

TEMAS Y FORMAS HISPÁNICAS: ARTE, CULTURA Y SOCIEDAD

Carlos Mata Induráin y Anna Morózova (eds.)



FURIA ESPAÑOLA. PICASSO IN PARIS, 1901-1914

Alexander Yakimovich
The Russian Institute for Cultural Research

The young Picasso was full of wrath and revolt when he was sixteen to twenty years old. He striped away common attributes of a well-to-do bourgeois offspring, and joined the bohème. Initially he found his place in certain circles of young artists of Barcelona. This city has been an important place on the map of new arts. Around 1900 the city could see the emerging new sculpture-like architecture and design by Antoni Gaudi.

A symbolic gesture marking Picasso's divorce from the paternal civilization was the choice of maternal family name. From the end of 1898 onwards the artist takes the name Picasso (his mother's name) and gets rid of his father's name Ruiz. Later the artist himself said that his definitive artistic name has been chosen by his bohemian friends in Barcelona. He just said yes to his friend's proposal¹. If so the fact of this decision is hardly less important. Finally the artist himself has met and accepted friends who have given him his name bound to future glory.

The flaring revolt further proceeds with the known episode of the romantic flight from the people. In the company of two friends (one of them must have been a genuine gipsy) the young Picasso spent several months in remote corners of Catalonia. Young people walked through mountain ravines, slept in caves around a bonfire like wild natives, and avoided meeting civilized people².

¹ Cabanne, 1992, p. 84.

² Palau i Fabre, 1981, p. 152.

Later on the artist claimed that his character and psyche have got its definitive imprint in these months of wandering adventures and almost full isolation from the outer world. In the magic circle of primordial nature he saw himself as a lonely wolf alien to the life and conduct of human herds. Norms and forms of inherited culture turned out hostile to his mind. This topic of individual revolt stems for most Europeans from Romantic substrate. We do not know for sure if Picasso knew names like Schiller and Karl Moor. However, wanderings of a lonely and odd character across human society and his alienation from its norms and forms belong to the cultural reservoir of Europe since Cervantes described wanderings and exploits of Don Quijote.

The important fact is the artist himself supported this tale of his youthful escapade, which means that he himself strongly desired not to be seen as an offspring of a cultured bourgeois family. To the contrary, he felt like to be a lonely ranger who crossed the Pyrenees and came back as a different person. And then, being different, off he went.

His itinerary included, as an interim stop, some time of study at Madrid's Academia de San Fernando. Unhappily for the honorable Academia, Picasso could see paintings by El Greco, Velázquez and Goya at Prado Museum. Academic routine learning must have been no more welcome to him than lessons of his father and other teachers of fine arts in Barcelona. The capital of free non-academic arts, Paris, saw the arrival of a young man from the South, known to nobody and hardly speaking any French, late in 1901.

Landing in the cosmopolitan centre of arts our hero joined the artistic life and went on annihilating the former man in himself and in the rest of the world. Pablo Picasso painted for several years his "blue" pictures, that is messages from an after- or underworld dedicated to lost souls forgotten in irradiating spaces. The "blue" period lasted until *ca.* 1906-1907. One hardly can see in its pictorial products anything lyrical and poetically charming. They rather show a painful departure from the former human nature. I can tell why.

Paintings of this half dozen years represent such figures as bohemian artists, beggars, circus clowns and close friends. They belong to the outskirts of society, to the outcasts. The artist's stance towards them, as many humanitarians are convinced, is tainted by a humanistic compassion and ethically valid solidarity with the oppressed. On

the level of the visual story we can see episodes from a broken and unhappy existence. We are accustomed to believe that any representation of suffering, oppressed, outcast people has to be morally valid and full of compassion. Hence we almost automatically conclude that paintings by Picasso made in these years are based on benignity, humanness and sympathy to the losers.

This is a very common prejudice indeed. Not everyone agrees to it, though. For example Karl Gustav Jung has left several penetrating remarks about Picasso's early paintings. The German thinker saw in "blue" works a recession into the "collective unconscious" of prehistoric ancestors. Jung has described Picasso's early paintings as reminiscences from the deeply buried kingdom of the dead. Actually Jung has once more reproduced here the known commonplaces of his neo-Freudian psychoanalysis. The psychoanalytic tradition has been very much inclined to recognize in art an escape from civilization and its discontents through immersing into depths of sub-consciousness and prehistoric, even pre-human memories³.

