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It is appropriate that this first major exhibition of the works of Albert Gleizes should be an international and collaborative venture among three nations indisputably linked with the painter. First and foremost, Gleizes is a French artist, a founder of Cubism and an influence on the School of Paris. He was also a member of Der Sturm, and his many theoretical writings were originally most appreciated in Germany, where especially at the Bauhaus his ideas were given sympathetic consideration. Finally, he spent four crucial years in New York, and played an important role in making America aware of modern art. His key paintings, long since scattered far and wide across the globe, are, at last, brought together in this retrospective evaluation of his life work.
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The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum is the obvious institution to launch the first retrospective exhibition of Albert Gleizes in America. For its collection numbers no less than 58 paintings, drawings and prints – a wealth unattained by any other museum in this country.

Such richness in the Museum’s custody contrasts with a prevailing indifference toward Gleizes’ art – an indifference that to date has remained unrelieved by a single full-fledged museum survey in this country. As a result, judgements about Gleizes and his work have been based too often upon ready-made assumptions and too seldom upon inspection of the works.

As we look again, or more likely, as we look for the first time, we become aware of the insufficiency of categories and of the damaging effect of generalizations. “Cubism” as a pigeon-hole becomes either too small or too large to accommodate the specific contribution of Gleizes if we insist that the term should also retain its validity for a particular period in the painting of Picasso and Braque. As is made plain in a key passage of the following introduction, Gleizes and those sharing his thoughts were seeking different solutions and employed quite different means. His aspirations deserve better than to be judged, as heretofore, in terms of their closeness or remoteness to an imaginary prototype.

The principal victim of superficial and generalized criticism is, of course, the individual work. In order to see a concentrated choice of such works for their own sake and to contemplate them within the amplitude of Albert Gleizes’ creative development, this exhibition and catalogue have been prepared.

The reevaluation of Gleizes’ contribution consists of two retrospective exhibitions, similarly conceived – one for North American, the other for European circulation – as well as of this catalogue that covers both. These separate parts of a comprehensive project were carried out by Daniel Robbins, Assistant Curator of The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum. Years of close attention to Albert Gleizes’ life-work have qualified Mr. Robbins to undertake a selection and documentation that now is gratefully acknowledged as an original and important contribution to scholarship.

Thomas M. Messer, Director
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1900 Worked in his father's fabric design atelier.
1903 First exhibits at the Salon d'Automne. Military service until 1905.
1905 Founder of the Association Ernest Renan.
1906-1908 Founded and participated in the Abbaye de Créteil.
1911 Exhibited in “room 41”, Salon des Indépendants. Scandal about Cubism.
1912 Published Du Cubisme with Metzinger. Assists in the formation of the Section d'Or.
1914 Called into Army. First completely abstract works.
1915 Demobilized, married Juliette Roche and visits New York.
1916 Barcelona. Spring through Autumn. 1916.
1917 Returns to New York via Cuba. Visits Bermuda.
1919 Returns to France. Spring.
1921 First painting students: early formulation of theories of picture construction.
1922-1926 Gradual withdrawal from Paris-centered art world:
increased interest in social and intellectual problems.
1927 Established Moly-Sabata, a second Utopian community of artists-craftsmen in Sablons.
1927-1928 Pochoirs, often recapitulating earlier paintings, are begun in an effort
 to make reasonably priced art available to a wide public.
1930 Strongest Romanesque influences appear in his art and in the concurrent writing of
1934-1935 Reintroduction of rigorous brush work.
1937 Executes murals for the Paris Exposition des Arts.
1939 Permanently moves to St. Remy-de-Provence.
1941 Rejoins Roman Catholic church.
1949-1950 Illustrated the Pensées of Pascal.
1951 Awarded Grand Prix at the first French Biennial. Menton.
1952 The Eucharist is executed in fresco for the Chapel “Les Fontaines” at Chantilly.
1953 Died, Avignon, June 23.
ALBERT GLEIZES: REASON AND FAITH IN MODERN PAINTING

BY DANIEL ROBBINS

Albert Gleizes was the son of Sylvan Gleizes, a successful fabric designer and talented amateur painter. His maternal uncle, Léon Commerre, was a fashionable painter who had won the Prix de Rome in 1875 as well as numerous official commissions and another uncle, Robert Gleizes, was a collector-dealer, specializing in eighteenth century paintings and objects. The name Gleizes, traced to Languedoc origins, is a Provencal version of église (evidence, as we shall see, in support of Lawrence Sterne's theories on the importance of names). The Gleizes lived in Courbevoie, which at that time was quite rural, in a comfortable villa surrounded by a garden large enough to include a separate studio for Albert. He was always very close to his two sisters Suzanne and Mireille (an elder brother had died in infancy), and his paintings frequently include their figures as well as that of his mother. It was intended that Gleizes should receive a normal bourgeois education but, rebelling against the discipline of conventional methods, he frequently—and secretly—substituted comedy classes at the drama conservatory for attendance at his prescribed courses. When his authoritarian father discovered what was going on, he promptly put Albert to work in his design shop where he could personally supervise and discipline him. Working with fifteen or twenty other employees, Gleizes found the activity valuable, later claiming that the necessary precision demanded by design was important to his artistic training. The anonymous designs produced in the atelier were largely eighteenth century in inspiration (destined for draperies, upholstery and clothing), but a certain art nouveau influence also crept in.1

Before his twentieth birthday, Gleizes was called to military service, a prospect which filled the father with more pleasure than it did the son, for the youth already exhibited a tendency toward pacifism and a desire to become a painter. This last would have been perfectly acceptable if Albert seemed likely to follow the example of his academic uncle but, since he appeared to prefer the Impressionist and Neo-Impressionist painters, his ambition was frowned upon. Despite lack of encouragement, however, Gleizes began to paint seriously while serving in the north of France, and even submitted his works to the Salon Nationale des Beaux-Arts.2 His early subject matter reveals a preoccupation with social themes: laundresses, workers

1Some of these fabrics are still preserved in the home of the artist's sister, Mireille Houot-Naynal, at La Flèche.

2The Société Nationale des Beaux-Arts was founded in 1890 by a group of dissident artists, including Puvies de Chavannes and Rodin, in opposition to the Société des Artistes Français, the official salon. See John Rewald, Post Impressionism: From Van Gogh to Gauguin, New York, Museum of Modern Art, 1956, p. 462.
on the quais, factory laborers; but it also included some mysterious night scenes: small solitary figures writing by lantern light in front of camp tents, or the silhouette of a windmill or church seen against a night sky. Gleizes and his closest friend, the future poet-wright René Arcos, had developed an inclination for symbolist poetry and for the politics of democratic socialism. Believing ardently in simple brotherhood without organized religion, they read and admired Whitman, Verhaeren and Ernest Renan; the philosophy of Comte, the sociology of Durkheim, the music of Wagner, the painting of Pissarro, the history of Taine and Michelet, all these contained concepts which influenced the two friends before they began active participation in the broader cultural world.

For the first five years of his serious artistic life, from about 1901–05, Gleizes appears to have had little direct awareness of activity in the art world, even less contact with other painters. Certainly, he was familiar with the work of Pissarro and Seurat and he admired Gauguin¹, but these connections provided vicarious rather than experienced culture. In contrast, young painters like Braque and Picasso, even Metzinger and Delaunay (who, as Gleizes' friends, were later to share many of his ideals), already were engaged in a struggle for recognition. In Paris they learned the channels for success, the structure of relationships and contacts, the development of the gallery-centered art market, and they observed with interest the growth of various personalities and schools. The unsophisticated Gleizes however, regarded the city as a bourgeois creation, a despicable place designed to trap artists as it trapped workers into a thousand evils, the worst of which would have been the corruption conferred by bourgeois approval.

Notwithstanding their aversion to bourgeois city culture, Gleizes and Arcos, on completing their military service, became involved with contemporary intellectual efforts, particularly those of a group of sympathetic young writers who had been associated with the shortlived review La Vie, (including Duhamel, Romain, Vildrac and Mercereau). Believing that artists, intellectuals and workers were natural allies, all chafing under the inequalities of the same system, and inspired by Gustave Kahn's Samedis Populaires and other mutualités, they helped to establish the Association Ernest Renan, a kind of popular university designed to bring working men and intellectuals—particularly artists—together. In 1906, with the financial aid of a new friend, Henri Martin Barzun, these young men established the Abbaye de Créteil, a phalanstery for artists and writers. Barzun, rather more sophisticated than his fellow-idealists of the Abbaye, also introduced Gleizes to the specific history of utopian socialism.⁴

Obviously, although Gleizes did not enter the Abbaye with a specific program and a crystallized ideal, the conditions of his earlier life and interests anticipated—even necessitated—his desire to found such a community. His early works, developed in isolation, consistently investing a vista or a genre scene with broader significance than the subject normally permitted, often reconciled the contrasts of exterior and interior or united ancient usage with modern practice in simultaneously plastic and symbolic terms. Gleizes seems never to have been absorbed by pure vision but always haunted at something more, at relationships and symbols. Thus, he would try to situate the whole of the modern city, an organism basically alien to him, within the broader context of surrounding countryside. Similarly, he was haunted by the synthetic possibilities of a river, not as an idyllic setting but as a source of life, an intrusion of external time and substance into the cities of the Ile-de-France. These concerns were all brought to the Abbaye, where they were expanded and matured.

The Abbaye, supposedly supporting itself through the communal métier of publishing, received the blessing of many Symbolists, but it was not long before its members began to break with the forms of art that had been practiced by the admired older generation. Like many Symbolists, the Abbaye artists scorned

¹In an unpublished part of his Souvenirs Gleizes wrote that an initial idea for the Abbaye de Créteil was to escape from corrupt Western civilization to the simplicity of life in the South Seas, as he then believed Gauguin had done.

⁴Barzun had been as deeply involved with politics as with poetry. In addition to publishing L'Art Social from 1905, he had served as secretary to Paul Boncour.
the structure of a bourgeois world and sought to substitute a communal society, but they did not reject the themes of modern life in favor of the Symbolist focus on single elements and internal, individual images. They wished instead to create an epic and heroic art, stripped of ornament and obscure allegory, an art dealing with the relevant subjects of modern life: crowds, man and machines, even, ultimately, the city itself. It can be argued, of course, that the Abbaye intentions—vast as they were—remained unfulfilled and that their dream, like that of the Symbolists before them, was an escape from reality. Yet there were important distinctions, for the Abbaye intention to create a total future a priori ruled out the Symbolist technique of creating solely from an aesthetic or a closed ideal.

If the physical scope and appearance of the world in 1906-07 hinted at the vast changes in progress, the Abbaye artists expected much more. It is important to realize that their vision, although responding to the conditions of modern life, did not seek to imitate those conditions, as Gleizes later accused the Futurist artists of doing.4 Gleizes and his associates dreamed of creating the future and collectivity, multiplicity, simultaneity were the key Abbaye concepts manifest in the work of Barzun, Arcos, and especially in the related Unanimitism of Jules Romain. Theirs was a self-conscious art, a synthetic concept of the possibilities of the future. Their images invariably encompassed broad subjects which, although dealing with reality, were restricted neither by the limitations of physical perception nor by a separation of scientific fact from intellectual meaning—even symbolic meaning. Even their images of simultaneity were synthetic because scope was too vast, both physically and symbolically, for one man’s limited participation. The Abbaye, whose fame circulated even in Moscow, attracted many artists. Marinetti and Brancusi were visitors there and young writers like Roger Allard (one of the first to defend Cubism), Pierre Jean Jouve, and Paul Castaix are typical of the artists who wanted to have the Abbaye publish their works. Nevertheless, after only two years, the Abbaye was forced to close, mainly because of material hardship. There simply was not enough money to keep going.

Gleizes’ style changed rapidly at the Abbaye. From a technique of paint application akin to Pointillism and a light palette similar to Impressionism, his paint handling became more robust, areas of color and brushwork grew simpler, and his structural rhythms became more pronounced, although softened by more curvilinear forms. A synthetic view of the universe, presenting the remarkable phenomena of time and space, multiplicity and diversity, at once was his painted equivalent to the ideals which were verbally realized in the Abbaye poetry. Experienced in the treatment of inclusive landscapes, he nevertheless had to solve the problem of balancing many simultaneous visions on a painted surface. Gleizes mitigated the distortion of distance by linear perspective, by flattening the picture plane; his skies were on the same plane as the simple flat objects in front and, although scale was retained, a form in the distance would be brought to the foreground by making it bright. Every element of the painting had to be reduced to clear planes, treated as uniformly as possible, for attention lavished on any one part would jeopardize the whole delicate balance. In 1908, although color range expanded in the winter river scenes and contracted in the summer landscapes, the horizon line consist etnly crept higher and higher.

Unknown to Gleizes, Le Fauconnier, who was living in comparative isolation in Brittany, was pursuing similar ends. The strange, red-bearded northerner, a former student at the Académie Julian and a friend of Denis and the Nabis, was painting rocks and sea. His rocks became progressively more geometric and his sea crept higher up the picture plane. He exhibited his rocks at the Indépendants in 1909 but Gleizes, who had not yet exhibited in that salon, appears not to have seen the work, for the two artists, although probably first introduced by Jouve or Castaix, (the editors of Les Banneaux d’Or) did not know each other’s work until 1909 when they met again through Alexandre Mercereau. Mercereau, perhaps, realized even before they did the extent of their common interests.

In the Salon d’Automne of 1909, however, Gleizes saw his new friend’s portrait of Pierre Jean Jouve and, as he recorded in his Souvenirs, was deeply impressed by the painting. (Gleizes was not represented

in that salon although he had exhibited there in 1903 and 1904). It is not unlikely that Gleizes’ strong response arose from the fact that Le Fauconnier’s painting, actually less geometric than Gleizes’ 1908 Pyrenees landscapes, applied sympathetic techniques to figure treatment. Gleizes had sketched figures often enough, but because his search for a synthetic vision that would reconcile disparate elements had fostered a natural predilection for landscape, his figure paintings were few. The Salon des Indépendants, 1910, saw the immediate influence of Le Fauconnier in Gleizes’ large portrait (now lost) of René Arcos. An oil sketch from 1909, however, remains in the collection of Madame Gleizes and its combination of curves and straight lines, strikingly related to the Jouve portrait, depicts Arcos in a dark, flatly-rendered coat, striding across an enormous landscape. In 1910 both artists continued to concentrate on figures: Le Fauconnier on a portrait of the poet Paul Castiaux and Gleizes on a majestic portrait of his uncle, Robert Gleizes. The two works are very close and establish Gleizes’ debt to Le Fauconnier for having stimulated his interest to encompass a new and important element, the figure.

Mercereau is also responsible for having introduced Gleizes to Metzinger in 1910. The same year that Mercereau included these three artists in a Moscow exhibition—probably the first Jack of Diamonds Exhibition. (Even before this meeting, Gleizes and Metzinger had been linked by Vauxcelle’s disparaging comments on “des cubes Blafards”6, which surely referred to Metzinger’s Portrait of Apollinaire and Gleizes’ Tree at the Salon des Indépendants.) Mercereau, who had missed the opening of the Abbaye in order to accompany Nicolas Riahouchnisky to Moscow, had previously included Gleizes’ Les Brumes du Matin sur la Marne in a Russian exhibition of 1908.7

Given Mercereau’s long standing delight in promoting group activity, it is easy to recognize his pleasure in having brought together three painters whose works exhibited similar interests and who could be identified with his own synthetic ideals, ideals which had been influential in the Abbaye’s development. As

---

7See Toison d’Or, Moscow, 1908, nos. 7-10, p. 15.
organizer of the literary section of the Salon d'Automne of 1909, he was able to introduce Gleizes to painters exhibiting there and to introduce his own concepts to the world of painting. Metzinger, in his study of Mercereau, noted that the 1905 Les Thuiribulums Affoissés had been an attempt to adjust the methods of the fading Symbolists to new concepts and that in the 1910 work Les Contes des Ténèbres. Mercereau had banished "anecdotal appearances", had made different forces operate within the same character and (like the painters) had changed settings rapidly and fantastically.

Thus, in 1909 and 1910, a significant group of painters came to be integrated with Gleizes' older circle of friends. The entire group, including Allard (whose book Le Bocage Amoureux Gleizes was illustrating in 1910), Barzun, Beauduin, Castiaux, Divoire, Parmentier, Marinetti, Theo Varlet, and even Apollinaire and Salmon, became party to the ideas of the Abbaye. Apollinaire and Salmon were only peripheral members, of course, the chameleon Apollinaire participating in almost every literary and artistic circle. but it is clear that Apollinaire's conception of Cubism was influenced by the epic notions found in the old Abbaye circle. In his preface to the 1911 Brussels Indépendants, he wrote: "...thus has come a simple and noble art, expressive and measured, eager to discover beauty, and entirely ready to tackle those vast subjects which the painters of yesterday did not dare to undertake, abandoning them to the presumptuous, old-fashioned and boring daubers of the official Salons." (italics mine). This conception is not based on the analytical Cubism of Picasso and Braque, which had already contracted to the intensive study of form, had almost annihilated subject confined in extremely shallow space. Instead, it suggests the broad concepts held by the Mercereau-Gleizes circle, concepts which were at that time visible only in the paintings of Gleizes, Delaunay, Le Fauconnier and Léger. The subjects treated by these Cubists, so markedly different from the isolated still lifes or figures chosen by Picasso and Braque, have vital significance both as intentions and as productive of different forms. Their significance is not diminished by the fact that the subjects themselves changed in the course of conceptual and technical advances, eventually being absorbed by the abstract art of Gleizes and Delaunay.

