



## Gertrude Stein and Pablo Picasso The Portrait of a Friendship

メタデータ	言語: eng 出版者: 公開日: 2010-07-29 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: Pavloska, Susan メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	<a href="https://doi.org/10.24729/00011160">https://doi.org/10.24729/00011160</a>

# Gertrude Stein and Pablo Picasso

## The Portrait of a Friendship

Susan Pavloska

According to the legend inscribed in *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*, “practically every afternoon” during the winter of 1905, Gertrude Stein would walk through the Luxembourg Gardens to the Odeon, take the horse-drawn bus to Montmartre, and then climb the hill to Picasso’s studio to sit for the portrait that now hangs in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Inside the little room with “*Au rendez-vous des poètes*” above the door, amid the “enormous” canvases of the Harlequin period and the smell of cooking and dogs, she would take her place in a large broken armchair while Picasso “sat very tight” in a “little kitchen chair and on a very small palette of a uniform brown grey color, mixed some more brown grey.” While Picasso struggled to possess Stein’s image, she passed the time “meditating and making sentences” or “talking and listening at the same time.” In the evening she would “wander” back to Montparnasse, on Saturdays bringing Picasso and his mistress Fernande home to dine, a custom that became the Steins’ weekly salon.<sup>1</sup>

Art historians and literary scholars alike have been at a loss as to how to account for the enigmatic friendship that grew out of this series of eighty or ninety sittings and lasted, “with all its troubled moments and complications” (*ABT* 15) a lifetime. As Neil Schmitz ([1983] 206) has noted, Stein’s part of the friendship has tended to be lost in the “strong light of Picasso’s glory”: while Stein’s critical reputation has been redeemed somewhat by the advent of postmodern literary theory,<sup>2</sup> Picasso has dominated the art world for most of this century and is, in the words of John Berger, “more famous than any other artist who has

ever lived” (Berger 3).

The overshadowing process began in the early years of Picasso’s fame, with Stein and Picasso’s contemporaries alternately striving to dismiss Stein as an onlooker, or at best a “wealthy muse”. When Stein withdrew her support, Matisse and Braque printed a broadside declaring her a “tourist” with little understanding of the art she collected (Matisse, Braque, 14). Another slighted friend, Ernest Hemingway, insinuated in his memoirs that the only reason that Picasso associated with Stein was because she was “one of the rich” and could finance his work (*A Moveable Feast* 10).

Art historians have similarly tended to deny Stein an active role in the revolution in modern art over which Picasso presided. John Rewald dismisses Stein’s theories of art as “poorly digested and badly expressed notions of things Gertrude had picked up from conversations with Leo, Matisse, or Picasso,” (71). John Richardson allows that the relationship was based on a “deep psychic feeling,” noting how after the completion of Stein’s portrait, Picasso’s canvases continued to be filled with images of massive women, many in poses that recalled Stein’s lesbianism, but he refuses to admit Stein to the ranks of the “poet laureates,” including Max Jacob, Guillaume Appollinaire, Andre Breton and Paul Eluard, whom Picasso cultivated throughout his life. Instead, Richardson confines Stein to the passive role of muse, characterizing the “three months or so of Picasso and Gertrude’s exposure to each other’s implacable regard” as a time when “the artist wrestled on canvas with Gertrude as if she were a sphinx whose image held the key to the future of his art,” while she in turn “set about hitching her covered wagon to Picasso’s comet” (405).

Because of the personal nature of each of these views, perhaps the most constructive way to assess the relationship is to look at the texts, or to use Stein’s all-inclusive term, the “compositions,” that it produced.

During the two years following the painting of *The Portrait of Gertrude Stein*, their work underwent the most profound changes of their careers. At the time of their meeting, both the thirty-one year-old Stein and the twenty-six year-old Picasso were newcomers to Paris whose work was preoccupied with images of outsiders: Stein in the stories of her *Three Lives* and Picasso in the paintings of his Blue and Rose Periods. During this period, both studied Cezanne and adopted an aesthetic of crudeness, incompleteness and ugliness that culminated, for Stein, in the “negro story,” “Melanctha”, and for Picasso, in *Les demoiselles d'Avignon*, which is sometimes referred to as “the masterpiece of Picasso’s Negro Period” (Rubin [1984] 27).

