencil was an intentional choice, one that enabled a closer, slower, more precise, methodical and contour line-based analysis of these masters’ works.

72 “As if to show where his artistic lineage lay he pinned up a series of reproductions of the old masters he admired all around the wall of the studio like a frieze: portraits by Van Eyck, Ingres and Clouet, peasant meals by the Le Nain brothers, landscapes by Corot and still lifes by Cézanne, the Via Crucis by Ghirlandaio, The Virgin and Child by Fouquet, fêtes galantes by Watteau and boaters on the Seine by Seurat.” Emmanuel Bréon, “Juan Gris and the ‘Boulogne Sundays’,” in Leal, Juan Gris, 110.
73 Green, Juan Gris, 60.
While some were signed and duly titled “after” their respective artist, many of these exercises in copy and reinterpretation were not dispersed through gifts or sales, unlike other surviving drawings from Gris’s oeuvre, but remained in his personal possession and subsequently estate. While it is impossible now to know exactly the sequence of the drawings, several from the group are dated 1916 in the artist’s hand. The Metropolitan Museum of Art further identifies the location where their *Portrait of Mme Cézanne after Cézanne* [Fig. 12] was created as Beaulieu, implying that it was made during Gris’s September and October 1916 travels. This dating is supported by the painting *Woman with a Mandolin, after Corot* from September 1916, and it is not implausible that the others in the group were rendered at this moment as well.

As if to state the obvious, these studies, as Christian Derouet wrote in the catalogue for the recent Juan Gris exhibition at the Museo Nacional Centro de Arte Reina Sofia in Madrid, “had nothing to do with plagiarism, everything to do with regrounding himself technically, a *sine qua non* of development.” Akin to an academic student sketching copies from a museum, some of the more direct copies within Gris’s series evoke a tradition of drawing as a vital component in technical training. Gris seemingly practiced to improve the “means of expressing [his ideas] plastically” that he alluded to in his 1915 letter. His copies after Velázquez’s portrait of Don Gaspar de Guzman [Fig. 56], Corot’s *Gypsy Girl with Mandolin* [Fig. 57], and Raphael’s *Tempi Madonna* [Fig. 58], for example, generally show naturalistic shading combined with controlled pencil outlines and diagrammatic overlays.

The act of copying however certainly carries with it questions of authorship and uniqueness. It is one thing to draw inspiration from an artist, quite another to copy his work directly. Gris’s goal, however, was never deception. By selecting from the canon of art history,

---

his subjects served as cultural “monuments” and familiar models to compare and contrast against his ‘copies.’ To further complicate the process, Gris’s sources, as mentioned, were in fact small black-and-white reproductions of the paintings. On the one hand, working from reproductions could be considered an act of convenience with new photographic technologies making these pocket-sized facsimiles an increasingly common phenomenon at the time.75 On the other hand, the practice became a necessity during the chaos of war, as institutions such as the Louvre were forced to shut their doors to the public, not to reopen again until 1919. Gris’s hand-wrought, imperfect pencil line almost seems a conscious statement in contrast to the uniform surface of the mechanical reproductions - at once performing a similar act of replication, while simultaneously departing from the original by analyzing the essential structural composition and seizing it through the disciplined and personalized means of pencil and paper.

The most direct lesson taken from these masters, however, considering the group as a whole, is not the modeling, color, or even construction, but the subject matter. All but one of the resulting dozen known copy drawings depicts a portrait or figure - both relatively rare occurrences in Gris’s oeuvre (painted or drawn) up to this point - as Gris looked to his predecessors to introduce a new subject into his work. As Gris essentially created “portraits” of portraits, he managed to take lessons in the genre from an intentionally distanced source - portraits without a sitter observed from life. In a commentary on representation itself, Gris’s

75 For more on drawing after reproductions see Susan Grace Galassi: “Picasso’s Drawing Journey: The First Thirty Years” in Susan Grace Galassi, Marilyn McCully; with the assistance of Joanna Sheers and Katie Steiner, Picasso’s Drawings, 1890-1921: reinventing tradition (New York: Frick Collection; Washington D.C.: National Gallery of Art; New Haven [Conn.]: in association with Yale University Press, 2011), 10: “Through the expanding use of photographic reproduction and an increasing number of loan exhibitions, museum installations, auction house and gallery shows, and scholarly catalogues, drawings by the old and modern masters, from Dürer to Daumier, became more widely accessible for general appreciation and study than at any time in the past. Picasso’s generation was one of the first to benefit from this increasing public access to the most private of the fine arts - then emphasized as the intimate expression of an artist’s thought and indubitable measure of his skill.” The turn of the century also coincided with the “Golden Age” of postcards (see also http://siarchives.si.edu/history/exhibits/postcard/postcard-history and Lynda Klich and Benjamin Weiss The Postcard Age: Selections from the Leonard A. Lauder Collection (London: Thames & Hudson, 2013).
copies of copies - simultaneously depictions of postcards, paintings, and living sitters - confound the notion of an image based in reality.

It is not a surprise that Gris would have turned to art history for guidance. Throughout his career he continuously looked to a range of artists and movements of the past. Historians cite Francisco de Zurbarán as a model for Gris’s austerity and mastery of still life. Later works are said to have been inspired by the sixteenth century Fontainebleau Mannerists, while early commercial illustrations show the clear influence of German Art Nouveau and artists such as Willi Geiger and Bruno Paul. “There are paintings by Gris,” curator James Thrall Soby wrote in his 1958 catalogue for the Gris exhibition at The Museum of Modern Art in New York, “in which azure passages are not unrelated to the art of Madame Pompadour’s estimable decorator [Boucher], and at times Gris’ use of repetitive, circular elisions connects him, however obliquely, to the Rococo style.” According to Kahnweiler, Gris’s admiration ranged from Ingres, Cézanne, and Seurat to Delacroix, Corot, Renoir, Fouquet, Chardin, Boucher, and others. “In front of a picture,” his dealer remembered, “there was no-one better able to describe its structure and the artist’s intentions.” Gris made an effort to educate himself and was known to frequent museums. “Though in my system I may depart greatly from any form of idealistic or naturalistic art,” he wrote in a 1921 statement, “in practice I cannot break away from the Louvre. Mine is the method of all times, the method used by the old masters: there are technical means and they remain constant.” Throughout his career, and specifically in 1916 when triggered by

76 Leal, Juan Gris, 23.
77 Soby, Juan Gris, 10. Soby recalls Gertrude Stein who considered Gris’s 1923-35 figure compositions inspired by 16th century Fontainebleau Mannerists.
78 Kahnweiler, Juan Gris, 59.
79 Soby, Juan Gris, 9.
80 Kahnweiler, Juan Gris, 26.
81 Juan Gris, L’Esprit Nouveau, no. 5 (Paris 1921), 533-534. Quoted in Kahnweiler, Juan Gris, 138.
war, Gris continued to learn from the masters especially when he sought to improve, develop, and perhaps even justify his own modernist methods.

Although he was known to embrace a range of art historical influences, nine of the twelve known 1916 master drawings were made after the works of Cézanne, whose influence on the artists of Gris’s generation is undeniable and a topic much too large to cover here in full. It is useful, however, to consider the particular moments when Gris and his contemporaries reflected upon Cézanne, and the implications each carried for their work. William Rubin, in his 1977 catalogue *Cézanne: The Late Work* identified a first wave of “Cézannism” in Europe from 1900 through 1909, beginning with Matisse’s *Male Model*, c. 1900 and moving through the early years of cubism. Kahnweiler, in accounting for Gris’s obsession with the artist, summarized the modernists’ newly found interest during this “first wave”:

Scarcely ten years before Gris became aware of French painting, a new generation had begun to realize the importance of Cézanne. Maurice Denis painted his *Homage à Cézanne*, in which his friends The Nabis were grouped around the great painter whom they had just discovered. Then came copies of Cézanne. And from 1900 on, both the Indépendants and the newly founded Salon d’Automne began to teem with what the critics of that time called “Three apples on a ramshackle table”. Next came the retrospective exhibition of Cézanne.  

