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The year 1981 marks the 100th anniversary of Pablo Picasso's birth. As part of the National Gallery of Art's celebration of this centenary occasion, we are presenting an exhibition, *Picasso: The Saltimbanques*. It focuses on the Gallery's *Family of Saltimbanques*, which as part of the Chester Dale Collection, could not be lent to the other Picasso exhibitions recently concluded or now being arranged.

This painting has played an important role in the development of the Gallery's collection of twentieth-century art. In 1952, the *Family of Saltimbanques* went on exhibition with other paintings by Picasso and Georges Braque lent by Chester Dale, marking the first major showing of works by living artists at this institution. In 1962 the Dale Bequest—including the *Family of Saltimbanques*—was accepted by the Board of Trustees, thus establishing the foundation of our twentieth-century collection. In the last decade, our acquisition activities in this area have expanded, with the goal of assembling by the year 2000 a body of works representing the key moments in modern art.

*Picasso: The Saltimbanques* brings together a selection of the artist's paintings devoted to that subject, augmented by related prints and drawings. The exhibition traces, through works by Watteau, Daumier, Manet, and Seurat, the traditions of Harlequin, Pierrot, and the jester, from their origins in the commedia dell'arte of the seventeenth century to their merger with the circus performers of Picasso's own day. It describes the evolution and meaning of the *Family of Saltimbanques* and includes a documentary section which provides a technical and visual record of the multiple stages in the creation of this grand painting.

This exhibition follows *Mondrian: The Diamond Compositions* as the second in a series of projects devoted to a study of key developments in twentieth-century art. These two shows also join *Berenson and the Connoisseurship of Italian Painting* in exploring in depth various aspects of the Gallery's collection.

We are most grateful to the lenders who have allowed their rare paintings, drawings, prints, and sculpture to be included in this exhibition. Although the condition of certain objects did not permit them to travel to Washington, we have included them in the essay and in the revised list of Saltimbanque works to permit a fuller understanding of this theme in Picasso's art.

*Picasso: The Saltimbanques* was organized by E. A. Carmean, Jr., our curator of twentieth-century art. Trinkett Clark, research assistant in the Twentieth-Century Department, aided in all phases of the exhibition. Ann Hoenigswald and Barbara Miller of our Conservation Department worked together with Mr. Carmean on the scientific examination of the *Family of Saltimbanques*. This study also required the assistance of a number of art historians who kindly made available their specialized knowledge of the subject. Many other Gallery staff members were involved in this project, and we extend to them and to the many generous lenders from America, Europe, and Japan our grateful appreciation.

J. CARTER BROWN
Director
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PICASSO: THE SALTIMBANQUES

E. A. Carmean, Jr.

Picasso had progressed, and the “Blue Period” gave way to the saltimbanques. The first of these was a large canvas: a group of acrobats on a plain. Some are resting, the others working. A child is trying to balance on a large ball. If I remember correctly this canvas was repainted several times.

FERNANDE OLIVIER (1933)

A famous painting, [the Family of Saltimbanques was] superimposed over . . . two other compositions as important. . . .

ANDRÉ LEVEL (1928)

FERNANDE OLIVIER did remember correctly. Picasso did begin the Saltimbanques with the large picture she described, and the canvas was repainted several times. The painting was not lost: it evolved to become the Family of Saltimbanques (pl. 1, fig. 69) now at the National Gallery.

Recent analysis has shown that beneath the surface of the Washington painting lie not only significant alternative states of the present composition but also two entirely different pictures, just as Level, its first owner, described. One of these —the earliest—is Olivier’s Circus Family (fig. 21, pl. 8). Like archaeological strata, the successive layers in the Family of Saltimbanques record the developments in Picasso’s art from the end of the Blue Period in late 1904 to the beginning of the pre-Gosol classical figures of early 1906. While the works of these fifteen months—often called the “Rose Period” or the “Circus Period”—have long been known, their art-historical organization has remained confused. “Chronologically we are entering the unknown,” wrote Pierre Daix and Georges Boudaille of this year and a quarter. Now, because of the sequential states of the Family of Saltimbanques, the Rose or Circus Period gains a new clarity. At the same time, we can observe how Picasso came to use, more fully comprehend, then finally deepen the meanings of this grand painting.

The present exhibition and the essay which follows form a study of the saltimbanque theme in Picasso’s early work. This project emerged from the research undertaken in preparation for a complete catalogue of Picasso’s paintings in the National Gallery’s collection. During these studies I came to realize that the artist’s Family of Saltimbanques not only summarized much of Picasso’s early work but also cast those concerns in a new, resolved, and more modern manner. The painting should be seen as his first masterpiece; its scale and its revisions indicate he clearly intended it as such. But more importantly, with the Family of Saltimbanques Picasso’s art became more resonant, both formally and thematically, and in that sense alone the work marks his artistic maturity.

The existence of numerous studies for the Family of Saltimbanques suggested that we examine the painting in the conservation laboratory. The discovery of not only the changes in the final composition but also the partial existence of earlier, completely different states required that Ann Hoenigswald and I undertake a more complex study of the work, counterpointing and combining scientific evidence and art-historical argument. The results of this research and analysis are published here as a separate section. This is followed by a “History and Critical Fortune” of the Family of Saltimbanques, providing a profile of its owners, its critical reception, and the scholarly interpretations of its meanings. The catalogue concludes with a checklist, proposing a reorganization of the Saltimbanque imagery, and a selected chronology and bibliography.

The Family of Saltimbanques has never been the subject of a full-length study, despite its prominence in Picasso’s oeuvre. Nevertheless,
our study would not have been possible without the crucial Picasso scholarship of the last twenty years. Christian Zervos in his catalogue raisonné began the collation of the various paintings and drawings and literally made discussion possible, a step continued in Daix and Boudaille’s *Picasso: The Blue and Rose Periods*. Their text went beyond Zervos’s overview and initiated the tighter focus on this period. In particular, Daix and Boudaille began to describe the emergence and importance of the saltimbanque theme. In many ways Theodore Reff’s “Harlequin, Saltimbanques, Clowns and Fools” of 1971 and a related lecture mark the turning point in the analysis of these works; his argument is indispensable to an understanding of the picture’s meaning. Following this study, Ronald Johnson’s “Picasso’s Parisian Family and the Saltimbanques” (1977) directly addressed the cast of characters in the painting, while the organization of the drawings was greatly clarified by Victor Carlson in his 1976 catalogue of the sheets at the Baltimore Museum. Other, unpublished studies made available to me by Reff, Robert Rosenblum, and William Rubin have further aided the following essay.

**Saltimbanque**

“But tell me, who are they, these acrobats, even a little/more fleeting than we ourselves—so urgently, ever since childhood—/wrung by an (oh, for the sake of whom?)/never-contended will?” wrote Rainer Maria Rilke in his fifth *Duino Elegy*, inspired by Picasso’s large painting. Like the poem, the painting presents a group of wandering acrobats and performers, and both belong to a stream of works which have this subject. Only by understanding this tradition can we begin to approach the *Family of Saltimbanques*.

The Washington painting was first published with the title, *Les Bateleurs*, in the catalogue of its public auction in 1914 (fig. 95). The present title, *Family of Saltimbanques*, although perhaps added later, is certainly more correct. Picasso exhibited several related works in February 1905 under the heading, *Les Saltimbanques*, and as early as 1924 the Washington painting was referred to by this same title. While the distinction between the two terms may be slight, it is an important one for our understanding of the precise iconography of the work.

Both the *bateleurs* and the *saltimbanques* are entertainers. The French term *saltimbanque* derives from the Italian *saltimbanco* which is a combination of *saltare* (to leap), in (on), and *benco* (bench). By its origin, *saltimbanco* not only indicates that the entertainer was athletic but also suggests he was itinerant, as his only stage was a portable bench. By contrast the term *bateleur* derives from the ancient French *bateleur*, a player of *basteaux*, small *baquettes*, or batons, and thus originally indicated the juggler. In a narrow sense, the saltimbanques—who may also juggle—can be synonymous with the bateleurs. However, the bateleur traces his origin back through the medieval church to Roman culture in France, and he has a long French tradition.

By the eighteenth century, the bateleurs had become associated with the *forains*, traveling merchants who enticed customers with a sideshow. The forains, who were identified as wanderers—and originally as gypsies—had appeared in Paris by 1427. Although they were often called “Les Belles Vagabondes,” by the eighteenth century these merchants had actually become permanently located in the Saint-Germain section of the city, and in 1749 they became a center of civic attention when their exhibition of a rhinoceros captured the Parisian fancy.

It is recorded that saltimbanques were at that time in Paris as well, and that they also were located in the Saint-Germain section. Because of this relationship the saltimbanques are sometimes identified as forains and also given a gypsy origin. However, even in Paris, they were not part of any larger organization. Where the forains employed the bateleurs as part of their show, the saltimbanques were independent, and they were more clearly itinerant.

Perhaps because of their peripatetic nature, the saltimbanques have been directly identified with the traveling troupes of actors who made up the commedia dell’arte. Both the commedia and the saltimbanques have Italian origins. After 1800 saltimbanques frequently dressed in the costumes of the commedia performers, and their identity was soon merged with that of these contemporary wandering actors.

**Commedia dell’Arte**

The commedia dell’arte arose out of the Italian medieval saltimbanque tradition of wandering entertainers. While saltimbanque troupes continued their street appearances, by the sixteenth century other performers had been organized into professional companies, although the circumstances of this transition remain obscure. True to their saltimbanque origins, the commedia players remained peripatetic and their presentations continued to be improvisational. While a general plot
outline was developed and stock characters created—who were recognizable through standardized masks—the dynamics of the commedia programs still remained in the impromptu interactions among the performers.

The commedia dell’arte, although it emerged in Italy, was also well received in France. An Italian troupe appeared in Paris as early as 1570, with a “principal” company returning the next year. In 1572, the famous Gelosi company performed at the nuptials of the king of Navarre, and in 1577, when they returned to appear for Henri III, the Gelosi were accorded the honor of performing at the Hôtel de Bourbon. The commedia became increasingly popular—their audience was recorded as “larger than that of Paris’ four most popular preachers”—and they soon were an almost constant presence at the French court.

During this period the cast of the commedia generally consisted of two elderly gentlemen, a lover and his love, a maidservant, two male servants, and occasional extras. In time, however, more specific characters were developed within different companies or by particular performers. Certain figures acquired a particular identity only in France, indicating the major role of Paris in the development of the commedia dell’arte. For example, the maidservant was given a specific mask—she had been played undisguised before—and an identity as Columbine in Paris in the late seventeenth century. Columbine’s counterpart, Harlequin, was most likely also of French origin, perhaps developing from one of the servants as early as 1572 with the arrival of the Gelosi company in France. Subsequently, Tristino Martinelli articulated the role in Paris so fully that Harlequin became a clearly defined figure and was especially popular with the French court.

Because of their Parisian origins, Columbine and Harlequin were clearly more French in their characterization. Columbine was delicate and coquettish, while her love for Harlequin, a new plot introduced specifically for the French, placed her in contrast to this dramatically different figure. Harlequin is the quickest of the performers, both in action and in wit. He is repeatedly—and suddenly—tumbling and jumping, while also plotting, scheming, and falling in love. The character was originally to be a black man, an identification which eventually was lost, and his mask was gradually transformed from the classic black band with eyeholes. Harlequin’s costume, initially a servant’s coat of multicolored patches, evolved to become a suit of regular diamonds of different hues and eventually became a garment with a lozenge pattern in black and white. More than the other figures, Harlequin, with his cunning, his acrobatics, and his patched costume, retained a linkage with the saltimbanque origins of the commedia dell’arte troupe.

The prestige of the commedia dell’arte increased at the French court during the seventeenth century. In 1650 Cardinal Mazarin brought Joseph-Dominique Biancolelli—called Dominique— to Paris, where this famous Harlequin became a court favorite and enjoyed a unique position similar to that of the medieval jester, free to talk openly and directly to the king, Louis XIV. Dominique, once present at the king’s dinner, looked longingly at a course of partridges being served on gold plates. Recognizing his interest, Louis XIV ordered, “Give them to Harlequin,” to which Dominique replied, “What, the partridges too?”

While this kind of repartee clearly delighted the king, it annoyed Mme. de Maintenon, his mistress. Her puritanical hauteur was offended by the coarseness of the commedia dell’arte performance, and in 1697 she had the troupe dismissed from the French court. After this royal rejection, the commedia actors did occasionally perform for the court; however, they also began a gradual return to their origin as saltimbanques. As we shall see, this combination of exalted status and subsequent wandering may underscore the theme in Picasso’s work.

Watteau

In Antoine Watteau’s paintings dating directly after the dismissal of the commedia dell’arte performers, we see a new, romantic idea of these entertainers develop, an interpretation which also continued in Picasso’s work and indeed survives today. Watteau’s teacher, Claude Gillot, had a passion for the commedia dell’arte, and this subject entered Watteau’s paintings by 1703, when the younger artist became Gillot’s assistant. But in Watteau’s hands the theme was given two new interpretations in reaction to the court’s rejection of the commedia’s “coarseness”; the actors became refined and elegant, while certain figures, especially Gilles (also known as Pierrot), who like Columbine and Harlequin was invented in France, became distant and introspective in contrast to their earlier more extroverted personalities.

Watteau was not alone in his desire to adapt the commedia dell’arte to the more refined world of the French court and Parisian society. The playwright Marivaux, for ex-
ample, produced a play entitled *Harlequin Polished by Love*, in which the awkward commedia figure is transformed by feminine—that is to say Parisian—influence. In Watteau’s elegant and charming pictorial world the ladies and gentlemen of society could be replaced by Columbine and Harlequin. When presented on stage as in the *Italian Comedians* of 1720 (fig. 1), the actors acquired graceful postures and refined movements, a personality shift culminating in the monumental Gilles placed in repose at the center of the work. Only the active Harlequin, on the left of Gilles, retains a sense of his origins.

In Watteau’s hands, Gilles also began to acquire a dual identity, as we see in this painting and in the famous Louvre Gilles. At once he is a performer—indeed, placed at the center of the work he is the focus of the comedy—while he is also isolated from the others, both spatially and emotionally, by his introspective expression. This detachment causes his private character to emerge. These works begin the theme of the entertainer who is also portrayed as a person behind his mask, a man forever distant from his audience yet required to perform.

### Countryside and City

The eighteenth century witnessed the wholesale transformation of the commedia dell’arte into wandering companies of performers. Watteau allegorized the new, politically motivated status of the commedia in a set of two related pictures. *Love in the French Theater* takes place by day in a garden, the performing figures as elegant as those of French society; by contrast, *Love in the Italian Theater*, set at night in a gloomy, untended space lit by a torch and a clouded moon, suggests the performers are spending a cold evening in the country, certainly a far cry from the grand comfort they formerly enjoyed at the French court.9 Interestingly the same situation existed in Italy, as illustrated by Giovanni Domenico Tiepolo’s *The Spring Shower* (fig. 2) from the Punchinello drawings. Here two Punchinellos and a central group of bateleurs stand isolated in the rain in an empty landscape. As Marcia Vetrocq observes, both the mood and the composition of this sheet directly anticipate Picasso’s *Family of Saltimbanques*.10 By 1831, when Dumersan and Verin made direct...
reference to the commedia dell'arte in a play consisting of three, uninterrupted acts, performed by buffoons, calembours, and Harlequin, they chose as their title a term which clearly defined the commedia performers' new place in society: Les Saltimbanques.

It is important to emphasize that the actual saltimbanques of the nineteenth century were still theatrical performers, however poor their stage equipment or remote their location. Their impoverished condition can be seen in Adolphe Roehn's Country Fair, for example, where the masked and costumed actors, including Harlequin, perform on a makeshift stage (fig. 3). An even more destitute troupe appears in Honoré Daumier's The Saltimbanques (fig. 4), their stage reduced to a small, bare rug and their etymological bench now a straight-backed chair. Attempting to literally "drum up" business, the figures are isolated from the crowd, and their identity as a family emphasized by Daumier's inclusion of the two child acrobats. In other works, Daumier's family of saltimbanques is seen in the city, as in the National Gallery's Wandering Saltimbanques (fig. 5), a picture which stresses their vagabond existence rather than their performance.

It is possible that Daumier identified with the saltimbanques. Art historians have often seen in Watteau's earlier Gilles a connection between the visual artist and the actor, each bound to the necessity of performance. In a similar way, Daumier's Saltimbanques can be seen as more than another example of his interest in varying aspects of French society. Indeed, to a greater degree than that of many artists, Daumier's career was devoted to a kind of per-
Edouard Manet, French (1832-1883), The Old Musician, 1862, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Chester Dale Collection, 1962. Cat. no. 10.

performance—his constant production of drawings for use as newspaper cartoons.

Not only do Daumier's saltimbanque families record the merging of the commedia with the wandering acrobats, but they also serve as the clearest pictorial and emotional prototype for Picasso's treatment of the theme. Besides their availability in reproductions, the Saltimbanque works were shown in a Daumier retrospective in Paris in 1901, which Picasso was likely to have attended. And Picasso may even have known the composition of The Old Musician, as a variant sketch for it was at one time in the possession of the Durand-Ruel gallery in Paris. Daumier's use of two acrobat children may be telling.

The theme of the rootless traveling entertainer appears in another work of the 1860s, Edouard Manet's The Old Musician (fig. 6) also in the National Gallery. It is this painting which had the greatest influence on Picasso's Family of Saltimbanques, a relationship discussed below. Anne Coffin Hanson has argued that The Old Musician is the product of a widespread mid-century interest in the theme of gypsies; the subject was a popular one in Salon painting of the time. Indeed, Manet himself painted a picture of gypsies during this period. In the Washington painting, however, he explicitly expands this theme to the much broader one of wandering entertainers and underscores this extension through references to earlier art. As Hanson observes, only the girl on the left, holding a child, can be iconographically seen as a gypsy since she suggests one of the standard activities associated with this group, the stealing of babies.

There is much evidence that the character types in The Old Musician depend upon actual figures seen in the “Little Poland” slum near Manet's studio, and the picture can thus be placed in a realist context. Yet Manet's clear intention was also to distance the figures from documentation, both by underscoring their psychological isolation and by connecting them to the theme of the wandering entertainer through the use of iconographic and formal art-historical references. For example, the cropped figure at the right...
has been identified as “a quack doctor or hawker of medicine,” a connection which in turn allows us to link the scene, tangentially, with the forains and their attendant performances.16

The entertainer, the “old musician,” is of course at the center of the work. Reff proposes that he is related to actual street musicians in Paris.17 However, even given this source, the scene is not set in Paris but in the country. This location can be an acknowledgment of Manet’s clearest compositional sources, the works of the Le Nain, such as the *Old Piper* and *The Rest of the Horsemen*. In these paintings and others (fig. 7) not only are there connections with the figures and mood in the Manet, but also “the broad expanse of landscape behind the figures . . . serves to separate them from each other as in *The Old Musician”*.18 This empty landscape can also serve to locate the entertainers within the same countryside tradition of saltimbanques seen in Daumier’s works from this decade. In a more important way, the idea that the boy in white derives from Watteau’s Gilles may be seen as poetically underpinning this connection. Through this “disguised Gilles,” Manet consciously evokes the commedia dell’arte tradition, which was continued in his time by the wandering saltimbanques suggested in this work.

The existence of a lost, yet present, commedia world implied in *The Old Musician* reflects a point of view prevalent in the mid- to late nineteenth century. At this time repeated efforts to revive or reinvent the commedia were made, beginning as we have seen with the play *Les Saltimbanques* of 1831. A reinvention of a different kind led to the direct association of the characters’ personalities with their costumes in situations unrelated to commedia performances. This transformation can be seen in Jean-Léon Gérôme’s *Duel After the Ball* (fig. 8) painted five years before the Manet. The scene depicted here—a Pierrot dying in the snow, defeated in a duel with an Indian who is led off...
by his second, a Harlequin—was based on an actual duel between party goers. Curiously, the combatants were really costumed as Pierrot and Harlequin. Gérôme’s picture, one of his many versions of the subject, was a reflection of the public’s great interest in this event. Thomas Couture also painted the scene, and both artists included their works in the 1857 Salon, where the Gérôme version was especially popular with viewers. What makes this death in the snowy Bois de Boulogne so moving is its contrast to the make-believe world of the stage. While Pierrot and Harlequin had quarreled in the commedia performances, this event was a real death, a vicious ending to a dispute between merrymakers.

Harlequin, Pierrot, and Columbine also had a theatrical existence apart from revivals of the commedia dell’arte. As Edgar Degas’s *Harlequin and Columbine* shows (fig. 9), these characters could be transferred to the ballet, while remaining recognizable both by costume and by identifying gestures, such as Harlequin’s hiding his bat. In contrast to the modified Harlequins of Gérôme and Degas, the real Harlequins did continue to perform on their makeshift stages in the country (fig. 3) or now more often on the streets of Paris and its outlying areas. Georges Seurat left a record in his drawings of urban entertainers, costumed as clowns rather than as Harlequins, performing on stage or dancing under the gas lights before a café (figs. 10, 11). By the end of the nineteenth century the saltimbanques as well as the commedia actors had begun to merge with the circus performers. The circus itself became a principal theme in nineteenth-century painting, in the works of Degas, Seurat, and especially Henri Toulouse-Lautrec (fig. 12). Thus by the turn of the century, art drew upon the commedia and the saltimbanques in various ways. The costumed figure could now be a merrymaker, a performer in the circus or on stage, or an actual wandering entertainer.


Literature

In contemporary literature the entertainer became an important subject as well. Reff observed in his study of the commedia theme that Flaubert, Banville, and Baudelaire—to cite only three—all wrote works in the nineteenth century which involve the saltimbanque performer. Furthermore, in these stories, essays, or poems, the artist—as a nonconformist figure—was identified with the rootless entertainer, while at the same time the circus performer—especially the clown and the acrobat—was again merged with the more restricted saltimbanque character. As Reff notes:

By the end of the [nineteenth] century, the association has become so familiar that a volume of biographical sketches of famous circus performers, comparing them in their inescapable loneliness and unhappiness to all entertainers and artists, is almost inevitably entitled Pauvres Saltimbanques.

Many writers have also identified with the entertainer on the basis of their shared need to perform and their possession of finely honed skills. Reff has observed that perhaps the most expansive work of the nineteenth century which builds upon this allegory of the artist as a performer refining his craft is Edmond de Goncourt’s Les Frères Zemganno. Both Edmond and his brother Jules achieved extraordinary careers as authors and art historians; Jules’s early death was paralleled in Les Frères Zemganno by the near death of the younger Zemganno. As Reff states, in this novel Goncourt’s focus is on “the arduous early training of the two acrobats and on their subsequent efforts to invent increasingly complex movements and forms.”

Early Picassos

Thus the end of the nineteenth century saw a cross-current in both literature and painting flowing between the circus performer, the saltimbanque proper, and the traditional commedia figure. It is this interaction which Picasso confronted upon his arrival in Paris in 1900. To be sure, aspects of this relationship were also current in Spain at the end of the century. While still in Barcelona, Picasso first used a commedia dell’arte figure in the illustration for a carnival handbill celebrating the New Year of 1900, known today from a preliminary sketch now in Spain and a more finished sheet in France (fig. 13). Pierrot is shown toasting the New Year with champagne glass in hand, accompanied by a masked woman clutching a bag at her waist. These revelers use the commedia figures’ identities as costumes suitable for a masked ball or a carnival, as here, and thus follow that aspect of saltimbanque tradition seen earlier in Gérôme’s Duel, although to a lesser degree. While both of Picasso’s sheets are beautifully drawn, their commercial purpose limited the theme to a conventional meaning.

