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Introduction:

DEFINING TASTE: ALBERT BARNES AND THE PROMOTION OF AFRICAN ART IN THE UNITED STATES DURING THE 1920s

He - for it is usually a he - comes across something unappreciated, neglected, forgotten. Too much to call this a discovery; call it a recognition. (with the force, the glee of a discovery.) He starts to collect it, or to write about it, or both. Because of these proselytizing efforts, what no one paid attention to or liked many find interesting or admirable.¹

-- Susan Sontag

Although objects from sub-Saharan Africa entered American museum collections as early as 1810,² it was not until the first decades of the twentieth century that African artifacts came to be valued for their formal qualities as sculpture. Initially stimulated by the interest of European and American artists, the appreciation of African art extended to private collectors during the period between the world wars. In contrast to the wide range of African material culture displayed in ethnographic museums of the time, early collectors were primarily interested in masks and statuary in wood and metal - the object types most easily assimilated into the established categories of fine arts in the West. Collectors and dealers designated regional and ethnic classifications, sometimes inaccurately, and placed value on authenticity, rarity, and antiquity. African artifacts also acquired a range of associative qualities through the writings of these collectors. "Classic" African art was compared to the art of ancient Greece or medieval Europe, though the African artist was seen as "primitive" and intuitive" by nature.

Because collectors, rather than scholars and museum specialists, were the driving force behind the growing admiration for African art in the United States, an examination
of those collectors is of critical importance to our understanding of African art connoisseurship. Despite the existence of natural history museums, private collections of African art provided the basis for contemporary exhibitions and were featured in early publications. The objects that collectors sought and displayed during this period subsequently became validated as “African art,” their formal qualities emphasized over their roles as cultural artifacts. Exhibitions of African sculpture introduced objects from these private collections to a wider public. At the same time, accompanying publications and lectures by collectors promoted the appreciation of African sculpture as an art form, shaping the legacy of aesthetic criteria that has been applied to African art. Although this canon and its attendant theories are in many ways still accepted today, no study has critically examined the role of collectors and the underlying values, motivations, and aesthetic biases that led to the selection of certain object types.

Of those collectors whose combined role as theoreticians makes them critically relevant to an analysis of Western taste in non-Western objects, Albert Barnes emerges as an important promoter of African art through his Barnes Foundation in Merion, Pennsylvania. Barnes was one of the first American collectors to selectively acquire an extensive collection of objects from Africa and to actively promote an artistic appreciation of African sculpture through his educational foundation. Enthusiasm for the celebrated modern European paintings in the Foundation’s holdings, however, has historically obscured the significance of Barnes’s collecting and advocacy of African art. Barnes began purchasing African sculpture in 1922 through Parisian dealer Paul Guillaume, who became foreign secretary of the
Barnes Foundation one year later. The resulting collection of over 100 masks and figural sculptures was carefully arranged by Barnes in the galleries of his Foundation to reflect his aesthetic approach to African art. This educational philosophy of art appreciation and its relevance to African sculpture was further advanced by Barnes in gallery lectures, public addresses, and published writings. Through numerous contemporary publications and photographic reproductions, the Barnes Foundation collection of African sculpture gained international recognition, contributing to the establishment of a canon that is, in many ways, still accepted today.

This dissertation critically examines Barnes’s collecting and promotion of African sculpture as a defining moment in the history of Western taste in non-Western art. My objective in this study is twofold. First, I evaluate the aesthetic positions endorsed by Barnes and the conceptual strategies he adopted in promoting an appreciation of African artistry within a Western aesthetic framework. Second, I consider the broader parameters of Barnes’s influence in defining “African art” and his role in fostering an interest in it, particularly among key figures of the Harlem Renaissance, or “New Negro” movement. As a vital and specific case study, my analysis challenges, as it engages, discourse about modernist “primitivism” as it relates to Western perceptions and constructions of African art.

Contribution to Literature

As Kristof Pomian has observed, “Identifying the taste of collectors, which can be gauged from their choice of objects, represents a different, and perhaps more
important, aspect of the study of collections. It is betrayed not only by the collections themselves but also by artists' commissions, by façades, interior decor, [and] architectural details. Yet, as described by Pomian, such studies on art collecting and taste rarely, if ever, consider Western appreciation of African art, suggesting a fruitful arena for art historical analysis. Historically-oriented analyses of taste typically focus on European or American art, though their approaches to the subject may equally be applied to non-Western art. Of these works, Francis Haskell's considerations of the cultural forces contributing to reversals in artistic values, as in the roles played by dealers, collectors and scholars, have proved most useful to this study. Other scholars have considered selective aspects of collecting and taste, such as the psychology of collectors or the economics of taste.