Stein’s style has traditionally been estimated more for its effect on other, more mainstream writers than in its own right. Her influence on Sherwood Anderson and Hemingway has been duly noted. Yet in the case of her relationship with Picasso, whether it was as hanger-on or patron or muse, or even “substitute younger sister” (Benstock, 153), Stein has always been depicted as creatively subordinate. The disproportion in their fame and the difficulty of comparing works in two different media serve partially to account for this bias; however, could it be possible that the creative practice of the two is actually more collaborative than has been commonly suspected?

Certainly Stein herself did all she could to advance such a view. As Schmitz observes, from its opening, with the ringing of Alice’s “genius-detecting bell” (for Stein, Picasso, and Alfred North Whitehead) *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas* was designed to “thrust” Stein into the center of the modernist movement, “beside Picasso” (Schmitz [1983], 212).

The year was 1907. Gertrude Stein was seeing through the press *Three Lives* which she was having privately printed, and she was deep in *The Making of the Americans*, her thousand page book.

Picasso had just finished his portrait of her which nobody at that time liked except the painter and the painted... and he had just begun his strange complicated picture of three women. Matisse had just finished his *Bonheur de Vivre*, his first big composition which gave him the name of Fauve or zoo. It was the moment Max Jacob called the heroic age of cubism.

The double-voiced construction of *The Autobiography* is uniquely suited to the task of advertising the friendship.<sup>3</sup> As Toklas, in the guise of narrator, confides:“(I wish I could convey something of the simple affection and confidence with which he always pronounced her name and with which she always said, Pablo. In their long friendship with all its sometimes troubled moments and complications this has never changed)” (*ABT* 15).

The picture that Toklas paints of Stein and Picasso’s relationship is one of not only the emotional but intellectual affinity:

She understands very well the basis of creation and therefore her advice and criticism is invaluable to all her friends. How often have I heard Picasso say to her when she has said something about a picture of his and then illustrated by something she was trying to do, *racontez-moi cela*. In other words tell me about it. These two even today have long solitary conversations. They sit in two little low chairs up in his apartment studio, knee to knee and Picasso says *expliquez- moi cela*. (*ABT* 72)

Of all of Picasso’s biographers, only Pierre Daix accepts the testimony of *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*. In his view, Stein’s friendship “constituted a priceless opening out” for Picasso, first of all, because Stein’s “American French” freed Picasso from his own “linguistic complexes” (56). Besides discussing her theories of art with him, she introduced him to Matisse, his future arch-rival, and could talk about the work of Cezanne, which at that time was known only to a small

group of enthusiasts, in relation to what she had learned in William James's Psychological Laboratory.<sup>4</sup>

The combination of Stein, Picasso, Cezanne and James was not merely fortuitous: James was the foremost American participant in an intellectual revolution whose artistic center was Paris. No longer satisfied with the articulation of "meaning" according to the dictates of a grand teleological plan, intellectuals had begun to investigate the process by which meaning was derived. In *Revolution in Poetic Language*, Julia Kristeva asserts that while in the United States the debates were largely confined to academic circles, in France they took place in the worlds of poetry and painting, and found their fullest expression in the post-Symbolist poetry of Mallarmé and the late-Impressionist painting of Cezanne (Kristeva [1974]).

In coming to Paris, both Stein and Picasso moved from the periphery of the intellectual movement to its center: Picasso's decision to settle in Paris was motivated by his dissatisfaction with Spanish *modernista* (Richardson, 129, 157).<sup>5</sup> Gertrude Stein, leaving Johns Hopkins Medical School for Paris, effectively switched fields from science to literature. Kristeva argues that because this revolution involved the estrangement of perception, "strangers" had a special advantage: "how can one avoid sinking into the mire of common sense, if not by becoming a stranger to one's own country, language, sex, and identity? Writing is impossible without some form of exile ([1986] 298).

Both Stein and Picasso were similarly ambitious in their claims for the revolutionary nature of their work. Stein referred to "Melanctha" as the "first definite step away from the nineteenth century and into the twentieth century in literature" (*ABT* 50), while *Les demoiselles d'Avignon* is widely regarded as the "first truly twentieth-century painting" (Fry 12). However, aside from Daix, art historians have been unprepared to make sense of Stein's wilfully naive style, what Marianne DeKoven

calls her “defiance of serious thought’s aura of respectability” (DeKoven [1988] 77), and have thus subjected her to a kind of ironic double standard. For example, Richardson notes Picasso’s fondness for *cursi*, his “taste for bad taste”, and praises the “way he made it work for him” (60); in the same work, however, he warns that before “hailing [Stein’s] discrimination” as a collector of cubist works, it is necessary to “examine her motives for embracing the movement” since “her own taste ran to kitsch” (405).

