

‘Immersed in Time’: Medardo Rosso and the originality of photomechanical reproduction

Writing in the *Daily Mail* in 1907, Medardo Rosso suggested that the previous two-thousand years of Western sculpture had left little more than an abundance of monumental ‘paperweights’. Against the ‘objectivity’ of this lineage he consistently emphasized the need for an art of vitality, his highest praise being reserved for the pursuit of the ‘infinite’ through a ‘preoccupation with the impression, the intuition of life, and the neglect of matter’.¹ Although such sentiments were hardly novel, Rosso was exceptional in advocating a sculpture of growth and life while simultaneously turning away from modelling—the act in which was then typically vested a sculptor’s creativity—to devote over two decades to processes more readily associated with repetition. Yet these repetitions offered fascinating revisions, through which Rosso extended his sculptures’ subject matter into the means of their production: the idea of ongoing birth and continual becoming migrated from modelling to reproduction.

This essay explores the photomechanical reproductions of Rosso’s works at the start of the twentieth century, the nascent years in the commercial development of the mass distribution of photographic images, which would profoundly shape twentieth-century visual culture and the visual historiography of art.² Following a brief consideration of Rosso’s use of reproduction in the creation of his sculptures and in his engagement with manually produced photographs, the first half of the essay undertakes close analyses of the evolving photomechanical representations of two of Rosso’s most influential conceptions—*Aetas Aurea* (modelled 1885–6) and *Ecce Puer* (modelled 1906)—in order to illuminate how intermedial translation could perennially renew the perception of sculpture. The second half locates the printed dissemination of Rosso’s works in relation to his milieu, arguing that although his uses of reproductive processes have been aligned with those of Auguste Rodin without evident conflict, these artists’ approaches to an art of becoming were radically divergent and most profoundly so in the presentation of their corpora in print. I suggest that Rosso used the printed page to allow the experience of a single ‘impression’ of the sculpture within a specific time and place to become immeasurably greater in memory; his works became ‘immersed in Time’, to appropriate the closing words of Marcel Proust’s

contemporaneous novel, which fittingly conclude its narrator's ultimate determination to begin his own.³

The printed page as the site of sculptural becoming

Casting was central to Rosso's creative use of reproduction. Although the artist employed commercial foundries throughout his career, from 1895 onwards he produced many casts in his own Paris studio.⁴ Across these sculptures he established sometimes nuanced and at others striking variations. Consider three casts (which Rosso is presumed to have produced) of his final sculpture, *Ecce Puer*.⁵ Modelled after a five or six year hiatus, the earliest cast of this sculpture is probably the plaster now in Milan's Civica Galleria d'Arte Moderna (fig. 1), which was displayed during the artist's lifetime, suggesting that Rosso understood it to be a successful embodiment of his artistic intentions.⁶ Although similar in colour, the oily translucency of the wax-over-plaster *Ecce Puer* now in Piacenza's Galleria d'Arte Moderna Ricci Oddi (fig. 2) offers a subtle reinterpretation of the earlier plaster in Milan. The two works respond very differently to light; the opaque plaster projects clearly defined shadows, whereas the translucent wax conjures a softly diffused image of the boy's face. The wax offers an uncanny reconsideration of an established form, challenging the perceptions and expectations of anyone familiar with the Milan plaster. As a plaster cast was a conventional intermediary stage when producing a bronze, so the cast wax that Rosso re-tasked into exhibition works might otherwise have served as a stage in lost-wax casting; in each case, Rosso elevated into the qualities of a finished work a discrete phase within the process of sculptural production.⁷ This interrogation of the processes through which a sculpture was realized deepened in what may be the final lifetime instance of *Ecce Puer*, a bronze now in a private collection (fig. 3). In this work the facial features are almost buried in residual plaster investment from the casting process; the child's face quite literally emerges from the process of making, foregrounding the coming into being of the sculpture from the creative act of casting.

In producing divergent iterations of the same sculptural form, Rosso's use of casting fits within a long tradition.⁸ However, in devoting the second half of his career to reproductive processes he placed unprecedented emphasis on the creativity of reproduction. Whether a

continual fascination with the variations that could emerge anew from each casting really offered sufficient cause for Rosso to stop modelling is moot. Historically, scholarship has sought other explanations, for instance that Rosso could not work in a state of bitterness induced by his public rivalry with Rodin, or that following artistic upheavals around the turn of the century, he appreciated that his vision no longer offered the radical challenge to artistic conventions that he advocated.⁹ These explanations hardly seem satisfactory—indeed, attempts to pin down this enigmatic artist seldom do. Recent scholarship has highlighted that Rosso’s movement away from modelling coincided with his greater attention to photography, a topic that has become central to academic and curatorial engagements with the artist.¹⁰ Despite the great interest in this subject, Rosso’s photographic corpus remains opaque. The extent to which he controlled the initial shooting of works is unknown, although his directorial influence is frequently assumed.¹¹ Rosso’s manipulations of the negatives and interventions on the resulting prints are easier to infer, yet dating specific instances is not.¹² These considerable limitations notwithstanding, it is now central to scholarship that Rosso’s photographs recapitulate something of his sculptural project, the medium offering an alternative means of extending his oeuvre’s continual becoming.

While Rosso’s experiments with chemical-based photographs have received much attention, how his works were presented during his lifetime on the photomechanically printed page remains relatively underexplored.¹³ That he took an interest in this process is perhaps not surprising: throughout the nineteenth century, evolving processes of image reproduction made the book an increasingly important site for the display and distribution of artworks, within which photography began to play a major role as the century drew to a close.¹⁴ By around 1890, photomechanical technologies had developed to the point of commercial viability, becoming commonplace if not yet ubiquitous around 1900.¹⁵ Thus it was that in 1902, fourteen of Rosso’s sculptures were reproduced in *De l’Impressionnisme en Sculpture*, a collection of brief essays and reflections by twenty-three artists and writers—including Rosso and Rodin—introduced with a longer essay by the journalist Edmond Claris.¹⁶ This publication marked a key moment in the development of Rosso’s career, giving the artist greater exposure and presenting his work in explicit and favourable confrontation with Rodin. It also contained the first of Rosso’s written

polemics. From this time onwards, the printed page became an important resource for the dissemination of Rosso's 'impressions' and of his ideas.

Photomechanical reproductions derive from chemical-process photographs. Underlying the print presentation of Rosso's sculptures are his experiments with darkroom prints. However, while they may share much, photographic prints and their photomechanical offspring should not be conflated: Rosso's sensitivity to the specificity of mediums throws into greater relief the general necessity of attending to the differences between these reproductive techniques—both in terms of the materiality of the image and the nature of its dissemination. Regarding the differing ways in which these formats could pass through the world, the movement from photograph to photomechanical print was not one from private to public; professionally shot photographs of Rosso's works are known to have been sent to prospective collectors from as early as 1883 and it is likely that Rosso's photographic prints were used in exhibition settings by 1902, as Rodin had likewise used photographs since 1896.¹⁷ However, whether in art periodicals or in lifestyle magazines, the image on the printed page addressed the viewer very differently than that on the gallery wall; unlike the mounted print, magazines and newspapers were disposable formats that in themselves embodied the transitory quality Rosso explicitly sought to express in his art. The ten images of Rosso's sculptures that appeared in 1913 on the front page of the Parisian illustrated daily *Comoedia* (fig. 4) were fundamentally unlike the framed photographs presented at the *Salon d'Automne* in 1904, even when they derived from the same sources.