In October of 1900 Picasso and his friend Carlos Casagemas left Barcelona for Paris, remaining there until mid-December. This visit
marked important changes in Picasso's work, for although he had certainly been aware of French nineteenth-century painting while still in Spain, in Paris he came into direct contact with it. Seeing the work of Bonnard, Cézanne, Lautrec, Degas, and others, Picasso responded by painting in a French style, especially keyed to that of Lautrec and Degas. He also reacted to their focus on the stage. Following Lautrec's images of Parisian nightlife, Picasso painted his first Paris oil, *Le Moulin de la Galette* (The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York). His attention to Degas's ballet world can be seen in *The Blue Dancer* where the dancer who fills the center of the stage is joined by a commedia dell'arte Pierrot.24 Although not specifically a ballet, Picasso's painting recalls Degas's picture of *Harlequin and Columbine* (fig. 9) discussed above. Thus the nineteenth-century's theatrical use of the commedia figures also becomes part of his work.

On December 20th Picasso and Casagemas left France for Barcelona, but the latter quickly returned to Paris as he was in love with a model called Germaine. Picasso continued on to Madrid. In February Casagemas committed suicide over his affair, and when Picasso returned to Paris in May he assumed his studio. Although Picasso again returned to French themes of nightlife, cafés, Parisian streets, and horseraces, the elements which lead to the Blue Period of 1902 also became evident in his work.

Brooding on Casagemas's suicide clearly changed Picasso's outlook and his art. By the fall of 1901 the influences of this new perspective can be seen in his next two commedia figures, a Pierrot now in New York (fig. 14) and the *Harlequin and His Companion* (fig. 15) in Russia.

---


These works are closely related in theme. Rather than the glittering world of the stage or the excitement of the masked party, here each commedia-clad figure is seen in a café, lost in thought, his profile silhouetted against a banquette and decorated wall.

The image of a pensive customer in a café is not rare. Picasso surely experienced the subject numerous times in his daily life, as one still does in Paris today. The theme had earlier served Degas, Lautrec, and Manet (fig. 16); the work of the former is close to Picasso’s Harlequin in its perspective and in the juxta-


position of male and female.\(^{25}\) What is distinctive about the Picasso pictures is the use of commedia dell’arte costumes.\(^{26}\)

Although the Moscow pair are traditionally referred to as saltimbanques, nothing in the work directly supports a reading of them as traveling entertainers. However, Picasso’s intention is clear: to show the performer as withdrawn and thoughtful, in contrast to his care-free theatrical antics. Picasso strips away the mask, either directly, as with Harlequin, or metaphorically, as with the still white-faced Pierrot. Thus he portrays the entertainer as both a performer and an individual, a characterization which we have seen was introduced by Watteau’s Gilles and developed in the nineteenth century. This duality underlies the 1905 Saltimbanques, but there it is enriched and deepened by personal and poetic meanings. The use of this theme in these two early works shows how quickly and successfully Picasso had comprehended the meaning of the subject and even added to its pictorial repertoire.

The Blue Period

Picasso returned to Barcelona in January of 1902 and remained there until April 1904, except for a brief trip to Paris in October 1902, a visit that ended in failure and poverty. The Barcelona years embrace the Blue Period, when “Picasso chose to paint misfortune.”\(^{27}\) The use of blue as a dominant color to establish mood had actually emerged earlier in Paris, as had the subject of less fortunate, remote figures, for example, those in the two café paintings. But back in Spain, Picasso’s blues deepen, the drawing becomes more mannerist (surely inspired by El Greco), while the subject matter is now “beggars, sick people, the crippled, the hungry and prostitutes [all] painted in the same style.”\(^{28}\) Les Misérables, as they are called, dominate Picasso’s paintings, drawings, and watercolors, especially after his humiliating return from Paris in 1903. Often, as in The Tragedy (fig. 17), Picasso presents them as a family group, huddled together before an empty seascape.

With this absence from France, Harlequin, Pierrot, and Columbine do not appear in the Blue Period work. However, Les Misérables do establish the broader theme of the poor, outcast family that underpins the later Saltimbanque pictures. And, while the commedia characters are not present, Picasso did paint other costumed figures—Catalan peasants dressed for a village dance. Among the Catalan watercolors, a painting showing four peasants (fig. 18) is the most ger-

17. Picasso, The Tragedy, 1903, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Chester Dale Collection, 1962. Cat. no. 82.

mane to our topic. This sheet is an uncanny prediction of the Family of Saltimbanques: not only are these figures in costume, but they are also composed in a similar fashion, with adults at the left and a child slightly separated to their right, staring away from the group. In both
works a barren landscape fills the background, and each contrasts the pleasure of performance and the despair of the private situation.

The realism of the Catalan peasants, who were probably sketched from life in the summer of 1903, predicts the general stylistic shift which begins to take place at the end of the Blue Period, signaling the start of the Circus Period in 1904. Not only were the Blue Period works mannered in their style and thus more abstracted, but the subjects in these pictures were largely treated as symbolic images rather than reflecting observed reality. In a similar way, the commedia café figures were presented as emblematic images, in accordance with their fin de siècle style. However by 1904, and especially after his return to Paris, Picasso began to base his work on subjects he had seen, rather than those he had imagined. During this period the mannerist style of exaggerated outlines and thin, attenuated figures continues, as in the Woman Ironing (fig. 23), but other pictures now appear which directly capture urban life.

With Picasso’s return to Paris in April 1904, the commedia figures return to his work. The most enigmatic of these commedia paintings is the Wedding of Pierrette (fig. 19), probably completed before the beginning of the Circus Period in late 1904, given the Blue Period mannerism of its figures. As Reff has shown, the title of the work is a traditional one, not one given by Picasso himself. Thus the conventional interpretation of the scene—Pierrette has been wed to the rich, top-hatted man at her right and now receives a bow and a blown farewell kiss from Harlequin—may be fanciful. This observation is supported by the lack of a comparable incident in the surviving commedia dell’arte texts. Furthermore, the presence of tables in the composition suggests a nightclub scene, rather than a view of a performance or a reference to one. The idea that the painting represents an offstage activity, however, is confused by the
surviving drawings for the work (fig. 20). Although the Harlequin in these sheets remains virtually identical with his final image in the painting, Pierrette—or Columbine—in the drawings is a standing figure, elegantly attired. Pierrot, in wide collar and hat, stands to the side, observing Harlequin’s farewell. The placement of the figures, their poses, and the dramatic interactions all suggest the stage.

Another enigmatic picture, dating from this period or perhaps slightly later and depicting the Harlequin in a café, is popularly known as *At the Lapin Agile* (pl. 2). While the meaning of the work remains obscure, the figures here can be identified. In pairing Harlequin and a female companion in a café situation, Picasso clearly returns to the theme of the earlier *Harlequin and His Companion* of 1901, to which the figures, their distant stares, and the foreground table with glasses all correspond. But where the earlier work is drawn from conventional symbols, this 1904-1905 picture uses the symbols to record aspects of Picasso’s personal life. *At the Lapin Agile* refers to a Montmartre café of that name which was a favorite haunt of Picasso and his close friends of the period—Max Jacob, Guillaume Apollinaire, André Salmon—and later his mistress Fernande Olivier as well. The guitar player depicted against the back wall is in fact Frédé, owner of the café. Portraiture extends to the seated couple, since Harlequin is clearly recognizable as Picasso himself, and the artist has identified his companion as “a likeness of Germaine, for whom his great friend, the painter Casagemas, committed suicide.” Thus Picasso continues the personal, allegorical use of the saltimbanques developed in the preceding century.

*At the Lapin Agile* poses a question: why are Picasso and Germaine together in this café and shown in this guise? On one level Germaine may have served Picasso as an image of the woman as evil. He had come to assume that she was responsible for Casagemas’s death; yet nothing in the picture specifically condemns her, aside from Harlequin’s slight aloofness. Indeed, she is as estranged as he. And, even if *At the Lapin Agile* is intended to refer to this death, its contemporary location would have the figures remembering the suicide across a span of two years.

Gertrude Stein later wrote of Germaine that “there were many other tales of Germaine Pichot and the circus where she found her lovers.” Has Picasso painted himself as one of these? Certainly Germaine appears in Picasso’s work frequently enough to suggest a possible relationship, but she is not cast as Columbine here which argues against that interpretation, as do Picasso’s strong feelings about the death of his friend. Stein’s statement does suggest that in the fall of 1904 Germaine might have introduced Picasso to the circus, where he found the Harlequin, jesters, and acrobats of the *Family of Saltimbanques*.

During the same period, Picasso probably became aware of paintings by Paul Cézanne which explore the commedia theme. In one of these works Cézanne portrays his son Paul in a Harlequin costume dressed for Mardi Gras (fig. 76), while the other, called *Mardi Gras*, repeats this figure joined by a Pierrot, portrayed by Paul’s friend. Picasso may have known either or both of these works; the latter was available at Ambroise Vollard’s gallery and became even more prominent when Cézanne exhibited it in the 1904 Salon d’Automne. Daix and Boudaille argue that in seeing the *Mardi Gras* at the Salon: “Picasso may have found there a kind of authorization to paint this character [Harlequin].” Furthermore, the November 1904 exhibition is exactly coincidental with the beginnings of Picasso’s visits to the circus and his almost total emersion in the saltimbanque theme and in the Harlequin figure in particular.

### Circus Family

Another important event took place in the fall of 1904: the beginning of Picasso’s affair with Fernande Olivier, who, as we shall see, played the central role in the final development of the *Family of Saltimbanques*. Olivier was a neighbor of Picasso’s in an apartment house in the artists’ section of Paris. She later described the scene of their meeting:

From 1903 to 1912, 13 rue de Ravignan, in Montmartre, an uncomfortable wooden house nicknamed the *Bateau-Lavoir*, was the refuge of assorted paint-
ers, sculptors, writers, humorists, actors, washerwomen, dressmakers, and barrowboys.

It was glacial in winter and like a Turkish bath in summer, and its inhabitants used to meet at the only source of water, carrying a large pitcher. . . . It was there that I saw him [Picasso] for the first time. . . .

As I lived in the same house as he did I often bumped into him. . . . I met Picasso as I was coming home one thundery evening. He was holding a tiny kitten in his arms, and he held it out to me, laughing and blocking my path. I laughed too, and he took me to see his studio. . . .

This was the end of the “Blue Period.” Huge, unfinished canvases stood all over the studios, and everything there suggested work: but my God, in what chaos!34

Their affair began soon after, as is documented in a watercolor.35 Thus Olivier was present at the beginning of the Saltimbanques. As she recorded:

Picasso had progressed, and the “Blue Period” gave way to the saltimbanques.

The first of these was a large canvas: a group of acrobats on a plain. Some are resting, the others working. A child is trying to balance on a large ball. If I remember correctly this canvas was repainted several times.36

In the late fall or early winter of 1904 Picasso began working on this large painting. The composition, which will be referred to here as the Circus Family, was subsequently painted over and is now under the Washington Family of Saltimbanques (see Study Section). Save for slight pentimenti, it is visible only in an x-radiographic montage (fig. 85). This montage clearly shows that the
composition of the *Circus Family* was very close to that known today in a watercolor now in Baltimore (fig. 21, pl. 8) and even closer to that of a drypoint made a short time later (fig. 22).

The tighter correspondence between the print and the larger composition now visible in the x-radiographic composite is an important clue in understanding Picasso's procedure in painting the *Circus Family*, his first large-scale work. We have recently discovered an unrecorded version of the drypoint, printed before the Delâtre edition of 1905. The earlier image is missing both a number of minor details, such as the interior definition of the wagon wheel and the artist's signature. This apparently unique working print has been lightly scored with fifteen horizontal and vertical lines. While such a grid would serve no function in the printing process, it would be enormously useful in greatly enlarging a composition as complex as the *Circus Family*. A detail of this squaring is significant. While there are fifteen horizontal and vertical divisions indicated, Picasso has numbered only fourteen of these in each direction: the upper register and the left margin have been eliminated from the grid. These cropped areas are exactly those portions of the drypoint composition which are missing from the x-radiographic image. We suggest therefore that this squared print was Picasso's maquette for the first state of the *Family of Saltimbanques*. 

Olivier claimed in her description of the work that it was the first of the Saltimbanque series. Interestingly, no evidence exists which disproves this statement. To be sure, indirectly related works, such as the Harlequin and Columbine pictures just discussed, probably preceded the large painting. But their world is largely theatrical, in contrast to the clear circus ambiance of the Saltimbanque paintings. There are other stylistically related works with the same theme which might also have predated the grand composition, but not by any significant period of time. It is important to note as well that, with the exception of the Baltimore/drypoint composition, the related works are not studies for the large painting.

Instead, these watercolors and gouaches form a stylistic constellation of pictures centered on the Circus Family state of the Family of Saltimbanques. We have dated this group to the period from the end of 1904 into the beginning of 1905 and have isolated certain common elements. In these paintings the male figure, in particular, is tall and thin, and his costume often includes not only the Harlequin’s motley or the jester’s tights but an identifying hat as well. Furthermore the performers are generally seen backstage. By contrast, the earlier Circus Family is set out-of-doors.

In a broad sense, the Saltimbanques as a whole extend the Blue Period’s subject of the poor and the outsider, symbolically placed in an anonymous space. But only in the Circus Family are there also clear subject types which are carried over from the Blue Period. The most telling of these is the old woman washing dishes at the lower center: her rigid and bony shoulders, her downward stare, lowered, nearly horizontal neck, and her thin, vertical arms match almost exactly those of a figure engaged in similar drudgery, the Woman Ironing (fig. 23), a classic picture from the late Blue Period. To a lesser degree, the woman and child carrying firewood at the right are also Blue Period types, and they clearly suggest Daumier’s influence as well. It is important to note that just as the mannerist figural distortions of the Blue Period are dropped in later works, so menial activity disappears in the subsequent Saltimbanque paintings, where Picasso concentrates instead on the tasks of performing and practicing or the ensuing periods off-stage.

Practice is, however, the central focus of the first composition. The Harlequin stands, hands on hips, studying the acrobat balancing on a ball. His thin, almost gaunt figural type relates to those of the Blue Period, although no direct connection can be cited. He reappears—or becomes a jester of similar proportions—in the other works of this Circus Family group. The child on the ball is clearly a new invention, the image of balance and athletic grace emerging with the developing circus theme. Picasso also made use of this figure in several drawings and a large oil (figs. 24, 25), where the child with its graceful skill and balletlike pose may be watched by a seated figure whose muscle-bound, heavy body suggests he is the circus strong man. Here, as he often does, Picasso introduces a contrast between qualities—grace and strength, light and heavy, actor and observer. Meyer Schapiro sees in this image a metaphor for the painter’s skills.

The experience of balance vital to the acrobat, his very life, in fact, is here assimilated to the subjective experience of the artist, an expert performer concerned with the adjustment of lines and masses as the essence of his art.37

The Organ Grinder (fig. 26), another work of this period, is also based on the contrast of subjects and on the theme of practice. Here an old jester with a long white beard sits staring blankly into space, hands clapping or playing an organ. A child dressed as Harlequin sits at right angles to him. The child’s face is imploring, and his hands show the tension of too long a confinement at that spot. Neither age nor youth offers relief from rehearsal.

Backstage

In contrast to the Circus Family composition, the Young Acrobat on a Ball, and the Organ Grinder, which are all set outside, the other works in the Circus Family constellation take place in backstage dressing rooms filled with temporary furniture and curtained walls. These pictures are also alike in mood. While one can
find precedents for the figures in later Blue Period paintings, there is a change here in the dominant emotion expressed. The saltimbanques are still seen as pathetic characters, yet the expressive distortions of 1903 are eliminated and the performers escape the bathos of their Blue Period predecessors.

The familial qualities stressed in the Circus Family works do continue an aspect of Picasso's earlier art, but one essential element of these early circus works distinguishes them from the Blue Period pictures: the theme of love between mother and child. This happiness, ironically, will ultimately counterpoint the final image of the Family of Saltimbanques. In the Circus Family the mother and child are bonded to-


gether and often serenaded by the father, an accordion-playing jester or a standing violinist (figs. 27-30). In the first work in this group Picasso includes a monkey who appears to be almost a part of the family. “Placed at the limits of life,” Apollinaire later wrote of these scenes, “the animals are human.”38 The monkey also appears in a beautiful, separate study, a subsequent print of the family (fig. 98), and in the most finished smaller work of the series, The Acrobat’s Family with a Monkey (fig. 29, pl. 3).39

The tenderness captured in this drawing is evident in another backstage work, where the protagonist is again the thin Harlequin from the large Circus Family composition. In this sheet, now in Paris (fig. 30), he stands with hands on hips, admiring his child who, cradled by the mother, tenderly reaches for her face. Another animal, an interested dog, completes the scene of domestic happiness.

Not all of the Circus Family works are so joyful. Domestic bliss is in fact totally absent from a large watercolor where Harlequin now holds the child and watches the woman, nude, prepare her hair (fig. 31). Although the action is enigmatic, Harlequin’s alienation from the woman is clearly legible. More and more in Picasso’s work, the performer’s detachment begins to take on two layers of meaning: an entertainer’s professional and social separation from the rest of the community, as in Watteau’s Gilles, and also his private, existential loneliness. As we will see, such multiple meanings come to increasingly dominate the Family of Saltimbanques.

Exhibition

From February 25 to March 6 of 1905 Picasso exhibited 33 works plus an unknown number of prints.
at the Galeries Serrurier in Paris (fig. 97). The first eight works in the checklist were gathered together under the title, “Les Saltimbanques.” Daix and Rosselet have argued:

The presence of eight works with saltimbanque subjects in an exhibition opening February 25, with the catalogue prepared ahead of time, proves that Picasso must have begun these themes in the last part of 1904. The vagueness of numbers 1–8 (group of saltimbanques) makes us think that Picasso wanted his most recent works in the exhibition but that he had not made the final choices at the time the catalogue was sent to the printers. No doubt he wished to feel free to finish some, to withdraw others, selecting only those he thought were best.

Although one cannot identify which works were exhibited from the generalized listing in the catalogue, we can pinpoint certain ones from Apollinaire’s review of the show in La Plume on May 15. Three Saltimbanque works were reproduced in this article, including *Two Acrobats with a Dog* (fig. 32, pl. 4), providing a terminus post quem for this gouache. Another work, *The Harlequin’s Family* (fig. 31), can be identified by Apollinaire’s description in the text:

In a square room, paternity transfigures the harlequin, whose wife bathes with cold water and admires her figure, as frail and slim as her husband, the puppet.

Two other descriptions of subjects are worthy of special notice. Apollinaire’s phrase, “adolescent sisters, treading in perfect balance the heavy balls of the saltimbanques,” clearly points to the image discussed above, although the exact work described cannot be specified from this portion of the text. However, another line, occurring earlier in the review, narrows the choices. This sentence—“A stove warms a nearby gipsy caravan”—must surely refer to the composition used for the large *Circus Family*, which also includes the girl on the ball. Does this reference mean that the *Family of Saltimbanques*, in its *Circus Family* state, was shown in the exhibition? Probably not, as Apollinaire would most likely have discussed such a grand composition at length. His allusions to the images are brief and are separated in the text, suggesting instead that the gouache study was included or perhaps even the drypoint. Similarly, Apollinaire’s failure to highlight the composition might indicate that Picasso had already begun to repaint the large canvas. As Picasso’s close friend, Apollinaire would have been aware of his studio activities and especially the condition of a work so large that it would have dominated the small studio in the Bateau-Lavoir. This
hypothesis can allow us to suggest that the revisions may not have been underway in early 1905 when Picasso included a version of the Circus Family in the Serrurier exhibition, since he would not have selected a rejected work for this important show. The changes could then have been made during the period between the opening of the exhibition in February and Apollinaire’s review of it in mid-May. The fact that the next stage in the large painting is based precisely on the imagery of these late winter/early spring months supports this thesis (see below).

Two Acrobats

In addition to reproducing Two Acrobats with a Dog, Apollinaire described its effect upon him, making this work the first one considered in his review:

There are children who have strayed off without having learned the catechism. They stop, and the rain stops falling. “Look, in front of those houses there are people whose clothes are shabby.” These children, whom one does not caress, know so much. “Mama, love me to death!” They are tumblers and their successful feats are like mental evolutions.

Two Acrobats with a Dog is the central work in a new constellation of Saltimbanque images, succeeding the Circus Family works of late 1904. Using the February exhibition date for Two Acrobats with a Dog, we can assign this second group to the early months of 1905, a period clearly extending through March 26 when a related watercolor, the Young Acrobat and Child (fig. 33), was inscribed by Picasso.46

Two significant characteristics identify what we call here the Two Acrobats works: the refined modeling of the figures’ faces and the barren, still setting. The performers of the Circus Family compositions had generally been thin and wiry with gaunt faces. In the second group the outline of the acrobats’ features remains sharply defined, but both their faces and their bodies acquire a degree of refinement, a near elegance which does not return to Picasso’s art until the works of the 1920s. We feel that these figures’ physical condition is less desperate.

As is often true in Picasso’s later works, this new figural type may derive from the appearance of a model used by the artist. The resemblance between the boys in several works (figs. 32, 33, 34) does suggest the use of a single model. However, an important transitional picture, The Acrobat’s Family with a Monkey, also shares this refinement and yet belongs thematically to the earlier group.

The environment of the saltimbanques also changes. While the works are still set in the backstage or off-stage world of the circus, the attributes of the performer—monkeys, balls, instruments—disappear. Family life is again suggested, but now solely through the juxtaposition of the figures. Rather than scenes of activity, here there is a stillness—almost a silence—which extends and amplifies the direction suggested by the preceding works. Although often depicted in pairs, the figures each seem isolated, a feeling which is heightened in its contrast to the characters’ physical refinement. The intensified emotion suggests that as Picasso consciously juxtaposes theme against form in these works, he is gaining further command of this subject and its presentation; a deeper and more perceptive analysis is now apparent.

Mother and Child (fig. 34) in Stuttgart, is a clear—and beautiful—example of the more refined treatment of the figures and faces. Painting in gouache on canvas, the artist has used an extremely delicate touch and subtle palette, especially in the modeling of the boy’s face where the highlights on the soft
skin are gradated into the passages of shadow.

This fragility is counterpointed by the bold contrast of the child's light blue tights with the warm red of the background, the “rose” of the Rose Period. This tone probably originated in—and thus serves to refer to—the actual rose color of the tent of the Médrano circus in Paris, which Picasso often visited (see below). He uses this warm color to counteract the overall gloom of the picture itself, which is far more somber than the Circus Family works. This emotion is conveyed not only by the mother's despondent pose and the child's tightly wrapped arms but also by the emptiness of the setting. Many of the anecdotal elements seen in previous works are gone, focusing our attention on the performers alone.

The child is very close in appearance to the smaller boy in the Two Acrobats, and he is used in two other works within this group which also pair two youths. In the Two Saltimbanques (fig. 35) the figures are set in an anonymous space, while a similarly dressed pair—only reversed—are seen on a stage in The Harlequin and Jester from the Barnes Collection.

The sense of isolation is carried further in the central work in this constellation, the Two Acrobats with a Dog, where the two figures are placed in a barren landscape, which can be indirectly related to the empty planes behind the earlier Circus Family composition. This environment sets the Two Acrobats apart from both the intervening Circus Family works and the majority of other pictures in the refined style of early 1905, where the performers, either in family groups or juxtaposed pairings, are seen in backstage dressing rooms or under a tent.

Iconographically, the empty landscape of the Two Acrobats clearly separates these figures from the urban circuses, such as the Médrano of Paris, and locates them instead on the outskirts of the city. A similar setting led Apollinaire to describe the Circus Family as a “gipsy caravan”; this environment identifies the figures in this work and the Two Acrobats as more traditional saltimbanques, like those seen earlier in Daumier's paintings, entertainers who travel and perform without the tents and other equipment of the urban circus.

Although Picasso probably intended to present the theme of wandering performers in the earlier Circus Family, its anecdotal qualities diluted that aspect of the subject. We should recall that the work emerged from Picasso's “realism” of 1903-1904. By 1905 he had eliminated the narrative elements in favor of a more directly personal portrayal, concentrating on two young, isolated figures and on the pathos of their homelessness.