Ultimately, however, art historians’ reservations about Stein hinge on their objections to her insistence on linking her writing to Picasso’s painting. Richardson admits that there are similarities:

True, the writer and painter both managed to liberate themselves from traditional themes of verbal and pictorial expression and come up with a new form of notation. True again, both of them had a similar way of displaying, at the same time concealing, their feelings, especially about the women in their lives, by resorting to a private code.

“But”, he concludes, “there the parallels end”, because the compositions of *Tender Buttons* are “dissociative word patterns, hermetic jingles, while Picasso “rejected abstractionism and liked to think that his work was if anything more, certainly not less, real than the real thing, ”which is why he “represented real things — newspapers, cigarette packs by themselves” (406).

This “hermetic” label was actually one that was attached to Stein’s writing by literary scholars. One early critic, B.L. Reid, was so exasperated by Stein’s style that he was moved to publish an “essay in decapitation.” Calling Stein “one of the greatest egos of all time,” Reid pointed to her shortcomings in relation to “the friendly communicative genius” of her “masters,” James, Whitehead and Picasso: while they pull “us gently or roughly up to the heights of their new insight,” Stein seems

to be “talking to herself,” and thus deserved to be “defined out of existence as a writer” (169). While Reid did leave room for the possibility of defining Stein as a *scientist*, his sole criteria for judging the literary value of her works seems to be whether or not he could comprehend them.

Oddly enough, Richard Bridgman, in *Gertrude Stein in Pieces*, arrives at the same destination as Reid by way of the opposite track. Like Reid, he holds the view that “the total of Stein’s work belongs to the phenomenology of the mind rather than to literature” (Bridgman [1970], 7); however, he attributes Stein’s method, and assertions of genius, to a lack of confidence, rather than its excess, arguing, “the more aggressively Gertrude Stein insisted on her success, the more resistant were the problems she was trying to resolve” (244). He depicts the situation as one in which “finding herself perpetually frustrated in her attempts to provide a full, satisfactory description of any one or any thing, she eventually found herself driven to rely on her own subjective response, expressed in whatever words emerged at the moment of concentration” with the idea that “true confusion was superior to false order” (55). Bridgman’s overall assessment of Stein’s method is that it is founded in incompetence, in “unresolved bewilderment” (252), arguing that because, from her beginnings as a writer, Gertrude Stein found it difficult to construct coherent paragraphs, to sustain a tone, an idiomatic level, or an idea, *faute de mieux* she “consistently defended the virtues of the fragmentary perception, uniquely expressed” (199).

At the same time that he renders an immeasurable service in cataloguing, contextualizing, and describing the body of Stein’s work, Bridgman also seems to have undertaken Reid’s project: his marshalling of Stein’s juvenilia and other background material seems to be aimed at proving that even if Stein were not “basically stupid,” as her brother insisted, she was at least as Hemingway versified, “very lazy.”<sup>6</sup> With



few exceptions, critics have praised this very influential study as “full of common sense,” (Hoffman, 17) and regarded it as the single most important book on Stein.

In one of the first essays to attempt to interpret Stein’s more difficult writings in light of her lesbianism, feminist critics Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar describe Stein as a “ravenous ego,” and her creative practice as “unmaking,” or “subtracting the signifier from the signified,” arguing that Stein replaces the traditional metaphor of artistic creation as gestation and childbirth with the childish and hence more archaic image of digestion and defecation. On the premise that “unmaking is a form of composition that confers masculinity even more inexorably than making does” (247), they see the incomprehensibility of Stein’s experimental pieces as an act of aggression of an anal, sadistic order.

Although they do not regard Stein’s writing as hermetic, Gilbert and Gubar’s view of Stein’s experimental method as a process of “unmaking,” or “subtracting the signifier from the signified” echoes the title of *Art By Subtraction* while their portrayal of Stein herself as an egocentric child seems to be influenced by their reading of Reid and Bridgman. Because of their outrage at Stein’s seeming violation of the egalitarian ethos of lesbian collaboration, even as they make a convincing case for the proposition that Alice B. Toklas may actually be the author of the Autobiography, in Captain Delano-like fashion, they are blind to the possibility that Toklas, rather than being “cooked and eaten” by Stein in her ravenous need to assuage her ego, might have shared a relationship with Stein every bit as complex as their model of lesbian collaboration initially suggests.