“Cubism” Kahnweiler continued, “...was the first serious attempt to carry on the work of Cézanne.” 1907, the same year that Picasso completed *Les Demoiselles d’Avignon*, was also the year, as Kahnweiler mentioned, of two major Cézanne exhibitions in Paris following the

---

82 Kahnweiler, *Juan Gris*, 65.
83 Ibid., 70.
84 Picasso’s masterpiece, as Edward Fry and others will argue, was made possible by the innovations of Cézanne, who, “had developed a way of denying illusionism by means of integrating surface and depth in his paintings, particularly by ‘passage’ - the running together of planes otherwise separated by space - and other methods of creating spatial ambiguity,” and who broke from one-point perspective by adding, “the psychological process of perception itself.” Fry, *Cubism*, 14-15. Rubin, citing Braque’s L’Estaque paintings and period of direct influence from Cézanne, traces a direct line from Cézanne through Braque to cubism, placing a higher emphasis on these seminal works than Picasso’s *Demoiselles*, which is typically cited as the first cubist, or cubist-leaning, work. These works, rejected from the 1908 Salon d’Automne, were shown instead in November of that year at Kahnweiler’s new gallery, wherein the critic Louis Vauxcelles would infamously liken them to “cubes”. See William Rubin, ed. *Cézanne: The Late Work* (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1977).
artist’s death in 1906.85 It was at this moment too that a nineteen-year-old Gris arrived in Paris, quick to absorb all that was around him.

The post-impressionist, for these young artists, came to embody the bridge between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and the facets and multiple viewpoints of early cubism owe much to Cézanne’s compositional strategies. Albert Gleizes and Jean Metzinger, for example, wrote of this early attraction to Cézanne’s forms in their 1912 text *Du Cubisme*:

[Cézanne] teaches us to understand a dynamism which emerges from the composition, a strange, disturbing dynamism that is universal….His work, a homogeneous mass, moves in front of our eyes, contracts, expands, seems motionless or flickers, and proves that painting is not - or is no longer - the art of imitating an object by means of lines and colours, but of giving a pictorial expression to our intuitions.86

The cubists selectively drew from and expanded upon their lofty model as they studied Cézanne’s structure, form, and construction. Very quickly, cubism moved to what has been called its “hermetic” phase, as Braque and Picasso rejected Cézanne’s “perceptual” approach of translating observations into a two-dimensional plane, in favor of a more “conceptual” one that relied on generalizations and signs. Kahnweiler outlined cubism’s continuation of Cézanne’s goals:

From the beginning [cubism’s] novelty lay in the fanaticism with which it tackled simultaneously the two aspects of the problem which emerged from Cézanne. It strove to make the architecture something firm, a real unity by virtue of which the subject-matter would be subordinated to the rhythm of the whole. It strove to produce a complete image of the objects signified by the emblems which formed this entity, but an image which should be at the same time devoid of everything ephemeral and accidental, retaining only what is essential and permanent.87

---

85 June 1907 exhibition of 79 watercolors at Berheim-Jeune Gallery, Paris; October 1907 exhibition of 56 paintings at the *Salon d’Automne* retrospective, Paris. Rubin, however, will argue that Braque and Picasso were well aware of Cézanne’s work prior to his 1907 retrospective, and the influence of this exhibition has historically been overstressed. They were however clearly influenced by an important group of later landscapes and unfinished canvasses that were exhibited here for the first time. See Rubin, *Cézanne: The Late Work*, 155.
The cubists were, in historian Edward Fry’s words, “learning to stand on Cézanne’s shoulders, extracting from his art its structural and non-illusionistic features while discarding Cézanne’s lingering interest in observed detail.”

By the time that Gris returned to Cézanne in 1916, his homages to the artist and his works could be understood in the context of a subsequent wave of Cézannism. An important volume by Cézanne’s dealer, Ambroise Vollard, was published in 1914, perhaps inviting a renewed interest in the artist’s works, and at the very least providing another opportunity for contemporary artists (including, one can hazard, Gris) to consider his oeuvre, especially when brought together in one book.

More significant was the changing contemporary political climate and French wartime propaganda. Whereas cubism had intentionally stirred the waters and provoked tradition, more and more artists (following Picasso’s lead) turned to an increasingly classicizing style, celebrating the country’s masters and history in what came to be termed a ‘rappel à l’ordre,’ or call to order. Cubism was even regarded by some as of foreign or enemy influence, and artists began to incorporate patriotic references as a way of “fitting in,” especially for those of foreign extraction who remained at the home front. It was at this moment of ideological reaction against the innovations of modernism, that artists seized upon another aspect of Cézanne’s identity as a classical, quintessentially French artist. Both conservative and avant-garde artists alike called for a turn away from the “excess” of cubist collage and fragmentation toward a more
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88 Fry, Cubism, 17.
89 Those discussed in this chapter that were reproduced in Vollard’s volume include Three Bathers (1879-82), Louis Guillaume (c. 1882), Madame Cézanne in a Yellow Chair (1888/90), and Leaning Smoker (1890).
90 The ‘return to order’, attributed to Jean Cocteau’s Le rappel a l’ordre, published in 1926, refers to the conservative trend in the arts during the war and the reaction to the excesses of cubism and the avant-garde.
91 Silver, “Cubism and Classicism” 196.
constrained and disciplined approach, looking to Cézanne and other great masters in a growing neo-traditionalism.93

Gris’s 1916 drawings after Cézanne and others clearly do not mask or suppress their source imagery, but instead embrace, and even celebrate these masters. Kenneth Silver wrote of Gris’s copies:

This kind of emulation, akin to copying a masterpiece at the Musée du Louvre, would have been close to apostasy for a prewar Cubist: by building so closely on a recognizable work by an artist of the past, Gris seemed to reinstate the master/apprentice hierarchy that the avant-garde had long since jettisoned as part of its rejection of the officially sanctioned Beaux-Arts educational system and its Prix de Rome competitions. With this homage, Gris, in effect, transformed Cézanne from a radical role model into a new old master, a maker of iconic monuments of modernist art history.94

Such conspicuous homage, the precise observed detail cubists previously would have avoided, highlights how wartime cubism encompassed an entirely new set of rules. It is useful then to take advantage of the side-by-side comparison between these drawings and their source paintings to better understand Gris’s goals in 1916. For the most part, the compositions of Gris’s drawings do not stray far from their source paintings - the closest perhaps being Bathers after Cézanne, 1916 [Fig. 59, private collection, Zurich], a small painting that Gris would likely have seen in person in the collection of Matisse (thus perhaps, as an exception, not copied from reproduction).95 As a subject, it appears to be the only instance in Gris’s oeuvre of figures in a landscape.96 In fact it is also, as far as I am aware, his only drawn nude.97 In this work, Gris not only follows Cézanne’s composition [Fig. 60], but also mimics his brushstrokes with very even, intentional, pencil lines,
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93 See Silver, *Esprit de Corps*. He cites avant-garde poet Paul Dermée who in his 1917 article “Quand le Symbolisme fut mort” in *Nord-Sud* (Pierre Reverdy’s wartime magazine), declares classicism to be a valid course: “After a period of exuberance and force must follow a period of organization, of arrangement, of science - that is to say, a classic age.” In Silver, *Esprit de Corps*, 89.


