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Auguste Rodin proclaimed again and again that his works reflected his role as nature’s “sublime copyist”. His words continue to echo in our ears. French writer Paul Gsell recounts a conversation in which Rodin said, “I obey Nature in everything, and I never pretend to command her. My only ambition is to be slavishly faithful to her.” In a 1913 interview with painter and politician H. C. E. Dujardin-Beauzet, Rodin asserted, “Art cannot be made except by approaching truth; thus nature is the only model that must be followed, since she inspires us and gives us the truth of the impression, shows us the truth of forms, and, when we copy her with sincerity, she shows us the means of uniting and expressing them.” And, after the sculptor’s death, another author remembered him claiming, “I don’t intervene. Between nature and the paper, I have eliminated my talent.”

Especially in the scholarship on his drawings – an oeuvre that comprises over seven thousand works in the Musée Rodin alone – his mantra about copying nature is ubiquitous. Rodin scholar Albert Elsen stated that “as a draftsman Rodin was a passionate reporter”, observing that ‘after about 1890 Rodin drew almost exclusively from the model’. More recently, Christina Buley-Uribe, former curator at the Musée Rodin, wrote that after 1900 “it was to the life model, to the drawing from nature, that Rodin now turned.” And while there are thousands of drawings that attest to the validity of these claims, there are many others that demand a more nuanced reading. This essay presents a counter-narrative to the persistent protestations of Rodin’s faithfulness to nature by examining a series of works on paper created over the course of his career, from the early so-called black drawings to the late watercolours of the models who roamed his studio. In them, Rodin often used collage, a technique associated with the modernist experiments of Pablo Picasso and Georges Braque in the early 1910s when they playfully invented a ‘Cubist’ language by engaging with pictorial codes and un-traditional materials. However, collage was not invented by the Cubists, and decades earlier Rodin had already engaged daringly and innovatively with this technique, which had been utilised by artists ever since the Renaissance. Moreover, in his later years, he would often make additional copies, tracing and retracing the outline of a figure onto new sheets of paper so that he could continue to play with its form, moving further away from ‘nature’ and toward the equally fertile realm of his imagination with each mark he made with pen or pencil.
The early years: collage and the black drawings

In the black drawings, Rodin devotes much ink to images he saw only in his mind's eye. These include disturbing illustrations inspired by Dante's *Inferno* such as his renditions of Ugolino's tragic tale, or re-imaginings of artworks he had copied in the Louvre. A drawing such as *Centaur Abducting a Young Man* [126] calls to mind the combat depicted on the Elgin marbles, yet its turbulence is heightened by the strong diagonal of the rearing centaur's body and the animated lines that surround the centaur and its rider. These lines emphasize the ferocity of the clash between the species, their bodies interlocked and rocking violently in battle. The gouache is applied sculpturally; as art critic Noël Clément-Janin wrote in 1903, “these whites, these reserves, are the high point of relief”.[10] Underneath the centaur’s muscular body, it gives the impression of dust stirred up by their combat. Here we have just the sort of twisted bodies that are characteristic of Rodin’s sculptural oeuvre: the centaur’s torso coiled as it turns almost 180 degrees to confront its rider, whose legs are pain-fully splayed across its back.

[126]
*Centaur Abducting a Young Man* (c. 1880). SMK/KKS. Cat. 5
Another black drawing, *Man Embracing a Woman* [24, 127], depicts a passionate embrace between two individuals. The larger figure's arms are wrapped tightly around his companion, but his voraciously gaping mouth and the figures' awkward positioning lend an uneasy quality to the image. The instability of the man's taut torso holding the semi-recumbent pose is both countered and exacerbated by his outsize left foot that seems to anchor his lower body to the ground, wedged into the bottom corner of the image. The drawing is on an irregularly cut piece of ruled paper, but the very top of the kneeling woman's head is completed on a tiny scrap of lighter-coloured paper whose shape echoes the curve of her skull. The main image and the additional scrap have both been glued onto a larger piece of paper. This may have been done simply to reinforce the fragile drawing, but it also serves as a sort of frame for the couple's rough embrace.
More dramatic still is the angular outline of the *Centaur and Woman* [128], aggressively cut and pasted onto a lighter sheet. Rodin’s scissor work renders jagged exaggerations in loose, rough echoes of the contours of these bodies, making the centaur in particular appear larger and more menacing as a result. The long horizontal shape around the back hooves acts as a sort of base to the figural group, securing its rearing, unstable form. Both the mythological creature and the woman on its back have been highlighted in white gouache, yet these dabs of white do not help to define the figures. The confusion is especially pronounced where the woman’s left shoulder meets the centaur’s right: here their bodies are conflated in an agglomeration of pen, pencil, brown wash and white gouache. Rodin has added marks to the support after pasting the figures down; the centaur’s raised hands conjure a flame-like mass of dark, translucent lines, extending the image vertically on the page and heightening the sense of imbalance. Thus, even in his early years as an artist, as he slowly developed a “highly personal style in sculptural imagery”, Rodin experimented with the technique of collage and its potential to contribute to the power, drama and even irrationality of a scene. As its inscription makes clear, *Centaur and Woman* was reproduced in 1897 in the extraordinary Goupil Album as *Return from the Sabbath*, its figures darker and moodier, with wash insinuating mist and shadow.12

