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Alexander Archipenko, the first sculptor of our century to recognize form as an illusion, investigated this mystery throughout his entire life. Almost from the beginning he became involved with the void, with perforated and concave planes, with what today we call negative form. Now, well over a half-century since his earliest experiments were initiated, we accept the fact that less can make more, that space can miraculously turn into form. What we occasionally forget is how much Archipenko was responsible for these intangible discoveries.

Long applauded as a pioneer Cubist sculptor, he was far more than that. He never merely transferred Cubist theories from painting to sculpture; he virtually invented his own kind of three-dimensional Cubism. Relying on the human body, preferably the female nude, as his point of departure, Archipenko constructed his figures with architectural precision, yet rarely sacrificed the rhythms of nature. His idealized women have the elongated elegance we sometimes associate with undulating plants, sometimes with those Gothic saints which echo the soaring churches they decorate. Archipenko confessed, "From the Gothic I learned to see the transformation of proportions as an . . . expression of the spiritual."

Unlike medieval sculpture, his figures are seldom frontal. They turn, twist, bend; they are inverted, foreshortened, and tautly poised. They move, yet more important—light moves over them with rippling speed. As early as 1912 Archipenko combined wood, glass, mirror, metal, canvas, and wire in dynamic constructions (or
should we say assemblages) where light was manipulated with meticulous control, and where reflections and transparencies were deliberately exploited. A year or two later, again predicting present-day trends, he was already considering environmental groups.

But his greatest contribution was metaphysical. He made what is, seem what it is not. It was the duality of vision that interested him, less the image itself than our reaction to the image. Turning total voids into solid form, he also discovered that surrounding space could become as potent as dense mass.

Though Archipenko was widely acclaimed in Europe, he was never fully appreciated in America where he lived for thirty-four years. Coming here at the age of thirty-six and at the height of his European fame, he remained something of a displaced loner, a man who always seemed to be looking in from the outside. Moving from place to place, he restlessly pursued his roots, but they were not to be found in America. And, of course, during the early twenties, this country was scarcely ready for his sophisticated metaphors. Later, his ebullient color, admittedly more decorative than structural, disturbed American eyes which at that time were happier with restrained Gallic taste.

For, from beginning to end, Archipenko remained a Ukrainian, a man who often seemed closer to the near East than the West. The golden ornament and linear eloquence of Byzantium are so manifest in his work as sometimes to obscure its vigor. But, make no mistake, Archipenko belongs securely to the history of modern art, less because he reflected its influence than because he himself helped create it.

Katharine Kuh
THE ARCHIPENKO COLLECTION

The memorial retrospective exhibition which is the occasion of this publication is drawn from the estate collection of my late husband's sculptures, drawings, and graphics. Some of the more recent works as well as works produced as early as 1908, here illustrated, are shown for the first time. The terra cottas and other works were considered too fragile to travel and could not be included—denying the exhibition and this publication much of the color with which my husband experimented. Color slides were made of twenty of the terra cotta sculptures, however, and their projection during the exhibition well serves to familiarize the viewer with this frequently used medium. Whenever possible bronze casts related to the colored works are shown.

Some of the terra cottas were produced in California. It seemed appropriate that the memorial exhibition originate in that state, for the time my husband worked and taught in California was always recalled with nostalgia. It was in California that he was able to produce and fire a life-size terra cotta, his largest, entitled MA (meaning in Hungarian the creative and mystic power in woman; not the colloquial English meaning for mother) which has the following inscription:

“MA is dedicated to every mother; to everyone who is in love and suffers from love; to everyone who creates in the arts and in science; to every hero; to everyone who is lost in problems; to everyone who knows and feels Eternity and Infinity.”

Alexander Archipenko with his second wife, Frances, showing her the lithographic technique at St. Gallen, Switzerland, March, 1963
In 1960, when my husband and I were visiting in Paris, quite by chance we were informed that old friends of his, Monsieur and Madame Jean Verdier, had recently returned to France after many years in South America and that they still had stored in Cannes the plasters which had been left with them for safe-keeping when my husband had left France to go to Germany about fifty years ago. Bronzes from these newly-discovered plasters are in this exhibition. They are Adam and Eve, Crossed Arms, Woman (Head on Knee), Woman with Cat, Small Reclining Figure, Blue Dancer, Boxers, Woman Combing Her Hair (Seated), and Egyptian Motif. The bronzes, Seated Figure and Repose, were cast from the terra cottas which also had been stored in Cannes. This is probably the first time that Seated Figure as well as Adam and Eve and Small Reclining Figure have ever been shown publicly. Of the more recent works, it should be noted that King Solomon and Seated Woman were never exhibited in the United States. King Solomon had been conceived as a model in 1963 (see last photograph of Archipenko) for a sculpture sixty feet high, a project which never was pursued, but it is my hope it will eventually materialize, perhaps in America. The small recent version of Family Life is also having its first showing in this exhibition. The early larger version of it which measured approximately six feet high was exhibited in the Armory Show and destroyed during World War I.

The European reaction to recent retrospective showings in Rome, Milan and Munich encourages me to believe in the

Last photograph of Alexander Archipenko in his New York studio working on plaster model of King Solomon, 1963
importance of keeping the comprehensive collection, which the memorial exhibition represents, as a permanently intact group so that it can be made available in perpetuity for viewing and research by artists, scholars and art enthusiasts. The Archives of American Art has just completed the microfilming of my husband’s very extensive personal archive, a collection that will undoubtedly be of assistance to art historians. Several personal photographs from this group, hitherto unpublished, are reproduced in this publication. Donald Karshan’s assistance in organizing and preserving the entire estate collection of objects and papers, his collaboration with the Archives of American Art, and his advice and efforts in connection with the memorial exhibition, have been invaluable. He is presently collecting widespread data for a catalogue raisonné of my husband’s sculpture.

The memorial exhibition of sixty-seven sculptures represents approximately one-sixth of the presently known Archipenko oeuvre. Many of the early pioneering, and fragile, polychrome sculptures and “sculpto-paintings” (an expression coined by my husband) are in public and private collections here and abroad.

Frances Archipenko

Bearsville, New York
December 11, 1966

1. This plaster of aoxnas is identical with the one from the Magnelli collection, now at the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum. Both plasters are from the same mold, done in 1913.

2. “Even though his first sculptures were inspired by the revolutionary theories, he showed immediately his strong personality by introducing an entirely new conception of sculpture. He gave the name ‘Sculpto-Paintures’ to reliefs generally made of plaster, carved and painted.” Marcel Duchamp, Collection of the Société Anonyme, Museum of Modern Art, 1950. Case, Lockwood and Brainard, 1950.
59. Eagle (1959) 10 1/2” x 15 1/2”
42. Torso in Space (1935) 8½" x 27½"
To course through the work of Archipenko now that his chronology is complete and all his various inventions take on more cohesion is to rediscover an extraordinary genius. One must strive to understand the totality of his contributions, for his early conceptions re-emerged decades later, and it was obvious that they inspired him all his life. But then, if there was this fugue aspect, there was also great ultimate change. It is difficult to see his last work implicit in his first, and we must keep in mind how strange and bold his first things seemed at the time: his early and late works have their newness in common.

