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The Evolution of Intent
Major Factors and Concepts in Figure Drawing

In creative figure drawings, the marks not only define but also enact and evoke the character of the subject, bringing the image to life.

Some Common Denominators

The main interest of people everywhere has always been people. One of the most enduring expressions of this captivating appeal is evident in the long history of the visual arts, where images of the human figure have always held a special fascination for artists and the public alike. Of the several means by which the figure is represented, drawings often seem to possess a greater sense of vitality and expressive eloquence than do many paintings, sculptures, and photographs. This may have to do with the direct, often more spontaneous nature of the drawing process itself. It may have to do also with drawing’s heightened demand on artists to simplify what they see or envision. And when it is the figure they see or envision the stakes are high. We may be more forgiving of some unintended errors and ambiguities in a still-life or a landscape drawing’s forms, or of some inconsistencies in its perspective or proportion, but when the subject is the figure, we view it with a more knowing and a more demanding eye. And one of the main qualities we insist on, whatever the drawing’s style be, is the sense of the figure’s living presence. Who is not affected by the magic of a drawing’s marks bringing a person to life on the page? And when that person’s convincing vitality is formed by a knowing economy, isn’t the achievement even more impressive? In good drawing, less is often more. Perhaps that is why to most connoisseurs, the economy and life-giving manner with which the figure is drawn remains a telling standard for evaluating an artist’s ability to draw.

The psychological and philosophical nature of people, and the ways we shape these qualities through the act of drawing, can evoke powerful expressive meanings. By losing ourselves in an intense visual encounter with another’s living nature, we have the satisfaction of better apprehending our own creative and human nature and of achieving important insights about the people around us.

An ability to draw the figure well is important not only to the representational artist. Something of the figure’s spirit and form can be sensed in many of the finest examples of abstract painting and sculpture, and of pottery, ornament, and architecture. As the noted art historian Kenneth Clark observed, “The nude does not simply represent the body, but relates it, by analogy, to all structures that have become part of our imaginative experience.”1 It is no coincidence that many of the best abstract artists of the twentieth century—for example, Picasso, Matisse, and Diebenkorn—are gifted exponents of figure drawing. Perhaps it is the visual analogies to human form and character—some inflections of shape, line, and color that set off human associations in our minds—that give their more subjective works a special meaning for us.

But mere facility in drawing the figure is not enough to hold the interest of the gifted artist or the sensitive viewer. Something else is necessary. The best figure drawings have the power to affect and involve us deeply. They seem to possess certain extraordinary energies, relationships, and metaphors that make them compelling expressions that we treasure. Other figure drawings, though deftly stated and inviting in subject matter, seem to lack the vitality, and, consequently, the lasting power of master figure drawings. They hold little interest beyond their descriptive content. Drawings preoccupied with facility, accuracy, or “storytelling” are bound to be limited to these creatively dubious goals.

What is it about the figure drawings of Rembrandt, Matisse, Kollwitz, and the many other old and contemporary masters that attracts and engages us so? It is certainly not their success as faithful documents of observed individuals and situations, for many are drastically altered or wholly invented images. Nor are they often the most precise or detailed accounts of what is presented. Sometimes, as in Schiele’s drawing of his wife and her nephew (Fig. 1.1), such works are strikingly inventive interpretations. Often, they are boldly concise, as in Kollwitz’s *Woman Weeping* (Fig. 1.2). It is surely not that the best figure drawings exemplify some cultural standard of beauty, for many do not meet even minimal standards of attractive human
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proportion. Still, no matter how plain or misshapen the forms, the best figure drawings always impart some kind of psychological or spiritual attraction (Fig. 1.3). Nor can a drawing’s theme or storyline lift it to the level of sound drawing. No matter how moving or important a drawing’s message may be, the means need to be part of the message, as Figure 1.2 shows. Here, both marks and movement amplify the woman’s withdrawal and grief. Finally, the appeal of master drawings does not often depend on their compositional inventiveness. Many are private preparatory studies, as are Figures 1.4 and 1.5, and as such, often concentrate on exploring various particularities of a subject’s forms. And while the artists’ innate sense of balance and order usually give such drawings a resolved
It seems, then, that the vitality and expressive impact of the best drawings cannot be explained solely in terms of facility, cultural ideals, accuracy, narrative theme, or composition. To understand why certain figure drawings have the power to please, provoke, and inspire us, we must begin by recognizing that each of us responds to far more than their representational or figurative content. All such works possess a dynamic “life”—a network of visual relationships and energies between the drawn marks and between the forms they produce. Beginning a drawing with a search for the figure’s gesture, that is, its suggestions of movements and spirit, is a vital strategy for approaching many of these relationships and energies. This network of activities—of movements, rhythms, and tensions, among a drawing’s parts—produces sensations in us that affect the way we “read” a drawing.

As we shall see in Chapter 5, these visual energies, inherent in the subject, can also be carried in the drawn marks defining the subject, and both of these energies resonate through a work. We respond to these sources of energy partly because of our kinetic sensibilities—our ability to identify, through our bodily senses, with the thrusts, pulsations, and rhythms that seem to animate the things around us. And everything we see suggests energy of some kind, if only we allow ourselves to experience them at play beneath the things we see around us. The path of a bent arm or a curved line, the thrust of a church spire or a drawn wedge, and the undulation of a tree branch or a brushstroke all express actions that resonate in us, we can sense them. These inherent actions are always present within and among all forms and in any pose a model may take, and should be an important aspect of how we see our subjects. Seasoned artists become very good at experiencing such “moving” actions in things that aren’t actually moving.

When we draw, such movements, issuing from the actions (and interactions) of the lines and tones themselves, convey the drawing’s “underground” system of
energies, its abstract character. And those actions inherent in a drawing’s recognizable forms convey its figurative or depictive behavior. These actions are mutually interacting aspects of a drawing’s dynamic and organizational life that finally fuse into its expressive life.