Few studies focus directly on the collecting of African art in the United States. Ezio Bassani and Malcolm McLeod trace the history of African material culture in European collections during the 16th and 17th centuries. Jean-Louis Paudrat provides the most comprehensive chronology of African art collecting in the West to date. Although the "discovery" of the artistic qualities of African objects was a widespread European phenomenon, Paudrat argues that Paris "became the point of convergence for the propagation of ideas and activities that bestowed on African art an essential role in the formation of Western sensibility." Thus, his study mostly focuses on developments in France at the expense of a fuller consideration of the American history of African art collecting. An overview of American contributions is provided by Warren Robbins,
although he outlines collecting and exhibition activity in the United States without critically evaluating its development.

Recently, the subject of collecting itself and its attendant philosophies of display have come under increasing critical scrutiny. In 1995, for example, Art Bulletin published a two-part volume examination of "The Problematics of Collecting and Display."11 Scholarship of particular relevance to this study addresses the cultural assumptions informing the formation and exhibition of institutional collections of non-Western art. Among the more important works are those by James Clifford, George Stocking, and Ivan Karp and Steven Lavine.12 The distinction between art and artifact in Western perception has been explored by curator Susan Vogel in a 1988 exhibition at the Center for African Art in New York in which various strategies for displaying African art were recreated and analyzed.13 These studies, however, while providing important methodological approaches and models, do not directly address the role of private collectors of African art in shaping public perception of and taste in African art. One important analysis that does relate to Western taste in African art is Christopher Steiner's study of contemporary commodification and the influence of Ivoirian dealers on the Western market.14

Regarding the particular historical situation that underlies the acquisition of African art, it has been noted that "no collecting has ever been carried out outside an unequal power relation."15 The collecting of African artifacts and its subsequent classification of as an art object is undeniably and inextricably tied to the history of the slave trade and colonialism in Africa. V. Y. Mudimbe, therefore, eloquently refers to
"the process which, during the slave trade period, classified African artifacts according to the grid of Western thought and imagination, in which alterity is a negative category of the Same." While the scope of this case study does not permit a comprehensive examination of the political and cultural dynamics of colonialism, the overarching perceptions of racial difference that inform Barnes’s collecting of African art will be addressed.

The complex relationship between African art and the West has been framed primarily by discourse concerning "primitivism" in Western art. Since the publication of Robert Goldwater’s groundbreaking *Primitivism in Modern Art* in 1938, the topic has generated much interest. In the 1970s, aspects of "primitivism" in Western art were considered by Lucy Lippard, Judith Zilczer, Jean Laude, and J. B. Donne. The highly controversial Museum of Modern Art exhibition in 1984 and its attendant catalogue "Primitivism" in 20th Century Art: Affinity of the Tribal and Modern, edited by William Rubin, spawned a host of rejoinders to what many saw as a Eurocentric approach to the subject. Of these, the most trenchant criticisms of the exhibition’s premise come from Thomas McEvilley and James Clifford, the latter of whom suggested that the show presented Modernism as a search for “informing principles” that transcend culture, politics and history.

Literature considering “primitivism” as a cultural construct is clearly germane to this topic. Historically grounded examinations that are informed by this perspective include those by Annie Coombes and Frances Connelly. Other studies take a broader view of the phenomenon of “primitivism,” as in the work of Sally Price and Susan Hiller’s
Marianna Torgovnick also explores the complex and varied conceptions of the primitive as a modern, and later postmodern, obsession. In contrast to these works, Patricia Leighten takes the unusual step of arguing that Picasso employed "primitivism" as a critique of European colonization.

Drawing from the more theoretically oriented discourse on "primitivism" and collecting in extant scholarship, this dissertation offers a specific case study of the promotion of African art by Albert Barnes during the 1920s. Barnes's interest in African art is an important aspect of the collector that has been largely ignored to date. The primary studies on Albert Barnes have, instead, emphasized biographical information and issues of self-presentation. Of these, the earliest by William Schack is an unauthorized biography from birth to death, the product of extensive research by the author, including many personal interviews with people acquainted with Barnes. Schack, while providing some positive observations, paints an overall portrait of an irascible eccentric. Schack's characterizations appear to have set the tone for later, more sensationalized studies of Barnes, such as those by Howard Greenfeld and Alain Boublil.