97 The only painted nude I have identified is Cooper 509, *Devant la baignoire* (1925).
perhaps a result of having observed the work and its textured surface in close proximity first hand, as such brushstroke effects are not seen in other of the “after” drawings. Gris’s black-and-white pencil translation emphasizes an interest in tonal contrasts, without the need for color.

Gris’s *Femme assise d’après Cézanne*, 1916 [Fig. 61, location unknown], another copy that stays fairly true to its original [Fig. 62], shows even planes of meticulous pencil shading which smooth and geometricize the rougher edges of Cézanne’s canvas, summarizing his textured overlaid marks into planes of unbroken tone. Gris’s lines gain sharpened, clean edges, and he is no longer concerned with following the post-impressionist’s constructive brushstrokes, but instead distills them in an effort to succinctly convey Cézanne’s core forms.

Similarly, Gris’s drawing after Cézanne’s *Self-Portrait* at The Art Institute of Chicago [Figs. 63-64] (an obvious choice of subject given Gris’s penchant for self-portraiture98) displays a very crisp, clean rendering of Cézanne’s figure. The bright tone of the paper adds clarity to the composition. Gris’s pencil edges are predominantly straight so that in the broader areas of tonal variety, such as in the head, the result is sharp and non-organic. He gave priority to the varying tones of light and dark – more pronounced, of course, when interpreted through a black-and-white photographic reproduction – and by doing so he began to block out the internal structure of the original painting.

In Gris’s version of Cézanne’s *Louis Guillaume* [Figs. 65-66], he allowed for his own compositional techniques to show through. He added a line extending from the boy’s lapel to the shaded space behind his ear, for example, which does not exist in the Cézanne [Fig. 66]. These structural connections between otherwise disparate compositional elements echo the pictorial rhymes that Gris continued to develop in his practice, as he attempted to describe increasingly complex objects with fewer and fewer means. The visual rhymes, along with his process of

---

98 For a further discussion of Gris’s self-portraits, see chapter 4.
building upon a geometric armature, serve as the basis of what he later termed his “deductive” method. Gris developed his use of outline to depict his figure in a smooth contour, and left an almost Ingresque unfinished sheet; perhaps also as an allusion to Cézanne’s own unfinished canvases, clearly prioritizing the figure’s face. He pinpointed the composition’s internal structure to extract its key elements, expanding upon Cézanne’s methods to co-opt them as his own.

Gris took even more liberties in compositions such as those after Cézanne’s Madam Cézanne in a Yellow Chair [Figs. 67-70], here allowing his long, unbroken and heavily pressured lines to play a more central role in the final composition. In this case, in addition to at least two surviving drawings [Figs. 67-68], there is also the unfinished painting made by Gris after the subject, Interprétation du Portrait de Madame Cézanne [Fig. 69]. In all three, Gris superimposed a template of flat, geometric shapes that connect and unify the figure, effectively reconfiguring Cézanne’s original composition to accentuate the inherent geometrical shapes and hard lines nascent within it. He made evident the direct “line” between Cézanne and cubist abstraction from nature. Gris’s overdrawn rays join seemingly unrelated components, as he instructs the viewer on how to comprehend the interconnectivity of the image. The waistline of the figure in Portrait of Mme Cézanne after Cézanne [Fig. 67], for example, joins with the left shoulder, and runs parallel to a line from the right shoulder to the hair. Straight lines through the figure’s hair and face map the solidity of her form, and highlight, rather than hide, Gris’s deductive process. In a way, Gris’s interpretations of Cézanne can almost be understood as backwards methods of construction - beginning with Cézanne’s finished composition and attempting to re-imagine the process by which Cézanne laid out his canvas. Here exists an

99 In a 1921 statement, Gris wrote, “I work with the elements of the intellect, with the imagination. I try to make concrete that which is abstract. I proceed from the general to the particular, by which I mean that I start with an abstraction in order to arrive at a true fact. Mine is an art of synthesis, of deduction, as Raynal has said.” Juan Gris, biography published in L’Esprit Nouveau no. 5, 1921, reproduced in Kahnweiler, Juan Gris, 138.
100 The painting was previously dated to 1918 but was later re-dated to c. 1917 based on 1917 correspondence between Gris and Rosenberg (see Green, Juan Gris, 123).
example of an unfinished painting by Gris from the series: a painting made after a drawing, made after a reproduction of a painting. Despite its distance from the original and the retention of the interconnected lines of the drawing, Gris’s oil, through the added element of color and reduced tonal subtleties, again loses some of the process, ambiguity, and curiosity of the black and white drawing. At this time Gris also created several masterful portraits of his companion Josette, Portrait of the Artist’s Wife (1916) and Portrait of Madame Josette Gris, (1916) likely inspired by the model of these images of Madame Cézanne. Gris’s 1916 drawings in this context were not merely statements of Gris’s wartime attitudes, but investigatory tools for his own personal practice.

Furthest perhaps from its related oil is Gris’s pencil drawing Homme accoudé d’après Cézanne (1916) at the Kunsthalle Mannheim [Figs. 71-72]. Here he imposed his own cubist “mask” when he rendered diagrammatic lines to summarize and translate Cézanne’s figure into abstracted geometric forms and angles. Given the lack of shading, in this drawing he has done away with value, texture, and chiaroscuro, and even reduces the volumes of the body to planes. In this schematic rendering, a sort of reverse preparatory drawing, Gris attempted to discern and recreate Cézanne’s compositional system, resulting in a copy less naturalistic than, say, Bathers after Cézanne [Fig. 59], but one that still conveys the essential composition of Cézanne’s original.

In 1914 Picasso too returned to the work of Cézanne during a summer in Avignon. “One of his principal goals [during this excursion],” Marilyn McCully has explained, “was to come up with an approach that would be based on the compositional structure of cubism but would reintroduce elements of naturalistic representation.”101 With a major focus on drawing and draftsmanship (owing much to another classical artist, Ingres, who also emphasized purity of

101 Galassi and McCully, Picasso’s Drawings, 217.
outline over atmospheric shading), Picasso at this time produced a series of seated male figures on the same format paper.\textsuperscript{102} \textit{Man in a Bowler Hat}, 1914 [Fig. 73], for example, was a result of this focused period and though not a direct copy, certainly owes much to Cézanne and works such as \textit{Le fumeur accoudé}, 1890. A new subject for Picasso, the seated figure was also a model for the melancholic artist in his unfinished oil \textit{The Painter and His Model} of 1914 [Fig. 74], and, Kenneth Silver argues, an inspiration for Picasso’s classically Ingresque 1915 pencil portraits of Max Jacob and Ambroise Vollard.\textsuperscript{103} The turn to an Ingresque classical drawing was also a turn to ‘disegno’ or the supremacy of drawing and the prioritization of line and form over color.

Sixteenth century Florentine artist and writer Giorgio Vasari had described “disegno” (Italian for drawing or design), as “the animating principle of all creative processes.”\textsuperscript{104} For a lineage of artists, disegno was not only a method, but a generative source of pure ‘idea’ and artistic vision. Gris was likely aware of Picasso’s classicizing turn when he produced his own seated figure in 1916 in an even more direct homage to Cézanne. By 1919 Gris expressed in words his ongoing conservatism in a letter to Kahnweiler:

The exaggeration of the Dada movement and others like Picabia make us look so classical, though I can’t say I mind about that. I would like to continue the tradition of painting with plastic means while bringing to it a new aesthetic based on the intellect. I think one can quite well take over Chardin’s means without taking over either the appearance of his pictures or his conception of reality. Those who believe in abstract painting seem to me like weavers who think they can produce a material with threads running in one direction only and nothing to hold them together. When you have no plastic intention how can you control and make sense of your representational liberties? And when you are not concerned with reality how can you control and make sense of your plastic liberties?\textsuperscript{105}

As Picasso before him had turned to Cézanne at a time when he desired to reintroduce naturalism into his works, Gris in these copy portrait drawings turned to the figure and observation based on

\textsuperscript{102} See the following chapter for further discussion of Ingres’ influence during these wartime years.