As Allard wrote of Gleizes, Le Fauconnier and Metzinger, in a review of the 1910 Salon d'Automne, "Thus is born at the antipodes of impressionism an art which cares little to imitate the occasional cosmic episode, but which offers to the intelligence of the spectator the essential elements of a synthesis in time, in all its pictorial fullness." The synthetic preoccupation with epic themes was destined to develop and to be transformed into abstract art in the work of Delaunay and Gleizes. In order to understand the passage of Gleizes' painting from an epic, visionary (as opposed to visual) reality to abstraction, it is important to understand his early Cubist style and its differences from our traditional understanding of analytic Cubism. We have already discussed some of the thoughts stemming from abstract considerations of relationships that intervened between appearances and the paintings of Gleizes and his friends. These involved the interaction of vast space with speed and action, with simultaneous work, commerce, sport, and flight; with the modern city and the ancient country, with the river, the harbor and the bridge and, above all, with time, for the sense of time—involving memory, tradition and accumulated cultural thought—created the reality of the world.

In poetry, this post-symbolist attempt to achieve new forms had to break decisively with the old unities of time, place and action. Unity of scene did not correspond with the reality of modern life; unity of time did not correspond with the culturally known and anticipated effects of change. That is why Mercereau (as Metzinger noted) shifted his scenes so violently, why Barzun tried to solve the problem of simultaneously developing lines of action by choral chanting. Similarly Gleizes and his painter friends sought to create a vision free from introverted or obscure imagery which could treat collective and simultaneous factors. This necessitated a new kind of allegory opposed to the old meaning which presented one thing as the symbolic.

---


11 See Metzinger, op. cit.
equivalent of another. A tentative precedent perhaps existed in Courbet’s Real Allegory which, however, might have been considered an allegorical failure by Gleizes and Metzinger because Courbet “did not suspect that the visible world only became the real world by the operation of thought.”

Modifications of one form by another are quite apparent. to be sure, but their relationships are made even clearer by contemplation stimulated by vision. The organic process of life and civilization, moving irresistably toward harmonious interaction, was the subject of Gleizes’ art. This subject was treated neither as a confined symbolic allegory nor as a cultural background indicated by specific real appearance, but was instead presented in concrete and precise terms. Gleizes’ Harvest Threshold, the masterpiece of the Section d’Or (no. 34), is not merely an anecdote in a scene. Rather, it is a multiple panorama celebrating the worker, his material life and his collective activity in securing that life on a permanently changing land. Gleizes confronts us not with one action or place, but with many: not with one time, but with past and future as well as present.

In contrast to Picasso and Braque, Gleizes never set out to analyze and describe visual reality, A mandolin, guitar, pipe or bowl of fruit—all more or less neutral objects from daily life—could not satisfy his complex idealistic concepts of true reality. He always stressed subjects of vast scale and of provocative social and cultural meaning. He regarded the painting as the area where mental awareness and the real space of the world could not only meet but also be resolved. The iconography of Gleizes, as of Delaunay, Le Fauconnier and Léger, helps to explain why there is no period in their work corresponding closely to the analytic Cubism developed by Picasso and Braque. It also explains why it was possible for Gleizes and Delaunay to become abstract painters, more theoretically sympathetic to Kandinsky and Mondrian than to Picasso, Braque and Gris, who always remained associated with visual reality.

Given the already established principle that the space of the physical world is not the same as the space of a picture plane and accepting the conviction that perception of the physical world is deformed by the effects of distance, Gleizes’ artistic concern was to reconstitute and synthesize the real world according to his individual consciousness. A major factor in his process was the study of volumes utilized to convey the known solidity and structure of objects, their weight, placement and effects upon each other. Add to this the inseparability of form and color, the modifications in one causing changes to appear in the other (one of the principal lessons of Cézanne) and we arrive at Gleizes’ 1910–11 style of painting. Although forms are simplified and distorted, each shape and color modified by another, they are not splintered. Although his color is sober, it is always rich, never grisaille.

Gleizes did not use the device (found in many works by Picasso and Braque) which involved placement of the form in a shallow space, usually down the center of the canvas, the edges filled with a textured horizontal brushwork, sometimes modifying the composition into an elegant oval. Having always to do with the synthetic treatment of a broad subject, no part of his canvas received less attention than another. Consequently, Gleizes always had to grapple with the problem of getting into the picture plane, a search that led him in 1913 to develop compositional innovations: broad, tilting planes that provide a transition from the perimetric rectangle to the rotating forms at the heart of the painting.

Nothing testified more clearly that Gleizes was aware of the differences between his own interests and those of Picasso and Braque than the article he wrote after seeing Picasso’s work for the first time. Having quoted Apollinaire’s remarks about a return to the grand principles of structure, color and inspiration, he wrote “that the very valuable [précieuses] indications of Picasso and Braque, in spite of everything, did not depart from an impressionism of form which, nevertheless, they opposed to (an impressionism

12Albert Gleizes and Jean Metzinger, Du Cubisme. Paris, 1912. The authors begin their work with a discussion of Courbet.  
13Gleizes and Le Fauconnier are supposed to have met Picasso for the first time when Apollinaire introduced them in a bar, Rue d’Antin, at the moment of the Salon d’Automne. 1911. They accompanied Picasso and Apollinaire to Kahnweiler’s gallery to look at Picasso’s paintings. See: Gleizes. Souvenirs; see also Gleizes. “L’Epopée”, Le Rouge et le Noir, October, 1929, p. 63; see Golding, op. cit., p. 23; see Cabanne, L’Epopée, Paris, 1965, p. 163. Kahnweiler, however, in conversation and in letters to the author, claims, to the best of his recollection, that Gleizes visited his gallery before this date.  
14From the catalogue preface to the Brussels Indépendants, 1911, (see p. 16 supra).
of) color."¹⁵ Gleizes considered the analytical Cubist works of Picasso and Braque, those fugues of intersecting planes, as "an impressionism of form" because of the emphasis on relationships and rhythms set up by parts of a dissected subject. He realized that they were quite distinct from his main concern which was to establish weight, density and volumetric relationships among parts of a broad subject. Although Gleizes himself characterized this phase of his work as an "analysis of volume relationships," it bears little similarity to the traditional use of the word "analytical" in our understanding of Cubism.

In the little reviews and newspapers from pre-World War I Paris, Gleizes had always been identified as one of the Cubist avant-garde. In the journals that chronicle the development of French modernism in the twenties, he continued to hold a prominent place, but he was no longer identified with the avant-garde because Cubism itself was no longer the avant-garde. Instead, it was regarded by some people as a freak, a phenomenon that had passed, or it was looked upon by others merely as groundwork for the newer freedom of Dada or the more specific program of Surrealism. Even after historians began their attempts to analyze the obviously vital role played by Cubism, the name of Albert Gleizes was always mentioned because of his early and important participation in the movement. Yet, by the thirties he came to be regarded as an anachronism for, being alive and decidedly articulate, he had never ceased to call himself a Cubist and presumably a Cubist he remained. Unlike Picasso, he had neither participated in Surrealism nor returned to reality. Nor did he practice that most rational and ordered art, Neo-Plasticism. Although in many ways his theories were close to those developed by Mondrian, his paintings never submitted to the discipline of primary colors and the right angle; they did not look Neo-Plastic. In fact, they looked like nothing else that was being done and indeed, they were rarely seen in the art world because Gleizes deliberately held himself aloof from extensive participation in the Paris scene. In the 1940's, after a decade of infrequent and generally negative criticism from the accepted art press, he was actively taken up by a small group of Catholic intellectuals who regarded

him as something of a hero-saint. Criticism continued in this dual vein until his death: a puzzling artist claimed and admired by a small group of dedicated followers, fervently respected by his few former pupils, but almost ignored by influential critics for some thirty years.

The literature of Cubism, (as of all twentieth century painting) may be divided into two categories: contemporary criticism and historical study—the two overlapping and intermingling as our century advanced. Serious historical study of Cubism, (distinct from criticism), began in the late 1920's. Drawing at first from sources of limited original data, chiefly the opinions of Apollinaire, it came to rely heavily on Der Weg zum Kubismus. (published in 1920 although begun in 1915), an important book by Daniel Henry Kahnweiler, which concentrated on the development of four Cubist painters. Picasso, Braque, Léger and Gris. Our traditional understanding of Cubism has evolved from Kahnweiler's discussion, which was based, to some extent, on the ideas of Juan Gris10 and the two major terms "analytical" and "synthetic", which subsequently emerged, have been widely accepted since the mid-thirties11. Both terms are historical impositions that occurred after the facts they identify, for neither phase was so designated or explained at the time corresponding works were being created. Their wide acceptance was at least partially due to an historical desire to give pattern and continuity to the course of a painting tradition which by 1911 had been irrevocably affected by the Cubist revolution. This, of course, does not invalidate our use of the words analytical and synthetic but it does suggest that a further examination of them might be well advised.

Analytical and synthetic, due to their clear applicability to the paintings of Picasso, Braque and Gris, have long seemed to be perfectly acceptable descriptions of Cubism's development. By 1911, the shattered planes of Braque and Picasso reached "analytical" pinnacles where the initial subjects were only hinted at within the context of the new reality: the painting itself. With the introduction of collage, there emerged a simplification resulting from the broader and flatter shapes of introduced fragments of reality which were reconstituted into a new "synthetic" whole that was, in fact, an image of reality. In addition to the twin phases of Cubism the traditional view also relies heavily on another pair of significant elements: the remarkable Picasso painting, the Demoiselles d'Avignon and the influence of primitive, particularly African and Catalan, sculpture on the Cubist painters.

The most serious general objection to an historical tradition which regards the Demoiselles as the origin of Cubism and, noting the evident influence of primitive art on it, as symptomatic of Cubism's relationship to primitive form is that such deductions are unhistorical. Despite the tempting advantage of simplicity, this familiar explanation fails to give adequate consideration to the complexities of a flourishing art that existed just before and during the period when Picasso's new painting developed. More than fifty years later, we are only beginning to examine the relationships between Cubism and contemporary developments in Germany, Holland, Italy and Russia, where a self-conscious search for a new style was also causing rapid changes in art. If we elect the Demoiselles as the beginning, we must forget that the Impressionists used the double point of view or that the Symbolists (who admired Cézanne, too) flattened the picture plane, reducing their subjects to simple geometry. We find ourselves minimizing the influence of Neo-Impressionist structure and subject matter, not because we do not admire Seurat, but because we cannot see his preoccupations reflected in the Demoiselles, (or in the subsequent work of Picasso and Braque). Similarly, by accepting the simplified view of the Cubist revolution, we tend to neglect parallels in the development of literature and social thought, turning to them only after 1911, after Cubism had become a recognized movement. We even cut ourselves off from a satisfactory explanation of Fauvism, especially with regard to Braque's Fauve period and its consequences for his Cubist activity.

These, briefly, are some of the major objections that can immediately be raised to the dominant historical view of Cubism as descending from the Demoiselles, as a system developed across analytic and synthetic phases by Picasso and Braque and practiced only later by Gris and Léger. As a valuable interpreta-


tion of these painters it has both validity and understanding but as historical analysis of the general development of painting it is incomplete and misleading.

Certainly, it matters little what designation later historians apply to events. If Kahnweiler considers Cubism as Picasso and Braque, our only fault is in subjecting other Cubists’ works to the rigors of that limited definition. The contemporary historian should analyze other Cubist works, even if in the process a qualifying adjective must be added to differentiate between branches of Cubism.

The traditional interpretation, formulated post facto to assist in an appreciation of the works of Braque and Picasso, naturally has also affected our understanding of other twentieth century French painters. But it is difficult to apply to men such as Delaunay, Gleizes, Villon, Metzinger, and Le Fauconnier, who exhibit such fundamental differences from the traditional Cubist works that Kahnweiler even questions their right to be called Cubists at all. If the now historical interpretation is regarded as an ideal definition, naturally these men will fall short of it. To suggest that merely because these artists developed differently or varied from the traditional pattern they deserved to be relegated to a secondary or satellite role in Cubism is a profound mistake. Similarly, it is foolish to assume that they did not understand Cubism’s real meaning, which traditionally had been defined without an examination of their work. Clearly it would be useful to examine their intentions, techniques and theories as carefully as we have those of Picasso and Braque, if necessary adjusting or redefining our theories to take account of what we find.

Our theoretical understanding of Cubism has changed very little since the main interpretive lines were first explored during the 1930’s. Recent studies have gathered and sifted a quantity of important documents from the original period but this information has generally been fitted into the existing framework, contributing many details but merely solidifying our extant comprehension of the movement.

The history of the very word “Cubism” illustrates the dangers inherent in our traditional approach to the history of Cubism. Like the names of many other art movements, its general use was an accident. The traditional approach stresses the fact that Matisse referred to cubes in connection with a Braque painting of 1908 and that the term was published twice by the critic Louis Vauxcelles in a similar context. It is interesting to observe, however, that Louis Chassevent, another critic, made a reference to Cubism as early as 1906 but, since it was made in reference to Delaunay and Metzinger rather than to Picasso or Braque, its possible significance has not been explored. Recent studies have confirmed that the term did not come into anything like general usage until 1911 and then mostly in connection with Gleizes, Metzinger, Delaunay and Léger. If, in attaching special meaning to the word’s history (as historians tend to do) one had sought to find precedence in connection with Metzinger and Delaunay rather than with Picasso and Braque, Chassevent’s use of the “cube” might have assumed the retrospective significance now attached to Vauxcelles’ remarks. Thus, the significance of the word itself is a matter of perspective for, in connection with a 1908 Braque, its general acceptance as the “beginning” of Cubism seems to have occurred because it suited an historical framework in which the historian deliberately sought evidence from an already specified direction. In contrast, recognizing its 1906 usage and the context of its general acceptance in 1911 as the basis, a different historian would be equally justified in identifying Cubism with the efforts of a second group of artists—those who were sufficiently products of their art-culture to fight their battles publicly in the traditional arena: the great salons.

In its earliest usage, the word was a rough characterization of the geometric appearance of certain canvases. In 1911, Apollinaire accepted the term on behalf of a group of artists who had been invited to exhibit at the Brussels Indépendants and the following year, Gleizes and Metzinger wrote and published Du Cubisme, an effort to dispel the confusion raging around the word. Clarifying their aims as painters, this work was, in effect, the first definition of Cubism and it still remains the clearest and most intelligible. The result not merely of collaboration between its two authors but also of discussion by the circle of artists who

---


20See p. 16 for quotation.
met in Puteaux and Courbevoie, it reflects the attitudes of the "artists of Passy", which included the Duchamp-Villon brothers, to whom parts of it were read before publication.

Why did these artists evidently want so much to be understood? It was because they had arrived at their art after a slow and meticulous search and did not relish (any more than had Manet or Cézanne) being taken for madmen. Their visual ideas were susceptible to formulation and, conceiving art as a social function, the authors felt a responsibility to articulate their evidently baffling painting. Such mental attitudes, while perhaps not the stuff of novels, are readily understandable in men who grew up at the end of the nineteenth century, imbued with optimism, believing that environment could be shaped, that life could be improved and—especially—that art, affecting both environment and man, was destined to expand its role in the human consciousness. The whole of the art and life of Albert Gleizes testifies to his consistent attempt to realize those aims. In examining his work—especially in relation to the succeeding interests and influences it manifests—we discover, if not alternatives to the dominant attitude, at least valuable supplementary information. Gleizes is a particularly good subject, for not only was he a fine artist but he was also a brilliant theoretician, even philosopher, who left lucid and logical evidence of his self-conscious development. In Du Cubisme, Gleizes and Metzinger pointed to their specific intentions when they wrote: "...let us admit that the reminiscence of natural forms cannot be banished—in any event, not yet. An art cannot be raised to the level of pure effusion at the first step." In 1912, however, that very year, Delaunay painted his simultaneous discs, in a single unprecedented jump raising the epic subject to cosmic proportions, going far beyond Gleizes' Meudon Landscape, 1911, and Metzinger's Port. But the audacity of Delaunay's synthesis of the sun and moon, daylight and darkness in the whirl of his simultaneous discs had a parallel, perhaps even a source, in Barzan's imagery from La Terrestré Tragédie, published by the Abbaye in 1907:

"In a single glance, I wrap up the earth:
Occident, Orient, both hemispheres—all the globe!
Bathed in daylight and night."