Interestingly, the isolation of the two acrobats in a landscape setting connects them with earlier, Blue Period works with similar compositions, works which also feature melancholy figures. This lineage may be evident in more than purely formal elements. In contrast to the rose colors of the other pictures from this group, the dominant tones of the Two Acrobats with a Dog are blue and gray, colors seen not only in the costumes but in the sky and landscape as well. To be sure, the blue is not the acid, cold color of the Blue Period, which Picasso employed to indicate the harshness of the world being portrayed. Rather, the blue here is warmer and is often mixed with white, creating a tonality which merges with the grays and pastels that dominate the rest of the picture. Yet we should note that however pleasing this pastel blue may be, it is still an otherworldly color, one divorced from the natural tones of the landscape.

Family of Saltimbanques: Two Acrobats State

The Two Acrobats with a Dog shares more with the large Circus Family composition than an empty landscape: the Two Acrobats succeeded the Circus Family to become the second composition beneath the Family of Saltimbanques. Picasso must have been dissatisfied with the large Circus Family picture. His financial condition—and the bleak prospect of selling the work—probably necessitated painting over the grand composition. As Ann Hoensigswald and I propose in the Study Section of this catalogue, the Circus Family was painted out and replaced with a new image which featured two acrobats standing in a landscape (fig. 36). Their facial types and positions echo those of the Two Acrobats with a
Dog, only seen in a mirror image (fig. 37). This wholesale reversal of a composition, including details, may reflect Picasso's simultaneous work on drypoints, where the printed image is also reversed from the artist's drawing. These graphic works were begun in early 1905, correlating with the date we propose for the second large composition.

Reading the imagery of the pair in the x-radiographic montage (fig. 85) is far more difficult than locating parts of the Circus Family. However, of all the underlayers it is the head of the smaller acrobat which is the most remarkably intact (fig. 38). This figure is located directly under the present small acrobat. The face of the taller performer is less legible, but still present, placed to the left and slightly above the drumhead in the final picture.

The recovery of the smaller acrobat's face by x-radiographic analysis allowed us to compare the image with a reversed print of the young acrobat's face in the gouache (fig. 38). The resemblance is striking. Not only is the fine, sharp drawing of the features evident in both, but the smoother interior modeling is present as well. The hairline, including the forelock, is also repeated. More importantly, the figure has a similar distant stare, the look so essential to the Two Acrobats constellation.

The taller figure is more obscure, yet still generally recognizable as a matching image for the older acrobat of the gouache, especially in his identifiable broad forehead. More-
over, his position and his relative scale accord with those of the complementary figure.

It has gone unremarked that although the landscape in the *Family of Saltimbanques* is presently colored with grayed browns, underneath these washes is a layer of blues. In fact this blue tonality invades other, figural areas as well. Clearly when the *Circus Family* state was changed to that of the *Two Acrobats*, the pervasive blue gray environment and the composition of the gouache were both present.

Given the direct connection between the *Two Acrobats* and this state of the *Family of Saltimbanques*, it is reasonable to date the changes to early 1905, but probably not before the opening of the exhibition at the Galeries Serrurier. Moreover, the fact that Apollinaire devoted considerable attention to the *Two Acrobats* gouache gives additional support to this dating. The picture's prominence in the review may reflect the existence of changes in the large work, just as the only casual mention of the *Circus Family* composition may indicate its complete rejection.

The decision to paint the *Two Acrobats with a Dog* at a grand scale may have been the result of Cézanne's influence upon Picasso. Numerous aspects of such an influence are evident in the composition, including both formal and thematic elements. The *Mardi Gras*, for example, could have sanctioned more than Picasso's use of the Harlequin. This work, where Harlequin is joined by Pierrot, might also be a source for the paired figures of Picasso's *Two Acrobats* compositions. Another Cézanne, *The Bather* of c.1885 (fig. 39), may have influenced the *Two Acrobats* state of the *Family of Saltimbanques* as well. While it was most likely not shown in the *Family of Saltimbanques*; however, this comment is intended only to identify the paired figures as one of the specific motifs of the Rose Period. Our recent awareness of their actual presence in the large Washington picture allows us to extend Rubin's intuited observation and to make these figures the focus of the next stage in the work, the creation of the saltimbanque family composition. But this next step required numerous trial works before the family would be painted at a grand scale.

### At the Circus

While the images and the theme of the Saltimbanques were partially derived from precedents in works by Degas, Daumier, Lautrec, and Cézanne, the larger influence on Picasso was surely his visits to the circus itself, again reflecting the "realism" of 1903-1904. "I was really under the spell of circus," Picasso recalled of this period, "sometimes I came three or four nights in one week. It was there that I saw Grock for the first time. He was just beginning, with Antonet." As Reff has shown, this attendance can be dated to at least as early as December 1904 when Grock debuted at the Cirque Médrano at the foot of Montmartre near Picasso's residence/studio. Olivier's recollection of Grock's beginning—"we were scarcely ever out of the Médrano after he arrived"—not only agrees with Picasso's but even suggests they attended before December, although less frequently. Thus the appearance of the saltimbanques in late 1904 may coincide directly with these evening events.

Gertrude Stein's recollection indi-
cates that Picasso and Olivier, as well as Apollinaire, his fellow poet Max Jacob, and others, did more than simply watch the performances: “At this time they all met at least once a week at the Cirque Médrano and there they felt very flattered because they could be intimate with the clowns, the jugglers, the horses and their riders.”

Olivier recalled that Picasso “would stay there all evening—Braque sometimes with him—talking to the clowns. . . . He admired them and had real sympathy for them.”

Picasso did watch the performances as well. Certain drawings exist which because of their sketchiness and caricaturing of the subjects imply that they may have been drawn during the performances themselves. One shows, among its many images, an equestrian, a strong man, a Barker, and a Harlequin, suggesting the latter was also part of the program. Other sheets, equally rapidly sketched, show Harlequin in varying positions (fig. 40) and could be derived either from an observed performance or published cartoons. Still other drawings are based upon acts seen at the circus, even if they were not made directly on the spot. Among the most enchanting of these are the equestrian figures, especially the young child riding sidesaddle or gracefully bal-
anced on top of the horse (figs. 41, 42).

In at least one case Picasso was attracted by the appearance of a specific performer, who is present in numerous drawings and watercolors. He is identified for us by an inscription on one sheet: “El tío Pepe don José à 40 años” (fig. 43). Indeed, this figure reoccurs so frequently that we cannot distinguish between his appearances as an actual performer and his merger with the characters of Picasso’s own saltimbanque world (fig. 44). He ultimately becomes the red jester of the Washington painting.

Prints

The red jester is also the subject of a print, the Seated Saltimbanque (fig. 100) made in 1905, and he reappears, slightly altered in character, in two other drypoints of this year, the Salomé and La Dame. These works, along with eleven others, represent Picasso’s activity as a printmaker during the period from late 1904 through 1905.

Although Picasso had made a print in 1901, the Frugal Repast, etched in 1904, was his first serious work in the medium. Working in the shop of Eugène Delâtre, he produced a number of other prints in time to include some of them in his February exhibition, as Apollinaire indicates in his review of the show: “[there are] almost unique examples of linear drypoints.”

Apollinaire’s choice of phrase—“almost unique”—suggests that very few prints were pulled, and these drypoints were unsuccessful commercially. Not until 1913, when Vollard steel-faced the plates and printed a large edition, were these works highly regarded. Vollard’s edition included the Frugal Repast and thirteen other images; the series was called Les Saltimbanques, although only seven of the prints can clearly be designated as part of that theme in Picasso’s art. Interestingly, these seven drypoints reflect the stylistic constellations we are considering here. In fact, the work known as Les Saltimbanques (fig. 22) repeats the composition of the Baltimore Circus Family and provided the first state of the Family of Saltimbanques, as discussed above. Three of the other works, the Family of Saltimbanques with Monkey (fig. 98), The Bath, and La Toilette de la mère (fig. 101) also share the stylistic qualities as well as the theme of the Circus Family group.

The second constellation, the Two Acrobats, is represented by a small drypoint, the Two Saltimbanques, which repeats the figural pairing, the athletic costume, the empty setting, and the refined definition of the faces. This print was made for André Salmon’s book Poems, and its known publication date of March 1905 confirms that Picasso’s work in the Two Acrobats style was undertaken near that time.

Another drypoint, Au Cirque (fig. 99), parallels Picasso’s drawings and watercolors of circus performers, especially those of a young girl standing on top of a horse. The final work, the Seated Saltimbanque, is
separated from the others by its presentation of an enlarged single figure. Stylistically and thematically this image belongs to the next constellation, the Circus Portrait, to which we now turn.

Circus Portrait

Sometime in 1905 Picasso began the studies for another circus family, but the final painting was presumably never executed. As we see in the penultimate drawing (fig. 46), the figures are arranged to create a formal Circus Portrait which contrasts with the earlier images of performers at work, at rest, or as isolated figures. This new composition, as Reff observes, derives from popular commercial photographs of famous circus troupes. These troupes were often called “families” or referred to by an equivalent term.

The exact date of these Circus Portrait studies, as we call them here (figs. 45, 46), and their place in the sequence of other circus images from 1905 are still unclear. The interior setting would suggest they relate to the Circus Family constellation of late 1904, a correlation supported by the Harlequin’s bent arm and his hat, which he wears exclusively in these earlier works.

However, the drawing in these studies is of a different character than that of the Circus Family style; it is now less brittle and fluidly defines the figures as rounded, volumetric forms. While this fluid line can be related to the refined drawing of the Two Acrobat images, the barren landscape and isolated figures which characterize those compositions are absent here. Indeed, since these sheets conform to neither of the first two Saltimbanque styles, it is probable that the Circus Portrait studies date after March 1905 and thus follow the Two Acrobat group.

One chronological point is clear: these sheets were drawn after Picasso had seen or met El tio Pepe don José, as a variant of this corpulent figure is the focus of the portrait. Seated with his hands on his knees, he also appears in a separate study on the same sheet with an image which may be the first sketch of the composition (fig. 45). Indeed, the other notations on this drawing suggest it was made on the spot and even that an actual circus family sat for Picasso.

It is argued here that Picasso intended the Circus Portrait as a study for the next stage of the Family of Saltimbanques, presumably replacing the Two Acrobat composition. This view finds support in the dimensions of the final sketch, which are
nearly equal, matching the slightly wider than high proportions of the *Family of Saltimbanques* canvas. The square picture is rare in Western painting as a whole and, with the exception of these portrait studies, is not found in any of Picasso’s finished works from this period. The presence of a sequence of refined sketches for the *Portrait* composition also points toward the preparation for a major painting. Not only is the composition a complex figurai one, but the relative scale of its figures is small, thus indicating that a large canvas would be required to give them pictorial authority.

If the *Circus Portrait* was planned for the large painting, it was never executed. Nothing in our technical examination indicates that Picasso attempted to transfer the composition there. Instead, I believe that Picasso set aside this image on the grounds that it was too formal and static. But rather than totally abandoning the *Circus Portrait* subject, Picasso began making revisions in the composition to enliven it: from this process would emerge the next state.

Revisions

The focus of the *Circus Portrait* is the corpulent jester seated in the center and the female figure at his feet, who reaches for a basket. Picasso rearranged these figures, shifting the jester off center to avoid the hieratic position used in the portrait and experimenting with other activities for the woman, including feeding a small dog or squirrel. Curiously Picasso retained her outstretched arm in the variations. This independent image was at one point transferred to the 1905 print known as *Salomé* and joined there by a variant of the seated red jester.

Other works using this seated figure are known. Among the most beautiful is the *Seated Saltimbanque with Boy* (fig. 47, pl. 5) at Baltimore, which employs the pastel palette developed in the *Two Acrobats* style. Again Picasso contrasts qualities of age, weight, and grace in the heavy torso of the jester and the supple body of the young acrobat. A variant drawing is extant, which shows the boy in a reversed position, indicating once more Picasso’s exploration of compositional alternatives. In other works, including the dry-point discussed above, the seated jester appears in the same position, but by himself.

In another drawing, the seated jester and the woman, now holding the basket, are joined by two other figures, a child urinating into a pan and a boy balancing a sack. The child is also the subject of a separate study now in Baltimore (fig. 48). These three figures, without the jester, appear in a second drawing (fig. 49). Here the woman holds up one hand, as if it contains a mirror, and uses the other to adjust her hair, an image which recalls that in *The Harlequin’s Family*. The small child is paired with another nude infant, while the boy with the sack becomes the boy with a drum, marking the first appearance of this *Family of Saltimbanques* figure.
hind the performers a rearing horse and a decorated column suggest that at this stage Picasso still envisioned the next state of the large painting as directly connected with the circus world.

The rearing horse, presumably performing inside the ring under the tent, is present in another drawing from this series (fig. 50). Here the seated figure has become a woman tending a child; her corpulent form makes her a mate to the jester. Completing this group, a younger woman fixes the hair of a seated girl. Nearby, the rotund jester appears, standing with a Harlequin; both converse with a woman costumed in a long dress and holding an amphora on her head. Apollinaire, in his review of the Serrurier exhibition, had compared Picasso’s drawing with that of Greek vase painters, a formal similarity which is not only present in the fine lines used in this sheet but extends to the imagery of the standing woman as well.65

As we have come to expect, a variant of this composition also is known. The jester, Harlequin, and woman now fill the center, with the seated group at the left.66 At the right the rearing horse has been replaced by a horse and rider. Another figural arrangement, probably created at this time, is known through drawings in Paris and New York (fig. 51). Here a young boy tames a crow, observed by a young girl holding an infant, a scene again suggestive of the off-stage life of the circus family.

It is clear that in addition to refining and rearranging the figures within a group, Picasso had also begun to conceive of these groups as units which could be repositioned within a composition. This theory is supported by certain drawings in which the figures have been cut out to allow their placement over other pictorial elements. Three such images are known: the jester and acrobat (formerly the Harlequin), the boy taming the crow, and the horse and rider (figs. 52, 54). The latter derives from the study discussed above but is more refined. Although this image was not combined with any others to create a different composition, Picasso employed it in a separate work. He angled the body of the horse, made the boy thinner, and clothed him in tights and a hat to produce the Jester on Horseback (fig. 53, pl. 6).

The boy taming the crow was not used in any subsequent picture nor was the jester and acrobat, at least not in this state. However, it is this image of two men which, in conjunction with Picasso’s practice of reversing compositions and his use of the montage technique, provided the key element for the next step in the Family of Saltimbanques.

Acrobat and Jester

Let us return to the large canvas, presumably left unfinished in the Two Acrobats state. We propose that while exploring the Circus Portrait subject through juxtaposed figural groups, Picasso at one point decided to add the standing jester and acrobat to the two younger performers. The new figures would be placed on the left to fill that portion of the
empty composition. The inclusion of these two would have required certain adjustments. In their established arrangement on the cut-out sheet both face to the left, presumably to converse with the absent woman with amphora, as seen in another drawing. If Picasso had directly transferred this unit to the large canvas the two men would have stared away from the two young figures and out of the composition. His solution was to turn the thin acrobat to the right by reversing the image, following a step he had taken in his contemporary graphics and in other works. At the same time, in reaction to the limited area of this section, Picasso slightly overlapped the acrobat and the portly jester. The diagram illustrated here (fig. 55) is a conceptual version of this interim step.
The reversed position of the figure in the diagram is very similar to that of the thin acrobat in the study for the Family of Saltimbanques now in Russia (fig. 56). Especially close are the placement of the feet, the nearly vertical alignment of the left arm, and the profile position of the head. Certainly the performer from this Russian gouache corresponds most closely to the acrobat at this stage; moreover, the study also furnishes the clearest record of the other images added in this and the next states.

Our proposed second step in the transferral of the adult figures was the slight revision of the jester. Keeping his face in the same position, so as to link the figure to the thinner acrobat, Picasso turned the jester’s body slightly to the right, opening the composition and leading the viewer’s eye across his chest to the two young acrobats in the center.

These two young figures are also revised. The taller boy is moved to the right and receives the figural proportions and the task of the barrel-carrying youth in another of the Circus Portrait studies (fig. 57). The small boy remains in the same position but is reproportioned to become much older than the boy of the Two Acrobats state. As with the larger figure, Picasso made an interim sketch of this small acrobat (fig. 58), which shows, at this stage, his face as still closer to that of his counterpart from the Two Acrobats state. Both figures are clad in leotards and tights in the separate sketches as well as in the Pushkin study. Only the taller youth is so dressed in the final work. However,
both technical and surface examination of the painting reveal that the smaller boy's ballooning pants and long jacket are later additions over an acrobat's costume corresponding to that in the sketches. (See the Study Section for all relevant technical discussions.)

Similar evidence discloses another aspect of the large picture at this stage: both the acrobat and the jester were full-length figures as depicted in the diagram. The little girl who stands before the corpulent performer in the painting and in the Pushkin study was not present. Her later addition resulted in the deletion of the jester's right leg and foot, which are still partially visible in the red underpaint to the left. Pigment-layer analysis of the girl's dress has also revealed the presence of the jester's limb beneath her body.

Furthermore, study of the picture's surface and technical evidence show that the adult acrobat was not initially clothed in the tights and shirt he wears in the sketches. Instead he was given a top hat and carried a satchel, matching those in the Pushkin study. The hat is clearly visible in the pentimenti at the top, while the satchel is only partially evident in the darkened layer at the left margin. Presumably the acrobat would have also worn the long coat of the Pushkin sketch, but no trace of this garment is now present. However, the long scarf, still wrapped around his neck, is clearly out of place with his current costume.

The presence of the satchel and also of the newly added sack carried by the jester indicates that a major change has taken place at this point in Picasso's interpretation of the theme of the large painting. These two objects suggest travel, moreover, travel with possessions of a very portable nature. They are attributes of saltimbanques rather than of metropolitan circus performers. Thus in joining the two older figures to the two acrobats, Picasso returns to the earlier, saltimbanque theme, the large picture's subject from its inception, rejecting the world shown in the preceding drawings. The thin acrobat and the red jester leave the Circus Portrait and enter the empty blue planes established around the two youths.

**Girl**

Picasso's next step was to add the small girl to the four male saltimbanques. Formally, she echoes the older acrobat; both stand with their backs to the viewer and their feet in similar positions. The girl also serves to slide the viewer's eye across the jester, whose position is somewhat spatially incongruous. Thematically, she acts as a counterpoint to the masculine identity of the others. Her delicacy and small size stand in direct contrast to the earthiness and bulk of the jester immediately before her.

The Pushkin study suggests the girl was initially unaccompanied; a separate but roughly contemporary sketch shows her with a dog (fig. 59). This same animal first appears at the left of the Two Acrobats with a Dog gouache and then reappears in the Pushkin sketch at the right, the proper position for the reversed image. No trace of the dog could be located in this area, however, in the Family of Saltimbanques. We can theorize, though, that after the Pushkin study Picasso decided to move the dog from the open plane over next to the girl, further blocking the jester. While no infrared or x-radiographic examinations revealed the dog beside the girl, the ghost of his dark, curling tail, matching the one in the sketch, is apparent in the corresponding area of the painting. More importantly, the dark outline of the dog's chest is visible next to the girl's leg, particularly in a segment which extends from below her knee outward toward the basket.

We can tell that this area was repainted at some point, as the pigment changes on the right portion of the girl's skirt. This revision replaced the dog with a flower-garlanded basket also drawn from the Circus Portrait sketches, an object which corresponds more directly with her delicacy than does the shaggy animal.

59. Picasso, Young Girl with a Dog, 1905, Location unknown. Cat. no. 57.

**Influences**

While numerous individual studies exist for the final composition of the Family of Saltimbanques, the Pushkin sheet is the only record of Picasso's evolving concept of the total pictorial image. This gouache
shows that following the addition of the two adult acrobats and the little girl, Picasso kept the painting narrowly within the saltimbanque theme.

The most striking feature of the Pushkin study is the horseracing scene in the background. Bordered by rows of spectators, the horses race, with the rider nearest to the viewers taking a spill. The closest scene in the background. Bordered Pushkin study is the horseracing race, with the rider nearest to the deed, in 1901 Picasso had made even more direct variations on Degas's works in his own scenes of races and spectators. In the Pushkin study, however, this scene serves not only to enliven the image but more importantly to locate the saltimbanques on the outskirts of Paris, near a racecourse considerably less elegant than Auteuil or Longchamp.

The racecourse appears only in this sketch. Detailed examination of the Family of Saltimbanques failed to reveal any trace of the horses or the crowds in the underlayers of the empty planes. Picasso's rejection of this reference in favor of the barren setting serves to heighten the isolation of the saltimbanques, making it actual rather than merely social. This nondescriptive landscape also removes the work from its Parisian location. Indeed, in the literature on the Family of Saltimbanques there are references to Picasso's intention to place the final composition in Spain rather than France. The similarity of the atmosphere and the composition to those in the watercolor of Catalan peasants supports this connection, as does the subsequent inclusion of the woman at the lower right (see below).

The relationship to Degas is not limited to the racecourse scene. Clearly the little girl, with her short skirt, pinned-up hair, and long body, owes a debt to Degas's paintings of young ballet dancers; these works were certainly numerous enough in Paris for Picasso to have gained direct knowledge of them. If Degas's pictures are a formal source, Daumier's Saltimbanques provide the closest thematic precedent for the Family of Saltimbanques, as discussed above. Especially important is his focus on the family as a unit linked by their isolation from the audience, a characterization continued and deepened in the final stages of Picasso's large picture.

Although there are no direct saltimbanque precedents in Paul Gauguin's oeuvre, his works probably influenced the Family of Saltimbanques as well. Picasso was clearly aware of Gauguin's paintings, and the flattened, patterned forms in his early works reflect this knowledge. Interestingly, Picasso's Three Dutch Girls, painted on a summer sojourn to Holland in 1905, is especially reminiscent of the post-impressionist's pictures. More directly, Picasso illustrated his own copy of Gauguin's Noa Noa in 1903. The latter's persistent exploration of the questions of existence—"Who are we, where are we going . . . ?"—creates a similar, if not identical, theme to that in Picasso's Saltimbanques. Gauguin's distancing of his subjects by choosing exotic South Pacific figures is echoed by Picasso's isolation of the performers in the large picture.

Of all nineteenth-century paintings, surely the work with the greatest connection to the Family of Saltimbanques is Manet's The Old Musician. Manet's subject, wandering entertainers placed in an empty landscape, is repeated in the Family of Saltimbanques as is the presentation of a tightly composed family group. More directly, Manet's young girl is thematically echoed in Picasso's work, while her formal function, anchoring the composition at the left, is assumed by the adult acrobat. A similar psychological distance between the figures is found in each work.

Considering Picasso's possible interest in the painting it should be noted that before entering the Dale Collection in 1928, the work also bore an alternative title, The Traveling Musician. The Old Musician was exhibited in October 1905 at the Salon d'Automne, which Picasso surely saw. Daix and Boudaille, who believe the Family of Saltimbanques was completed before this exhibition, argue that the Manet would have appealed to Picasso and would have earlier been known to him through reproductions. We have here dated the Circus Portrait studies to spring 1905 and the beginning of the Family of Saltimbanques to the months immediately following. Thus we believe Picasso's journey to Holland would have interrupted the work on this painting. Given this development, the picture might not have been finished until the opening of the Salon d'Automne in November 1905, and given the complex layering in the work, such a scenario is more likely. This would suggest Picasso's direct knowledge of the Manet at the crucial final stages of the painting.

Beyond the correspondences noted above, two other aspects of the Family of Saltimbanques suggest this personal knowledge of The Old Musician. The last figure added to the Family of Saltimbanques was the woman at the lower right, relieving the openness of the composition on this side of the work. Was the inclusion of a seated figure sanctioned at this stage by Picasso's direct confrontation with the seated musician in Manet's work? This image is traditionally known
as the woman of Majorca, after the title of a watercolor study for her now at the Pushkin Museum (fig. 61). In this sheet, the woman wears a scarf-bound hat typical of Majorcan costume. Although the hat is replaced by a simpler—but ill-placed—one in the Family of Saltimbanques, the Majorcan woman is clearly the source for the seated female, supporting the idea that Picasso intended to imply a Spanish location, a setting further suggested by the simple, red clay water pitcher typical of the Mediterranean. Significantly Level described the work as connected to Picasso’s “country of origin.”


