DANIEL ROBBINS

Ladies and gentlemen, I hope you can hear me. This is the first lecture in our series. I suppose it might be called a spring semester, although it's difficult enough to think of spring today. Tomorrow, Mr. Tuchman, a lecturer on our staff, will begin a series on expressionism. Today, I'll begin a series on cubist painters, and I will alternate in this series with Dr. Svendsen, a curator of education in the Museum here, who will speak on five painters associated with fantastic art, or actually, art of fantasy. [01:00] The lecture series beginning with Juan Gris, or if you prefer, Juan Gris, will deal with a very difficult problem, the problem of cubism, which involves the problem of reality in painting, and which involves, also, the problem of abstraction in painting. How well I'll be able to deal with these problems, I don't know. Nevertheless, I'll do what I can.

I start with Juan Gris, and that's the pronunciation I use, because in the opinion of probably the greatest and the most articulate scholar on cubism, the historian, critic, and dealer, [02:00] Daniel-Henry Kahnweiler, Gris represents that cubist, who more than any other, realized the aims of this revolution in twentieth century painting in terms of its alternate meaning philosophically. That is, the picture in relation to reality. It's always difficult to start in talking about an artist without setting him into an historical context, just as it's difficult to talk about any period in history without talking about what came before.

Now, last semester, if I can use that expression, I gave a series of seven or eight lectures starting from the middle of the nineteenth century called "The Origins of Modern Painting," [03:00] or the origins of twentieth-century painting. I don't know if any of you in this audience now were here for any of those lectures, or that is I know that only a few of you were. And I consider that those of you who were have kind of the benefit of a head-start, unless, of course, the others are students of modern painting. In a sense, I hope you aren't because then I will be embarrassed if I'm too trivial. On the other hand, if you do have a background in the origins of cubism, you will probably find that we don't simply start in with brand-new and fresh material.

But enough of this prologue, let's look at our first slide, a painting by Juan Gris in the collection of the Guggenheim Museum called, reasonably [04:00] enough, *Rooftops*, and painted in 1911. 1911 was the year when Gris started to paint for all practical purposes. He was born in Madrid in 1887. That means he was six years younger than Pablo Picasso. It also means that he came from a distinctly provincial center. Picasso came from Barcelona. Barcelona was the industrial and cultural capital of Spain. Madrid, although it had the Prada Museum, had little else that would contribute to the fundamental training of someone interested in art. He came from a family that was moderately well-off and his early studies were in engineering, in mathematics and in physics. However, as is the case [05:00] generally with people who become painters, he always had a feeling for drawing. He liked to draw. And even before he left Madrid in 1906, he was making little sketches and little designs in a kind of art nouveau manner, strong linear, serpentine drawings of a kind of caricature nature for the few magazines that were available to him at that time.

When he came to Paris, he changed his name from José Victoriano González, his family name, to Juan Gris. He chose this name even before he left Madrid, and there's a certain amount

conjecture that he chose it because he liked the affinity between this name and the French word [06:00] for grey, which as you know, is *gris*. When he came to Paris, very poor, no allowance from home or not much of one anyway, he settled — and no one knows if it was by design or by accident — in the famous Bateau-Lavoir, the ramshackle house on Montmartre where Picasso had his studio and where at this very time Picasso was experimenting in the early modes of cubism.

But from 1906 till 1910, he painted, as far as anyone knows, no oil paintings. He simply continued to make drawings in this art nouveau fashion. But I'm sorry I have none of these drawings to show you, but they're very difficult to get ahold of, and as far as I know, no slides of them exist in our immediate vicinity. [07:00] But his studio was on the first floor of the house where Picasso dwelt, and Picasso was his friend, and they had long conversations in Spanish night after night. He watched Picasso develop.

And so, when he finally came to paint in oil, when he finally decided that he was to be a painter, he turned out this, *Rooftops*, a view from his studio in which as you see everything is severely simplified in which, as you see, the color is very limited, greys, pale blues, blacks, just perhaps a touch of brown in here and in here, very much akin to the kind of color scheme that was favored by Picasso and Braque during the years of analytical cubism. Is this, however, [08:00] a work that can properly be called an example of analytical cubism? The answer, I think, has to be, no. There is very little in the way of exploring a form from all sides, looking at it simultaneously which, as you probably know, is one of the most obvious characteristics of the early analytical cubist style. There is instead a kind of hint of what Gris was later to develop into one of his most pronounced individual mannerisms. That is, a sense of light sweeping across the picture plane at an angle somewhat different to the organization, the major organization of the forms.