Reid, Bridgman, and Gilbert and Gubar all assume that the aim of writing is to communicate, and to various degrees their hostility is generated by Stein’s perceived unwillingness—or in Bridgman’s case, inability—to do so. Stein’s tenacious insistence on the words of her

compositions—her refusal to fade them into the background and let her readers lose themselves in the “story”—is thus seen as annoying and even aggressive. However, from a formalist standpoint, this foregrounding of the words of a literary work is precisely what a literary work is meant to do.

From early on, critics have recognized the promise that formalist theory holds for the understanding of Stein’s writing (Schmitz, “Gertrude Stein as Post-Modernist” 1974). In 1983, Marianne DeKoven published a book-length study of Stein’s experimental (“hermetic”) writings using the terminology of “current French Feminist, post-structuralist and psychoanalytic criticism” (xvi). The poststructuralist model of language developed by Julia Kristeva that DeKoven applies in her analysis of Stein is in many ways ideal for the purpose of examining her relationship to Picasso. It has the advantage that, like semiotics, it can encompass the sign-systems used by both writers and artists, while at the same time, unlike structuralism, it can account for the interaction of the conscious and the unconscious in the user of signs, or “speaking subject”.

However, DeKoven’s eagerness to claim Stein (and Kristeva) as feminists causes her to make some serious errors. Specifically, she confounds the idea of the pre-Oedipal, itself an interpretation of Lacan’s adaptation of Freud, as it is differently used by Helene Cixous, Luce Irigaray, and Kristeva. For the former two, the pre-Oedipal is the feminine space *extraordinaire*, while for Kristeva, following Freud and Melanie Klein, the pre-Oedipal mother who looms above the pre-Oedipal phase is neither feminine nor masculine, but both (Kristeva, *About Chinese Women* 29). Thus, DeKoven ends up asserting that Stein’s experimental writings arise from a “pure state of language,” in which words “simply have no lexical meaning” (63), a conclusion that supports Richardson’s negative view.

Yet if we examine Kristeva's linguistic theories, we see that there is little room for "pure language." For Kristeva, language is a process (rather than an "object", as in the classical model of language) that is generated by the interaction of two "modalities" within the speaking subject: the "semiotic," arising from the unconscious, the body, and its instinctual drives, and "the symbolic," which is controlled by "external" constraints such as the laws of syntax, culture, society (*Revolution* 21-24). Thus, a nonverbal "signifying system" like music is predominately "semiotic," while a system such as mathematics, where nearly every move is governed by fixed laws of syntax, is predominately symbolic.

Kristeva's term, "the signifying process," conveys something of the active sense of the word "text": having the same base as "textile," a text is something that is constructed, woven together by a user. Because texts, are woven from both the semiotic and the symbolic, "no text, no matter how 'musicalized' is, or can be, "devoid of meaning or signification" (*Revolution* 65).<sup>12</sup> Marjorie Perloff has argued that many studies of Stein's "cubism" are marred by their equation of cubism with abstraction, pointing out that in art criticism it is a commonplace that there are "representational traces" in even the most "analytical" cubist works: the words "Ma Jolie," the newspapers and cigarette packs that Richardson mentions (Gombrich 281-6, in Perloff 71). Likewise, Lisa Ruddick and others have shown the extensive "representational traces" in some of Stein's most "opaque" writings.

Alluding to Freud's definition of fetishism as "the replacement of a love object by a thing... in the same way savages believed their gods were embodied in things," (Freud 19) Kristeva argues that art, because it substitutes its own meaning for the Symbolic, is a type of fetish. Nevertheless, what distinguishes art from a true fetish is that art "serves signification, even when it dislocates it" (*Revolution* 65). In DeKoven's

reading, Stein's experimental writing is a pure fetish, a completely opaque substitute for the Symbolic.

Stein herself did not consider her writing to be abstract, and vehemently defended herself against charges of "automatic writing," noting that "one always does like a resemblance" ("Pictures," *Lectures in America*, 79). Furthermore, her theoretical mechanism for creating "resemblance" resembles Kristeva's two-stranded model of language. In "Arthur, A Grammar," she declares "there is no resemblance without grammar," but then turns around and asks, have you any need for grammar except for explanation" (87, 60).