Another later addition is less dramatic but of greater importance in relationship to the Manet. From the Two Acrobats state through the Pushkin sketch, the smaller boy in the Family of Saltimbanques had been clad in the acrobat’s costume. Late in the evolution of the painting this costume was painted over, and the figure dressed in the dark blue, ballooning pants and loose, light blue jacket of the final image. Precedents cannot be found in any Saltimbanque studies for these clothes. However, in the costume’s shape and in the position of his hands, which were also revised at this point, the small acrobat now echoes his counterpart in Manet’s Old Musician (fig. 60). As we have seen, Manet’s figure itself is intended as a reference to Watteau’s Gilles, and Picasso, presumably understanding this allusion, may have meant not only to consciously evoke both Manet and Watteau’s figures in his acrobat but to do so in a way—by a hidden reference—that in itself further quotes the Manet. Picasso’s blue Gilles, or Pierrot, supplies a hidden clue to the link between these saltimbanques and their commedia origins, as does the white boy in Manet’s Old Musician.

60. Detail from Watteau, Italian Comedians, fig. 1; detail from Manet, The Old Musician, fig. 6; detail from Picasso, Family of Saltimbanques, fig. 69.

Collage

The indirectness of this reference is exemplary of the character which Picasso’s art developed during 1905. In the initial, Circus Family composition the subject—a wandering circus troupe—is presented directly through the incidents of the performers’ daily lives: cooking, child rearing, gathering wood, and practicing. The subsequent, Two Acrobats works are less descriptive, but the figures are still portrayed with a sentimentality intended to elicit the viewer’s sympathies. Thus these characters resemble Les Misérables of the Blue Period. The absence of anecdotal elements persists in the Circus Portrait works and becomes more marked when Picasso abandons the “documentary” gathering
and begins to explore more purely formal groupings. This tendency reaches its peak in the *Family of Saltimbanques*, where both story line and props are absent. As Alfred Barr observes:

We find the *Family of Saltimbanques* entirely without drama or sermon. The figures are almost unrelated psychologically and Picasso's romantic sentiment for circus people is restrained. Reticent, too, the muffled color, the subtle drawing and the sensitive placing of the figures.74

The movement in Picasso's art toward an aloof and enigmatic image was apparent to Apollinaire at the time of his review in May 1905:

You cannot confuse these saltimbanques with actors. The spectator must be pious for they are celebrating silent rites... this Spaniard scathes us like a sudden chill. His meditations are laid bare in silence.75

It is fair to ask what influence Apollinaire himself had on the emergence of this quality in Picasso's work. Art historians have repeatedly cited him, as well as Jacob and Salmon, as thematically important to Picasso's Saltimbanques; these men were seen as a conduit to precedents in nineteenth-century literature which also affected their own works. But it is possible that Picasso was interested as well in their conception of poetry. New friends—which they were—often exchange ideas and try to discover common beliefs and interests. Picasso himself has said of this period: "In those days, painters and writers influenced each other mutually."76 Perhaps he came to see the figure as self-sufficient—like a word—capable of transmitting on its own a symbolic and visual message. Rather than using narrative elements, Picasso could allude to his theme by stripping the picture down to essential characters, whose demeanors and costumes would carry his meaning.

While the tendency toward symbolism was not unique to Picasso and his friends, their use of emblematic elements was especially intricate and was intrinsic to the creation of their increasingly complex structures. In the *Family of Saltimbanques* this aesthetic creates a resonant assemblage which forecasts Picasso's collages of seven years later. In these works the pasted elements, often printed with text, can be seen as bits of paper, as representations of items from Parisian café tables, or as disguised references to the artist's private life, references which are also made in the painting.

The analogy to collage can be extended to the process of making the *Family of Saltimbanques*. As we have seen, the picture is a montage of numerous juxtaposed figural units. Yet the focus is on each image rather than on the entire work. The figures not only are emotionally detached but are formally separated as well; each unit was individually conceived and stands apart from the others in terms of its particular definition in pictorial space. It is this change, not only from the narrative to the symbolic but also from the interdependent structure to a construction of self-sufficient units, which affects Picasso's work from this point on. As George Heard Hamilton writes:

The picture is important because its effect is the sum of its artistic parts, not of any anecdotal relationships among the figures. Henceforth, and with only rare exceptions such as those induced by the political crises to which Picasso has felt himself committed, the content of his work has been identical with its formal structure.77

La Bande à Picasso

In spite of the figures' emotional and formal detachment, the *Family of Saltimbanques* has yet another layer of meaning, one which is both personal and poignant in nature. "Tell me, who are they, these acrobats...?" Rilke asks in reference to the characters in the picture, alluding poetically to their symbolism, their history, and their present existence. But his question may have a direct answer. Ultimately, the saltimbanques become emblems of the people in Picasso's life.

In finishing the *Family of Saltimbanques* Picasso made further changes in the picture, clothing the adult acrobat in a Harlequin costume, moving his hand, and repainting his face. William Lieberman's 1952 discussion of the work was the first to identify this figure as Picasso's self-portrait.78 Although stylized, the face bears a direct resemblance to that of the artist, including the locks of dark hair which fell over his forehead at this period (fig. 67). Furthermore, as we have seen, Picasso painted himself as Harlequin in *At the Lapin Agile*, a work of the preceding year. There are numerous later accounts of Picasso's love of costume and masks and of particular clowns, especially Charlie Chaplin, whom he occasionally would imitate.79

In 1958 Roland Penrose observed the relationship between the fat jester and Picasso's friend Apollinaire, a visual connection evident both in contemporary drawings and in photographs (fig. 62).80 Extending these readings in 1971, Reff identified the two youths as Salmon and Jacob.81 Salmon, tall and thin with a broad forehead, becomes the drum-carrying acrobat (fig. 63), while Jacob, small and lean, becomes the younger performer (fig.
Reff has suggested as well that Jacob's holding the tip of his shawl may repeat a Jewish ceremonial gesture involving a prayer shawl; while Olivier's mémoires discuss Jacob pulling small slips of poetry out of his pockets and holding them forward, a habit possibly alluded to here. Picasso had earlier used Jacob as the model for his saltimbanque sculpture, the Head of a Jester (fig. 65), which was begun as a portrait after an evening's visit to the circus. Only the jester's lower face now remains at all descriptive, as Picasso subsequently altered the eyes as well as the forehead and added the peaked cap.

Reff is more cautious in identifying the seated woman as Olivier since the painted image's features do not directly correspond to those of Picasso's mistress. However, as Reff notes, Olivier does appear in a later picture by Marie Laurencin in almost the same pose and in the same location as the figure in the Family of Saltimbanques (fig. 66); this
work also repeats the positions of Picasso and Apollinaire. Moreover, in certain photographs taken at that time one can see a relationship between the woman and Olivier (fig. 67), and in others she wears a similar large hat. The water pitcher may be an additional clue. A similar vessel appears in the Circus Portrait drawings, balanced on the head of a woman who, perhaps significantly, is in conversation with the jester and acrobat. We should also recall that Picasso and Olivier briefly adopted this child from an orphanage in Paris. She may also be the model for a young girl with an almost identical basket of flowers in a painting purchased by Gertrude Stein in 1905 (fig. 68).

Reff concluded his study by proposing that the Family of Saltimbanques was in fact, "Picasso's gang," that select circle of painters and poets which was already known and admired at the time as "la bande à Picasso." Building on his thesis, Ronald Johnson identified the remaining figure, the little girl, in a 1977 essay on the picture. She represents a young girl, named Raymonde or Léontine, whom Reff first discussed in connection with other circus works. Picasso and Olivier briefly adopted this child from an orphanage in Paris. She may also be the model for a young girl with an almost identical basket of flowers in a painting purchased by Gertrude Stein in 1905 (fig. 68).

Raymonde did not remain with Picasso and Olivier. For unknown reasons, Olivier had her returned to the orphanage over the objections of Picasso, Salmon, and Jacob. Jean Paul Crespelle records Jacob’s tale:

There is situated in the story of the relationship [of Picasso and Olivier] a very sad and inexplicable episode. . . . Out of idleness, or perhaps to bind her lover to her advantage. . . . In any case with inconsistency . . . Fernande who, it seems, could not have children—and never had any—wanted to adopt a little girl. She went to select one, on a trial basis, at the orphanage on the rue Caulaincourt. Picasso was gentle with the little girl. Max Jacob brought her a doll and Salmon a bag of candy. For several days the orphan was the last attraction at the Bateau-Lavoir. And then, Fernande had had enough of playing the little mother: "Decidedly," she said, she "didn’t have the maternal fiber!"

Max Jacob was charged with the returning of the child to the nuns. . . . The employee of the orphanage who responded, took him for an unworthy father desiring to abandon his child: "It is understood," the employee told him, "that you lose all rights of government over the child entrusted to the administration. It's as though she is no longer your girl, since you also renounce deliberately the exercise of your paternal authority. When she arrives, you can never take her back. . . ." With these words, the little girl burst in tears, clasped her big friend, and—with a happy inspiration—cried: "Papa Max . . . Papa Max . . . don't leave me!" Max, greatly moved, refused to abandon the child, brought her back to a restaurant, spending all the money he had on amusing her. That night, the two cried and thought of the uncertain future.

"Keep me with you!" said the little one beseechingly.

"I can't."

"Why not! Nobody wants to keep me. go. I am a lost child. . . ."

"I am also," replied the poet. "I too, am a lost child." Did Picasso see in the already established Family of Saltimbanques a metaphor for this sad event? The young girl could become Raymonde, while the young acrobat would be given the features of Jacob, the other "lost child." The jester was probably already a likeness of Apollinaire, as Picasso had previously painted the poet in this guise,
and the drum-carrying figure, whose physique matched that of Salmon, was most likely slightly revised at this stage to echo his physiognomy even more closely. As the story would suggest, the young girl is grouped with the men, her face hidden from the woman. The child clutches the right hand of Picasso while his other hand, newly placed, reaches out toward her. He becomes the Harlequin in this state in direct contrast now to his love, Columbine or Olivier, the seated woman who is perhaps also added at this time. She is isolated from the others—as Olivier was in her decision—while behind her Salmon and Jacob now stare coldly in her direction. Picasso is neither active nor aloof; his expression is at once determined and pensive. Only Apollinaire, who appears not to have been directly involved with the orphan, seems to communicate, his inquiring expression directed at the Harlequin.

The position of Olivier’s arms and hands may be important to this theme. In the Woman of Majorca study only her raised left arm and hand are present, and Reff and I have both observed that the right arm and hand seem to be additions to the work.99 In a recent article discussing this painting, Mark Rosenthal analyzed the position of these limbs as symbolic of the “disintegration of the feminine ideal” in Picasso’s art.90 His comments are important for the story of the child as well:

Touching her hair with her left hand, she has the attribute of the vain women who are frequently seen in the following year. But the right hand and arm form a niche as if for a child, which is precisely the use of the arm that appears in contemporaneous works [fig. 30]. Thus the woman reveals two natures, a quality that sets her apart from either the completely maternal or completely jaded figures.
of the Blue Period.

We can further speculate that Picasso may have also intended the empty niche to indicate the absent child, and the vain gesture of the other hand to present the reason for the abandonment.

There are larger thematic reasons which explain Picasso's recognition of a metaphor for Raymonde's life in the *Family of Saltimbanques*. The clown, the artist, and the orphan all exist apart from society. "Cut off from their biological past," writes B. J. Lifton, the adoptees are "made into a separate breed, unreal even to themselves." Like a saltimbanque, the adopted child is homeless, wandering in a world where others seem rooted, permanent. Like Harlequin and Columbine, he must wear a mask—he is really another, but unknown person—and he must perform. As Raymonde's story so graphically illustrates, the unloved child can be returned. While the saltimbanques play with great skill the games of childhood, the adopted person keeps a part of himself as child: "The adopted child can never grow up," as Lifton writes, "who has ever heard of an adopted adult?" And finally, orphans dream of their unknown, perhaps royal, heritage, while the costumes of the saltimbanques evoke memories of their commedia days at court. Harlequin in particular may recall his former exalted status. Perhaps this is why he holds Raymonde's hand and why their formal positions rhyme so clearly.

I believe that Picasso did see the correspondence between the saltimbanque and the adopted child and that the final changes in the *Family of Saltimbanques* (fig. 69) are not intended to alter its meaning but rather to ground one theme in the other. The large picture progressed from a descriptive scene to a sentiment one to a timeless frieze of symbolic and poetic images, but in the last stage, these figures are changed, if only slightly, to create a further meaning, one which obviously moved Picasso. Just as the painting's collaged nature underscores the isolation of the saltimbanques, so the subtle connections among these figures, made across the canvas and through its layers, create a cross-current of meaning, which when felt lifts the work to its greatness.

**Subsequent Works**

It is proposed here that the *Family of Saltimbanques* was not completed until the fall of 1905. Level, in writing about the work, said, "The large painting [Family of Saltimbanques] brought to a definitive close one of his most seductive periods." The number of changes involved in painting the picture, reflecting successive Saltimbanque styles, supports this *achevé* date, which would also accord with the direct influence of Manet's *Old Musician* upon the final stages. Important to this proposition is the aloof quality of the expressions of Picasso's figures. This characteristic can be seen in other works, such as the *Boy with a Pipe*, that date to the fall of 1905 (fig. 70). These faces appear in the overpaint of the *Family of Saltimbanques*, arguing strongly that they were introduced in reaction to, or in concert with, the aloof pictures of the later part of the year, a dating further underscored by Picasso's subsequent revisions after this stage itself.

Within the chronology of the Rose Period works there is sufficient time to allow such a late date for the completion of the *Family of Saltimbanques*. Juggler with Still Life (fig. 71), for example, was made in the fall of 1905 and initiates a new circus idea which, although revised, lasts until the next year, while the *Death of Harlequin* (fig. 72, pl. 7) may date from 1906. Both prove Picasso's interest in the saltimbanque theme well past his visit to Holland in summer 1905.

A formal isolation underscores the attitude of the figures in the *Death of Harlequin*. The frieze of his body and those of the two mourners suggests Greek funerary reliefs on the one hand, while on the other, as Reff observes of the gestures:

... his hands joined as if in prayer, the dead Harlequin recalls both the recumbent effigies in Gothic tomb sculpture and the central figure in Renaissance pictures of The Entombment or The Lamentation. The attitudes of his former companions, gravely bending over him in mourning, are like those in Lamentation scenes by Fra Angelico and other Quattrocento artists. . . .

The subject itself is an invented one. Here Picasso explicitly returns
The Juggler with Still Life, in contrast, is clearly a studio work, the model holding a pose against a curtained background and standing beside a still-life arrangement. The latter is rather casually composed but significantly includes a vase related to the one added to the Family of Saltimbanques. The juggler can be identified as a model Picasso used for several paintings in the fall of 1905. Both his physiognomy and the position of his hands are echoed in those of the Boy with a Pipe.

Although he is a cousin to the acrobats of the Family of Saltimbanques, The Juggler differs from them in the direct and formal frontality of his stance. Already in this painting we see the influence of classical art which would arrive more fully in the works of the following summer in Gosol, where similar figures are portrayed nude and painted in warm terra-cotta colors.

The chef d’oeuvre of the works transitional between the Circus Pe-
period and the Gosol paintings was the large *The Watering Place*, a grand composition planned but apparently never executed. It is known today from a watercolor study and a dry-point variation, which show the whole composition (fig. 73), as well as individual studies, culminating in the large oil now at The Museum of Modern Art, the *Boy Leading a Horse*. Although these works differ from the *Family of Saltimbanques* in many ways, especially their lack of anecdotal and costume references, the *Watering Place* pictures can be connected to the earlier painting. The liaisons between them are both thematic, as in their shared barren landscapes, and formal, as in the bravura brushwork in the skies of the Washington and New York works.

*The Juggler* forms the direct link between the Saltimbanques and the *Watering Place*. As we see in a watercolor now at the Tate (fig. 74) it is the juggler who becomes the central figure leading the horse. In this sheet he retains both the costume of his acrobatic profession as well as the position of his hands in the studio composition, only reversed as Picasso’s images so often are. Moreover, in *The Watering Place*, the timelessness of the *Family of Saltimbanques* is still apparent, but rather than serving as a poetic undercurrent to a larger theme, it is now given a direct presence, notably in the barren landscape and nude figures.

**Harlequins**

After the *Family of Saltimbanques* and the *Juggler/Watering Place* works Picasso did not return to the theme of saltimbanques or commedia characters until early 1909 when he and Georges Braque were rapidly developing cubism. This year marks their greatest concentration on Cézanne’s paintings, and Picasso’s new cubist commedia figures are clearly inspired by the work of the post-impressionist master.

The centerpiece of early 1909 was the grand *Carnival at the Bistro*, based on Cézanne’s *Card Players* compositions. Although the finished canvas no longer depicts the original theme, the image is known from several studies, which portray Harlequin, Pierrot, and others seated at a table. Several independent paintings and oil sketches drawn from this composition also exist, focused on Harlequin alone, including the beautiful painting now in Basel (fig. 75). This picture recalls Cézanne’s *Harlequin* (fig. 76) which had earlier inspired Picasso’s 1905 works.

One senses that in the Basel painting and the other 1909 Harlequins, as well as in the few Harlequins which follow in the later, synthetic cubist style of 1912-1914, Picasso was interested primarily in the formal qualities of the imagery. He focused especially on the sculptural quality of Harlequin’s hat, which is particularly Cézannesque in character, while the diamond patterns of his costume were seen as suitable for either the fractured units of analytical cubism or the independent planes of the synthetic style. Certainly, the sense of autobiography which underscores the Rose Period works, and even certain other synthetic cubist pictures, is missing from these more remote commedia performers.

A partial exception to this observation is the *Circus Family* now at Wuppertal (fig. 77). Here Harlequin, at the left, is joined by a female figure on the right, while a...
small youth is placed between them, suggesting a cubist variation of the family gatherings from the early Rose Period. Yet nothing in the picture describes a particular family, either observed or imagined. Here the identities of the figures remain unknown, and Harlequin is more fully emblematic than he was in the circus works of three years earlier.

This general tendency toward remoteness changed dramatically in late 1915 when Picasso painted the monumental Harlequin now in New York (fig. 78). This “disquieting” figure, to quote Rubin, dates from the period when Picasso was alone in Paris, his mistress Eva dying and his closest friends Braque, Apollinaire, André Derain, and Fernand Léger all fighting in World War I. Thus the joy traditionally associated with the pure commedia characters is wholly inappropriate to this time in his life; rather, the Harlequin must here relate to the melancholy saltimbanque figure, as in the Family of Saltimbanques, where this image was also a self-portrait. As Rubin observes:

But a hostile spirit that may well reflect the tenor of the times has slipped into this Harlequin. The decorative character of the red, green and tan costume is neutralized by the rigid rectilinearity of the configuration and the somber blacks of the background and figure, which permit chillingly stark contrasts of black and white. In this setting, Harlequin’s toothy smile seems almost sinister. It is possible that here Picasso identified his earlier bohemian life with the more rakish Harlequin character he had used for self-portraiture before, who now is suggested by a street musician with his violin and music. But at the same time the more refined—and traditionally more faithful—Pierrot begins to


emerge from the Harlequin image, a prediction of Picasso’s new, married, and middle-class life with Olga.

The Early 1920s

Picasso’s life in the 1920s was decidedly different from that of the two previous decades. It was dominated by Olga’s world of the ballet, and Picasso’s connections with his pre-War friends, who were just returning, were either strained or severed. Another change occurred when Olga gave birth to Picasso’s first child, a son named Paulo, perhaps in reference to Cézanne—or his son Paul—since Picasso regarded Cézanne as his artistic master. And like him, Picasso painted his son in commedia costume, as Harlequin, and as Pierrot (figs. 80, 81). We can only speculate on the other levels of personal reference which also might be contained in this pair of pictures, particularly in light of Picasso and Olivier’s saltimbanque child of twenty years earlier.

Saltimbanques of a sort do appear in Picasso’s works in the early 1920s. These are the ballet figures of his and Olga’s stage world, dressed either in tights or in a Harlequin’s costume (fig. 82). Their environment is the stage, the practice room, or the middle-class apartment, rather than the barren landscape of the suburban countryside. Nevertheless, in spite of a certain sweetness in these pictures, Picasso has caught an air of wistfulness and slight resignation which connects these figures to his Rose Period entertainers. And the character of their formal definition—the drawn outline and softer interior modeling—accords with the precedents in the Two Acrobats and Circus Portrait styles.

Certainly the most important paintings from this period to present the commedia figure are the two works from 1921 now in Philadelphia and New York, each called Three Musicians (fig. 83). Closely related in style and subject, these pictures form a virtual pair, or a theme and variation. In each work Harlequin fills the center, flanked by Pierrot on the left and a monk on the right. Traditionally Harlequin and Pierrot in these paintings are seen as deriving generally from Picasso’s work with the Ballet Russe, as discussed above, and from the production of Pulcinella undertaken by Diaghilev the previous summer. Indeed, during 1920, Picasso made several studies which combine Harlequin and Pierrot (fig. 103) and depict them with a formal vocabulary which predicts that used in the monumental figures from the following year. This vocabulary is especially evident in the flat planes which have been cut into irregular shapes and then
overlapped to create complex spatial layers.

The unusual appearance of a monk in a commedia work has been overlooked in discussions of the theme of the *Three Musicians*, although this character is not included in any traditional program. Building from this disparity, Reff has brilliantly reinterpreted the meaning of the picture, arguing that the *Three Musicians* is a portrait of Picasso, Apollinaire, and Jacob.105 Although these two paintings are often described as the summation of cubism, Reff correctly points out that the cubist style continued into the later 1920s. Rather than reacting to aspects of the works’ purely formal qualities, viewers, Reff suggests, are “responding to something elegiac in its content . . . since the picture is . . . a memorial to his lost friends and bohemian youth, painted at a moment when he felt that loss most keenly . . . .”106

As we have seen, the use of Harlequin as a self-portrait has been an aspect of Picasso’s work since *At the Lapin Agile* and the *Family of Saltimbanques*. Reff now identifies the monk as Jacob, drawing upon the fact that he had taken up residence in a Benedictine monastery in the spring of 1921, only months before the *Three Musicians* compositions were begun. The Pierrot, Reff continues, is Apollinaire, his French blue suit contrasted with the unconventional, but rather Spanish, colors of red and yellow in the Harlequin’s costume. Apollinaire himself had made references to Pierrot as “a poet, an artist,” and Picasso has continued that identification, using it for his own poet friend in this work.107

Like his awareness of Jacob’s absence in spring of 1921, Picasso had reason at this time to feel again the absence of Apollinaire, who had died of a war wound in 1918. In May of 1921, immediately preceding this work, a committee had commissioned Picasso to design a monument to his friend. In this context, these two grand works emerge, and as Reff observes, the inclusion of the dog in the New York picture—a symbol of the soul of the dead returned to earth—and its placement adjacent to the Pierrot/Apollinaire make the idea of the monument more immediate, only now as an elegy to both Picasso’s friends and his own earlier life.108

Reff convincingly argues that the New York *Three Musicians* is the second version of the composition, citing both its thematic differences from the Philadelphia canvas as well as its formal qualities, which are “at once more complex and more cohered in organization.”109 It is that formal definition in the New York version which is intriguing, for I believe the tipped and layered planes, with their cut-out openings, not only indicate a relationship with Picasso’s later 1920s cubist style but also can be directly associated with his sculptural projects of 1919-1920, which are ultimately responsible for that later style’s character.110 This suggests in turn, that the monumental New York canvas can be seen as a step toward an image which could be realized in sculptural form, that is to say, the painting could become the memorial to Apollinaire.
Of course, the monument was never realized in this form, but the two paintings remain powerful examples of the grand compositions which occasionally occur in Picasso's art, the first of which was the *Family of Saltimbanques*. These extraordinary works signal either the summation of a period or a more thorough exploration of one of the artist's thematic preoccupations. In this regard, our speculative identification of the *Three Musicians* as a sculptural image which would be shown in a public place points out an important aspect of the painting. Because of its commedia characters and compositional connections with the preceding *Pulcinella* work, the *Three Musicians* has generally been associated with the stage. Yet nothing in the picture specifies such a location. More correctly, these performers should be seen as street entertainers, figures of the same character as those observed earlier in Seurat's drawings. Thus the grand *Three Musicians* identifies Picasso, Apollinaire, and Jacob as urban saltimbanques, an elegiac cubist reprise of their autobiographical appearance fifteen years earlier as the Harlequin, jester, and acrobat of the *Family of Saltimbanques*.