That said, dividing the chemical-process and photomechanical prints into two discrete groups may suggest a misleading commonality within each; hemmed in by text and crowded by images of other sculptures, the small, low-quality halftone of *Ecce Puer* in *Comoedia* is a very distant relative of the finely detailed print of the same work that graced a dedicated page of coated stock in the 1909 book *Il caso Medardo Rosso* (fig. 5).¹⁸ The following discussion draws from magazines published in Amsterdam and Milan, exhibition catalogues from London and Vienna, books from Paris and Florence. The prints it assembles originally illustrated essays in Italian, German, Dutch, French, and English. Bringing together images from such disparate sources offers an encounter with the works that differs greatly from that of any contemporary viewer other than the artist or his close associates—but it is an enlightening experience when regarding Rosso's

project more broadly, as will be explored later. It should also be noted that the illustrations accompanying this discussion in no way attempt to approximate the original sources, either in their materiality or their presentation on the page.

Before examining the presentation of Rosso's works in print it is necessary to offer several qualifications, the most obvious of which are technical and regard the extent of Rosso's involvement in the production of each example. Uncertainties over Rosso's control of the darkroom prints are compounded by the lack of documentary evidence concerning the artist's role overseeing specific publications. However, both Rosso's general statements and his approach to the display of his works more broadly suggest that he consistently desired his vision to prevail. For instance, regarding the use of his photographs for reproduction in an article in the Milan newspaper *L'Ambrosiano* in 1926, Rosso urged the Futurist painter Carlo Carrà to 'show me all photographs before publication—as we had agreed. That is, never publish them without my approval'.¹⁹ This is late in life, yet from at least 1889 onwards Rosso evidences a similarly aggressive interest in controlling the conditions through which viewers encountered his works, his friend the poet Jehan Rictus noting how Rosso forced a prospective collector to face a wall for several minutes, only being allowed to turn when a sculpture's lighting was correct.²⁰ It is then more than plausible that he would always have fought to have 'his' photographs represent his sculptures.

Perhaps the most conclusive evidence of Rosso's involvement in the reproduction of his sculptures are the eventual outcomes: that he typically got his way is suggested by the frequently unconventional images of his works in books and magazines. That said, there are a small number of articles illustrated with surprisingly conventional images, such as those in an essay by the young critic Ettore Cozzani, published in 1910 in the major journal *Vita d'Arte*, which appear more like the reproductions in Claris's book of 1902 than those published the previous year to illustrate *Il caso Medardo Rosso*, an important study of the artist by his self-appointed Italian champion, Ardengo Soffici.²¹ Perhaps, then, Rosso did not always get his way. But those cases where he appears to have done so offer fascinating insights into the creative use of photomechanical reproduction.

To appreciate the complexity of Rosso's uses of reproduction it is necessary for the development of individual works to be assessed at length. For concision, discussion of how Rosso's sculptures were presented in print will be limited to two examples, the mother and child pairing *Aetas Aurea* and the isolated bust of a young boy, *Ecce Puer*. The former dates from Rosso's early years in Milan, whereas the latter is the artist's final new sculpture. Conclusions drawn from such a small sample can hardly claim validity across Rosso's oeuvre. Yet, at the very least, this focused study will illuminate a complexity that threads through the evolving lives of two of the artist's most discussed works and that I believe the reader, on consulting the reproductions of other works in contemporary publications, would find applies across the great majority of Rosso's works (even though, once again, there are cases where works were repeated across publications, such as *Bambino ebreo* (c. 1892–4), which was presented identically in several books).²²

Modelled in the mid-1880s, *Aetas Aurea* takes as its most evident subject a woman and a young child, presumably her own. An early example of the sculpture's presentation in print was offered in 1905 in a richly illustrated article by Ludwig Hevesi in the journal *Kunst und Kunsthandwerk*, which coincided with a solo exhibition of Rosso's works in Vienna at Kunstsalon Artaria (fig. 6).²³ The image derives from an installation shot taken the previous year at the *Salon d'Automne* in Paris, which Rosso manipulated in order to avoid that of which, in his essay published three years earlier in Claris's book, he accused others: 'materializing a *being* in space'.²⁴ To undermine the idea that this is an art object documented alongside others the image is cropped so that the framed photograph behind *Aetas Aurea* no longer appears to be part of a wall of photographs—as it was in the *Salon*—but a fragment of domesticity. To emphasize that this might be an image of living beings rather than of inert matter, a grasp of the sculpture's outline is robustly denied. This is achieved by cropping the sculpture's base and right-hand side and by the dramatic overexposure of the print's left-hand side, which shrouds the sculpture's reverse in a shadow that wraps around the figure. Furthermore, it appears that the artist worked into the print's left-hand side in paint or collage, both excising from the scene the framed photographs on the walls and producing tonal modulations that correspond with the texture of the sculpture's relief surface. (It should be remembered that while uncertainties regarding Rosso's interventions could

potentially be resolved by consulting surviving photographic prints and negatives, rather than elucidate the photomechanical images this would obscure the importance of the ambiguities that underscored Rosso's works in their most public presentation.)

In short, all Rosso's manipulations direct the viewer away from the sculpture as an object—'paperweight'—by blending the outline into the atmosphere of its environment and thus focusing attention on the emotive crux of the composition, the child's face and the maternal caress. Even from this brief account it is evident that the presentation of *Aetas Aurea* diverges starkly from the typical portrayal of sculptural objects at the turn of the century, which was grounded in conventions that had become well established in the mid-nineteenth century in the major photographic studios such as those of Alinari, Braun, and Girardon. Central to these conventions was displaying the entire sculptural object (but typically not the entire plinth) and using a neutral ground to aid the viewer's apprehension of a defining silhouette, which typically coincided with 'frontal lighting directed slightly from above'.²⁵ Rosso was consistent in eschewing such conventional portrayals of his sculptures, yet he was anything but consistent in his means to this end. As with the evolving lives of his sculptures that he achieved through casting, the presentation of his works from one publication to the next established an almost organic sense of development. With *Aetas Aurea* this resonates profoundly and on several levels with the sculpture's subject matter, the overtly reproductive pairing of a mother and child.