\textsuperscript{103} Silver, \textit{Esprit de Corps}, 71.


a known reality in order to distinguish himself from pure abstraction and the “exaggeration” of Dada and its contemporaries.

The subject of Gris’s *Harlequin after Cézanne* directly draws from the classicism of the era. Multiple drawings after Cézanne’s painting [Fig. 75] exist: a close, detailed view of the head in the collection of the Musée National d’Art Moderne Centre Georges Pompidou, Paris [Fig. 76], a (perhaps) intermediary stage with some shading [Fig. 77], and a more refined line drawing, complete with the geometric pattern of the harlequin’s suit at the National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C. [Fig. 78]. With ties to the imagery of the *commedia dell’arte*, the harlequin and Pierrot figures came to stand for another form of a recognizable, classical French iconography, especially fashionable during wartime Paris.106 The Cézanne-based harlequin was Gris’s first foray into the subject, but he revisited the harlequin figure consistently through the end of his life (including in at least twelve drawings), developing the form into what Paloma Esteban Leal has termed a sort of “alter ego”.107

The later period of Gris’s career has been said to uniquely embody a sort of “second cubism,” a distinctly different, pure, and logical approach.108 Gris’s prominence within this phase is notable, and can be attributed to his signature flattened style, which reinforced ideas of order and clarity in contrast to the obscure analyses of pre-war cubism. He was remembered in an announcement to the 1938 exhibition at Galerie Roland Balaÿ & Louis Carré as, “not only one of the masters of the modern movement, but an artist who gave cubism its brief phase of classical

107 Ibid., 59.
108 Christopher Green and others cite Gris and his characteristic clarity and logic as the leading force in this second wave. It was painter-writer André Lhote who termed the “second cubism,” “invented by Picasso” but “reduced to formulas by Juan Gris and Diego Rivera” (quoted in Green, *Juan Gris*, 22).
perfection.” Gris himself articulated this later style in his biography from *L’Esprit Nouveau*, no. 5 (1921):

> I work with the elements of the intellect, with the imagination. I try to make concrete that which is abstract. I proceed from the general to the particular, by which I mean that I start with an abstraction in order to arrive at a true fact. Mine is an art of synthesis, of deduction, as Raynal has said.

This “deductive method” is an important distinction that Gris made between himself and his fellow cubists. The early analytical cubism, he found, began with an object from reality, which then became abstracted and skewed. In his later years however Gris began with abstract “architecture” of planes of color and texture, and then moved to a depiction of reality. In fact, in his 1924 lecture “On the Possibilities of Painting,” Gris specifically posed himself against “one of his friends, a painter” (Braque), arguing, “It is not picture ‘X’ which manages to correspond with my subject, but subject ‘X’ which manages to correspond with my picture.” Kahnweiler dated this major shift in Gris’s work specifically to the summer and autumn of 1916 (perhaps at the same moment of these copy drawings). He wrote in 1947:

> Gris finally gave up presenting the beholder with a great variety of information (acquired by empirical observation) about the objects which he displayed. He now offered a synthesis: that is to say, he packed his knowledge into one significant form, a single emblem. True conceptual painting was born.

I believe that Gris’s 1916 copies played a significant role in this rift. The drawings not only engage with the classicizing subjects, but also demonstrate Gris’s intention of distilling the essence of form as he describes his subjects through flattened planes and minimal details.

In copying from these past masters, Gris was able to begin to articulate his own method, and this act of imitation unexpectedly led him to find his own original expression. By 1921 Gris

---

112 See Green, *Juan Gris*, 51.
113 Kahnweiler, *Juan Gris*, 89.
wrote of wishing to “humanize” the mathematical architecture of Cézanne,\textsuperscript{114} and published the statement that serves as the epigraph to this chapter, contrasting his method to Cézanne’s. In a letter from that year, a maturing Gris reflected back on his influences:

Don’t think of me as too intransigent. I admire Matisse, I like Bonnard’s pictures, I appreciate Signac at his true value. As for the Louvre, I have learnt a great deal there. But it’s only natural that I should be more receptive to the beauty of a Picasso or a Braque because their way of representing things is related to my own and their pictorial qualities are traditional. That is the whole point: the way of representing things can change but painting remains always the same.\textsuperscript{115}

It is clear that in this body of 1916 pencil drawings Gris did not simply copy Cézanne and other masters, but instead embarked on a much broader rethinking of representation. The copy drawings therefore mark a turning point in Gris’s oeuvre. Following his early cubist studies, technical drawings, and collages, these drawn copies, along with his Ingresque line drawings discussed in the following chapter, mark a turn toward a form of drawing-driven creation and a new role for his drawings in his practice.\textsuperscript{116}

\textsuperscript{114} Juan Gris, biography published in \textit{L’Esprit Nouveau} no. 5, 1921, reproduced in Kahnweiler, \textit{Juan Gris}, 138.
\textsuperscript{116} See Temkin “Los Dibujos de Juan Gris”, in Tinterow, ed. \textit{Juan Gris}, 310.
Chapter 4: Portraits

Nowadays when I have finished working I don’t read serial novels but do portraits from life. They are very good likenesses and I shall soon have as much skill as a Prix de Rome winner. It is a perpetual thrill for me to discover how it is done. I can’t get over it, because I thought it was much more difficult.\footnote{Letter to Kahnweiler September 1915, in \textit{Letters of Juan Gris}, 31.}

-Juan Gris, 1915

During this wartime moment, Gris began to engage concertedly in portraiture drawings - an avenue of investigation that had little to do with his painting, but clearly related to the development of an ever more clarified and exacting style. His paintings of the period, as Christopher Green, Kenneth Silver, and others have shown, realize the lessons of synthetic cubism in a more “classicizing” style. They remain abstracted but the planes have become sharper, more rigorously defined, and ambiguity and visual confusion have been replaced by transparency, harmonious visual rhythms and a new cohesion and purity of design. Gris’s drawings, in turn, take up not an abstract interpretation of classical values, but a neo-classicizing, figurative idiom and a direct nod to pre-cubist academic traditions. Nonetheless, the lessons of cubism continue to inform much of their emphasis on the picture plane and caricature-inspired distillation to a ‘type.’ To a certain extent, Gris followed Picasso’s own lead in indulging in pastiche with his neo-classical Ingres style drawings of 1915. Yet, Gris made this “Prix de Rome” manner very much his own. From the period of 1915 to the early 1920s, one perceives in his drawings an ever more loosening of line and attitude, and a drawing practice that develops into an increasingly independent artistic form.

The precise drawings that Gris referred to in the above-cited 1915 letter to Kahnweiler are not identified; indeed no portrait drawings from that year are documented in any
publications. At least three highly detailed drawn portraits are dated to 1916, and they exhibit qualities of an academic, neo-classicizing, or “Prix de Rome” style. These works are the portraits of Germaine Raynal at the Museo Nacional Centro de Arte Reina Sofia, Madrid [Fig. 79], Max Jacob at the Musée de Beaux-Arts, Orléans [Fig. 80], and an unknown man [Fig. 81, private collection]. All three depict only the figures’ faces, centered on the page in three-quarter view. The accentuated contour lines and even shading of Gris’s pencil betray his origins as a caricaturist.