In the best drawings, expression will always be found at both the figurative and abstract levels, or what is sometimes called, the what and the how of drawing. To illustrate this point, let us once again turn to Figure 1.2. Both the woman and the lines and tones that shape her reveal similar expressive qualities. Note how the downward flow of the lines, like the lines of a weeping willow tree, intensify the figure’s expressive mood. Such lines do not flow from conscious choice alone. Rather, their emotive character reflects the artist’s intuitive as well as empathic response to the subject’s state. Kollwitz feels as well as sees her subject. The best figure drawings are never merely descriptive. They evolve out of negotiations among the subject’s gestural actions, its figurative actualities, and the artist’s sympathetic interests in these qualities—his or her interpretation of the subject’s human and abstract energies and consequently the expressive meanings they carry.

The figure’s measurable features—its differing masses and their various shapes, planes, values, textures, sizes, and locations in space—can be reduced to two fundamental considerations: its general constructional nature and its specific anatomical one. We will refer to these as the structural factor and the anatomical factor. Although these factors are always interdependent aspects of a figure’s draped or undraped forms, in the next three chapters we will consider them separately to better examine the nature of each and to see how they interact.

Similarly, for discussion purposes, we will divide the figure’s dynamic properties—those directional and relational energies that give a drawing its order and impact—into the design factor and expressive factor. These two factors are also interdependent, but by separating them (in Chapters 5 and 6), we can explore each more fully. Because we make these arbitrary divisions, it is important to bear in mind that artists understand a drawing’s design and expression as parts of the same phenomenon in the subject: its allusions to expressive order (or, in the case of strongly expressive images, organized expression). Furthermore, in practice, all four factors always interact. One of the major themes of this book is to call attention to the high degree of interdependence of the measurable and the dynamic factors.

In the best figure drawings, then, representational content not only coexists but also interacts with a system of dynamic content that carries expressive meanings. A drawing’s figurative and abstract content comes from the way artists use the visual elements—the seven basic tools of visual communication. These elements are line, shape, value, volume, color, space, and texture. Chapters 5 and 6 examine these visual tools and the energies they release.
Here, it is important to recognize that this first universal common denominator of creative figure drawing—the interacting of abstract and figurative meaning—is a given fundamental condition.

All marks relate in some way. Left unregarded, the abstract behavior of a drawing’s visual elements will produce confusing discords and inconsistencies—a kind of visual “noise” that confuses representational meanings. The best exponents of figure drawing have always understood that the organizational and emotive powers of the visual elements affect the clarity and meaning of the figurative forms they denote: that the dynamic nature of the marks by which the visual elements show themselves and of the recognizable forms they produce are interdependent considerations. In creative figure drawings, then, the marks not only define, but also enact and evoke the character of the subject, bringing the image to life.

And good figure drawings are always “alive.” In Rembrandt’s Bearded Oriental in a Turban, Half-Length (Fig. 1.6), the animated behavior of the figure and of the lines and tones expresses vigorous life. Swift but certain strokes intensify the man’s confident stance. The fanlike eruption of rhythmic lines emerging from the arms and waist further heightens the figure’s barely contained energy. Even the more specifically drawn forms of the head are developed with a graceful and animated authority. The burst of dark tones, establishing a sense of light, also adds to the turbulent “storm” of the drawing’s undulating rhythms.

But aliveness in drawing does not always depend on graceful harmonies. The goal in Hokusai’s Wrestlers
(Fig. 1.7) seems to be the ruggedly potent, even awkward character of the two struggling figures. Their gnarled and straining forms contrast with the more supple forms of the man on the right, who is observing. He serves as an expressive counterpoint against which the tensions and stresses of the struggling wrestlers gain greater impact. Note that the wrestlers are drawn with lines that are deliberate, even crabbed, suggesting the tension and strain of the fighting figures, while the forms of the third figure are drawn in a more flowing manner. This contrast can even be seen in the difference between the shapes of the wrestlers’ feet (and the lines that form them) and the feet of the onlooker. Likewise, the more complicated and “lumpy” shapes of the wrestlers’ bodies are in clear contrast to the simpler, more rhythmic shapes of the third figure. Hokusai even extracts a heightened sense of drama (while simultaneously balancing the masses of the entire drawing within the picture plane) by emphasizing the leftward lurching of the wrestlers with the opposing tilt in the figure on the right.

Note that Hokusai, like Rembrandt, has altered anatomical fact to strengthen expressive meaning. (Note the features of the face in Fig. 1.6.) The best exponents of figure drawing utilize rather than eulogize anatomical facts because their purpose is to express, and not simply to record. For the same reason, artists often take liberties with laws of perspective and illumination and the “rules” of composition, or rules that refer to the ways various media should be used. Freedom of inquiry and of interpretation must always overrule conformity to any convention or system.

Another common denominator of good figure drawings is the economy and directness with which the artist establishes the drawing. Invariably, master drawings are as concise and straightforward as the artist’s theme, style, and tools permit. The best artists tell their truth plainly. Choosing a medium that permits such a concise graphic statement is important. All master drawings demonstrate a sensitive interaction between the meanings and the means used to convey them.

Still another important common denominator is that the best drawings show a unique temperament and attitude. As Edgar Degas put it, “Drawing is a way of looking at form.” This quality stems partly from the nature of what the artist chooses to draw and partly from the artist’s innate temperament—his or her general likes and dislikes—both as an artist and as an
individual. How we come to have our particular creative persuasion is beyond the scope of this book, but we all know that an artist’s temperament determines his or her perceptions and responses. Perhaps less obvious is that the artist’s ability to clearly assert his or her attitude is crucial to the drawing’s success as a work of art. Genuine creative invention demands genuinely personal interpretations, deflected as little as possible by outside influences. The best figure drawings show an unwavering point of view; they are often eloquent in the clarity of their intent. They are keenly bold or delicate, schematic or sensual, deliberate or impulsive. In other words, good figure drawings will plainly declare the artist’s views about the subject, and about the joy of drawing.