The word "explanation" denotes a concept that is of secondary importance for Stein (she once dismissed Ezra Pound as "a village explainer" (*ABT* 189)), but which is of the first importance for most people. Kristeva coined the term "phenotext," to refer to this more common type of text, composed of "language used to communicate, which linguistics describes in terms of 'competence' and 'performance'" (*Revolution* 87). Its opposite, which Kristeva calls a "genotext," is a text in which the semiotic component is dominant, a text that is woven by the unconscious and the instinctual drives on the warp of the symbolic. Unlike phenotexts, genotexts are not created with communication in mind. Kristeva sees instances of genotexts in "magic, shamanism, esoterism, the carnival," incomprehensible "poetry" and all other such practices that "underscore the limits of socially useful discourse and attest to what it represses: the *process* that exceeds the subject and his communicative structures" (*Revolution* 16).

Kristeva's notion of the genotext bears a striking resemblance to the practice that evolved out of Stein and Picasso's association during the winter of 1905-6, which de-emphasized competence, communication—"grammar"—in favor of unconscious processes similar to the Semiotic. In one of her notebooks from that time Stein speculates about her

attraction to painters, rather than to other writers:

Leo does his job with his brains... Matisse, Pablo and I do not do ours with either brains or character we have all enough to do our job but our initiative comes from a propulsion which we don't control, or create. (NB B.20, in Ruddick 104)

Picasso spoke of the "reality" of Cubism as being "like a perfume... everywhere, but you don't know where it comes from" (Rubin 72). Elsewhere, he would describe "forms... that stem sometimes from an atavism that antedates animal life." (Boggs). This conception of an instinctual "propulsion," "perfume," or "atavistic form" was codified and elaborated upon in Stein's theory of "repetition". According to Bridgman ([1966] 179-82), repetition had first appeared in Stein's writing as a result of her attempts to recreate the diffuse effect of colloquial speech, as in the following passage from "The Gentle Lena":

Did Lena think it gave Mrs. Haydon any pleasure, to work so hard to make Lena happy, and get her a good husband, and then Lena was so thankless and never did anything that anybody wanted. It was a lesson to poor Mrs. Haydon not to do things any more for anybody...it just made trouble for her and her husband did not like it. He always said she was too good, and nobody ever thanked her for it, and there Lena was always standing stupid and not answering anything anybody wanted... "No, it ain't no use your standin' there and cryin,' now, Lena... You should have cared some before, and then you wouldn't have to stand and cry now, and be a disappointment to me, and then I get scolded by my husband for taking care of everybody, and nobody ever thankful." (*Three Lives* 256)

Stein herself associated "repetition" with the pleasure of speech. In her lecture, "Portraits and Repetition," she says that she first became aware of repetition as a student living with "a whole group of very lively little aunts who had to know anything":

If they had to know anything and anybody does they naturally had to say and hear it often, anybody does, and as there were ten and eleven of them they did have to say and hear said whatever was said and any one not hearing what it was they said had to come in to hear what had been said. That inevitably made everything said often. I began then to consciously listen to what anybody was saying and what they did say while they were saying. This was not yet the beginning of writing but it was the beginning of knowing what there was that made there can be no repetition. (168-69)

Stein's assertion, "there is no such thing as repetition" (166) is consistent with the conception of the human mind that she had learned from William James, who wrote in his *Principles of Psychology* that "when the identical fact returns, we must think of it in a fresh manner, see it under a somewhat different angle, apprehend it in different relations from those in which it last appeared"(156).

While repetition served as an important naturalistic device in Stein's early narratives, during the writing of "Melanctha" it took on a life of its own, becoming, as Lisa Ruddick argues, a "force within herself and her prose" that explodes "nineteenth century beliefs and values" (2) and was specifically erotic. A third of the way into *The Making of the Americans* Stein describes "loving repeating" as a universal feeling—"loving repeating is always in children" (295) — that gets repressed during adolescence: "mostly when they are growing to be young men and women they have not it in them to have loving repeating being in them as a conscious feeling" (296). Once reactivated, "repetition" manifests itself as a bodily sensation, as a "pounding"(302) that "sounds louder and louder and louder inside me through my ears and eyes and feelings" (300).