Harry Cooper has suggested that *Aetas Aurea*'s literal presentation of biological reproduction is imbricated with a more metaphorical representation of generation, in which the mother's hand caressing the child's cheek is understood to thematize the sculptor's act of modelling, sculptor and mother both giving life to new form.²⁶ The potential correspondence of mother and sculptor that Cooper raises is lent weight by subsequent photographic presentations of the work. In the plates of *Aetas Aurea* in Soffici's *Il caso Medardo Rosso* and Louis Piérard's *Un Sculpteur impressionniste* (figs. 7 and 8), the invitation for viewers to project themselves into the role of the modeller is reinforced by qualities intrinsic to photography: the fixed angle from which the work is shot, when combined with the cropping of the woman's arm, dislocates her right forearm from her body, allowing the hand to be associated with the viewer. The work's lighting conspires to reinforce this, highlighting the child's face and obscuring the mother's, which is

already dramatically foreshortened and marginalized. Yet, however interesting Rosso's interrogation of the relationships between mother, maker, and viewer, when assessed together the two images from 1909 perhaps offer a deeper reflection on reproduction and the technologies then transforming the perception and dissemination of sculpture. Not only do both images derive from the same cast, each was developed from the same negative—if not necessarily directly. Rosso arrived at the unorthodox shape of the image reproduced in *Il caso Medardo Rosso* (fig. 7) through apparently loose scissor cuts made directly to a photographic print, which then became the subject of the photomechanical plate. The related shape of the reproduction of this work in 1909 in Piérard's slim book (fig. 8) appears to have been masked directly onto the glass-plate negative. It presents the viewer with an image that is explicitly about a state of transition, the markings both speaking of the future life it is destined to assume and offering a compelling composition in the present. Through qualities intrinsic to photomechanical reproduction, processes of reproductive mediation are foregrounded to recapitulate something of the play on creation that was explored in the sculpture's original modelling.

The subtle weave of generations and regeneration orchestrated across the varied instantiations of *Aetas Aurea* should not distract from quite how remarkable each image is in relation to contemporaneous documentary conventions. In this regard two later images of *Aetas Aurea*—one accompanying an essay on Rosso by Kurt Seidel in a 1911 issue of the fortnightly *L'Artista Moderno*, the other a 1919 essay by Rosso's long-standing patron Etha Fles, published in the widely distributed Dutch journal *Elsevier's geïllustreerd Maandschrift*—are far less overtly unorthodox, although still by no means sitting comfortably within prevailing documentary practice. The former (fig. 9) presents a similar composition to those published in 1909, yet the camera position is slightly altered, allowing the viewer less access to the mother, whose head—reduced to an amorphous blur by shallow depth of field—occludes her face, once again focusing attention on the child's features and the adult hand. Conversely, after a period of nearly a decade, the illustration to Fles's article (fig. 10) emphasizes the mother. By presenting the mother's head on the other side of the child from the viewer and by making clear that the modelling—caressing hand belongs absolutely to this distanced and distancing figure, any projection of the viewer into the act of modelling is frustrated. Indeed, the mother and child are isolated into a closed unity in

which vision and touch seem to be relegated by the sculpture's compelling evocation of breath—the mother now the creator, breathing life into matter. If any association of mother and modeller still obtains, it is no longer a relationship into which the camera or viewer may enter but only observe.

The mother and child pairing of *Aetas Aurea* offers fascinating subject matter for considering Rosso's complex engagement with reproduction and becoming. However, it was by no means his most prominent work, as is attested by its relative under-representation within the photomechanical reproductions of his sculptures. In contrast, since its first exhibition in Paris at the 1906 *Salon d'Automne*, *Ecce Puer* has played a pivotal role in determining the reception of Rosso's oeuvre. Its photographic portrayal is however markedly homogenous when compared with the majority of Rosso's works: from its early presentation in 1907, as one of three images accompanying a short but insightful essay by Everard Meynell in the women's sporting weekly *The Ladies' Field*, until Rosso's death, the vast majority of images used for its print dissemination derived from just two source photographs.²⁷

In comparison with the reproductions in the catalogue accompanying Rosso's exhibition at Cremetti Gallery in London at the close of 1906—at which *Ecce Puer* was exhibited but not reproduced in the catalogue²⁸—the presentation of *Ecce Puer* early the following year in *The Ladies' Field* is notably conservative (fig. 11). Perhaps this was to be expected from such a recent progeny. The same source image was far more developed two years later, when reproduced in three varied iterations across Piérard's *Un Sculpteur impressionniste*, Soffici's *Il caso Medardo Rosso*, and in the Italian journal *La Voce*.²⁹ In the three images of *Ecce Puer* across these publications, the outline of the head is no longer contained within the frame. In the illustration in Piérard's study (fig. 12), the print is darker than the 1907 instance and the facial features less distinct. Unlike a conventional mask, its dark ground does not emphasize an outline but rather blends with the overexposed form to intensify the equivalence between figure and ground. In Soffici's book a similar porosity of boundaries is achieved though different means (fig. 5). It appears that paint or ink has been unevenly applied to the background of a print, the modulations suggesting finger indentations or some similar manipulation of a malleable material—in effect, a continuation of modelling undertaken on the photographic print. Similarly, it is evident from the

contrast between the sharp focus of the vertical scores on the child's proper-right cheek and those on the sculpture's left-hand side that the former were executed on a photographic print in order to mimic and continue the distinctive striations in the clay. This bleeding of sculpted figure and ground is compounded by Rosso's irregular cropping, mounting, and re-shooting of an intermediary photograph, which is explicitly treated as an object, distracting attention from the object-quality of the plaster from which it derived. The image of *Ecce Puer* in *Il caso Medardo Rosso* establishes a fascinating dialogue with that in *La Voce* (fig. 13). When compared, the image in *La Voce* reads as an earlier life of that in Soffici's book, the ravages of time having softened the hard-edged, non-orthogonal cropping of the former, which is now preserved as a relic in the latter. Although appearing in May 1910, the illustration in *La Voce* was part of a series of nine images of Rosso's works that appeared sporadically in the journal over the course of an entire year. These began with a reproduction of *Bambino malato* (c. 1893–5) in July 1909—accompanying an article by Soffici that tied in with the launch of his book—and closed with *Carne altrui* (1883–4) in July 1910.³⁰ As such, it is reasonable to assume that all the images would have been supplied in 1909 and that the relationship between the images in the periodical and in the book may well have been considered, given that the illustrations of Rosso's works in the journal were offered, in part, as advertisements for the book.

Through the operations adumbrated above, Rosso developed multivalent exchanges between photography and sculpture. Perhaps most comprehensively in the illustration to Soffici's book, Rosso established a material equivalence between the represented sculpture and its photographic ground, which he combined with an emphasis on the sculptural quality of the intermediary print. Taken together, these allowed the substitution of the materiality of the print for that of the sculpture. The result advances the artist's desire to undermine the viewer's grasp of the literalness of the sculpture's objecthood, not simply by masking sculptural material beneath photographic effects but by asserting the materiality of the intermediary photograph. Yet if Rosso desired a work's ongoing growth there could be no enduring solution to his attempt to overcome sculptural objecthood: if the same strategies were frequently employed the approach would move from being part of a project of becoming to an expression of being—it would be the defining way of representing this work, not least if applied to the same source image. It is then perhaps not

surprising that around 1910 Rosso shifted his attention to developing new representations of *Ecce Puer* from different negatives. The reproduction of *Ecce Puer* in an essay by Ettore Cozzani in the journal *Vita d'Arte* presents a relatively conventional image. Likewise, the image of this work published in 1911 to illustrate an article by Kurt Seidel in *L'Artista Moderno* also offers the sculpture relatively 'objectively' (fig. 14). However, whereas the image in Cozzani's article did not lead to any further developments, a host of subsequent variations were derived from the same source as the image in Seidel's article. The ensuing reproductions of *Ecce Puer* that developed from this source all dramatically crop the image, forming what may initially appear to be an almost homogenous group (figs. 4, 15–18). Rosso's use of repetition is, however, deceptive. The variations in cropping and the alterations of contrast and sharpness eke out a wealth of formal and associative nuances. Indeed, it is this that is most fascinating and illuminating about the reproductions of this work; that despite their similarity, identity is forever deferred.