Another quality that you can detect in this painting characteristic of Gris now and characteristic of Gris even in the year he died, which is 1927, is the very strict geometry of the picture, [09:00] the rigid order of it. If we look at another work from the same year where Gris is beginning to assimilate the cubist vocabulary some three years after it had been developed by Picasso and Braque, we see more of this sense of order, a kind of sober and cool quality. These forms, for the most part, are not rigidly analyzed as we will presently see in a Picasso or in a Braque. To be sure, in looking at this glass, he's distorted it slightly. I hope my little light is showing. There, that's better.

The edge of the glass, as if it was turned. But there is no profound analysis of how it works. Same is true of the bottle seen somewhat on the top and mostly from the side, the inside, round [10:00] circle explored. The same is true of the pot compote and its top. But for the most part, we see a strong geometric grid, these verticals, and counter to that, this kind of light, diagonal motion, absolutely rigid, absolutely regular, and the whole of the color cool and sober, and the whole of the mood somehow classical. Now, when I speak of light, I don't mean physical light. I don't mean that we should look at the paintings of Gris in terms of a ray of light coming from a particular source and filtering across specific objects. To do that, as I hope I will be able to indicate as I go along, would be a gross misinterpretation of what he was doing. Rather, I mean only the quality of light. I mean that when I use the word light, I do it in [11:00] the sense of a word to describe the effect that we see.

If we look at a painting by Braque of 1910, I think we can have a better idea of precisely what was analytical cubism like at this time at a fairly early stage in its development. If we look simply at the violin, we will see how its form is distorted and how it's distorted on the basis of a very clear rationale. That is, the simultaneous points of view. Here, you look at it, conscious of its major elevation, to use a kind of architectural term. Here, we look at it [12:00] aware of a thickness of its bottom. Here, we look at it aware of the thickness of its side. Here, we see the strings as we might in one physical perspective. Here, we see it as we would in another physical perspective. Here, we see the whole neck of the instrument turned, turned in a position which obviously you would not be able to see it in from, say, this view, or this view. But nevertheless, a position which is there. The same is true in a general way of the other forms. This is the so-called analysis in analytical cubism.

Let's look at it again in a more complicated fashion, in a more humorous fashion, stamped with an inevitable personality of Pablo Picasso, his *Aficionado*, his bull-fight fan, of 1912. In this work, the head, very complicated. The mouth, [13:00] the mustache, the nose, in profile and full-on, the eyes, the hat, the collar, the whole figure, inside and now fragmented, into almost an infinity of views.

This is what was one of the essential problems of analytical cubism. If one looks at an object in reality, and if one assumes that either the object turns or the spectator who is looking at it, walks or turns about it, then, of course, what is the definite nature of the object? Because you can see it in a hundred, in two hundred, in three hundred, in one thousand, in ten million, [14:00] different ways. And each way has its validity. This is a problem involved in analytical cubism. This is a problem that probably necessitated analytical cubism's end because one could never say that if the problem of cubism was to fix the reality of the object, that indeed it was fixed, because the more you looked, the more views there were.

A second point, and probably a more important and significant one in terms of picture development was that in working out the kind of geometry of the picture that you see here, these artists, Picasso, Braque, later, Gris, and others whom we'll speak about in the course of the weeks, developed a method for organizing a picture which they insisted (and this is [15:00] very important) had an independent existence of its own. That is, if they could not settle the question of the reality of what the observer sees in the world, they could at least establish once-and-for-all that the painting exists in its own right. It is its own reality. It has its own structure. Its structure is independent of a structure of the world.

How this was done varied from painter to painter. But in these years, 1910, 1911 and 1912, there was a certain close proximity in their efforts. That is, the orientation was vertical, the shallow space is very evident. The fact that one area divided from another by this vertical line is connected by a similarity of color [16:00] or by an evenness of brush stroke. These are the qualities that will greet us in almost all of the paintings by all of these men for these few years.

Let's look at another painting by Georges Braque from 1910-11. It's called *The Round Table*. This also is a very clear illustration of a kind of analytical approach to form. That is, the problem, grappling with the problem of how you see what actually exists in the world. Here is

the table, it is round, clearly. We look down on it here. We look straight at it here. The table has a flat surface. We're made aware of this flat surface because this is treated as a flat surface and, also, because the composition breaks right across here, as if we looked at the whole thing in elevation and not in plan. Here are the legs. [17:00] And on top, the violin and other objects from the conventional still-life vocabulary that these men were so fond of using.