Gris made few portraits prior to these three, although character types feature prominently in his early satirical magazine illustrations and related sketches. Aside from several studies for 1911 and 1912 paintings, and drawings made after Cézanne and other masters, the only other drawn portraits (or figures for that matter) made previously were a series of self-portraits, begun as early as 1909, continuing to 1926. After 1915-16 and following neo-classicizing trends, Gris introduced more and more drawn portraits to his oeuvre, developing the practice into an independent, pleasurable pastime and diversion from his commercial painted work. As this chapter argues, Gris’s portraiture - from his ongoing series of drawn self-portraits and caricature-inspired cubist portraits, to his wartime draftsmanship and subsequent post-war line drawings and lithographs of friends - was inherently rooted in a linear, realist, and essentially drawing-
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118 The Reina Sofia dates Fig. 1 1916. The 1916 dates of fig. 2 and fig. 3 come from Galerie Louis Leiris’ 1965 catalogue of drawings. Gris’s 1915 letters share many anecdotes of both Germaine Raynal, whom Gris would see often at this time while Maurice Raynal was on the front, and Max Jacob, a French poet and fellow resident of the Bateau Lavoir who Gris befriended shortly after moving to Paris. By 1916 he specifically writes that he sees less of Germaine, suggesting that these portraits could actually have been produced slightly earlier than typically thought.

119 The Reina Sofia identifies the sitter as Germaine Raynal, whereas Douglas Cooper in his catalogue raisonné no. 202a identifies the sitter as Josette Gris. In my opinion, the features of the face, especially the nose, are further from earlier portraits of Raynal, and much closer in fact to the 1916 oil which the Reina Sofia identifies as Portrait of Madame Josette Gris.

120 Two early, almost Seurat-inspired 1910 sketches (not reproduced as far as I am aware) depict an unidentified woman intimately seated at a bed. The subject here may suggest a lingering influence from his commercial journal illustrations (generally considered apart from his formal painting and drawing) at this transitory time. One such illustration from the July 1910 L’Assiette au beurre reveals a similar figure seated upon a bed in the same arrangement, suggesting that the sketches could perhaps have been preparatory, though in a much more realistic, observed style. Gris would not revisit such a private interior scene in his paintings or drawings.
based mode of representation. The resulting portrait-style approach came to dominate his post-war works on paper, marking a fundamental shift in his drawing practice as Gris’s drawn oeuvre came to stand on its own, apart from his paintings.

Aside from a May 1916 oil that Douglas Cooper, in his catalogue raisonné of Gris’s painting, titled doubtfully as Tête d’homme (Auto-portrait?), Gris’s self-portraits are exclusively works on paper. His ongoing series of at least eight self-portrait drawings made between 1909 and 1926 [Figs. 82-90] especially highlight his penchant for the drawn portrait. The intimacy of the subject matter is heightened with the drawing format, as we imagine Gris making these repeated studies in the privacy of his home and mirror. Only three from the series are known to be signed by the artist, suggesting that the majority were either considered unfinished or were created for personal use, without the intention of their being sold or given to friends. Their range in styles would support this theory, indicating their function as a sort of vehicle for exploration as Gris tested his shading, faceting, and line with a familiar subject. One from the group was even published in the magazine Papitou in 1911 alongside other caricatures of the publication’s contributing artists, marrying Gris’s artistic and professional production in a sort of hybrid genre [Fig. 90]. Of the 1920-21 self-portrait, Christopher Green wrote, “He drew himself as Platonist, the ideal hero of a transcendent art.”121 Together, despite differences in style in these self-portraits, what becomes apparent throughout the lot is a homogeneous composition: each figure posed at a three-quarter turn (most over the left shoulder), with parted hair and only the hint of a jacket collar (startlingly similar to Cézanne’s self-portrait, which Gris studied). The consistency is especially striking when comparing, for example Self-portrait (1909-10) [Fig. 83] and Self-portrait (1920-21) [Fig. 88], made some ten years apart, suggesting that Gris may have referred

121 Green, Juan Gris, 77.
back to his portraits over time and it could even raise the possibility of a photographic model. The repeated form parallels Gris’s reworked sequences of pitchers and siphons and becomes a sort of intermediary between the familiar or universal still life subjects of his cubism and the more specific or individual portraits of friends and acquaintances that follow.

While it is his works on paper that account for the bulk of his self-portraits, Gris’s oil portraits in general are relatively scarce. Cooper’s catalogue raisonné lists six, all dating to before 1917. Kahnweiler accounted for their rarity in his 1946 biography of the artist:

At the beginning of 1912 [Gris] painted numerous still-lifes, landscapes and portraits: one of Picasso...one of his mother...; others of Germaine and Maurice Raynal, and of Legua. Need I add that they were perfect likenesses? Gris would never have thought of painting a portrait that was not a real portrait. He painted no more after this (with the exception of two portraits of Josette...). The development of his painting, tending as it did toward the type, turned his mind away from observation of the individual. So Gris restricted his future portraits to line drawings.

Portraits of individuals, for Gris, necessitated direct observation and marked a contrast to the synthesized Neoplatonic ideal of his paintings. One of Gris’s first publicly exhibited paintings however, as Kahnweiler mentioned, was his Portrait of Pablo Picasso (1912) [Fig. 91], which debuted at the spring 1912 Salon des Indépendants. Subsequent interpretations of the work largely focused on the relationship between the painting’s sitter and its artist, the contrast of the creative Picasso on the one hand, and the intellectual Gris on the other. Guillaume Apollinaire, in his review of the 1912 salon, remarked that the work showed, “a praiseworthy effort and a
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122 Christian Derouet also discusses the possibility of a photographic source in “Experimentation with a Return to Representation in Gris’s Drawings,” in Leal, Juan Gris, 121. Harry Cooper, in his essay “The Matrix of Juan Gris’s Cubism” in Emily Braun and Rebecca Rabinow, eds. Cubism: The Leonard A. Lauder Collection, 74, also suggests Gris’s use of a photographic model in his 1912 oil, Portrait of the Artist’s Mother.
123 For this paper, portraits are defined as depictions of known sitters. Figures, by contrast, are unnamed, anonymous subjects.
124 Kahnweiler, Juan Gris, 83.
125 See also Green, Juan Gris, 14-15: as he discusses among others, comments from Apollinaire, Stein, and Louis Vauxelles (who referred to Portrait of Pablo Picasso as a portrait of “Père Ubu-Kub”).
noble disinterestedness. Juan Gris’s exhibit could be entitled ‘Integral Cubism’,” implying that Gris, even while depicting Picasso, could differentiate himself from the great master of cubism.

John Golding commented on the portrait and its negative implications for Gris and other artists’ legacies in relation to Picasso’s status as leader, writing that it, “must have had the character of a tribute to the chef d’ecole,” in other words, a form of flattery or glorification.  

Kenneth Silver, in 1984, wrote of the work:

> Posed against a high-backed fauteuil, Picasso seems enormous, and with his big head, military-looking jacket...and palette in hand, he has the authority of an Ingres portrait...But Gris knew just what he was about. Not only did the portrait, which he exhibited at the Independents in early 1912, make a public declaration of the younger Spaniard’s allegiance to the Grand Old Man of Cubism, and demonstrate his privileged place within a coterie that was difficult to access, but it also proved his artistic distance from the Wright Brothers of modern art.

The cubist portrait, while clearly depicting a likeness of Picasso, was also embedded with much broader connotations for the sitter, the artist, and cubism generally.

> Some scholars have observed the painting’s roots in caricature - ironic given that it represented one of Gris’s first public breaks from his commercial work. During its debut at the Indépendants, the magazine *L’Assiette au beurre*, referred to “the humourist Juan Gris who has portrayed the ‘master’ Pablo Picasso.”  