The reproductions of *Ecce Puer* and *Aetas Aurea* suggest that Rosso desired each reproduction of a sculpture to be different, while the 'work' retained its identity across these varied iterations. This is somewhat conjectural, and it is unclear whether a desire for insistent variation stemmed from the artist's intentions or whether it was the result of a personal excitement in exploring across various mediums what his works could become. My initial interest in Rosso was focused on the latter; on how the quality of wonderment that he desired his art to elicit also permeated his approach to making, and how this may have led to results that differed from his initial expectations. Regarding the former, it is hard to imagine the artist believing that the sum of the images discussed above—the developing life of the work that they build—could be appreciated by anyone other than himself and possibly his closest acquaintances. However, although the sum of variations would not have been appreciable, it would not have been unreasonable for the artist to believe that something of the quality of continual reinvention that unites the sum may have been conveyed to viewers. This is especially true when the images are located in relation to other reproductive processes. A viewer who had known a work only through one of Rosso's enigmatic photographs might subsequently encounter a cast not as a fleshing out or fulfilment of the two-dimensional image but as another moment, mood, or 'impression' of something more elusive than any material artefact. Likewise, the Parisian who had spent time with

the wax *Ecce Puer* at the *Salon d'Automne* in 1906 would not simply be reminded of this encounter when happening upon the distinctive trapezoid image of this work in the pages of *La Société Nouvelle* a couple of years later, but would encounter a new possibility of the work—this conflation and revision of past experiences again revised on a cold January morning in 1913, when passing a newspaper stand and glancing at the front page of *Comoedia*. Undoubtedly, these chance reacquaintances with the evolving life of a work were unlikely to be frequent, but this was not due to the artist's desires: whether intentionally for this purpose, Rosso sought the widest and most diverse distribution of his 'impressions', each new iteration increasing the probability of these encounters.

Becoming rivals—Rosso and Rodin in print

This section explores how the development of the photomechanical presentation of Rosso's works relates to contemporaneous uses of print media in the first decade of the twentieth century. It should be noted in passing that this narrow focus on the paradigm shift in print reproduction around 1900 excludes engagement with later artists with whom Rosso's practice has been aligned, most obviously Constantin Brancusi.³¹ Brancusi's importance within discussions of sculpture and photography in the early twentieth century is undeniable, not least in relation to the theme of becoming that has threaded through this essay—if Brancusi's studio was a 'place of rebirth', photography endowed his 'entire work with the character of something reborn'.³² Yet despite using photography in a limited capacity from around 1905, Brancusi's concerted engagement with the medium dates to a decade later, his own photography of his works plausibly beginning in 1917.³³ This was fifteen years after Claris's book photographically contrasted Rodin and Rosso; it was the year of Rodin's death and that in which perhaps the most important printed reproduction of a sculpture was Alfred Stieglitz's image of Richard Mutt's *Fountain*.³⁴ That is, Brancusi's mature engagement with photography emerged from a very different artistic climate than Rosso's, which develops from the nineteenth century and for which Rodin provides the most obvious and illuminating contemporary reference—not least given that he had been acquainted with Rosso from the early 1890s, a relationship that had become publically rivalrous, as the early print presentation of his works in 1902 testifies.³⁵

Kirk Varnedoe has productively divided the early print presentation of Rodin's works into two categories: those based on negatives produced under Rodin's instruction, intended to present the sculptures in a readily apprehensible manner for the purpose of trade and publicity, and those of 'self-consciously expressive intent', undertaken at the initiative of artist-photographers.³⁶ Discussion of the relationship between Rodin and photography has tended to focus on the latter category, especially those prints by several established artistic photographers, such as Stephen Haweis and Henry Coles, Alvin Langdon Coburn, and most famously Edward Steichen. Steichen's earliest involvement with Rodin, in 1902, resulted in such memorable reinterpretations as *Rodin, le Monument à Victor Hugo et le Penseur* and later, in 1908, he produced the negatives of his several famed moonlit shots of *Balzac* (sculpture 1898), which were first exhibited as unique prints in 1909. Much discussed in relation to Rodin, these photographs have guided sensitive considerations of the parallels between Rodin's and Rosso's involvement with the medium.³⁷ There is certainly much to recommend this, indeed the comparison of these 'expressive' photographic interpretations of Rodin's works with Rosso's photographs is one that Rosso likely instigated when, at the *Salon d'Automne* of 1904, he juxtaposed photographs of his *Impression d'omnibus* (c. 1884–7) and *Dr Fles* (c. 1900–1) with photographic prints of Rodin's works, such as Henry Coles of *Crouching Woman* (print 1903–4, sculpture c. 1882).³⁸

However, extending to Rodin this essay's focus on contemporary photomechanical representations of sculpture relocates discussion primarily within the first of Varnedoe's divisions. For instance, Steichen's nocturnal author first appeared in print in 1911, across three plates of *Camera Work*, Stieglitz's showcase for international photographers associated under the loose banner of Pictorialism.³⁹ The lavish photogravures were explicitly presented as attempts to reproduce in photomechanical form Steichen's unique carbon prints, artworks in their own right which interpreted an iconic sculpture already well known through images in newspapers, journals, and books. These publications were predominantly illustrated with anonymously authored images indebted to the documentary conventions of the day, as outlined above: displaying the entire object with a clearly defined silhouette against a neutral ground.⁴⁰ Such a presentation typifies the four sculptures presented alongside Rosso's works in Claris's book. Before reflecting on how this conventional mode of portrayal offered a cogent and perhaps necessary response to the complex

demands of Rodin's richly mutable oeuvre, there are two further characteristics of the documentary portrayal of Rodin's works that are worth exploring, both of which relate to the theme of becoming. Firstly, the reuse of the same image across publications; secondly, the presentation of a single work from multiple angles within the same publication.

When a work by Rodin—say *Balzac*, for its centrality in his oeuvre and in discussions of his relationship with Rosso—was reproduced in a book, the same image frequently appeared in a number of subsequent publications. For instance, alongside images of Rosso's works in Claris's *De l'Impressionnisme en Sculpture*, *Balzac* stands emphatic against a masked ground. An identical image is reproduced in a contemporary book on Rodin by Camille Mauclair, juxtaposed with a side view of the work shot under the same conditions. The side view is again reproduced in a book on Rodin by Frederick Lawton, alongside a more 'expressive' shot by Eugène Druet. This same pairing reappeared in two books that soon followed, now with the dark mask removed from the side view.⁴¹ Unlike the shifting shadows that vary the character of *Ecce Puer* between publications, Rodin's sculptures retain a far more stable identity.