More sympathetic descriptions of Barnes and his educational foundation are found in works by Abraham Chanin, Gilbert Cantor, and Henry Hart. In particular, Abraham Chanin's "Parnassas in Merion, Pa." is an important source of information on the Foundation's programs. As a former student at the Foundation, Chanin provides "a typical case history of how one entered the Foundation as a student" and a description of the program. Gilbert Cantor's The Barnes Foundation, Reality vs. Myth also offers a mostly laudatory description of the Foundation and its program based on the
reminiscences of Cantor’s wife who was a student at the Foundation. Indeed, the whole second half of the book is devoted to “debunking myths” and may be considered a rebuttal to the claims of Schack’s earlier publication.

Larger studies of collectors also offer chapters on Barnes, although most focus on his patronage of modernist painting. More recently, a number of authors provide more analytical accounts of Barnes as a collector. In John Rewald’s work on the American reception of paintings by Cézanne, for example, a chapter is devoted to Barnes’s collecting of such works through Durand-Ruel. While Rewald’s account is rather vitriolic, his analysis of the gradual reception of Cézanne’s art in America overall offers a useful methodological model for this study. Kristian Romare compares the collecting activities of Barnes and those of Sergei Schuchkin, situating both on the peripheries of the art world. None of these studies, however, have had the cooperation of the Barnes Foundation or access to the rich archival sources there. Limited access was given the contributors to the exhibition catalogue _Great French Paintings from the Barnes Foundation_. Of these, Wattenmaker’s essay, in particular, provides some trenchant observations concerning Barnes’s educational philosophy and his “wall ensembles,” that are informed by both Wattenmaker’s own education at the Barnes Foundation and the new archival information.

Most of the works above, however, contain only passing references to Barnes’s interest in and collecting of African sculpture, if at all. Perhaps the only contemporary study to discuss Barnes’s African art collection at any length is by J. Newton Hill. Hill, a former student at the Foundation and later President of Lincoln
University, provides an illuminating instance of the articulation of Foundation tenets applied to African sculpture. Hill argues that African sculpture must be evaluated through a qualitative, objective approach and cites specific attributes to seek in such appreciation. He concludes with a lengthy visual analysis of two Barnes Foundation objects, the well-known Dogon couple from Mali and a Luba/Hemba stool from the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Colette Giraudon’s important studies of the dealer Paul Guillaume also consider Barnes’s collecting of African art, though not at any length. Giraudon’s thorough research makes ample use of previously unpublished letters, photographs and other archival documents, some of which are from the Barnes Foundation. Yet her discussion is limited due to the absence of Guillaume’s collected papers. This noticeable lacuna in archival information on Guillaume has historically hindered work on this important dealer. In fact, Jean Bouret’s 1970 study of the relationship between Guillaume and the poet Guillaume Apollinaire is one of the few to derive from actual correspondence between the two men. Giraudon’s work on Guillaume was further hindered by her minimal access to the Guillaume-Barnes correspondence in the Barnes Foundation Archives in preparation for her chapter on Barnes and Guillaume.

While Barnes’s interest in African American culture is noted by a number of these authors, scholars of the Harlem Renaissance, on the other hand, tend to disregard Barnes’s contributions to the movement and only rarely mention his involvement. Nathan Huggin’s critical study of 1971, The Harlem Renaissance, challenges its authenticity
as a black cultural movement, arguing that white patronage set the standards of the movement. While Huggins cites Locke’s importance in urging African-American artists to look to African visual traditions, he makes no mention of Barnes Foundation collection as an exemplar for these artists. Similarly, David Levering Lewis, who counterposes Huggins’s work and supports the concept of black agency in shaping the movement, also does not discuss Barnes’s role. Bruce Kellner dismisses Barnes’s publications in “New Negro” texts as merely a way the leaders of the movement could placate the eccentric, yet wealthy, collector. Jeffrey Stewart also addresses the complex relationships between African American artists and their patrons during the 1920s. He maintains that Barnes, like with other white patrons of the Harlem Renaissance such as Carl Van Vechten and Charlotte Mason, was primarily motivated by an interest in the “primitive,” which he defines as “the African and African American who were uncorrupted by European or European American civilization.” This “bias for cultural primitivism,” he notes, impaired the artistic production of African Americans, who chafed under the demands of white patronage.