For two years Gleizes meditated on the significance of what Delaunay had accomplished against all expectations. Expressing thoughts which led to the transformation of his own art in 1914–15, Gleizes wrote: "...In 1913 Delaunay defined the goal of Cubism... Behind that luxuriant color... one could realize what Mallarmé meant by 'azure', the perception of plasticity in time, perfect, final, circling, astronomical. Delaunay played with moons and suns like a wondering child."21

Gleizes became obsessed by the search for plastic equivalents of the great themes which had absorbed him for so long but he also became convinced that for every combination of perceptions there was a plastic truth. This development can almost be charted in his portraits of Florent Schmitt. In the 1915 Song of War. (no. 71) the musician's features and movements were described, even though they were contracted to forceful rhythms. But in the later version (no. 72) the figure itself has disappeared, replaced by a synthesis of essential plastic equivalents of his physical reality. The Lorraine Pitcher (no. 73) and its preparatory watercolors (no. 74) witness the same process and in a series of paintings of Toul, Gleizes experimented with the plastic translation of one of his most cherished themes, the city which draws life from the river. His old interests were intensified and pursued even when he came to America. The three Brooklyn Bridge paintings are key examples. Similarly, his continuous development is documented by the 1917 painting Stunt Flying which derives from the 1914 Acrobats. In the earlier work, three trapezists are frozen in flight, suspended in a specifically described circus environment. In Stunt Flying, however, imitated forms are abolished, replaced by soaring rhythm, the exultant sensations of height and velocity. This synthesis of controlled kinesthetic action within a given experience is achieved without the methodology of simultaneous views, without facetting or fragmentation, even without Gleizes' own technique of volumetric relationships.

21 Albert Gleizes, Robert Delaunay, an unpublished manuscript prepared for Abstraction-Création in 1933, revised in 1937 and 1945.
Between 1914 and 1917, Gleizes' evolution was not marked by absolute consistency, for the artist did not conceptually lead his painting toward unshakeable convictions. His work was always directly engaged with environment, especially an unfamiliar one. Thus, his 1916 voyage to Spain resulted in a number of obviously Spanish paintings, (no. 104) hot and exuberant (as well as in a lost Sailboat painting, more consonant with the general course of his development in synthetic abstraction) and few of his paintings are as sensual and immediate as those of Bermuda in which a Cézannesque concern for light-modified forms and his consistent diagonal brushwork overcome any conceptual efforts. Gleizes' concern for human and social values, the very basis of both his subject matter and his individual plastic treatment, did not diminish as his style developed certainty. On the contrary, it increased and at one point, judging by a sudden reduction of his activity in 1918, it even seems to have threatened his life as an artist. Living in the most modern city in the world, the very epitome of collective life, he was alternately exhilarated by its energy and depressed by its industrial conformity, its monotonous production of drab, tasteless shapes. This experience of the "future" occurred at the very moment when he was writing about the need to subordinate individual ego to the greater life of the group in L'Art dans l'Évolution Générale, and was still optimistic about the course of events in Russia. He was torn apart by conflicting forces; his cherished ideals were all but contradicted by a maddening reality.

These conflicts doubtless contributed to an unforeseen experience which took place in the summer of 1918 at the Gleizes' rented house in Pelham, New York. One afternoon, Albert Gleizes came to his wife and said, "A terrible thing has happened to me: I believe I am finding God."23 This new religious conviction resulted not from any mystical visions but instead from Gleizes' rational confrontation of three urgent problems: collective order, individual differences and the painter's role. Although Gleizes did not join the Church until 1941, his next twenty-five years were spent in a logical effort not only to find God but also to have faith. The many-levelled struggle was enacted on the plane of painting, supported by writing and by the manner in which he chose to organize his life. To him, all human activity was inextricably interrelated and he believed that in the post-war world the principles once thought to be the foundations of society were exhausted, no longer valid. "...In all the spheres of the human spirit, there was not one where night was so solidly entrenched as in art. It was an ivory tower, it spoke a strange language, unintelligible to those who lived in the world... The Artist [had become] a curious being, an anarchist, a product of spontaneous generation, a being apart from the crowd."24

His dissatisfaction with the old system and with the anarchy of art led Gleizes toward a passionate pursuit for an absolute order. His self-discipline was extreme, including even renunciation of the broad and powerful touch so characteristic of all his previous painting. The elimination of bewitching textures, surface variations and sensual paint were the clearest sacrifices his own painterly ego could make; plastic interest would henceforth reside in the relationships among forms and shapes, relationships that would communicate the austere essentials usually clouded by appearances. The most disciplined works from the twenties do not produce the tenderest results but, although achieving their effects by color and form alone, Gleizes retained even in their extreme austerity a more varied pallette than any of his contemporaries; violets, pinks and yellows acting on each other. He regarded as false and pernicious the distinction between easel painting and decoration, developed and sustained for so long only because of the pretensions of class society. Thus, in his effort to abolish that distinction, he created paintings like In the City and Along the Avenue, preliminaries to an enormous project for the Gare de M (Moscow) which, of course, was never realized.25 Yet, even as he

22Such a work also reveals in a direct fashion the influence of early training in his father's design atelier.
23Juliette Roche Gleizes, Memoirs, to be published soon. See also J. R. G., "La Belle Journée est Passée", Zodiacque, no. 25, April, 1955, p. 34.
25The project for the Gare de M is in the collection of the Musée de Grenoble.
purgd his art of textures, his color doubled its intensity and his own personality persistently cropped up in vigorous and unique patterns—bars, dots, hatchings and curves, intersections and reverses.

During the early twenties, Gleizes' conscious cultivation of certain subjects at the expense of others became a factor increasingly vital to his artistic developments. In the works from 1914 through the end of the New York period, paintings without subject and paintings with an evident visual basis exist side by side, their difference in degree of abstraction hidden by the uniformity with which they were painted and by the constant effort to tie the plastic realization of the painting to a specific, even unique, experience. In the absence of his individual reflexes, these unique references—no matter how neutral—seem less and less in accord with the generalized nature of his austere, flat painting style.

Throughout the decade, Gleizes tried to reconcile the meaning of life and the universality of painting with the particular image, the source of each work's visual idea. Extending and clarifying his older value distinctions about subjects, he concluded during the twenties that a painting which dwelled wholly on essential rhythms (an object total in itself) was more universal and therefore superior to a painting which retained reminiscences of subjective, individual perception. Thus, although still life, derived from a specific and limited subject, had little universality, his reasoned construction—even an imaginary still life—was more ideal and hence represented a higher reality. Gleizes was approaching abstraction conceptually rather than visually and his intricate dialectic caused him, in 1924, to produce two amusing paintings which departed from his usual subject matter: the Imaginary Still Life: Blue and Green. In effect, Gleizes would have inverted Courbet's "Show me an angel and I will paint you an angel" to be "As long as an angel remains an unembodied ideal and cannot be shown to me, I'll paint it."

These years, during which Gleizes developed his consistent hierarchy of values, also witnessed critical changes in the artist's life. By 1919 the unity of the Cubist movement, the pre-war sense of common effort, had been totally shattered. Paris was dominated by a strong reaction against those dreams of revolutionary construction and common effort which Gleizes continued to cherish, while the avant-garde was characterized by the anarchic and, to him, destructive spirit of Dada. Neither alternative held any appeal for him and, with the Salons once again dominated by conservative painters, his old hostility to the city was constantly nourished. Although supported by Archipenko and Braque, an attempt to revive the spirit of the Section d'Or failed. Similarly, an effort to organize an artists' cooperative received the support of Delaunay, but of no other major painters.

Gleizes, although he had enjoyed considerable prestige both as a man and a painter, gradually became alienated from the Paris art world. Like the ideal protagonists in a Henry James novel, he and Madame Gleizes had enough independent income to pursue their goals without bowing to material considerations, remaining unfettered by the realities that made such heavy demands on many other artists. The Gleizes spent more and more time in the country, at Serrières, Madame Gleizes' family home, or at Cavalaire, then an even quieter spot on the Riviera. Becoming involved with people more sympathetic to his social ideas, he was active in the Union Intellectuelle and lectured extensively in France, Germany, Poland and England. He continued to write and in 1924 the Bauhaus, (where certain ideals analogous to his own were practiced) requested a new book on Cubism.

Gleizes' ideals of a social art, so severely contradicted by the epoch, were nonetheless constant and in 1927, he founded the commune of Moly-Sabata, a second Utopian colony idealistically related to the Abbaye

25Gleizes painted an ironic—and naturalistic—canvas of bathers in 1919, entitled it Homage to the Salon d'Automne.
27Albert Gleizes, Kubismus, Bauhausbücher 13, Munich, Albert Langen Verlag, 1923.
de Créteil. Obstinate ... difficulties, Gleizes established this miniature society deliberately to counterbalance the centripetal pressures of modern life. Into this venture he poured energy, money and all his hope. Planned as a community of artists who were to support themselves by artisan production and agriculture, Moly-Sabata did manage to survive until 1951, although for many years—especially during World War II—it functioned almost purely because of the remarkable dedication of an Australian woman named Anne Dangar.30 The relatively long life of Moly-Sabata was due more to the strength of her commitment than to the general workability of such a semi-agrarian scheme at a time of greater and greater centralization and industrialization.

Concurrent with the establishment of Moly-Sabata, where art was created as a métier and where craftsmanship, agriculture and other activities were placed within the rhythm of daily life, Gleizes embarked on a systematic examination of the art forms of other cultures. In his book La Forme et l'Histoire, Celtic, Romanesque and Oriental forms particularly were studied for their innate and unselfconscious presentation of what he considered to be the fundamental basis of human life. From these studies he concluded that all form derived from human movement, from the kinesthetic sense of man in space, and that all human activity bred form. Architecture was the supreme plastic activity, for it was the most spiritual and socially organized. The natural cadence of life had never been expressed more fruitfully than in Romanesque art, where painting and sculpture were so naturally adjusted to architecture, and that period was to Gleizes a dazzling ideal.

Consciously drawing on traditions that he recognized to be XIIth century, Gleizes exposed himself not only to the exhaustion of his financial resources in Moly-Sabata but also, more cruelly, to the charge of extreme reaction. Unfortunately, Moly-Sabata's program of "a return to the earth" later became one of the principal slogans of Marshal Petain's Vichy government and this ironic mental association, coupled with the Gleizes' long-standing (and intensely sincere) pacifism and work for European unity, eventually led to an understandable bitterness among those who were active in the French resistance.

For a time, in 1928–29, his own painting suffered. One suspects that although this was partly due to a lack of practice it also resulted from a too literal search for the rhythms of the Romanesque (seen in a group of religious paintings related to his studies of Autun and St. Savin) and the practical needs of an ideal; he wanted walls to decorate. A completely non-objective 1924 mural project31 had been rejected because it was incomprehensible. Similarly, his murals for the church of St. Blanche de Serrières, in spite of the iconography depicting the Descent from the Cross, were again rejected as incomprehensible. The Church he so admired could not see the spiritual values of his curves and planes! Indeed, only once did he get an opportunity to realize a large religious mural and it came only in 1951 when he was too old to do much of the execution himself. In a pediment high above the altar in the Jesuit Chapel of Les Fontaines at Chantilly, Gleizes' design for the Eucharist ironically concedes more iconography in title than in specific form.

In La Forme et l'Histoire, Gleizes had subordinated iconography to plastic activity and as he resumed almost feverish painting activity in 1931 his energies were absorbed in the large abstract Paintings for Contemplation. His relatively brief plunge into Scholasticism had naturally strengthened his old hierarchy of values but the key to his entire effort is found in his illustrations for Blaise Pascal's Pensées. Executed in 1949–50, toward the end of Gleizes' life, these etchings deliberately reviewed his entire artistic and human career. The Pensées have for centuries provided philosophical insights into almost all of the ultimate problems of life: the sufficiency of reason, the verifiability of experience, the plausibility of revelation, the exercise of free will. It is perhaps the noblest effort in Western literature to reconcile faith with reason, to reconcile significant human activity with the eternity of Catholicism.

30Originally a painting student of Gleizes', Miss Dangar under his influence became a superb potter, a true disciple of his social ideals and a sincere extension of his artistic consciousness, adapting his art to ceramics and participating selflessly—often under heartbreakingly difficult material conditions—in the rural community life of Iseré.

31For the École du Pharmacie, Paris.

It is from these etchings that we learn the titles of Gleizes’ first *Painting for Contemplation*, (no. 147), a horizontal composition in which the circular movements of earlier more sensual works are reconciled with the austere manner characteristic of his painting of the twenties. From the Pascal we can also trace Gleizes’ intellectual iconography, the meanings that he attached to other works. Thus, the nature of the central element in the *Painting with Seven Elements* (no. 151) is revealed as a variation on the theme “Grandeur of Man.” (see no. 177). Furthermore, the complex development of Gleizes’ attitude toward perception and unique experience is traced through works like the 1914–19 circus theme pictures, which in Pascal are *divertissements*. Reprises of these paintings are juxtaposed with Pascal texts that demonstrate why man cannot remain idle, for he then falls into a melancholy helplessness, realizing his own misery.

Above all, in the Gleizes illustrations to Pascal, we find a conscious explanation for the painter’s final style change which, in the mid-thirties, gradually allowed the austere matte surfaces to metamorphize into an exuberant freedom of application and reintroduction of brushwork, even while keeping the sense of structure and control achieved by his earlier ascetic discipline. The result is the most lyrical work of the artist’s career. With the reintroduction of fluid parallel brushstrokes, serving the double function of texture and cross-rhythms, his paintings of the late thirties point toward the perfect ease, the lyricism of his last paintings. This development is sequential both visually and in terms of Gleizes’ intellectual growth.

His post-Cubist style of the twenties—flat, forthright, uncompromising—is virtually Pascal’s “Spirit of Geometry”. His style of the late thirties, matured in the Meditation series of the forties, is Pascal’s “Spirit of Finesse”, the product of a nimblly discerning mind. The first is reason and the second is faith, originally in opposition to each other but ultimately reconciled.

The “Spirit of Geometry” (exemplified by Pascal’s mathematical approach and Gleizes’ ascetic period) is coolly reasoned. In painting, the shapes are intellectually, if also elegantly, arranged and they represent the structural principles of reality manifest in the solution of pictorial problems. The “Spirit of Finesse”, however, as in the Paintings for Meditations (see especially no. 168), produces shapes that have opened, like a rose relaxing into bloom, creating fullness, grace and a more liquid movement which suffused the picture plane. In his final paintings Gleizes surrendered pure reason to the back of his consciousness and returned (with delight) to the pleasures of paint. Paint was his faith and theory was his reason; and after years of struggle, the two could coexist, complementing and nourishing each other.

Gleizes’ individual development, his unique struggle to reconcile forces, made him one of the few painters to come out of Cubism with a wholly individual style, undisturbed by later artistic movements. Although he occasionally returned to earlier subjects (for example, in 1943 he did a new version of the *Composition with Seven Elements*), these later works were treated anew, on the basis of fresh insights. He never repeated his earlier styles, never remained stationary, but always grew more intense, more passionate.

Albert Gleizes is perhaps the only painter of our century to have consciously struggled between the demands of reason and faith, in a reasonable—indeed a brilliant—manner and finally to have come down on the side of faith. Like Pascal, it is possible to regard him as an apologist for intellectual orthodoxy but it is also possible to regard him as a lucid sceptic who consistently demonstrated that his firm decisions are possible in any area of human activity. He was a metaphysician in an age that wanted not only to reject metaphysics but to deny the relevance of its unanswerable questions. For Gleizes, such a denial was equivalent to denying the grandeur of Man. His life ended in 1953 but his paintings remain to testify to his willingness to struggle for final answers. His is an abstract art of deep significance and meaning, paradoxically human even in his very search for absolute order and truth.
CATALOGUE

Except for certain works which are juxtaposed beside the final versions to which they relate, entries in this catalogue are chronological. References to literature and exhibitions under each heading are abbreviated, and may be found in detail in the documentation section which follows the catalogue.

1. VIEW OF PARIS TOWARD MONTMARTRE. 1901.
(VUE DE PARIS VERS MONTMARTRE).
Oil on canvas, 21 x 251/4" (53,5 x 65 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes 1901".
Lent by Rex de C. Nankivell, London.

An interest in epic subject matter, here the modern city set in surrounding countryside, was already manifest in 1901, the first year that Gleizes began to paint seriously. Although clearly related to Pissarro in technique, the particular point of view as well as the composition and conception of this canvas is a departure from the style of late Impressionism. The density with which it is painted and its solid framework suggest affinities with Pointillism which were often noted by early critics.

2. THE BRIDGE OF NEUILLY IN THE RAIN. 1901.
(LE PONT DE NEUILLY).
Oil on canvas, 21 x 251/4" (53,5 x 65 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes 1901".
Lent by Commandant Georges Houot, La Flèche, France.

In one of several night scenes executed between 1901 and 1903, Gleizes balances his concern for social activity with a study of atmosphere and motion.

3. THE MARKET AT ABBEVILLE. 1903.
(LE MARCHE D'ABBEVILLE).
Oil on canvas, 20 x 231/2" (51 x 60 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes, Abbeville, 1903".
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.

During his years of military service in Picardy and the north, Gleizes' style again moved closer to Impressionism.

Oil on canvas, 21 x 19" (54,5 x 45,5 cm.).
Signed, dated and inscribed l.r. "Albert Gleizes, Picardie, 1904".
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.

Although Gleizes became increasingly concerned with light and color effects, his early interest in views over enormous distances nevertheless continued.

5. THE MARKET AT COURBEOY. 1905.
(LE MARCHE A COURBEOY).
Oil on canvas, 21 x 251/4" (54 x 65 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes 05".
Lent by Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lyon.
Chapelle du Lycée Ampère, Lyon, 1947, no. 2.