While writing *The Making of Americans*, Ruddick observes, Stein's "love of repetition" which was the "original stimulus" for her interest in

psychology, now becomes her “overt theme”: “They are all of them repeating... I love it and now I will write it” (*MoA* 289, in Ruddick 74). According to Stein, “Slowly [peoples’ nature] comes out from them in the most delicate gradation, to the gentlest flavor of them. Always it comes out repeating from them... This a joy to anyone loving repeating” (293). Listening to these various repetitions eventually yields a type of synthesis, which Stein called a person’s “bottom nature”:

In the Making of Americans I was doing what the cinema was doing, I was making a continuous succession of the statement of what that person was until I had not many things but one thing.

A portrait thus conveyed “the rhythm of anybody’s personality.” (“Portraits and Repetition”, 174)

Stein’s portraits follow a model of mimesis based on process rather than on imitation, or in Kristeva’s words, “not an imitation of an object” but “the reproduction of the trajectory of enunciation” (*Revolution*, 248, n. 72). Stein identified this idea as the lesson she learned from Cezanne:

Up to that time composition had consisted of a central idea, to which everything else was an accompaniment and separate but not an end in itself, and Cezanne conceived the idea that in composition one thing was as important as another thing... that impressed me so much I began to write *Three Lives* under this influence and this idea of composition and I was more interested in composition at that moment, this background of word-system, which had come to me from this reading I had done. I was obsessed by this idea of composition, and the Negro story [“Melanctha”] was the quintessence of it. (Haas, 15)

Daix asserts that Stein was “the first to understand” that the various stylistic shifts that *Les demoiselles d’Avignon* (and her own portrait) underwent, or rather, “the shift of vision that composition imposed” were the true subject of the painting: “Picasso said look at that face, all

faces are as old as the world. And so Picasso commenced his long struggle to express heads, faces and bodies of men and women in the composition which his composition" (*Picasso*, 39-40). In other words, "faces," are a constant, like "grammar," or the "background of word-system." It was up to the artist to use this given as the frame on which to weave the "composition that was his composition," out of the "rhythm of his personality."

Because a "composition" consists of a combination of the known and the unknown, an artist never knew what a composition would result in. Picasso described the painting of *Les demoiselles d' Avignon* in the following way:

I had finished half the picture. And I thought to myself, 'This isn't it!' I did the other half. And I asked myself if I should redo the whole thing. And then I thought, 'They'll understand what I was trying to do!' (Vallentin, 236)

Creation becomes revision, with the signs of the struggle left in evidence for others to read. "Write without thinking of the result in terms of a result," Stein admonished a young writer, "but think of writing in terms of discovery, which is to say the creation must take place between the pen and the paper" (Schmitz [1983] 190-1). The style of composition that Stein advocates is radically different from the classic western model, in which all elements are subordinated to a "central idea". However, critics have typically failed to take this orientation into account. For instance, Bridgman views the fact that in *Three Lives* there is "no attempt to unify the style" as another sign of Stein's incompetence, and he attributes the roughness of the style of another piece as the "result of not editing" (179). In a similar way, Leo Stein criticized Picasso's portrait of his sister as "stylistically incoherent" (Mellow 93) because its masklike face contrasted with the rose-brown realism of the rest of the painting.



However, such criticisms of Picasso were soon drowned out by the general roar of acclamation that has only recently begun to wane. While the legend grew up about Stein as egoistic, opportunistic, and monumentally lazy, Picasso was hailed as the first truly twentieth-century artist. These factors served to obscure Stein's intellectual contribution to Picasso's art; however, the similarities between Stein and Picasso's creative practice suggests that their relationship had a deeper intellectual basis than the superficial characterization given by most art historians and literary critics. It is time to award Stein her place among Picasso's poet laureates, and even to entertain the tantalizing possibility that Picasso might have been the first of the legion of young men who were modernized at Stein's knee.

## Note

1 Gertrude Stein, *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas* 46, hereafter cited in the text as *A BT* “Talking and listening at the same time,” is from Stein’s lecture, “Portraits and Repetition,” in which she claims, “one may really indeed say that it is the essence of a genius, of being most essentially alive, that is being one who is at the same time talking and listening” (170). Daix describes Picasso’s notion of painting as the best means to “possess” a woman (54).