---

[128]

_Centaur and Woman* (c. 1885). Philadelphia Museum of Art. Cat. 16
Another collage reproduced in this album, *Demon in Space*, exemplifies Rodin’s early inventiveness with paper, pen and scissors [129]. The body of a flailing figure, made up solely of black ink with no defining of forms or features, is glued at a diagonal on an otherwise blank piece of paper. The strong outlines of the demon’s body are formed by the edge of the paper cut by the artist’s scissors. There is enough information here to be able to read the image: the figure falling back, arms stretched out in a futile effort to regain balance, legs unprepared to hold it up, head turned towards the void created by the blindingly white paper on which it has been mounted. With remarkably reduced means, Rodin has crafted a figure that activates the space around it. Leo Steinberg saw the “implied space” of Rodin’s sculpture as critical to its modernity; his words apply equally well to this collage:

> Psychologically, it supplies a threat of imbalance which serves like a passport to the age of anxiety. Physically, it suggests a world in which voids and solids interact as modes of energy.14
Rodin experimented with other types of collages in these early years. Count Guidon is a drawing pasted onto a support illustrated with an ornate oval frame [130]. His rectangular image does not respect the elliptical space of the frame; the corners protrude, covering some of it and making the viewer exceedingly aware of the two-dimensionality of its naturalistically rendered branches, leaves and flowers. Yet Rodin cannot resist tweaking the viewer’s nose, dabbing in some playful tension: a pair of delicately arching lines at the bottom edge of his drawing suggest a continuation of the lush foliage of the frame ‘underneath’ and visually imply that his drawing has been placed inside a three-dimensional frame.\textsuperscript{15}

[130] An Angel will Come to Light the Torches, the Dead Ashes, known as Count Guidon (n. d.)
Museum of Fine Arts of Lyon
A brief history of collage

There are also collages in which Rodin extended the image by adding paper to it. This method in particular is akin to the traditional uses of collage by artists dating at least as far back as the Renaissance. Raphael (1483–1520) crafted his Venus in metalpoint on two conjoined pieces of paper, the goddess’ body split just above the *mons veneris* (1498–1520, London, British Museum). The Flemish painter Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640) either added strips of paper above or below drawings to complete images or pasted small drawings on bits of paper to a larger study in order to ‘correct’ certain of its elements. Using an irregularly shaped scrap of paper, Swiss portraitist and pastellist Jean-Etienne Liotard (1702–1789) replaced a hand with which he was apparently dissatisfied in his portrait of Ekaterina Mavrocordato (1742–43), Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin). In France, Neoclassical painter Jacques-Louis David (1748–1825) created his early study for *The Intervention of the Sabine Women* (1799, Paris, Musée du Louvre) by adding paper to paper; ultimately, five pieces are pasted on to a paper support, including a small scrap just right of centre in which the artist has inadvertently highlighted the plight of an infant raised above the fray by his mother (1794, Paris, Musée du Louvre). More boldly, David ‘inscribed’ the powerful portrait of his dead friend the Revolutionary martyr Jean-Paul Marat by cutting off its four corners and pasting it onto two other vertical sheets of paper; he thereby was able to frame the image with the words: “To Marat, friend of the people” (1793, Versailles, Musée national du château). And, in an entrepreneurial spirit, the Romantic artist Théodore Géricault (1791–1824) simply replaced the head of a general on horseback in his lithographic series on the wars of independence in Latin America in an efficient decapitation that allowed other military men to be honoured in his place (1819, Paris, École nationale supérieure des Beaux-Arts).