Gleizes' affinity with Pissarro was particularly marked in scenes of city life.

6. THE CHURCH NEAR THE ABBEY OF CRETEIL. 1908.
(L'eglise, SOUVENIR DE L'ABBEY DE CRETEIL).
Ink, 13 x 11" (34 x 28 cm.).
Signed, dated and inscribed l.r. "Albert Gleizes 1908 L'Eglise, l'Abbaye de Creteil 1908".
Lent by Walter Firpo, Marseilles.

The taut surface of this drawing, completed just before the dissolution of the idealistic Abbey, possibly results from a reworking in the early forties.

7. CHURCH AT CRETEIL (EGLISE A CRETEIL). 1908.
Oil on canvas, 55 x 40" (141 x 101,5 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes 1908".
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.
Exhibition: Galerie Drouant-David, Paris, 1943, no. 10.

The landscapes from the Creteil period show an increasing concern for solidity, a much broader handling of the paint, and a careful balancing of rhythms, foreshadowing what would develop into one of Gleizes' paramount concerns. The man in the foreground is probably Dr. Morinaud, later the subject of The Man on the Balcony (no. 32).

8. CANAL BOATS ON THE SEINE. 1908.
(PENICHE SUR LA SEINE).
Oil on canvas, 21 x 251/4" (54 x 65 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes 1908".
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.
Musée Calvet, Avignon, 1962, no. 4.

Unmodelled areas of bright color appear in a 1903 Still Life of Flowers (in his sister's collection at La Fée), but Gleizes does not seem to have explored these possibilities further until early in 1908 when works such as this show affinities to Fauve painting.

9. PARIS FROM THE SEINE (BORD DE RIVIÈRE), 1908.
Oil on canvas, 21 1/4 x 25 1/4" (54 x 65 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "A. Gleizes 08".
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.
Musée Calvet, Avignon, 1962, no. 5.

Gleizes' Fauve-like period was brief, lasting only a few months, and even when his painting was thickest and color brightest, his concern for structural rhythms and simplification was dominant.

10. LANDSCAPE IN THE PYRENEES MOUNTAINS, 1908.
(PAYSAGE DANS LES PYRÉNÉES).
Oil on canvas, 20 1/4 x 25 1/4" (53 x 65 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "A. Gleizes 1908".
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.
Exhibitions: René Gimpel Galerie, New York, 1937, no. 2 (as "Paysage à la coulure simplifiée").
Chapelle du Lycée Ampère, Lyon, 1947, no. 3.
Musée Calvet, Avignon, 1962, no. 7.
Musée de Grenoble, 1963, no. 3.

Gleizes spent several summers in Gascouy where he painted this key work in which the process of geometric simplification (more akin to Point Aven and Nabi principles than to Cézanne) is well advanced. The painting also bears a marked affinity to the work of Le Fauconnier, although the two artists had not yet become friends.

11. DONKEY CARTS, 1906.
(CHARETTES À BAGNÈRES DE BIGORRE).
Watercolor, 9 1/4 x 12 1/4" (24 x 32.5 cm.).
Signed and dated l.l. "A. Gleizes 06 B. de. B."
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Meyer P. Potamkin, Philadelphia.

12. LANDSCAPE NEAR BAGNÈRES DE BIGORRE, 1909.
(ENVIRONS DE BAGNÈRES DE BIGORRE).
Ink, 11 x 17" (28 x 43 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "A. Gleizes près de B. de Bigorre 09".
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.

During his 1909 trip to Gascouy, Gleizes concentrated exclusively on landscape, reducing the forms of nature to primary shapes.

13. WALLED CITY (VILLE FORTIFIÉE), 1909-10.
Oil on canvas, 21 1/4 x 25 1/4" (54 x 65 cm.).
Signed l.r. "A. Gleizes".
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Siegfried Ullmann, Palm Beach, Florida.
Provenance: Private Collection, Wisconsin.
André Emmerich, New York.

By treating the sky in geometric terms and by modifying curves to become sharper, slightly angled lines, Gleizes began to hold his compositions consistently to the surface plane. His awareness of Cézanne is here more evident, even in the handling of paint.

14. PARIS (LES QUAI), 1908.
Oil on canvas, 21 x 25 1/4" (54 x 65 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "A. Gleizes 08".
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.

Preliminary drawing for no. 13.

15. PARIS (LES QUAI), 1910.
Oil on canvas, 21 x 25 1/4" (54 x 65 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "A. Gleizes 1910".
Lent by Professor and Mrs. Milhou Handler, New York.
Provenance: George Moos, Geneva.

He converted older drawings (no. 14) into new paintings, subordinating his former concern for social activity to his fresh interest in construction. Here, an overall rose tonality was employed to counter the illusion of depth.

16. HOUSES AMONG TREES, 1910.
(MAISONS DANS LES ARBRES).
Oil on canvas, 44 1/4 x 60" (113.5 x 154 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "A. Gleizes 1910".
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.
Exhibitions: Exposition Universelle, Lyon, 1914.

In this work, Gleizes attempted to consolidate his recent advances with the older Picard landscape theme (no. 4), in order to find the underlying principles that organize a vast scene.

17. BY THE SEINE (BORD DE LA SEINE, MEUDON), 1909.
Pencil and ink, 9 1/4 x 12 1/4" (23.5 x 31 cm.).
Signed and dated l.l. "A. Gleizes 09".
Lent by Walter Firpo, Marseilles.

18. ROAD, TREES AND HOUSES, 1910.
(ENVIRONS DE MEUDON).
Pencil, crayon and watercolor, 9 1/4 x 12 1/4" (23.5 x 31 cm.).
Signed and dated l.l. "A. Gleizes 1910".
Lent by Walter Firpo, Marseilles.

19. THE TREE (L'ARBRE), 1910.
Oil on canvas, 36 x 28 1/4" (91.5 x 72.5 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "A. Gleizes 10".
Private Collection, Paris.
Salon de la Section d'Or, Paris, 1912, no. 34.
Trente Ans d'Art Indépendant, Grand Palais, Paris, 1926.
René Gimpel Galerie, New York, 1937, no. 6.
The effort to grasp the intricate rhythms of a panorama resulted in a comprehensive geometry of intersecting and overlapping forms which created a new and more dynamic quality of movement.

23. LANDSCAPE AT MEUDON (PAYSAGE, MEUDON). 1911.
Oil on canvas, 57 × 45 1/4 (147 × 115 cm).
Exhibitions: Les Indépendants, Brussels, 1911, no. 30, (as Le Chemin).
Salon de la Section d’Or, Paris, 1912, no. 39.

Man is reintroduced, but subordinated to the heroic concept of landscape which simultaneously comprehends the close and the distant, the earth’s curve, the sun, even the force of wind against trees.

24. PORTRAIT OF MADAME BARZUN. 1911.
Oil on canvas, 39 × 28” (99 × 71 cm.).
Signed and dated li. “Albert Gleizes 1911”.
Lent by Jacques Barzun, New York.

Began in the spring, this portrait was never finished, for after the summer Gleizes realized that his intervening stylistic development made it impossible to complete the portrait in a homogeneous style.

Ink, 20 × 15” (51 × 38 cm).
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.

Oil on canvas, 23 1/4 × 21” (65 × 54 cm).
Signed and dated lr. “Albert Gleizes 11”.
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.
Exhibitions: Art Contemporain, Paris, 1911, no. 36.
Galerie Dalmau, Barcelona, 1912, no. 17.
Musée Calvet, Avignon, 1962, no. 8.
Musée de Grenoble, 1963, no. 6.

27. PORTRAIT OF JACQUES NAYRAL. 1911.
Oil on canvas, 70 × 51 1/4” (180 × 130 cm).
Signed and dated lr. “Albert Gleizes 1911”.
Lent by Commandant Georges Honat, La Flèche, France.
Salon de la Section d’Or, Paris, 1912, no. 38.
In 1910 Gleizes began this portrait of his old friend, Jacques Nayral, the young author-dramatist who two years later married Mireille Gleizes. Nayral, a partisan of the synthetic-social ideas of the Abbaye, was editor-in-chief for the publishing house of Figuière, and directly responsible for the publication of Gleizes and Metzinger’s Du Cubisme as well as for Apollinaire’s Les Peintres Cubistes and the projected series Tous les Arts. This work, in which the background shows Gleizes’ Courbevoie garden, stylistically fulfills the direction established in the unfinished portrait of Mme. Barzun.

Oil on canvas, 48½ x 38½" (123 x 98 cm).
Signed l.r. “Albert Gleizes”.
Lent by Edouard Labouchère, Paris.
Provenance: René Jaffé, Brussels.
Jack of Diamonds, Moscow, 1912.
Salon de la Section d’Or, Paris, 1912, no. 37.
Le Cubisme, Musée National d’Art Moderne, Paris, 1913, no. 64 bis.
Les Chef d’Oeuvres des collections privées françaises, Haus der Kunst, Munich, 1961, no. 51.
Musée de Grenoble, 1963, no. 3.

Literature: APOLLINAIRE, G. L’Intransigeant, October 10, 1911.
(Chroniques d’Art, 1960, p. 199).
Cahiers d’Albert Gleizes, Lyon, 1957 (frontispiece).

Here Gleizes not only created a synthetic landscape, in which elements are placed in unreal but symbolic relationships to each other, but also created a synthesis of social experience, showing two distinct types of human use of the land. Le Fauconnier painted a similar subject the following year. Dorival has suggested that the treatment of the horses may well be an important source for those of Duchamp-Villon in 1914.

29. THE KITCHEN (LA CUISINE). 1911.
Oil on canvas, 46½ x 37½" (118.5 x 94.5 cm).
Signed and dated l.r. “Abb Gleizes”.
Lent by Marlborough-Gerson Gallery, New York.
Exhibitions: Salon de la Section d’Or, Paris, 1912, no. 36.
Moderni Umeni, S.V.U., Manes, Prague, 1914, no. 34.
René Gimpel Galerie, New York, 1937, no. 7.
Passepied Gallery, New York, 1949, no. 3.
Le Cubisme, Musée National d’Art Moderne, Paris, 1953, no. 64 ter.

Oil on canvas, 24 x 15½" (61 x 39 cm).
Signed and dated l.l. “Abb Gleizes 12”.
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Harry Lewis Winston, Birmingham, Michigan.
Provenance: Earl Stenaul, Hollywood, California.
Théodore Schemp, Paris.
Exhibitions: Moderne Kunst Kring, Amsterdam, 1912, no. 113.
Société Normande de Peinture Moderne, Rouen, 1912, no. 92.
Winston Collection, University of Michigan Museum, 1955.
The Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Lewis Winston, Detroit, Institute of Arts, Virginia Museum of Art, San Francisco Museum of Art, The Milwaukee Art Institute, 1957–58, no. 45.

This study, developed in connection with the large Bathers (no. 31), is related to a 1910 painting, Nude, (present whereabouts unknown) and represents an effort to fuse classical subjects to new methods.

Oil on canvas, 41½ x 67½" (106 x 170 cm).
Signed and dated l.l. “Albert Gleizes 1912”.
Moderni Umeni, S.V.U., Manes, Prague, 1914, no. 36.
Trente Ans d’Art Indépendant, Grand Palais, Paris, 1926, no. 1057.

BONFANTE, E. and RAVENNA, J. Arte Cubista con “Le Meditazos Estetiche su la Peinture” di Gail- baume Apollinaire, Venice, 1945, no. LVIII.

In The Bathers (as in Delaunay’s City of Paris, 1912 and, to a lesser extent, in Metzinger’s Meadow Landscape, 1913), certain elements from modern industrial life are sharply contrasted with the classical presence of the nudes, yet the relationships are formally resolved. This optimistic reconciliation of traditional harmony with contemporary life was an aspect of simultaneity that was of particular concern to the Passy group of Cubists.
32. THE MAN ON THE BALCONY, 1912.
(L'HOMME AU BALCON).
Oil on canvas, 77 × 53" (195 × 135 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes 12".

International Exhibition of Modern Art (The Armory Show), New York, Chicago, Boston, 1913, no. 196.

This work, with Delaunay's City of Paris, is the largest and most ambitious Cubist painting undertaken up to this point (1912). It summarizes Gleizes' interests, presenting an epic panorama of mountains, valleys, clouds and smoke, towns, workers and wheat, a simultaneous celebration of the harvest, nature and man in idealistic harmony. The painting is Gleizes' parallel to Le Fauconnier's Abondance, and it seems likely that it takes its theme not merely from the social and synthetic program of the Abbaye de Créteil, but specifically from the long poem of Henri Martin Barzun, La Montagne, poème légendaire, the 5th part of La Terre Terrestre Tragédie (Paris, Mercure de France, 1908); "Les Moissonneurs dans les Épis, armés de faux et de fanciles ..." (pp. 49-56).

33. SKETCH FOR "HARVEST THRESHING", 1912.
(ÉTUDE POUR "LE DÉPIQUAGE DES MOISSONS").
Oil on board, 20 × 25½" (51 × 65 cm.).
Signed l.r. "Albert Gleizes".
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Josefsowitz, New York.

Exhibitions: Salon de la Section d'Or, Paris, no. 43 bis.
Moderni Umeni, S.V.U., Manes, Prague, 1914, no. 37.

The cathedral had a special fascination for many French Cubists, not only because of its admirable architecture but because of the social and historical synthesis which resulted from its context as the focal point of an otherwise modern town.

34. HARVEST THRESHING (LE DÉPIQUAGE DES MOISSONS) 1912.
Oil on canvas, 106 × 138½" (269 × 353 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes 1912".
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.

Exhibitions: Salon de la Section d'Or, Paris, 1912, no. 43.
Trente Ans d'Art Indépendant, Paris, 1926, no. 1038.

This work, with Delaunay's City of Paris, is the largest and most ambitious Cubist painting undertaken up to this point (1912). It summarizes Gleizes' interests, presenting an epic panorama of mountains, valleys, clouds and smoke, towns, workers and wheat, a simultaneous celebration of the harvest, nature and man in idealistic harmony. The painting is Gleizes' parallel to Le Fauconnier's Abondance, and it seems likely that it takes its theme not merely from the social and synthetic program of the Abbaye de Créteil, but specifically from the long poem of Henri Martin Barzun, La Montagne, poème légendaire, the 5th part of La Terre Terrestre Tragédie (Paris, Mercure de France, 1908); "Les Moissonneurs dans les Épis, armés de faux et de fanciles ..." (pp. 49-56).

35. CHARTRES CATHEDRAL, 1912.
(LA CATHÉDRALE DE CHARTRES).
Oil on canvas, 28½ × 33½" (72.5 × 60 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes 12".
Lent by Städtische Galerie im Landesmuseum, Hannover.

Exhibitions: Société Normande de Peinture Moderne, Rouen, 1912, no. 93.
Salon de la Section d'Or, Paris, 1912, no. 42 (as The Church).

The cathedral had a special fascination for many French Cubists, not only because of its admirable architecture but because of the social and historical synthesis which resulted from its context as the focal point of an otherwise modern town.

36. THE PORT (LE PORT), 1912.
Pencil, 6 × 7½" (15 × 19 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r., "Alb Gleizes 12"; on reverse, "Dessin pour le tableau Un Port 1912 qui appartient à Madame Duchamp-Villon Rue Lemaître à Puteaux (Seine) No. 211."
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.

Provenance: from the artist, 1938.

37. THE PORT (LE PORT MARCHAND), 1912.
Oil on canvas, 35⅓ × 45½" (90 × 116.5 cm.).
Signed l.r. "Albert Gleizes 12".
Lent by The Art Gallery of Toronto, Gift from the Junior Women's Committee Fund, 1955.

Provenance: Raymond Duchamp-Villon.
Madame Lignières Duchamp-Villon.

Galerie Berthe Weill, Paris, 1913, no. 1.
Moderni Umeni, S.V.U., Manes, Prague, 1914, no. 43.
Le Cubisme, 1907–1914, Musée National d'Art Moderne, 1953, no. 87.
II Bienal, São Paulo, 1953, no. 17.


The Port, also a popular Neo-Impressionist subject, was another characteristic theme appropriate to the interests of the Passy
Cubists. The word on the hull of the center ship is probably the first

time lettering appeared in a Gleizes painting, perhaps due to the

influence of Picasso and Braque, but in this case, the foreignness of

the word “King” reinforces symbolic associations of the Port, an

international commercial center.

38. LANDSCAPE (PAYSAGE). 1912.

Oil on board, 14\texttimes 17\texttimes (37.5 \times 43.5 cm).

Signed and dated l.l. “Alb Gleizes 12”.

Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.

Provenance: from the artist, 1938.

Exhibitions: Moderne Kunst Krüng, Amsterdam, 1912, no. 114.
Cubism, Arts Club of Chicago, 1955, no. 36.

With this work (actually the mouth of a river) Gleizes again takes up

themes from his earliest paintings.


Oil on canvas, 22\texttimes 28\texttimes (58 \times 72.5 cm).

Signed ll. “Albert Gleizes”.


Exhibitions: Salon de la Section d’Or, Paris, 1912, no. 41.
Société Normande de Peinture Moderne, Rouen, 1912, no. 91.
Der Sturm, Berlin, July, 1914.