There were difficult times for him when the spate of creation slackened, years without immediate reward. Was it coming to America too early when there was no such ambiance of talent as the thirties and forties provided? Or was it disappointment over lesser acknowledgment in his new homeland? His precocious achievements were well behind him, yet he continued to refine and re-define them, even as his future sculptural intuitions were lurking in working drawings. There was some relation between his difficulty in offering and his audience’s difficulty in accepting. Archipenko had a way of forcing reluctances upon us, as if for the pleasure of beating them down. For he was free of that conventional taste that has clung to the most revolutionary figures in Western art until just now, so that he could seem either too tasteful, or tasteless, and apparently not care. Perhaps he was so far outside our pervasive materialist faith (in his Eastern way) that his subtleties and dedications embarrass us without our knowing why.

_Alexander Archipenko, Moscow, circa 1907/8_
In the midst of such thoughts, one has the strange sensation that one is also rediscovering the 20th century that we still call “modern,” and that everything now falls into place more simply. Cubism becomes more understandable, and less narrowly Picasso-Braque, a phase through which artists mysteriously passed. It becomes construction, the desire to invent or build, which is still very much with us. The early examples take on the look of the earlier Archipenko. (Even the Nude Descending the Staircase looks like an Archipenko for all its debt to photography.) It is not only Archipenko’s early work which completes art history like the last piece in a puzzle (and immediately Brancusi’s contribution is no longer eccentric), it is Archipenko’s late work, with its wide range of materials, that comments on where we are now. The late Archipenkos are fresh and wonderful and again elucidate the contemporary.

Perhaps this exhibition, being in bronze, makes Archipenko’s virtues more obvious. If the color is lacking, the forms stand clear. The fragile terra cottas and some of the large “sculpto-paintings” cannot travel, and bronze variants take their place.

Archipenko was twenty-one when he arrived in Paris in 1908. He was enrolled at the Beaux Arts for a matter of weeks. Actually, he went to school to the Louvre where he could plunge into the conglomerate past. “In my work from 1900 to 1910,” he was to write in a truculent letter of a later date, “any intelligent connoisseur should find inspiration from such styles as Assyrian, Egyptian, Hindu, early Byzantine, Gothic, and Archaic Greek.

*Alexander Archipenko and his first wife, Angelica, aboard the S.S. Mongolia in October, 1923, en route to their new life in the United States*
From those are derived my thirty-year old style, not from the Negro or Picasso period." And, if so, then how Cubist is Archipenko? "I cooperated in creating it (Cubism) together with a small group of artists of whom I was the youngest. When I arrived in Paris this group was not organized as a unit. Only in 1910 was formed the Section d'Or." And Archipenko proceeds to list twenty-two members. Section d'Or was a confraternity.

It is true that many more things were happening than the Cubism that we think of now. Archipenko constructed; he worked with cylinders and elongated sections of cone, because metal bent that way, and with sheets of glass and with wood. In so doing, he followed more literally than others Cézanne's over-quoted statement that the sphere, cylinder and cone are the basic forms, that shibboleth of the Cubist.

To go back to a glimpse of Archipenko before he put on the armor of his style, he was born in Kiev in the Ukraine, the son of an engineer and inventor who taught at the university. He studied painting and sculpture in an art school in Kiev, went to Moscow and from there to Paris. His earliest work in Paris is instinctively mannerist and fluent—it is not surprising that Modigliani and Gaudier-Brzeska were attracted to his studio. His Woman with Crossed Arms (1908) is modeled with the facility of a Clodion, and he has been compared to Gian Bologna. As a young artist, he stated that Rodin's figures looked to him like those clinker-bodied victims of the cataclysm at Pompeii. Brancusi had also turned away from Rodin, and, for a brief moment in 1909 and 1910,
Archipenko was carving figures (WOMAN, HEAD ON KNEE; WOMAN WITH CAT) that stayed monumentally close to the shape of the block. The archetype in this kind is perhaps Brancusi's THE KISS of 1908. In Archipenko, however, there are already conflicting planes building up a tension in the form, and the sculptor's instinct for the swelling curve was to offset this blockiness.

The fluid yet massive little figure, REPOSE (1911)—seen at the Armory Show along with his FAMILY LIFE—hints at the elegance to come. We have already passed the architecturally inspired silhouette, a completely accomplished and nearly abstract spiral figure of 1910. MADONNA OF THE ROCKS is curvilinear Cubism before its time, and a similar composition that goes a long step further into the abstract is DRAPE WOMAN, an up-piling into a pyramid of swirling form. And then we come to the altogether exceptional PENCHÉ.

This little leaning figure sets a life pattern for Archipenko. The image is impersonal, the bulk is gone, and a series of tubular forms or cones with an oval, featureless head provide the plastic vocabulary. In its smoothness it has a “streamlined” quality, although the word had yet to come into existence; and here is the mannerist objet d’art aspect that criticism was quick to assign to Archipenko and has been slow to see in Brancusi. But PENCHÉ is essentially construction with an implied inner backbone or armature that gives it subtle strength. The only things lacking are the Archipenko concaves and voids. He had yet to slice into the cylinder and show us the forms from the inside. In retrospect,
Penché seems so essential to Archipenko’s life work that we ask whence it could have come.

Among his many sources, Archipenko himself lists Byzantine art. There is reference to images in the cathedral of St. Sophia at Kiev. The elongated figure that is Archipenko’s own, is she not essentially Byzantine? Is not the characteristic oval head her Byzantine head from now on and her drapery which is part of her physical and spiritual anatomy, in its series of planes and cones (oftentimes later ribbed or grained), the very essence of Byzantine drapery?

Archipenko is full of language that describes Byzantine art. “All ideas exist forever in the universe at all times, in earth, air, and water, and simultaneously belong to all that exists, has existed or may exist in future, and may serve any purpose.” Or, “a perfect example of spiritual detachment from material existence is music;” or “through the modulation of space, our consciousness participates in the creative process because that which does not exist is re-created within us in the abstract form of space, and becomes a reality in our optical memory... For me the non-existence of something known provoked the desire and impulse to transform the absent into reality.” Archipenko liked to quote Bergson who perhaps led him into the incongruity of a lifetime which troubled neither Bergson nor Archipenko—the drive to be at once dynamic and timeless. Archipenko uses the word “dynamic” constantly. And flux and flow may have challenged the basic Byzantine armature of his art. But contradictions do no harm to an artist; they provide tension.
This stressing of a Byzantine source is not offered out of the vanity of interpretation, for if Archipenko is a maker of icons, does it not account for decades of design adjustment and refinement in several of his major images? Is not ritual art an endless approach to invisible conception? Brancusi’s life work followed the same pattern: invention, refinement, elimination, repetition. Archipenko delighted in the translation of forms into different media; they reappear like a creed in different languages.

In the two years before the First World War, we come to major achievements. To quote Alfred H. Barr, Jr. (Cubism and Abstract Art, 1936): “Archipenko, who had studied Egyptian and archaic Greek figures in the Louvre after his arrival in Paris in 1908, was the first to work seriously and consistently at the problem of Cubist sculpture. . . . After a series of solid Cubistic figures Archipenko modeled in 1912 the radically original WALKING WOMAN in which the Cubist search for far-fetched analogies in the deformation of ‘nature’ is applied to sculpture by substituting voids for solids in the face and torso and concavities and convexities in the left leg and the skirt. The figure was tinted in two tones, perhaps the first departure toward the polychrome which became so conspicuous in Cubist sculpture and construction of 1915-20.

“In 1912 Archipenko also made the first of his famous MEDRANO series of figure constructions in polychrome glass, wood and metal.”