The best figure drawings, even when they are highly subjective images, also reveal the artist’s knowledge of the structural and anatomical factors. As noted earlier, however, in master drawings it is always evident that these matters serve, but never dominate the artist. Some artists, such as Michelangelo (Fig. 1.14), are even able to elevate their private anatomical studies to the level of art. Such drawings show an interplay between facts and feelings, that is, between the figure’s measurable matters and the expressive power implicit in its forms. Structure and anatomy are essential as liberating, not restricting, factors.

One of the most important realizations of such understanding is that structural and anatomical considerations can add to a drawing’s dynamic interest; they can both stimulate and strengthen relational and emotive ideas. In Lachaise’s Back of a Nude Woman (Fig. 1.8), the “beat” of ovoid shapes and the rhythmic undulations of contour lines are abstract expressions of the figure’s pose and forms. It is impossible to view Lachaise’s drawing without responding to the animating energy of the lines and shapes that express in abstract terms his interests in the subject’s sensuous forms and gesture.

The structural aspects of Lachaise’s drawings, as shown in the solid interlocking masses, and his knowledge of anatomy used to simplify some forms and amplify others are the product of sound understanding, and they seamlessly interrelate with the drawing’s active design and sensual expression. Here, all four factors—structure, anatomy, design, and expression—interweave to advance the same theme.

This leads us to the last common denominator. Great figure drawings reveal an authoritative and personal governance among the factors of structure, anatomy, design, and expression inherent in human form. Although the degree to which each factor participates in a drawing’s creation is determined by what we see, feel, and intend, all four must be successfully integrated in forming the image. Because these four elements are given conditions in figure drawing, and each is dependent on the others, none can be disregarded without weakening the quality and meaning of the rest.

THE EMERGENCE OF INTERPRETIVE FIGURE DRAWING

Interpretive figure drawing, in the sense described earlier as conveying the felt convictions of an individual temperament, was a relatively late arrival in the history of art. But when it arrived, structure, anatomy, design, and expression were all interacting properties. Perhaps figure drawing’s main strength, namely its ability to function as a direct means of personal inquiry and interpretation—its power as a means for quickly finding and stating—is the reason for its delayed appearance as a major category of creative expression. Earlier creative modes had little to do with personal expression.

Visual imagery from the dawn of history to the late Middle Ages (if such a sweep of time can be summarized) was largely determined by highly formalized, collective conventions. Representations of human and animal figures conformed to these rigid schemas. The earliest depictions
of the human figure are few and rather more schematic when compared to the cave paintings of bison and other animal figures which show a sensitivity to gesture and rhythmic line. By the Neolithic era, humans had begun to leave a visual record of their activities conveying a sprightly charm (Fig. 1.9), but these representations conformed strictly to formula and were simple in concept. With the emergence of the Egyptian civilization and the civilizations of the Tigris–Euphrates Valley, far more sophisticated but still rigidly stylized conventions developed for representing human form (Fig. 1.10).

Although impressive humanistic developments occurred in many aspects of Greek civilization, in early Greek art formula solutions for depicting the figure showed only slight allowances for objective investigation. Not until about 550 B.C. did Greek art begin to develop its grand aesthetic concepts based on objective visual inquiry and a collective ideal that saw humans as physically and spiritually perfected according to Greek cultural and religious standards. This fertile convention was flexible enough to permit a modest degree of personal interpretation, and the first individuals of outstanding mastery begin now to be known to us by name. Sculptors such as Phidias and Praxiteles and vase painters such as Epictetus and Douris leave their imprint on later Greek art. This classic style was to have a profound impact on Renaissance artists and, periodically, on many artists throughout the world, especially in the West. But despite the great heights that idealized representations of the figure—owing much to a sensitive understanding of human form—attained in later Greek sculpture and painting, drawings of the figure (done almost exclusively as vase decorations) generally show a markedly conventionalized treatment (Fig. 1.11). This is not to suggest that these drawings are less aesthetically valid or pleasing; indeed, many are of outstanding artistic
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merit. But they are less the result of inquiry and response than of a collective formula for depicting human forms. Virtually no drawings on flat, bounded surfaces emerged from Greek or, still later, Roman art. And with the exception of a small number of sculptors and painters, no tradition of art done in a spirit of personal interpretation developed from these cultures.

During the Middle Ages, a highly symbolic convention arose in the art of manuscript illumination, which became somewhat more observational and interpretive with time. Occasionally, as in Figure 1.12, such manuscript art reached some degree of freedom from convention, but such works were the exception.

Drawing, and especially figure drawing, resulting from an investigative, humanistic, and personally interpretive attitude did not begin to appear as a serious creative activity until the Renaissance. With the emergence of a sense of individuality, a thirst for scientific and philosophical knowledge, and a desire to understand the nature of the world and of humankind, drawing became an efficient and even necessary mode of exploration and expression. In this climate of inquiry, earlier collective conventions of art quickly gave way to individual interpretation, and a powerful interest in drawing flowered. Not only did this emancipation from the restrictions of formula solutions dramatically alter the motives and meanings of works in painting and sculpture, but the spirit of the Renaissance can also be credited with the birth of interpretive drawing—as especially figure drawing—as a serious form of creative expression.

The engraving *Battle of Nudes* (Fig. 1.13) by the fifteenth-century Italian sculptor Pollaiuolo provides an example of the emerging interest in human form during
the early Renaissance period. The artist’s unflagging attention to anatomical facts and his sensitivity to the supple, rhythmic nature of human forms represent a new level of understanding in the art of figure drawing. Although the drawing’s overall style is one of deliberate, refined delineation—characteristics which typify earlier artistic attitudes—the almost sculptural modeling and the expressive force of the drawing’s curvilinear and diagonal movements show an integration of structure, anatomy, design, and expression.

1.14 MICHELANGELO BUONARROTI
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By the sixteenth century, the tendency toward a calculated elegance in figure drawing had been, for many artists, largely replaced by a more direct and even spontaneous approach to matters of inquiry and response. This shift in attitude resulted from a number of conditions. These included a growing visual sophistication nurtured by the cross-influences among artists, the value that patrons of the arts now placed on original concepts, the emergence of drawing as an admired form of expression, and the ready market for major projects in painting and sculpture that required many preparatory drawings.