Books and periodicals frequently presented multiple viewpoints of Rodin's sculptures within a single volume, often on the same page. For instance, an extensively illustrated study published in 1900 to coincide with Rodin's hugely influential retrospective at the Pavillon de l'Alma presented *Balzac* threefold, shot under identical lighting and presented against a black ground (fig. 19).⁴² These multiple images raise an instructive conflict between the representation of Rodin's works and Rosso's theories of art. In 1902 Rosso urged that 'one does not move around a statue ... in order to conceive the impression'. This view became something of a motif; for instance, in 1925 he reiterated that the artist 'should no longer make any of those things that nobody has ever seen, those statues made for walking around!'⁴³ It is with good reason that this sentiment is understood as a response to Charles Baudelaire's salon of 1846, specifically Baudelaire's denigration of sculpture in the round as a 'boring' medium in comparison with the 'more forceful' message available to painting, which results from its 'despotic' single point of view.⁴⁴ Yet Rosso's objections to moving around a sculpture also accord with more contemporary debates regarding time and becoming.

The presentation of a work from multiple angles asserts the enduring identity of the object depicted—its being. In 1923, in an interview with Luigi Ambrosini for the Turin newspaper *La Stampa*, Rosso restated his objection to moving around a sculpture in terms that call to mind the multi-image reproduction of *Balzac*: ‘artworks in which there are three or four pictures, in other words three or four points of view, are not art’.⁴⁵ Rosso’s hostility echoes well-known examples in the contemporaneous thought of Henri Bergson, for instance the suggestion in the widely read *Introduction to Metaphysics* (1903) that, ‘were all the photographs of a town, taken from all possible points of view, to go on indefinitely completing one another, they would never be equivalent to the solid town in which we walk about.’⁴⁶ In this interview Rosso offered a broader repudiation of technological mediation in which he aligned his ‘disappointment’ with cinema with the objectivity of the photographed sculpture, believing that the ‘Kodak eye’ shows ‘so little respect to so many *moving* moments of life ... that would have been so beautiful if I had seen it with my own eyes!’⁴⁷ For Rosso, the objectivizing technology of cinema accorded with the ‘habits of laziness’ that characterized contemporary perception, an objectivity against which his art strove. In this, Rosso reflects views famously expressed by Bergson in *Creative Evolution* (1907): ‘whether we would think becoming, or express it, or even perceive it, we hardly do anything else than set going a kind of cinematograph inside us ... *the mechanism of our ordinary knowledge is of a cinematographical kind.*’⁴⁸ As Rosso pursued the ‘infinite’ through a ‘preoccupation with the impression, the intuition of life, and the neglect of matter’, so too Bergson sought an ‘infinite’, an ‘absolute’ that ‘could only be given in an *intuition*, whilst everything else falls within the province of *analysis*’.⁴⁹ Both philosopher and sculptor argued against conceiving the human subject as a spatially discrete observer of a measurable and enumerable world, affirming instead the subject’s organic and organized unfolding within an indivisible temporal continuum. Although the parallels in their articulation are suggestive, I am not trying to assert that these correspondences between Rosso and Bergson represent anything more profound than a shared interest in themes of becoming that were then in wide circulation. My main interest regards what Rosso’s comments highlight about the presentation of Rodin’s works in print: as will be elaborated below, ideas of becoming and evolution are as applicable to Rodin’s oeuvre as they are to Rosso’s; yet Rosso could adopt a Bergsonian vocabulary to sharpen

an effective critique of Rodin's works, one that applies directly to how it was presented on the printed page.

Rodin's use of reproductive processes to transform existing works into new entities is widely recognized and has long been central to scholarship on the artist.⁵⁰ In relation to Rosso, the most pertinent example is offered by the exchanges between *St John the Baptist* (1880, fig. 20), *The Walking Man* (1899, fig. 21), and *Torso* (1878–9/87, fig. 22), alongside a version of which Rosso placed his own works in public confrontation.⁵¹ Modelled during Rodin's development of *St John the Baptist*, the clay that would become *Torso* was initially left neglected in Rodin's studio. After nearly a decade the cracked form was cast in bronze as the *Torso*. Later, the addition of stray legs that had also been modelled as part of the development of *St John* transformed the same torso into the *The Walking Man* (1899). By recycling the preliminary studies for one work, Rodin not only arrived at new sculptures that were classified as discrete new entities but also established a complex dialogue in which the preparatory emulated the relic. A similar practice of re-tasking informs Rodin's *Assemblages*, which bring together previously separate works through what Albert Elsen felicitously terms a 'sculptural matchmaking'.⁵² There are many examples, perhaps the most striking being *Assemblage: Mask of Camille Claudel and Left Hand of Pierre de Wissant* (c. 1895), which fuses the mask of Claudel with the colossal left hand of one of the *Burghers of Calais* (1884–9).

When presented on the printed page, the ceaseless generative combination and recombination of parts—the 'becoming' of Rodin's sculpture—came to a halt. Unlike the reproductions of Rosso's *Ecce Puer* and *Aetas Aurea*, photographs of Rodin's work freeze the sculpture as a fixed entity. As such, a publication-by-publication analysis of any major work's representation would not only be unfeasible due to the prolific print dissemination of Rodin's works in the early years of the new century make, it would also be uninformative: the movement from one publication to the next would frequently involve a repetition of an existing image (on different paper stock and of different size) rather than a movement to an appreciably new image. The contrast between Rodin's ongoing sculptural metamorphoses and the fixity of each conception's photomechanical reproduction emphasizes a clear division between how the mediums were understood—one as engaged with transformation and life, the other with

representing rather than embodying this. With Rosso this division does not obtain. This is not to claim any superiority for Rosso, or to suggest that he was necessarily more profoundly engaged with the possibilities opened by photomechanical reproduction: the artists' divergent means resulted from unlike aspirations that were equally concerned with an idea of becoming, yet which demanded different strategies when expressed in print.

To focus on the reproduction of one work by Rodin (*Adam*, say, or *The Walking Man*) from publication to publication would overlook how material elements of one sculpture were reproduced elsewhere within the same volume. The hybridity between works that resulted in the modified form of *Adam* existing in *The Three Shades* is rightly understood as central to the vitality of Rodin's project. Representing Rodin's sculptures through documentary conventions that displayed the entire object with great clarity aided the appreciation of these transformations when they were displayed on the printed page. For example, the finely reproduced plates in Gustave Coquiot's *Rodin* (1915) lucidly present the evolving relationship between *St John*, *The Walking Man*, and *Torso* (reproduced above as figs. 20–22). The silhouette of the dark bronze saint is readily grasped against its light backdrop, offering itself almost as a tonal—and by extension a photographic—negative of its plaster kin, *The Walking Man*, which is displayed from the same angle and set starkly against a black ground. Likewise, the presentation of *The Walking Man* and *Torso* makes evident their indexical link, the lesions to the right breast of the former offering a striking trace of a singular injurious incident, an unnerving *punctum* that commits the wound to memory, a memory that resurfaces when viewing the latter.