Gris's progress in 1911-1912 was very rapid, but never, never did he submit any shapes to this kind of probing, looking around it from different directions that Picasso and Braque did. This painting, almost the equivalent of an old eighteenth- or nineteenth-century graduation piece. It's called *Hommage á Picasso*. It's a portrait of Picasso. And if you look at the face, you will see that there's a quality, a touch of this analysis of forms, but it hasn't anything like the consistency of Picasso or of Braque. You can see the nose and profile, and you can see [18:00] something of its development full-front. Same is true of the eyes. Same is true of the chin.

But more than that, I think one is struck again by this grid-like geometry, this cool control by the diagonals balancing the verticals, and by the marvelous repetition of elements. And again, one is struck by this quality that I call the light quality in Gris, that is, that each one of these diagonal motions seems as if it was a ray of light cutting across the shape, but not casting any shadows. Note how the little buttons in the jacket set up rhythms, down-up, down-up, and here, down and up, mirroring the sharpness of a background. But notice, also, that there is this [19:00] kind of translation of planes which we saw incipient even in rooftops. That is, here, the shoulders of Picasso and here, at a slightly different angle, again, the shoulders of Picasso. This double-image that makes a kind of polyphonic rhythm which will grow stronger and stronger in his work.

For the most part, Juan Gris was a very serious artist, as serious and as cool and as sober as the colors you see here. I think there are perhaps only one or two pictures that show him in the kind of playful mood that we so often associated with Picasso. This is one of them, *Man in a Café*, a painting of 1912. And it's clearly based on this drawing of 1911. This is a rather humorous, and also a [20:00] rather static, and also a rather conventional kind of cubist painting, not completely realized. The space in the painting is remarkably close to the space that one might perceive in the real world. There is no confusion here in seeing a ground plane and then a back plane, and then a scene of houses beyond and a sky, nor is there any difficulty in the table with its conventional cubist distortion of the legs from two different points of view, or the chair at the next table, or the next table itself, or the hand.

What there is, is a great deal of wit, rather obvious wit in the face, in the characterization. The moustache, the little mouth, the top hat, the eyes that seem to be watching the [21:00] strollers go by. It's quite amusing. The one here on the right is even more of a caricature. And this is probably the last time that Gris's overt sense of humor, that which had been manifested in his art nouveau caricatures for various publications in Madrid and in Paris, came to the surface. For the most part, from 1912 on, he proceeded in a very cool way to advance his art in the fashion which we will presently see.

The painting on the left, *Guitar and Flowers*, of 1912 is again Gris trying to assimilate the meaning of analytical cubism. The guitar is confounded with the flowers. It's blended in with

the flowers. It's mixed in with the flowers. You have a sense of the kind of [22:00] tissue paper that a bouquet is wrapped in, and the buds blooming before your eyes in all of these shapes here. And the guitar itself with its great, open sound hole, and the top and the side complementing all this, set on a table. And again, in the black part of the table, as opposed to the white part of the table, something of this polyphony that he sets up.

The picture on the right shows still more of this kind of exploration of form, the violin looked at from different angles. And now, in the color, this, a painting from the same year, 1912, a sudden burst into a brilliance that he was rarely to use, a kind of almost Baroque flavor in the handling of the cloth, the yellow-and-white cloth [23:00] sticking up, a kind of playing with a different quality of pattern in the wallpaper background and in the woodgrain on the bottom. A kind of organization of the whole variety of elements to make something fresh and something solid.

The very next year, he was to return to the cooler harmonies that he favored, even in a painting where the reference was supposed to be rather gay. Here on the left, you see A*uprès de ma Blonde*, that famous and distinctly gay, French song flat on a table. You see [24:00] the pattern of wallpaper. You see the violin. You see the glass. And the quality of looking down on the table and the quality of having something almost pinned to a wall very clearly articulated. And one very curious element, one that I find very difficult to explain, left over from the experiments of Picasso and Braque, and analytical cubism, all this brushwork in the upper-left, something that we see in the early vertical orientations of their paintings, but which we rarely encounter in the work of Juan Gris. The violin in the painting on the right is perhaps as far as Gris ever went in conventional exploration of an object seen simultaneously from a variety of points of view.

