I. Extremes converge

One of the pictures in the catalogue *Hidden Treasures Revealed* (1995) of the Hermitage Museum in St. Petersburg shows *Still Life with a Coffeepot* by the French painter Camille Pissarro (1830-1903), dated 1900 (see Figure 1). It was part of an exhibition of French – mostly Impressionist – works of art looted by the Russian army from German collections at the end of World War II. Since then, they had been stored at the Hermitage and had never been exhibited publicly, which means they also had not been objects of art history research for half a century, and so a lot of them were practically unknown. The changing political climate of the 1990s rescued them from obscurity.

As for Pissarro’s *Still Life with a Coffeepot*, the Hermitage catalogue focuses on Pissarro’s indebtedness to Cézanne’s still lifes. However, I am concerned with another element of inspiration: the curtain in the background. The catalogue describes it as follows:

The background is very active. No other painting by Pissarro, before or after, shows the decorative fabric used in this work. Such fabrics, some of which were woven in a textile mill in Lyon, were fashionable at the turn of the century due to Japanese influence. Their design harks back to the studies of birds from Hokusai’s *Manga*.

With due respect to the fabric industry of the city of Lyon or Japanese woodcutting, it is quite easy to recognise the real identity of the textile: *Bird*, a woollen cloth originally designed by William Morris in 1878 for his own drawing room at Kelmscott House (see Figure 2). The weaving itself was done by or under the supervision of a French weaver, from Lyons indeed, Mr. Bazin. Morris contracted him to start up
Jacquard handloom weaving at his firm.\(^3\)

Looking at Pissarro’s painting, I was amazed to see together in one picture the artistic principles of Arts and Crafts, and the quite opposite practice of Impressionist painting. Camille Pissarro started his career as a Realist and Impressionist, ‘converted’ to Neo-Impressionism around 1885, but returned to his earlier style during 1890. How and where did these antagonistic tendencies in art collide and meet? In this essay I will try to trace some points of difference and convergence.

II. **Conflicting tastes in the Pissarro family**

It is necessary to commence this account with some discussion of Pissarro’s family life. Camille Pissarro had many contacts in England: several of his mother’s relatives lived in London, among whom were her four children from her first marriage. One of Camille’s half-sisters had a daughter, Esther Isaacson, who was Camille’s favourite niece and later became his daughter-in-law: she married his second son Georges (1871-1961) but died soon after in childbirth. Esther Isaacson and Camille Pissarro corresponded frequently.

During the Franco-Prussian war in 1870, Pissarro had moved to stay with his relatives in London, not as a political refugee or exile – only later was he to become an anarchist – but because his residence at Louveciennes was invaded by German troops besieging Paris. Claude Monet fled with him, as he did not want to risk mobilisation for the national army. Pissarro, by contrast, wanted to serve, but did not possess French nationality. Monet introduced Pissarro to Paul Durand-Ruel, who had set up a gallery in London and organised shows of French artists – and so Durand-Ruel became Pissarro’s dealer, and remained so for most of his life.\(^4\) Pissarro was not very successful in England and he struggled to sell his paintings. During the summer of 1871 he complained to a friend that he had only met disdain, indifference and coarseness in England, especially in the field of art, where collegial jealousy and commercialism were dominant. He wanted to return home as soon as possible.\(^5\)

There is no firm evidence to suggest that Pissarro had contact with William Morris or any of the Pre-Raphaelites during his stay in London, though there might once have been a chance. On one occasion, Monet and he had lunch with their countryman Alphonse Legros (1837-1911). Pissarro and Legros had known each other since the 1860s, when they were both young and enthusiastic participants in the avant-garde of realist painting. In 1863 Legros, who was a friend of James McNeill Whistler, joined Pissarro in London, where he had a successful academic and social career and made friends with the Rossetti brothers, Ford Madox Brown, Edward Burne-Jones and the Ionides family. During 1870-71 Legros served as a pillar of support for his French colleagues in refuge, always willing to support them and to
introduce them to his British connections. Pissarro, however, did not seize the opportunity, and, as it turns out in his letters, even distrusted Legros. To him Legros had betrayed the sound realist principle of following Nature, to become a weak imitator of old masters. Time and again – up to 1898 – he warned his eldest son Lucien (1863-1944), who took lessons from Legros, against Legros’s academism.

Pissarro’s unfavourable opinion of Britain and British art, in particular Pre-Raphaelitism, seems not to have changed very much over the years, and he afterwards visited London a few times and followed what was going on in the British art scene primarily because of his sons, his second family tie with England. To ensure their artistic careers through training in the decorative arts, Pissarro sent three of them to Britain, probably because of the very good reputation of its art and design education at the time. His above-mentioned sons were Lucien, with whom he corresponded intensively from 1883 onward, Georges, and his third son, Félix (1874-1897), who died of consumption in London at an early age. Lucien specialised in lithography, print-making and book-printing. Much to the annoyance of his father, he became
acquainted with the circle of Emery Walker, Charles Ricketts, Charles Shannon and other participants in the Arts and Crafts Movement, and was influenced by them.