The view that all references to African themes must be judged within the context of “primitivism” has been contested by Kathy Ogren in her discussion of “African” strategies employed in the Harlem Renaissance. Similarly, George Hutchinson argues for a restoration of the interracial dimensions of the Harlem Renaissance. He is, in fact, one of the few authors to consider Barnes’s influence on the Harlem Renaissance, though he suggests this was mostly through Barnes’s friendship with John Dewey. Hutchinson maintains that many of the leaders of the “New Negro” movement, such as Locke and
Johnson, were strongly influenced by pragmatist philosophy, specifically the writings of James and Dewey. Amy Kirschke’s monograph on Aaron Douglas also provides a consideration of Barnes in her discussion of Douglas’s 1928-29 fellowship at the Barnes Foundation.43

This study of Barnes’s promotion of African art has been fortunate to have benefited from generous access to the Barnes Foundation archives. Of particular relevance is Barnes’s prolific, almost daily, correspondence with Guillaume between 1922 and 1934. While of obvious importance to an analysis of Barnes as a collector, this material also provides the only comprehensive documentation of Guillaume’s role as dealer and critic in the absence of his collected papers. I have also consulted the privately held Morgan Archives, which contain photographic and archival records concerning the Morgan lantern slides of the Barnes Foundation collection. Other archival material that I have examined is accessible at public institutions, including the Archives of American Art, the Philadelphia Museum of Art, The Brooklyn Museum, The Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, and the Moorland-Spingarn Archives at Howard University.

Order of Chapters

Chapter One sets the stage for Barnes’s collecting of African art by examining the developing market for African art, first in Paris and then in New York. The advent of European modernism encouraged an appreciation of African sculptural form, which was transmitted to the United States during World War I via the
American expatriate community and the influx of French dealers. I focus on the role of Parisian dealer Paul Guillaume, considering his evolution, in less than a decade, from young employee at an automobile shop to preeminent connoisseur of African art by 1920. Of particular relevance is Guillaume’s expansion of the market to the United States through his loan of works to the historic 1914 exhibition of African sculptures at the New York gallery “291,” organized by Alfred Stieglitz and Marius de Zayas.

In Chapter Two, I introduce Barnes and examine his development as a collector, focusing on the formation of Barnes’s collection of African art. After a brief biographical background, I consider the formative experiences leading to his later appreciation of African art, in particular his interest in African-American culture and his maturing aesthetic outlook. I then address the collaboration between Barnes and Guillaume in forming a collection of African art, detailing his purchasing trips to Paris beginning in 1922, and his selective acquisition of African art from Guillaume’s gallery. Barnes’s goals for the development of the collection, his strategies for buying and creating a market for African art, and his competition with other collectors are also examined.

Chapter Three considers Primitive Negro Sculpture, published in 1926 by The Barnes Foundation, as a codification of the aesthetic criteria that Barnes applied to African sculpture. Although authorship of this book is credited to Paul Guillaume and Foundation teacher Thomas Munro, I maintain that Barnes was intensely involved in its production, and that his influence is reflected in the stylistic analyses and critical
evaluations of the text. *Primitive Negro Sculpture*, featuring illustrations of objects from the Barnes Foundation, delineates various African “style regions” according to shared formal characteristics and defines great sculptural design as the repetition of lines, planes and masses, punctuated by contrast and variation. That the text reflects Barnes’s beliefs is demonstrated by comparing its aesthetic criteria and doctrine to the specific content of the Barnes Foundation collection of African art.