1. Olivier's description of the large canvas has been most frequently interpreted as a mistaken impression; the work was believed to have never been executed. Other art historians have argued that the composition was destroyed: Adelyn Breeskin, writing on the Baltimore gouache, cited Olivier and concluded, "this 'large canvas' no longer exists," in "Early Picasso Drawings in the Cone Collection." *Magazine of Art* 45 (March 1952), 105. See the "Family of Saltimbanques: A History and Critical Fortune" in this catalogue.


3. This has been true of the majority of Picasso's major works, with the exception of *Guernica*, as William Rubin has observed in *Picasso in the Collection of The Museum of Modern Art* (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1972), 11 (hereafter cited as Rubin).

4. The following account of the commedia draws upon numerous sources. I am especially indebted to Pierre Schneider for his assistance.


7. Watteau recorded the event in a painting now lost, the *Departure of the Italian Comedians in 1697*; it is known today through an engraving.


9. The commedia never performed as a troupe at Versailles.


11. This theme may have a much wider range than scholars currently believe, one which even extends into American art. For example, see Winslow Homer's *The Carnival* (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York).


13. Later cut into fragments by the artist, the composition is known today from an etching.

14. Hanson, 63.

15. Hanson, 63.

16. Hanson, 66.

17. Hanson, 64.


24. This work is in a private collection (cat. no. 18); for an illustration see William Rubin (editor), *Pablo Picasso: A Retrospective* (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1980), 31.

25. See for example Degas's *Absinthe Drinkers*, 1876 (Louvre, Paris) and Lautrec's *A la Mie*, 1891 (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston).

26. Edward Hopper's *Soir Bleu*, 1914 (Whitney Museum of American Art, New York) offers a reprise of this theme and raises the question whether Hopper observed this subject or drew upon the same pictorial tradition as Picasso.


32. Mardi Gras is in the collection of The Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow.
33. Daix, Rose, 70.
36. Olivier, 58.
39. A beautiful sheet depicting a monkey is in the Cone Collection, The Baltimore Museum of Art (Zervos XXII, 162; Daix, Rose, 268).
41. Daix, Rose, 254.
42. Apollinaire, in Daix, Rose, 335.
43. Apollinaire, in Daix, Rose, 336.
44. Apollinaire, in Daix, Rose, 336. This does not totally eliminate the possibility that one of the single image sheets was shown; however, given the limited number of works included in the exhibition, it is more likely that the Circus Family composition is the one discussed.
45. Apollinaire, in Daix, Rose, 335.
46. If this inscribed date refers to the work’s completion; as a donation, the drawing was probably dated upon its presentation.
47. Reff first observed this connection, in “Harlequins,” 35.
48. See Daix, Rose, 264.
49. See for example Figures by the Sea (Smith College Museum of Art, Northampton, Massachusetts). Les Pauvres (Von der Heydt Museum, Wuppertal, West Germany) and The Tragedy (fig. 17).
50. Both Reff and I noticed this pronounced blue when examining the Family of Saltimbanques in the conservation laboratory.
51. Rubin, 34.
52. Rubin, 33.
55. Olivier, 155. Her statement suggests an earlier attendance which was altered after Grock appeared. The December date corresponds to the inscription on a drawing of a mother and child (Zervos XXII, 93)—“7 décembre 04.” This work directly relates to the parental imagery in The Harlequin’s Family (fig. 30), suggesting that the Circus Family composition was begun earlier, perhaps in November.
58. Such as those published by Willette, which were especially popular with Apollinaire.
61. Reff, Brendel.
62. The relationship of this composition to Les Demoiselles d’Avignon (The Museum of Modern Art, New York) has been overlooked.
63. The Woman of Majorca (fig. 61) is also repeated in the Salomé print, suggesting the drypoint was made later in the year. Her raised left hand, with its vain gesture, is also important for this theme. Like the Woman of Majorca, the figure in the Salomé print is missing the cradling right arm and hand of the Family of Saltimbanques figure (see below).
64. Zervos VI, 690.
65. Apollinaire, in Daix, Rose, 336.
66. Zervos VI, 693.
67. Our x-radiographic examination of this area revealed the presence of a female figure whose existence cannot currently be explained, see Study Section.
68. See the Family of Saltimbanques: A History and Critical Fortune.
69. See especially the young girl in the foreground of The Dance Lesson of 1875 (Louvre, Paris).
71. Daix, Rose, 48.
72. Daix, Rose, 76. The formal and thematic relationship between Manet’s seated old musician in the painting and Picasso’s seated old musician in The Organ Grinder has not been noted before (figs. 6, 26). The early date of the Picasso would suggest knowledge of The Old Musician before the final stages of the Family of Saltimbanques.
73. André Level, Picasso (Paris, 1928), 22.
75. Apollinaire, in Daix, Rose, 336.
76. Cecily Mackworth, Guillaume Apollinaire and the Cubist Life (London, 1961), 70.
77. George Heard Hamilton, Painting and Sculpture in Europe 1880 to 1940 (Baltimore, 1967), 90.
81. Reff, “Harlequins,” 42.82. Reff in conversation with the author; Olivier, 13; Picasso repeats the position of these hands in his 1915 Ingresque drawing of Jacob (private collection, Pablo Picasso: A Retrospective, 179).
83. Reff, “Harlequins,” 42.
84. See for example the photograph of Olivier and Picasso in 1906, reproduced in Pablo Picasso: A Retrospective, 59.
87. She is identified as Raymonde by Johnson. She also appears in Salmon’s novel *La Négresse de Sacre-Cœur* (1920) where she is called Léontine and is described as “a pretty little girl of about thirteen, rather tall in her school dress . . . the shape of her skirt suggested . . . some stylish person, if the scissors had not cut off the material at the height of the knee . . . the girl was beautiful, of a grave and serious beauty . . . pallid and dark haired, Léontine possessed the grace of Diana—a little Montmartrois Diana swinging a net basket. . ..” Quote from *The Black Venus* (New York, 1929), 32-33.
89. Reff and I observed this in the laboratory.
93. Lifton, 3.
94. Level, 26.
95. A drawing for *Death of Harlequin* is dated 1906, suggesting the gouache be placed later in the series (Zervos XXII, 337).
97. Stylistically this work belongs with the *Two Acrobat* group, and its use of younger, male figures also relates to this constellation.
98. Due to the darkening of the paper the dog is now seen as a dark form against the white sheet, but close examination reveals a drawn outline, which is also apparent in early reproductions of the picture.
99. For reproductions of the studies, see *Pablo Picasso: A Retrospective*, 124. 100. In his collages and certain paintings from the synthetic cubist period Picasso used letters and images to form complex puns about his daily life.
101. Rubin, 98.
103. Henning, 6.
104. Henning, 5-6.
105. Reff, in his “Picasso’s Three Musicians, Maskers, Artists and Friends,” forthcoming in *Art in America* (December 1980) and made available to me in manuscript. Portraiture in later cubist painting may extend to the work of Léger as well. Indeed, his own *Three Musicians* might be a portrait of Braque, Picasso, and himself. This composition was begun in the later 1920s and is known in several versions, including the large oil at The Museum of Modern Art, New York.
106. Reff, “Maskers.”
107. Reff, “Maskers.”
108. Reff, “Maskers.”
109. Reff, “Maskers.”
110. See Zervos III, 415.
84. Signature from *Family of Saltimbanques*. 
STUDY SECTION
E. A. Carmean, Jr. and Ann Hoenigswald
with Barbara Miller

This section of the catalogue examines in detail the Family of Saltimbanques now in Washington. The thesis proposed here is based on a combination of art-historical information about the picture and related works and evidence gathered in a laboratory study. Because of its more technical nature, this report has been separated from the general discussion of the Saltimbanques.

Ann Hoenigswald and I want to emphasize that the evidence discussed in this study should not be seen as prescriptive of Picasso's work in the Rose Period. Clearly the revisions and wholesale changes which took place in the Family of Saltimbanques present an extraordinary case. Just as the preceding essay attempts to order the development of the Saltimbanque imagery, so this study focuses on the particular path taken in the creation of this special work. We do believe that with similar examinations of other major paintings our knowledge of Picasso's procedures will increase, and with that gain will come a greater understanding, both formally and thematically, of his work.

EAC, Jr.

History

As André Level wrote, albeit obscurely, in 1928, beneath the surface of the Family of Saltimbanques there exist two other important compositions also by Picasso. The initial composition, called here the Circus Family, corresponds to Fernande Olivier's 1933 description of a large canvas which began the Saltimbanques. The image which forms the second layer, called here the Two Acrobats, was previously unknown. Between the Two Acrobats and the final image lie numerous other revisions, recording the long development of this grand picture.

Although critics and art historians have considered Picasso's Family of Saltimbanques one of his major works for nearly half of a century, surprisingly little extensive discussion of the work exists, and the vast majority of this scholarship is devoted to the painting's iconography. Scant attention has been paid to the physical characteristics of the Family of Saltimbanques in spite of 36 years of almost continuous public exhibition. During this time Level's description remained unnoticed, and Olivier's mémoire was misinterpreted.

In the spring of 1980 we began a detailed examination of the Family of Saltimbanques, using the facilities of the conservation laboratory for infrared, x-radiographic, binocular microscopic, and cross-section paint analysis. This technical research resulted from previous study which had revealed that pentimenti visible in the picture corresponded to compositional variations known in the extant studies for the work. These correlations suggested that the painting had been revised. Our analyses confirmed this thesis.

Study of the work did not progress level by level but proceeded deductively. Evolving art-historical research suggested technical investigation of various areas, while in other ways, especially as the second state was decoded, the technical evidence reordered the art-historical sequencing. Rather than writing this report from a chronological point of view, we propose to discuss in turn the five states of the work we believe are present. A presentation of certain problems is appended.
State one: *Circus Family*

Remembering the large painting which began the Saltimbanques, Olivier described a group of acrobats on a plain, resting and working, with a child balancing on a large ball. Her inventory matches—and was subsequently interpreted as a description of—a gouache now in Baltimore (fig. 21). We now know that under the *Family of Saltimbanques* exists a composition which not only contains Olivier’s figures but also corresponds in numerous essential details to the *Circus Family* sketch.

The Baltimore *Circus Family* has a horizontal format, and thus is presumably a study for—rather than a record of—the nearly square com-
position under the *Family of Saltimbanques*. At some time the gouache was cut down, losing a portion of its imagery. A print of the same subject records the full composition (fig. 22). As we discussed in the essay, an early version of this drypoint has been found which was scored by Picasso and used to transfer the composition from the print to the canvas. Both the drypoint and the gouache are essential to understanding the *Circus Family* painting under the *Family of Saltimbanques*.

One of the first steps in our laboratory examination was to make an x-radiograph of the entire *Family of Saltimbanques*, a process that required numerous exposures of various sections which were then combined to create a composite x-radiograph of the entire work (fig. 85). An x-radiograph provides an image of the inner structure of a painting by recording the relative densities of materials. In this case, it revealed the compositions under the present painting and the artist’s changes as well as providing a more detailed picture of the brushwork. Lead white, the pigment least penetrable by x-rays, defines the essential image, and since so much white is used in flesh tones, the alterations in the figures are shown most dramatically. The disadvantage, however, of this density is that it also conceals any layers which are covered by white. For similar reasons, many areas painted in earth pigments and dark tones are often very difficult to read in an x-radiograph.

Our composite x-radiograph also shows the wooden stretcher bars behind the canvas; these appear as lighter bands because they are denser, creating a grid pattern of three horizontal and three vertical divisions. We took advantage of this stretcher pattern by marking a similar grid pattern over a photograph of the print as well as over a reproduction of the painting (figs. 86, 87), thus enabling us to readily locate the various elements of the *Circus Family* on all three images. The horizontal and vertical bands are
indicated as ABC and XYZ, while each of the sixteen divisions of the surface are numbered.

The focal figure of the Circus Family, the Harlequin, standing with his elbows bent outward and hands on hips, is clearly visible in the x-radiograph. His upper torso is located in section 7, with his right arm extending through line B into section 6. His face is no longer present, although some indications of his hat do remain (fig. 88). Below, in section 11, are traces of his legs.

The object of the Harlequin’s attention is the girl balancing on the ball, as singled out by Olivier. Her torso is visible in its graceful swing to the right, along line C extending into section 12. Below, straddling line C in sections 15 and 16, is the round shape of the ball, while her arms are visible in the bent passages above in sections 11 and 8 (fig. 89). Once the ball has been located in this way we can recognize its “ghost” still visible in the Family of Saltimbanques in the dark gray circle below and to the left of the water pitcher.

Perhaps the clearest surviving element of the Circus Family is the small child at the extreme right margin (fig. 90). The darker head, placed on line Y, stands out boldly from the lighter background. Extending upward from the child, in section 8 is the silhouette of the woman carrying sticks, her elbow also sharply contrasted with the lighter ground. At the other side of the work, along the left edge, the ladder is visible in section 5 with some traces of the stove apparent in section 9. The head of the child held aloft is suggested below the intersection of lines A and X, while the silhouette of the rightmost of the two fighting (or playing?) babies may be below in section 14. Much more distinct is the horse, crossing line Y in sections 6 and 10. Little of the remaining composition can be traced, as it was either painted in darker tones or now falls under major areas of subsequent additions. There is also the possibility that this and succeeding layers were never fully executed. Alternatively, they might have been removed; the paint is very thin in the Family of Saltimbanques, a sparseness which, like the reuse of the canvas itself, reflects Picasso’s poverty at this time.

An x-radiograph can only record the density of the underlayers by registering them as light and dark contrasts, creating the black, white, and gray image illustrated here. Having established the compositional similarities, we were also eager to determine what relationship existed between the colors used in the Baltimore gouache (plate 8) and those of the Circus Family.

We explored this issue through cross-sections of the paint layers made at various points (see fig. 86). A section from area 12 was selected to determine the color of the costume of the girl balancing on the ball. Our first sample revealed that her left leg was indeed painted a royal blue, matching the color of the tights shown in the Baltimore study. Another sample, taken in the girl’s torso, matched the pink of the leotard in the sketch. A third sample, from section 6, revealed a white
layer between the ground and the red layer of the jester's suit, confirming that the white horse seen in the watercolor was also present in the *Circus Family*. These three samples as well as the x-radiographic evidence suggest that in painting the *Circus Family* state of the *Family of Saltimbanques* Picasso closely followed the design and palette of the Baltimore study and the drypoint.

89. Details showing the girl on the ball in the x-radiograph and *Circus Family* drypoint.

90. Details showing the child at right in the x-radiograph and *Circus Family* drypoint.
State Two: Two Acrobats

When we began our laboratory examination, one of the first areas targeted for x-radiography was the head of the smallest acrobat, as it was marked by the wide cracks often made when paint is applied over other wet areas, thereby strongly suggesting that this area had been substantially revised. The x-radiographic print of the section proved to be a surprise, however, as there was a significantly different face underneath, one larger in scale, facing the opposite direction, and with much more refined features (fig. 91). It did not correspond to any image in the known Family of Saltimbanques sketches.

However, the face did relate directly to one in another work by Picasso, Two Acrobats with a Dog, now in a private collection in New York (fig. 32). Indeed, the resemblance between the x-radiographic head and that of the smaller acrobat was uncanny, especially when the latter was photographically reversed (fig. 38). At this point in our research it became clear that we were dealing with another stratum in the painting, a layer unconnected to either the Circus Family composition or the evolutionary stages of the Family of Saltimbanques. Could this be Level’s unknown second composition?

This thesis gained support when the composite x-radiograph was assembled. It showed, in section 2 at line B, the face of the taller acrobat but also revealed another face, above and to the left of this figure, located beneath the drum carried in the final state. This head was larger than that of the taller acrobat. Studying the general character of the features, and more specifically the scale and the placement of the face in relation to that of the head below, again suggested a connection with Two Acrobats with a Dog.

Although connections had been drawn between the thematic character of the acrobatic pairs in these two works, no more direct relationship had previously been suggested. However, the design of the landscape in each work is similar, and—despite the overall brownish tone of the Family of Saltimbanques—the coloration in the skies is very much alike. The compositional relationship of the figures, the character and modeling of the clearly visible face, along with the features of landscape and sky, all suggest that a reversed composition of the Two Acrobats had been painted over the Circus Family state. We have accepted that thesis here, although it is supported by less evidence than supports the existence of the earlier state. The art-historical side of the case is far clearer, especially the evidence suggested by the chronology established in the essay.

Seeing Two Acrobats as the second state of the Family of Saltimbanques explains the prevalence of a blue tone under the brown landscape; the New York gouache is permeated by a similar chalky blue color, even though it is primarily a gray landscape. Picasso may have carried the tonality of the gouache into the oil, just as he had earlier used the color accents of the Baltimore sketch in the Circus Family. More importantly, the existence of the Two Acrobats explains Level’s statement, since the theme of two youths was the dominant one for Picasso during this period. Its existence as the second layer in the Washington painting corroborates Level’s comment that the Family of Saltimbanques was superimposed over two important compositions.

State Three: Acrobat and Jester

The evolution of Picasso’s large painting from the Two Acrobats state to the final Family of Saltimbanques cannot be charted with any degree of exactness. While it is clear from the pigment layering that the various figures were added at separate stages, the precise sequence of these additions can only be deduced by art-historical argument augmented by the small amount of laboratory evidence pertinent to each case.

Visual study of the picture suggests that the two groups of paired male figures—the young acrobats and the older acrobat and jester—are separate from each other; they do not appear continuous in space. It is therefore proposed that the two groups were individually introduced into the composition at this stage. We must recall that the painting in its second state featured
a pair of acrobats in roughly the same location as the pair in the final version. We believe that Picasso revised these two youths to accommodate the addition of the jester and acrobat, who were based on a pair already established in drawings (fig. 54). It is currently unknown, however, which change occurred first.

But the revisions within the individual figures are clear. We can see from pentimenti that beneath the blue pants the youngest acrobat wears in the final state are the more conventional tights (fig. 60). This costume corresponds with that in a study drawing (fig. 58). Furthermore his elbow may have originally been bent outward, as is also the case in this preparatory sheet. The taller acrobat was reduced in size and moved to the right at this stage; aside from minor revisions he remains unchanged from this point on.

Turning to the other pair, we can trace numerous revisions. In transferring the jester and the acrobat from the drawings into the painting, Picasso changed the identity of the latter by giving him a different costume. We can get an idea of his appearance in this state from a study now in Russia (fig. 56) where a top hat and long coat replace the acrobat's tights, and a traveling satchel is added to his left hand. Although the acrobat was later revised to become the Harlequin, evidence of his identity as a traveling figure is still present in the final picture. Clearly visible in the pentimenti around the figure's head is the top hat. This area is marked by very wide cracks which were probably caused by the presence of a slow drying dark pigment underneath. Around the figure's neck Picasso left the scarf—an object reasonable on a cloaked figure but curious on one dressed in motley. The extended left hand which held the bag is not as evident, yet some traces of its presence can be seen in the x-radiograph, and the surface of the work reveals a dark underlayer where the satchel would have been.

State Four: Little Girl

The Russian study shows a little girl placed before the jester. However, the drawings indicate that the jester was originally a full-length figure. We postulate therefore that the little girl was an addition made at this stage in the area of the jester's abdomen and legs. Indeed the inclusion of the girl presented a problem—it caused the removal of the jester's right leg which was initially placed in the space now present between the acrobat's leg and that of the girl. Although Picasso reworked this area with tan paint, similar to that used in the landscape, the dark red of the jester's leg is still visible. By itself this "ghost" of a leg would not indicate that the girl was a later addition: we could argue that Picasso might simply have preferred to change this section. Thus, in order to locate the jester under the girl, a cross-section was taken in the area of her skirt (fig. 86). While we did not find the red of the jester's suit as an underlayer, this sample came from a shaded portion of his body. The dark blue pigment which was extracted does match the tone used to model his torso. Moreover, not only does this pigment differ from the color used in shading the girl, but also it is clearly from a different layer than that corresponding to the girl's dress.

From this evidence we can propose that the Russian study represents ideas Picasso was considering as revisions to state three—chief among them the addition of the girl to a composition where only four males were present. In transferring the girl from this sketch to the painting, however, Picasso made a further change—the addition of a dog. Although there is no evidence from either x-radiography or infra-red examination, it is possible that at one point a dog was located to the right of the youngest acrobat, as one is shown there in both Two Acrobats with a Dog (when reversed) and the Russian study. In any case, when the little girl was added to the composition she was accompanied by a dog, standing beside her on the right. This area was subsequently repainted, as can clearly be seen on the hem of her skirt near her hand. We argue here that this revision covered the dog, rather than being a change from the placement of her hand in the Russian sketch. No evidence can be found in the painting of a hand in the higher position, and its relocation would not have affected the girl's skirt.

The existence of the dog can only be supported by secondary evidence. There is no trace of its presence in the x-radiograph, perhaps because of a lack of dense pigment. We do know what the dog would have looked like, however, since a pastel sketch exists—showing the girl and dog—which is clearly a study for this state (fig. 59). By comparing this sketch with the same area of the picture, two small clues emerge which indicate the dog. Below the heels of the drum-carrying acrobat we find a dark layer with a curved shape that corresponds in outline and placement with the curling tail of the dog as shown in the sketch. On the other side, next to the girl's right leg we find a dark passage, which initially seems to model her limb. However, not only is this shading unusually
heavy, but also it actually detaches itself from her leg below the knee and juts off toward the basket. This spatial incongruity can be explained, though, as this dark passage is not actually shading; rather, it is part of the chest and right foreleg of the dog, as seen in the study, a remnant of its former presence (fig. 92).

**State Five: Family of Saltimbanques**

We must assume that at the end of state four the *Family of Saltimbanques* looked very much like the Russian study, with the top-hatted and cloaked acrobat, the jester, the two younger acrobats both in tights, and the little girl, only now with the dog moved next to her. Despite the correlations between the painting and the study, examination of the landscape to the right has failed to disclose any evidence of the horse-racing scene.

Between this state and the final version, here called state five, four major revisions were made: the costume and face of the tall acrobat were changed, as were those of the youngest acrobat, the dog was replaced by the basket of flowers, and—most dramatically—the seated woman in the lower right corner was introduced. As noted above, scientifically we cannot deduce any sequence for these last revisions since they are isolated from each other; art historically, as outlined in the essay, we have proposed that they are connected with the return to the orphanage of a child briefly adopted by Olivier.

Picasso’s revision of the tall acrobat affected the work both compositionally and thematically. By moving the figure’s left hand upward, toward the child, and eliminating the bag, Picasso opened the left hand margin into a broader landscape plane. The Harlequin’s suit adds a note of color to this area, while also introducing the costume of Picasso’s self-portraiture. At the same time, the face was repainted to reproduce the artist’s profile with its determined and pensive expression, qualities further emphasized by the removal of the top hat.

Substitution of the basket of flowers for the dog was easily accomplished, although the resulting placement of the girl’s hand atop the handle is less convincing than was its former position on the animal’s head. Symbolically, the basket adds a more delicate, fragile note to the child.