As for Georges, Camille Pissarro wanted him to specialise in woodcarving, sculpting and furniture design. For some time, Georges attended the Guild and School of Handicraft at Toynbee Hall (founded by C.R. Ashbee, a follower of Morris) and was trained in copper brazier. Pissarro praised one of the picture frames which his
son made there, but evidently did not trust that the craft would ever earn him a living. As it turned out, Pissarro repeatedly had to sustain his sons during his lifetime. In addition to money, he also provided them with advice on artistic affairs. Time and again he warned them, especially Georges, who collected prints by Walter Crane, against the dangerous influence of Crane whom he regarded as too weak, too Greek, too much inclined towards Lawrence Alma-Tadema. They should not imitate Crane, he urged, but should instead find inspiration in Egyptian, Japanese and gothic art, in late medieval ‘primitive’ painting and, of course, in Nature itself.

In several letters Pissarro’s niece Esther Isaacson made mention of Morris, Ruskin and the Arts and Crafts Movement. The letters reveal that she held them all in high regard, and obviously Pissarro did not want to hurt her feelings by attacking her taste. For instance, when she sent him a picture book by Randolph Caldecott he found it ‘really too beautiful for children’, and wrote that he thought the chromolithographs by Caldecott a little faded, and his drawing somewhat weak, but his vignettes were vigourous, free and lively. However, to Lucien he wrote: ‘beware of Caldecott and Kate Greenaway’. Two years later, when Esther sent a large allegorical print by Walter Crane, The Paris Commune (1887), Pissarro wrote to Lucien: ‘very good, of grand style’. Usually, however, he detested the ‘Graecian’ way Crane rendered women.

In 1887, Esther Isaacson proposed to her uncle a secret plan in favour of Georges. In order to accomplish Georges’s training as a furniture designer, she would try to get him an apprenticeship in the workshops of William Morris:

I shall tell you why. – Morris is an honest man, in his principles as well as his works, and, as far as I can judge (by his writings, his lectures and his decorative designs, furniture etcetera) a gentleman. I should say a serious, competent, good and kind man. I know he works on his furniture, textiles etcetera personally, and I am sure a young man under his direction would be guided by an intelligent and capable teacher, and not only in terms of carpentry.

Pissarro consented, but hesitantly: an apprenticeship at Morris and Co. would be a financial relief to him. To Lucien, however, he confessed a fundamental objection: he suspected Morris and Co. to be in fact a commercial enterprise, and this went against his pride as an independent (and anti-capitalist) artist. He feared that Georges would turn into a commercial entrepreneur, a merchant; he wanted him to become a good artisan and not a dealer. Esther did write to Morris but got no answer, as can be deduced from later correspondence. In 1891, Camille Pissarro himself alluded to a possible training of Georges at Morris’s firm: ‘[c]ouldn’t there be an opportunity
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to get him a position at Morris’ or elsewhere where he could practice either sculpture, or embossing, drawing, in short, any craft whatsoever that leads him a little bit to earn his own living.” And Lucien answered his father: ‘I have told Esther about your letter. She thinks Morris will be of no use, because she wrote to him on behalf of Georges [...] and did not receive any reply [...]’. Camille Pissarro never quite lost his distrust about the ‘commercialism’ of Morris’s enterprise. At the very time he painted *Still Life with a Coffeepot* he recorded his fear that the sincere modern movement in the arts would devaluate itself by commercial imitation ‘in the same way as W. Morris has influenced the English market’.

III. Reception of Pre-Raphaelitism and Morris in France

Most probably Pissarro was not opposed to the Arts and Crafts Movement as such, as a craft represented honest labour. His objections, apart from his dread of commercialisation, were about its ideological Pre-Raphaelite background: content and style were neo-Catholic, mystifying, sentimental and regressive, just like the Symbolism of Gauguin in his own country. It had a political impact too: ‘this neo-catholic movement’, he wrote, ‘corresponds to the reactionary mood of the bourgeoisie, resulting from its fear of anarchist ideas’.

He was not alone in his disapproval, at least not in France. Pre-Raphaelite painting was known there since it had been on show at the Parisian World Fair of 1855, where it found no approval: it was condemned as cool, ascetic, archaic, weird and unintelligible. During the following decades, this verdict gradually softened, and during the 1880s Pre-Raphaelite art even gained public appreciation, favoured by a growing ‘anglophobia’. The year 1884 was a turning point: from then on, Pre-Raphaelitism, and in its slipstream the Aesthetic Movement and Arts and Crafts, became immensely popular. In 1895, however, the tide turned again, at least in the eyes of French art critics: appreciation for British painting and arts and crafts declined, and the latter were said to be superficial, modish, commercial, flat and soppy. After 1900, the taste for Pre-Raphaelitism faded away in France. Impressionism had won out.

As for William Morris, what exactly could Pissarro have known about him when he corresponded with his niece in 1887? The answer is: probably not very much. According to H.A. Needham, the first to give a bibliographical survey of French writings on Morris and Ruskin, publishing on Morris did not start in France before 1894, when Jean Lahor’s article ‘William Morris et l’Art décoratif en Angleterre’ appeared in the *Revue encyclopédique*. Jean Lahor (a pseudonym for Henri Cazalis (1840-1909)) was a many-sided person: beside his profession as a medical doctor, he was active as a littérateur and poet. He visited Morris personally at Hammersmith in
1893. In particular Morris’s ideal of ‘Art for the People’ appealed to him. It corresponded to his own ideals about better conditions of life for the working class and the improvement of its moral standards by means of well-built, neat and hygienic dwellings in pleasant surroundings. Ugly, dirty houses were a breeding-place of bad taste as well as epidemics. He did not believe in ‘Art from the People’. In line with this view, he published Les habitations à bon marché et un art nouveau pour le peuple (1903). Following the example of Morris, he also advocated the foundation of the French Société pour la protection des paysages. Other publications by Lahor deal with healthy food, sound marriage, heredity and family planning, the risks of venereal diseases, tuberculosis and alcoholism.20