The presentation of the collection visually is the subject of Chapter Four. At the Barnes Foundation, Barnes applied his didactic aesthetic philosophy to the arrangement of the African art collection, defining African artifacts as “fine art” within a Western aesthetic framework. Through strategies of display, Barnes disassociated African objects from an ethnographic context and arranged the sculpture visually to emphasize specific formal elements he valued. At the same time, Barnes paired the sculpture with modern European paintings in “wall ensembles,” situating African art within a continuum of form as a catalyst for modernism. The importance of African art to the Foundation educational mission was further emphasized by the incorporation of African motifs from the collection, designed by Barnes himself, into elements of architectural design in the central gallery, interior and exterior ironwork, and at the Foundation entrance. The chapter concludes by exploring how photographs of the Barnes Foundation’s African art collection, produced and sold by Willard and Barbara Morgan in the 1930s, employ conventions that visually parallel Barnes’s aesthetic standards, highlighting the rhythmic forms and contrasting lines of the sculptures.
Chapter Five reevaluates Barnes's role in the "New Negro" movement, arguing for the importance of Barnes and his collection of African art to the development of the movement. I maintain that Barnes played a significant role both in introducing African art to the African-American community and in his evaluation of Africa's contributions to artistic expression. Central to my examination of Barnes's impact on the "New Negro" movement is a discussion of his relationships with two of the movement's leaders, Alain Locke and Charles Johnson, in light of new archival evidence from the Barnes Foundation.

My study of Barnes and his collecting and promotion of African art is one of the first to examine critically the underlying values, judgments and biases that have shaped Western aesthetic criteria in relation to African art. It is sited at the convergence of modernist and Africanist art history, addressing important lacunae in both fields. Modernist scholars, for example, have typically focused on the influence of African art on Western artists, disregarding modernism's influence on the very perception of that art. Likewise, Africanist art historians have rarely questioned the foundations of African art connoisseurship and the forces that shaped its development in the West. Thus, my analysis of the influential collector and theoretician Albert Barnes will engage and remedy several significant omissions in Twentieth Century Western and Africanist art history, providing critical insight into perceptions of African art in the United States during the 1920s.
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Chapter One:

PARIS AND NEW YORK: PAUL GUILLAUME AND THE EMERGENCE OF A MARKET FOR AFRICAN ART

It was my good fortune to be young enough, and venturesome enough, when the world of art first became conscious of these monuments of negro civilization, to tie my fate to that of the new movement.  

-- Paul Guillaume

In his 1920 essay “Negro Sculpture,” the critic Clive Bell recounts the beginnings of interest in African art among the European vanguard. Situating the decisive encounter between contemporary Western artists and objects from sub-Saharan Africa in Paris around 1905, he credits a number of painters, including Pablo Picasso, Henri Matisse, André Derain and Maurice de Vlaminck, as being among the first to recognize the “real merit” of African sculpture. Turning then to the market that subsequently developed for l’art nègre, Bell emphasizes the role of only one person, the dealer Paul Guillaume: 

Thus a demand was created which M. Paul Guillaume was there to meet and stimulate. But, indeed, the part played by that enterprising dealer is highly commendable; for the Trocadero collections being, unlike the British, mediocre both in quantity and quality, it was he who put the most sensitive public in Europe - a little cosmopolitan group of artists, critics, and amateurs - in the way of seeing a number of first-rate things.

Written just one year before the Parisian dealer met the Philadelphia collector Albert C. Barnes, Bell’s essay indicates that Paul Guillaume was already a well-established dealer of African art whose importance was widely recognized by his contemporaries.

This chapter traces the evolution of Paul Guillaume’s early career as an influential dealer and promoter of African art during the 1910s and assesses his role in the emergence
of a market for African art between the wars. I have divided these formative years of Guillaume's career into three periods. The first, from around 1911 until the outbreak of World War I, marks the beginning of Guillaume's interest in African art, his early dealing in such objects, and his initiation into the Parisian avant-garde, aided by his friend, the poet Guillaume Apollinaire. During the war years, or second period, Guillaume expands his market to the United States while continuing to deal African art in Paris, thus emerging, by 1918, with a solid reputation on both sides of the Atlantic as a purveyor of l'art nègre.

The third period begins in 1918 with two significant events that contributed to Guillaume's emerging from under the shadow of his mentor: the introduction of Guillaume's periodical, Les Arts à Paris, in May 1918 and the death of Apollinaire that November.