Furthermore, sixteenth-century art, especially in Italy, often dealt with religious or mythological themes of a monumental kind, usually requiring large numbers of figures in complex settings, conditions that prompted more inventive and economical approaches to the act of drawing. Renaissance drawings continued to reflect an attraction for the humanism and grandeur of Greek and Roman art, but in ever more forceful terms. A comparison of Pollaiuolo’s drawing of male figures with Michelangelo’s treatment of the figure (Fig. 1.14) shows the high degree of understanding of, and feeling for, human form that developed in later Renaissance drawing. Although both artists demonstrate their outstanding knowledge of anatomy and show their subject’s surface structure with great clarity, Pollaiuolo’s treatment is deliberate and precise, whereas Michelangelo’s is more experiential and rugged. It also employs a light source that dramatically shows the figure’s surface structure by the way light and dark values are arranged. This change in the way drawings were conceived is also due in part to the growing regard among later Renaissance artists for more intuitional and spontaneous responses.

Throughout the Renaissance, especially in Italy and Northern Europe, an increasing understanding of an interest in drawing the human figure flourished. Like Michelangelo’s drawing, many of these drawings represent preparatory sketches for works in painting and sculpture. Many other drawings, like Durer’s and da Vinci’s (Figs. 1.15 and 1.16), resulted from the...
intense investigatory spirit of the time. Some, such as *Portrait of Anna Meyer, the Daughter of Jacob Meyer* (Fig. 1.17), by the Northern Renaissance artist Holbein, were intended as final graphic statements. In Holbein’s drawing, the precise and subtle fluctuations of volume-revealing edges and surfaces and his sympathetic attitude toward the young woman are conveyed by lines and tones as gentle as the subject and the design. In color (see Plate 1), the cool gray of the background recedes to create the spatial depth needed to give the figure’s lighter- or warmer-toned forms greater solidity. Holbein’s drawing provides a striking contrast with Michelangelo’s rugged modeling of human form. Seen together, these drawings suggest something of the range of interpretation made possible by the liberating spirit of the Renaissance.

An interest in the figure’s structure and anatomy as capable of conveying powerful dynamic meanings continued to flourish in the seventeenth century. Often, these drawings showed a more daring search for the figure’s expressive essentials than a thorough exploration of its parts. Rosa’s *Nearly Full-Length Figure of a Youth Pulling off His Shirt* (Fig. 1.18) and Canuti’s *Study of a Dead or Sleeping Man* (Fig. 1.19) illustrate this more interpretive concept. It is immediately apparent that these artists have
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1.19  **DOMENICO MARIA CANUTI** (1620–1684),
*Study of a Dead or Sleeping Man*.
Red and white chalks.
The Pierpont Morgan Library, NY (1975.2)/Art Resource, NY.
an increased attraction to the movements flowing through the figure’s forms creating a strong sense of animation and vitality. Such movements and energy require more than an understanding of anatomical and structural facts. They also require a sensitivity to the underlying abstract and expressive energy of human forms. Whether these artists observed or imagined their subjects, they had to feel the weight and tension of the head, torso, and limbs, the fullness and hollows of the forms, and even the figure’s position, as if it were their own. Only a strong identification with the figure’s physical behavior could have led to the judgments and handling that express this behavior with such economy, clarity, and impact.

The great seventeenth-century Flemish painter Rubens was also an enthusiastic student of Renaissance attitudes and techniques, but brought to them an individual stamp of vigor and tactile sensitivity. In his Study for the Figure of Christ on the Cross (Fig. 1.20), there is the same high degree of knowledge about, and empathy with, human form that we see in the Michelangelo drawing. Rubens’s emphasis on the figure’s action, masses, design, and character, rather than on finished surfaces, reveals the artist’s identity with the figure’s situation. Rubens feels as well as visualizes what he sees.

If the Renaissance artists were attracted to the idealized forms of antiquity, seventeenth-century artists were usually more impelled toward encounters with human forms as they found them. And as Figures 1.18–1.20 show, they often drew them with more tumultuous energy. But if some traces of the Renaissance interest in an idealized, heroic interpretation of people lingered (as in the Rubens drawing), this influence is wholly absent in the drawings of perhaps the greatest seventeenth-century artist, Rembrandt.

Although Rembrandt’s drawings depict people realistically, they possess discreet visual metaphors that allude to psychological and spiritual meanings. No one, until Rembrandt, had focused with such penetrating clarity on the introspective nature of ordinary people, and few have ever expressed such insights with more economy and force. Although drawings in a realistic manner and with a sensitivity to psychological subtleties had appeared earlier (Fig. 1.17), few approach the power found in Rembrandt’s drawings to transcend narrative content to imply universally understood meanings. In Rembrandt’s works, even simple domestic scenes suggest moments of deeper significance.

Rembrandt’s figure drawings do more than integrate abstract and psychological expressions with figurative content. There is, instead, a fusion of these qualities. In Femme Couchee (Saskia Sick in Bed) (Fig. 1.21), the lines and tones are simultaneously engaged in creating the design and the mood as well as the depiction. Each mark is engaged in all of these functions. Consider, for instance, how the value, shape, and stormy activity of the broader strokes of the background complement the value, shape, and curved movement of the pillow, figure, and blanket, and how, by their airy nature, the background strokes reinforce the figure’s solidity. Additionally, these strokes, representing a large cast shadow, explain the light source and, by their agitated nature, serve to deepen the figure’s stillness. The figure’s hand is at once an expression of relaxation and a reflection of the fingerlike curved lines, large and small, that appear in the clothing, the wall, and surrounding bedding. On the far left, the large dark tone acts as a necessary “containing wall” for the vigorous undulations that course through the foreground, and by its texture and dark tone, this “wall” calls attention to similar passages on the bedding. Collectively, the behavior of the visual elements expresses Saskia’s frail state, seemingly in the grips of ominous forces.