Looking from this viewpoint one would not see in "blue" paintings any ethical content at all, no sign of compassion towards slim, almost immaterial figures of melancholic and alienated cranks and dreamers. Bathes in blue fogs shadows live their shadowy lives. Some melancholy and bitterness emanate from their eyes and gestures. Maybe one should remember here the specific Spanish melancholy called by the special term "angustia". Like the notorious Russian melancholy which easily grows over to a dare-devil's behavior, the Spanish version of blue soul is ready to switch over to aggressiveness. If so, the paintings under discussion do not presume any kind of moral relation at all. This means that the artist does not involve into any kind of consolation of the suffering human race. Among blue shadows there is no compassion and no consolation. Ethics did not give any help to the artist's brush.

To sum up the above one may say that we have two interpretations of the early Parisian paintings by Picasso. The one is – he is a highly compassionate and ethically oriented artist who transmits us his deploring of human fate and his woe for the souls of purgatory. The opposite idea is – the artist reveals his subconscious strata, irrational pre-human depths of one's self. There is no human morals and no

³ Jung, *Collected Works*, vol. 15, p. 136f.

empathy there. Pre-human depths do not house any human criteria. The big body of the Universe outside us is free from morality.

A third conclusion is also possible. In his “blue” period (1900–1906) Picasso still is not certain himself about his own choice. On the one hand he is willing to express human pain and suffering and solitude in his art. He is about to mourn the human misery. On the other hand, something prevents him from demonstrating such sentimentality and mellowness. He must have embraced the role of a hard Spanish guy. He harshly deforms figures and sinks them into a cold blue smoke. Telling stories of bitter human fate he never forgets he must stay cold and hard. Deformations visible in hands and legs and necks of his twisted figures make an uncomfortable impression.

In 1906–1907 Picasso’s new series arose, namely his Archaic and Neolithic female figures and portrait works. (Hermitage Museum in St. Petersburg has in its collection a representative set of this pictorial group.) The Early Avant-Garde in Western Europe (until *ca.* 1914) has been thoroughly permeated by the new cult of the “new primordiality”⁴. In Paris this propensity has been displayed by Matisse and Picasso. In German art centres as Munich, Berlin and Dresden we can observe the wave of Expressionists like Ernst Ludwig Kirchner and Franz Marc. A couple of years later Russia witnessed the appearance of Neo-Primitive painters and so-called “Donkey Tail” artistic group with Mikhail Larionov and Nathalia Goncharova. An energetic “wildness” invited their creative vision.

Matisse started first. At this moment he ran a bit faster than his future rival Picasso. The last jealously observed the evolution of the elder and was ready to react to the challenge. In 1905 Matisse was 36 years old; Picasso just grew to be 25. This rivalry of the two representatives of two different generations goes then through the rest of their lives. The beginning falls to the definitive point on the timetable: autumn of 1905.

At this date occurred the important event of Paris life – *Le Salon d’Automne* of 1905. Matisse exposed several paintings, among them the “Open Window” and “Portrait of M-me Matisse”. Contemporary viewers and journalists have been chocked by the flatness of the

⁴ The term “new primordiality” applied to the Early Avant-Garde has been coined by Valery Prokofiev (1928–1982) – an outstanding art historian and connoisseur of Goya and Picasso.

painted surface and “lines thick as a finger”, as one of exhibition visitors noted with perplexity. One can imagine that Picasso felt alert and took, metaphorically speaking, a fighting position. About 1905 he still painted his melancholic “blue” visions. (And tried to make them harder and more aggressive.) And here comes a surprise! Matisse, this mature master in full command of professional cunning, makes a turn about, and he gives up his former way of painting by halftones and fine color symphonies, and now he paints boldly and daringly with explosive color strokes and stains as if he were a little child or a far-off native!