My analysis of these critical years situates Guillaume's activities within the context of the rise in Western interest in African art and traces the aesthetic evolution that preceded Guillaume's relationship with Albert Barnes. Although the first decades of the twentieth century witnessed the gradual appreciation of the artistic properties of objects from Africa, "African art" was characterized in a number of different, and often contradictory, ways through exhibitions and publications. The category of l'art nègre encompassed works from both Africa and Oceania and included figural statuary and masks, as well as textiles and other objects of a primarily utilitarian nature. Associative qualities acquired by African artifacts ranged from the "classic," an art comparable to that of ancient Greece, to the "savage," a product of fear and superstition. Despite Paul Guillaume's influential role in drawing Western attention to African objects during his
early years as a dealer, he did not, as will be demonstrated, adopt an authoritative voice in this debate over the artistic merits of African sculpture. I contend instead that Guillaume was primarily motivated by the market potential of African art. Only after his association with Albert Barnes, beginning around 1922, does Guillaume demonstrate a desire to establish a definitive canon of "classic" African art based on specific aesthetic criteria.

The Origin of a Dealer

Paul Guillaume (fig. 1) was a man whose rather modest beginnings hardly foreshadow his future importance as one of the most influential art dealers of the 20th Century. Born in Paris in 1891, Guillaume early on sought to rise above his humble parentage as the son of a clerk and a homemaker. He spent his youth on the peripheries of communities to which he was drawn, that of the avant-garde and the wealthy classes. In his early teens, he became intrigued by the artists of Montmartre and familiarized himself with their world by frequenting the same cafes. Guillaume was also introduced, again indirectly, to the world of the French upper class as a young employee of an automobile supply shop in Paris that catered to wealthy clients.

Although Guillaume was only employed as a clerk, it was at the automobile shop that he made his first sale of African sculpture. Intrigued by an object from Central Africa, Guillaume placed the work in a vitrine in the shop's window, where it attracted the attention of Joseph Brummer, a Hungarian sculptor and dealer of art, who purchased the work for a mere 10 francs. While the date of this fateful event is not securely established, it likely occurred around 1911. Guillaume's initial acquisition this work also remains
unclear. By his own account, Guillaume purchased his first African sculpture from his laundress, whose son had brought the object home from a military expedition in Africa. By his own account, Guillaume purchased his first African sculpture from his laundress, whose son had brought the object home from a military expedition in Africa. The work sold to Brummer at the supply shop, however, was more likely obtained by Guillaume as part of a shipment of raw rubber, used for automobile tires, sent to the automobile company from Gabon.

At the time of Guillaume’s first sale, a market for African art was just beginning to emerge in Paris, fueled by the newfound interest in l’art nègre on the part of European vanguard artists. Seeking new forms of artistic expression, artists such as Pablo Picasso, André Derain and Maurice de Vlaminck began looking at and collecting African sculpture as early as 1905. The abstract formal properties of certain types of African art appealed to early modernists who desired to move beyond realism in representation in their own work. Objects from Africa - along with those from Oceania and the Americas - inspired successive waves of Western art movements that are often collectively grouped under the term “Primitivism.”

The encounter between Guillaume and Brummer was to be a fateful one. Brummer had begun to sell sculptures from Africa and Oceania as early as 1909 from his gallery on Boulevard Raspail and played a decisive role as dealer to the artistic vanguard in Paris. Jean-Louis Paudrat has emphasized Brummer’s role, stating that:

starting with a vast network of friendships contracted in the favorable climate before World War I, when young artists from the United States and from all over Europe were questioning each other about the foundations of modern art, Brummer encouraged the confrontation with what constituted one of its essential sources.
According to Paudrat, it was Brummer who encouraged the young Guillaume to continue to procure African objects and then bring them to Brummer's gallery. Through Brummer, Guillaume was also introduced to the poet and critic Guillaume Apollinaire, with whom he would form a long-standing friendship.

Apollinaire (fig. 2) was a central figure among the artistic vanguard. As editor of Les Soirées de Paris, Apollinaire was intimately connected with virtually all the influential avant-garde writers and artists in Paris. Like his artist friends, Apollinaire was also an early admirer of African art and had a small collection himself, one that was likely assembled prior to meeting Guillaume. Apollinaire saw in Guillaume an enterprising young man with similar interests in modernism and African art, and the two quickly formed a close friendship. This relationship was a determining factor in the early stages of Paul Guillaume's career as an art dealer and, as their contemporary Adolphe Basler has suggested, a significant influence on the formation of Guillaume's aesthetic sensibilities during these critical years. Through Apollinaire, Guillaume soon became an accepted member of this avant-garde community to which he had long desired to belong.