Literature:

A synthesis of the modern city with its smoke, river and steel
bridges, this work probably refers also to the spirit of solidarity
among the newly formed “Artists of Passy”. In this sense it
indicates an awareness of factions within Cubism.


(LES JOUEURS DE FOOTBALL).

Oil on canvas, 89 \times 72 \texttimes (226 \times 183 cm).

Signed and dated ll. “Albert Gleizes 1912–13”.

Private Collection, New York.

Provenance: Collection Dalmau, Barcelona.

Erster Deutscher Herbstsalon, Berlin, 1913, no. 147.
Galerie Dalmau, Barcelona, 1916.

Literature:
Montjoie, no. 4, March 29, 1913, reproduction of drawing for Football Players.
Azagra, E. El Cubismo, Barcelona, 1949, no. 41.

The role of team sport, especially in the context of mass audience
participation, reflects another interest of the artists of Passy.
Jacques Nayaral was occasionally a sports writer (cf. L’Action Nou
velle, February 25, 1914) and a fan (as was Delaunay) of foot and
bicycle racing. Gleizes’ Football Players dates from the same year as
Delaunay’s Cardiff Team.

41. THE METRO (LE METRO). 1912.

Oil on canvas, 15 \times 18 \texttimes (38 \times 46 cm).

Signed ll. “Alb Gleizes”.

Lent by Rex de C. Nan Kivell, London.

Exhibition: Galerie Berthe Weill, Paris, 1913, no. 3, (as La Gare).

Embodying as it did the modern realities of speed and decreased
distance (hence simultaneity), the railroad, treated in plastic terms,
was a logical subject for Gleizes. Although less heroic than Delaun-
ay’s Hommage to Blériot, it is symptomatic of an essential over-
lapping interest shared by these men.

42. PORTRAIT OF THE PUBLISHER FIGUIÈRE. 1913.

(PORTRAIT DE FIGUIÈRE).

Oil on canvas, 56 \times 40\texttimes (143 \times 102 cm).

Signed and dated ll. “Alb Gleizes 13”.

Lent by Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lyon.

Exhibitions: Salon d’Automne, 1915, no. 768.
Moderni Umeni, S.V.U., Manes, Prague, 1914, no. 47.
Chapelle du Lycée Ambérie, Lyon, 1947, no. 4.

Literature:
 Allard, R. Les Écrits Français, 1913, p. 3.
 Gleizes, A. Kubismus, Munich, 1928, pl. 9.

Engène Figuière, head of his own publishing company, strove to be
identifiable with every modern development. In this portrait which
Salmon admired for its “fine and most adroit psychology”, he is
surrounded by his publications which were written by Gleizes’
friends: Mercereau, Georges Polti, Apollinaire, Metzinger, Paul
Fort, Gustave Kahn, Henri Martin Barzun and Jacques Nayaral.

43. MAN IN A HAMMOCK (L’HOMME AU HAMAC). 1909.

Sepia ink over pencil, 12\texttimes 16\texttimes (32 \times 40.5 cm).

Signed ll. “A. Gleizes”.

Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.

44. MAN IN A HAMMOCK (L’HOMME AU HAMAC). 1913.

Pencil and ink, 7\texttimes 6\texttimes (20 \times 15 cm).

Signed and dated ll. “Alb Gleizes, 1913”.

Lent by Walter Firpo, Marseilles.
45. MAN IN A HAMMOCK (L’HOMME AU HAMAC). 1913.
Oil on canvas. 51¼ × 61¼" (130 × 155.5 cm.).
Signed and dated ll. “Alb Gleizes 13”.
Lent by Albright-Knox Art Gallery, Buffalo.
Exhibitions: Moderni Umeni, S.V.U., Manes, Prague, 1914, no. 41.
Der Sturm, Berlin, July, 1914.
Literature: apollinaire, g. L’Epopee, Le Rouge et le Noir, October, 1929, p. 31.

This painting presents an interesting synthesis of back and forth motion and introduces a composition based on the intersection of powerful diagonals. It goes back to a number of related sources in addition to the drawings no. 43, 44. A large and finished painting of Man in a Hammock dating from the summer of 1909 is on the reverse of Houses among Trees 1910, (no. 16). In the pre-Cubist version and in a small oil sketch (once in the Dr Bienert collection, Dresden), the man wears a large sombrero.

46. THE CITY AND THE RIVER. 1913.
(LA VILLE ET LE FLEUVE).
Ink. 7/8 × 6/7" (19.5 × 16 cm.).
Signed, dated and inscribed lr. “Alb Gleizes 1913 La Ville et le Fleuve”.
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.

This drawing (see fig. 3, p. 10) is the only presently known record of one of Gleizes’ most important works, The City and the River, which combined in a large canvas all his attitudes toward the modern city: its location in landscape, its establishment and life on the bank of a river. An oil sketch, once in the Graf collection, Stuttgart, unfortunately has also disappeared.

47. SEWING WOMEN (FEMMES COUSANT). 1913.
Oil on canvas. 73 × 94½" (185.5 × 242 cm.).
Signed and dated ll. “Alb Gleizes 13”; on reverse “A. Gleizes les femmes qui cousent”.
Lent by Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller, Otterlo.
Blumenfeld, Berlin, with Komter, Amsterdam.
Komter sale, Marks, Amsterdam, January 24, 1922.
Exhibitions: Der Sturm, Berlin, 1913.
Kestner Gesellschaft, Hannover-Düsseldorf, 1928, no. 65.
Volkswissenschaft, Rotterdam, 1949.
Gleizes, a. Tradition et Cubisme, Paris, 1927, pl. 5.

The artist’s mother and two sisters were the models for this work. The treatment of faces and hands shows the close relationship between the individual styles of Gleizes and Metzinger shortly after the publication of Du Cubisme. An oil sketch for the central head is in the collection of Dr. Kriegl, Lackawanna, New York.

48. THE HARBOR, sketch for “FISHING BOATS”. 1913.
(LE PORT, étude pour “LES BÂTEAUX DE PÊCHE”).
Watercolor. 25½ × 19½" (65.5 × 49 cm.).
Signed and dated lr. “Alb Gleizes 1913”.
Lent by Nationalmuseum, Stockholm.

49. FISHING BOATS (LES BÂTEAUX DE PÊCHE). 1913.
Oil on canvas. 65 × 43½" (165 × 111 cm.).
Signed and dated lr. “Alb Gleizes 13”.
Lent by Madame Ferdinand Möller, Cologne.
Provenance: Kornier, Essen.
Moderni Umeni, S.V.U., Manes, Prague, 1914, no. 44.
Der Sturm, Nationalgalerie, Berlin, 1961, no. 85.
küppers, p. e. Der Kubismus, Leipzig, 1920, pl. 3.

Apollinaire called this painting the “glory” of the Salon d’Automne, 1913. It recapitulates the artist’s longstanding social concern for scenes of work as well as his interest in night effects.

50. DRAWING FOR “HEAD IN A LANDSCAPE”. 1913.
(ÉTUDE POUR “TÊTE D’HOMME”).
Sepia ink. 4½ × 6½" (11 × 16.5 cm.).
Signed and dated lr. “Alb Gleizes 1913”.
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York, Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Cohn, 1964.

51. HEAD IN A LANDSCAPE (TÊTE D’UN HOMME). 1913.
Oil on canvas. 14¼ × 19¼" (36 × 50.5 cm.).
Signed and dated lr. “Alb Gleizes 13”.
Lent anonymously.
Exhibition: Galerie Hans Goltz, Munich, 1913, no. 31.

The work is probably a self-portrait.

52. LANDSCAPE WITH BRIDGE. Circa 1912–13.
(PAYSAGE AVEC UN PONT).
Ink. 7 × 5½" (18 × 14 cm.).
Signed and dated ll. “Alb Gleizes 1910–12”.
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Lester Avnet, Kings Point, New York.

53. LANDSCAPE (PAYSAGE). 1913.
Oil on canvas. 33½ × 28½" (85 × 72.5 cm.).
Signed and dated ll. “Alb Gleizes 13”.
Lent by Ferdinand Howald Collection, The Columbus Gallery of Fine Arts, Ohio.
Provenance: John Quinn, New York, 1927.
Ferdinand Howald.
One of a number of small paintings from 1912-13 involving the theme of the bridge, this suburban landscape relates to the background of Seating Women (no. 47) and the preparatory drawing (no. 52).

54. LANDSCAPE WITH WINDMILL. 1913.
(PAYSAGE AVEC MOULIN).
Oil on canvas, 381 x 314" (98.5 x 79.5 cm.).
Signed LL. "Alb Gleizes 13."
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Arthur G. Altschul, New York.
Concentrating more on effect, the power of wind, harnessed for man's use, rather than on the object, this painting contrasts with a slightly earlier variant once in the Jacques Villon collection.

55. STUDY FOR "PORTRAIT OF IGOR STRAVINSKY". 1914.
(ÉTUDE POUR STRAVINSKY).
Ink, 101/2 x 71/2" (26 x 20 cm.).
Signed, dated and inscribed LR. "Étude Stravinsky, Paris, Juin, 1914, Alb Gleizes".
Lent by Walter Farpo, Marseilles.

56. PORTRAIT OF IGOR STRAVINSKY. 1914.
Oil on canvas, 51 x 45 1/4" (130 x 114.5 cm.).
Signed, dated and inscribed LR. "Albert Gleizes 1914, Igor Stravinsky."
Lent by Richard S. Zeidler, New York.
Exhibitions: Montross Gallery, New York, 1916, no. 35.
Chapelle du Lycée Ampère, Lyon, 1917, no. 5.
L'Oeuvre du XXe siècle, Musée National d'Art Moderne, Paris, 1922.
"Présence d'Albert Gleizes", Zodiaque, nos. 6-7, January 1952, p. 31.
For the Portrait of Stravinsky there exist half a dozen pen and ink studies, such as no. 55, as well as a large oil sketch which bears the inscription, "Étude pour Stravinsky, Petrouchka, Théâtre de Champs-Élysées". Gleizes had followed the development of modern music since his association with Albert Doyen at the Abbaye.

57. TWO WOMEN IN FRONT OF A WINDOW. 1914.
(FEMMES ASSISES DEVANT UNE FENÊTRE).
Gouache, 181 x 211" (47.6 x 54 cm.).
Signed and dated LR. "Alb Gleizes 1914."
Lent by Marlborough-Gerson Gallery, New York.
Exhibition: Marlborough Gallery, London, 1956, cat. no. 46.

58. TWO WOMEN IN FRONT OF A WINDOW. 1914.
(FEMMES ASSISES DEVANT UNE FENÊTRE).
Oil on canvas, 41 x 57" (103.5 x 45 cm.).
Signed and dated "Alb Gleizes 14."
Lent by Pedro Vallenilla Echeverría, Caracas.
Provenance: John Quinn, 1927.
Pierre Matisse.
Exhibition: Carroll Galleries, New York, 1915, no. 31.
Literature: The John Quinn Collection, Huntington, New York, 1926.
The artist's mother and sister once again are seen from the interior of the Courbet house where the arabesque against the window recalls the grille motif first expressed in the 1909 drawing for The Kitchen, now in Lyon.

59. SKETCH FOR "THE CITY". 1914.
(ÉTUDE POUR "LA VILLE").
Ink, 10 1/2 x 8" (27 x 20 cm.).
Signed and dated LL. "Alb Gleizes 14."
Lent by Mrs. and Mrs. Samuel J. Zacks, Toronto.
There is another version of this drawing in the Leftert collection, New York. Both are the basis for one of Gleizes' rare early etchings, and are preliminary notations for the 1914 painting The City, formerly in the Quinn collection, now in a private collection, Chicago.

60. MONTREUIL LANDSCAPE. 1914.
(PAYSAGE DE MONTREUIL).
Oil on canvas, 281 x 361" (73 x 92 cm.).
Signed and dated LR. "Alb Gleizes 14."
Lent by Saarländisches Museum, Saarbrücken.
Provenance: Nell Walden.
Stuttgarter Kunstkabinett, 1954.
Exhibitions: Sammlung Nell Walden, Galerie Flechtheim, Berlin, 1927, no. 75.
Wege abstrakter Malerei, Galerie Gunther Franke, Munich, 1929-30, no. 12.
Der Sturm, Kunstmuseum, Bern, 1944-45, no. 284.
Expressionisten, Kunsthalle, Zürich, 1945, no. 38.
Exposition Verkaufter Kunst, Kunsthalle, Recklinghausen, 1957, no. 55.
Der Sturm, Nationalgalerie, Berlin, 1961, no. 86.
Among the last of Gleizes' pre-war suburban landscapes, this canvas should be compared with the Landscape, no. 53, to demonstrate that although he continued to deal with deep space and wide vistas, he did so with a marked reduction of specific references to reality.

61. STUDY FOR "WOMAN AT THE PIANO". 1913.
(ÉTUDE POUR "FEMME AU PIANO").
Watercolor, 101/2 x 81/2" (27 x 21 cm.).
Not signed or dated.
This painting of one of his sisters playing the piano in the house at Courbevoie is an important source for the first Portrait of Florent Schmitt (no. 70).

In terms of picture construction, sketches such as this for the unfinished 14th of July are of critical importance, for their rhythms anticipate Gleizes' vital theory of translation and rotation. They culminated in a gouache, (sold from the Gleizes exhibition, Galerie des Garets, 1947, whereabouts unknown) because the projected painting was barely underway when war broke out in 1914.

These studies survive for this majestic portrait of Professor Lourbet of Nancy. Painted at the fortress city of Toul, late 1914-early 1915, it began to fuse circular rhythms (see the treatment of the shoulders) to the established composition based on intersecting diagonals, (see cat. nos. 45, 47).

The Moselle river, spanned by a bridge, dominates the lower part of this composition, one of several studies for two 1915 paintings of the City of Toul. The first of these, in the Bourdon collection, Paris, is an echo of the City and the River theme. The second, (exhibited Marlborough, London, 1956, no. 11) converts the subject into powerful circular rhythms, akin to nos. 72, 73, 75.

Florent Schmitt, an important French composer, was stationed at Toul with Gleizes. This large portrait marks the beginning of an attempt to preserve specific and individual visual characteristics while experimenting with a radically different compositional treatment in which broad planes, angled from the perimeter, meet circles. The source for such a method is found in the drawings for the 14th of July, (no. 63).

At least eight studies survive for this majestic portrait of Professor Lourbet of Nancy. Painted at the fortress city of Toul, late 1914-early 1915, it began to fuse circular rhythms (see the treatment of the shoulders) to the established composition based on intersecting diagonals, (see cat. nos. 45, 47).

The Moselle river, spanned by a bridge, dominates the lower part of this composition, one of several studies for two 1915 paintings of the City of Toul. The first of these, in the Bourdon collection, Paris, is an echo of the City and the River theme. The second, (exhibited Marlborough, London, 1956, no. 11) converts the subject into powerful circular rhythms, akin to nos. 72, 73, 75.

Florent Schmitt, an important French composer, was stationed at Toul with Gleizes. This large portrait marks the beginning of an attempt to preserve specific and individual visual characteristics while experimenting with a radically different compositional treatment in which broad planes, angled from the perimeter, meet circles. The source for such a method is found in the drawings for the 14th of July, (no. 63).
Lent by Musée National d'Art Moderne, Paris.

Galerie Drouant-David, Paris, 1943, no. 16.
La Musique, Besançon, 1957.


The Song of War realized the fusion sought in the first portrait of Florent Schmitt and successfully integrated schematic indications of the composer into the overall whirl of the composition.

72. COMPOSITION. 1915.
Oil on canvas, 39\(\frac{1}{2}\) \(\times\) 53\(\frac{1}{2}\)" (97 \(\times\) 131 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Alb Gleizes 15".
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.
Exhibitions: L'Art Abstrait, St. Etienne, 1937, no. 59 (pl. 25).
Musée de Grenoble, 1963, no. 11 (frontispiece).

This work, based on The Song of War, is Gleizes' first abstract composition. In it a total balance of planes and circular movement is achieved, the painter carefully building his forms in logical transition from the square of the canvas. A student's version of this painting later decorated the exterior wall of his studio in St. Remy-de-Provence.

73. COMPOSITION. 1915.
Oil on canvas, 40 \(\times\) 50\(\frac{1}{2}\)" (101.5 \(\times\) 99 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes 15".

This complex painting is based on compositional problems related to nos. 71 and 72.

74. THE LORRAINE PITCHER. 1914.
(LA CRUCHE LORRAINE).
Watercolor, 12 \(\times\) 8" (30.5 \(\times\) 20.5 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes. Toul. 14".
Lent by The Los Angeles County Museum, Mr. and Mrs. William Preston Harrison Collection.

75. THE LORRAINE PITCHER. 1915.
(LA CRUCHE LORRAINE).
Oil on canvas, 40 \(\times\) 40" (101.5 \(\times\) 101.5 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Alb Gleizes 15".
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Herbert M. Rothschild, Kitchawan, New York.
René Gimpel Galerie, New York, 1957, no. 10.

Searching for subjects appropriate to his new interests in circular movement, Gleizes found a typical Lorraine vase, a long jar with as many as four circular handles attached to its neck. This traditional form, whose possibilities had been explored for centuries, became the subject for one of Gleizes' rare still life paintings. (Throughout his life Gleizes was deeply attached to the principles of artisanship.) Several studies, among them no. 74, preceded this work.