Immersed in time

Whereas Rosso used the movement between publications to sustain the evolution of discrete conceptions, Rodin's approach to becoming could best be expressed across the leaves of a single volume. The implications of this extend beyond the pages of books and magazines, pointing to deeper conceptual divisions between artists whose uses of reproductive processes have readily been aligned without evident conflict.⁵³ It is hoped that appreciating this will promote a reconsideration of their place within fin-de-siècle culture, not least regarding each artists' engagement with time. Whether presented in the Pavillon de l'Alma, in books, magazines, or at

Meudon, Rodin's works ask for simultaneity and prompt comparisons between entities collected under different titles, discrete conceptions playing interacting, hybridizing roles within the theatre that was Rodin's career. Writing in 1901 ('to understand him you must see all that he has done') or 1999 ('to understand Rodin one needed to go much further than a single figure on show in the Salon'), Rodin's art is rightly understood as one of promiscuous reinvention that requires a panoramic view of the entire project—of the *artist's* life.⁵⁴

Conversely, Rosso offers an intense focus on each *work's* life. In doing so he makes problematic the notion of a 'work' as a physical entity in a singular way. For Rosso, the arts were 'indivisible': the artist should convey an 'impression' that conjures lived experience and the intensity of this impression should eclipse questions of medium—'there is no painting at one end and sculpture at the other'.⁵⁵ It was highlighted above that Rosso believed that his photographs conveyed an 'impression' and that—provided they were not 'retouched to render them possibly objective'—this would be expressed within their photomechanical reproductions. As such, despite great material differences—not least in practical terms of sales and distribution—for Rosso, the disparate artefacts relating to the same 'work' were in an important regard conceptually continuous. Whether or not any given instance should be considered an 'artwork', each successful iteration of a conception must be an artistic creation: each conveyed an 'impression' and all added to the growth and vitality of a 'work', yet the locus of this became increasingly enigmatic.

The preceding analyses of *Ecce Puer* and *Aetas Aurea* suggest that through the intermedial unfolding of each conception, around a single 'impression' there could coalesce the recollections of kindred yet temporally remote experiences. In this way Rosso's project parallels that begun in Paris in the first decade of the new century by Marcel Proust—the transition of *Ecce Puer's* form from plaster to page recalling the transposition of Vinteuil's little phrase from sonata to septet. The experience of a single iteration within a specific place became immeasurably greater within time; through photography, the work of memory achieved a more profound dematerializing of sculptural objecthood than was possible in any single photograph. Across mediums, Rosso nurtured the growth of a number of conceptions that remained discrete (as *Ecce Puer*, *Aetas Aurea*, and so forth) while evolving through varied lives, or stages of a single life: to appropriate the concluding lines of Proust's novel, Rosso's works seek 'a place far larger than the

very limited one reserved for them in space, a place in fact almost infinitely extended, since they are in simultaneous contact, like giants immersed in the years, with such distant periods of their lives, between which so many days have taken up their place—in Time.’⁵⁶

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the AHRC and the Leverhulme Trust; Brandon Taylor, Jason Gaiger, and Jon Wood; Alastair Wright, Olivia Tait, and the two anonymous reviewers for *Oxford Art Journal*.

¹ Medardo Rosso, 'Impressionism in Sculpture, an Explanation', *Daily Mail*, London, 17 October 1907.

² Geraldine A. Johnson, "'(Un)richtige Aufnahme': Renaissance Sculpture and the Visual Historiography of Art History', *Art History*, vol. 36, no. 1, February 2013, pp. 12–51. See also Mary Bergstein, 'Lonely Aphrodites: On the Documentary Photography of Sculpture', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 74, no. 3, September 1992, pp. 475–98.

³ Marcel Proust, *Time Regained*, trans. Stephen Hudson (London: Chatto and Windus, 1949), p. 434.

⁴ On Rosso's casting, see Sharon Hecker, 'Reflections on Repetition in Rosso's Art', in *Medardo Rosso: Second Impressions*, ed. Harry Cooper and Sharon Hecker (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003), pp. 23–68.

⁵ The dating and attribution of Rosso's direct involvement in specific casts is problematic; although imperfect, I work from Paola Mola and Fabio Vittucci, *Medardo Rosso: Catalogo Ragionato Della Scultura* (Milan: Skira, 2009). For clarification of the technical, legal, and ethical complexities surrounding Rosso's direct involvement with casting, see Sharon Hecker, 'The Afterlife of Sculptures: Posthumous Casts and the Case of Medardo Rosso (1858–1928)', *Journal of Art Historiography*, no. 16, June 2017.

⁶ On Rosso's use of plaster in relation to his contemporaries, see Sharon Hecker, 'Shattering the Mould: Medardo Rosso and the poetics of plaster', in *Plaster Casts: Making, Collecting and Displaying from Classical Antiquity to the Present*, ed. Rune Frederiksen and Eckart Marchand (Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 2010), pp. 319–29.

⁷ On Rosso's casting processes, see Derek Pullen, 'Gelatin Molds: Rosso's Open Secret', in *Medardo Rosso*, ed. Cooper and Hecker, pp. 95–102.

⁸ See Jacques de Caso, 'Serial Sculpture in Nineteenth-Century France', in *Metamorphoses in Nineteenth-Century Sculpture*, ed. Jeanne L. Wasserman (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975), pp. 1–27.

⁹ Margaret Barr, *Medardo Rosso* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1963), p. 55; Luciano Caramel, *Medardo Rosso* (London: South Bank Centre, 1994), p. 38.

¹⁰ On Rosso's darkroom output, see Jane Becker, 'Medardo Rosso: Photographing Sculpture and Sculpting Photography', in *The Artist and the Camera: Degas to Picasso*, ed. Dorothy Kosinski (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999), pp. 159–75; Paola Mola, *Rosso: Trasferimenti* (Milan: Skira, 2006); Francesca Bacci, 'Sculpting the Immaterial, Modelling the Light: Presenting Medardo Rosso's Photographic Oeuvre', *Sculpture Journal*, vol. 15, no. 2, December 2006, pp. 223–38; Geraldine A. Johnson, "'All Concrete Shapes Dissolve in Light': Photographing Sculpture from Rodin to Brancusi', *Sculpture Journal*, vol. 15, no. 2, December 2006, pp. 199–222; Paola Mola, *Rosso: the Transient Form* (Milan: Skira, 2007); Francesca Bacci, 'Momentary vs. Monumentary: Medardo Rosso and Public Sculpture', *Sculpture Journal*, vol. 22, no. 1, January 2013, pp. 83–96. For recent exhibitions with catalogues, see Sharon Hecker and Tamara Schenkenberg (eds), *Medardo Rosso: Experiments in Light and Form* (St. Louis: Pulitzer Arts Foundation, 2016); Paola Zatti (ed.), *Medardo Rosso: La luce e la materia* (Milan: 24 Ore Cultura, 2015); Peter van der Coelen (ed.), *Brancusi, Rosso, Man Ray*, (Rotterdam: Boijmans Van Beuningen, 2014).