Lahor was not a socialist: above all, he was a patriot and his ultimate concern was with the strength of the French race and nation; he characterised the socialism of Morris as vague and dreamy, based on generosity and on pity towards poor and humble workers. His 1894 essay was partly meant to warn the French: some fifty years ago, he said, British people had made great progress in taste, and now they were superior to the French. The British examples were les plus instructifs comme les plus inquiétants. Everywhere in England, in public buildings as well as private homes, architecture, decoration and furnishing were well designed, while in France artists had neglected interior decoration. Decorative arts in France lacked both inspiration and an innovative attitude, and stuck to obsolete styles of the past. In fine printing, for instance, the French might be technically superior in colour-printing, but as for style, French books, magazines and journals could not equal those of the English. He finished with a call to follow their example: joining forces, the French would also be able to create a new art, and emulate, even win over their rivals.21

Camille Pissarro read Lahor’s article and — ignoring all passages on Morris — fulminated against Lahor’s disfavour of French printing:

typical passage in which the author tells in the field of chromolitho we are as good as, and even better than the English [...] !! ...

The author speaks of Ricketts and in particular of Beardsley, who promises to be a great artist; as for etching: Whistler, Seymour Hayden, and nothing in France! Sapristi this Lahor does not know Degas! [...] Finishing with war cries and patriotic exhortations. Surely, they do not understand anything.22

Pissarro was particularly watchful concerning printing and typography, his son’s business. In 1896, he reacted to reviews of an exhibition of fine books at the Galerie de l’Art Nouveau, where some of Lucien's work was on show. Critics compared English
and French book design, and England was said to hold the foremost place, with ‘the works of William Morris and the Chiswick Press, the publications of M. Ricketts and Mr. Lucien Pissarro’ and others, amongst whom, of course, was Walter Crane. ‘The printed books in the French section present no special novelty either in typography or illustration. With very few exceptions, our publishers seem to have no idea of a decorative scheme for a book, logically conceived and, so to speak, forming part of the book itself.’23 This time Camille agreed: ‘William Morris and Ricketts [...] are the only ones who show beautiful things; here are only commercial goods’.24

The theme of rivalry between the two nations in relation to ‘renewal’ versus ‘conservatism’ in artistic style dominated French publications on the Arts and Crafts Movement.25 Such rivalry can also been seen in Pissarro’s letters:

I do not doubt the books of Mr. Morris are as beautiful as the Gothic ones, but one should keep in mind the Goths have been inventors and you should not do it better, which is not possible, but differently and in your own way; only much later the results will be recognized. [...] From this point of view, you should be suspicious of your friend Ricketts who surely is a charming man, but as it concerns art he seems to me to wander from the goal, which is to return to nature, and one can only do that by way of observing nature with our own modern temperament; invention and imitation are different things.

In France, according to Camille Pissarro, the cream of nineteenth-century artists had shown that way, but it was not the route followed by Ricketts, who opted for ‘prettiness’ and élegance italienne. Lucien, for his part, did not believe the two schools, Impressionism and Pre-Raphaelitism, to be irreconcilable: on the contrary, a mingling together of both might bring forth the new school of art for the future.26 In some way he realised this intended fusion: in cooperation with his father, he edited the portfolio Les Travaux des Champs (1893). Lucien translated Camille’s drawings into coloured woodcuts suited to his own typography and book design.27

‘William Morris just died, of diabetes – it’s a real disaster and what a confusion will it bring – one wonders what will happen with his splendid material in the hands of his followers who don’t understand anything of it’, Lucien Pissarro reported in October 1896.28 Father and son exchanged French and English obituary articles and discussed some of these.29 But there was also hope for Lucien to improve his position, now that the superiority of Morris no longer dominated the art scene.30 Together with Charles Ricketts, he planned the edition of a small book on typography, in which Morris was to be honoured as the godfather of harmonious book design. When this project faltered, he took up translating and editing one of Morris’s essays, Gothic
Architecture (1889) (l'Architecture gothique). Informed of this plan, Camille immediately arranged the sale of the future book with the Parisian fine book dealer Floury. More hesitant was his reaction when Lucien asked for a loan to fund the edition, but in the end he agreed to advance the full amount. However, this project came to nothing as Morris’s executors did not give their consent for a translation. Eventually, in 1898, Lucien and Ricketts edited the booklet De la typographie et de l’harmonie de la page imprimée: William Morris et son influence sur les arts et métiers, a combination of delicate English book design and robust typography à l’Eragny. Camille Pissarro financed the edition.