For Rembrandt, even a drawing of an old woman bathing is transformed into an expression of dignity and grace. In the etching Woman Bathing Her Feet at a Brook (Fig. 1.22), Rembrandt approaches his subject with empathy.
and respect, not sentimentality. The depictive and the dynamic factors merge to form an affirmation of human strength and nobility and to tell of spiritual, not physical, beauty.

In the eighteenth century, the growing awareness of drawing’s versatility of design and expression and a deepening need to make drawings reflect a more personal viewpoint continued to spur exploration of new approaches to figure drawing. An example of this trend can be seen in the Study for “Jupiter et Antioche” (Fig. 1.23) by the eighteenth-century artist Watteau. The drawing shows the artist’s sensitivity to inflections of movement and modeling, revealed by the confident supple lines and by his emphasis on the animated nature of the figure. Rhythmic, searching lines often weave through large segments of the figure, their action relating even distant parts to each other. For example, some of the lines in the right arm move along its entire length and appear to continue down the left arm, giving evidence of the relatedness of the two limbs. (How often, in student drawings, are limbs drawn without reference to each other?) Note how these tactile lines grow thicker and thinner as they “ride” the forms, suggesting volume, joinings, muscular tensions among parts, and even the presence of a light source. As they do this, the lines establish a design theme—a discernible pattern of light and heavy stresses—of the line itself and of curving actions. These stresses and curves, in addition to the activities already noted, give the drawing an animated energy at both the depictive and the abstract level. In other words, the abstract behavior of the lines is compatible with the nature of the figure’s action; the vigorous dynamic and representational expressions reinforce each other.

Yet another example of the trend toward more personal modes of expression in drawing is Tiepolo’s Seated River God, Nymph with an Oar, and Putto (Fig. 1.24). By assuming that a brilliant light source illuminates his subject, Tiepolo is able to model the forms broadly in three
1.23 **ANTOINE WATTEAU** (1684–1721), *Study for ‘Jupiter et Antioche’.*
Conte crayon on toned paper, 9 5/8 × 11 3/8 in.
Photo R.M.N./Musée du Louvre, Paris.
(c) Réunion des Musées Nationaux / Art Resource, NY.

1.24 **TIEPOLO, GIAMBATTISTA** (1696–1770), *Seated River God, Nymph with Oar, and Putto.*
Pen and brown ink, brush with pale (yellow) and dark brown wash, over black chalk, 9 3/4 × 12 7/8 in.
(23.7 × 31.3 cm). Rogers Fund, 1937 (37.165.32).
values: the white of the page, a light tone, and a dark one. The economy and clarity with which these imagined forms are drawn demonstrate the artist’s knowledge of structure, anatomy, and perspective. The rhythmic behavior of the lines and of the variously toned shapes shows the artist’s sensitivity to the power of moving energies to enhance expressive meanings. Note how the drawing’s often-rounded forms give it a suppleness and vigor that a more “correct” treatment could never achieve.

Another eighteenth-century artist, Goya, in one of his etchings from the series of etchings called The Disasters of War (Fig. 1.25), effectively communicates his feelings through a powerful system of abstract strategies. The atrocity shown here relies for its impact on more than recollections of the grim event. The entire configuration describes a large, weighty, triangular shape interrupted only by the “softer” shape of the lounging French officer, a wry visual counterpoint to the severe vertical lines of the hanged man. Goya’s knowledge of structure and anatomy, and of the expressive power of directed movement, helps him emphasize the weight of the hanged man. The awful forward thrust of the head is emphasized even more by the heavy mass of dark hair sloping downward. Fast-moving verticals add to the victim’s weight. Even his long shirt is simplified with its edges drawn severely vertical.

Although Goya gives us only a few suggestions of the body’s presence beneath the shirt, we are convinced it is there: We can even guess that the hanged man’s body is stocky. The fallen leggings, even the severe fall of the cast shadow below the victim’s arm, help us experience what has happened here. Goya further strengthens the sense of falling weight by repeating the vertical lines of the foliage in the distance and by the strong vertical edge of the block against which the officer relaxes. Goya increases our initial shock of recognition by harshly contrasting the stark white of the victim’s shirt with the dark tones that surround him, and by contrasting the officer’s relaxed pose with the rigidity of the hanged man.

Despite the widespread and deepening interest in more subjectively interpreted figure drawings, there were some, like the French artist Ingres (Fig. 1.26), who favored the aesthetics of earlier periods. Because of their more deliberate and refined imagery, they were regarded as “classical” in orientation. An opposing group of
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1.27 EUGENE DELACROIX (1798–1863),
Two Nude Studies.
Pen and ink, washes of color, 190 × 148 mm.
(c) Réunion des Musées Nationaux /Art Resource, NY.

artists, famously represented by the French artist, Delacroix (Fig. 1.27), felt that more expressive themes and more spontaneous techniques held the promise of more creative possibilities. They were regarded as “romantic” in orientation. Ingres and Delacroix represent the two extremes of aesthetic persuasion that occupied the attention of many European artists of the early to middle nineteenth century.

Ingres, the older of the two, held that “the simpler the lines and forms, the more effectively they reveal beauty and power.” Figure 1.26 shows his dedication to the volume-informing delineation of forms as the desired means by which to draw. This drawing shows Ingres’s attraction to the ideals and forms of ancient Greek and Roman art. The figures are shaped by the same concern for the classic standards of beauty that attracted such Renaissance masters as Raphael (Fig. 1.28). In both Figures 1.26 and 1.28, elegant and precise contours create figures of somewhat idealized proportions. In both, general structural facts and specific anatomical ones are important in the overall design of the forms. Ingres’s lines, like Raphael’s, are easy-paced and serenely harmonious. They express a graceful order among even the smallest surface details.