Matisse’s creative philosophy has been defined in 1905, and towards 1910, when he produced his panneaus “Dance” and “Music”, his art has fully emerged in his basic features. There is nothing subversive about him. He would not attack the European civilization as many other new artists do. He is ripe as a therapeutic artist. His program is to extract deep elementary feelings and perceptions of eye and body, the natural irrational drives. But not the dangerous nor predatory ones. Calmness, Epicurean sensuality, pure color and relaxing meditativity. The two famous panneaus in Hermitage commissioned by the Russian businessman Sergey Schchukin may be considered as psychotherapeutical machines. (This might appear an unwanted joke, for Schchukin was considered by many contemporaries too strange and unpredictable to be normal.)

At this timepoint Picasso probably grasped what his friend and rival Matisse aimed at in his art. The latter tried to support and console, to help his co-humans in conditions of insane and destructive modern reality. The stunted and fierce Spaniard lived through his moment of truth at this point. In fact he found his way of life and behavior earlier, in Barcelona. The year of Autumn Salon in Paris was the year of decision in his art. Namely decision by the contrary. He had to paint unlike Matisse and contrary to Matisse. Picasso went on disturbing and shocking his public. Primordial energies (relaxing, meditative and helpful with Matisse) had to be uncomfortable and dangerous with Picasso.

Both Picasso’s life and art look for some time more and more harsh and challenging. Sarcasm, revolt and uneasiness look on us from them. After 1905 he will for several years act on the art scene as an exploding bomb bringing destruction. Until his Cubist period goes to finish after 1912 (and new experiments begin) his art is like

the epicenter of a Spanish wrath, *furia española*. In a sense, he realized in his paintings of 1905 – 1912 the arsenal of young revolt and recalcitrance which he was full of in his early years⁵.

After 1914 we shall observe meaningful changes in his art. Picasso grew to be more complicated and multifaceted in his art. He became “softer”. His irony never became really friendly to people and events but in his mature years he took a much more relaxed position and renounced to furious and provocative gestures in art and life. Still, a constant charge of a toxic dislike in relation of European civilization kept on working in his art. “Classicist” paintings and etchings from 1920- 1939 displayed brisk changes from hard sarcasm and shocking grotesque, on the one side, to a sort of distanced humanistic ideal, on the other. Such are p.e. famous illustrations for Ovid’s “Metamorphoses”. But they stay outside our attention here. Thus, we have to return to the first stages of the master’s development in Paris.

Friends and combatants of his youth like A. Salmon claimed in later memoirs that the young Pablo fell in love with African and Oceanian art as early as 1905-1906. Within these years Matisse (the object of special attention on the side of Picasso) publicly declared his program of a serene Fauvism and strengthened in the mind of the Spaniard his will to make art on the contrary, inverting the friendly anthropology of the French master to a martial gesture.

Picasso himself asserted that he did not know anything of non-European art until he finished (or stopped painting) his scandalous and historical picture “*Les Femmes d’Alger (O. J. R. M.)*” in 1907. Could he have been able to see artworks of non-European people earlier than that? Historians of art employ a maximally possible scrutiny in dating events and findings in artistic biographies. Here, however, one has to content oneself with the statement by Picasso himself who told much later that he has been excited by the art of Black Africa in June, 1907, visiting the museum of Trocadéro. Exactly in these days and months he worked on his big canvas with wild and idol-like “*Femmes d’Alger*”⁶. The question is, though, to what degree can we trust the story about his stormy beginnings told by the artist in his later years.

⁵ Blunt and Pool, 1962, p. 14.

⁶ *A Picasso Anthology: Documents, Criticism, Reminiscences*, p. 55; *Primitivismus in der Kunst des 20. Jahrhunderts*, p. 345.

Maybe he saw the African tribal art with open eyes just because he was ready for this meeting and willing to make a picture with masks and idol-like figures. Or (another version) African native artists seen in Trocadéro have first helped him to open his eyes and understand that he had to paint like this. This may be a curious but very narrow problem. The general course of Picasso's development is clear enough.