The most extensive and revealing analysis of the use of collage in nineteenth-century France focuses on the drawings of Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres (1780–1867). Adrien Goetz’s study of the collection of the Musée de Montauban examines not only the artist’s creations with pasted paper but also his collage aesthetic. Here we see many of the traditional uses of collage discussed above – for example, paper added to increase the size (and therefore possibilities) of a drawing and drawn elements pasted over others in order to improve a design. While these kinds of intrusions do not affect the ultimate coherence of the image, other combinations – of disparate bodies and body parts – lead to a disruption of meaning atypical of the history we have traced so far. As Goetz puts it, these works signal that collage is “no longer the brilliant intuition of ‘composition’ but the slow work of decomposition” – a ‘decomposition’ that yields more than the sum of its parts. In one of his many studies for the unfinished mural *The Golden Age* (1843–47, Dampierre-en-Yvelines, Château de Dampierre), Ingres focuses on the mother of the so-called *A Family With a Dog* [*Famille au Chien*] [131]. Her tensed body stretches out to fill the lower half of the horizontal sheet, her form modelled deftly in pen, a schematically sketched baby on her lap. Faint grid lines across the figure reveal the practice of tracing that was fundamental to Ingres’ artistic process. Unlike the focused attention on the single dynamic form in the lower half of the sheet, the top half is replete with faces and hands repeated again and again – mother facing right, baby facing left – in different scales and with different expres-
sions, faces pasted on to reinforce their insistent regard. The drawings on these *papiers collés* engage with the mother’s body – the head of the schematically sketched baby in her lap continues onto the pasted sheet above – and fight it. A disembodied hand (the father’s, perhaps?) on one approaches her face menacingly, while its twin reaches out toward the top of her head. Meanwhile the mother’s hands are repeated, both clasp-ing and ignoring the baby; these quickly sketched lines on the upper half of the sheet form a sort of connective tissue, but also a barrier, between the mother’s gaze and the child’s. Thus the collage elements reinforce the connection between the members of this family, while seemingly tearing it apart. Paradoxically, its multiple iterations draw attention away from the forms themselves and highlight Ingres’ own obsessive working methods, in which re-creations and repetitions ultimately lead away from “copying nature” (i.e. the model) in favour of a reliance on the artist’s own powers of invention.
Nude Woman Carrying a Vase on her Head, 1909. National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C. Cat. 43
The later years: tracing, cutting, playing

Rodin’s later works on paper reveal the same move away from ‘nature’ toward the free play of his imagination, leading to works that surprise with their innovations. In them, the artist distances himself from his self-proclaimed faithfulness to nature and embraces a ludic experimentation that loudly declares his modernity. Goetz’ formula for Ingres’ method of collage is equally applicable to Rodin: “Élire, choisir, réunir” (select, choose, assemble). Select a model, choose a pose or body part, assemble disparate elements. Rodin did this by cutting out the figures in his drawings, sometimes carefully, other times more roughly, often excising limbs or body parts in a manner akin to his sculptural process. These cut-outs he could use as stencils in order to replicate their contours. From drawings to which he did not take his scissors, he could trace over figures, producing new variations that he could then continue to manipulate. Clément-Janin wrote about this process in 1903: “Completing a first draft, Rodin resumes his work, sometimes correcting it directly with a stroke of red pencil, but most often, it is in tracing it that he corrects it”. The process of tracing and retracing, especially, meant that all his drawings were potentially reproducible ad infinitum. Rodin, in other words, borrowed one of sculpture’s inherent properties – its reproducibility – and applied it to his drawing practice.