By contrast, Delacroix abhorred the idea of patient and deliberate contour drawing. For Delacroix, emphasizing a volume’s edges by contour lines only serves to weaken the sense of mass by calling forward those most distant parts of forms—their outlines. Instead, he advised that volumes should be grasped “by their centers, not by
their lines of contour.” And even though Figure 1.27 is based on contour drawing, those contours are spontaneously and vigorously drawn. Note how, especially in the figure on the left, Delacroix moves “inland” to locate planes that give the figure a greater sense of mass. Nor did Delacroix possess the temperament that could devote itself to explicit nuances and little harmonies. His interest lay in capturing fleeting actions by direct means. One of the boldest Romantics of nineteenth-century art, he sought, as Figure 1.27 shows, the animated, sensual qualities of the figure. In René Huyghe’s view, “It is not form he studies, but rather its animating principle, its living essence that he transcribes.” That a passionate interest in essentials was an important theme in Delacroix’s drawings is borne out by the artist’s advice to students: “If you are not skillful enough to sketch a man jumping out of a window in the time it takes him to fall from the fourth story to the ground, you will never be able to produce great works.”

These opposing attitudes—a deliberate delineation versus a spontaneous attack—have continued to contest with each other to this day. Indeed, these differing views about the act and purpose of drawing existed long before the 1800s. They are, after all, as much determined by individual temperament as by the stylistic trends of a particular period or culture. We have only to compare the drawing by Veronese (Fig. 1.29) with that of another Italian Renaissance artist, Primaticcio (Fig. 1.30), to recognize the fundamental differences between a direct

1.28 RAPHAEL (1483–1520),
Detail from
\textit{Combat of Nude Men},
Red chalk over preliminary stylus work, 14⅜ × 11⅞ in. (entire work).
Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

1.29 PAOLO VERONESE (1528–1588),
\textit{Peter of Amiens before the Doge Vitale Michele} (1576–7).
Pen and wash, 190 × 273 mm.
and searching approach and a studied and explicit one—between the wish to seize and the wish to explain.

Other artists, however, saw the desirable qualities of the two approaches not as opposing but actually as complementing each other. In fact, embracing both ideas, these artists sometimes emphasized the letter and at other times the spirit of their subjects. Raphael, Michelangelo, Rubens, and Rembrandt are a few of the artists for whom the seeming conflicts between the prose of delineation and the poetry of evocation are not only resolved but become necessary interworking concepts that allow for a more encompassing view of human form and spirit. Such artists cannot accept the restrictions of either precision or suggestion as exclusive approaches to drawing. For them, the freedom to range between exactitude and impression is an essential condition of creativity (Figs. 1.14, 1.22, 1.23, and 1.28).

Figure drawings by the French artist Degas, regarded by many as one of the greatest exponents of figure drawing of the nineteenth century, offer an interesting example of an artist’s shift, over the years, from a deliberate and refined mode to a strongly animated and more painterly one. Early Degas drawings show his interest in precise images, influenced by an envisioned ideal. The later drawings show his attraction to a more direct and spirited style. As Degas’s drawings became less calculated, their abstract activities grew bolder. This, in turn, led to drastic changes in the expressive content of his work (see Plate 5). It is impossible to say whether a change in his aesthetic interests, perhaps influenced by the work of his Impressionist fellow artists, led him from refined images to more direct ones. Perhaps a more philosophical change toward the figure (and life) led him from idealized to more earthy conceptions. But whatever stimulus triggered the change, both his abstract and figurative interests changed together and were always well suited to each other.

As a young man, Degas was attracted to the classical view, as exemplified by Raphael and Ingres. These influences are evident in an early drawing, Study of a Nude for “The Sorrows of the Town of Orleans” (Fig. 1.31). But there are already some clues to the direction that Degas’s
drawings would take. Note the more realistically drawn passages in the left arm, the head, and the legs. These seem to depart from the drawing’s main theme of idealized form. There is a hint of conflict between the desire to refine every nuance of edge, every dip and rise of the terrain, and an urge to simplify what is observed. The more direct treatment of the right arm and hand; the frequent rhythmic accents, especially in the arms and along the figure’s lower left side; the heavy accents of charcoal along the raised arm; and the fast, more forceful lines occurring throughout the drawing—all these suggest a wish to come to grips with issues concerning figurative and abstract essentials. The result is a work in which an idealized concept of Woman and the felt perceptions of a woman coexist in a tenuous alliance.

Comparing this drawing with a later lithograph by Degas, *Nude Woman Standing, Drying Herself* (Fig. 1.32), we see the release of the energies hinted at in the previous drawing. There is still something of a vision—a personal convention for human form and proportion. But in place of the lithe and sensuous ideal of the early drawings, the figure now suggests more weighty and simplified forms. The drawing’s visual theme is now more insistently on movement. The hair, the curving torso, the wedge shape of the towel, and even the pattern of the background all exhibit moving actions. Notice how much stronger these abstract activities become when Degas shifts from an emphasis on denotation, as in Figure 1.31, to an emphasis on the figure’s essential structure and spirit. In these two Degas drawings, the four factors interact differently, but in each, they succeed in shaping figures that come alive.

Nineteenth-century artists frequently brought more inventive subjectivity to drawing. Sometimes creative crosscurrents pointed to new concepts. Cassatt’s *The Coiffure* (Fig. 1.33), for example, shows the influence of Japanese prints on the artist. Often, the passions of the artist, finding encouragement and inspiration in the ever-expanding themes and styles of art, especially in France, were able to hit on more daring expressive modes. The drawing by Rodin (Fig. 1.34) shows something of the tempo that graphic expression can attain when strong abstract and sensory forces drive it.
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Nude Woman Standing, Drying Herself (ca. 1891–1892). Lithograph, 50 × 28.5 cm. design.
Courtesy of the Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University Art Museums.
Gray Collection of Engravings Fund G8830.