The magic expression and animalistic energy of tribal and primordial art forms had to help new art renounce to the senile weakness and spiritual paralysis of Europe. Young artists in France, Germany, Russia and Britain met with this way of thinking. "Dreams of the Primordial" appear in creations of R. M. Rilke, A. Gide, in the "Celtic Revival" of Glasgow and Edinburgh and elsewhere. In Barcelona Gaudi erected edifices of the Park Güell – a variation on the idea of pagan sanctuaries dedicated to snakes, salamandras and other beings living in real nature or fantasy.

One more factor which influenced Picasso's development is imitation of styles and manners of other artists. Max Jacob who was the first friend of the Spanish newcomer in Paris mentioned in his memoirs edited in 1927 that Picasso has been severely reproached for imitating⁷.

Imitation and citation may play a sedative function in European artistic tradition. This is a signal of loyalty. Let us imagine an Academic pupil imitating style and manner of Poussin or Raphael. He has to be criticized for dull emulation, but please remark the fact that imitating contains a correct signal. He takes the side of cultural and moral people who sit in academies, read good books, go to best museums and observe rules of ethics and aesthetics. He may be a tedious and flat personality but he is a socially valid personality. He adheres to professoral elite, Parliament deputies and ministerial functionaries, ergo he defends covenants of good fathers of the Nation and the State.

However, there is a delicate moment about it. Imitators have a problematic status in European cultural tradition. This tradition demands originality and innovation in Modernity. We have a duplicity of values. Following great masters and imitate them is a very positive thing but somehow the follower of good tradition has to find his

⁷ *A Picasso Anthology: Documents, Criticism, Reminiscences*, p. 37.

own way in art. How to combine imitation, on the one hand, with artistic originality, on the other hand? This was the stumbling block for Academic theory and practice all over the world in Modernity.

From the very beginning of his artistic career Picasso readily imitated styles and manners of ancient and new artists. He practices imitation with a remarkable enthusiasm. His drawings followed classic examples, and in Paris he emulated El Greco and Daumier. Traces of many museal reminiscences surfaced here and there. What is particularly stunning is his obvious joy of copying. This is a strange effect indeed. Imitators and copy makers more often than not produce their artefacts with hard work and sweat. There is something slavery about imitation. Any imitation but not Picasso's. He married imitation to inspiration.

A talented and inspired imitation of somebody's art; can it be possible? In theory, hardly so. But life supposedly has more dimensions than any theory. Picasso demonstrated that he is able to follow another's manner and produce original results. But the main question is he imitated historical examples for attacking them. So, he invented a partisan strategy in art. What is meant by that?

About 1907 Picasso has been captured by an acute idea. He thought that he could use a museal Academic composition with nude figures in Classicist postures. But this conservative group had to be transposed to the language of non-European art – that of African masks or Tasmanian idols or artifacts made in New Zealand or Tahiti. The point is two ways of seeing (the traditional European one and the primordial "savage" one) have to meet each other in one pictorial space. This meeting would produce a harsh collision. Clash of civilizations! The one side is the European following of Academic tradition. The other side taken by a "native" talent, a primordial maker of idols, bursting of natural energy and alien to correct drawing and composing by Poussin or Raphael.

As if a native maker of idols and masks dimly reminds himself of another life when he has been European and has painted classic pictures.

Something like this metempsychosis one can subsume in paintings like "*Bathing woman*" in New York and, of course, "*Les Demoiselles d'Avignon*" in the same MOMA. This stage of development lasted no more than two years. But an important key for understanding Picasso rests in such works from 1907 – 1908. It would be an unpar-

donable simplification equaling mistake to claim that he moved to the side of Tribal art and primitive deformations. The crux of the matter is our master combines two artistic languages in one and the same canvas. The one is classical composition of nude figures balanced in their masses and gestures, and put to a system of a mis-en-scene with coulisses left and right. This structure and principle of classical visual art visibly appears in “*Demoiselles*”. But faces and bodies in this quasi-classical picture are treated like African ritual masks of Iberian stone idols from Pyrenean archeological excavations found after 1900. These Neolithic artifacts have aroused vivid interest and affection with many artists including Picasso⁸.