[25:00] By 1914, Gris had pretty much found his style. What I'm trying to indicate is that with very little preparation in what is called analytical cubism, he went into what is called Synthetic cubism. And this I'll try and explain in a little while. That is, he ceased to be interested in the nature, the real nature of the object, and decided that the important thing in painting was the independence of the painting and the symbolic evocation of what one would recognize.

One could get, I suppose, [26:00] almost metaphysical about this painting on the left. It's simply called *Still Life*. It's an oval still life. And the quality that makes it oval is, again, as if a beam of light were passed onto something. Not something in reality, but something in this painting. It's almost as if I had a gigantic torch and I could illuminate a section of the picture. It's hard to resist the temptation that Gris himself was thinking in terms of throwing a spotlight on a scene and affording us a key to his art. Down here, you see the key. The key throws a shadow [27:00] just as it would as if a light were really dropped from above on this scene.

The headline in the newspaper says, "*Le Vrai et Le Faux*," "the true and the false." So, then, is he now simply content to say, vision is a paradox. It's very hard to tell what is true and what is false. I present these images to you as emblems, no more, in the sense that a corner of a newspaper means newspaper. A piece of a cigarette means cigarette. A book means a book. The question arises, does a book mean simply a particular shape [28:00] to look at or does it also mean knowledge, learning? In other words, is there a distinction between emblem and symbol? And this is a question that I think we have to very seriously explore with Juan Gris, and we will shortly. The painting on the right has much of the same quality. You'll notice that what we

mentioned in the very beginning is still more developed within these cool color harmonies. That is, there is a kind of large double-rhythm. One here, and another one at an angle to it.

When Gris uses material different from paint or different from charcoal, [29:00] he uses it specifically as that which he uses. That is, when he puts down newspaper, he means it to be a newspaper. He doesn't simply mean it to be an interesting texture. This, I think, is shown in the painting at the left, as well as in the painting at the right. And the painting at the right with its beautiful colors, its sense of light, reveals, again, his rather unobtrusive but always present sense of humor because it's signed with a newspaper, Gris. And the journal, *Le Journal*, is formed or very close to Juan.

[30:00] By 1916, by 1915 even, his compositions become even sharper, even stronger. If we could focus the one on the left a little bit better, thank you. *Book, Pipe and Glasses*, is its conventional title, but it might just as well be titled, *Coffee Grinder, Coffee Pot, and Table Top*, it doesn't matter. Here, the coffee grinder, here, the pipe, here, the book, and this translation of planes which I spoke of before. Here, the glasses. Here, the table top. And the same is true of the chessboard [31:00] on the other side. His composition is getting stronger, his color richer, and at the same time, still retaining its great sobriety. These beautiful harmonies of greens and browns. These restrained textures. These deep-wine reds, that very lovely blue. The articulation of white, line drawing, to sharpen the design and not particularly to sharpen your sense of a table top.

By 1917, Gris had really hit full-stride. The painting on the right is called *Coffee Pot*. [32:00] Now, let's deal with this question of whether it's a symbol of anything or simply an emblem. Does this shape, which in a remote way, relates to the actual shape of a coffee pot, stand for anything? For example, the joys of breakfast or the taste of coffee, or the coziness of home? The answer is, no. I think it's no. The same is true of the top of the paper and the cup in there. This is simply to assist the spectator in the paradox of a beautiful form which everyone is familiar with. It's not to evoke [33:00] its particular reality, it's simply as a means of identification, so you don't feel completely lost.

The painting on the left in the collection of the Guggenheim Museum is called *Black, White and Tan*. Now, is this to suggest that Gris, like a great many of his cubist colleagues, was moving towards abstraction? If you look at it carefully, you can make identifications. Not identifications of particular objects seen as they would have been seen in an analytical cubist painting from various points of view and analyzed carefully, but rather simply broad identifications that enable you to say, cup, table, bottle. [34:00] Enough, so that you can make the poetic association, and that's all, between the reality that you encounter in daily life and the exquisite reality, the beautiful harmonies that are involved in this painting. Harmonies that would call to mind in the painting and then when you leave the experience of the painting and carry it only in your mind, the fact that a bottle has something to do with a leg. Not really, not essentially, but only as a kind of plastic metaphor, only as one shape is like another. And if you look at these shapes, a leg, like a table, a great dimension is added to your experience of the beauty of the physical world.