Archipenko’s voids for solids and concavities for convexities are by no means arbitrary devices. In hollowing the figure, he subjects it to more complete exposure than it had ever sustained.

Russian caricature, 1915.
Archipenko’s work used as the caricature of Wilhelm II.
before. The figure lies open to us, and we are aware of it from the inside as it is aware of itself. His new momentous discovery and mastery of living voids, with a matrix or shell enclosing them, states clearly that we are a sentient illusion, hollows within hollows, and voids within voids, and that the inner core or personality is the most immaterial part of us.

At this pre-war date begins the use of color, whether in the construction to which Barr refers, or in painted plaster and terracotta. We see it in this exhibition only in some subdued degree, as color went over into the bronzes. Archipenko did not invent polychrome sculpture, but he used color in sculpture as it had never been used before, and it was to grow upon him—his later work is increasingly polychromatic. For Archipenko, color sets off that division between inner core and outer shell which is so important to him. Just as his concavities give him a whole new range in composition, with a new system of shadows, so color allows Archipenko to superimpose form on form.

Previously, color in sculpture had served to simplify; it went over sculpture like costume, and costume, with its symbolism, was often reason enough for its introduction. But in the real world, color and form are frequently at cross purposes. Color is often for camouflage, for creating an image which does not exist. So it is with the coloration of birds and reptiles. If we bear this in mind, we can see how the sculptor makes form and color impinge on each other, sometimes to reinforce each other, sometimes for the tension between them. This is using color in an essentially modern
way, for controlled complexity. But color patterns fused into sculpture have once more become a common experience; there is no need to argue their case.

12 1912 saw Dance, two fragmentary figures that join hands to define an open space that becomes the core and unity of the composition, and this work leads on to the Blue Dancer (1913), a lyric, airy creature. The shape of spaces is as carefully studied here as are the solid forms. This sculpture breathes the spirit of an epoch, but Archipenko can do still better, and step out of his time, as with Green Concave of the same year. Here he achieves forms that appear altogether noble and primeval. The relation between hollow torso and solid limb strikes us as profound truth; so does the single raised arm, or enough of arm to determine a gesture, and the raised arm reveals a breast. On the other side there is nothing; no gesture, hence no arm, hence no breast. Then (we are still in 1913) come the pure intersecting planes of the construction, Head, possibly his most successful Cubist work, a complete transformation into geometric terms and negative space without loss, even of personality.

Archipenko was given an exhibition in Berlin by Herwarth Walden in 1913. At the time, Apollinaire wrote on Archipenko in Walden's Der Sturm: "One senses in the solemn character of Archipenko's art a religious influence in the development of his temperament. Holy, naive pictures must have been a delight for his eyes as a child." Apollinaire must have thought well of his exuberant essay, as he parsimoniously re-worked it in his

36. Standing Woman (1920) 28½” x 16½"
comments on the Salon des Independents of February, 1914.

In this same fateful year, Archipenko produced what Barr considers his finest sculpture: boxers, a work that has to be mentioned in any history of twentieth-century art. Here we have an architectonic cage of thrust and counter-thrust that makes a composition of the space it encloses, as did dance before it. Also of this same year is gondolier, a superb silhouette, completely stylized, and all the more communicative. The man's sweep merges with a leg, and all is managed with the dignified adroitness of a gondolier at work. Geometric statuette, also of this year, is a perfect little image, at once "minimal" and bold in conception.

The sharp-edged, blade-like flat torso (1914) is followed two years later by white torso, which introduces the neoclassical Archipenko. Woman combing her hair (1915) is one of his most renowned sculptures, very simple (granted the complexities that are now Archipenko's special contributions), monumental, and quite goddess-like in her detachment.

Archipenko lived in Nice for the duration of the war.

Important works came out of those years. Española (1916) is a relief that is both figure and still life on table, an imagery that one might expect to see reserved for painting. Seated black concave (1916) carries the composition of green concave (1913) further.

Egyptian motif (1917) testifies by form and title to Archipenko's early concern with Egyptian sculpture—the svelte forms, the tapered body resolved into geometry, the dignity, the simplification, all this spoke to him. It is a motif that will recur.
with and without color, for in his use of color there is a debt to Egypt too. The inverted cone from the knee down, as we see it in this sculpture, has become part of Archipenko’s language. He is a very conscious, inventive artist. Perhaps—and here he was ahead of his time (our time) for better or worse—he was completely committed to aesthetic inventiveness. For instance, in this figure, one breast, concave, is the inversion of the other. One must accept that in Archipenko the emotion is integral to the idea.

There is a “sculpto-painting” in the next year, a relief well over on the side of painting, but heightened into actuality. Still life with book and vase on the table is rich in color that translates well into bronze, only less arresting than the Española relief of two years before.

In 1918 Archipenko modeled vase figure (Ray is its variant). Earlier than Brancusi’s bird in space, it inevitably invites comparison with it. Ray does not celebrate flight, but the amazing erectness of the human body. There is just enough modulation to make plain that it is a figure; it stands with serenity and poise, and the half moon that serves for head (the oval of face outlined) is alert and lovely. Ray has all the Archipenko virtues, and an overriding dignity achieved without the price of heaviness.

In geometric figure with space and concave (1920), a seated figure, the excitement comes definitely from the abstract quality, for the observer as it does for the artist, and there is a sense of upward climbing, of elevation, of verticality as a characteristic achievement. One feels that he cannot take this
development further without breaking the figure into fragments, or else bringing it support, and these are precisely the steps he takes. The verticality of standing woman (1920) is achieved by the symmetrically placed curvilinear elements that rise out of the receding blue bronze. By contrast, Archipenko then modeled a large figure, turning torso (1921), using the Hellenic half turning torso as a point of departure. But then the deliberate takes over, and the turn becomes tighter, the waist narrower, the axis more defined.

The first years after the war were a time of travel. Archipenko was given a one-man show at the Venice Biennale in 1920. He married Angelica Schmitz in 1921 and for the next two years lived in Berlin. Here he opened a school—he had had a school in Paris as early as 1912, and he would always continue to teach. From Berlin he came to America. He seems to have had a willingness to burn bridges, yet his staying in the United States was more expedience than pilgrimage; he originally planned to exhibit in Japan, with America as a stopover. Wherever he went in America he taught: in New York, in Seattle, in Los Angeles, and for a long time in Chicago, then back in New York and in Woodstock.

His first decade in America included a period of graceful attenuated naturalism—perhaps in an effort to be in contact with the world around him. There is a certain amount of dashing portraiture; many times the model is his new wife. Of a number of little deities, perhaps the best is melancholy (1931). It is really

61. Fragmentary Relief (1959) 23" x 14"
quite grand, in its Baroque way, with the excitement of large concept in small scale. Photography can bring out this largeness. Archipenko’s sculpture photographs well, for that matter, being a strongly defined and conceptual art. Its refinement discourages touching, which would break the spell of its presence. It has the excitement of ideas, the low temperature of thought.

Torso in Space, 1935 and 1936, exists in many versions, one lifesize. The svelte, reclining, upward bent figure has a Madame Recamier to Pauline Bonaparte pose, and indeed, mood; we are uncomfortably in the presence of elegance, and are reminded that elegance, in this century at least, is a packaged product.