1.33  MARY CASSATT (1844–1926),
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Rosenwald Collection, Photograph (c) 2003 Board of Trustees, The National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. 1948.11.50
So far, in broadly tracing the emergence of interpretive approaches to figure drawing, we have seen fluctuations in emphasis between depicting the figure and experiencing it. During the early Renaissance, emphasis focused on depiction. By the nineteenth century, some artists continued to favor depictive imagery, but most showed a growing interest in a subject’s underlying abstract condition. But as we have seen, for some artists both qualities were (or, as in the case of Degas, became) compelling and interdependent themes. Much twentieth-century figure drawing continued to move in the direction of amplifying subjective meanings by concentrating on abstract rather than representational strategies. But as in earlier periods, the strongest drawings, both in creative and human terms, seem to be those that reveal a sensitive interaction among the four basic factors and between the figurative and abstract meanings they generate. The best exponents of figure drawing have always understood that each factor inevitably affects—and is affected by—the other three.

It should not be inferred that artists who favor more representational imagery are necessarily less sensitive to dynamic matters or that artists who emphasize abstract and emotive matters are less concerned with representational ones. In either mode, artists must regard both aspects. When they do not, the drawings that result usually lack the impact of works in which the “what” and the “how” reinforce one another. Although Goya’s etching (Fig. 1.25) emphasizes the figurative whereas Lachaise’s drawing (Fig. 1.8) stresses the abstract, both are integrated systems of these two themes. Their differences in emphasis are decided by differing expressive purposes.

Later nineteenth-century figure drawings and those of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries are characterized by their general tendency toward more daring, inventive, and ever more subjective points of view and by their broad range of interests and goals, which now often includes color as a consideration. In Schiele’s drawing of his wife and her nephew (Fig. 1.1; also see Plate 2), the animated, swirling figures and the bold abstract life of the elements that produce them are strong intensifications of both considerations. Notice, though, in Plate 2, how the orange stripes of the mother’s dress help animate the drawing’s swirling motion, intensifying the figures’ bonding gestures. In Figure 1.1, however, the absence of color’s dynamic force reduces the sense of action.

This more personal and inventive approach to figure drawing encouraged artists to explore new ways of interpreting the human figure and of communicating ideas and...
feels. For the German artist Kollwitz, the figure became a vehicle for expressing her (and everyone’s) anguish at the grief and loss that war brings. As noted earlier, her drawing of a weeping woman (Fig. 1.2) is a deeply moving expression of sorrow. The wavering flow that envelops the figure suggests the movements we associate with weeping. In contrast to the soft fall of the lines of the drapery and kerchief, the angular arms, the fist pressed to the face, the sudden tonal contrast between the right shoulder and head, and even the figure’s scale and placement on the page all add to the expression of grief.

Some artists have always been motivated by the need to convey a moving, provocative, or perhaps amusing message. It might be compassion, as in the drawing by the Northern Renaissance artist Grünewald (Fig. 1.3); it might be sensuality, as in the drawing by the late nineteenth-century sculptor Rodin (Fig. 1.34); or it might be rage and protest, as in the drawings by the twentieth-century artists de Kooning (Fig. 1.35) and Rothbein (Fig. 1.36).

Such artists are impelled as much by psychological as by visual themes. Unlike artists for whom figure drawing is first of all an act of inquiry and analysis, artists oriented toward human commentary are motivated by the need to tell as well as to find. Note how in de Kooning’s drawing (Plate 3), angular shards of strong color punctuate the frenzied forms of the women, adding to the drawing’s turbulent expressive power.

In the twentieth century, the factor of design in figure drawing became increasingly important. This
For many recent and contemporary artists, expanding the abstract activities on the picture plane has allowed for new graphic ideas and experiences. In Matisse’s *Seated Nude with Tulle Blouse* (Fig. 1.37), a bold pattern of straight and curved lines and textural, tonal, and shape contrasts call our attention to the drawing’s surface state. There are equally strong clues to the figure’s forms as volumes in space, but these share in, rather than dominate, the drawing’s overall design. This enables us to “read” the drawing in two compatible and satisfying ways. No sooner do we experience an ordering of two-dimensional conditions than volumes emerge to reveal an ordering of masses in space. This impression, in turn, subsides into the matrix of picture-plane activities to start the cycle over again. This creates a pulsation between flat and deep space, where the contrasts between geometric and organic areas and among the variously patterned textures take on different visual meanings.

Picasso’s *Two Nudes* (Fig. 1.38) is an example of a somewhat more two-dimensionally oriented drawing.


interest in the abstract, relational ordering of the elements and of the figurative forms they produce led to a notable characteristic of many contemporary artists: emphasis on the two-dimensional aspects of the figure and its environment. Although the best artists have always been sensitive to a drawing’s two-dimensional design—to the relational interactions of the visual elements within the flat, bounded area of the page, or picture plane—such relational activities were generally subordinated to those of the third dimension. This should not suggest that the two-dimensional conditions of earlier drawings are necessarily less fully considered or sophisticated; rather, their impact—their ability to dominate our attention—had to be reduced to avoid intruding on the drawing’s volumetric and spatial order, which was the most highly regarded means of graphic communication in Western art.
In contrast to the Matisse drawing, which relies for its design strategy on strong patterns and strongly defined enclosed shapes, Picasso’s theme is based on subtle tensions. There is tension in the broken lines that strongly suggest but never actually enclose shapes, in the lines and shapes that suggest vertical and horizontal directions but are themselves always diagonal, and in the overall fluctuation between the depictive and the abstract function of the lines. Additionally, small bursts of textural activity in the hair of both figures, in the chair, and in the floor contrast with the more open character of the two figures and their surroundings.

The expressive effects of more abstract approaches to drawing in general and figure drawing in particular has greatly expanded the options of creative invention. In Rico Lebrun’s Crucifixion, from Grunewald, 1961 (Fig. 1.39), a masterful interweaving of clues to picture-plane and deep space phenomena results in an innovative and moving interpretation of the Crucifixion. Here, strange conflicts and contrasts create a turbulent mood. Strong light illuminates the forms, but its source remains a mystery. Figure forms slip in and out of more abstract configurations, just as shadows are only sometimes faithful to the forms that generate them. There is even a “warring” between geometric and organic shapes. Based on an almost symmetrical design that echoes Grunewald’s fifteenth-century painting of the same subject, Lebrun’s version uses the stability of the symmetrical arrangement as a kind of trampoline from which the drawing’s forms, shadows, and shapes leap up in a provocative and troubling way.