Furthermore, as art historian Kirk Varnedoe writes of *Nude Woman Carrying a Vase on Her Head* [132], “some shapes [...] became so familiar to Rodin that he could easily have produced many versions without recourse to a model or tracing”. In other words, in contours he returned to again and again Rodin mentally recreated the figure. It was through this imaginative process of distillation that the woman carrying a vase *became* a vase. The head and arms are pulled so far behind the figure that they disappear, and the shoulders and hips form the contours of an ancient amphora. Rodin’s choice of watercolour – *Sienna*, we are told by numerous commentators – mimics not only the flesh tones of his French models but also the terracotta containers of antiquity. In *Woman as a Vase*, Rodin recreated in pencil the simple patterns that could have appeared on these vessels [133]. In this drawing, as well as in *Female Nude Kneeling* or in *Rock* [134 and 135], in which blue watercolour covers the figure and the sheet, connoting the eternal washing of waves onto rock, this process of refinement is taken to such an extreme that they recall the Surrealist fantasies of Man Ray [136]. This body multiplied – “a thought obsessively thought again” – becomes pure shape and begins to verge on abstraction.
Woman as a Vase. She Is Kneeling, Head and Arms Back (n.d.)
D. 4771, Musée Rodin. Cat. 45
Female Nude Kneeling, Head Tilted Backwards (n.d.)
D. 9421, Musée Rodin. Cat. 48
[135]  Rock. Kneeling Female Nude Seen from the Front, detail (n.d.) D. 4636, Musée Rodin. Cat. 44

Iris, Messenger of the Gods, study (1890/91)
S. 851, Musée Rodin. Cat. 93
Moreover, just as in his sculptural oeuvre, Rodin often kept the accidents of chance in his retracings. *Iris, Messenger of the Gods*, for example, displays casting lines, a river of rough matter on the belly and crevices in the neck that all point to the process of creating the work and to the artist’s hand [137]. Similarly, in a collage such as *Two Women*, the background figure seems to refer to *Dance Movement, one foot and hand clasped behind the head* in which the left foot is cut off by the edge of the paper [138, 139, and 140]; this ‘accident’ is repeated in the collage despite the fact that there was room to complete the foot. In this figure, too, Rodin’s manipulations are evident in the head, which has been transformed from a profile (with right ear and bun visible in the drawing) to the back of the head, focusing our attention further on the self-possession of the dancer.

[138]  *Two Women*, detail (n.d.)
D. 5188, Musée Rodin
More radical still are the ways in which Rodin conceived of and utilised the figures he cut out from his drawings. According to Rodin scholar Claudie Judrin, in the first decade of the twentieth century, the artist excised about one hundred figures from his watercolours, “[leaving] them free in order to be able to manipulate them like puppets. For reasons of conservation, [the curators of the Musée Rodin] had to paste them onto a support, but Rodin played with them as he pleased according to his needs”.  

33 Like the small, sculptural fragments of hands, arms and legs that Rodin accreted in drawers in his studio – works he would often “pick […] up tenderly one by one and then turn them about” in his hands – the free-floating drawn figures seem both private and playful, allowing his imagination free rein.  

34 The collages he crafted from these bodies purportedly drawn from “nature” often defy perspectival arrangement, compositional clarity, spatial logic and anatomical accuracy.

[139]  Dance Movement, one foot and hand clasped behind the head (n.d.)
D. 4418, Musée Rodin
In *Two Women* [140], the disjunction between the figures is particularly clear. They are different sizes and colours. The figure on the right who clutches at her own torso is enveloped down to her waist in a dark wash that suggests hair or shadow; there is excess paper on her lower back, where the sculptor has left some of the original sheet. Despite eyes that seem closed and legs softly bent in a position that hints at the model’s reclining state, this figure has been abruptly pushed upright, in a manner akin to the “gisante” (recumbent female figure) of Picasso’s *Demoiselles d’Avignon* [141], the traces of her original recumbent position evident in her posture.35 Similarly, the feet of this woman are impossibly scaled; she stands en pointe on feet that could not support her. Even though her body seems to turn in space and overlaps the dancer behind her, their convergence calls attention primarily to the flatness of the image and to the artist’s act of making. These figures have nothing in common but their two-dimensionality and their self-involved attitudes.
Pablo Picasso, *The Young Ladies of Avignon*, 1907. MoMA
New directions

The trajectory that I have been tracing so far privileges the artist’s imaginative reworkings of bodies – both invented and real – on paper. If we look more broadly at Rodin’s drawings, especially those after 1900, we can see the emergence of a collage aesthetic. For instance, a cage of dark vertical lines of graphite and olive green, pink, yellow and acid orange watercolour frames the figures in *Standing Couple Embracing*, c. 1900 [142], which are enveloped in a thin aureole composed of the white surface of the paper and soft pencil lines. The isolated couple appears cut out, separate from the space they inhabit: a drawing masquerading as a collage.
This collage aesthetic can be fruitfully compared to Rodin’s innovations in sculptural assemblages. His Female Nude from The Birth of Venus Standing in a Vase consists of a headless and mostly armless woman emerging from a vase, which may have belonged to his personal collection of pottery [143].\(^{36}\) The strong contrast of the white plaster and the dark pot increases the dissonance of the two elements brought together solely through the force of the artist’s creative vision. Probably created around 1900,\(^ {37}\) this work is just one example of Rodin’s desire to test the limits of what could be termed ‘sculpture’, just as his experiments with works on paper push at the traditional boundaries of drawing practice.