76. THE PARISIENNE, PORTRAIT OF JULIETTE ROCHE. (LA PARISIENNE). 1915.
Oil on canvas, 241 \(\times\) 141" (61.5 \(\times\) 36.5 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Alb Gleizes 15".
Lent by Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lyon.
Exhibitions: Chapelle du Lycée Ampère, Lyon, 1947, no. 7.
Galerie Berry, Avignon, 1950, no. 1.

Juliette Roche, noticing the word "Julie" on a ship in The City and the River at the 1913 Salon d'Automne, had arranged through her friend Canudo to be taken to Gleizes' studio. During the first year of the war they corresponded and in September, 1915 they were married.

77. NEW YORK. 1915.
Gouache and ink. 26 \(\times\) 20" (66 \(\times\) 51 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Alb Gleizes 1915 New York".
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.

78. COMPOSITION (FOR "JAZZ") (POUR "JAZZ"). 1915.
Oil on board, 28 \(\times\) 23" (73 \(\times\) 58 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes 15 N.Y.".
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.
Literature: The Literary Digest, New York, November 27, 1915, p. 1225.

Gleizes was tremendously impressed by New York City but the earliest New York paintings continued without break the formal research advanced at Toul (nos. 71-75) even though the influence of new subject matter is apparent. In a photograph first published in the New York Herald, later reprinted in The Literary Digest, October 27, 1915, he can be seen at work on this painting.

79. JAZZ (LE JAZZ). 1915.
Oil on board, 39\(\frac{1}{2}\) \(\times\) 29\(\frac{1}{2}\)" (100 \(\times\) 75 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes New York 1915".
Lent by René Deroudille, Lyon.
Exhibitions: Galerie Betty, Avignon, 1930, no. 2.
Galerie Drouant-David, Paris, 1943, no. 15 (as Banjo).
Literature: DERODUILLLE, R. J. Self, no. 2. 1935, pp. 6-7.

Jazz again exploits circular movements in combination with broad tilting planes, incorporating the specific gestures of the two players into an inner framework that points clearly to the style of the 20's.

80. CHAL POST. 1915.
Gouache with oil on board, 39\(\frac{1}{2}\) \(\times\) 30" (101 \(\times\) 76 cm.).
Signed and dated l.l. "Alb Gleizes New York 1915".
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.
Provenance: from the artist, 1936.
Exhibition: Montross Gallery, New York, 1916, no. 36.
81. KELLY SPRINGFIELD. 1915.
Gouache with oil on board. 39 x 30" (101 x 76 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. “Albert Gleizes N.Y. 15”.
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.
Provenance: from the artist, 1938.

Gleizes was fascinated by the signs of New York, especially those painted across windows read in reverse from the interior.

82. BROADWAY. 1915.
Oil on board. 38 1/2 x 30" (98 1/2 x 76 cm.).
Signed l.r. “Albert Gleizes”.
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Arthur G. Altschul, New York.
Provenance: Durlma, Barcelona.
Exhibition: Yale University Art Gallery, New Haven, 1960. no. 104.
Literature: Literary Digest, New York, November 27, 1915.
The initial American reaction to Gleizes might be typified by a letter about this painting published in Literary Digest on December 3, from Mr. W. E. Bolles in Detroit, Michigan: “... Among the mass of indicated characteristics of Broadway, such as skyscrapers, great newspapers, rapid transit, etc., a person with a vivid imagination can see... in the grouping of these elements the face of a prosperous, well-fed, well groomed keen minded business man...” A related study, developed from the strong diagonals, is in the Howald collection at the Columbus Gallery of Fine Arts.

83. BROOKLYN BRIDGE. 1915.
Ink and gouache. 94 x 74" (25 x 19 cm.).
On reverse: “Albert Gleizes Brooklyn Bridge 1915”.
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.
The first of Gleizes’ Brooklyn Bridge drawings, this work is a study for the 1917 oil, no. 66.

84. BROOKLYN BRIDGE. 1915.
Oil and mixed media on canvas. 40 1/4 x 40 1/2" (102 x 102 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. “Albert Gleizes 1915 Brooklyn Bridge”.
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.
Provenance: John Quinn, (Sale, 1927).
J. B. Neumann, 1944.
Contemporary Movements in European Painting, Toledo Museum of Art, Ohio, 1936, no. 40.
Literature: Literary Digest, November 27, 1915, p. 1225 (visible in photograph of Gleizes).

The Bridge, which appears in elevation in Cha/ Post (no. 80) is here synthesized into a dizzying structure in which a cityscape is seen through the great swing and intersecting patterns of the cables which dominate the canvas surface. In the first interview given after his arrival in America, Gleizes stated his admiration for the Brooklyn Bridge, comparing it to the noblest achievements of European architecture.

85. BROOKLYN BRIDGE. 1915.
Oil with sand on board. 59 x 47 1/4" (150 x 120 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. “Albert Gleizes New York 1915”.
Lent by Madame P. de Gavardie, Paris.
Exhibition: Musée de Grenoble, 1963, no. 10.
This second oil version of the Brooklyn Bridge is totally abstract, its dominant patterns derived from the criss-cross of intersecting supporting cables. This work marks Gleizes’ first use of sand on a picture’s surface and signals a period of experimentation with new painting techniques.

86. ON BROOKLYN BRIDGE (SUR BROOKLYN BRIDGE). 1917.
Oil on canvas. 65 1/2 x 51" (162 x 129 1/2 cm.).
Signed, dated and inscribed l.r. “Albert Gleizes New York 1917 sur Brooklyn Bridge”.
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.
Provenance: from the artist, 1937.

This third and last oil version, related most closely to the 1915 drawing (no. 83), attempts to synthesize the City under the symbol of the Bridge. Unleashed by whirling circles, the composition shows both ends of the bridge with the river below and buildings of Manhattan and Brooklyn beyond. Gleizes and Joseph Stella had been friends since 1915 and it is interesting to compare this painting with Stella’s Brooklyn Bridge of 1917–1918, painted somewhat later.

87. THE ASTOR CUP RACE (FLAGS). 1915.
(LE PRIX ASTOR CUP OU LES DRAPEAUX).
Gouache with oil on board. 39 x 29 1/2" (99 1/2 x 74 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. “Albert Gleizes 1915 N.Y.”.
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.
Provenance: from the artist, 1938.
The gay motif borrowed from the races was later incorporated into the second version of Cloisens, 1917, at the Musée d’Art Moderne de la Ville de Paris. Despite the exuberance realized here, however, a note of deep irony is struck for the numbers 8 and 6 are those of his dead friend Noyal’s regiment in the French Army. (See no. 98).

88. OVERLAND. 1916.
Oil on canvas, 31 x 23 1/4" (81 x 65 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. “Albert Gleizes 1916”.
Lent by Galerie L. Bourdon, Paris.

89. TOWARD NEW YORK. 1916.
(IMPRESSION DE NEW YORK).
Ink, 17 x 13 1/4" (43.5 x 33.5 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. “Albert Gleizes 16, N.Y.”.
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.
90. STUDY FOR “DOWNTOWN”. 1916.
(ÉTUDE POUR “DOWNTOWN”).
Gouache, 24⅛ × 18⅝” (63 × 48 cm).
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.
Provenance: from the artist, 1938.

91. TARRYTOWN. 1916.
Gouache, 24⅛ × 18⅝” (62.5 × 47.5 cm).
Signed and dated ll. “Alb Gleizes Tarrytown 1916 N.Y.”; on reverse “No. 17 Aquarelle gouache Tarrytown’ N.Y. 1916 Pas de tableau”.
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.
Provenance: from the artist, 1938.

This is clearly preliminary to no. 92, despite the artist’s inscription.

92. COMPOSITION (TARRYTOWN). 1916.
Oil on canvas, 36⅛ × 29¼” (93.5 × 74.5 cm).

In his attempt to organize in plastic terms the abstract equivalent of his earlier broad panoramas, Gleizes reverted to the tilting planes reminiscent of smaller ones in such volumetric cubist works as The Hunt and Jacques Nayral, both of 1911 (nos. 28, 27).

93. NEAR NEW YORK (ENVIRONS DE NEW YORK). 1915.
Gouache and ink, 25⅛ × 19⅝” (65 × 50 cm).
Signed, dated and inscribed ll. “Albert Gleizes, 1915, Tarrytown, N.Y.”.
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.

94. HEAD OF A CLOWN (TÊTE DE CLOWN). 1915.
Ink, 7⅛ × 7⅛” (19.2 × 18.2 cm).
Signed, dated and inscribed ll. “Alb Gleizes Toul 1915 Etude pour Tête de Clown”.
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Freeman, New York.

This is actually a portrait of the artist Georges Valmier, who was in Gleizes’ regiment at Toul.

95. HEAD OF A CLOWN (TÊTE DE CLOWN). 1914-17.
Oil on canvas, 46 × 33” (117 × 96.5 cm).
Signed and dated ll. “Albert Gleizes 1914-17”.
Lent anonymously.


Developed from studies begun at Toul in 1915 (see no. 94), this painting displays Gleizes’ characteristic fusion of tilting planes with circular motion. This specific method of picture construction was (theoretically) formulated by Gleizes several years later, between 1920 and 1923.

96. CLOWNS. 1916.
Oil on board, 29⅛ × 25” (75 × 63 cm).
Signed and dated ll. “Alb Gleizes 16”.
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.
Exhibition: Musée de Grenoble, 1963, no. 16.

The circus theme interested Gleizes for several years, appearing in pre-war Paris works (no. 119, for example) and continuing through 1920, (no. 120). We also know a second version of this painting from 1917, (see comment for no. 87).

97. TO JACQUES NAYRAL (À JACQUES NAYRAL). 1914.
Gouache, 16 × 12” (40.5 × 30.5 cm).
Signed, dated and inscribed ll. “Alb Gleizes 14; Jacques Nayral tué a La Bossee, 1914”.
Lent by Marlborough-Gerson Gallery, New York.

Gleizes first learned of the death of his brother-in-law and friend when a postcard on which he had written “Patience, a little more patience, it is impossible that this war can endure much longer... then we will put ourselves back to work...” came back marked “disparu”.

98. TO JACQUES NAYRAL (À JACQUES NAYRAL). 1917.
Oil on board, 30 × 23¼” (76 × 60 cm).
Signed, dated and inscribed ll. “Alb Gleizes 17, à Jacques Nayral”.

This is a private portrait, an intensely personal memorial to his closest friend, a key figure who shared the hopes of the pre-war Passy group for a collective artistic program.

99. STILL LIFE WITH FLASKS. 1916.
(NATURE MORTE AUX FLACONS).
Ink, 10¾ × 8¼” (27.5 × 21.5 cm).
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.
Provenance: from the artist, 1938.

Preliminary drawing for no. 100.

100. STILL LIFE WITH BOTTLES. 1916.
(NATURE MORTE AUX BOUTEILLES).
Oil on board, 18⅛ × 13¼” (46 × 35 cm).
Lent by Dr. Jules Vaché, Luned, France.
Exhibition: Galerie Berry, Avignon, 1950, no. 4.
Gleizes rarely painted still lifes, his epic interests usually finding sympathetic echoes in more inclusive themes. His earliest Cubist still life, dating from 1912, formerly in the Weimar Museum, is unfortunately lost and a second of 1915 relates to this Barcelona work. Apart from The Lorraine Pitcher (no. 75), he made no more until 1924.

101. JEAN COCTEAU. 1915.
Gouache, 22 x 25 1/2" (56 x 40 cm).
Signed and dated l.r. “Albert Gleizes, Jean Cocteau 1915”.
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.

Gleizes and Cocteau, who was later a witness at Gleizes’ marriage, first became friends during their collaboration on an unrealized production of A Midsummer Night’s Dream. This would have been the first Cubist stage production and Gleizes was to design the costumes and André Lhote the sets. It was to be performed at the Cirque Médran in the summer of 1915, but, because of the war, this proved impossible. All of Gleizes’ costume drawings are in the collection of the Musée des Beaux-Arts de Lyon.

102. PORTRAIT OF JEAN COCTEAU. 1916.
Oil with plaster on canvas, 45 1/8 x 31" (116 x 79 cm).
Signed, dated and inscribed l.r. “Albert Gleizes, Barcelone, 16 Jean Cocteau”.
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Siegfried Ullmann, Palm Beach, Florida.
René Gimpel Galerie, New York, 1937, no. 11.
Passepartout Gallery, New York, 1949, no. 7.

In this portrait, painted in Barcelona, Gleizes treated Cocteau in the same vein as their Shakespeare project. Although he carries a basket of fruit, (as did Ariel who produced the grand banquet at the end of the Tempest) the costume also relates to the Red Cross uniform worn by Cocteau during the war. Such an interpretation would be in agreement with the generally symbolic tenor of Gleizes’ thinking.

103. DANCER (DANSEUSE). 1916.
Oil and gouache, 104 x 81 1/2" (26 x 20,5 cm).
Signed and dated l.r. “Alb Gleizes, Barcelone 16”.
Lent by Dr. Henry M. Roland, London.

104. SPANISH DANCER (DANSEUSE ESPAGNOLE). 1916.
Oil with sand on board, 39 1/2 x 30 1/4" (101 x 76,5 cm).
Signed and dated l.r. “Alb Gleizes 16”.
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.
Exhibitions: Bourgeois Galleries, New York, 1917, no. 29.

Ardsley Studios, New York, 1919, no. 3 (west room).

The brief Barcelona period produced a host of similar paintings in which specific patterns and motifs were exploited in an effort to place the painting in the context of a precise encounter.

105. BERMUDA STUDY (LES BERMUDUES). 1917.
Watercolor and pencil, 11 x 8 1/2" (28 x 22 cm).
Signed and dated l.r. “Alb Gleizes 17”; on reverse “Aquarelle pour Paysage, la maison du Gouverneur... Bermuda 1917. le tableau appartient à Stieglitz, N.Y.”.
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.
Provenance: from the artist, 1938.

106. BERMUDA STUDY (LES BERMUDUES). 1917.
Watercolor and gouache over crayon, 11 x 9 1/2" (30 x 24 cm).
Signed and dated l.r. “Alb Gleizes, Étude Bermudes 17”.
Lent by Walter Firpo, Marseilles.

107. THE GOVERNOR’S HOUSE, BERMUDA LANDSCAPE. 1917.
(LA MAISON DU GOUVERNEUR).
Oil on board, 35 1/4 x 27 1/2" (89,5 x 70 cm).
Signed and dated l.r. “Alb Gleizes 1917”.
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Arthur G. Altschul, New York.
H. D. Walker, Minneapolis.
Exhibition: Loan Exhibition, Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, 1920, no. 45.

Returning to America early in 1917, the Gleizes’ left almost immediately for Bermuda, where they stayed about two months. The effect of Bermuda’s mild weather, lush foliage and pastel colors directly influenced Gleizes’ style, which became unusually sensuous. These paintings seem removed from the complex formal and intellectual concerns which Gleizes had already begun to deal with. The parallel brushstrokes indicate also a temporary return to a Cézannian technique.

108. BERMUDA DRAWING (LES BERMUDUES). 1917.
Pencil and watercolor, 104 x 81" (27,5 x 21,3 cm).
Signed and dated l.r. “A. Gleizes 17”.
Lent by Galerie Moos, Geneva.

Oil on canvas, 32 x 25 1/2" (81 x 64,5 cm).
Signed and dated l.l. “Alb Gleizes 17”.
Collection Romainet, Paris.
Provenance: Pierre Faure.

A variant of this painting, with the composition reversed, is in the collection of the Musée National d’Art Moderne, Paris.

Mixed media on paper, 18 1/2 x 23" (46,5 x 58,5 cm).
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.
Provenance: from the artist, 1938.
111. HERE IN PORT (DANS LE PORT). 1917.
Oil on board, 60 x 47 in (153 x 120 cm).
Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes New York 1917".
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.
These subjects of On a Music Hall Singer, On a Vaudeville Theme and On a Circus Theme (collection Baltimore Museum of Art), gave rise to the concept of the subject as a "springboard" credited to Gleizes and elaborated by Walter Pach in his little monograph on Jacques Villon for the Société Anonyme (New York, ca. 1924).

112. STUNT FLYING (VOLTIQUE AÉRIENNE). 1917.
Oil with sand on board, 40 x 29 in (101.5 x 76 cm).
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.
Exhibitions: Ardsley Studios, New York, 1919, no. 6 (west room).

Although not the last painting of the circus theme, this is in many respects the culmination of Gleizes' treatment of the subject. Derived from a 1914 painting in the collection of Madame Gleizes where trapezers, audience and nets are clearly identifiable, this work is abstract, employing tilting planes and circular movement to express the essence of dynamic rhythm.

113. STUDY FOR "ON A VAUDEVILLE THEME". 1916.
(DESSIN POUR "SUR UN VAUDEVILLE").
Ink and pencil, 11 x 8½ in (28 x 21.5 cm).
Signed and dated l.r. "Alb Gleizes 'Vaudeville' Broadway N.Y. 1916"; on reverse "Dessin à la plume pour 'Sur un Vaudeville', Broadway New York 1916 La peinture à l'huile appartient à le Guggenheim Foundation".
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.
Provenance: from the artist, 1938.