Torso in Space belongs to the family of Flat Torso and White Torso, and one suspects that in that moment of very hard times for him and others, in the 1930’s, this was the sculpture that most people managed to like most easily, for it became unfairly a symbol of the artist. Lying Horizontal Figure (1957) is one of the last of these streamlined female silhouettes, brought to an abstract conclusion.

Then in 1936, Seated Black comes as a culmination of the familiar seated torso image. It has a poised strength and simplicity in place of the more open and articulated qualities.

In Architectural Figure (1937), one is tempted to see the first of a new phase. Actually, it is only a revival of vivid polychrome, but it is a magical event, colored like a Japanese pheasant. And where was the audience for this in the mid-thirties? We were illustrating poverty.

62. Kimono (1961) 31½"
In the mid-forties, Archipenko produced sculptures in plastic into which he fed light from below, so that they glow with inner-lighted perimeters, like events in space. The light is thus completely controlled, in fact it is the controlling of light that is the sculpture. As always, these plastics are perfect performances. With Archipenko there never seems to be any evident technical groping; he is a superb craftsman, here exploring methods of carving plastic with complex machinery. Seat Figure (1947) is typical of Archipenko’s rising forms translated into this new medium, Religious Motif (1948) of his frontal hieratic figures. Much was made of these inventions when his work was shown in Europe again in 1955-56. One has the feeling, however, that this is only one more phase of a mobilization of resources, a preparation for the new.

For Archipenko does achieve his final breakthrough in his last ten years; it is quite true that his two periods of greatest inventiveness are the first and last decades of his life as an artist. One must see his late objects in relation to the times that have come upon us. A willingness to use all materials, any method, now has general acceptance. It is now a moment when an exceptional idea is demanded, together with exceptional technical control; there must be no fumble. But often these requirements are not by any means fused, often idea and performance are invited to glare forth as ends in themselves. Multi-Colored Figure (1957) is such a work. The interest vacillates between form-color and hard opaque surface. A figure composed of separate elongated
fragments rises from a background as though breaking the surface of a bath. The rest is a womb-like surround in various levels and colors—Archipenko’s typical oval containing walls. The sculptor does not bother to remind us of anything in our experience, unless we share the experience of his previous work. It is MEDRANO II (a revolutionary painted construction using multi-materials, in the Guggenheim Museum, New York) up to date, with the emphasis on the magical and the forms now taken for granted.

In oval figure of much the same moment, the shape of the figure is a vacancy; the concrete object, light in tone, and fat in full relief, is the space around the figure materialized. The substances are bone clean and smooth. By now, bakelite, mirror background and glass hard surfaces demand an industrial designer’s sensibility. The surfaces are easy to resent. These objects raise distracting questions and unsettle definitions. Before they carry conviction, they mar earlier pleasures, until one says: Let us be fair, the past is past. The sculptor is ahead of his time.

The extreme event of this productive year, 1957, is CLEOPATRA. This is an Arabian Nights fantasy beside which MULTI-COLORED FIGURE is pale and dim. The gold and ivory body is its own couch or barque. Somewhere there is blue sea and a shimmer of wood grain, like water or watered silk. A swan neck, that doubles for an arm, reaches forward and upward, without head, but with a small Egyptian eye, and looks at itself in a real mirror. The reflection is unescapably there, to confirm the hallucination.
A real silver bracelet, a real handful of coral beads, and crystalline stone appear in the background, like objects put into evidence. This is something that an ancient mariner, magically drawing on all the resources of art, might have carved out of whale ivory at the end of a long voyage. Before such an hypnotic presence, who can talk of planes and textures and such jargon? What is important is to avoid the mirror. If symbols are to work, they must be new, and genius is never embarrassed. Archipenko has, in Cleopatra, marshalled a life's experience in use of convex, concave, reflection, floating forms, "sculpto-painting" and assemblage.

Decidedly the sculpture has come alive in a new way. Form is no longer an end in itself; it exists for the magic it contains—to hypnotize. This quality is now inherent. In Kimono (1961), Archipenko has taken the voids usually located at the heads of his statues and opened the main trunk of the torso. The psyche thus emanates through a "heart" rather than through the cerebral center. This shift is reinforced by a fascinating double image—these voids that are breasts also become eyes in a mask-like shape.

Festive (1961) is a tour de force of texture and polychrome even more provocative than Kimono. In this cloaked figure the front view is unabashedly exposed, while from the rear the all-encompassing garment becomes a formidable enclosure. The dichotomy between exposure and inaccessibility reinforced by the polychrome, stirs the fantasies normally allocated to the theatre; the detachment associated with sculpture has vanished.
At this late hour, Archipenko created a great sculpture, *Queen of Sheba* (1961). Sheba is too complex to dismiss with generalities. Starting with the bottom of this large statue (for it does grow upwards in an evolutionary process), a massive concavity, his largest concave, forms the first structure, heavy through size, but freed of bulk by its flowing surge. Inscribed on the hollow walls is a repeated pattern. Out of the space formed by this enclosure rises a vertical shaft with incised upward parallel lines that moves to the next elevation, a massive disk, which it proceeds to penetrate. The surface of this floor is also incised with concentric patterns. The core tapers, then flares out to support the third and last formal level, a half sphere, its flat and smooth side tilted upwards, reflecting. The second and third tiers are connected by four curved struts. At first glance, one thinks these help support the third level alone but, like a suspension bridge, the second, cantilevered level, is partly supported by these ribs. In addition, a second spatial environment is created by this system. The core now passes through the third tier, emerging in a sculptural shape which can only be interpreted as a symbol of an intelligence. But such detailed visual investigation of *Sheba* in no way accounts for the strange imperious sense of the aloof yet alert which invests the figure and gives it its unity.

*Woman in the Chair* (1963) is somehow related to the *Queen of Sheba*. She sits regal, yet strangely benevolent, the magic of the earlier piece remaining in the one gimlet eye.

Archipenko’s *King Solomon* (1963) is horned like Moses, spiky,
august. One must remind oneself when viewing this small sculpture that its architectonics—Archipenko has fused his Cubist and organic shapes into symbolic architecture—were designed for monumental scale, sixty feet high. The idea of this colossus, seen with its diagonal shafts reflecting the atmosphere as no ancient colossus could, is, perhaps, for the artist's last sculpture, his most fitting legacy.

His late images have a quality which cannot be rationally explained; they are unified by a presence within them which does not seem to be directly related to their form or shape. But we recognize them, and they us, and this recognition has a vaguely ennobling effect on the beholder. It is as though Archipenko, in his early work, was able to make plain that a void was there, and in his last work was able to fill it.

But then there are the drawings and prints, and, above all, the remarkable sculpture studies from 1932-35. When so little seemed to be happening, we can look at sculptures that had yet to come into being, and did in due course. Here Archipenko explains himself: shells, carapaces, endlessly the sense of hidden core, of contrast between opaque outside, and the transparent living void, a world in which the appearance versus the inner reality of woman is an endless theme. Archipenko's art is to make a division between sacred and profane space.

FREDERICK S. WIGHT
ARCHIPENKO's drawings and prints fall into two general categories: those which are studies for sculpture and those which use existent sculpture as a point of departure for further research. The sketches of 1932 to 1935, for example, were eventually realized in sculpture, were rejected, or further refined in subsequent drawings. The closeness of the sketch to the final sculpture is striking—simplicity and self-assurance are so evident that we might well interpret them as the final conception before working in the round. However, by observing the artist's notations on concaves, space, textures and colors, we can follow his continuing creative process of choice and refinement. Those which were selected for sculpture and those rejected, taken together, give us an entrée into the sculptor's symbolic language.