The alterations made in the costume and face of the smallest acrobat may have occurred in two stages. As noted above, there is some indication in the x-radiograph that his left arm was originally bent outward, matching the position shown in the Russian sketch. The revised position, extending downward across the body, joins the change in costume—to ballooning pants and puffy, long jacket—creating a figure which recalls the boy in Manet’s *The Old Musician* and Watteau’s *Gilles* (see the essay, fig. 60). The change in the acrobat’s face is more explicit; his features become those of Max Jacob, and he stares directly at the seated woman. The emphatic direction of his gaze indicates that the addition of the woman was at least planned if not actually executed at this point; understanding Jacob’s feelings about the child’s return explains this aspect of the acrobat’s revision.

The seated woman at the lower right was probably added in the last stages of the picture, as she does not appear either in the interim Russian study or in any other, related Sal-
timbanque or circus works. She is drawn from a study now in Russia called the _Woman of Majorca_ (fig. 61) after the scarf-bound hat that woman wears. In transferring the figure Picasso first eliminated the hat, substituting a chignon which is clearly visible in infrared photographs. Subsequently he replaced the hat, changing its style and perching it atop her head. Picasso also added the right hand crossing into the lap, as well as the long reddish orange skirt. A piece of clay pottery was placed above the woman, at once emblematic of Spain and of Olivier (see the essay).

**Problems**

Our counterpointing of art-historical argument and evidence with the data obtained in the laboratory examinations composes the proposed development of the _Family of Saltimbanques_ outlined above. In the course of studying the work, however, certain other problems arose which still remain unresolved. Each represents an aspect of the painting which cannot easily be fit into the creative scheme we have devised for the work.

The changes in the area around the seated woman are especially difficult to chart. Both surface examination and x-radiography confirm that many revisions were made in this area, but taking the Russian study as a guide, we have postulated that only in the last stage was any figural image or object considered for the lower corner. In the woman’s skirt, directly below her right hand, is a lighter, V-shaped passage which has no explicit function. Its form, when joined to a vertical line shown in darker underpaint directly beneath the younger acrobat's left foot, suggests that beneath the woman is a box drawn in perspective; no x-radiographic evidence supporting this observation can be found. Yet the possible existence of these elements raised the question: did Picasso consider an addition to the _Circus Family_ state of the strong man seated on a box, who is shown in several drawings watching the girl on the ball (fig. 24)?

Atop the left edge of this phantom box we found the pentimento of a child’s leg, remarkably legible through the brown landscape wash painted over it. Furthermore, its appearance is not recent; it can already be seen in the reproduction of the _Family of Saltimbanques_ in _Comedia_ of 1914 (fig. 96). This limb is problematic: it cannot be connected with the woman or any of Picasso’s work during this period. At most it recalls certain features of the children painted during the Blue Period. When we first considered this leg, we divorced it from Picasso’s hand and argued that it was already on the canvas when he began the _Circus Family_. However, it is closer to the surface; in fact it lies on top of the ball of the balancing girl, which is visible below the clay pitcher. Thus, this limb must be from an interim state. Is it the “ghost” of a boy on a box, indirectly related to other works in the _Circus Family_ style (fig. 26)?

One of the constant dilemmas in studying x-radiographs is the challenge of reading figuration or objects in nondescriptive paint patterns, roughly the way that one “sees” animals in abstract designs. In the _Family of Saltimbanques_ there is the suggestion of another face in the pentimenti to the upper left of the Harlequin's head. This face, more recognizable in the x-radiograph, is larger than that of the Harlequin and looks inward and across the composition. To what does it relate?

Unlike this “ghost” face, another image is clearly legible in the x-radiograph, although not visible on the surface of the work (fig. 93). This is the striking woman at the left vertical edge of the canvas. With a broad face and strong neck, she suggests sturdy peasant stock, a reading further underscored by her costume, a V-necked blouse and a shawl. Her right arm and hand extend into the painting. While she is too general in style to be directly related to Picasso’s earlier work, she does appear to be stylistically different from any known Saltimbanque or circus pictures. Only her figural scale suggests she might have been
added to the first state, to fill in an area to the left of the ladder and cooking stove.

State Six: Post-Picasso

At some date after it left Picasso’s hands the Family of Saltimbanques was reduced in size; portions of the original surface were pulled around a new, smaller stretcher. The original tacking margin is still present, and there we discovered the original nail holes where the canvas was first attached to the larger, initial stretcher. We also found a long line on each of the four sides, showing that Picasso had indicated the size of the composition at some point. The cropping is unfortunate, of course, as portions of the original image are now on the new tacking margin. For the most part this loss occurs only in border areas which contained empty sky or landscape; its clearest impact is on Picasso’s signature, where the P now extends around the edge of the work (fig. 84).

The difference between the present dimension of the work and its initial size is small: approximately 12 centimeters in height and 5.5 centimeters in width. These figures correspond to the dimensions first published for the work at the time of its 1914 auction (fig. 95)—2.250 x 2.350 meters—versus its present measurements—2.128 x 2.296 meters. Given how small this area of loss is in relationship to the total scale of the surface, it could have often been cropped in early illustrations. However, we can gain some idea of the initial appearance of the work from its reproduction on the cover of the February 21, 1931 issue of Art News, which shows the painting in its initial, larger size (fig. 102).

The fact that this illustration of the Family of Saltimbanques was a reproduction for an article announcing the painting’s acquisition by Chester Dale suggests strongly that the work was reduced after the Dale purchase (see the History and Critical Fortune section). The reproduction is not proof of this conjecture, however, for the photograph used by Art News may have been an older one, rather than one taken near or upon the Dale purchase.

We do know that the 1916 catalogue issued by Thannhauser lists the original dimensions. Puzzling, however, is a Thannhauser label—entitling the work Les Bateleurs (following the name used in the 1914 auction)—which is attached to the new, smaller stretcher. Presumably the label was transferred from the initial stretcher.

It is probable that the work was reduced after the Dale purchase. Accounts of the painting’s appearance upon arrival in New York in 1931 mention its need of restoration (see History and Critical Fortune), and when this work was undertaken the new, smaller—and very good—stretcher may have been used. The painting was at some time lined as well. Unfortunately, no record of any conservation work on the Family of Saltimbanques exists in the Dale papers at the National Gallery; they merely record that it was “cut down.” In any case, the reduction had been made by 1932, as Christian Zervos’s catalogue of Picasso’s work, published in that year, lists the present, smaller measurements.

Conclusions

Unfortunately, the condition of the turned-under areas, especially along the line where the canvas folds over the stretcher’s edge, is so fragile and unstable that it is prohibitive of restoration at this point. We have changed the assigned date of the work from “1905” to “late 1904—late 1905,” in order to indicate the duration of the complex steps taken in creating the Family of Saltimbanques. These layers of invention now lie hidden beneath the surface of this great painting.

1 A curious drawing is known (Zervos VI, 730), related to the image of the strong man seated on a box. The right leg of this figure is crossed in such a way that his calf and foot can be indirectly connected with the mysterious limb. Furthermore, the back of the cube he sits upon is suggested in the dark areas of underpaint directly below the woman’s right hand. No traces of this figure are present in the x-radiograph, and the character of the booted foot now visible in the pentimenti suggests a child rather than an adult. Nevertheless, the only figure to wear boots in the Saltimbanque works is the strong man.
Chronology

Late 1904
Picasso paints a large composition entitled here the *Circus Family*.

March (?) 1905
The *Circus Family* is replaced by a new work based on *Two Acrobats with a Dog*.

Spring—Summer 1905
The *Two Acrobats* state is set aside as Picasso explores another composition, the *Circus Portrait*, which evolves into studies of figural groups. One of these, with a standing acrobat and jester, is transformed and added to the two young acrobats, who are also revised. Following this step, a little girl petting a dog is added to the painting.

Fall 1905
Possibly in reaction to Manet’s *The Old Musician*, the younger acrobat is recostumed, and his left arm moved. At the same time or perhaps subsequently, the Harlequin appears over the top-hatted acrobat, the little girl’s dog is replaced by a basket of flowers, the younger acrobat’s face is repainted, and the seated woman is added.

1931 (?)
Probably after the Chester Dale purchase, the *Family of Saltimbanques* is slightly reduced in size, as border strips of the work are folded behind on a smaller stretcher.
94. The New York apartment of Mr. and Mrs. Chester Dale. Cat. no. 93.
This section of the catalogue is a history of the *Family of Saltimbanques*, tracing the work's provenance from Picasso's studio through its entrance into the National Gallery's collection. The fame of the painting is also chronicled, from its first public appearance in 1914, to its reemergence with the Dale purchase seventeen years later, and finally to its continual public exhibition in Washington after 1952. We have also logged the picture's critical reception and the varying interpretations of its meaning. Our coverage is necessarily limited, especially after 1931, but we have selected events which survey the history of the work.

The Painting

1904—1905

It is proposed here that the *Family of Saltimbanques* was begun in the *Circus Family* state as the initial circus work from late 1904 (see the Study Section). This composition was twice repainted by Picasso; the later version was then revised several times before becoming the present painting, which was probably completed in the fall of 1905.

It is unlikely that the *Family of Saltimbanques*, even as an earlier state, was exhibited in Picasso’s show at Galeries Serrurier in February 25–March 6 of this year. While the catalogue for the exhibition does list the circus works under the general title, “1-8: Saltimbanques,” Apollinaire's review in *La Plume*, on May 15, does not describe any work as being of extraordinary size. Given this omission, the fact that he mentioned details seen in the initial state of the *Family of Saltimbanques* suggests he was referring either to a gouache version or a drypoint variation (figs. 21, 22), especially given the description's lack of prominence in the article. In a similar way, his discussion of *Two Acrobat with a Dog*, most probably refers to the gouache (fig. 32)—which he illustrated—rather than the second state of the *Family of Saltimbanques*.

From the Level Purchase to the Hôtel Drouot Auction

1909—1914

Although Picasso sold several studies for the *Family of Saltimbanques* to important collectors at the time, including Sergei Shchukine in Russia (fig. 56), he apparently retained possession of the large canvas itself. According to D. H. Kahnweiler, Picasso’s dealer after 1907, André Level purchased the work directly from the artist in 1909, possibly for 1000 francs. Level, who wrote on modern art, was acting for La Peau de l’Ours, a group composed of himself, young friends, and relatives, who had banded together in 1904 to assemble a collection of works of art, primarily by young painters. This collection was formed over a period of ten years, ultimately to be sold at public auction.

The large size of the *Family of Saltimbanques* caused considerable problems, however, and Guy Habasque records: “As none of the associates’ dwellings were large enough to house it, it passed several years in a coach-house.”

The collection of La Peau de l’Ours was sold at auction at the Hôtel Drouot in Paris on Monday, March 2, 1914. *Family of Saltimbanques* was number 63 in the sales catalogue, listed under the title *Les Bateleurs*. The entry provided a description of the work, citing its dimensions as 2.25 x 2.35 meters. (fig. 95). The winning bid for the picture was 11,500 francs, a sum dramatically in excess of the already high presale estimate, 8,000 francs; this bid established the highest price yet paid for a Picasso. Indeed, in the words of one of the underbidders, it “astonished all Paris, where only Kahnweiler was Picasso’s dealer and friend,” the artist having dropped other dealers and refused all public exhibitions. Comparative prices at the sale shed further light on this record figure: works by Gauguin and van Gogh were purchased for between 4,000 and 4,200 francs, while Matisse’s paintings sold at around 600 francs.

The auction, and especially the record price for the *Family of Saltimbanques*, did not go unnoticed by the press. *Comedia*, on March 8, published a lengthy account of the sale and, due to its new notoriety, illustrated the *Family of Saltim-
95. Entry for the *Family of Saltimbanques* in the sales catalogue from the 2 March 1914 auction at the Hôtel Drouot. Cat. no. 90.

*PICASSO*

(Pablo)

63. — Les bateleurs.

Il se tiennent debout à gauche : l’arlequin, l’avant-bras gauche au dos, la main voilant sa tête à droite et donnant la main à la petite fille, en jupe de danseuse, dont la paume droite s’appuie légèrement sur l’aisselle d’une corbeille ; le gros homme de face, un sac sur le dos, l’adolescent, en maillot de travail, portant le tambour sur une épaule ; et l’enfant en vêtements trop amples pour lui.

A droite, une jeune femme assise, en chapeau de paille, le bras gauche replié, la main à l’épaule, — l’autre main reposant sur les genoux. Derrière, une cruche.

_Signé à droite en bas : Picasso._

_Taille._ — Haut, 2 m. 25 ; large, 2 m. 35.

banques. This was the first reproduction of the work (fig. 96). Seymour de Ricci in *Gil Blas* profiled the purchaser, Galerie Thannhauser, and quoted Mr. Thannhauser as saying he would have “willingly paid twice as much.” Thannhauser and the *Family of Saltimbanques* were both attacked in Maurice Delcourt’s account in *Paris-Midi* as an example of a plan to destroy French art: “Well, a new proof of this German meddling is obvious. It’s the sale of La Peau de l’Ours . . . since these ‘considerable prices’ were attained by the grotesque works, and given form by undesirable foreigners . . . the money they wasted yesterday could have been better spent.”

Given the prominence of the *Family of Saltimbanques* in the press, Picasso was certainly aware of the sale, and he may have intended to make reference to it in his collage *Bottle of Bass, Glass, Tobacco Package and Visiting Card* (Daix 660; Zervos II, 456). This work, generally dated to the “beginning of 1914,” can be more precisely placed in the period around early March and the auction, as the visiting card of the title, one of André Level’s, is most likely used to commemorate the sale of the *Family of Saltimbanques*.

Herta Koenig and Rilke

1915

Following the auction, Thannhauser returned to Munich with the *Family of Saltimbanques*. It became part of his gallery stock and was published as such in a catalogue issued in 1916: number 150, under the title *Gaukler*. A corresponding Thannhauser label is attached to the stretcher of the picture, entitling the work *Les Bateleurs*. However, in spite of this entry in a 1916 catalogue,
the Family of Saltimbanques had earlier been sold to Herta Koenig, also of Munich. The transaction occurred before the summer of 1915. We are assured of this date because the poet Rainer Maria Rilke wrote to a friend on the 22nd of June 1915, “I am sitting here in the apartment [of Frau Koenig] with the finest Picasso in which there is so much Paris. . . .”

Rilke’s connection with the Family of Saltimbanques played an important part in its history. He may have known Picasso and thus the large painting as early as 1905; his friend Willem von Uhde was close to Picasso (and also to Level) and had begun at that time to acquire the artist’s work, including the Death of a Harlequin (fig. 75), which Uhde lent to Rilke in 1907. Rilke may have earlier suggested to Koenig that she acquire the Family of Saltimbanques, and after the auction Rilke may have been instrumental in her purchase of it from Thannhauser.7

Rilke was especially drawn to the painting’s theme, as his own work centered on the same subject. Confronting the Family of Saltimbanques in the Koenig apartment evoked memories of Parisian street entertainers and inspired what became the fifth of the Dunio Elegies, which were ultimately dedicated to Koenig. Rilke’s opening lines were later linked to the picture’s interpretation.

Seclusion

1915

It is ironic that, given its newly acquired fame at the 1914 auction, the Family of Saltimbanques soon disappeared again from public view. Herta Koenig was a most private person and, according to a witness’s record, “never let anyone see the painting.”8 Thus the picture is virtually absent from any discussion of Picasso’s works for the next seventeen years, until the Chester Dale purchase in 1931.

1924

In this year Pierre Reveroy did illustrate the Family of Saltimbanques, without comment on the work, in his Pablo Picasso: Les Peintres Français Nouveaux, No. 16 (plate 27).

1928

Level published the Family of Saltimbanques in his book, Picasso, its second reproduction in book form (plate 17). Placing the Family of Saltimbanques as the “crowning accomplishment” of the Rose Period, Level described the work, recalled the fame of its 1914 auction, and lamented its disappearance in Munich: “lost for its adopted country as for its country of origin, it has gone to enrich a German collection and seems promised to a museum.” Level’s comment on “its country of origin” was the first to suggest a “Spanishness” in the picture. He also remarked that the painting brought the Saltimbanques to a “definitive close,” indicating the work’s place late in the series. Level’s text has been overlooked in the art-historical literature on the Family of Saltimbanques. Yet in a brief passage he outlined the stages in the development of the painting, noting the layers which would not be discovered until the x-radiographic analysis made this year: “A famous painting,” Level wrote, “[it was] superimposed over the canvas of two other compositions [which were] as important.” As these underlayers are hidden from unaided view we must assume that Picasso had either described them to Level, or that as a friend of Picasso, Level had actually seen the other compositions on the canvas during 1904-1905.

Reappearance

1931

With the Dale purchase in 1931 the Family of Saltimbanques made a dramatic reappearance. For financial reasons the picture was not given to a museum by Herta Koenig, and when it came on the art market it was quickly purchased by Chester Dale. John Walker described the acquisition:

In 1931 Chester bought [a] picture whose size caused him difficulties. He was shown a photograph of Picasso’s Saltimbanques by Val Dudensing, who stated correctly that it was one of the greatest masterpieces of the twentieth century. The price was $100,000, and it was held by a Swiss bank as collateral for a loan which was in default. Chester concluded that the money owed was probably considerably less than $100,000 and that the bank would be glad to settle for the amount of the loan, regardless of the feelings of their client. He cabled a bid well under the offering price, and it was accepted at once. The picture arrived in New York, and Dudensing was told to have it delivered immediately. After several days Frank McCarthy, an old friend and an important Customs official, called Chester and said something funny was going on and that he had better send a check for the picture at once. He did and it was released by the Customs. He then discovered that several French dealers had been negotiating for the Saltimbanques at a still lower figure and had not expected any competition. To their surprise they learned that the painting had been sold, but to their relief they also found that it had not been paid for. They told their American representative to say that the deal with Dale was off, and to have the picture reloaded and returned to France, whence they could continue their negotiations.

Once Chester had the picture . . . he could not get it into his apartment. He decided to have it delivered to Val Dudensing. Henry McBride, the art critic, describes walking along Fifty-seventh Street at twilight on a snowy afternoon. He looked up and to his astonishment saw a huge Picasso silhouetted against the wintry sky, swinging in
The date of the Dale purchase was February 10, 1931. Eight days later the Family of Saltimbanques was put on public view in an exhibition of works by Picasso, Braque, and Léger, organized by Mrs. Maud Dale at the Museum of French Art in New York (February 18 to March 17, 1931, no. 4). The emergence of such a major work—after virtual seclusion since its completion—was seen as an important occasion. Art News illustrated the painting on the cover of its February 21st issue (fig. 102), and in his review Ralph Flint called the work the “pièce de résistance” of the exhibition. In this same article Flint became the first to describe the hypnotic qualities of the composition, referring to its “poignant effect.” Arts Magazine also reviewed the exhibition saying “the sensation of the event is the large Picasso Family of Saltimbanques,” while McBride, who had seen the work arrive, described it as “sensitive and powerful” in the New York Evening Sun (February 14). The New York Times (February 22) and The New Yorker (February 28) also reported the event.

The painting appears to have suffered somewhat during the period before the Dale purchase. In his review Flint observed that “the large ‘Saltimbanque’ canvas is going to look a hundred percent finer when some of the traces of its recent voyaging are judiciously removed.” No records exist which describe the conservation procedures used; and this is especially unfortunate as the work was reduced in size either at this time or somewhat earlier (see the Study Section).

In this year, in connection with the reappearance of the Family of Saltimbanques, André Beucler published “The Precubism of Picasso” in Formes (April), the first article to deal with the picture at any length. Beucler’s response to the work—“vagabonds with mysterious and thoughtful eyes”—is similar to that often repeated in subsequent years, while his text is the first to comment on the isolation of the figures.

From Zervos to Von Blanckenhagen

1932
Although the Family of Saltimbanques was installed in the Dale’s New York apartment (fig. 94) and thus was not on public view during the 1930s, critics and art historians did have access to the work. Its appearance in the 1931 exhibition marks the beginning of increasingly frequent discussion of the painting in the art-historical literature. Central to the study of the Family of Saltimbanques was the publication in 1932 of volume I of Christian Zervos’s catalogue raisonné, which covered Picasso’s oeuvre through 1906. Zervos not only illustrated the Family of Saltimbanques (no. 285, with its present dimensions) but also included many of the study drawings and other related works, thus establishing the context of the picture. In this same year Zervos published the Family of Saltimbanques in an article in Cahiers d’Art (June).

1933
Fernande Olivier’s memoir Picasso et ses amis was published. This book included her description of the large Circus Family picture and its subsequent revisions.

1939
The relationship between the Family of Saltimbanques and Rilke’s poem was underscored in 1939 when the picture appeared as the frontispiece in Norton’s edition of the Dunio Elegies, translated into English by Stephen Spender and J. B. Leishman. Subsequently, Rilke’s lines are almost uniformly quoted when the Family of Saltimbanques is discussed.

1943
The Family of Saltimbanques returned to public view in this year when the Dales placed it on long-term loan at the Art Institute of Chicago, where it remained until 1952. For a period before this Chicago loan, the Family of Saltimbanques was on deposit at the National Gallery, along with other Dale paintings. No records exist showing that the large painting was exhibited at this time in Washington, but such exhibition would have run contrary to the then existent general Gallery policy against “permanent” display of works by artists dead less than twenty years (the so-called Louvre rule).

1946
In this year Alfred H. Barr published Picasso: Fifty Years of His Art, a book expanding his 1939 catalogue for a Museum of Modern Art exhibition. Barr’s publication marks the first consideration of the Family of Saltimbanques within the context of Picasso’s work as a whole, and his sensitive appreciation of the painting is still accurate: “We find the Family of Saltimbanques entirely without drama or sermon. The figures are almost unrelated psychologically and Picasso’s romantic sentiment for circus people is restrained. Reticent, too, the muffled color, the subtle drawing and the sensitive placing of the figures.”

1947
Daniel E. Schneider published a
psychological study of “The Painting of Pablo Picasso” in the College Art Journal of this year (Winter, no. 2). Disagreeing with Barr’s reading of the figures, Schneider’s text is the first attempt at decoding pictorial meanings from the composition and the facial expressions:

... the grouping tells the story. The woman—the mother—is a thing apart. No child makes a gesture toward her. The men and the little sister (whose face does not appear) are stiff, elongated, posed. The unsmiling, sad stiffness of the younger men adds to the meaning of the grouping as they look at the mother. The fat red clown (the father) looks away, and the little girl looks down. It is a moment of rest and apartness for the burdened woman, and the total note is one of subtle tender pity for her—with a feeling of defensive rejection and perhaps shame portrayed in the others.

1951

The relationship between Picasso’s saltimbanques and those in Rilke’s “Elegy” was explored by Peter Von Blanckenhenagen in an article in Das Kunstwerk from 1951 (no. 4). Von Blanckenhenagen suggested that Picasso’s Luncheon of the Soler Family of 1903 was the prototype for the Family of Saltimbanques.

From Lieberman to Daix

1952

In this year William Lieberman’s Pablo Picasso was published; it included a text which marked a major change in the understanding of the Family of Saltimbanques. Although his discussion is brief, consisting of a short introduction and notes on ten pictures reproduced in color plates, Lieberman’s entry on the Family of Saltimbanques is the first interpretation of the work in art-historical terms. This entry compares the picture with its studies, makes reference to the literature, and provides a reading of the composition:

Every few years Picasso concentrates into one large composition the problems of an entire period of work. In 1905 he planned two paintings using those saltimbanques he had drawn so often during the first months of the same year. The first, a camp of itinerant performers, was never executed but its composition is outlined in several prints and drawings [figs. 21, 22]. The second composition is the Family of Saltimbanques... . .

The preliminary sketches differ considerably from the finished painting. The actors were more encumbered by personal belongings, and, instead of the flower basket beside the little girl, the dog was repeated from [fig. 32]. The arid, rolling terrain of the background replaces the original view of mounted horses racing before a crowd. In the final painting the harlequin’s profile has also been changed to suggest a self-portrait of the young Picasso himself.