For this reason we hardly can join the common opinion which ascribes to this picture a break with European tradition. Breaking with it would mean taking leave and going another way. “*Demoiselles*” is something else: a machine of subversion from inside. The artist demonstrates that he is in full command of the traditional European cunning. He imitates the main principles of this tradition. He would not break with basic concept of classic art. His idea is to reproduce this concept but to add to this representational code another code borrowed from far-off magic figures produced by native carvers and painters. This alien ferment destroys the classic concept from inside but not to kill it. A museum masterpiece and a savage ritual artifact stay in a tense embrace not able to annihilate each other. As Ch. Green has put it: “The ‘*Demoiselles*’ simultaneously invoked and demolished the canon celebrated in the great museums where Picasso had trained his eye”⁹.

Hence the grade of hatred and fear which was and still is addressed to this subversive artwork. It shows one of the brilliant masters of the traditional artworld undermining the basements of our civilization – not because the artist was ignorant or forgetful of them (as one might think of Malevich). He is dangerous because he deeply knows and cunningly treats the classical tradition (in Green’s words, “canon”) but breaks it from inside. Not a simple enemy but virtuoso of secret operations.

From 1908 on Cubism is present on the scene. This is the vast item not to be described here. We have to tackle only one aspect of

⁸ Richardson, 1991.

⁹ Green (ed.), 2001, p. 7.

it. The complex trajectory of Cubism in art has been studied by a constellation of old and new historians from A. Barr and J. Golding to Ch. Green and J. Richardson. My task now is to understand the message contained in Cubist works by Picasso. Other individual versions of Cubism belonging to Braque, Gris, Leger and the rest of the team stay beyond my attention.

Content and message inherent to this new pictorial language have instantly moved to the spot of interest and grew to be the object of theories and hypothetic assumptions. Until now these theories of Cubism are influential enough to convince the majority of educated public today.

Picasso's friends and admirers felt obliged to speak and write on his art, to defend and comment it at the moment when, in 1908, he started the new line of unusual paintings. They got the (initially) mocking nickname "Cubism" because of their faceted forms. New works visibly outstripped everything done before by their harsh deformations. Comments came ready in numbers. Apollinaire's voice and word was the most notable in the choir. The outstanding poet simultaneously was a highly effective art critic. He had charisma which is very important for playing an advantageous role on the art scene. The question is, however, who invented the notorious theory of "smart art of Cubism" with its supposedly scientific and almost mathematical analysis of form and space.

One ought to stress that the idea of "smart Cubism" was not a proposal of Picasso and Braque themselves. These two played the roles of "parents" of Cubism, but they also had "children", namely Juan Gris, Albert Gleizes, Jean Metzinger, Fernand Leger and others. Like most followers of strong leaders, they tried to systemize and structure the energetic strike made by Picasso with his pictures of 1908. Some support in constructing the rational and quasi-scientific theory ensued from the term "Cubism" itself. In reality painters did not represent geometric bodies called cubes, they deformed and dissected visible forms in many ways and transformed them into new configurations. The word "Cubism" has its aura, it informs the European educated mind that scientific geometry is at work here, and, thus, some rational process dominates in Cubist representations.

The circle around Picasso produced a whole set of reasonings. The popular press brought several statements, then more serious texts followed suit. The manifest "*Du Cubisme*" was issued by Gleizes

and Metzinger in 1912, Guillaume Apollinaire's booklet "*Les Peintres Cubistes*" appeared in 1913. At this time Cubist painters came to favor with the remarkable art lover, intellectual and gallery owner Daniel-Henri Kahnweiler. The comprehensive treaty written by this German-born cosmopolitan student and dealer was published in after-war years¹⁰. In pre-war years he has been an active visitor of artistic ateliers and interlocutor of leading persons of the scene. Probably his systematic and well-organized reasonings caused his prestige in this milieu.

A new theory has been readily accepted among them. There was a visible imprint of scientism about it. Thanks to well-educated Kahnweiler they thought their Cubist art has a fundamental affinity to the new scientific vision of nature. Space and time ceased to be constant and turned out to be variable and dynamic. The new art supposedly responds to the challenge of the new science. Artistic community must have been happy about such theory – or, at least, not resisting to it.