The color drawing, Festive (1961), which evolved from a small work sketch, is the artist's color and textural research for the polychromed bronze of the same name. Although the color in the drawing is more vivid than in the sculpture, the balance and interaction of textures, colors, volumes, and silhouette are basically established. The translation into bronze is not facile, since the sculpture has its own color-patina requirements and adjustments, problems inherent in bronze polychromy.

The drawing, Space, Light, Transparency (1948), was done after the plexiglass sculpture, Seated Figure (1947). The carved plastic's internal lighting could only be studied after it existed sculpturally and could be lit; Archipenko probably believed that by carefully drawing this phenomenon post facto he could explore sculpted light for further work in a technique.

116. Luminosité des Formes (1963) 30" x 22"
he was pioneering. It is interesting to compare this drawing with his use of luminosity in *Les Formes encerclées* (1963), from the St. Gallen series, where a bent light effect has been masterfully achieved with the lithographic crayon. Other drawings concerned with internal light include *People* (c. 1951) and *Illuminated Figures* (1948). The former gives cursory indications of where the light would emerge compositionally within the large plexiglass wall. In the latter, the artist used a technique he called "engraved painting." He scratched through an overlay of dark tone to reach a white base, controlling the modeling in this manner and achieving an effect of pure form and intense luminosity. The surrounding vibrant colors add to the electric intensity of this composition.

*Torsos in Space* (1953), the print inspired by the sculpture of the same name of 1935, combines lithography, silk screen and embossing. Archipenko placed the silhouetted form against a pointillist background and silk-screened over a reflecting aluminum ink, to produce an over-all vibration that offsets the serene and self-contained torso. He has also placed in the upper right of the print a figure which subtly emerges from the background, thus creating the familiar classical dialogue. The contour of the torso in space has been further accented by embossing its silhouette. This major print in Archipenko's graphic oeuvre hints at sculptural concepts to come, namely *Cleopatra* (1957). The imagery is prepared and its intrinsic arrangement with mixed media is indicated.

The lithograph, *Coquette* (c. 1950), is superficially reminiscent
of the style of Marie Laurencin. But the deep sculptural form of this figure has an almost ominous presence and explores the thematic material expanded upon in Archipenko's late sculpture, such as Woman in the Chair (1963) or even Queen of Sheba (1961). The dark blue of this lithograph, a pigment first applied to his early German lithographs, heightens the perception of form in space—a patina device he occasionally used in his late sculpture, such as Linear Oriental (1961).

Archipenko produced many lithographs during his residence in Germany between 1920 and 1923. The number is unclear, for there is yet to be prepared a catalogue raisonné of the artist’s graphic works, but it is known that they had a broad influence on artists in Western Europe and even in Poland. One of these prints is Two Women (1921), from the important collaborative portfolio, Die Bauhaus Mappen. The soft lithographic strokes and open composition of Still Life (1922) contrast with other artists’ cubist prints of this subject which were usually etched. It is interesting to compare this print with the “sculpto-painting,” Still Life (1957), and its bronze counterpart of the same year.

Realizing a sculpture from a drawing sometimes involved a time gap as wide as a half a century. One example is the small lithograph, Seated Figure (1913), his earliest known print, from which the bronze relief, Abstraction, was made in 1959.

The little drypoint, Angelica (1922), is also in the Cubist mode, with its deep angular strokes. Here again, as in his two delicate drypoints, Kneeling, and Bending (1916), Archipenko is working out sculptural problems. The head of Angelica is to
appear in this three-quarter view in terra cotta and bronze, merged into a solid background.

The series of ten lithographs entitled **LES FORMES VIVANTES** (1963), his last prints, also evolved from the type of pencil notations alluded to earlier. Each one can be interpreted as a projected sculptural problem expressed planographically. They range from concentrated volume to expanding space, from controlled atmospheric rendering to sfumato, from chiaroscuro to calligraphy. The lithographic medium is exploited in all its gradations and vibrant contrasts. The white of the paper functions in many ways: as a color, as an internal or spatial light or as a subtle highlight. There is an audacity in Archipenko’s use of this medium which takes getting used to. As our vision clears, the cogency of the title, **LES FORMES VIVANTES**, becomes revealed; these are truly living forms that can provoke the viewer and draw him into creative participation. The large lithographs were more than studies for individual sculptures, they were massive stimuli. Unfortunately, they were produced at the end of the artist’s long career (he was seventy-four) with no time left to finish the sculptural journey that they chart.

When evaluating the spectrum of Archipenko’s work on paper, his sketches, studies, gouaches, pastels and collages, and his etchings and lithographs, one is inclined to rank him as one of the most versatile and acute draftsmen among the master sculptors of this century.

**DONALD H. KARSHAN**
SCULPTURE

1. Adam and Eve (1908) 19 3/4"
2. Crossed Arms (1908) 13 1/4"

5. Woman with Cat (1910) 13 3/4"

3. Woman (Head on Knee) (1909) 17"
8. Draped Woman (1911) 22″

7. Repose (1911) 13½″ x 14½″
6. Penché (Bending) (1910) 11\frac{1}{4}”

11. Walking (1912) 52\frac{1}{2}”
10. Family Life (1912) 22"

13. Seated Figure (1912) 15½"
12. Dance (1912) 24½" x 19"

14. Blue Dancer (1913) 41"
22. Boxers (Struggle) (1914) 23\frac{1}{2}" x 18"

17. Green Concave (Woman Combing Her Hair) (1913) 19\frac{1}{2}"
16. Seated Geometric Figure
(Seated Figure) (1913) 18”

18. Small Reclining Figure (1913) 4½” x 12¼”
19. Flat Torso (1914) 15 1/4"

21. Gondolier (1914) 32 1/4"
24. Geometric Statuette (Statuette) (1914) 27"
20. Statue on Triangular Base (Statuette) (1914) 29¼”

27. Woman Combing Her Hair (1915) 71”
28. Portuguese (Woman Standing) (1916) 24"
30. White Torso (1916) 18½”

Left: Vase Figure (1918) 18”
Right: Vase Figure (1919) 23”
(Source for Ray)

35. Ray (1919) 63¼”
33. Egyptian Motif (1917) 13 3/4"

37. Geometric Figure with Space and Concave (Geometric Seated Figure) (1920) 25 1/2"
38. Turning Torso (1921) 28"
41. Melancholy (1931) 13⅔"  

43. Seated, Black (1936) 21⅜"  

40. Hand (c.1928) 7"
44. Architectural Figure (1937) 34½”
(wood, polychromed)

45. Seated Figure (1947) 22½”
(carved plastic)

46. Religious Motif (1948) 36”
(carved plastic)

48. Dualism (1954) 22½”
50. Oval Figure (1957) 43" x 36½"
(wood, bakelite)

53. Orange and Black (1957) 49" x 25"
(wood, metal, bakelite)
52. Multi-colored Figure (1957) 51\(\frac{3}{4}\)" x 25\(\frac{3}{4}\)"
(wood, metal, plastic)