The composition gathers together performers already familiar from other works of the circus period. This may explain why the figures seemed posed, static, and curiously independent of each other. The seated lady at the right bears no psychological relationship to any of the other characters. She seems a subject for a separate painting and indeed did not appear in any of the preliminary studies.

If various elements of the painting seem unresolved, it is perhaps this very incompleteness that contributes an air of expectancy, a suggestion of mystery and romance.

Lieberman’s discussion of two paintings is clearly drawn from Olivier’s description of the Circus Family state of the Family of Saltimbanques which has now been discovered under the picture. His interpretation of her memory of the Circus Family canvas as being rather of a “never executed” work becomes an often-repeated analysis. The identification in the entry of Picasso’s self-portrait is the initial step in the identification of the figures, while Lieberman’s observation that the composition gathers together figures from other works suggests already the collagelike process of assembly which we now know lies behind the painting.

The first step toward Chester Dale’s eventual donation of the Family of Saltimbanques to the National Gallery also took place in this year. During the summer the painting was returned to Washington from Chicago, joining other Dale works which had previously been on extended loan to Chicago and to the Philadelphia Museum of Art. In November the Gallery opened an exhibition of pictures from the Dale Collection, including the Family of Saltimbanques. During the Second World War the Gallery’s policies had changed to more freely allow temporary exhibition of works by living artists. The Family of Saltimbanques remained on view as an extended loan until Chester Dale’s death in 1962.

1959

Roland Penrose’s major biography of Picasso was published. In his discussion of the early Rose Period, Penrose continued the Lieberman concept of an unexecuted Circus Family composition, now dating the work to spring 1905 and pairing it with the Family of Saltimbanques. Both were seen as outgrowths of numerous paintings and studies that [had] accumulated.” In describing the Washington picture Penrose observed that the characters were drawn from Picasso’s visits to the Cirque Médrano:

In the Saltimbanques there is no message, no allegory, and a balance between spontaneity and sensitive judgement relieves it of any suspicion of sentimentality. Picasso has assembled the studies of his circus friends and grouped them together under a blue sky with an empty, timeless landscape as their background.

Like Lieberman, Penrose identi-
fied the Harlequin as Picasso’s self-portrait, and he also observed that a formal relationship exists between the fat jester and Picasso’s drawings of Apollinaire.

1962
John Richardson, in *Picasso: An American Tribute*, accepted Lieberman’s concept of an unexecuted *Circus Family*, adding *The Watering Place* as another unrealized Saltimbanque picture, to total, with the *Family of Saltimbanques*, three planned, large compositions. In December of this year Chester Dale died, bequeathing the majority of his collection, including the *Family of Saltimbanques*, to the National Gallery.

1964
Pierre Daix published his *Picasso*, giving this description of the *Family of Saltimbanques*:

That halt of a wandering circus, with the fat clown, the romantic harlequin, the adolescent with the narrow hips, the two boys with their bodies already wiry from training, the little girl with the basket of flowers, the urchin with the face of an adult, arise out of the depths of time and past ages, in a stony waste reminiscent of the back country of Malaga. Do they see the Majorcan woman on the other side of the picture? Is she aware of their presence? The canvas snatches us up and bathes us in unlimited space and time. This contrasts with the blue series, seemingly made up of closed snapshots. Here, we plunge into history, human continuity, . . .

Daix also proposed that the picture took considerable time to complete and stated that its execution was interrupted by Picasso’s trip to Holland in summer 1905.

1965
The National Gallery opened new installations of the Dale pictures in this year, including 88 works formerly kept in the Dale apartment in New York. The acceptance by the Gallery of the *Family of Saltimbanques* and other works by living artists changed a policy at the institution which had excluded from the Permanent Collection the work of artists dead less than twenty years (the *Family of Saltimbanques* had previously been on loan). As Frank Getlein observed in *The NewRepublic* (June 5), this change “alters the Gallery and its sphere of influence in Washington.” Getlein also pointed to the thematic connections between the *Family of Saltimbanques* and Daumier’s *Wandering Saltimbanques* (fig. 5), another work in the Dale bequest.

1966-1967
The 1966 publication (in French; English version in 1967) of Daix and Georges Boudaille’s catalogue raisonné of the paintings from the Blue and Rose Periods, supplemented by related drawings, was a major event. Daix and Boudaille analyzed the artist’s career in a lengthy biography, while the catalogue proper, compiled with the assistance of Joan Rosselet, discussed the works in depth. The catalogue text for the Saltimbanques organized them into more definite groupings and identified the works shown in the 1905 exhibition. Daix and Boudaille discussed the various direct studies for the *Family of Saltimbanques* and their variation from the final image. They concluded again that the *Family of Saltimbanques* was interrupted by the summer trip to Holland. They also suggested an influence from Manet’s *Old Musician*, but not a direct one, as the exhibition of the Manet in the Salon d’Automne of 1905 was subsequent to the date of completion they assigned the Picasso. In addition they responded to the collage-like assembly of the figures: “in the [Family of] Saltimbanques Picasso has chosen models he can dispose exactly as he wishes to, to whom he can give the expression he has decided on, as if he were both author and director of the play and they were actors.”

From Reff to the Present
1971
In October of this year, Theodore Reff published his study of the Saltimbanque theme in Picasso’s work, a subject he also presented in a lecture at the National Gallery during the same month. Reff’s discussions mark another major change in the analysis of the *Family of Saltimbanques*, as he traced the theme in nineteenth-century painting as well as literature and discussed Picasso’s visits to the circus. Building upon his analysis of Picasso’s self-portrait in the *Family of Saltimbanques*, Reff located Jacob, Olivier, and Salmon and concluded that the work “can also be seen as a group portrait [of] Picasso and his closest friends.” This article is also the first to mention Olivier’s brief adoption of a young girl. Following the publication of Reff’s text, greater attention is focused on the “portrait” aspect of the painting.

Zervos published volume 22 of his Picasso catalogue, including many unknown drawings related to the *Family of Saltimbanques*.

1972
William Rubin’s *Picasso in the Collection of The Museum of Modern Art* appeared in this year and included a discussion of *Two Acrobats with a Dog* in which Rubin described their character:

The two young acrobats in this picture are caught in a wistful moment—perhaps their band must move on to yet another town. “But who are . . . these wanderers . . . even a little more fleeting than we ourselves,” wrote Rilke of the *Family of Saltimbanques* . . . in which they reappear.
1973
Following years of exhibition in the ground floor galleries, where the work of living artists was shown, the Family of Saltimbanques was reinstalled on the main floor of the National Gallery in a room devoted to Picasso’s paintings, the first upper level gallery dedicated to the works of a living artist. Picasso died three days before the scheduled opening.

1976
In a festschrift for Otto J. Brendel, Reff analyzed the drawings which first appeared in Zervos’s volume 22. He segregated several of them, identifying a new subject called “Circus Portrait.”

1977
Drawing from Reff’s 1971 study, Ronald Johnson continued the “portrait” analysis of the Family of Saltimbanques in Arts (January). Johnson identified the remaining figure, that of the little girl, as Raymonde, the orphan child briefly adopted by Olivier and Picasso, and concluded: “This symbolist family is not Picasso’s given one but an adopted Parisian family of his own choosing. It is a family of poets among whom Picasso takes his place.”

1978
With the opening of the National Gallery’s East Building in June, the Family of Saltimbanques is transferred from the West Building and included in “Picasso and Cubism,” a section of an inaugural exhibition entitled Aspects of Twentieth-Century Art. While the painting has been on public view for 35 years, this is only its third appearance in a special exhibition.

1980
Dore Ashton presented an extended discussion of the Family of Saltimbanques and Picasso’s connection with poets in A Fable of Modern Art.

NOTES

2. Habasque (translation by author and Mimi Kolombatovic), 20.
5. Habasque (author’s translation), 22.
97. Cover of exhibition catalogue from Picasso’s first show, at the Galeries Serrurier, 25 February to 6 March 1905.
CATALOGUE

The following is a selected list of Picasso's Saltimbanque works, organized into separate groups which correspond to the sequential stages in the *Family of Saltimbanques*. These groups are augmented by sections devoted to the earlier Saltimbanque or Commedia images of Picasso and other artists, a selected list of Picasso's later works which develop this theme, as well as a section containing documentary material.

Brief stylistic and iconographic notes introduce the sections. The entries are followed by a list of related works designated only by a relevant citation. Certain paintings and drawings have been given new identification titles for clarity; the former titles follow in parentheses. In the measurements, height precedes width, width precedes depth. The Zervos citations refer to his catalogue raisonné of Picasso's oeuvre, while Daix numbers refer to either his catalogue of the Blue and Rose Periods, compiled with Georges Boudaille and Joan Rosselet (D-B), or the catalogue of cubist works compiled with Rosselet (D-R). Bloch citations refer to his catalogue raisonné of the prints, while Spies numbers refer to his volume on the sculpture.

A ♦ indicates the work is in the exhibition.

The Tradition

1 Antoine Watteau, *Italian Comedians*, probably 1720, ♦ oil on canvas, 64.0 x 76.0 cm (25 1/4 x 30 in), National Gallery of Art, Washington, Samuel H. Kress Collection, 1946. Fig. 1.

2 Antoine Watteau, *Love in the French Theater*, c.1714, oil on canvas, 36.8 x 48.3 cm (14 1/2 x 19 in), Staatliche Museen, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Gemäldegalerie, West Berlin.

3 Antoine Watteau, *Love in the Italian Theater*, c.1714, oil on canvas, 36.8 x 48.3 cm (14 1/2 x 19 in), Staatliche Museen, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Gemäldegalerie, West Berlin.

4 Giovanni Domenico Tiepolo, *The Spring Shower*, undated, pen and brown ink with brown wash, over black chalk, 35.5 x 47.2 cm (14 x 18% in), The Cleveland Museum of Art, Purchase from the J. H. Wade Fund. Fig. 2.

5 Adolphe Eugène Gabriel Roehn, *Country Fair*, 1821, oil on canvas, 32.5 x 40.4 cm (12 13/16 x 15 7/8 in), Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, Williamstown. Fig. 3.

6 Honoré Daumier, *Wandering Saltimbanques*, ♦ c. 1847/1850, oil on wood, 32.6 x 24.8 cm (12% x 9 3/4 in), National Gallery of Art, Washington, Chester Dale Collection, 1962. Fig. 5.

Cat. no. 3. Antoine Watteau, *Love in the Italian Theater*, c. 1714, Staatliche Museen, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Gemäldegalerie, West Berlin.
7 Honoré Daumier, *The Saltimbanques*, undated, pen and wash on tracing paper, 31.5 x 38.5 cm (12⅜ x 15¼ in). Location unknown. Fig. 4.

8 Jean-Léon Gérôme, *Duel after the Ball*, 1857-1859, oil on canvas, 38.7 x 55.9 cm (15¼ x 22 in), Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore. Fig. 8.

9 Thomas Couture, *The Duel after the Masked Ball*, 1857, oil on canvas, 24.1 x 32.7 cm (9½ x 12¾ in), The Wallace Collection, London.

10 Edouard Manet, *The Old Musician* (also known as *The Traveling Musician*), 1862, oil on canvas, 187.4 x 248.3 cm (73⅜ x 97¾ in), National Gallery of Art, Washington, Chester Dale Collection, 1962. Fig. 6.

11 Edgar Degas, *Harlequin and Columbine*, 1884, pastel, 41.0 x 41.0 cm (16⅛ x 16⅛ in), Private collection. Fig. 9.

12 Georges Seurat, *First Study for “La Parade de Cirque,”* c. 1886, black conte crayon on cream laid paper, 31.8 x 24.1 cm (12½ x 9½ in), The Phillips Collection, Washington. Fig. 11.


14 Georges Seurat, *Couple Dancing*, 1887, conte crayon, 24.8 x 31.1 cm (9¾ x 12¼ in), Private collection. Fig. 10.

15 Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec, *In the Circus Fernando: The Ring Master*, 1888, oil on canvas, 98.4 x 161.3 cm (38⅓ x 63½ in), The Art Institute of Chicago, Joseph Winterbotham Collection. Fig. 12.

16 Paul Cézanne, *Harlequin*, 1888-1890, oil on canvas, 100.0 x 65.1 cm (39⅛ x 25⅝ in), Private collection. Fig. 76.

**Early Works**

17 Pierrot Celebrating the New Year (Carnival handbill), 1 January 1900, watercolor and charcoal, 48.3 x 31.4 cm (19 x 12⅜ in), Musée Picasso, Paris. Fig. 13 (Zervos XXI, 127).

18 *The Blue Dancer*, 1900, oil on canvas, 38.0 x 46.0 cm (15 x 18¾ in), Private collection (Zervos XXI, 224; D-B II, 23).

19 Pierrot (Harlequin), 1901, oil on canvas, 82.7 x 61.2 cm (32½ x 24⅜ in), The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Purchase, Gift of Mr. and Mrs. John L. Loeb. Fig. 14 (Zervos I, 79; D-B VI, 22).

20 *The Two Saltimbanques (Harlequin and His Companion)*, 1901, oil on canvas, 73.0 x 60.0 cm (28⅜ x 23⅜ in), The Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow. Fig. 15 (Zervos I, 92; D-B VI, 20).

21 *Untitled (Wedding of Pierrette)*, 1904, oil on canvas, 95.0 x 145.0 cm (37⅝ x 57⅝ in), Location unknown. Fig. 19 (Zervos I, 212; D-B XI, 22).

22 *Harlequin, Columbine and Pierrot*, 1905, pen and India ink, 25.7 x 19.5 cm (10 1/8 x 7 11/16 in), Location unknown. Fig. 20 (Zervos XXII, 144).

**Circus Family**

This group is entitled *Circus Family* after the gouache in Baltimore (cat. no. 23), which relates to the initial composition of the *Family of Saltimbanques*. These works are the first Saltimbanque compositions. They rely more directly on the theme of circus life than do the later pictures and show figures engaged in work or leisure activities backstage. The figures are wiry, and their stance is often rigid in character. Harlequin appears frequently, dressed in a diamond-patterned motley or a ruffle-collared suit; he usually wears a hat. The outline drawing is brittle, and the facial modeling is frequently defined by dramatic contrasts.

23 *Circus Family*, 1904-1905, pen and black ink, brush and gouache on brown composition board, 25.2 x
31.2 cm (9¾ x 12¼ in). The Baltimore Museum of Art, The Cone Collection, formed by Dr. Claribel Cone and Miss Etta Cone of Baltimore, Maryland. Fig. 21, pl. 8 (Zervos XXII, 159; D-B XII, 18).

24 **Girl Balancing on a Block.** 1904-1905, pen and ink, 23.5 x 15.2 cm (9¼ x 6 in), Anonymous loan. Fig. 25 (Zervos VI, 602).

25 **Study for “Young Acrobat on a Ball.”** 1904-1905, pen and ink, 26.0 x 16.0 cm (10 1/4 x 6 5/16 in), Location unknown. Fig. 105 (Zervos VI, 603).

26 **Young Acrobat on a Ball.** 1904-1905, oil on canvas, 147.0 x 95.0 cm (57¾ x 37¾ in), The Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow. Fig. 24 (Zervos I, 290; D-B XII, 19).

27 **Circus Family with Violinist.** 1904-1905, watercolor over pen and black ink on off-white wove paper, 18.1 x 15.8 cm (7 1/16 x 6 3/16 in), The Baltimore Museum of Art, The Cone Collection, formed by Dr. Claribel Cone and Miss Etta Cone of Baltimore, Maryland. Fig. 27 (Zervos XXII, 161; D-B DXIII, 7).

28 **The Jester’s Family.** 1904-1905, ink, colored pencils and wash, 16.5 x 12.4 cm (6 5/8 x 4 7/8 in), Dumbarton Oaks, House Collection, Washington. Fig. 28 (D-B DXII, 5).

29 **The Harlequin’s Family.** 1904-1905, pencil, 37.0 x 27.0 cm (14¾ x 10¾ in), Musée Picasso, Paris. Fig. 30 (Zervos XXII, 154).

30 **The Harlequin’s Family.** 1904-1905, gouache and India ink, 57.5 x 43.0 cm (22¾ x 17 in), Private collection, from the Sam A. Lewisohn Collection. Fig. 31 (Zervos I, 298; D-B XII, 6).

31 **The Organ Grinder (Old Jester and Harlequin),** 1904-1905, tempera on cardboard, 100.5 x 70.5 cm (39¾ x 27¾ in), Kunsthau, Zurich. Fig. 26 (Zervos VI, 798; D-B XII, 22).

32 **The Acrobat’s Family with a Monkey,** 1904-1905, gouache, watercolor, pastel, and India ink on cardboard, 104.0 x 75.0 cm (41¼ x 29¾ in), Göteborgs Konstmuseum, Sweden. Fig. 29, pl. 3 (Zervos I, 299; D-B XII, 7).

33 **At the Lapin Agile,** 1904-1905, oil on canvas, 99.0 x 100.3 cm (39 x 39½ in), Private collection. Pl. 2 (Zervos I, 275; D-B XII, 23).


---

**Two Acrobats**

This group is entitled *Two Acrobats* after the gouache *Two Acrobats with a Dog* (cat. no. 34), which relates to the second state of the *Family of Saltimbanques*. The pair of young figures in a barren setting is a frequent, but not exclusive, subject. A crisp outline drawing, similar to that in the *Circus Family* works, is present, but the definition of the forms is less brittle. The modeling in the faces is very finely gradated, and they are refined in character. Usually the figures are seen full-length and dominate the picture plane.

34 **Two Acrobats with a Dog.** 1905, gouache on cardboard, 105.5 x 75.0 cm (41½ x 29½ in), Collection, Mr. and Mrs. A. M. Burden, New York. Fig. 32, pl. 4 (Zervos I, 300; D-B XII, 17).

35 **Young Acrobat and Child,** 26 March 1905, ink and gouache on gray cardboard, 31.3 x 25.1 cm (12 5/16 x 9 7/8 in), The Justin K. Thannhauser Collection. The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York. Fig. 33 (Zervos VI, 718; D-B XII, 15).

36 **Two Saltimbanques,** 1905, pastel on brown paper, 69.9 x 52.1 cm (27½ x 20½ in), Location unknown. Fig. 35 (Zervos I, 295; D-B XIII, 11).

37 **Mother and Child,** 1905, gouache on canvas, 90.0 x 71.0 cm (35½ x 28 in), Staatsgalerie, Stuttgart. Fig. 34 (Zervos I, 296; D-B XII, 8).

38 **The Death of Harlequin,** 1905 (1906?), gouache on board, 66.0 x 92.7 cm (26 x 36½ in), Collection, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon, Upperville, Virginia. Fig. 72, pl. 7 (Zervos I, 302; D-B XII, 27).

For related works see Zervos I: 306; VI: 720?; XXII: 237, 334-337.

---

**At the Circus**

Many witnesses have recorded Picasso’s frequent visits to the circus during the period from late 1904 to early 1906. Several drawings exist which seem to have been made at that location, while other more refined sheets seem to be studio works but nevertheless strongly evoke the performances.

39 **Studies: Harlequins with Rapiers, Head, and Female Nude,** 1904-1905, pen and ink, Location unknown. Fig. 40 (D-B DXII, 25).

40 **Galloping Horse with Rider,** 1905, pen and black ink on thin tan wove paper, 23.9 x 30.9 cm (9½ x 12½
Girl Standing on a Horse, 1905, pen and black ink on thin tan wove paper, 23.9 x 30.9 cm (9 1/8 x 12 1/8 in), The Baltimore Museum of Art, The Cone Collection, formed by Dr. Claribel Cone and Miss Etta Cone of Baltimore, Maryland. Fig. 41 (Zervos XXII, 259; D-B DXII, 14).

41 El tío Pepe don José, 1905, pen and ink, 25.5 x 21.5 cm (10 1/16 x 8 1/2 in), Collection, Mr. Lee A. Ault. Fig. 43 (Zervos XXII, 217; D-B XII, 30). This work will not be shown for the duration of the exhibition.

42 Jester, 1905, India ink on paper, 24.0 x 32.5 cm (9 7/16 x 12 13/16 in), National Gallery of Art, Washington. Fig. 44 (Zervos XXII, 220).


Circus Portrait

The third Saltimbanque constellation may have begun with a portrait of a particular circus troupe (cat. nos. 44, 45), as the central figure, El tío Pepe don José, appears to have been an actual performer (cat. no. 42). This group evolved into compositions with fewer figures which were then rearranged and reassembled to form new images. The drawing is fluid in character, and the figural modeling rounded and soft.

44 Circus Portrait, 1905, pencil, 31.0 x 20.0 cm (12 3/16 x 7 7/8 in), Location unknown. Fig. 45 (Zervos XXII, 211).

45 Circus Portrait, 1905, gouache and India ink, 20.0 x 31.0 cm (7 7/8 x 12 3/16 in), Location unknown. Fig. 46 (Zervos XXII, 221).

46 Seated Saltimbanque with Boy, 1905, watercolor, pastel, and charcoal on tan laid paper, 59.0 x 47.3 cm (23 3/4 x 18 3/8 in), The Baltimore Museum of Art, The Cone Collection, formed by Dr. Claribel Cone and Miss Etta Cone of Baltimore, Maryland. Fig. 47, pl. 5 (Zervos I, 283; D-B XII, 29).

46b Seated Saltimbanque with Young Girl, 1905, charcoal and watercolor on paper, mounted on cardboard, 30.5 x 19.2 cm (12 x 7 9/16 in), Collection, Frau Hilde Thannhauser (Zervos VI, 697; D-B DXII, 19).

47 Study: Family with Horse, 1905, pen and ink, 21.0 x 19.5 cm (8 1/4 x 7 11/16 in), Location unknown. Fig. 49 (Zervos VI, 707).

48 Boy Urinating, 1905, pen and black ink, brush and gray wash on off-white laid paper, 21.0 x 19.4 cm (8 3/4 x 7 1/2 in), The Baltimore Museum of Art, The Cone Collection, formed by Dr. Claribel Cone and Miss Etta Cone of Baltimore, Maryland. Fig. 48.


49 Study: Family with Amphora, 1905, pencil and India ink, 18.0 x 26.0 cm (7 1/8 x 10 1/4 in), Location unknown. Fig. 50 (Zervos XXII, 212).

50 Family with a Crow, 1904-1905, pen and ink, and wax crayon, 32.6 x 24.1 cm (12 7/8 x 9 1/2 in), The Museum of Modern Art, New York, John S. Newberry Collection. Fig. 51 (Zervos VI, 703; D-B DXII, 7).

51 Horse and Rider, 1905, India ink and collage, 15.0 x 20.0 cm (5 15/16 x 7 7/8 in), Location unknown. Fig. 52 (Zervos XXII, 230).
52 Jester on Horseback (Harlequin on Horseback), 1905, oil on cardboard, 100.0 x 69.2 cm (39 3/8 x 27 1/4 in), Collection, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon, Upperville, Virginia. Fig. 53, pl. 6 (Zervos I, 243; D-B XII, 24).

53 Acrobat and Jester, 1905, India ink and collage, 25.5 x 18.0 cm (10 x 7 3/8 in), Location unknown. Fig. 54 (Zervos XXII, 229).


Family of Saltimbanques

54 Study for “Family of Saltimbanques,” 1905, gouache on cardboard, 51.2 x 61.2 cm (20 3/16 x 24 1/16 in), The Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow. Fig. 56 (Zervos I, 287; D-B XII, 33).

55 Youth with a Barrel, 1905, red chalk on faded brown paper, 48.9 x 32.1 cm (19 1/4 x 12 3/8 in), The St. Louis Art Museum, Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Pulitzer, Jr. Fig. 57 (D-B XII, 32).

56 Young Acrobat, 1905, pen and ink, 18.0 x 11.0 cm (7 1/16 x 4 5/16 in), Location unknown. Fig. 58.

57 Young Girl with a Dog, 1905, pastel and gouache, 70.5 x 47.5 cm (27 3/4 x 18 3/4 in), Location unknown. Fig. 59 (Zervos I, 286; D-B XII, 31).