IV. The anarchism of Pissarro and Morris

Pissarro, although never involved in political activism, was a convinced anarcho-communist, befriended some leading anarchist thinkers and was an avid reader of Kropotkin’s writings. Anarcho-communists did not practice violent actions (so-called ‘propaganda by deed’), let alone bomb-throwing, but mainly believed in educating and learning as strategies, in which art also could play a role. For them, a new society should be realised and bound together by cooperation, mutual aid and communal property. Anarcho-communists also believed in science and technology as driving forces leading to the new society; they did not idealise harmonious communities of primeval times. In Pissarro’s criticism of ‘regressive’ Pre-Raphaelitism or the ‘gothic’ books of William Morris, political and artistic convictions met. Nevertheless, certain ideological affinities existed between Pissarro and Morris, and it is puzzling that Camille Pissarro only once, in 1889, referred to the political activities of Morris. In France, the ideological position of Morris was not quite clear. But he had known Kropotkin personally since 1883, when the anarchist leader came to live in exile in London. Many times they spoke on the same platforms at the same demonstrations, like the yearly memorial meetings of the Paris Commune, and they certainly respected each other. Did Pissarro know anything about their connection?

It was Morris’s role in the 1889 Socialist Congress at Paris that caused the few political comments on Morris in Pissarro’s correspondence. Due to ideological and personal controversy in the French Socialist party, which organised the congress, the congress was split up into two congresses: the official congress organised by the pragmatic (Possibiliste) party fraction, and the other by the more programmatic ‘Marxists’. Morris was a delegate of the Socialist League at the ‘Marxist’ congress, for which, in Pissarro’s eyes, Morris ought to have admitted publicly to be wrong. At both assemblies, anarchist factions played a prominent oppositional role; they caused commotion and sometimes they were silenced or thrown out. It seems that Morris was visiting the Rouen cathedral when an Italian anarchist delegate was expelled, and that he could only protest afterward. This caused Pissarro to grouse:
I regret that William Morris did not join those who protested against the assaults towards anarchists to prevent them to proclaim in public their honest convictions! [...] By this, the socialist congress proves to be no more than a bourgeois party [...] somewhat more progressive, but harbouring the same prejudices.35

After that, in 1890, Morris left the Socialist League, which had grown more and more anarchist, and founded the small-scale Hammersmith Socialist Society, which had its headquarters in his own house. Some months after, Lucien Pissarro wrote to his father that he and his wife regularly visited the meetings of the Hammersmith Society and were about to join it. He mentioned the membership of Morris, Walter Crane and Emery Walker.36 Camille Pissarro gave no reaction, so his opinion on the Hammersmith Society is unknown.

V. Anarchist art strategies
Kropotkin may have sympathised with Morris, but in the few passages in his writings devoted to art, he hardly refers to Morris’s proposal to connect art and social ideas by means of the applied arts. In his memoirs he criticised Morris’s ‘hatred of machines’, which in his own eyes were a true force of progress.37

Furthermore, Kropotkin seems to have adhered to the credo of realist art: *constamment vivre avec ses sujets*. He argued in *La conquête du pain* (1892) that the artist ought to share the life of his or her subjects. In living the life of peasants and fishermen, the artist would see through their eyes the splendour and force of nature, and in living the life of factory workers, the artist would come to know their toils and exhaustions, but also their joys, and would experience the force of the machines. Social life itself had to be the inspiration and leading idea of the artist: ‘[o]ne has to immerse oneself in the life of the people in order to have the courage to depict it’.38 In *Paroles d’un révolté* he called on young intellectuals and artists to bid farewell to their bourgeois background and join the ranks of the people. But they should not conform to contemporary art practices by meticulously but mindlessly rendering the trivial, dirty or superficial banalities of life; this would corrupt their art and become unsatisfying in the end.39 For Kropotkin, artists had to create moving stories and appealing pictures to memorialise the titanic struggle of the people against their oppressors; they should pass on to new generations the revolutionary fire of their forerunners, and they should show how ugly daily life had become under the ruling order of society. It could be their vocation to point to the cause of this ugliness and to show alternatives. In this context he mentioned Ruskin and ‘le grand poète socialiste Morris’: they had shown how men’s living environment, their dwellings, streets and
public buildings could become beautiful if leisure and comfort were available for all.  

Reading Kropotkin’s *Paroles d’un révolté* and *La conquête du pain*, Camille Pissarro must have recognised in these passages what he was actually doing: painting neither trivialities nor utopian visions, but ‘the heroism of modern life’. His Neo-Impressionist landscapes of the 1880s, peopled with peasant women sewing and harvesting, marketing, laundering and picking fruits, glorify rural life as a cooperative and autarkic community, independent of national states or central governments, and far removed from capitalist bourgeois cities. Present-day authors emphasise that Pissarro’s countryside images were idealised rather than truly experienced, but many of his contemporaries respected his intentions. Most of Pissarro’s landscapes are merely agricultural ones, but in line with Kropotkin’s trust in industrial technology he sometimes added industrial details, or painted landscapes with factories. His political beliefs were most outspoken in his prints, showing not only peasants and peasants’ fairs, but also tramps, vagabonds and wanderers who, as outcasts of capitalist society, were on their way to a new world. He criticised bourgeois society in an album, *Turpitudes sociales* (1890) – the cover designed by Lucien – showing the evils of capitalist corruption: forced marriages, prostitution, people starving to death, crime driven by need, and so on. Anarchist leader and editor Jean Grave (1854-1939) could count on him when he needed illustrations for his uproarious periodicals. Even the overviews of city boulevards and squares he made later in his life might be considered as a distanced reflection on modern urban business, and sometimes as a veiled protest against the demolition of old city quarters – though, to be frank, the urgings of his dealer Durand-Ruel to paint these saleable cityscapes was important too.