Gris may have intended for the image to carry an element of tongue-and-cheek humor given the public’s (and popular magazine caricatures’) early mocking reception of cubism. “There was a real similarity,” Christopher Green has noted, “between the way that Cubism and caricature aroused the hilarity of their audiences (even if the
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127 Golding, *Cubism*, 4. Golding also notes that it was hung in the Salon next to works by Kandinsky, and “the freedom and spontaneity of Kandinsky’s technique and the extravagance of his colour must have made Gris’ canvas look particularly cold and forbidding.” (97).


laughter was on the one hand hostile and on the other a matter of collusion.”

Portrait of Madame Germaine Raynal (1912) and Man in a Café (1912), two works with similarly exaggerated, even humorous faces, have likewise been characterized as caricatures. Adam Gopnik, in his article on caricature and the cubist portrait, argues that, in what he terms a “monumental caricature,” cubist portraits represent a hybrid of high and low cultures comparable to that found in caricature. He writes:

Caricature...has as an intrinsic and inevitable feature precisely the kind of doubleness, the sort of “meta-awareness,” that commentators on Cubism have correctly seen as central to that style as a whole. Caricature is in embryo what the Cubist syntax brought to maturity: a working representational code that comments on the way representational codes work.

Caricature in this sense becomes a sort of “drawing about drawing,” an art form which is as much about the subject as the means of representing the subject. With a special combination of traditional naturalistic or idealizing portraiture and the exaggerated language of caricature that seeks out a subject’s most characteristic feature, cubist portraits arrive at something new, as Gopnik argues:

We can parse the grammar of a portrait style that combines the deliberate physiognomic ambiguities of the Leonardesque portrait with the strategies of simplification and purposeful distortion that derive from caricature. Instead of a simple substitute of low for high, instead of the simple importation of an exotic vocabulary, we find a complex but systematic exchange of dialects.

The specificity of the subject was largely not the goal of a cubist painting. Pierre Reverdy, for example, in his 1917 text “On Cubism,” wrote, “What is created is a work...not a head or an object.” As Kahnweiler wrote, Gris prioritized the “type,” meaning the generalized idea, over the “individual.” Both cubism and caricature however arguably rely on intentionally anti-
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130 Green, Juan Gris, 118-119.
132 Gopnik, “High and Low,” 376.
133 Pierre Reverdy, ‘Sur le cubisme,’ Nord-Sud, no. 1 (March 1917), in Green, Juan Gris, 113-114.
naturalistic means to achieve a likeness of their subjects. Gris, with his early training in caricature and illustration, was uniquely positioned to take advantage of this reduction to essentials and merging of fine art and commercial.

While Gris’s early cubist portraits owe much to the drawing-based genres of caricature and popular illustration, his 1916 “Prix de Rome” style drawings, which are almost by definition traditional representations of likenesses, thus mark a clear break in his method and approach to portraiture, last seen in his cubist ones of 1912. The intimate drawings, by way of their scale, level of detail, and specificity of sitter evoke a live model and a return to a traditional drawing practice of verisimilitude. The portrait of Max Jacob [Fig. 80] especially clearly depicts the poet’s likeness, and the curvature of the lines within the portrait accentuates an expressiveness and almost lifelike movement.134 When Gris wrote to Kahnweiler in 1915, “It is a perpetual thrill for me to discover how it is done. I can’t get over it, because I thought it was much more difficult,” he implied learning a new skill. Unlike the academically trained Picasso who was driven to cubism by his longing to break from tradition, Gris essentially began his fine art career as a cubist. His turn to classicism during the war was not a return to traditional methods, but an inauguration of new (and as he puts it thrilling) styles.

The impulse behind Gris’s shift toward a highly refined, linear style of portraiture at this particular historical moment undoubtedly also carried with it an intentional reaction to the current state of art and cubism. In January 1915, Picasso, Gris’s perpetual model and source for inspiration, completed a portrait of Max Jacob in a dramatically traditional, French, and what critics termed as “Ingresque” style [Fig. 92]. The drawing marked not only a shift in Picasso’s personal style, but also a larger nation-wide move in the avant-garde (which would include Gris)

134 See also Max Jacob, portraits d’artistes (Orléans: Musée des beaux-arts d’Orléans; Quimper: Musée des beaux-arts de Quimper; Paris: Somogy, 2004), for other portraits of the poet.
toward a more classical, conservative, and French wartime approach. Jacob himself wrote of the 1915 Picasso portrait as a curious combination of old and new: “he made a portrait of me in pencil which is very beautiful, it resembles both my grandfather, an old Catalan and my mother.” Picasso made another portrait of the poet in 1916 which was reproduced in print and sold to profit a conference organized by Paul Dermée titled, “Max Jacob et son oeuvre,” on December 3, 1916.

Emerging as a sort of symbol for the era, Picasso’s 1915 drawing was selected by Amédée Ozenfant for use in the final issue of his patriotic publication, *L’Elan* in December 1916. The drawing was reproduced in the issue alongside Ozenfant’s essay, “Notes sur le Cubisme,” which put into words some of the growing anti-cubist and anti-avant garde sentiments of the time. In his essay, Ozenfant portrayed cubism as a movement of the elite, an “ivory tower.” He encouraged what he saw as the formalist and anti-expressive aspects of cubism, and advocated for representationalism and “serious rigor.” Ozenfant, with Charles-Édouard Jeanneret (Le Corbusier), expanded on these sentiments later in 1918 with their manifesto *Après le cubisme*, wherein they called for clarity, purity, simplicity, and a rejection of excess following the war. In their third chapter, titled “The Laws,” the authors declared a new hierarchy of subject matter, with the figure at the top, followed by landscape and still life. The specificity of portraiture in contrast to abstraction made it an apt genre at this conservative moment. Picasso’s portrait in this context embodied the spirit of this new traditionalism, and became a sort of model for other artists at the time (See, for example, Francis Picabia’s mocking Dadaist response, *Portrait of Max Goth* (1917), whose head was not drawn but a cut-and-pasted photograph.)

While wartime neo-traditionalism drew from a range of past masters, the model for this

---

135 “Je pose chez Pablo et devant lui: il fait de moi un portrait au crayon qui est bien beau, il ressemble à la fois à celui de mon grand-père, d’un vieux catalan et de ma mère.” *Max Jacob, portraits d’artistes* (Orléans: Musée des beaux-arts d’Orléans; Quimper: Musée des beaux-arts de Quimper; Paris: Somogy, 2004).
classical portraiture undoubtedly was the great French draftsman Jean-Auguste Dominique Ingres (himself a Prix de Rome winner). As if praising this Ingres-cubist connection, André Salmon referred to the neoclassical artist in a 1921 issue of *L’Europe Nouvelle*: “Ingres was a great draughtsman, that is to say, a great deformer, that is to say a great constructor.”

Within the context of his own work, this Ingresque trend for Picasso was less straightforward and carried with it a dimension of irony and humor. In a letter to Apollinaire in January 1915, André Level observed, “as for him whom we cherish more than all other and who fortunately is in no danger, he is expanding every day, while becoming more precise and, by way of drawings that make you think of Ingres, surpasses him [i.e. Ingres] while amusing himself.”

The turn to Ingres was both an homage and a sort of game or challenge as Picasso joined in conversation with an artist who epitomized the Academy and tradition, proving to critics that he was not limited to one style. Gris’s 1916 portrait of Jacob likely followed Picasso’s by several months, and, like Gris’s work generally, took on a more serious and deliberate tone. While Picasso at this time knowingly turned to Ingres for inspiration, Gris it seems looked rather to Ingres via Picasso, a step removed.

It was Gris, however, as Kenneth Silver has argued, who, “took his neo-Ingres draftsmanship even further after the Armistice,” embracing the relative freedom allowed by the drawing medium in contrast to his more public-facing cubist paintings.

In 1921, Gris wrote to Kahnweiler:

> I have been thinking about what is meant by “quality” in an artist...Well, now I believe that the “quality” of an artist derives from the quantity of the past that he carries in him - from his artistic atavism. The more of this heritage he has, the more “quality” he has.