¹¹ See Mola, *Transient Form*, p. 33.

¹² On the extent of Rosso's involvement with photography, see Francesca Bacci, 'Impressions in Light: Photographs of Sculptures by Medardo Rosso (1858–1928)', unpub. PhD thesis, Rutgers University, 2004, pp. 11–38.

¹³ The photomechanical reproduction of Rosso's works is valuably touched upon in Mola, *Trasferimenti*.

¹⁴ For studies focused on the complexity of reproductive processes on the page in the nineteenth century, see Carol Armstrong, *Scenes in a Library: Reading the Photograph in the Book, 1843–1875* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998); Stephen Bann, *Parallel Lines: Printmakers, Painters and Photographers in Nineteenth-Century France* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 2001); the same author's *Distinguished Images: Prints in the Visual Economy of Nineteenth-Century France* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013). Relating specifically to photography, the essays collected in Bann's *Art and the Early Photographic Album* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011). For a fascinating broader survey, Patrizia Di Bello, Colette Wilson, and Shamoon Zamir (eds), *The Photobook: From Talbot to Ruscha and Beyond* (London; New York: I. B. Tauris, 2012).

¹⁵ Tom Gretton, 'Signs for Labour-Value in Printed Pictures after the Photomechanical Revolution', *Oxford Art Journal*, vol. 28, no. 3, 2005, pp. 375–8; Johnson, '(Un)richtige Aufnahme', pp. 23–6.

¹⁶ Edmond Claris, *De l'impressionnisme en sculpture* (Paris: La Nouvelle Revue, 1902).

¹⁷ On the early presentation of Rosso's photographs in exhibitions, see Sharon Hecker, *A Moment's Monument: Medardo Rosso and the International Origins of Modern Sculpture* (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2017), p. 193; on Rodin's use, H  l  ne Pinet, 'Montrer est la Question Vitale: Rodin and Photography', in *Sculpture and Photography: Envisioning the Third Dimension*, ed. Geraldine A. Johnson (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 74–8.

¹⁸ The vast majority of examples of Soffici's book that I have seen (thirteen of fifteen) do not contain an image of *Ecce Puer*, due to unexplained alterations made when it was at press (the omission of *Ecce Puer* is not the only difference).

¹⁹ Letter to Carlo Carr  , February 1926, in *Medardo Rosso*, ed. Gloria Moure (Santiago de Compostela: Centro Galego de Arte Contempor  nea, 1996), p. 297.

²⁰ Hecker, *Moment's Monument*, p. 148.

²¹ Ettore Cozzani, 'Sui confini della plastica: Medardo Rosso', *Vita d'Arte*, vol. 5, March 1910, pp. 103–17; see also Curt Seidel, 'L'Arte di Medardo Rosso', *L'Artista Moderno*, vol. 10, no. 5, March 1911, pp. 81–96.

²² The most overt example of this is Louis Pi  rard's book *Un Sculpteur impressionniste*, published as an edition by *La Soci  t   Nouvelle*, which recycles not Rosso's photographs but the actual printing plates in drawing together the text and illustrations from Pi  rard's identically titled article in the journal *La Soci  t   Nouvelle*, vol. 33, no. 1, July 1909, pp. 57–63. The following will make use exclusively of the book.

²³ Ludwig Hevesi, 'Medardo Rosso', *Kunst und Kunsthandwerk*, vol. 8, no. 3, 1905, pp. 174–82; Medardo Rosso, *Medardo Rosso, Paris: Bronzen, Impressionen in Wachs* (Vienna: Artaria, 1905).

²⁴ 'Impressionism in Sculpture' [1902], in *Medardo Rosso*, ed. Moure, p. 130, my emphasis.

²⁵ Alex Potts, 'Sculpture in Photography', in *Photography and Sculpture: the Art Object in Reproduction*, ed. Sarah Hamill and Megan R. Luke (Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute, 2017), p. 262. On the evolution of these conventions and their debt to the history of pre-photographic representations, see also

Johnson, '(Un)richtige Aufnahme', pp. 19–26. For a contemporary justification from 1896, see Heinrich Wölfflin, 'How One Should Photograph Sculpture', trans. Geraldine A. Johnson, *Art History*, vol. 36, no. 1, February 2013, pp. 52–71.

²⁶ Harry Cooper, 'Ecce Rosso!', in *Medardo Rosso: Second Impressions*, ed. Cooper and Hecker, pp. 1–21.

²⁷ An exception being that in Ettore Cozzani's 1910 article in *Vita d'Arte*. There is another anomaly in the reproductions of this work: *The Ladies' Field* article was illustrated with three images, two of *Ecce Puer* (*avant la lettre*), one very clearly a commercial shot and plausibly taken without Rosso's knowledge. The images were differently titled, suggesting that the editors were unaware of their shared identity. Everard Meynell, 'The Sculpture of Medardo Rosso', *The Ladies' Field*, 16 March 1907, p. 49.

²⁸ Medardo Rosso, *Medardo Rosso: Impressions* (London: Cremetti, 1906).

²⁹ *La Voce*, vol. 2, no. 24, 26 May 1910, p. 326.

³⁰ *La Voce*, vol. 1, no. 32, July 1909, p. 129; *La Voce*, vol. 2, no. 30, July 1910, p. 355.

³¹ On Rosso and Brancusi generally, see Paola Mola, *Brancusi: The White Work* (Milan: Skira, 2005), p. 18; Nina Schallenberg, 'Mise-en-Scène as Sculptural Method', in *Brancusi, Rosso, Man Ray*, ed. Van der Coelen, pp. 19–33.

³² Friedrich Teja Bach, 'Brancusi and Photography', in *Constantin Brancusi: 1876–1957*, ed. Friedrich Teja Bach, Margit Rowell, and Ann Temkin (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995), p. 314.

³³ Bach, 'Brancusi and Photography', p. 312; Paul Paret, 'Sculpture and its Negative: the Photographs of Constantin Brancusi', in *Envisioning the Third Dimension*, ed. Johnson, p. 101. See also Elizabeth A. Brown, *Brancusi Photographs Brancusi* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1995); Roxana Marcoci, 'Constantin Brancusi: The Studio as *Groupe Mobile* and the *Photos of Radieuses*', in *The Original Copy: Photography of Sculpture, 1839 to Today*, ed. Roxana Marcoci (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2010), pp. 97–111. For a remarkable example of the sculptural and photographic evolution of Brancusi's *Mademoiselle Pogany*, see 'Brancusi Number', *The Little Review*, vol. 8, no. 1, Autumn 1921.

³⁴ Stieglitz's image first appeared in *The Blind Man*, no. 2, May 1917.

³⁵ See Bacci, 'Sculpting the Immaterial', pp. 234–5.