**VI. Ruskin and Neo-Impressionist theory**

Whatever he may have thought about Morris, Pissarro explicitly did not think much of Ruskin. To Esther Isaacs he wrote in 1883 that, though he had never read any of Ruskin’s writings, he in general distrusted opinions of literary people on the visual arts. He had been introduced to Ruskin’s ideas by some fellow artists who knew of his theories, but Pissarro was unfavourably disposed towards these doctrines. In Pissarro’s opinion, Ruskin was discredited by his disapproval of Whistler, *un grand artiste*. The fellow artists in question however – most probably his Neo-Impressionist comrades – willingly referred to Ruskin as a respectable forerunner. For the most part they were anarchists like Camille Pissarro, and Ruskin’s vision of society was anything but anarchist. Despite this, they made use of his ideas on art to explain and legitimise their own artistic principles, especially the group of publications by Ruskin concerning the teaching of drawing, such as the later volumes of *Modern Painters, The Elements of Drawing* and *The Laws of Fête*, which include meticulous observations on colour.
reflections and gradations. *The Elements of Drawing* opens with the statement: '[e]verything that you can see in the world around you, presents itself to your eyes only as an arrangement of patches of different colours variously shaded'. To master the variations in hues Ruskin prescribes exercises in filling up and gradating squares of paper, first by pen and pencil in one colour, then by brushwork in layers of watercolour. In subsequent advice to represent colour hues, Ruskin's formulations often come near to the principles of Neo-Impressionism.

During the late 1890s Robert de la Sizeranne (1866-1932) published a series of articles (later to be assembled as a book), in which he dealt with Ruskin's life, character, writings, social engagement and theories of art. Remarkable in de la Sizeranne's discourse are Ruskin's prescriptions on the handling of colour in painting, with the idea of humility at its core, while respect and adoration are taken as a basic condition for the artist's approach to Nature. The Ruskinian statement 'All great Art is Praise' ("*Tout grand art est adoration*") is repeatedly used by de la Sizeranne. He argued that all lines and colours in nature ought to be studied attentively; for instance, the intense blue and purple shadows of mountainsides or the warm orange heart of wild roses between yellow stamens. Hues of shadow were to be represented as fiercely as the colours of light. Colours were not to be darkened by adding black or brown, but by increasing intensity. Nature taught 'Le culte de la couleur', and in Ruskin's view all Nature should be seen as a huge mosaic of different colours, simply to be rendered one by one. Colours should not be mixed at the palette: if a spot of red colour had to be changed into a purple one, then a thin layer of blue should be laid on it. Colours, as de la Sizeranne paraphrased Ruskin, should be placed by *petit points* or *atomes de couleur*. According to de la Sizeranne, Ruskin had thus formulated the principles of pointillism as early as 1836, and again in 1846 and 1851.

In his writings de la Sizeranne amply quoted and completely intertwined passages from *Modern Painters*, *Stones of Venice*, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, *The Elements of Drawing*, *For Clavigera* and several other works of Ruskin. Likewise in 1899 Paul Signac, in his programmatic publication *d' Eugène Delacroix au Néo-Impressionisme*, made a hardly extricable mix of fragments of Ruskin's works (mostly from *The Elements of Drawing*) with borrowed citations after Ruskin translated by de la Sizeranne, and passages by de la Sizeranne himself.

Signac mostly focused on Ruskin's statements about colour, but he also included some other Ruskinian notions in his quotations, as Ruskin's *Elements of Drawing* deals with composition, and with the relation of colour and composition. Though Ruskin declared it impossible to give rules for composing a good picture, he gave nine 'simple laws of arrangement' of lines and forms that could help to understand how the works of great artists were composed. Of these laws, the most influential one in producing
beauty was the ‘Law of Radiation’, the coming together of curving lines in one point: uniting action and enforcing it at the same time. As flowers, leaves and branches of trees were all regulated by systems of curvature, radiation formed an essential part of the beauty of all vegetable forms. Ruskin also had the idea that all human moral vices and virtues had their counterpart in the art of painting; he found men’s moral level reflected ‘with mathematical exactness’, in conditions of line and colour in their art. The patterns of lines following the Law of Radiation also had their moral analogies:

It typically expresses that healthy human actions should spring radiantly (like rays) from some single heart motive; the most beautiful systems of action taking place from motives not so deep or central, but in some beautiful subordinate connection with the central or life motive.

Maybe Signac had this in mind, when he painted the 1890 portrait of his close friend (see Figure 3), the art critic Félix Fénéon (1861-1944). It is well known that this picture, subtitled Against the Enamel of a Background Rhythmic with Angles, Tones and Hues, was also an allusion to the theories of colours and lines of Charles Henry, partially adopted by Signac and explained and defended by Fénéon in his essays of art criticism. Further, a possible source for the radiating motive was a Japanese print, probably showing the pattern of a kimono. Fénéon was known as a complex, enigmatic personality, but on the whole he seems to have integrated his opposing traits and interests successfully in one persona, and as a friend he is said to have been sensitive and generous. His character could be interpreted more or less in the sense of Ruskin’s ‘Law of Radiation’.

Camille Pissarro did not like this portrait of the man who was also his friend. He described it to Lucien as ‘[a] very bizarre portrait of Fénéon, standing upright and holding a lily, and at the background enlacements of colours […] without giving at all a sensation of decorative beauty to the work’. After his break with Neo-Impressionism during the 1890s, Camille Pissarro violently reacted against its theoretical ‘rigidness’ and the lack of freedom of its technique.