[143]  *Female Nude from The Birth of Venus Standing in a Vase*  
(1880–1917). S. 3716, Musée Rodin. Cat. 88
Even when he did not literally take scissors to paper, his drawings show a playful manipulation of the space offered by the paper support. For example, he was known to reorient a sheet, writing ‘bas’ (‘bottom’) on the newly-designated lower edge. “In this way”, Varnedoe states, “he obtained a spatially freed figure, and, in at least two cases known, he added figures or landscape below to suggest that the figure was indeed flying. He liked the suggestions afforded by such new points of view, and would sometimes also note a title relating to a natural form, such as a tree, which the body suggested in its new orientation”. For instance, although the left-hand figure in *Francesca from Rimini, known as Madeleine* is standing, the model may well have been reclining, the mass of lines suggesting a pillow under her legs. Similarly, Rodin often used casts of the same figure in multiple sculptures, simply changing their orientation to suit the composition. *The Prodigal Son* (1905, Paris, Musée Rodin) – vertical, kneeling in anguish, arms outstretched in desperation or supplication – reappears in the guise of the male lover in *Fugit Amor* (1886, Paris, Musée d’Orsay) – horizontal, arms outstretched languorously, lustfully. The artist’s imagination determined the body’s meaning.

[144] *Francesca from Rimini, Known as Madeleine* (1898–1907?)
D. 4122, Musée Rodin. Cat. 67
Modern diversions

Ultimately Rodin’s works on paper are less about his fidelity to ‘nature’ than the power of the artist to create meaning. Here we have a deliberate ‘de-skilling’ – a strategy Rodin used in his sculptural oeuvre after the well-known incident with his first Salon sculpture, *The Age of Bronze* [145]: his naturalistically rendered male nude was also the subject of his first major scandal when he was accused of casting the figure from life. Rodin went to great pains to prove his detractors wrong. After this traumatic incident that threatened to derail his chances of success, he changed track and began to produce works with uneven surfaces, anatomical impossibilities and accidental fissures that shifted the focus from the artist’s skill at *re-creating* bodies to the more radical act of *creating* bodies.

Rodin employed the same strategy in his graphic oeuvre – let us not forget that as a young man he passed the exam for drawing at the École des Beaux-Arts, but failed the test for sculpture three times. With the techniques of tracing and collage, Rodin not only privileged the imaginative reworking of form, but also opened up his graphic oeuvre to self-reflexive iterations and manipulations. Moreover, unlike the emphatic three-dimensionality of his sculptural practice, Rodin’s collages especially play with the two-dimensional picture surface, creating dream-like, irrational juxtapositions. Roland Barthes spoke of the power of bringing together discontinuous elements: “the fragment breaks [...] the discourse that one constructs with the idea of giving a final meaning to what one says”. He continues, “the fragment is a spoilsport, a discontinuity, which becomes a kind of pulveriser of sentences, images, thoughts, none of which ‘takes’ definitively”. Rodin’s ludic experimentations, emancipated from servitude to nature, delight in un fettered artistic play with the human form and the strictures of anatomy, perspective and gravity. Realised with humble tools – pencil, pen, watercolour, paper, scissors, glue – they are a testament to the malleability and modernity of his artistic vision.
For full references, see Literature, p. 214.
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7 In the literature on Cubism, a distinction is made between ‘collage’, in which materials foreign to art are glued onto a support, and ‘papiers collés’ (pasted papers). However, given that the term ‘collage’ is better known and that its origin from the French word ‘coller’ literally means ‘to glue’, I have chosen to employ it here to denote drawings in which paper is pasted onto paper. In the Rodin literature, the terms usually used are ‘cut-outs’ or ‘découpages’.
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