114. ON A VAUDEVILLE THEME (SUR UN VAUDEVILLE). 1917.
Oil on board, 47¼ x 38½ in (120.5 x 98 cm).
Signed and dated l.r. "Alb Gleizes N.Y. 1917".
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.

Based on the drawing no. 113, this work is also a return to an equestrian theme first treated in 1914 (no. 119) and relates to the circus series.

115. ON A MUSIC HALL SINGER. 1917.
(SUR UNE CHANTEUSE DE MUSIC HALL).
Oil on board, 40 x 29 in (101.5 x 75.5 cm).
Signed and dated l.r. "Alb Gleizes, 17"; on reverse "Alb Gleizes No 17 sur une chanteuse de music hall New York 1917".

Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.
Gift, Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1941.
These subjects of On a Music Hall Singer, On a Vaudeville Theme and On a Circus Theme (collection Baltimore Museum of Art), gave rise to the concept of the subject as a "springboard" credited to Gleizes and elaborated by Walter Pach in his little monograph on Jacques Villon for the Société Anonyme (New York, ca. 1924).

116. STUDY FOR "BUILDING CONSTRUCTION". 1916.
(DESSIN POUR "NAISSANCE D'UN BUILDING").
Ink and crayon, 9⅜ x 7½ in (25 x 20 cm).
Signed and dated "Naisance d'un building New York 1916 Alb Gleizes"; on reverse "No 8) Dessin à la plume pour 'Naissance d'un building' New York 1916 Le tableau à l'huile doit être dans une collection allemande Il a été vendu par Walden".
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.
Provenance: from the artist, 1938.

117. BUILDING CONSTRUCTION. 1917.
(NAISSANCE D'UN BUILDING).
Oil on canvas, 40 x 30 in (101.5 x 76 cm).
Signed and dated l.r. "Alb Gleizes 17".
Lent by The Cincinnati Art Museum, Gift of Thomas C. Adler.
Exhibition: Ardsley Studios, New York, 1919, no. 7.

This work (and the preceding study for it) are Gleizes' final synthesis of New York. In it we see all the elements of his style of the 1920's, combined with the sensuous paint handling which he renounced a few years later.

118. ON THE FLAT IRON (SUR LE FLAT IRON). 1916.
Ink, 101 x 84 in (27 x 21 cm).
Signed, dated and inscribed l.r. "Alb Gleizes New York Sur le Flat Iron 16".
Lent by Herbert M. Barrows, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

119. SKETCH FOR "THE EQUESTRIAN". 1914.
(ÉTUDE POUR "SUR UNE ÉCUYÈRE DE CIRQUE").
Crayon, 10⅛ x 8¼ in (27 x 21 cm).
Signed, dated and inscribed l.r. "A. Gleizes Courbevoie 14".
Lent by Augustin Terrin, Marseilles.

This drawing furnished a departure point for an etching of the same year, as well as serving as the basis for a series of paintings.

120. THE EQUESTRIAN. 1919.
(SUR UNE ÉCUYÈRE DE CIRQUE).
Oil on canvas, 37¾ x 29¾ in (95 x 75 cm).
Signed and dated l.r. "Alb Gleizes, New York 19".
Lent by Augustin Terrin, Marseilles.
Exhibitions:  Ardsley Studios, New York, 1919, no. 2 (west room).

This is the penultimate version of the *Equestrian* which in 1914, (no. 119), had begun the circus pictures. The last version from 1920 was reproduced in Ozenfant and Jeanneret's *La Peinture Moderne*, Paris, 1924, and is in the collection of the Musée National d'Art Moderne, Paris. Both works, as well as the study, relate not only to the Vaudeville theme (nos. 113, 114) but also to the *On a Circus Theme* in the Baltimore Museum.

121. **ALONG THE AVENUE (SUR L'AVENUE)**, 1920.
Oil on canvas, 63 1/2 x 50 1/4" (162 x 129 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes 1920".
Lent by Rudolf Indlekofer, Basel.
Provenance: G. David Thompson, Pittsburgh.
Exhibition: Der Strom, Berlin, 1921.

In Paris after the war, Gleizes retained specific themes from New York City as representative of the direction that modern collective life would pursue. Although his manner of composing did not change, he deliberately purged his art of all powerful touches of paint application in order to focus attention on the relationships among forms. He eliminated the dominating presence of his physical gesture because it was too individual, amounting— he thought—to an "esthetic trick". Although eliminating sensuousness in his painted surface, Gleizes retained vibrant color and even began to make his own, often mixing pigments with gasoline. The result was an extremely fragile matte surface, forthright but, unfortunately, highly susceptible to damage from moisture. Works such as this found their most ambitious realization in the enormous mural sketch for the *Cave de Moscou*, now in the Grenoble Museum.

(FEMME AU GANT NOIR).
Oil on canvas, 49 1/2 x 39 1/2" (126 x 100 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes", dated ll., "1920".
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.
Exhibitions: Marlborough Gallery, London, 1956, no. 13 (as *Femme Assise*).
Musée Calvet, Avignon, 1962, no. 17.
Musée de Grenoble, 1963, no. 23.

There are a number of small versions of this painting which illustrate one aspect of Gleizes' activity in the early 20's: reminiscences of specific reality evoked within the context of increasingly careful picture construction.

123. **COMPOSITION (TABLEAU)**, 1921.
Tempera on panel, 36 1/2 x 28 3/4" (92 x 73 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes, 1921".
Lent by The Trustees of The Tate Gallery, London.

James Wardell Power, Jersey, Channel Islands.
Power Sale, Sotheby's, November 7, 1962, no. 17 (as *Abstraction*).


Most of Gleizes' pictures of the period, however, were "paintings without subject"; explorations of plastic relations that concentrated on familiar visual problems of movement and depth.

124. **COMPOSITION**. 1921.
Oil on canvas, 47 1/2 x 37" (120 x 94 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes 21".
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.

Gleizes' reputation as an uncompromising practitioner of austere abstract art in 1921 brought him his first pupils, the Irish painters Mainie Jellett and Evie Hone. Obliged to clarify his methods for his students and for himself as well, he called the new characteristic tilting planes "translation" and the circular movements "rotation". Both compositional techniques can be traced back to about 1914 (see no. 63). The developing theories were incorporated in his book *La Peinture et ses lois, ce qui devait sortir du Cubisme*, written in 1922.

125. **COMPOSITION WITH TWO NUDES**, Circa 1922.
(COMPOSITION AVEC DEUX NUDES).
Tempera on canvas, 47 1/2 x 37" (120 x 94 cm.).
Not signed or dated.
Collection Lady Norton, London.

In order to achieve what he called "supple movement", Gleizes organized his canvas by the guided movement of a chosen plane surface. Plane surfaces move back and forth, to right and left, progressing to more complex forms, so that curves were infused into the developing rhythm.

126. **OCTAGONAL COMPOSITION**, Circa 1922.
(COMPOSITION OCTOGONALE).
Oil on canvas, 35 1/4 x 27 1/2" (90 x 69.5 cm.).
Not signed or dated.
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.

This is an example of the principles of translation and rotation at work. A related drawing, the final illustration of *La Peinture et ses Lois*, when it was printed in *La Vie des Lettres et des Arts* (1923), was purchased by Larionov who presented it to the Museum of Western Art in Moscow.

127. **FOR A PAINTING ON A FAMILIAR THEME**, 1923.
(POUR UNE PEINTURE FAMILIÈRE).
Gouache and watercolor, 9 x 7 3/4" (23 x 20 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes, 23 (?)".

128. **COMPOSITION OCTOBER**, 1922.
Oil on canvas, 57 1/2 x 37 1/2" (146 x 94.5 cm.).
Signed l.r. "Albert Gleizes"; dated ll., "V BRE 1922".
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.
This painting relates to a 1923 painting entitled *La Vieille Dame* (Marlborough, London, 1956, no. 18, ill.) and both were inspired by a yellowed photograph of Madame Gleizes' grandmother found by Gleizes in the Roche family home at Serrières.

129. **WHITE COMPOSITION.** Circa 1922.

*(PEINTURE-OBJET À DOMINANTE BLANCHE).*

Oil on board, 36 1/2 × 29 1/2" (92 × 73 cm).

Not signed or dated.

Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.

Exhibitions: Musée Calvet, 1962, no. 22.


After two years of increasing austerity, Gleizes still occasionally indulged in an exuberant display of lively pattern. A 1920 drawing for this work is reproduced in J. Chevalier's *Albert Gleizes et le Cubisme*, Basel, 1961: a related gouache, entitled *Three Themes*, is in the collection of The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum; and a large oil (present whereabouts unknown) was exhibited at the Gleizes exhibition, Der Sturm, 1921.

130. **VILLAGE ON THE RHONE, SERRIÈRES.** Circa 1923.

*(PAYSAGE PROVENÇAL, SERRIÈRES).*

Oil on canvas, 41 1/8 × 29 1/4" (105 × 75 cm).

Not signed or dated: on reverse "du paysage midi".


The Gleizes’ spent much time in Serrières, south of Lyon, where Gleizes established a second artist’s community, Moly-Sabata, in 1927.

131. **THE SCHOOLBOY (L’ÉCOLIER).** Circa 1924.

Oil on canvas, 34 1/8 × 26 3/4" (87.5 × 67.5 cm).

Signed l.r. "Albert Gleizes".

Lent by Mr. and Mrs. John Strauss, Glencoe, Illinois.


J. W. Faulkner, Chicago.

132. **THE SCHOOLBOY (L’ÉCOLIER).** 1924.

Gouache and tempera on canvas, 36 1/4 × 28 1/2" (92 × 73 cm).

Not signed or dated.

Lent by Musée Cantini, Marseilles.


133. **FAMILIAR THEME, STUDY FOR “IMAGINARY STILL LIFE, BLUE” (PEINTURE FAMILIÈRE, DESSIN POUR “NATURE MORTE IMAGINAIRE, BLEUE”).** 1923.

Pencil, 10 1/4 × 7 3/4" (27 × 19 cm).

Signed and dated l.r. "Alb Gleizes 23"; on reverse "No. 50) Peinture familière Dessin mine de plomb 1923 pour Peinture à 1 Huile app. à Alb Gleizes").

Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.

Provenance: from the artist, 1938.

134. **IMAGINARY STILL LIFE, BLUE.** 1924.

*NATURE MORTE IMAGINAIRE, BLEUE).*

Oil on canvas, 41 1/4 × 29 1/4" (105.5 × 74 cm).

Signed and dated l.r. "Alb Gleizes, 24".


René Gimpel Galerie, New York, 1937, no. 23.

Galerie Drouant-David, Paris, 1943, no. 20.


135. **STUDY FOR “IMAGINARY STILL LIFE, GREEN”**. 1923.

*(DESSIN POUR “NATURE MORTE IMAGINAIRE, VERDÂTRE”).*

Pencil, 10 1/4 × 8 1/4" (27 × 21 cm).

Signed and dated l.r. "Alb Gleizes 23"; on reverse signed, dated and inscribed to hills Relay, 1938.

Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.

Provenance: from the artist, 1938.

136. **IMAGINARY STILL LIFE, GREEN.** 1924.

*(NATURE MORTE IMAGINAIRE, VERDÂTRE).*

Oil on board, 39 1/8 × 29 1/4" (101 × 75 cm).

Signed and dated l.r. "Alb Gleizes 24".

Lent by Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford, Connecticut, The Ella Gallup Sumner and Mary Catlin Summer Collection.


By the time Gleizes painted the two Imaginary Still Lifes of 1924, his conceptual hierarchy of values was almost wholly formed and still life—as a subject in itself—was insignificant for he felt that every day objects precluded largeness of conception. An ‘imaginary’ still life, however, was another matter: it could reflect ideal relations, pure and non-imitative forms.

137. **IMAGINARY STILL LIFE, GREEN.** second version, 1924–36.

*(NATURE MORTE IMAGINAIRE, VERDÂTRE).*

Oil on canvas, 39 1/8 × 29 1/4" (100 × 73 cm).

Not signed or dated.

Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.

Exhibitions: René Gimpel Galerie, New York, 1937, no. 56.

Galerie Berry, Avignon, 1950, no. 11.

138. **SERRIÈRES.** 1923.

Pencil, 10 1/4 × 8 1/4" (27 × 21 cm).

Signed and dated l.r. "Alb Gleizes, Serrières 23"; on reverse "Dessin mine de plomb ‘Sur Serrières 1923’ pour un peinture qui appartient à Alb Gleizes No. 10".

Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.

Provenance: from the artist, 1938.


141. FORMS, ADORATION. 1930. Oil on canvas, 441 x 32" (112 x 81 cm.). Not signed or dated. Lent by Leonard Hutton Galleries, New York. Echoing an old Thomist axiom, Gleizes had always told his students to paint the inner principles rather than the appearance of nature. By the early thirties he was convinced that these principles were, in fact, God and that He was discernable in any aspect of nature. Thus in this work and in the related gouache (no. 142), the painter reveals an essential identity between flowers and divine love.


143. SYMPHONY IN VIOLET, 1930-31. (SYMPHONIE EN VIOLET). Oil on canvas, 77 x 51" (196 x 131 cm.). Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes 1930-31". Lent by Rudolf Indelefer, Basel. Exhibition: René Gimpel Galerie, New York, 1937, no. 29. Literature: Chevalier, J. Albert Gleizes et le Cubisme, Basel, 1962, p. 51. Gleizes wished to infuse his large compositions of many elements (typified by earlier works such as nos. 150, 151) with lyrical movement. By applying curvilinear greys, which picked up surrounding color tonalities, he made color an active compositional force, turning the forms and causing them to create rhythmic thrusts and depth in the picture plane.


145. STUDY FOR TRIPTYCH, 1930. A. STUDY FOR LEFT PART OF TRIPTYCH, (ÉTUDE POUR TRIPTYQUE, PARTIE GAUCHE). Gouache on board, 134 x 51" (34 x 15 cm.). Signed and dated "Alb Gleizes 30".

B. STUDY FOR CENTER TRIPTYCH, (ÉTUDE POUR TRIPTYQUE, CENTRE). Gouache on board, 134 x 121" (34 x 31.5 cm.). Signed and dated "Alb Gleizes 30".

C. STUDY FOR RIGHT PART OF TRIPTYCH, (ÉTUDE POUR TRIPTYQUE, PARTIE DROITE). Gouache on board, 134 x 51" (34 x 14.5 cm.). Signed and dated "Alb Gleizes 30". Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Lester Avnet, Kings Point, New York. Provenance: Galerie 7, Paris. Margit Chanin, New York. There were a number of studies for wings of the great triptych of 1930-31 in which different color tonalities were explored, but this seems to be the only surviving study for the central portion which itself has been all but destroyed by moisture.

146. WINGS OF TRIPTYCH, 1930-31. A. LEFT WING (TRIPTYQUE, PARTIE GAUCHE). Oil on canvas, 63 x 26" (160 x 66 cm.). Signed and dated l.r. "Alb Gleizes 30-31".

B. RIGHT WING (TRIPTYQUE, PARTIE DROITE). Oil on canvas, 63 x 26" (160 x 66 cm.). Signed and dated l.r. "Alb Gleizes 1930-31". Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Lester Avnet, Kings Point, New York. Provenance: C. Renault, Puteaux. Margit Chanin, New York. During the late 20's, Gleizes became increasingly absorbed with religious themes. His continuing studies of Romanesque architecture, sculpture and frescoes (in preparation for his book, La Forme et L'Histoire) already had given rise to a number of compositions which are influenced by Autun and St. Savin.

147. COMPOSITION, FOR "MEDITATION", 1932-33. (COMPOSITION POUR "MÉDITATION"). Oil on canvas, 294 x 49" (75.5 x 124.5 cm.). Signed l.r. "Alb Gleizes 32-33". Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris. Gleizes made his first paintings for "meditation" or "contemplation" in 1932-33 and in his personal hierarchy of valid subjects (the key to which is found in his illustrations to the Pensées of Pascal) he attached the greatest significance to these works.
Oil on canvas, 44 3/8" x 30 1/2" (112 x 78 cm.).
Signed and dated lr. "Alb Gleizes 32-33".
Exhibitions: René Gimpel Galerie, New York 1937, no. 50.
Galerie Drouant-David, Paris, 1943, no. 23.

"The problem of light", wrote Gleizes, "is a problem of faith. For
light is not concrete, it is perfectly metaphysical, being ineffable".
Believing that space, time and light were one and the same, he felt
that if he could make color move, analogous to the flow in a rain-
bow's spectrum, he could approach the absolute.

149. GREEN-BROWN SPIRAL (SPIRALE VERT-BRUN). 1932-33.
Oil on canvas, 66 3/8" x 30 1/2" (168 x 78 cm.).
Signed and dated lr. "Alb Gleizes 32-33".
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.
Galerie Lucien Blanc, Aix-en-Provence, 1960, no. 44.

150. COMPOSITION WITH SEVEN ELEMENTS, first version.
(LES SEPT ELEMENTS) 1924-25.
Oil on canvas, 56 3/8" x 40 1/8" (143.5 x 103.5 cm.).
Signed and dated lr. "1925 Alb Gleizes".
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.
Exhibitions: L'Art d'Aujourd'hui, Paris, 1925, no. 66.
Trente ans d'Art Indépendant, Paris, 1926, no. 1060.