No less significant was his disapproval of Signac’s large decorative painting of 1895, In Times of Harmony: The Age of Gold is not in the Past, it is in the Future (see Figure 4), a painted anticipation of the coming ideal society, firmly based on anarcho-communist convictions. Pissarro, still struggling to get rid of Neo-Impressionism, complained that he found the painting joyful, pleasant and colourful, but exaggerated in its juxtaposition of unmixed complementary colours. He was tired of divisions systématiques; even his own works painted in his former manner bored him. Lucien
Pissarro, to whom this verdict on Signac’s work was sent, agreed. What strikes one most is how both father and son merely commented on the artistic qualities of *In Times of Harmony*, though its political meaning, akin to their own convictions, was well known.

The fact that the theories of Ruskin, the advocate of Pre-Raphaelitism, also suited his former – albeit still anarchist – Neo-Impressionist colleagues once more impeded him from appreciating the Pre-Raphaelites. However, even after his breakaway from Neo-Impressionism, Pissarro persisted in juxtaposing contrasting colours, associating strong contrasts with political opposition to the aesthetic values of the bourgeoisie. Typical in this sense are his comments on an embroidery by his niece Esther Isaacson: he praised the contrast of orange and blue, combined with hues reminiscent of tapestries from the Orient. This contrast was like a clarion call in an orchestra.

As it happens, the blue-orange contrast is exactly what William Morris applied in his *Bird* textile (see Figure 2). The inspiration for this and other textile patterns did not stem from Italy or Greece but from oriental textiles in the South Kensington Museum, studied there by Morris just as Pissarro advised his sons to do. Surely he
approved of this source of inspiration in Morris’s textiles: in a letter of 1890 to Esther he regretted not having had the opportunity to visit the tapestries of William Morris, on show in London.68

VII. Looking through the window
Pissarro did not only paint city boulevards to show his distance from capitalist urban life or to please his dealer. In his later years he suffered from an eye disease, which meant that he was no longer able to paint in the open air. So he rented hotel rooms and apartments with large windows in quick succession, from which he painted the view. Thus his panoramic series came into being: views of the boulevards and squares of Paris, Knocke in Belgium, Rouen, London and other places. In January 1899, he rented for the winter season the apartment at 204 Rue de Rivoli in Paris, right in front of the Tuileries Garden (see Figure 5). Views of the Tuileries, the Louvre and the Arc du Carroussel were to become the subjects of his next series of paintings (see Figure 6).

This apartment was the one to be furnished with Morris’s Bird curtains. Pissarro
produced a number of pictures showing parts of the interior of this residence; though they are rather sketchy, as Impressionist paintings tend to be, they clearly show the Pissarro family did not furnish its home according to Arts and Crafts principles. They suggest a mix of nineteenth-century French furniture styles. Nevertheless, the curtains, rather expensive and hard to acquire from abroad if not ordered through Bing’s Galeries d’Art Nouveau, must have been chosen intentionally, and in spite of Pissarro’s disapproval of the commercial aspects of Arts and Crafts.

In the correspondence between Camille and Lucien Pissarro the purchasing process of this textile can be traced, though some letters are lacking. During March 1899, shortly after settling down at the Rue Rivoli, Pissarro asked Lucien to send him a prospectus (possibly of textiles). Most probably a real catalogue of textiles was not available at that time, because it is stated in a somewhat later prospectus that ‘Morris & Company have no pattern books of their silks and woollen fabrics, but full-sized patterns to suit any scheme of colouring will be sent on application’. During the summer season the Pissarro family did not use their apartment in Paris. Meanwhile, Lucien and his wife Esther continued their search for textiles on behalf of their parents:
We just received from Morris’ firm a package of samples of curtain material; we will send you them as a registered parcel post. There are some very nice pieces among them – Esther has searched through the shops, but only at Morris’ she could find some really fine things. [...] You will see that, given the quality of fabric and pigments, the price is reasonable, all the more since the textiles are so to speak indestructible.\footnote{72}

Lucien asked where the parcel should be sent, and Camille answered from Eragny that it should be sent to the family’s summer residence: ‘[s]end the W. Morris samples to your mother here’.\footnote{73}

At the customs there must have been some trouble with importing the samples. In a letter to his father of November 1899 Lucien made allusions to it, but these references are not very clear, relating to import duties but also to remarks of customs officers on ‘des tissus de ces horrrrrribles étangers!!’. And in the same letter: ‘... I received samples of that other firm about which I spoke to Mother in my last letter, but I found them so very ugly that I thought it better not to affront the border control again’.\footnote{74}
On 16 November, Pissarro reported the arrival of the samples. He made his choice immediately and returned the parcel (grumbling about being taxed) with a label attached to the chosen sample specifying the required amount of fabric.\textsuperscript{75} The following week, Lucien forwarded the invoice receipt of Morris and Co.; as soon as the bill was paid, the firm would send off the order. He advised his father to pay by cheque.\textsuperscript{76} The amount seems to have been FrF 350.\textsuperscript{77}

At the end of November, one day before the fabric was to be sent, Lucien Pissarro made mention of some delay: at the Arts and Crafts Exhibition his wife and he had seen a version of 	extit{Bird} looking less harmonious in colour:

Esther has gone to the shop and has found that the material was not quite the same as the sample, and she has asked to send us a new sample in order to compare it with the first – Actually, the blue background of the new specimen is darker and the result is that it’s more harsh – This means the textile is dyed with real indigo and so it will be nearly impossible to obtain twice the same hue, and the first sample is a little bit faded after having circulated many times – Yet I have ordered the fabric since it will fade harmoniously in course of time.\textsuperscript{78}

In the end all went well. On 1 December, Camille reported having received a message saying that the curtains had been shipped, and on 16 December he wrote: ‘we received the fabric of W. Morris, which we found admirable and delicious of colouring’.\textsuperscript{79} 	extit{Still Life with a Coffeepot} may have been a confirmation. However, the 	extit{Bird} textile did not hang for a long time at 204 Rue de Rivoli. By November 1900 Pissarro rented another Parisian apartment at 28 Place Dauphine – his last, before he died in 1903. We may suppose that the curtains also moved to the new address, but after 1903 they disappear from sight.

In his old age, Pissarro was an acknowledged master and his views of the Tuileries gardens and his still lifes – among them 	extit{Still Life with a Coffee Pot}, priced by Pissarro at FrF 1500 – were bought by his dealer Durand-Ruel. They were on show at the Durand-Ruel galleries in January-February 1901 and at the salon of 	extit{La Libre Esthétique} in Brussels some months later. The exhibition was a success, as Pissarro wrote.\textsuperscript{80} Nevertheless, 	extit{Still Life with a Coffeepot} was not sold and stayed in Durand-Ruel’s stock for a long time. It wandered between galleries and exhibitions until 1935 when it was sold to a German collector, Dr. Otto Krebs at Holzdorf.\textsuperscript{81} From there it was transported to Russia.

So 	extit{Still Life with a Coffeepot}, however modest it may look, embodies Pissarro’s diverse ideological and artistic convictions. The colourful Arts and Crafts textile, with
juxtapositions of contrasting colours recalling his erstwhile Neo-Impressionist principles, here appears subordinated to the Impressionism of his later years. Maybe Pissarro also thought about his and Morris’s shared revolutionary political convictions, as opposed to the regressive and ‘commercialist’ Pre-Raphaelite ideology. But surely the curtains were a sign of the close ties between Camille Pissarro and his family abroad.

NOTES


8. ‘Ton cadre est vraiment charmant, à bonne heure, voilà un travail bien fait, et le dessin est bien, on sent l’influence des études d’après nature faites à Éragny’. Camille to Georges Pissarro, Éragny, 12 January 1890, in Correspondance CP, II, p. 325, no. 563. In this letter, one also finds a very negative verdict on Crane by Camille Pissarro.


12. ‘Je vais te dire le pour’ – Morris est un homme, honnête comme prince et comme travail, et, autant qu’il m’est possible de le juger (ce que je fais par ces écrits, ces conférences et ses dessins, meubles, etc.) un gentleman. Je veux dire un homme sérieux, instruit, bon et aimable. Je sais qu’il travaille lui-même à ses meubles, teintures, etc., et je suis sûr qu’un jeune homme placé sous sa direction, serait sous un maître intelligent et habile, et non seulement au point de vue du travail de charpentier’. Esther Issacson to Camille Pissarro, [London], 26 May 1887, commented and included in letters Camille to Lucien Pissarro, Eragny, 28 May 1887 and 31 May 1887, in Correspondance CP, II, p. 176, no. 430; p. 177, no. 431.


14. ‘N’y aurait-il moyen de le faire entrer soit chez Morris soit ailleurs où il pourrait faire ou de la sculpture, du repoussé, du dessin, enfin, un travail quelconque qui le mène à gagner à peu près sa vie?’ Camille to Lucien Pissarro, Paris, 10 January 1891, in Correspondance CP, III, pp. 13-14, no. 620.


25. Prominently, for instance, in Henry Nocq, *Tendances nouvelles: Enquêtes sur l'évolution des industries d'art* (Paris, 1896), in which Morris and Crane were interviewed personally (pp. 186-91). Morris appears to have been very modest about his own influence.

26. ‘Je ne doute pas que les livres de M. Morris ne soient aussi beaux que les Gothiques mais il faut se rappeler que les Gothiques ont été les inventeurs et il faut que vous fassiez non pas mieux, ce qui n’est pas possible, mais autrement et dans votre voie; on ne s’apercevra des résultats que plus tard. […] A ce point de vue, il faut te méfier de l’ami Ricketts qui certainement est charmant comme homme, mais qui au point de vue art me semble s’éloigner du but, qui est le retour à la nature, et l’on ne fait dans ce sens qu’en observant la nature avec notre propre tempérament moderne; autre chose est d’inventer ou d’imiter.’ Camille to Lucien Pissarro, Rouen, 19 August 1898, in *Correspondance CP*, IV, p. 504, no. 1574, and Lucien to Camille Pissarro, Kew, October 1896, in *Letters LP*, p. 508. Lucien also tried to convince his father of the difference between his books and those of Morris and other English artists. His were of the ‘School of Eragny’: ‘[q]uand tu me prêches à propos des gothiques, tu prêches un convertit.’ Lucien to Camille Pissarro, Epping, November 1896, *ibid.*, pp. 510-11.