The strongest impact has been produced by Apollinaire's booklet of 1913. He declared that Cubism has the goal to realize the space-time connection, and to involve into painting the fourth dimension, namely time. In other words, a Cubist painting shows simultaneously different sides of one and the same thing of figure¹¹. Similar ideas were put down by Gleizes and Metzinger in their known manifest of 1912.

Theoretical texts which emerged in Picasso's surroundings tell us that a Cubist painter moves around the object he represents, and then unites partial views collected in this circumferential trajectory, in one space. Regarding pictures produced by "children" one may somehow swallow the bulk of scientist theories. For example Gleizes' painting "*Man on the balcony*" in Philadelphia Museum, or "*Portrait of Picasso*" by Juan Gris in Art Institute of Chicago. These pictures demonstrate fine and resourceful partition into many plans combined into new combinations leading up to a process of a sophisticated intellectual play. One hardly can say that Gris and Gleizes observed formulas of the theory they shared. But at least both painters display

¹⁰ Kahnweiler, 1920.

¹¹ Apollinaire, *Les Peintres cubistes*, pp. 19, 39.

a rational, unmistakably intellectual approach, and a very balanced treatment of surfaces, plans and details.

The fact is that paintings of Picasso's emulators and theories emerging in his entourage basically differ from his own artworks of 1908 – 1912. Impossible to imagine that Picasso, after creating his tense “blue” pictures and magic alternative pictures with masks and idols dismissed his former aggressive state of mind and became a serene rationalist, a scientific artist who cultivated a kind of geometry and cared a lot for the fourth dimension – time.

Believing into such a miraculous conversion is a thing impossible. Picasso, the dangerous guy and friend of gypsies, wandering wolf and enemy of conventions – and such a dramatic turn? Could he forget his own self and become a rationalistic, balanced character and brainiac working with the problem of fourth dimension in order to construct circumferential spaces on the canvas? Who can believe it?

Historians of art are well acquainted with the phenomena of theories born and growing in the shadow of great masters and their masterworks. Sometimes artists themselves concoct theories in order to give reasonable arguments to their impulsive artistic gestures. This way emerged theories belonging to Poussin, Reynolds, Delacroix and others. Theories are needed for integration and absorption of artistic creation into social and national life.

Worth noting is the fact that Picasso lived and worked for six decades after his Cubist period was closed. Through the long rest of his life he was silent on the theme of theories which surrounded the activity of the group of artists who followed him in early years. He neither joined the opinion of Apollinaire – Kahnweiler nor denied it. He tolerated their suggestions. In his mature years he was rather patient about reasonable and soft comments given by others to his explosive and subversive pictures. So, the picture of New York MOMA repeatedly mentioned above was named by the artist himself “Whorehouse of Avignon” or “Prostitutes of Avignon”. This name was extremely hard and shocking, and, given the fact that this work has for many reasons aroused big indignation, Picasso's friends convinced him to be patient about the compromise title «*Les Demoiselles d'Avignon*». It is a mild title because the word “*Demoiselles*” is ambivalent and may mean not only female sexual service but also decent gentlewomen. In order not to pull society's leg Picasso consented to accept the soft title.

Supposedly Picasso saw ideas of his comrades as indulgently as that. Students and journalists could massively reproduce and relay the rational theory of Cubism. – Nothing to do with those people, – must have thought the shrewd artist reading and hearing the mild conception. Harsh lessons do not reach social co-humans. Therefore one has to wrap up cutting edges into soft and safe package.

If one asks about the most important thing, that is what content Picasso himself has put to his paintings, one has to observe pictures themselves and try to see how they have been made.

Picasso evoked in his early Parisian pictures the life style and surroundings he lived in. Artists and their girls, people in cafes, street scenes, guitars, bottles, glasses on an old worn-out table. This milieu was definitely located outside the “good society”. This dimension was inhabited by strange youngsters and weird old types, marginal persons and other outsiders – among them patented criminals and bohemian stars (some of them considered today great painters, poets and musicians). Intensive production of pictures depicting scenes and elements of this life world began with “blue” paintings. They contained a confession of a tense soul vibrating with Spanish

“angustia” , a strange double of the German Existentialist “Angst” which means “desperation” and “hopelessness”.