In Close’s Phil/Fingerprint II (Fig. 1.40), there is a barely contained standoff between the second and third dimensions. The representation is plain enough, but the insistent means of depicting it—by a pattern of fingertip daubs—returns us to the picture plane and to the realization that these daubs are the reality and the young man’s head is the illusion.

In the four previous drawings, the visual activities of the second and third dimensions are roughly equal. This is not the case in de Kooning’s Two Women III (Fig. 1.35; also see Plate 3), which is conceived in a way that greatly reduces the impression of forms in space. Here, the tempestuous life of the elements, occasionally breaking free of any depictive role, accomplishes two things: It creates a predominantly two-dimensional drawing, and it conveys a powerfully aggressive statement about the subject. De Kooning relies on the expressive nature of the elements’ dynamic behavior to carry the message; here, evocation largely replaces denotation.\(^2\)

We have seen that a concern with abstract considerations is not new in figure drawing. We have also seen that a
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sound understanding of structure and anatomy has always informed and influenced the best figure drawings. Whether it is a dominant theme, as in Figure 1.14; a spur to animated imagery, as in Figures 1.18 and 1.27; or a guide to expressive summaries of human forms, as in Figure 1.35, it is evident that structural and anatomical knowledge participated in the choices that shaped these images.

For many artists, then and now, structural considerations are important in the early stages of developing their figure drawings. In Rubens’s Presentation in the Temple (Fig. 1.41), we can follow the artist’s thinking about the placement and general character of the volumes. Many lines in these figures are preliminary “soundings” to establish masses. Note that some of these lines are drawn through forms, as if the figures were transparent, enabling Rubens to understand the masses in more sculptural as well as gestural terms. Some pale washes are applied to define the large planes and the general behavior of the light. In the kneeling figure, massed lines have been placed over the washed tones, further developing the big masses. Such inquiries about the structural essentials of a subject, whether actually drawn or only observed in the mind’s eye, are crucial to an understanding of a subject’s structural nature.

Similarly, Papo’s Standing Figure (Fig. 1.42) uses ranks of schematic lines to establish the subject’s major planes and masses. Papo’s interest in understanding the architectural nature of these forms can be seen in the way the lines measure them, how lines are drawn through some forms to locate their far sides and connect them, and how the lines explore the forms’ terrain. Note the surprisingly curvilinear movements among these incisively summarized and mainly angular masses. In Chapter 2, we will examine this analytic, planar approach to the figure’s forms. Although such structural considerations are only sometimes a dominant theme, as here, many good figure drawings show them to some degree, however subtly, interacting with the other factors.

Yet another useful example of structural considerations is Giacometti’s Trois Femmes Nues (Fig. 1.43), where a coming together of flat and curved planes that abut and interlock in various ways forms the figures. Contrary to the beginner’s tendency to rely heavily on contours, Giacometti fits together planar “facets” of the figure, only some of which form the figure’s silhouette. For Giacometti, the figure’s contours are partly determined by the planes that, seen together, create the forms. Instead of first establishing a fixed contour “fence” into which a form’s planes must fit (which is seldom successful), contours are left tentative and partly open, enabling the planes, in their necessary shapes and sizes, to take their place. Only then are the contours more firmly drawn.

This is especially evident in the left and central figures, where, once the drawing is underway, the emphasis shifts from the tentative sketching of outer edges to the construction of the figure’s planar conditions. Notice that on the way to seeing a part’s shape, the artist favors straight-line segments. There are several reasons for this that we will examine in Chapter 2. Here, though, it should be noted that such lines play an important role in seeing shapes and planes. As these structurally dominant drawings show, conceiving the figure as an architectural event holds useful creative potential.

Every age redefines humankind. Twenty-first-century artists, creating with a sense of limitless freedom to inquire and interpret, have come forward with a multitude of definitions. These differing approaches to figure drawing, whether they tend toward an expressionistic (Fig. 1.44), a subtle or a pronounced design-oriented (Figs.1.45 and 1.46), or a realistic persuasion (Fig. 1.47), have to contend with the same forms that confronted Michelangelo, Rembrandt, Kollwitz, Picasso, and all the other great exponents of the figure. And this common challenge—the figure—has imposed its conditions on artists of every age, as they have imposed their modes of order and expression on it.
In this broad review, anatomy and the underlying factor of structure have been only briefly commented on; these considerations will be discussed more fully in the following chapters. Their importance in figure drawing cannot be overemphasized. But it should again be noted that structure and anatomy are tools to be utilized, not concepts to be worshiped to the exclusion of the figure’s dynamic aspects or to be regarded as obliging the artist to draw in a naturalistic mode. Our purpose in understanding these systems is to broaden, not restrict, choice; to enhance, not diminish, expressive meanings. This is the case even when anatomical forms are themselves the subject, as in Rothbein’s Study for the Nazi Holocaust Series (Fig. 1.36). Here both the skulls and the eruptive fury of the dynamic forces cry out a warning. To lose sight of anatomy’s function as both a source and an agent of visually expressive inventions is to replace felt responses and insights with unselective scrutiny. Such an attitude tends toward taxidermy, not life.

Art is not science. Young artists today who wish to draw the figure cannot pick up the trail where Degas or Matisse ended theirs. They cannot begin by building on the achievements of these artists, not only because beginning artists lack the vast factual knowledge about human form that masters acquire but because they also lack the visual comprehension and informed intuition that all great artists evolve over a lifetime of encountering human form and spirit. In any case, we cannot (and shouldn’t want to) adopt another’s sensibility.

We must “draw our own conclusions” through a dedicated study of the basic factors involved in figure drawing and by a searching examination of what these factors demand of us as artists and as members of the human family.
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