54. Walking (1957) 16\(\frac{1}{2}\)"

58. Flying (1957) 11\(\frac{1}{2}\)"
57. Objects on the Table (1957) 25” x 16½”

55. Lying Horizontal Figure (Lying Figure) (1957) 5½” x 14”
63. Linear Oriental (1961) 24½”

64. Queen of Sheba (1961) 65”
66. Woman in the Chair (Seated Woman) (1963) 11⅝”

67. King Solomon (1963) 26¼”
DRA   WINGS

70. Figure, sketch for sculpto-painting (1919) 13⅜” x 9¼”

72. Nine Work Sketches for Sculpture (1932-1935) 29¼” x 18⅜”
73. Nine Work Sketches for Sculpture (1932-1935) 29½" x 18¼"

92. Four Figures (1962) 13¾" x 11¼"
89. Two Figures (1960) 21½" x 27½"

75. Ten Work Sketches for Sculpture (1932-1935) 28½" x 17¼"
93. Linear Ovals (1962) 27¾" x 21½"

94. Figure on Orange Background (1962) 31¾" x 26½"
PRINTS

104. Still Life (1922) 12" x 16"

114. Le Couronnement des Formes (1963) 30" x 22"
117. Les Formes Majestueuses (1963) 30" x 22"
118. Les Rendez-Vous des Quatre Formes (1963) 30" x 22"
When Archipenko produced a variant design based on an earlier idea that he had previously developed, he dated the new variant with the early source date. There are sixteen sculptures in the exhibition (those with asterisks in the listing below) that were produced during an approximate ten year period from 1950 through 1960, in which the artist worked from several early designs and refined and modified them. Several of the source designs were first done in papier-mâché and other perishable materials. Others, like the Family Life plaster, were destroyed in World War I. By making the later variants, the artist was able to work the older ideas and modify them according to subsequent experiences, as well as to enable the making of permanent bronze editions.

All sculptures are in bronze unless otherwise noted.

Names in parentheses are other titles by which sculptures are or were known. Casts “A” are artist’s casts.

Measurements do not include small attached bases designed by the artist. A single dimension refers to height; with more than one dimension, height precedes width.

2. 1908 CROSSED ARMS, 13 1/8”, cast 2/12.
4. 1909 BLACK SEATED TORSO, 15”, cast “A”.
5. 1910 WOMAN WITH CAT, 13 1/4”, cast 1/12.
7. 1911 REPOSE, 13 1/2” x 14 1/2”, cast 7/8.
8. 1911 DRAPEOED WOMAN, 22”, cast 4/6.
10. 1912 *FAMILY LIFE, 22”, cast 1/12. Cast from plaster circa 1960 which is a variant of the six foot high plaster destroyed in World War I.
11. 1912 *WALKING, POLychROMED, 52 1/2”, cast “A”. Cast from plaster circa 1958 which is a variant of the 24” plaster conceived in 1912. A 27” variant was made in 1918 and another was made in 1935.
12. 1912 *DANCE, 24 1/8” x 19”, cast 6/8. Cast from plaster of circa 1955 which is a variant of the plaster conceived in 1912.
13. 1912 SEATED FIGURE, 15 1/2”, cast 1/12.
15. 1913 HEAD, POLYCHROMED, 14 7/8”, cast 6/6. This cast made from original wood construction of 1913.
16. 1913 *SEATED GEOMETRIC FIGURE (SEATED FIGURE), POLYCHROMED, 18”, cast “A”. Cast from polychromed terra cotta circa 1935. This is a variant of a plaster conceived in 1913.
17. 1913 *GREEN CONCAVE (WOMAN COMING HER HAIR), 19 1/8”, cast 4/6. Cast from a terra cotta circa 1935 which is a variant of the terra cotta conceived in 1913.
18. 1913 SMALL RECLINING FIGURE, 4 1/8” x 12 1/8”, cast 3/12.
19. 1914 FLAT TORSO, 15 1/4”, cast “A”.
20. 1914 *STATUE ON TRIANGULAR BASE (STATUETTE), 29 7/8”, cast 5/8. Cast from plaster circa 1955 which is a variant of the plaster conceived in 1914.
21. 1914 GONDOLIER, 32 1/2”, cast 7/12. Cast from plaster of circa 1955 which is a variant of the plaster conceived in 1914. A 64” version was made circa 1953.
22. 1914 BOXERS (STRUGGLE), 23 1/2” x 18”, cast 7/8.
23. 1914 *WOMAN WITH PAN, relief, polychromed, 35 3/4", cast 2/8. Cast from plaster circa 1958 which is a variant of painted construction in wood, glass, metal, and canvas conceived in 1914.

24. 1914 *GEOMETRIC STATUETTE (STATUETTE), polychromed, 27", cast 3/6. Cast from polychromed terra cotta of circa 1935 which is a variant of polychromed terra cotta of 1914.


27. 1915 *WOMAN COMING HER HAIR, 71", cast "A." Cast from plaster circa 1952 which is a variant of the 13 3/4" plaster conceived in 1915. A 25" variant was also made.

28. 1916 *PORTUGUESE (WOMAN STANDING), polychromed, 24", cast 3/6. Cast from a polychromed terra cotta which was produced circa 1935. The terra cotta was based on a monochromed plaster design of 1916.

29. 1916 *SEATED BLACK CONCAVE (SEATED FIGURE), 30 1/2", cast 5/8. Cast from plaster circa 1958 which is a variant of the 14" terra cotta conceived in 1916. A 14" variant was also made.

30. 1916 WHITE TORSO, 18 3/4", cast "A."


32. 1917 FIGURE, sculpto-painting, oil on canvas and wood, 27" x 20 1/2".

33. 1917 EGYPTIAN MOTIF, 13 3/4", cast "A."

34. 1918 *STILL LIFE WITH BOOK AND VASE ON THE TABLE (STILL LIFE), relief, polychromed, 13 3/4" x 18", cast 4/8.

35. 1919 RAY, aluminum, 63 3/4", cast 5/6. Cast from plaster of 1956 which is a variant of the 18" and 23" plasters conceived in 1918 and 1919 and called "Vase Figures."


37. 1920 GEOMETRIC FIGURE WITH SPACE AND CONCAVE (GEOMETRIC SEATED FIGURE), 25 1/2", cast 4/8. Cast from plaster circa 1955 which is a variant of the terra cotta conceived in 1920.


40. C.1928 HAND, bronze, gold plated, 7".

41. 1931 MELANCHOLY, lead, 13 3/4", cast 1/3.

42. 1935 TORSO IN SPACE, 8 1/2" x 27 1/2".

43. 1936 SEATED, BLACK, 21 1/2", cast 4/6.

44. 1937 ARCHITECTURAL FIGURE, wood, polychromed, 34 3/8".

45. 1947 SEATED FIGURE, carved plastic, illuminated from within, 22 1/2".

46. 1948 RELIGIOUS MOTIF, carved plastic, illuminated from within, 36".

47. 1953 MEDIEVAL, relief, polychromed, 25" x 21", cast 1/8.


49. 1954 QUEEN, wood, polychromed, 34".