Turning to Ingres as a model implied not only a refined, neo-classical portraiture, but also a

---


139 Ibid., 251.
supremacy of line and pure form. This too placed Gris’s drawings within the lineage of ‘disegno,’ with its implication of creation or ingenuity and a prioritization of classical draftsmanship over painterly color.

Picasso’s neoclassical portraiture coincided with a period of the artist’s revived interest in drawing that dominated his exhibitions from 1919 through 1925. Gris’s drawings too, beginning with his 1915-16 portraits, became increasingly independent of his paintings and within a few years took on a style quite apart from his contemporary oils. Silver has observed this trend in other artists of the time (including Robert Delaunay and Roger de la Fresnaye) writing of an ever more common “gallery of Ingres,” as a drawn oeuvre distinct from their painting. The divide in practice was a way for these artists to allow their (drawn) traditionalism and (painted) modernism to coexist. Through the less scrutinized medium of drawings these artists could essentially hide their “retrogression.” Drawing and portraiture thus developed into an almost illicit activity for the avant-garde. Gris, by claiming to draw only as a pastime, allowed himself to loosen up and experiment with varied styles and forms of representation, thus encouraging a vivacity inherent in the lively qualities of the line drawing. Contemporaneous painted figures, by contrast, such as *Harlequin with a Guitar* (1917) in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, or *Man from Touraine (Le tourangeau)* (1918) in the collection of the Musée national d’art moderne Centre Georges Pompidou retain the cubist fracturing of the figures into flat, blocked out planes.

Following the 1915-16 shift to drawing-based neo-classicism, Gris gave in wholeheartedly to the human figure, and the majority of his portraiture comes after 1916. The following year, he drew Josette and the Chilean poet Vincent Huidobro and his wife in seated
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140 As Silver points out, Picasso in fact only exhibited drawings in his 1919 and 1925 Paris exhibitions (he would show paintings in 1921 and not again until 1926).
141 Ibid., 255-57.
portraits from life, complete with soft shading, patterned wallpaper, and details from the surrounding space [Figs. 93-95]. His delicate pencil and naturalistic observation are in sharp contrast to his increasingly abstracted canvasses of transparent and overlapping planes or what, as noted earlier, has been termed “Crystal Cubism” following the start of the war. In 1918 he revisited the formal portrait through drawings of Pierre Reverdy and Madame Lipchitz, now even including colored pencil, increasing the naturalism as if truly embracing the neo-traditional “Prix de Rome” style. All of these drawings were made as gifts to their respective sitters.

In 1919 Gris returned to Max Jacob as a subject, this time in a highly stylized, linear pencil portrait of the poet [Fig. 96, The Museum of Modern Art, New York]. Silver wrote of the drawing that, “nearly every trace of Cubism has been expunged and in its place is a pristine line with only the most discreet areas of modeling.”\textsuperscript{142} Gris’s line by this time had become much more expressive, with an intermittent weight and delicacy afforded by the pencil, rather than chiaroscuro, to suggest the dimensionality of forms. This portrait, in contrast to the 1916 version, presents a full figure with torso and background. Gris’s attention notably extends past the Ingresque face. Instead, his linear figure drawing seemingly spreads over the entire sheet, developing into a distinctly new style. The handling of the lines is consistent throughout, and the overall effect flattens the image and shortens the depth of the page. Gris further melded the figure with the background of the space through his characteristic “rhyming.” Take, for example, the wave-like wrinkles of Jacob’s forehead, which become mirrored in the jacket cloth, which in turn mirrors the figure’s interwoven fingers. The right angle of the pocket square appears again in the frame in the background of the figure, which in turn follows the top left corner of the paper itself. The circles of the eyes are repeated in the buttons of the jacket and even in the modeling of the fingers. The interrelationships of objects mingle to a point where the subject of the drawing,

\textsuperscript{142} Silver, \textit{Esprit de Corps}, 250.
while straightforward, gains a visual and conceptual complexity. Gris’s drawing expands past the fixed figure of the sitter to create a dynamic formal representation.

Between 1919 and 1922 Gris continued his linear style portraits in a series of at least ten portrait drawings dedicated to friends and acquaintances.\(^{143}\) Each at first appears to be a traditional portrait depicting a likeness of the sitter - and in a way is - however Gris is also clearly prioritized the “rhyming” and more lyrical aspects hidden within the forms. He introduced a more legible, even sensual aspect to his contemporary paintings as well, leading him to declare, “This painting is to the other what poetry is to prose.”\(^{144}\) What Kahnweiler termed his “poetry” period, many of these post-war drawings in fact include sitters such as Jacob, Huidobro, and Reverdy who were notably poets themselves. As with the Jacob portrait, Gris similarly melds the figures with their surroundings, leading the eye through the scene in an almost narrative sequence. His 1921 portraits of Kahnweiler and Huidobro present their sitters’ likenesses again in flattened, increasingly flowing and expressive (less neo-classical) contexts [Figs. 97-98]. Gris’s roots in caricature and his ability to extract a sitter’s essence also return in these late line drawings. Kahnweiler sits in front of canvases in an homage to his profession, or, as Silver guessed, a “perhaps slightly bitter reference to his sequestered property.”\(^{145}\) Huidobro’s swirling eyes are the same proportion and configuration as the buttons of the chair behind him, as his figure subtly blends into the setting through lyrical visual echoes and puns. As Kahnweiler
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\(^{143}\) Others were likely made and distributed, including an unknown drawing of Picasso which Gris refers to in a letter to Raynal from August 25, 1920, “I haven’t seen Picasso for a long time and I don’t remember exactly what his face is like. I only made a success of it last time because I had been to see him the evening before. Even if ‘L’Europe Nouvelle’ would sell you the one I did, I don’t think you should use it for your book because it is not important enough.” *Letters of Juan Gris*, 80.


wrote, “Gris’ poetry is in the forms of the picture and the relationships between them. The rhythm of his ‘poem’ is dependent on the cadence of these relationships.”

Gris produced six transfer lithographs after line drawings in 1921, which were published in editions of fifty by Galerie Simon (run by Daniel-Henry Kahnweiler) [Figs. 99a-99f]. Gris wrote of two from the series in a March 1921 letter to Kahnweiler, “They are, of course, naturalistic drawings.”

Portrait of a Boy, dated March 1921 [Fig. 99a] contains the most shading and retains some skewed perspective and geometrization of the mouth and nose in a sort of naturalized cubism. The sitter was a pupil of Gris’s, a young son of a local butcher in Bandol. As Gris wrote to Kahnweiler in February 1921, “I have drawn a head of my pupil; perhaps I shall make a lithograph of it.” Also dated March 1921 are Marcelle La Brune and Marcelle la Blonde [Figs. 99b-99c]. In a March 12, 1921 letter to Kahnweiler, Gris noted, “I’m very happy here and when I’ve finished working we go and dance with the neighbours, one of whom is the lady of the portrait.”