[35:00] Gris wrote something in a letter to Kahnweiler in 1919 that kind of touches on this

problem of abstract form. That is, he said, he always said, that he would avoid abstract form because it wasn't anchored to anything that would make people relate to the experience of the painting. It was important, yes, but let me read it to you. "I should like to continue the painting tradition with plastic means while bringing to it a new aesthetic based on the intellect. There seems to me no reason why one should not pinch Chardin's technique without taking over the appearance of his pictures or his conception of reality. Those who believe in abstract painting are like weavers, who think they can produce a material with only one set of threads and forget that there has to be another set [36:00] to hold these together. When there is no attempt at plasticity, how can you control representational liberties?" And that simply means that in the rendering of anything from life, you have to think in abstract terms. Yes. But then he goes on to say, "And where there is no concern for reality, how can you limit and unite plastic liberties?" In other words, he says, if you don't anchor the forms as emblems of something in the real world, then no one will be able to understand you.

He goes on, "For some time now, I've been quite pleased with my own work because I think that at last I'm entering on a period of realization. What's more, I've been able to test my progress. Formerly, when I started on a picture, I was satisfied at the beginning and dissatisfied at the end. [37:00] I've also been successful in ridding my painting of too-brutal a descriptive quality. It has, so to speak, become more poetic. I hope I shall come to express with great precision a reality imagined in terms of pure intellectual elements." This really means painting which is inaccurate but precise, that is to say, the reverse of bad painting which is accurate but unprecise. Our painters often seem to talk in riddles, and I hope that lecturers on paintings aren't guilty of the same difficulty.

This is a painting called, *The Chess-Board*, 1917. And in it, we can see these qualities that I've been discussing more, clear than ever. That is, the kind of double polyphony of the picture. [38:00] The table here, I call it a table for convenience's sake, and an angle of a table back like that. The chessboard here, and another angle of a chessboard in another direction. That is, a kind of double-thrust of each image.

The same is true of this painting called, *The Sideboard*, from the same year. This marvelous color, these glorious browns and greens and blacks. And here, almost like a black light, a black light with the quality of marble in it, thrown down on the sideboard. And, again, emblems of bottles, and of pans. And this light and dark, indicating the paneling of the wall. One wants to say the wall behind, but of course, it doesn't matter [39:00] whether it's behind or not.

To show you what makes the Gris quality of cubism so very distinctly different from that of another cubist painter, who was fond of the same kind of vocabulary in reality, compare *The Chess-Board* by Gris on the right with *The Chessboard* by Louis Marcoussis, another cubist, on the left. And see how Marcoussis, even well past the so-called invention of the cubist vocabulary and approach to forms, is still dealing with the problems of analytical geometry. The clear double-views, the table from on top, but cup on top and in the side. The same is true of the bottle, the label here. A great profusion of forms and a kind of atmospheric effect. Somebody might almost want to call this [40:00] a kind of an impressionistic cubism.

Another chess-board by Gris, and another bowl of Fruit on a checkered table cloth. You see how

these forms tend to repeat each other. The top and the bottom, so that in a sense, he is making a kind of metaphor. Almost as in poetry, he's saying, a grape or a fruit bowl is like a checkered table cloth. Not qualitatively, but simply visually. And the same is true of the painting on the left.

If you look at the still life here on the left, you'll see the emblem of the kind of bottle that everybody knows, the sort, I suppose, that has [41:00] seltzer in it, and that has a metal grid in front. And you can explore, you can explore for hours, the delight he takes in the pattern, and the cleverness with which he has arranged everything. The diamond shapes here carefully worked out, the black and a grey, and a white. And then an instant translation into a reverse pattern which somehow looks smaller, but which is really the same size. You can see how the pattern of the wood is compared to another pattern which is reversed up here. You can see how the package of cigarettes is worked in again strictly as an emblem. And you can see how the top of the bottle is turned into the bottom of the bottle. These are simply the delights of an eye [42:00] and the delights of a mind controlling an eye exploring form.

If you want to compare the Gris of 1917 with the Gris of 1915 to see how far he had moved, you can look at these two works. The *Place Ravignan*, that is the view from his window where he worked, two years apart. They're both fascinating paintings. The one on the left, if you look at it, is as if a kind of magic glass was interposed between you and an actual, physical reality. And this magic glass distorted everything behind according to a very regular and rigid procession so that the bottle of Medoc in here starts out with its label seen tilted to the left, passes through the glass, [43:00] and is tilted to the right, so that the table top which holds this newspaper starts with the letters tilted to the left. And then they jump as you get into the word *Journal*, and then there is a serious curvature in the glass and you get the O-U, and then finally, the N-A-L which is inevitably compared with the railing here, and the balcony here, and the pattern here.