2 For example, Margot Norris writes, “the greater admiration for the lost generation novelists, Hemingway and Fitzgerald, which was inspired by New Criticism’s formalistic emphasis from the forties to the sixties when the canons and values of modernism were being codified has shifted during the seventies and eighties to the avant-garde productions of Gertrude Stein and Djuna Barnes, who respond more interestingly to the metaphysical inquiries of poststructuralist theory.” “The Early Twentieth Century, *The Columbia History of the American Novel* ed., Emory Elliott et. al (New York: Columbia UP, 1991) 330; see also DeKoven [1988]; Ellen G. Friedman, “Where are the Missing Contents? (Post)modernism, Gender, and the Canon,” *PMLA* 108 (March 1993): 240-252.

3 I concur with the idea, proposed by Bridgman [1970] and clarified by Gilbert and Gubar [1989] that Alice Toklas is actually the author, or at least the co-author, of her “autobiography.”

4 As Jayne L. Walker points out, James’s studies of the process of perception and Cezanne’s technique of notating his visual sensations come from “the same fundamental hypothesis”: that it was possible to circumvent the conventions upon which perception was known to be based and see with an “innocent eye” (7).

5 “Modernista” is a provincial offshoot of symbolism and art nouveau rather than an authentically modern movement (Richardson, 129).

6 Hemingway, “Portrait of a Lady,” *8 Poems*, ed., Nicholas Geogiannis (New York: Harcourt, 1979) 90. The couplet devoted to Stein reads, “Gertrude Stein was never crazy/ Gertrude Stein was very lazy.”

7 Dearborn 245, n. 9. See also Gilbert and Gubar II, 418, n. 96; Stimpson, “Mind, Body” 494, n. 10. Marianne DeKoven takes exception to the way Bridgman roots Stein’s style in “pathology rather than intention” (xxiii); Janice L. Doane comments on the sexism of Bridgman’s equation of Stein’s “hysteri-

cal" emotional life and her writing, and of his comparisons of her style to such things as a woman driver and a "great sow surrounded by sucklings" xvii-xxi, 67.

8 For a full treatment of anality in Stein, see Ruddick 77- 92 .

9 Gilbert and Gubar, Vol. II, 418, n. 96; 419, n. 121.

10 Kristeva regards "pure language" in the same way that Deleuze and Guattari regard "schizophrenia": a valuable reserve of psychic energy that is valueless without connection to the social world. See Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus* 379.

11 Kristeva's formulation of the semiotic and the symbolic is based on Lacan's idea of the "imaginary" and "the symbolic," the main difference being that Kristeva associates the semiotic with an enigmatic structure that she calls the semiotic "chora." See *Revolution* 25-30.

12 The converse, as some mathematicians would say, is also true: no system, no matter how dominated by syntax, lacks an element of chaos.

13 Lisa Ruddick, "A Rosy Charm: Gertrude Stein and the Repressed Feminine" in Hoffman, 225-239; *Reading Gertrude Stein*, 148-179, 190-252; see also Elizabeth Fifer, "Is Flesh Advisable The Interior Theater of Gertrude Stein," *Signs* 4 (1979): 472-83; Schmitz, "Gertrude Stein as Post-Modernist, 123-4; Stimpson, "Somagrams," 190.

## WORKS CITED

- Berger, John. *Success and Failure of Picasso*. 1965. Rpt. London: Granta, 1992.
- Benstock, Shari. *Women of the Left Bank: Paris, 1900-1940*. Austin: U of TXP, 1986.
- Boggs, Jean Sutherland. *ArtNews*.
- Bridgman, Richard. *The Colloquial Style in America* New York, 1966.
- . Gertrude Stein in Pieces. New York: Oxford UP, 1970.
- Daix, Pierre. *Picasso: Life and Art*. New York: IconEditions/HarperCollins, 1993.
- Dearborn, Mary. *Pocahontas's Daughters: Gender and Ethnicity in American Culture*. London: Oxford UP, 1986.
- DeKoven, Marianne. *A Secret Language: Gertrude Stein's Experimental Writing*.  
Madison: Wisconsin UP, 1983.
- . "Half in and Half Out of Doors: Gertrude Stein and Literary Tradition." *A Gertrude Stein Companion*. Ed. Bruce Kellner. Westport: Greenwood, 1988.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*.  
Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, Helen R. Lane. London: Althone Press, 1984.
- Doane, Janice L. *Silence and Narrative: The Early Novels of Gertrude Stein*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1986.
- Freud, Sigmund, "The Sexual Aberrations." *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*. Trans. James Strachey. New York: Basic, 1975.
- Fry, Edward. *Cubism*. New York: Oxford, 1966.
- Gilbert, Sandra, and Susan Gubar, "She Meant What I Said: Lesbian Double Talk" in *No Man's Land: The Place of the Woman Writer in the Twentieth Century Vol. II, Sexchanges*. New Haven, Yale, 1989.
- Gombrich, E.H. *Art and Illusion: A Study in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation*, the A.W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts, 1956. New York: Pantheon, Bollingen Series 35, 1960. In Perloff, Marjorie. "Poetry as Word-System." *The Poetics of Indeterminacy*. Princeton:

- PUP, 1981.
- Haas, Robert Bartlett, "Transatlantic Interview," *A Primer for the Gradual Understanding of Gertrude Stein* Los Angeles: Black Sparrow Press, 1971.
- Ernest Hemingway. "Portrait of a Lady." *88 Poems*. Ed., Nicholas Geogiannis (New York: Harcourt, 1979).
- . *A Moveable Feast*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1964.
- Hoffman, Michael J. Introduction. *Critical Essays on Gertrude Stein*. Boston: G.K. Hall, 1986.
- James, William. *Principles of Psychology*. New York: Henry Holt, 1913.
- Julia Kristeva. *About Chinese Women*. Trans. Anita Barrows. London: Boyars, 1977.
- . "A New Kind of Intellectual: The Dissident." Trans. Sean Hand. Rpt. in *The Kristeva Reader*. Ed. Toril Moi. New York: Columbia UP, 1986, 292-300.
- . *Revolution in Poetic Language*. 1974. Trans., Margaret Waller. New York: Columbia UP, 1984.
- . "The System and the Speaking Subject." *Times Literary Supplement* (12 October 1973, 1249-52) Rpt. Moi, 24-33.
- Matisse, Henri and Georges Braque. "Testimony Against Gertrude Stein" *Transition*(1934-35) ed. Eugene Jolas. The Hague: Servire Press, 1935, 14.
- Mellow, James. *Charmed Circle: Gertrude Stein & Company*. Boston: Houghton, 1974.
- Reid, B.L. *Art By Subtraction*. Norman: OKUP, 1958.
- Rewald, John. "The Steins and Their Circle." *Cezanne and America: Dealers, Collectors, Artists and Critics*. The A.W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts, 1979. Bollingen Series XXXV.28. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1979.
- Richardson, John. *A Life of Picasso, Vol. 1: 1881-1906*. New York: Random House, 1991.
- Rubin, William. *Picasso in the Collection of the Museum of Modern Art*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1972.
- . ed. "Primitivism" in *Twentieth-Century Art: Affinity of the Tribal and the Modern* 2 vols. New York, Museum of Modern Art, 1984.
- Ruddick, Lisa. "A Rosy Charm: Gertrude Stein and the Repressed Feminine." Hoffman, 225-239.

- . *Reading Gertrude Stein*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1990.
- Schmitz, Neil. "Gertrude Stein as Post-Modernist: The Rhetoric of *Tender Buttons*." 1974. Rpt. in Hoffman, 117-130.
- . *Of Huck and Alice: Humorous Writing in American Literature*. Minneapolis: U of MNP, 1983.
- Stein, Gertrude. "Arthur a Grammar." *How to Write*. Paris, Plain Ed., 1931.
- . *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*. 1932. Ed. Carl Van Vechten. *Selected Works of Gertrude Stein*. New York: Random House, 1946.
- . The Gentle Lena. *Three Lives*. 1909. New York: Vintage/Random House, n.d.
- . Letter to John Hyde Preston. "A Conversation." *Atlantic Monthly* CLVI (1935) 188, in Schmitz [1983], 190-91.
- . *Picasso*. 1938. Rpt. New York: Dover, 1984.
- . "Pictures," *Lectures in America*. 1935. Boston: Beacon, 1985, 57-93.
- . "Portraits and Repetition." *Lectures in America*, 165-209.
- Stimpson, Catherine. "The Mind, the Body and Gertrude Stein." *Critical Inquiry* 3 (1977): 489-506.
- . "The Somagrams of Gertrude Stein." *Poetics Today* 6 nos 1-2 (1985): 67-80.
- Vallentin, Antonina. *Picasso* 1955, 236, in Daix, 75.
- Walker, Jayne L. *The Making of a Modernist: Gertrude Stein from "Three Lives" to "Tender Buttons"* Amherst: UMass P, 1984.