28. ‘William Morris vient de mourir; de la diabète – c’est un véritable désastre et quel désarroi cela va causer – on se demande ce qui va arriver, avec le matériel splendide entre les mains des gens de sa queue qui n’y entendent goutte!’. Lucien to Camille Pissarro, Epping, October 1896, in *Letters LP*, p. 502.


35. Je regrette que W. Morris ne soit pas au nombre de ceux qui ont protesté contre la violence faite aux anarchistes pour les empêcher de dire au grand jour ce qu’ils pensent être la vérité! […] le congrès socialiste se trouve pour ce fait n’être qu’un parti bourgeois, plus avancé, mais ayant les mêmes préjugés’. Camille Pissarro to Alice Isaacoaa, Paris, 28 July 1889, in *Correspondance CP*, II, p. 285, no. 533 (and footnote p. 286); see also Thompson, *William Morris*, pp. 535-36.


41. Camille Pissarro to Esther Isaacson, Eragny, 12 December 1885, and to Octave Mirbeau, Eragny, 21 April 1892, in *Correspondance CP*, I, pp. 360-61, no. 300; *Correspondance CP*, III, p. 217, no. 774.
48. See, for instance, *Ruskin’s The Laws of Fèsole*, in Ruskin, *Works*, XV, p. 361. See also, *ibid.*, p. 414: ‘shadows are as full in colour as lights are, every possible shadow being a light to the shadow below it, and every possible light, a shade to the light above it, till you come to the absolute darkness on one side, and to the sun on the other.’
51. *ibid.*, (1897), pp. 189-94.
52. *ibid.*, (1897), p. 194.
53. Jean Autret, *Ruskin and the French before Marcel Proust: with the collected fragmentary translations* (Genève: Droz, 1965), pp. 27-128. Autret collected all translated fragments used by De la Sizeranne and other French authors (many of those originally not adequately annotated) and classed them under the sources from which they had been taken.
55. De la Sizeranne also dealt with the ideas of Ruskin about lines, especially his preference for curved linearture, see De la Sizeranne, ‘Religion de la Beauté’, (1897), pp. 182-83, 185-86, 188-89.
60. ‘Un portrait très bizarre de Fénéon debout, tenant un lys, et comme fond, des entrelacs de couleurs
[…] qui ne donnent pas non plus une sensation de beauté décorative de l’œuvre’. Camille to Lucien Pissarro, Paris, 30 March 1891, in *Correspondance CP*, III, p. 50, no. 647.


62. Camille to Lucien Pissarro, Paris, 8 April 1895 and 11 April 1895, in *Correspondance CP*, IV, pp. 56, no. 1125; p. 61, no. 1127.


64. Signac even planned to publish a lithographed version of *Au Temps d’Harmonie* in *Les Temps Nouveaux*, an anarchist periodical edited by Jean Grave. Both Camille and Lucien Pissarro contributed several times to *Les Temps Nouveaux* and other publications of Grave. See Dardel, pp. 34-35.

65. Smith, pp. 125-34.

66. Camille to Georges Pissarro, Eragny, 31 January 1890, in *Correspondance CP*, II, pp. 331-32, no. 569. One of Pissarro’s theoretical sources of inspiration, M.E. Chevreul’s *De la loi du contraste simultané des couleurs et de l’assortiment des objets colorés* […] (Paris: Pitois-Levrault, 1839), was the result of experiments to improve the colouring of tapestries of the Manufactures royales de Gobelins and Beauvais.


73. ‘Envoie les échantillons W. Morris à ta mère ici’, Camille to Lucien Pissarro, Eragny, 3 November 1899, in *Correspondance CP*, V, p. 50, no. 1669.

74. ‘J’ai reçu des échantillons de cette autre maison, dont je parlais à Maman dans ma dernière lettre, mais je les ai trouvé si laid que j’ai cru qu’il valait mieux ne pas affronter la douane une seconde fois’. Lucien to Camille Pissarro, London, n.d. [October/November 1899], in *Letters LP*, p. 621.


by 1890: Bird is priced at 0.83 per yard. In the brochure of Morris and Co., Morris chintzes, silks, tapestries, etc, n.d., Bird (in two colour variations) is indicated as: 'width 54 ins, price 16/6 per yard'. available online: <https://archive.org/details/morriscintzessi00morrisuoft/page/n27> (last accessed 7 October 2018).

78. 'L’étoffe pour les rideaux sera expédiée sans doute demain il y a un petit retard parce que nous avons vu à l’exposition ses Arts & Crafts un morceau de la même étoffe qui ne nous avait pas paru aussi harmonieux. Esther est allée à la boutique et a trouvé que l’étoffe n’était pas tout à fait comme l’échantillon et a demandé qu’on m’envoie un nouveau échantillon pour que je compare avec l’ancien — En effet le fond bleu du nouveau morceau est plus foncé et le résultat est que c’est plus dur — Cela tient que l’étoffe est teintée avec du véritable indigo et qu’il est presque impossible d’obtenir 2 fois la même teinte, et le 1er échantillon est un peu fané ayant beaucoup roulé — j’ai commandé l’étoffe tout de même cela se fanera harmonieusement avec le temps.' Lucien to Camille Pissarro, London, n.d. [November 1899], in Letters I.P, p. 627. For the use of indigo by the Morris firm, see Thompson, Work of William Morris, pp. 113-16.