50. 1957 OVAL FIGURE, sculpto-painting, wood, bakelite, 43" x 36 1/2".
51. 1957  STATUE ON ALUMINUM BASE (FIGURE), polychromed, 18¼", cast 2/6.
52. 1957  MULTI-COLORED FIGURE, sculpto-painting, wood, metal, plastic, 51¼" x 25¾".
53. 1957  ORANGE AND BLACK, sculpto-painting, wood, metal, bakelite, 49" x 25".
54. 1957  WALKING, polychromed, 16½", cast 1/8.
55. 1957  LYING HORIZONTAL FIGURE (LYING FIGURE), polychromed, 5½" x 14", cast 3/6.
56. 1957  OBJECTS ON THE TABLE, sculpto-painting, wood, 25" x 16¾".
59. 1959  EAGLE, polychromed bronze on marble, relief, 10½" x 15½", cast number 1/8.
60. 1959  ABSTRACTION, bronze on marble, relief, 17" x 17", cast number 1/6. Based on a design in a lithograph of 1913 (see exhibition catalogue number 98 in prints section).
61. 1959  FRAGMENTARY RELIEF, polychromed bronze on marble, relief, 23" x 14", cast 1/8.

DRAWINGS

71. c. 1932  SEATED NUDE, charcoal and pastel, 20" x 12½". Signed.
72. 1932-1935  NINE WORK SKETCHES FOR SCULPTURE, pencil, 20½" x 18½". Signed. Red circles are artist's annotations indicating those that were executed as sculpture.
73. 1932-1935  NINE WORK SKETCHES FOR SCULPTURE, pencil, 20½" x 18¼". Signed. Red circles are artist's annotations indicating those that were executed as sculpture.
74. 1932-1935  FIVE WORK SKETCHES FOR SCULPTURE, pencil, 26¼" x 19½". Signed. Red circles are artist's annotations indicating those that were executed as sculpture.
75. 1932-1935  TEN WORK SKETCHES FOR SCULPTURE, pencil, 28½" x 17¼". Signed. Red circles are artist's annotations indicating those that were executed as sculpture.
76. 1932-1935  TEN WORK SKETCHES FOR SCULPTURE, pencil, 26¼" x 21". Signed.
77. 1932-1935  NINE WORK SKETCHES FOR SCULPTURE, pencil, 27¾" x 16½". Signed. Red circles are artist's annotations indicating those that were executed as sculpture.
78. c.1940  MOTHER AND CHILD, pencil, ink and gouache, 17½" x 11 3/8". Signed.

79. 1948  ILLUMINATED FIGURES, oil and ink, 22 3/4" x 16 3/4". Signed. The artist engraved lines into the oil paint while still wet, a process he named "engraved painting."

80. 1948  SPACE, LIGHT, TRANSPARENCY, ink and colored pencil, 28 5/8" x 14 3/4". Signed. After lucite sculpture, "Seated Figure," 1947.

81. 1948  AFRICANA, gouache and pencil, 28 1/2" x 7 7/8". Signed. After polychromed terra cotta, "Orange and Black," 1940.

82. 1948  THREE FIGURES IN THREE COLORS, ink and colored pencil, 21 3/4" x 13 3/4". Signed.

83. c.1951  PEOPLE, pencil and gouache, 10 1/2" x 13". Signed. Study for movable wall in transparent carved plastic, to be illuminated from within.

84. c.1957  STILL LIFE WITH JUG, ink, 18 1/2" x 12 1/4". Signed.

85. c.1960  STUDY FOR SCULPTO-PAINTING, pencil, 11 1/2" x 7 7/8".


87. 1960  TWO FIGURES, pencil, ink, gouache, 13 1/4" x 10 3/4". Signed.


89. 1960  TWO FIGURES, gouache and pastel, 21 1/2" x 27 1/2". Signed.


92. 1962  FOUR FIGURES, collage and colored pencil, 13 3/4" x 11 1/4". Signed.

93. 1962  LINEAR OVALS, gouache and colored pencil, 27 7/8" x 21 1/2". Signed.

94. 1962  FIGURE ON ORANGE BACKGROUND, gouache and pastel, 31 3/4" x 26 1/4". Signed.

95. 1962  STUDY FOR POLYCHROMED WOOD CONSTRUCTION, gouache and pastel, 26 5/8" x 32 1/4". Signed and dated 1962.

96. 1962  THREE FIGURES, gouache and colored pencil, 27 1/2" x 21 1/2". Signed.

PRINTS

97. 1913  TWO FIGURES, lithograph, Paris, 12" x 9". Signed in the stone and annotated by the artist "Lacerba 1914." Reproduced in Lacerba (Italy), 1914.


100. 1916  BENDING, dry-point etching, 10" x 6". Unsigned. Posthumous proof by Estate of the artist.

101. 1916  KNEELING, dry-point etching, 7" x 5". Signed "A.A." Posthumous proof by Estate of the artist.

103. 1922 ANGELICA, dry-point etching, Berlin, 6½" x 4½". Signed and dated 1922.


107. 1953 TORSO IN SPACE, lithograph, silk screen, and embossing, 14¾" x 23¾". Artist's proof. Signed.

108. 1962 MOTHER AND CHILD, two-color lithograph, 20½" x 20½". Signed and numbered 48/50. Published by "Im Erker" Press, St. Gallen.


CHRONOLOGY

1887
May 30. Born in Kiev, Ukraine, Russia, to Porfiry Antonovich and
Poroskovia Wassilievna Machova Archipenko. Paternal grandfather,
icon painter. Father, mechanical engineer and inventor, professor of
engineering, University of Kiev.
Privately tutored to age nine, when entered Kiev Gymnasium.

1900
Injured left elbow in bicycle accident. Confined to bed age 13-14. Stud-
iied and copied Michelangelo drawings from book given to him by
grandfather.

1902
Having grasped the relationship between mathematics and art, de-
cided on career in art. Inspired by "the fact that Leonardo's creative
genius not only covered art, but science as well as engineering and
that he considered mathematics as the foundation of all arts."
Entered art school in Kiev to study painting and then sculpture. Influ-
cenced by Byzantine tradition in art, the writings of Andreyev, and
later, the revolution of 1905.

1905
Expelled from art school because he criticized his teachers for being
"too old fashioned and academic."

1906
First one-man show in a town in the Ukraine.
Went to Moscow, worked and participated in different group shows.

1908
Left for Paris at age 20.
Entered Ecole des Beaux Arts, but left after two weeks, finding the
academic system too confining and tedious.
Continued study of art independently in museums. "My real school
was the Louvre and I attended it daily." Inspired especially by Egyp-
tian, Assyrian, archaic Greek, and early Gothic works.

Established Montparnasse studio where Modigliani, Gaudier-Brzeska
and others studied sculpture with him.

1909
Produced series of revolutionary sculptures, such as SEATED BLACK
TORSO, SUZANNE, AND WOMAN (HEAD ON KNEE).

1910
Began exhibiting in Salon des Artistes Indépendents (showed in
1910, 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914).
"Section d'Or" formed in Paris. Archipenko among its members, who
exhibited together until 1914 and again for a short time after the war.
Included Picasso, Braque, Gris, Léger, Delaunay, de La Fresnaye,
Villon, Picabia, and Marcel Duchamp.

1911
Exhibited in Salon d'Automne, Paris (also in 1912, 1913, 1919).
French newspaper caricatured sculpture, WOMAN WITH CAT, which
was displayed in this exhibition.

1912
Opened own art school in Paris.
First one-man exhibition in Germany at Folkwang Museum, Hagen.
Catalogue analysis by Guillaume Apollinaire.
Produced sculpture, MEDRANO (JUGGER), the first three-dimen-
sional construction in modern sculpture in various painted materials
(wood, glass, metal wire). Rejected by jury of Salon d'Automne in
Paris; exhibited in Budapest, 1913, in Exposition d'Art Moderne,
organized by Alexandre Mercereau.
Started creating reliefs, generally made of plaster, carved and
painted, which he named "Sculpo-Printures." These are the first
sculpto-paintings in modern art.
Created WALKING WOMAN, first modern sculpture formed with ab-
stracted concaves to create implied volume and abstracted voids
(openings through mass).
Produced dance, one of first examples in modern sculpture of creating a spatial environment; reproduced and ridiculed on the cover of the English magazine, The Sketch, of October 29, 1913.