This first version of Seven Elements is one in a series of large
compositions intended as studies for huge wall murals.

151. PAINTING WITH SEVEN ELEMENTS. 1924-34.
(LES SEPT ÉLÉMENTS).
Oil on canvas, 102 3/8" x 70 1/2" (260 x 180 cm.).
Signed and dated lr. "Alb Gleizes 24".
Lent by Musée National d'Art Moderne, Paris.
Chapelle du Lycée Ampère, Lyon, 1947, no. 16.
Musée de Grenoble, 1963, no. 31.
(illustrated before final changes).

This is a close reworking of the first version, with the addition of
circular rhythmic greys. The central element (derived from a 1924
painting) is identified as "Graudeur de Man" in the illustration for
Chapter 3 of the Pensées of Pascal. Still a third version exists, from
1943, in which the center element is totally replaced by a series of
rotating spirals.

152. SEATED WOMAN. 1934.
(Figure ovale, cercle brun-bleu-ver). 
Oil on canvas, 50 x 33" (127 x 84 cm.).
Signed and dated lr. "Alb Gleizes 34".
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.
Exhibitions: Galerie Lucien Blanc, Aix-en-Provence, 1960, no. 44.
Musée Calvet, Avignon, 1962, no. 31.

This painting is a variation of the 1920 Woman with Black Glove,
no. 122.

153. YELLOW LIGHT (LUMIERE JAUNE). 1933.
Oil on canvas, 33 1/2" x 44 1/2" (85.5 x 114 cm.).
Signed and dated lr. "Alb Gleizes 1933".
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.
Literature: Gray, c. "Gleizes", Magazine of Art, October, 1950,

Oil on canvas, 41 3/4" x 53 3/4" (105.5 x 136.5 cm.).
Signed and dated lr. "Albert Gleizes 32-33".
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.
Galerie Drouant-David, Paris, 1943, no. 35.

This composition exists as an etching in a limited edition of the
Pensées of Pascal.

155. CRUCIFIXION. 1935.
Oil on canvas, 54 x 36 1/4" (137 x 92 cm.).
Signed and dated lr. "Alb Gleizes 1935".
Lent by Musée de Dijon.
Marlborough Gallery, London, 1956, no. 34.

A larger version of this crucifixion, from 1936, is in the collection of
Madame Gleizes.

156. VIRGIN AND CHILD (LA VIERGE À L'ENFANT). 1935.
Oil on canvas, 56 3/4" x 37 3/4" (143 x 95 cm.).
Not signed or dated.
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.

This composition exists in several versions, one reversed, and was
also adapted in ceramic tile by Anne Dangan. Although more literal
and specifically iconographic than many works of this period, it
nevertheless shows a loosening of painting technique.

Ink, 10 1/4" x 7 1/2" (27.5 x 18.5 cm.).
Signed and dated lr. "Alb Gleizes 36".
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Isadore Levin, Palm Beach.

158. SKETCH FOR AIR PAVILION MURAL, PARIS EXPOSITION.
(ÉTUDE POUR LE PAVILLON DE L'ART À L'EXPOSITION
DES ARTS, PARIS). 1937.
Gouache, 114 x 254" (28.5 x 64 cm.).
Signed lr. "Albert Gleizes 37".
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Lester Avnet, Kings Point, New York.
Margit Chanin, New York.
159. STUDY FOR "THE TRANSFIGURATION". 1939-41.
(ÉTUDE POUR "TRANSFIGURATION").
Gouache, 22 3/4 x 15 3/4" (57 x 39.5 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "39-40-41 Albert Gleizes".

This is a study for the central panel of an immense triptych in the
Musée des Beaux-Arts de Lyon. A related gouache of the same sub-
ject is in the Musée d'Art Moderne de la Ville de Paris. These works
represent Gleizes' final attempt to reconcile traditional iconography
with the demands of his painting style in order to produce murals under-
able to a wide public. The iconography of the Trans-
figuration, however, had been largely forgotten and inclusion of its
traditional, but obscure, symbols only further alienated the artist
from popular appreciation.

160. SKETCH FOR ALADDIN (ÉTUDE POUR ALADIN). 1938.
Gouache, 17 3/4 x 10 1/4" (44 x 27 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Alb Gleizes 38, Aladin".
Lent by Marlborough-Gerson Gallery, New York.

(QUATRE PERSONNAGES LÉGENDAIRES DU CIEL).
Oil on canvas:
A. LEONARDO DA VINCI, 118 1/4 x 50" (300 x 127 cm.).
B. ALADDIN, 122 3/4 x 74 3/4" (310 x 188 cm.).
C. SINBAD, 121 3/4 x 74 3/4" (306 x 189 cm.).
D. ICARUS, 122 3/4 x 74 3/4" (309 x 189 cm.).
Not signed or dated.
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.
Exhibition: Chapelle du Lycée Ampère, Lyon, 1947, nos. 54, 55,
56, 57.
Literature: LABASTIE, A. "Albert Gleizes", Arts de France, 9,
1946, pp. 77-85.
"Présence d'Albert Gleizes", Zodiacque, January,
1952, p. 37.

While working on murals for the 1937 Paris Exposition, Gleizes and
Jacques Villon conceived the idea of executing a mural for the
auditorium of the Ecole des Arts et Métiers, Paris. Their plan was
to integrate four Villon panels dealing with the physical conquest
of space with four Gleizes panels reflecting man's dream of space.
Although the mural was never executed, many studies for it were
produced and Gleizes made a separate canvas of each of his subjects.
Illustrations for the Pensées of Pascal show that the Leonardo
figure developed into the theme "Granulor of Man" while the Icarus
panel was related to "the hateful ego" and suggests the fall of man.
In 1963, The Gobelin's studios of the French Government began to
translate the work of the two friends into a tapestry.

162. COMPOSITION. 1937.
Gouache, 11 3/4 x 8" (28 x 20 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Alb Gleizes 37".

163. COMPOSITION. 1939.
Oil on canvas, 72 1/4 x 58" (183 x 148 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes 39".
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.
Musée Calvet, Avignon, 1962, no. 29.
Musée de Grenoble, 1963, no. 40.

164. STUDY, PAINTING FOR CONTEMPLATION. 1943.
(ÉTUDE POUR SUPPORT DE CONTEMPLATION).
Ink, 13 1/4 x 9 1/4" (34 x 24 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Alb Gleizes 43".
Lent by Walter Firpo, Marseilles.

165. STUDY, PAINTING FOR CONTEMPLATION. 1943.
(ÉTUDE POUR SUPPORT DE CONTEMPLATION).
Ink, 14 1/4 x 11" (36 x 28 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Alb Gleizes 43".
Lent by Walter Firpo, Marseilles.

166. PAINTING FOR CONTEMPLATION, DOMINANT ROSE AND
GREEN (COMPOSITION, DOMINANTES ROSES ET VERTES).
1942.
Oil on burlap, 59 3/8 x 52" (127 x 132 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes 42".
Lent by The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.
Literature: "Présence d'Albert Gleizes", Zodiacque, January,
1952, pl. 16, p. 42.

During the war, which made materials impossible to obtain, Gleizes
painted on burlap, sizing the porous material with glue mixed with
paint. He had used burlap in some of his earliest paintings and now
found it congenial to his again vigorous touch, for it took the most
powerful strokes even while preserving the matte surface he so
valued.

167. SKETCH FOR "MOVEMENT WITH BLUE SPOTS". 1943.
(ÉTUDE POUR "MOUVEMENT À TACHES BLEUES").
Gouache, 4 3/4 x 5 3/4" (11 x 14 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Alb Gleizes 43".
Lent by Walter Firpo, Marseilles.

168. MOVEMENT WITH BLUE SPOTS. 1943.
(MOUVEMENT À TACHES BLEUES).
Oil on canvas, 43 1/4 x 61 1/4" (115,5 x 156 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Albert Gleizes 43".
Lent by Madame Gleizes, Paris.
Exhibitions: Galerie Lucien Blanc, Aix-en-Provence, 1960, no. 46.
Musée Calvet, Avignon, 1962, no. 32.
Musée de Grenoble, 1963, no. 43 (pl. XIII).

169. COMPOSITION. 1943.
Gouache, 12 x 8" (35,5 x 20 cm.).
Signed and dated l.r. "Alb Gleizes 43".
170. FOR MEDITATION (POUR MÉDITATION), 1944.
Oil on burlap, 251 × 213 1/2 (65 × 54.5 cm).
Signed and dated l.r. “Alb Gleizes 44”.
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.
Exhibition: Chapelle du Lycée Ampère, Lyon, 1947, no. 61.


The drawing is preparatory to an etching in the Pensées of Pascal (Chapter III) (see no. 161). In a general way it relates to the Pascal phrase, “Le Coeur a ses raisons...”

171. IMAGE, 1944.
Oil on canvas, 281 × 231 1/2 (73 × 60 cm).
Signed and dated l.r. “Alb Gleizes 44”.
Lent by Musée d’Art et d’Industrie, St. Étienne.

172. SKETCH DEDICATED TO ANNE DANGAR, 1944.
(ETUDE DEDIÉE À ANNE DANGAR).
Gouache, 61 × 41” (17 × 11.5 cm).
Signed and dated l.r. “Albert Gleizes 1944”; inscribed “pour ma chère élève Anne Dangar Saint Rémy-de-Provence Avril 1945 Les Mêlades Albert Gleizes”.
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.

This is a late return to earlier compositions, see nos. 131 and 132.

174. FOR MEDITATION, WHITE. 1944.
(POUR MÉDITATION, BLANC).
Oil on burlap, 361 × 291" (92 × 75.5 cm).
Signed and dated l.r. “Alb Gleizes 44”.
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.

175. THE MISTRAL (VENT DU NORD), 1945.
Oil on canvas, 391 × 311 1/2 (100 × 80 cm).
Signed and dated l.r. “Albert Gleizes 1945”.
Lent by René Deroudille, Lyon.

Literature: DERROUILLÈRE, R. “Albert Gleizes et les destinées du Cubisme”, i 4 Soli, no. 2, 1955, pp. 6-7 (ill. as Ornament).

To his typical tilting planes and circular motions, since the late 30’s Gleizes had increasingly added what he called “the cadence”, dark emphasis to regulate the movement of his forms.

176. COMPOSITION, 1948.
Oil on board, 18 × 13” (46 × 33 cm).
Signed and dated l.r. “Albert Gleizes 48”.
Lent by Madame Albert Gleizes, Paris.

This is among the last paintings made before Gleizes’ two year project, the illustrations of the Pensées of Pascal.

177. GRANDEUR OF MAN (GRANDEUR DE L’HOMME), 1950.
Ink, 121 × 91” (32 × 24 cm).
Signed l.r. “A.C.”; inscribed l.l. “No 18. III Grandeur d’Homme”.

Most of the titles of the late paintings, and this is his last, were tentative. But Arabesques is a term he often used and it has reference appropriate to his often stated admiration for the lyrical and passionate geometry of Islamic art (see “Arabesques, L’Entrelac Arabe”, in Cahiers du Sud, special no., August-September, 1935).
DOCUMENTATION
ONE MAN EXHIBITIONS

galerie dalmau, Barcelona, 1916 (Fall), Albert Gleizes.
galerie de l'effort moderne, Paris, 1920, Albert Gleizes. See
der sturm, Berlin, November, 1920, Albert Gleizes. 91st exhibition
of der sturm. Travelled to Stuttgart, Rome and New York. See
Der Sturm, Baden-Baden 54, 1954, p. 266.
chez la cible (PovoloZky), Paris, April–May, 1921, Albert Gleizes.
belmaison gallery of modern art, Wanamaker’s, New York,
March 15–31, 1923, Exhibition of Recent Paintings by Albert
Gleizes.
kehn and kuhn, Dresden, 1924, Albert Gleizes.
galerie yavin-raspail, Paris, 1925, Albert Gleizes retrospective.
abstraction-creation, Paris, June 1–15, 1934, exposition gleizes:
oeuvres de 1901–1934.
rené gimbel galerie, New York, December 15, 1936–January 15,
1937, Albert Gleizes, a retrospective exhibition.
Preface by Jean Chevalier.
by dom. Angelico surchamp, o.s.b.
chapelle du lycée amprére, Lyon, November 15–December 14, 1947,
Albert Gleizes, 50 ans de peinture. Preface by marcel michaud,
extracts by surchamp and gleizes from témoignages, 12 and 14.
galerie des carcets, Paris, April, 1948, Gleizes: 30 gouaches,
dessins et céramiques.
pas de noit gallery, New York, October 10–November 5, 1949,
Albert Gleizes retrospective exhibition.
galerie berry, Avignon, July 22–August 20, 1950, Albert Gleizes,
galerie Moullot, marseille, September, 1950, Albert Gleizes.
chapelle de l’oratoire, Avignon, July 22–August 31, 1950, Pensées
de pascal sur l’homme et dieu: 57 eaux fortes par Albert
Gleizes. Preface by Albert Gleizes.
musée d’art et d’industrie, Saint Étienne, September, 1950, Pensées
de pascal sur l’homme et dieu: 57 eaux fortes par Albert
Gleizes. Preface by maurice allemant.
librairie la hune, Paris, October 20–November 10, 1950, Pensées
de pascal sur l’homme et dieu: 57 eaux fortes par Albert
Gleizes. introduction by gleizes.
musée des beaux-arts de Lyon, December 2–31, 1950, Pensées
de pascal sur l’homme et dieu. illustrées de 57 eaux-forces
originales par Albert Gleizes. Preface by René jullian.
galerie lucien blanc, Aix-en-Provence, November–December, 1954,
Rétrospective Albert Gleizes. Preface by André schoeller.
marlborough five art, ltd., London, September–October, 1956,
Albert Gleizes: Paintings, Gouaches, Drawings. Preface by
Juliette rocque gleizes.
galerie simone hellier, Paris, September–October, 1958, Albert
Gleizes.
galerie lucien blanc, Aix-en-Provence, July–August, 1960, Albert
Gleizes, 1881–1953.

CHATEAU DE LOURMARIN, Lourmarin, July–August, 1960, Albert
Gleizes, Art Sacré.
musée calvet, Avignon, Spring–Summer, 1962, Albert Gleizes, 1881–
musée de Grenoble, Grenoble, June 15–August, 1963, Albert Gleizes
et Tempête dans les salons, 1910–1914. Preface by Gabrielle
Kueny.

GROUP EXHIBITIONS

Salon d’Automne, Paris, 1903.
Salon d’Automne, Paris, 1904.
la française, Paris, January–February, 1968, les peintres de
l’Abbaye”.
Exposition de l’Art Français. Spring, 1908, organized by andre
Mercereau for the tuison d’or, moscow.
Jack of diamonds (Valet de Carreau), moscow, 1st exhibition, 1910:
2nd exhibition, 1912.
Salon des Indépendants, Paris, 1911.
Brussels Indépendants: Delauny, Gleizes, Leger, Le Fauconnier,
Segonzac, Brussels, June 10-July 3, 1911. Catalogue preface by
Apollinaire.
galerie d’art ancien et d’art contemporain, Paris, November 20–
December 16, 1911, Exposition d’Art Contemporain. Catalogue
preface by René Blum.
Salon d’automne, Paris, 1911.
Salon des Indépendants, Paris, 1912.
Salon d’automne, Paris, 1912.
Société Normande de Peinture Moderne, Rouen, opened May 6, 1912.
2ème Exposition.
musée municipal suasso, amsterdam, October 6–November 7, 1912,
Moderne Kunst Kring. Catalogue preface, “La Sensibilité Mo-
derne et le Tableau”, by Henri Le Fauconnier.
galerie de la boetié, Paris, October 10–30, 1912. Salon de la
Section d’Or. Catalogue preface by René Blum.
galerie berthe weill, Paris, January 17–February 1, 1913, Gleizes,
Salon des Indépendants, Paris, 1913.
International Exhibition of Modern Art (The Armory Show), New
York, Chicago, Boston, 1913.
der sturm, Berlin, November, 1913, Expressionisten, Kubisten,
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The bibliography divides into two groups: first, a complete list of works by Albert Gleizes, including articles, books, unpublished manuscripts and illustrated books; and second, a selected list of works about Albert Gleizes together with related source material, including articles, books, unpublished manuscripts and those general studies of Modern Art which contain significant material about the artist. Entries are arranged chronologically.
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arp, hans and lisztzky, el, eds. Die Kunstismen, Zürich, Munich, Leipzig, Eugen Reents Verlag, 1925.
collection of paintings, watercolors, drawings and sculpture from the John Quinn Collection, Huntington, New York, 1926. Foreword by forbes Watson.
mejskie muzeum historii i sztuki, Lodz, Poland, Collection Internationale d'Art Nouveau, Lodz, 1932.
grohmann, will. Die Sammlung Alois Biedert, Dresden, Potsdam, Müller & Kiepenheuer, 1933.
cassou, jean; jullian, rene, villon, metzinger, severini, etc. Albert Gleizes: Hommage, Lyon, Atelier de la rose, 1954.
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