58 Woman of Majorca, 1905, gouache on cardboard, 67.0 x 51.0 cm (26 3/8 x 20 3/4 in), The Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow. Fig. 61 (Zervos I, 288; D-B XII, 34).

59 Family of Saltimbanques, 1904-1905, oil on canvas, 212.8 x 229.6 cm (83 3/4 x 90 3/8 in), National Gallery of Art, Washington, Chester Dale Collection, 1962. Fig. 69, pl. 1. (Zervos I, 285; D-B XII, 35).

For a related work see Zervos XXII: 149.

Later Works

60 Juggler with Still Life, 1905, gouache on cardboard, 100.0 x 69.9 cm (39 3/8 x 27 1/2 in), National Gallery of Art, Washington, Chester Dale Collection, 1962. Fig. 71 (Zervos I, 294; D-B XIII, 20).

61 Juggler with Horse (Horse with Youth in Blue), 1905-1906, watercolor on paper, mounted on panel, 50.0 x 32.0 cm (19 3/4 x 12 3/8 in), The Trustees of the Tate Gallery, London. Fig. 74 (Zervos I, 270; D-B XIV, 4).

62 Circus Family, 1909, oil on canvas, 100.0 x 81.0 cm (39 3/8 x 31 3/8 in), Von der Heydt Museum, Wuppertal, West Germany. Fig. 77 (Zervos II, part 1, 120).

63 Harlequin, 1909, gouache, 62.5 x 47.5 cm (24 1/2 x 18 3/4 in), Private collection, Ernst Beyeler, Basel. Fig. 75 (Zervos II, part 1, 149).

64 Harlequin, 1915, oil on canvas, 183.5 x 105.1 cm (72 3/4 x 41 3/8 in), The Museum of Modern Art, New York. Fig. 78 (Zervos II, part 2, 555; D-R 844).

65 Harlequin with Violin (“Si tu veux”), 1918, oil on canvas, 142.0 x 100.3 cm (56 x 39 1/2 in), The Cleveland Museum of Art, Purchase, Leonard C. Hanna, Jr., Bequest. Fig. 79 (Zervos III, 160).

66 Pierrot and Harlequin, 1920, gouache, 25.7 x 19.7 cm (10 1/8 x 7 3/4 in), Collection, The Estate of Mrs. Gilbert W. Chapman. Fig. 103 (Zervos IV, 69).

67 Three Musicians, 1921, oil on canvas, 200.7 x 222.9 cm (79 x 87 3/4 in), The Museum of Modern Art,
New York, Mrs. Simon Guggenheim Fund. Fig. 83 (Zervos IV, 331).

68 Saltimbanque Seated with Arms Crossed, 1923, oil on canvas, 130.5 x 97.0 cm (51 1/8 x 38 3/4 in), Bridgestone Museum of Art (Ishibashi Foundation), Tokyo. Fig. 82 (Zervos V, 15).
This work will not be shown for the duration of the exhibition.

69 The Lovers, 1923, oil on canvas, 130.2 x 97.2 cm (51 1/4 x 38 3/4 in), National Gallery of Art, Washington, Chester Dale Collection, 1962 (Zervos V, 14).
This work will not be shown for the duration of the exhibition.

70 Paulo as Harlequin, 1924, oil on canvas, 130.0 x 97.5 cm (51 1/4 x 38 3/8 in), Musée Picasso, Paris. Fig. 80 (Zervos V, 178).

71 Paulo as Pierrot, 1925, oil on canvas, 130.0 x 97.5 cm (51 1/4 x 38 3/8 in), Musée Picasso, Paris. Fig. 81 (Zervos V, 374).

**Prints and Sculpture**

In 1904-1905 Picasso worked as a printmaker and sculptor. Although these prints were published at the time by Eugène Delâtre, they were not commercially successful until the large Vollard edition of 1913. After steelfacing the plates, Vollard published fourteen prints from this period under the title *Les Saltimbanques*, although only seven images can be directly related to this subject. A unique working impression of *Circus Family: Les Saltimbanques*, printed before the signature and other, small details were added to the plate, was squared by Picasso and presumably served as the maquette for the enlarged composition which became the first state of the *Family of Saltimbanques* (cat. no. 72).

The bronze *Jester* was begun as a portrait of Max Jacob, but the face was later altered and the hat added, creating a more generalized saltimbanque image (cat. no. 80).

† drypoint, 32.7 x 40.3 cm (12 13/16 x 15 11/16 in), Anonymous loan. Fig. 22.

73 *Circus Family: Les Saltimbanques*, 1913 (original edition, 1905), drypoint, 35.7 x 42.0 cm (14 x 16 1/2 in), National Gallery of Art, Washington, Rosenwald Collection, 1950. Fig. 87 (Bloch 7).

74 *Family of Saltimbanques with Monkey*, 1913 (original edition, 1905), drypoint, 44.8 x 29.8 cm (17 3/8 x 11 3/4 in), National Gallery of Art, Washington, Rosenwald Collection, 1950. Fig. 98 (Bloch 11).

75 *Le Bain*, 1913 (original edition, 1905), drypoint, 34.4 x 28.9 cm (13 1/2 x 11 1/8 in), Bloch 12.

76 *La Toilette de la mère*, 1913 (original edition, 1905), etching, 23.5 x 17.6 cm (9 1/4 x 6 15/16 in), The Baltimore Museum of Art, The Cone Collection, formed by Dr. Claribel Cone and Miss Etta Cone of Baltimore, Maryland. Fig. 101 (Bloch 13).

77 *Les Deux Saltimbanques*, 1913 (original edition, 1905), drypoint, 12.2 x 9.1 cm (4 13/16 x 3 9/16 in), Bloch 5.

78 *Au Cirque*, 1913 (original edition, 1905), drypoint, 22.0 x 14.0 cm (8 3/8 x 5 1/2 in), The Baltimore Museum of Art, The Cone Collection, formed by Dr. Claribel Cone and Miss Etta Cone of Baltimore, Maryland. Fig. 99 (Bloch 9).

79 *Seated Saltimbanque*, 1913 (original edition, 1905), drypoint, 48.0 x 33.3 cm (18 7/8 x 13 1/8 in), National Gallery of Art, Washington, Rosenwald Collection, 1952. Fig. 100 (Bloch 10).

80 *Head of a Jester*, 1905, bronze, 48.2 x 39.1 x 23.0 cm (19 x 15 1/2 x 9 3/4 in), Hirshhorn Museum and
Documents and Related Works

81 Louis Le Nain, *Landscape with Peasants*, c. 1640, oil on canvas, 46.5 x 57.0 cm (18½ x 22½ in), National Gallery of Art, Washington, Samuel H. Kress Collection, 1946. Fig. 7.

82 *The Tragedy*, 1903, oil on wood, 105.4 x 69.0 cm (41½ x 27½ in), National Gallery of Art, Washington, Chester Dale Collection, 1962. Fig. 17 (Zervos I, 208; D-B IX, 6).

83 *Catalan Peasants (Sailors)*, 1903, watercolor, 31.7 x 22.5 cm (12½ x 8¾ in), The McNay Art Institute, San Antonio, Bequest of Marion Koogler McNay. Fig. 18 (Zervos I, 376; D-B IX, 16).

84 *Young Girl with a Basket of Flowers*, 1905, oil on canvas, 155.0 x 66.0 cm (61 x 26 in), Private collection, New York. Fig. 68 (Zervos I, 256; D-B XIII, 8).

85 Marie Laurencin, *Group of Artists*, 1908, oil on canvas, 61.9 x 79.1 cm (24¾ x 31¼ in), The Baltimore Museum of Art, The Cone Collection, formed by Dr. Claribel Cone and Miss Etta Cone of Baltimore, Maryland. Fig. 66.

86 Picasso and Fernande Olivier in Montmartre, c. 1906, Musée Picasso, Paris. Fig. 67.

87 Max Jacob standing in front of his house in Montmartre, Musée Picasso, Paris. Fig. 64.

88 André Salmon in Picasso's studio, 1908, Photothèque Hachette, Courtesy Galerie Louise Leiris, Paris. Fig. 63.

89 Guillaume Apollinaire, 1905, pen and ink, 31.0 x 23.0 cm (12¼ x 9⅛ in), Collection, Henry Brandon, Washington, D.C. Fig. 62 (Zervos XXII, 294).

90 Entry for the *Family of Saltimbanques* from a catalogue of an auction held at the Hôtel Drouot in Paris, 2 March 1914. Fig. 95.

91 Article from Comedia, 8 March 1914; the first reproduction of the *Family of Saltimbanques*. Fig. 96.

92 Cover of 21 February 1931 issue of Art News, reproducing the *Family of Saltimbanques*. Fig. 102.

93 The Chester Dale apartment, New York. Fig. 94.

94 Composite x-radiograph of *Family of Saltimbanques*. Fig. 85.

101. Picasso, *La Toilette de la mère*, 1913 (original edition, 1905), The Baltimore Museum of Art. The Cone Collection, formed by Dr. Claribel Cone and Miss Etta Cone of Baltimore, Maryland. Cat. no. 76.
102. Cover of 21 February 1931 issue of Art News, reproducing the Family of Saltimbanques. Cat. no. 92.
SELECTED CHRONOLOGY AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Trinkett Clark

The following chronology and bibliography is a selective one, providing a general record of the artist’s life and the critical and art-historical response to his art. For a much more thorough chronology the reader should consult the extended life and work published by The Museum of Modern Art in conjunction with their Picasso retrospective of 1980. Picasso: A Comprehensive Bibliography by Ray Anne Kibbey (New York, 1977) provides a detailed listing of the Picasso literature. Within our chronology and bibliography, particular attention has been paid to the use of the saltimbanque and commedia dell’arte themes in Picasso’s oeuvre and the exhibition history of related works.

Through the Blue Period

1881 Pablo Ruiz Picasso born 25 October to Don José Ruiz Blasco and Doña María Picasso y López.

1889-1890 Begins to draw and paint.

1891 Family moves to La Coruña where Picasso begins studying drawing and painting.

1895 Family moves to Barcelona where Picasso enters the School of Fine Arts.

1897 Enrolls in the Royal Academy of San Fernando in Madrid.

1898 After a bout of scarlet fever, returns to Barcelona.

1899 Becomes part of “bohemian” group which frequents Els Quatre Gats, a Barcelona café, where he paints portraits of his friends on the walls and designs menus for the establishment. Meets painter Carlos Casagemas and poet Jaime Sabartés.

1900 Executes Pierrot Celebrating the New Year (fig. 13), illustrating for the first time a figure in the commedia dell’arte. Lives in Barcelona, sharing a studio with Casagemas, until the two painters travel to Paris (Picasso’s first visit). Paints The Blue Dancer. Before leaving Paris, Casagemas falls in love with Germaine (who later marries Ramón Pichot). Picasso and Casagemas leave Paris in December, but Casagemas returns immediately while Picasso goes back to Barcelona.

1901 Casagemas, unhappy with his relationship with Germaine, commits suicide. Picasso returns to Paris in May, settling into Casagemas’s studio. Beginning of the Blue Period. Through the dealer Pedro Mañach, meets Max Jacob. Paints The Two Saltimbanques (fig. 15) and Harlequin (fig. 14).

1902 Returns to Barcelona in January. In October he is back in Paris, sharing a room with Jacob (87, boulevard Voltaire). Sets working schedule which he follows throughout his life: working during the night and sleeping until mid-day. Cannot afford to buy canvas, so his work is limited to drawings.

1903 Returns to Barcelona, settling into studio he had shared with Casagemas.

1904 Returns to Paris, moving into 13, rue
Ravignon, more commonly known as the Bateau-Lavoir. Meets Fernande Olivier and André Salmon, both residents of the Bateau-Lavoir. Olivier becomes his mistress for the next seven years. Jacob introduces Picasso to Guillaume Apollinaire. In December Picasso, Olivier, Salmon, Jacob, and Apollinaire begin to frequent the Cirque Médrano at the foot of Montmartre. Late in the year starts to make his Saltimbanque works, beginning with the large painting *Circus Family* (figs. 21, 22).

**The Saltimbanques**

1905 Paints works with saltimbanque themes, shifting to the style of *Two Acrobats with a Dog* (fig. 32) by early spring. From 25 February to 6 March, Picasso's work is included in an exhibition at the Galeries Serrurier, where his first Rose Period paintings, drawings, and prints are shown. Catalogue lists eight Saltimbanque works, including *Two Acrobats with a Dog, The Harlequin's Family* (fig. 31), *Seated Harlequin with Red Background*, and *Acrobat and Young Harlequin*. In the spring begins work on the *Circus Portrait* drawings (figs. 45, 46) which evolve into the *Family of Saltimbanques* (fig. 69). Becomes a frequent customer of the bistro, Lapin Agile. The owner, Frédé, is the guitar player in Picasso's painting, *At the Lapin Agile* (pl. 2); Picasso is the Harlequin and Germaine Pichot the woman in this work. Frédé's daughter, Margot, also becomes one of Picasso's subjects, appearing in *Family with a Crow* (fig. 51). Does first etchings and drypoints, using saltimbanque themes. Eugène Delâtre publishes these prints in a limited edition, but they are not successful at this time. Executes the sculpture, *Head of a Jester* (fig. 65), which is cast in bronze by Ambroise Vollard. Work on the *Family of Saltimbanques* is interrupted by a summer journey to Holland, but the painting is completed in the fall.

**Cubism**

1909 Plans a large composition, *Carnival at the Bistro*, with commedia dell'arte figures. This is followed by a *Circus Family* (fig. 77) and several portrait busts of *Harlequin* (fig. 75). Moves from the Bateau-Lavoir in the fall into 11, boulevard de Clichy. *Family of Saltimbanques* sold to André Level, acting for La Peau de l'Ours.

1911 Relationship with Olivier dissolves. Introduced to Eva Gouel (Marcelle Humbert) at Gertrude and Leo Stein's. Picasso and Eva begin a liaison.

1912 Included in an exhibition in Cologne: *Städtische Ausstellungshalle, Sonderbund Internationale Kunstaustellung*, 25 May to 30 September. Number 209 is *Harlequin* of 1901. In the fall moves into a new studio, thereby disassociating himself completely from the Bateau-Lavoir, where he had still kept a studio.

1913 In February a large Picasso exhibition is held in Munich at the Galerie Thannhauser. Seventy-six paintings and thirty-eight watercolors are exhibited, including *The Death of Harlequin* (fig. 72). Vollard acquires the plates of fourteen of the 1905 series of prints. After steel-facing them, he and Louis Fort publish deluxe editions of the series, entitled *Les Saltimbanques*.

1914 On 2 March the collection of La Peau de l'Ours is auctioned at the Hôtel Drouot. *Family of Saltimbanques*, lot no. 63, is sold for 11,500 francs to Thannhauser in Munich. It is subsequently reproduced for the first time in an article discussing the sale in the 8 March edition of *Comaedia* (fig. 96).

1915 In the fall Eva becomes extremely ill. Picasso paints a possible self-portrait, *Harlequin* (fig. 78), at the end of the year. Eva dies on 14 December. *Family of Saltimbanques* is sold to Herta Koenig, Munich.
Later Cubism to the 1930s

1916 Begins work on the set designs for Parade, a ballet written by Jean Cocteau and directed by Serge Diaghilev. The Ballet Russe will perform the ballet in 1917. The themes from the commedia dell’arte again become more prevalent in Picasso’s work.

1917 Meets Olga Koklova, a ballerina in the Ballet Russe.

1918 Paints Harlequin with Violin (“Si tu veux”) (fig. 79). Marries Olga.

1919 Collaborates in December (and through the winter) with Diaghilev on Pulcinella, a ballet based on a theme from the commedia dell’arte.

1920 Paints series of gouache studies of Pierrot and Harlequin (fig. 103). Pulcinella first performed in May.

1921 Paulo Picasso born, 4 February. In the summer Picasso paints two large versions of the Three Musicians (fig. 83) which symbolize himself, Apollinaire, and Jacob.

1923–1924 Paints “elegant” pictures of Harlequins and acrobats as saltimbanques (fig. 82). Paints son Paulo in Paulo as Harlequin (fig. 80) in 1924.

1925 Paints Paulo as Pierrot (fig. 81).


1928 Wilhelm Uhde publishes Picasso et la tradition française (Paris). André Level publishes Picasso (Paris) in which the following are reproduced: Jester on Horseback (fig. 53), Young Acrobat on a Ball (fig. 24), Family of Saltimbanques, Three Musicians, Paulo as Harlequin, and Head of a Jester.

1930 Eugenio d’Ors publishes Pablo Picasso (Paris) in which Two Acrobats with a Dog, The Acrobat’s Family with a Monkey (fig. 29), and The Harlequin’s Family appear. Maud Dale publishes Modern Art: Picasso (New York), reproducing Two Acrobats with a Dog and Juggler with Still Life (fig. 71).

1931 Chester Dale acquires the painting Family of Saltimbanques on 10 February. The picture is included in an exhibition at the Museum of French Art organized by Mrs. Dale (18 February to 17 March). It is illustrated on the cover of the 21 February issue of Art News (fig. 102). Henry McBride writes “The Chester Dale Collection” and André Beucler writes “The Precubism of Picasso” which are both published in the April issue of Formes (Paris). Juggler with Still Life, The Death of Harlequin, and Family of Saltimbanques are reproduced.

1932 A major exhibition is held at the Galeries Georges Petit in Paris. Exposition Picasso (16 June to 30 July) contains 236 works, including Jester on Horseback (no. 18) and the series of saltimbanque prints (no. 231). In October Christian Zervos publishes volume I of his catalogue raisonné of Picasso’s oeuvre. This first volume illustrates and lists the works from 1895 to 1906.

1933 Fernande Olivier publishes Picasso et ses amis (Paris), in which she describes life at the Bateau-Lavoir.
1936 The Harlequin figure reappears in a gouache done in May and is later used as a design for the drop curtain in Romain Rolland’s production, Le 14 Juillet, at the Alhambra theater. Picasso: “Blue” and “Rose” Periods, 1901–1906 is organized at Jacques Seligmann & Co. in New York (2 November to 26 November). Number 22 is The Harlequin’s Family.

Exhibitions and Publications

1939 Alfred H. Barr, Jr. organizes a major retrospective entitled Picasso: Forty Years of His Art at The Museum of Modern Art in New York (15 November to 7 January 1940), which subsequently travels, in segments, around the United States. The following works are included: Harlequin, 1901, no. 12; Two Acrobats with a Dog, no. 31; Head of a Jester, no. 32; The Harlequin’s Family, no. 47; Harlequin, 1915, no. 126; Harlequin with Violin (“Si tu veux”), no. 140; and Three Musicians, no. 165.

1940 Jean Cassou publishes Picasso (Paris).

1944 Paul Eluard publishes A Pablo Picasso (Geneva-Paris), which is a tribute to Picasso.


1947 Knoedler Galleries, New York, holds an exhibition Picasso Before 1907 (15 October to 8 November), in which the following works appear: Harlequin, 1901, no. 5; Two Acrobats with a Dog, no. 22; The Harlequin’s Family, no. 31; and Head of a Jester, no. 36.


1954 Zervos publishes Pablo Picasso: Volume VI (Paris), which is a supplement to volumes I to V of the Picasso catalogue raisonné. Lieberman republishes Pablo Picasso: Blue and Rose Periods (New York), in which the following additional works are reproduced: Harlequin, 1901, The Jester’s Family (fig. 28), Head of a Jester.


1957 *Picasso: 75th Anniversary Exhibition* opens in New York at The Museum of Modern Art (22 May to 8 September), traveling to The Art Institute of Chicago (29 October to 8 December). Included are *Circus Family, Two Acrobats with a Dog,* and *Head of a Jester.*

1959 Sir Roland Penrose publishes *Picasso: His Life and Work* (New York; 1958, London). There is a major exhibition *Picasso: A Loan Exhibition of His Paintings, Drawings, Sculpture, Ceramics, Prints, and Illustrated Books* at the Philadelphia Museum of Art (8 January to 23 February). It includes *Harlequin,* 1901, no. 10; *Circus Family,* no. 24; and *Three Musicians,* no. 99.

1960 A major exhibition organized through The Arts Council of Great Britain opens at The Tate Gallery, London: *Picasso* (6 July to 18 September). *Horse with Youth in Blue* (fig. 74), no. 28, and *Three Musicians,* no. 97, are among the 270 works in the show and in the catalogue by Roland Penrose.

1962 Anthony Blunt collaborates with Phoebe Pool on the publication *Picasso: The Formative Years* (Greenwich, Connecticut). A major exhibition, *Picasso: An American Tribute,* is held at nine galleries in New York (25 April to 12 May). It includes 309 works and is accompanied by a catalogue edited by John Richardson. Among the works shown are: *Harlequin,* 1901, no. 15; *At the Lapin Agile,* no. 16; *Circus Family,* no. 21; *The Harlequin’s Family,* no. 22.

1964 A major exhibition, *Picasso and Man,* takes place at The Art Gallery of Toronto (11 January to 16 February) and The Montreal Museum of Fine Arts (28 February to 31 March). Some of the 273 works shown are the saltimbanque drypoints; *Head of a Jester,* no. 26; and *Family with a Crow,* no. 28. Françoise Gilot, with Carlton Lake, writes *Life with Picasso* (New York), describing her life with the artist in the 1940s and 1950s. Brassai publishes *Conversations avec Picasso* (Paris), later republished in English as *Picasso and Company* (New York, 1966).

1965 An exhibition *Picasso et le Théâtre* is held at the Musée des Augustins in Toulouse (22 June to 15 September).

1966 A major exhibition, *Hommage à Pablo Picasso,* is organized by Jean Leymarie and the French government, to be held at the Grand Palais and the Petit Palais. The show includes over 700 works and runs simultaneously with *Pablo Picasso gravures,* an exhibition of graphics at the Bibliothèque Nationale. *Picasso: Sixty Years of Graphic Work* is held at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art; it contains 443 works from 1905 on. This show, and the Paris exhibitions, celebrate Picasso’s 85th birthday.


1970 The Bateau-Lavoir is destroyed by fire. Christian Zervos dies. The Museum of Modern Art organizes *Four Americans in Paris: The Collections of Gertrude Stein and Her Family* (16 December to 1 March 1971). Included in the show are *The Acrobat’s Family with a Monkey, Circus Family with Violinist* (fig. 27), and *The Jester’s Family.* During 1970 and 1971, Picasso
makes a series of crayon drawings of Harlequin as well as sculpted busts of this figure.


1973 On 8 April Pablo Picasso dies at Mougins, France.


1978 Denys Chevalier publishes Picasso: The Blue and Rose Periods (New York). Illustrations include Family of Saltimbanques, The Harlequin's Family, Young Acrobat on a Ball, Jester on Horseback, The Organ Grinder (fig. 26), Mother and Child (fig. 34), The Death of Harlequin, The Acrobat’s Family with a Monkey, and Woman of Majorca.

1979 Pierre Daix publishes Le Cubisme de Picasso (Neuchâtel). Included in this book is the Catalogue raisonné de l’œuvre peint 1907–1916 by Daix and Joan Rosselet, which lists Harlequin, 1909, no. 260. Picasso: Oeuvres reçues en paiement des droits de succession is held at the Grand Palais in Paris (11 October to 7 January 1980), including Head of a Jester, no. 7; Paulo as Harlequin, no. 130; Paulo as Pierrot, no. 131; The Harlequin’s Family (fig. 30), no. 396.

1980 William Rubin and Dominique Bozo organize Pablo Picasso: A Retrospective at The Museum of Modern Art (22 May to 30 September). Included are Pierrot Celebrating the New Year; Harlequin, 1901; The Acrobat’s Family with a Monkey; Two Acrobats with a Dog; The Harlequin’s Family (fig. 31); Head of a Jester; and Three Musicians.

105. Picasso, Study for “Young Acrobat on a Ball,” 1904-1905, Location unknown. Cat. no. 25 (Photo: Courtesy Galerie Louise Leiris, Paris).