So, all of these things are alike somehow. Again, not qualitatively, but only visually. And the distortion, which is very considerable in the front part of the picture, gives way to a very simple and rather realistic progression of form in the background from shutters that are closed, to one that is partly open, to one that is fully opened, to one that is closed again. And the leaves form a kind of T-PAT across the top.

The painting on the right, [44:00] the tree here is just an emblem. The shutter, just an emblem. The wall and shutter, just an emblem for wall and shutter with an interesting paradox of vision between inside and outside, between a form that defines the depth, perspective depth, even, going into the picture, and one that establishes a horizontal plane on the bottom.

The painting on the right, *Still Life on a Chair*. Now, with the information, *Still Life on a Chair*, one needs nothing else. One simply explores this with the eye. You don't need to know what it is, you just need to enjoy the superb patterns, the beautiful colors, the exquisite balance of the whole work.

Towards 1918, [45:00] Gris became interested in figures. But his approach to figures was no different than his approach to still life. In fact, all of these categories really break down in terms of his art, in terms of his interest. Here is a harlequin. But what fascinates him about the

harlequin and what fascinates us about the harlequin is, look, a harlequin is plastically like the pattern on a floor. The diamond shapes here, and the diamond shapes there. And once again, you have the double-project, the figure this way, and then this kind of shadow of the figure this way, so that the two intersect and form this marvelous balance and harmony. The same is true of the harlequin on the right in a slightly more complicated vein. What richness of pattern, the harlequin holding a guitar. The guitar, just an emblem of a guitar. The harlequin, [46:00] just an emblem of a harlequin. The picture, the reality, and the only reality for this painter.

Perhaps one of the reasons that Gris is such a moving painter, once you come to know him, once you get used to the kind of passion that is involved in such a cool and mental approach to vision, is the fact that he died so young. He died in 1927. And these paintings of the '20s, showed that he just continued to find more and more of these metaphors in what he looked at.

[47:00] He took the outside, and he brought it into the inside, as in this picture called *Table Before the Sea*. Here is a table, of course. Again, the kind of polyphonic projection. One, and then another. Here is a vase, and one side of the vase is a side of the guitar. Another vase. The quality of a vase, there to hold something, is paralleled by the pallet, with its lozenge-like spots of paint. Not real spots of paint, simply emblems of them, holding brushes.

The side of the table becomes the side of the book. The book itself becomes almost like, again, the tissue-wrapping of paper. The lines on the book are [48:00] like the silver lines of light on water. The open book is like the mountain in the background. The blue of the sky is in the blue of the shutter. The lines of the shutter are like the strings of a guitar. The aperture of the guitar is like the lozenge-like spots of paint.

This is simply not pattern, it is the evocation of one vision that anybody can have in looking at the world with something else that he can see in the world. And I don't know any painting more beautiful and that may sum all this up as a 1922 work called, as you can see, *The Canigou*, a mountain, a well-known mountain [49:00] in the Pyrenees.

The table, again. The side of the table becomes the side of the room. The guitar, an emblem of a guitar. The strings on the guitar, related to the book. Above all, the beautiful mountain, snow-capped, in which the table plays an enormous role. The beautiful, snow-capped mountain that swings into the shutter like a page of a book in which, again, the top of the mountain is mirrored. The shutter, which swings us into the picture, holding us in the picture. The shutter, like the page of the book. [50:00] And one could look at it, I think perhaps, for hours and never exhausted because the colors are so sober, and yet so rich, so beautiful.

And this is the quality of Juan Gris's art, a quality which he said was intellectual. A quality, which he said was to express with great precision, a reality that was imagined. That is, he's not trying to tell you, this is the nature of reality. He's simply trying to tell you that if you look at reality, you can find all sorts of unexpected delights in it. You have to use your eyes, but you also have to use your mind. This is why he is one of the most beautiful cubist painters there ever was. Thank you very much. [51:00] (applause)

END OF AUDIO FILE
615214T06_01.mp3

Juan Gris / Daniel Robbins. 1962/2/15. Reel-to-Reel collection. A0004. Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum Archives, New York