1913

Represented by four sculptures and five drawings in Armory Show in New York, including family life which was ridiculed by caricature in The World (New York).
First one-man exhibition at Der Sturm Gallery, Berlin.
Produced highly polychromed sculpture, Carrousel Pierrot.
Created Head, construction with crossing planes.

1914

Created boxers, one of the most abstract modern sculptures done to that date.
Produced gondolier, caricatured in Le Bonnet Rouge, No. 15, 7 Mars 1914 (Paris).
Cubist exhibition held by Mânes Society, Prague, organized by Alexandre Mercereau, included five sculptures of Archipenko, five of Brancusi, and six of Duchamp-Villon.

1915

Produced sculpture, Woman combing her hair, which again used deep concaves and void.

1915-1918

Spent war years working on his sculpture in a villa at Cimiez, a suburb of Nice, loaned him by a wealthy friend.

1918

Produced sculpture, Ray, first of three highly simplified vase figures. Left collection of plasters of early work with Monsieur and Madame Jean Verdier in Cannes, for safe-keeping, on the eve of his departure for Germany.

1919

Began extensive tour exhibiting his works in various European cities, including Geneva, Zurich, Paris, London, Brussels, Athens, Berlin, Munich, etc., lasting through 1921.

1920

Large one-man show in Biennale Exhibition, Venice (XII Exposizione Internazionale d'Arte). Ridiculed in Le Corriere della Sera of June 11, 1920. Cardinal La Fontaine, Patriarch of Venice advised the faithful not to attend. “Section d'Or,” of which Archipenko was member, resumed exhibiting after war (in Paris at Galerie Weill, and in Brussels, 1920; in Rome—organized by Enrico Prampolini, and in Geneva, 1921).

1921

Married Angelica Bruno-Schmitz, German sculptress and great granddaughter of artist, Bonaventura Genelli.
Moved to Berlin, opened own art school.
Symposium on the Psychology of Modern Art and Archipenko held at Société Anonyme, New York.
Retrospective exhibition in Potsdam. Catalogue introduction by Ivan Goll.
“Archipenko Album” by Ivan Goll, Theodor Däubler and Blaise Cendrars published in Potsdam by Gustav Kiepenheuer Verlag.
One-man exhibition at Der Sturm Gallery, Berlin.

1923


1924

Opened summer art school in Woodstock, New York.

Invented variable image system as “movable painting” known as “Peinture Changeante” (also called “Archipentura”), (U.S. Patent 1,626,496 granted in 1927), dedicated to Thomas Edison and Albert Einstein. “The observer is shown a screen on which is painted an abstract form. Archipenko presses an electric button, the abstract form begins to change proceeding through most of the phases of the female body Archipenko painted and chiseled.”

Featured at one-man exhibition at The Anderson Galleries, New York, in 1928.

One man exhibition, Société des Artistes Nikka, Tokyo, Japan.

1927

Became an American citizen.

1929

Number of exhibitions of works of students at Arko, a laboratory school for ceramics which Archipenko established in New York City. Purchased thirteen acres on abandoned rock quarry site near Woodstock, New York, art colony. Began construction of what was to be a complex of art school buildings, his own studio, and new location for his summer art school.

1932

Started to lecture on theories of creativeness in colleges and universities on Pacific Coast, in the Middle West and the East.

1933

Taught at Mills College, Oakland, California (Summer Session), and at Chouinard School, Los Angeles.

1935

Took up residence in California, opened own art school in Los Angeles, and exhibited in several western cities.

1935-1936

Taught summer sessions, University of Washington, Seattle.

1937

Moved to Chicago; opened school of creative fine arts.

Associate instructor at New Bauhaus School of Industrial Arts, Chicago.

1939

Created moose, seven foot high sculpture, for benefit of artists exiled by Fascist regimes of Europe, but its planned tour was cancelled due to delays of wartime transportation. During the Nazi purge of “decadent modern art,” twenty-two of his paintings and most of his sculpture then owned by German museums were confiscated; and his work was singled out for attack in the Nazi book, *Saubertung des Kunsttempels*, by Wolfgang Willrich (Munich: Verlag J. F. Lehmanns, 1937).

Returned to New York. Re-opened art school as well as summer school in Woodstock, New York.

1944

Taught at the Dalton School, New York.

1946

Taught at the Institute of Design, Chicago.

1947

Produced seated figure, the first carved plastic sculpture illuminated from within, featured at his 78th one-man show at the New York Galleries of the Associated American Artists, in 1948.
1950
Taught at the University of Kansas City, Kansas City, Missouri. Commissioned to create two statues for the entrance of the University. The two identical iron figures, 14-foot high constructions with crossing planes, were completed in 1951.

1950-1951
Made lecture tour of southern cities of United States.

1951
Taught at Carmel Institute of Art, Carmel, California; at the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon; and at the University of Washington, Seattle.

1952
Taught at University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware.
Delegate to U.N.E.S.C.O., New York City.
One-man exhibition, Museum of Modern Art, Sao Paulo, Brazil.

1953
Inaugurated Associate Member of International Institute of Arts and Letters.
One-man exhibition, El Instituto Guatemalteco-Americano, Guatemala City, Guatemala. 1955-1956
Tour of one-man exhibition to six German cities.

1955
Began work on book, Archipenko: Fifty Creative Years 1908-1958, by Alexander Archipenko and Fifty Art Historians, a 346-page book which includes a 52-page manifesto on creativity by Archipenko, an extensive bibliography, quotations, and 292 plates of his works.

1956
Taught at the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
Produced REVOLVING FIGURE (THE ART OF REFLECTION), a 78-inch high, motorized, revolving construction with crossing planes, made of wood, mother-of-pearl, formica and metal.

1957
Created CLEOPATRA, a 38-inch by 84-inch sculpto-painting of wood and bakelite, polychromed.
December 5. Angelica died at age 65.

1959
Awarded Medaglia D'Oro at XIII Biennale d'Arte Triveneta, III Concorso Internazionale del Bronzetto, Sala della Ragione, Padova, Italy, in October.

1960
August 1. Married Frances Gray, a sculptor and former student.
Recovery of plasters of early works stored in 1918 by Monsieur and Madame Jean Verdier in a gardener's cottage on their property in Cannes.

1961
Produced 66-inch high sculpture, QUEEN OF SHEBA, his last large bronze.

1962
Elected to the Department of Art of the National Institute of Arts and Letters.

1963
Produced LES FORMES VIVANTES, a series of ten lithographs, his last graphics, at Erker-Presse in St. Gallen, Switzerland.
Large retrospective exhibition of Archipenko sculpture, drawings and prints at Ente Premi Roma in Rome and Centro Culturale S. Fedele in Milan in 1963, and at Galerie Stangl in Munich in 1964.

1964
February 25. Alexander Archipenko died in New York, shortly after casting his last sculpture, KING SOLOMON.

1965
Preparations begun for memorial retrospective exhibition sponsored by UCLA and traveling to eleven museums across the country.
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