The background in La Brune is a cross hatching pattern, not unlike Gris’s early grids and checkerboards. La Blonde contains a similar allusion to a geometrized organization in the row of stairs at the right, which meet at even intervals with the folds in the sitter’s blouse, again blending the foreground and background. Jean le Musicien, dated April 1921 [Fig. 99d] portrays Jean-Claude Brune, whom Gris referred to in a March 1921 letter as, “a young man from a family which is very important locally - he's the son of a conseiller général of this department … he's a good musician and a very intelligent boy who I think would like to own something by myself.”
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146 Kahnweiler, Juan Gris, 100.
147 Letters of Juan Gris, 99.
149 Letters of Juan Gris, 96.
150 Ibid., 100.
151 Letters of Juan Gris, 101.
wilder scene, which is echoed in Jean’s slightly ruffled shirt and lapel. In *Boris* [Fig. 99e], one of the more simple of the series, the suggested frame in the background continues through the sideburns of the figures hair, and in the slightly less subtle *Mahomet* [Fig. 99f], the figure’s hair is echoed in the curved structure in the background, his jacket collar connects to the detail below, and even his coat now melds with his name at the bottom. The portraits display remnants of cubist distortion and also mirror Gris’s early caricature through their ability to seize the sitter’s distinctive physiognomies. As fine art prints sold through Kahnweiler’s gallery, they became a sort of bridge between Gris’s gallery paintings, commercial illustrations, and private drawings made for leisure.

Gris made few prints, but as Kahnweiler wrote, “one can but regret that Gris only began to engrave shortly before his death: he would have excelled at it.”¹⁵² Letter after letter to Kahnweiler and others at this time touched upon the lithograph reproductions, and it seems that they were not only a preoccupation, but an exciting new project for Gris. There is a playfulness to these portraits that suggests Gris enjoyed making them (in place of his “serial novels” perhaps). Their subjects - close friends and neighbors - are remarkably personal for Gris who seems to have relaxed his “demonic logic,” expressing his personality through the project.¹⁵³

Despite their intimate tone, the printed editions were also commercial products intended for sale, a rarity within Gris’s portraits, which were typically made as gifts to the sitters. During these years Gris also took on several projects illustrating publications for friends and colleagues. The practice of commissioned drawings for a printed commercial medium again mirrors his early popular magazine illustrations, adding another branch between his commercial and artistic projects, and his drawn and printed mediums.

¹⁵² Kahnweiler, *Juan Gris*, 110.
¹⁵³ The phrase “demon of logic” is taken from Apollinaire’s 1912 review of the *Salon de la Section d’Or*. See Apollinaire, Chapter 7 [October 1912], of *Les Peintres cubistes* (Paris: 1913), quoted in Fry, *Cubism*, 116.
While these late portraits explore a non-traditional merging of the foreground and background and an increased expression and command of line, they certainly follow in the lineage of Gris’s post 1915-16 traditional portraiture and mark a practice pointedly apart from his painting. The distilled linear style permeates his 1918-1920 still-life drawing practice as well (as exemplified by the breakfast scenes discussed in chapter one), arguably transforming his entire approach to works on paper. From 1919-1923 Gris exhibited his drawings in several shows at the Galerie l’Effort Moderne, and critics at the time begin to note the growing disparity between practices. André Lhote, in issue 70 of Nrf (July 1, 1919) wrote of Gris’s drawings as “happy exceptions to the cubist rule. It is thanks to such ‘weaknesses’ that one can immediately recognize those cubists who fortunately allow themselves to be ruled by their heart rather than simply by their head.” An anonymous critic for La Gerbe (April 3, 1921) observed, “Some drawings are so close to nature that one ends up doubting the sincerity of the rest.” In 1921 Waldemar George, in the Bulletin de l’Effort Moderne, emphasized Gris’s inclination toward drawing as indicated by these 1921 portraits: “The drawings of Juan Gris are the product of a painter with a special leaning towards draughtsmanship, a painter who scrutinizes form, observes it before re-creating it, simplifies it and feels the need to complete it.”

These confident works on paper reveal a pleasure and passion for drawing and concede the draftsman at the heart of Gris’s artistic practice. His post-war drawing not only marked a break from his paintings, but also served to elevate his works on paper to a critically acclaimed component of his oeuvre. The inherent observation and imitation required in portraying an accurate likeness, as Kahnweiler argued, did not fit with the cubist tendency toward deformation, and Gris’s solution was to keep his painted cubist and his drawn classicist practices divided. For
this same reason, classical portraiture developed into the perfect form of rebellion from cubism during the war, even if on another level it signaled a respect for tradition perfectly attuned to wartime conservatism and patriotism. The portrait thus became a pleasurable pastime for Gris, and a form of diversion from his more serious (as Golding put it, “methodical, more purely intellectual”\textsuperscript{157}) painting.

Earlier, I noted that Gris painted six portraits, all dating to before 1917. He would depict unnamed human figures in seven more paintings before 1918, and a staggering 78 (of various idealized types such as harlequins, Pierrots, unnamed men and women, dancers, and guitar players) from 1918 through 1927.\textsuperscript{158} While he clearly broadened his repertoire in these later years, becoming more and more open to depictions of the human figure (prompted, perhaps, by his aforementioned 1916 studies of Cézanne and masters), he continued, very intentionally, to restrict his portraits of individuals to his works on paper. Portrait drawing in fact developed into a pleasure and a pastime for Gris, and as his intention was never to make a living as a portraitist, the fact that he mostly drew portraits is significant for understanding their particular place within his oeuvre. Whereas in his earliest years as an artist Gris had distanced himself from the commercial figures of caricature and popular journalism, he seemingly changed his view at this post-war moment, eventually embracing his roots and developing them into an original style. Gris’s turn to draftsmanship through portraiture during the second half of his career shows not only the progressions and developments brought about during the war, but also the liberated role that drawings came to play in his oeuvre.

***

\textsuperscript{157} Golding, \textit{Cubism}, 97.
\textsuperscript{158} Counted from Cooper, \textit{Juan Gris: catalogue raisonné de l’oeuvre peint.} (2nd ed.) (Portraits being identified sitters, and figures being anonymous).
“One must after all paint as one is oneself.”

-Juan Gris 1915

The above statement could also be applied, perhaps even more pointedly, to Gris’s drawing practice. His career began, as we have seen, with drawing. From the consistent presence of his still life drawings; to the drawings that aided his first cubist canvases; to those made after Cézanne and other masters as a way to alter the direction of his work; to his Ingresque portraits and autonomous post-war linear style, his drawings account for a substantial and integral body of work. As Gris came to embrace the neo-classicism of wartime Europe, so too it seems did he come to embrace and truly acknowledge his core practice of drawing and its changing role in relation to his painting. As a closer study of his works on paper reveals, the masterful hand and breadth of style, subject, utility, and regard that they carried for Gris attest to their privileged place within his oeuvre. Not only did Gris’s drawings drive his creative process and influence his decidedly graphic approach, but they provided a creative outlet and encouraged what he valued most as an artist: the continued, repeated, study of form.

Gris left behind few notes, sketchbooks, or archives, and much of his life and work still remains a mystery. As a person, he was intensely serious, worrying, even moody or melancholy, but also he had a love for French culture, and according to Kahnweiler insisted that friends call him “Jean.” He was an atheist, was “extraordinarily superstitious,” he was a Freemason, enjoyed science, mathematics, poetry, coffee, and dancing. He had an estranged son with a French mistress in 1909, but from 1912 until his death lived with his companion Josette. From spring 1920 until his early death from uremia in 1927 was very ill, often hospitalized and

---

159 Letter to Kahnweiler, December 14, 1915, Letters of Juan Gris, 33-34.
160 Kahnweiler, Juan Gris, 9.
161 Gris was initiated to the Grand Orient of France as a Freemason in Feb. 1923. (Green, Juan Gris, 23)
bedridden. Gris’s early death in 1927, it has been argued, marked the true end of cubism.\textsuperscript{162} As Kahnweiler wrote, “Thus died the purest of men, the most faithful and tender friends I have ever known, and one of the noblest artists ever born.”\textsuperscript{163} We must look then to his surviving art for hints to his methods, process, and development. Gris’s drawings therefore stand on their own, and for an artist who was essential to cubism, his drawings were essential to his art.

\textsuperscript{162} Golding, \textit{Cubism}, 200.
\textsuperscript{163} Ibid., 36.
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