This state of mind would be comprehensible to Vladimir Mayakovsky, the enemy of the good old world of professors and newspapers, mondaine public and police rules he often broke. Like the young rebel Mayakovsky, the young Picasso was ready to stand up and fight against the good old order of things in hope to find an undiscovered continent of freedom, love and understanding.

In this critical moment his friendly rival Matisse appeared on the avant-scene and launched his tender, mild and therapeutic Avant-Garde version. Picasso went up like a madman. At first he married the principle of a Classic figure scene with the treatment of an African or Neolithic idol. This way came challenging and frightening pictures – bugaboos for bourgeois public. (The most famous or notorious of them is of course the New York picture “*Les Femmes d'Alger*”). This subversion wasn't enough for the red-hot artist.

The birth of the soft and friendly Avant-Garde in Matisse's art about 1905 may have been a last drop which set the emotion in motion. He reacted to the outer call. He saw that his colleague and maybe the most talented painter of his generation, Matisse, chose the

side of peaceful, serene and humanistic art (using hard means of Avant-Garde). What next? Next came the most toxic subversion of Museum canon – “*Les Demoiselles*”. He goes further. “*Furia epañola*” boiled over. Cubist paintings represent this stage of the unrestrained “*furia*”.

He set out to press and crumple things and figures and faces. Surfaces crossed each other and came together into lumps. Forms penetrated each other. Cubism is revolt, aggression, attack. It has been invented by the hard Spanish fighter. Not by his rival, the mild and consoling French painter. No joy for our eyes has been envisaged. He attacks us. *Desperado*.

Now again: What about the theory of the fourth dimension and mathematical analysis of dissected forms? The answer is: study it, think it over but never take it for granted.

Theories of art are not the same as works of art. Impossible to imagine that Picasso treated pictorial form and space as a scientist does with his materials and instruments in laboratory. Picasso as a smart and rational analyst of dimensions and student of forms-in-time is a fiction never having existed in reality. This fictional personage has been invented by his fellows and followers. They wished well to the reputation of new art. They sincerely cared for the status of Cubism in the cultural society. This is a normal aspiration of social human beings. But paintings made by Picasso have nothing common with that. Theories describe Cubism as a rational quasi-scientific process. Character, nature and psychic condition of the Spanish artist have nothing to do with that. His Cubist canvases were born in a dramatic process of attacking the public across the canvas.

Matisse is reported to have said that Picasso was a bandit. Maybe it was uttered without any scorn but rather with a good-humored joke. But in a sense Matisse has grasped very well the nature of his confrere. *Picasso desperado*. Uncontrollable fighter. But not for ever. Soon will come the time he will go through considerable changes.

When the Great War came in 1914, the senseless wrath will destroy the formerly well-organized world. European plains will be sewn by millions of dead bodies. Picasso in these years will go other ways, and his art will grow more friendly and mild. But this is a different story.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A Picasso Anthology: Documents, Criticism, Reminiscences*, ed. by Marilyn McCully, London, The Arts Council & Thames & Hudson, 1981.
- APOLLINAIRE, Guillaume, *Les Peintres cubistes*, Paris, Adrien Maeght, 1982.
- BLUNT, Anthony, and POOL, Phoebe, *Picasso: The Formative Years*, London, Studio Books, 1962.
- CABANNE, Pierre, *Le siècle de Picasso*, t. 1, 1881-1912, Paris, Gallimard, 1992.
- GREEN, Christopher (ed.), *Picasso's «Les Femmes d'Alger»*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001, p. 7.
- JUNG, Carl Gustav, *Collected Works*, vol. 15, London / New York, Princeton University Press, 1966.
- KAHNWEILER, Daniel-Henry, *Der Weg zum Kubismus*, München, Delphin, 1920 (English transl.: *The Way to Cubism*, New York, 1949).
- PALAU I FABRE, Josep, *Picasso: The Early Years 1881-1907*, New York, Rizzoli, 1981.
- Primitivismus in der Kunst des 20. Jahrhunderts*, ed. William S. Rubin, München, Prestel, 1984.
- RICHARDSON, John, *A Life of Picasso, The Cubist Rebel 1907-1916*, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1991.