³⁶ Kirk Varnedoe, 'Rodin and Photography', in *Rodin Rediscovered*, ed. Albert Elsen (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1981), p. 206. These are Varnedoe's internal divisions of the 'third and final phase' in Rodin's relationship with photography, from around 1900 onward. On Rodin and photography see also Jane Becker, 'Auguste Rodin and Photography: Extending the Sculptural Idiom', in *Artist and the Camera*, ed. Kosinski, pp. 91–115; Pinet, 'Montrer est la Question Vitale', pp. 68–85; Johnson, 'All Concrete Shapes Dissolve', pp. 200–4; Albert Elsen, *In Rodin's Studio: A Photographic Record of Sculpture in the Making* (Oxford; Ithaca, NY: Phaidon, 1980).

³⁷ For a thorough example, Johnson, 'All Concrete Shapes'.

³⁸ Whether Rosso orchestrated this encounter is debated: in favour, see Hecker, 'Reflections on Repetition', pp. 64–5 and Mola, *Transient Form*, p. 153; against, Bacci, 'Sculpting the Immaterial', 234. That he approved of the result is confirmed by later photographic reproductions of the installation, for example in the 1905 exhibition catalogue *Medardo Rosso, Paris: Bronzen, Impressionen in Wachs*.

³⁹ *Camera Work*, nos. 34–5, April–July 1911, pls. 2–4. On Pictorialism, see Pam Roberts, 'Camera Work': *The Complete Illustrations, 1903–17* (Cologne: Taschen, 1997); Todd Brandow and William Ewing,

Edward Steichen: Lives in Photography (Minneapolis, Lausanne, and New York: W. W. Norton, 2008); Patrick Daum (ed.), *Impressionist Camera: Pictorial Photography in Europe, 1888–1918* (London; New York: Merrell, 2006).

⁴⁰ Details of Rodin's sculptures are not rare when partnered with the full figure, for instance Eugène Druet's shot of *Balzac's* trunk and head was often presented in books on Rodin alongside images of the entire figure. Frederick Lawton, *François-Auguste Rodin* (London: Grant Richards, 1907); Otto Grautoff, *Auguste Rodin* (Bielefeld; Leipzig: Velhagen & Klasing, 1908); Auguste Rodin, *L'Art* (Paris: B. Grasset, 1911).

⁴¹ Camille Mauclair, *Auguste Rodin: The Man, His Ideas, His Works* (London: Duckworth, 1905); Lawton, *François-Auguste Rodin*; Grautoff, *Auguste Rodin*; Rodin, *L'Art*.

⁴² Octave Mirbeau, et al., *Auguste Rodin et son Oeuvre* (Paris: La Plume, 1900). See also *Bellona, Danaid, Monument to Victor Hugo* in Mauclair, *Auguste Rodin*; *Age of Bronze, St John* in Grautoff, *Auguste Rodin*, etc. In early periodicals, Charles Quentin, 'New Work by Auguste Rodin', *Art Journal*, London, April 1902, pp. 121–3, presents four sculptures, three illustrated by paired images; Gustave Kahn, 'Auguste Rodin', *L'Art et le Beau*, no. 2, 1906, has multiple images of *The Female Centaur, Nature, Study of a Nude, La Pensée, Eve, Balzac*, etc.

⁴³ Rosso, 'Impressionism in Sculpture' [1902], in *Medardo Rosso*, ed. Moure, p. 131; Margherita Sarfatti, *Segni, colori, luci* (Bologna: Minerva, 1925), in *Medardo Rosso*, ed. Moure, p. 193.

⁴⁴ Charles Baudelaire, 'The Salon of 1846', in *Charles Baudelaire: Selected Writings on Art and Artists*, trans. P. E. Charvet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), p. 98. Rosso's essay of 1902 was explicitly framed in relation to Baudelaire, with whom his work had been aligned since 1896, on which see Hecker, *Moment's Monument*, pp. 155–6.

⁴⁵ Medardo Rosso and Luigi Ambrosini, 'Medardo Rosso's Words', *La Stampa*, Turin, 29 July 1923, in *Medardo Rosso*, ed. Moure, p. 182.

⁴⁶ Henri Bergson, *An Introduction to Metaphysics*, trans. T. E. Hulme (London: Macmillan, 1913), p. 4.

⁴⁷ Rosso and Ambrosini, 'Medardo Rosso's Words', in *Medardo Rosso*, ed. Moure, p. 181.

⁴⁸ Henri Bergson, *Creative Evolution* (London: Macmillan, 1922), p. 323.

⁴⁹ Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, p. 6. For a different take on Rosso and Bergson, see Jane Becker, "'Only One Art': The Interaction of Painting and Sculpture in the Work of Medardo Rosso, Auguste Rodin, and Eugène Carrière, 1884–1906", unpublished PhD, New York University, Graduate School of Arts and Science, 1998, pp. 164–82; Marco Fagioli, 'Medardo Rosso tra Darwin e Bergson', in *Le difficili vie del realismo: Rosso, Pocek, Sickert, Hopper, Wendt* (San Miniato, 1997), pp. 11–48.

⁵⁰ See Leo Steinberg, 'Rodin', in *Other Criteria: Confrontations with Twentieth-Century Art* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), pp. 322–403; Rosalind E. Krauss, *Passages in Modern Sculpture* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1981), pp. 14–20; Rosalind Krauss, 'The Originality of Avant-Garde: A Postmodern Repetition', *October*, vol. 18, 1981, pp. 47–66; David J. Getsy, *Rodin: Sex and the Making of Modern Sculpture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010), pp. 101–22; Nathalie Bondil (ed.), *Metamorphoses: In Rodin's Studio* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2016); Alexandra Gerstein (ed.), *Rodin and Dance: The Essence of the Movement* (London: Paul Holberton, 2016).

⁵¹ For instance, Rosso presented Rodin's *Torso* alongside his own works in his 1905 exhibition in Vienna. Photographically, both the Cremetti catalogue and Soffici's book present confrontations between Rosso's

Bambino ebreo, Rodin's *Torso*, and a small model after Michelangelo. The titles of Rodin's works were unstable; I follow Antoinette le Normand-Roman, *The Bronzes of Rodin: Catalogue of the Works in the Musée Rodin* (Paris: RMN, 2007).

⁵² Albert Elsen, *The Gates of Hell* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1985), p. 82.

⁵³ Mola, *Transient Form*, p. 14; Penelope Curtis, *Sculpture 1900–1945: After Rodin* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 108–12.

⁵⁴ Gutzon Borglum, 'Auguste Rodin', *Artist: An Illustrated Monthly Record of Arts, Crafts and Industries*, no. 32, September 1901, p. 195; Curtis, *Sculpture 1900–1945*, p. 108. On the significance of Rodin's persona in giving a sense of unity to his works, see Getsy, *Rodin*, throughout.

⁵⁵ Rosso, 'Impressionism in Sculpture' [1902], in *Medardo Rosso*, ed. Moure, p. 131.

⁵⁶ Marcel Proust, *Finding Time Again*, trans. Ian Patterson (London: Penguin, 2003), pp. 357–8.