While still an employee of the automobile store, Guillaume made a number of subsequent sales of sculpture from Gabon and the Congo to both Brummer and to Apollinaire. Guillaume eventually left his job at the garage to make a living selling African art. He apparently maintained an inventory at his home, having his suppliers in Gabon ship to his private address. Guillaume also actively solicited African works through advertisements in the colonial press, beginning as early as 1912.
account in 1926 of his earlier dealings that, while undoubtedly embellished, provides a glimpse of how his inventory was accumulated:

Travelers, explorers, officials in African territories came to see me, wondered, then grew interested in my fixed idea. From the Niger to the banks of the Ogowe spread slowly the report of my researches. My name, my address, came to be known in these distant regions... A legend was built up about me. People came to me, the descendants of the great persecuted chiefs... to offer me aid. 16

Guillaume early on demonstrated an interest in transcending the typical role of the dealer by becoming more actively involved in the study of the art itself. In 1912, he founded the “Société des melanophiles” under the pseudonym of Guy Romain. 17 The society, whose membership is uncertain, was apparently dedicated to the study and documentation of African art toward the development of a small museum devoted to the subject. 18 The museum never materialized, possibly because Guillaume felt, mistakenly, that there was insufficient documentation concerning African culture for the project to fulfill its goals. 19 Guillaume was later to express frustration at his inability to understand the “African mentality” because of a perceived lack of cultural information which, he reasoned, forced him to rely solely on the aesthetic analysis of African sculpture. 20 Still, the formation of the “Société” suggests that Guillaume early on did not consider a cultural interest in African art as a hindrance to its aesthetic appreciation, a view he would later adopt after meeting Barnes.

Though he might have been thwarted in his study of African artistic expression, Guillaume was able to capitalize on the growing interest in African art in Paris during the years leading to World War I. In addition to French collectors, there were a sizable number of American expatriates who, like their European counterparts, began to acquire
African art as a facet of their commitment to modernism. American collectors were among the first to patronize European modernist artists and were, in fact, quite influential. One of the most vital gathering spots in Paris in the years before World War I was the salon of siblings Leo and Gertrude Stein, who had, along with their brother Michael and his wife Sarah, amassed significant collections of modern European art. In addition to visiting Americans, those frequenting the Stein salon included European critics such as Guillaume Apollinaire, Clive Bell and Roger Fry in addition to artists such as Picasso and Matisse. A lively exchange of ideas about modernism was thus fostered by such gatherings. Significantly, as Judith Zilczer has noted, the American expatriates “either by correspondence or upon their return to America transmitted modernist ideas to the receptive sector of the American art world.”21

An important aspect of the modernist enterprise, the appreciation of African art, was thus fueled by American collectors living in and/or traveling to Paris.

American expatriate interest in African art was gaining steadily around the time Guillaume decided to make a career as a purveyor of l’art nègre. The painter Max Weber was one of the earliest American artists to collect African art. Weber spent most of the period from 1905 to 1908 in Paris, where he became familiar with the African collection at the Trocadero Museum.22 He also included African art in his paintings, as in his Congo Statuette (fig. 3) of 1910, which features a Yaka figure from the Congo amidst other objects in a still life.23

Another American expatriate artist, Patrick Henry Bruce (1881-1936), was also collecting African sculpture by 1910. He eventually assembled a diverse group of African
objects that included mortars and pestles as well as a significant number of Akan gold weights (fig. 4). Bruce had been living in Paris since at least January 1904 and was an intimate of the Stein salon and a student of the artist Henri Matisse around 1907. It was likely through Matisse that Bruce became interested in African sculpture, which his venerable teacher employed in a sculpture class to demonstrate characteristics of volume.

Frank Burty Haviland was also a well-known American artist and collector of African art. He exhibited his work frequently in Paris and was favorably reviewed by noted critics, including Apollinaire. Haviland, accompanied by Adolphe Basler, a dealer in modern art, was one of Guillaume’s earliest visitors to the automobile shop. The artist’s interest in African art was, in fact, a long-standing one. Guillaume recounted that when he began to frequent the studios of artists in Paris, it was at Haviland’s that he first saw a number of “sculptures nègres.” Several of the African works collected by Haviland, including a Fang reliquary figure from Gabon (fig. 5), were prominent enough to be included in Carl Einstein’s 1915 book, Negerplastik. It is difficult, however, to determine whether these pieces were actually in Haviland’s possession at the time of publication.

Weber, Bruce, and Haviland were among the American expatriates who acted as a conduit through which the vogue for l’art nègre was transmitted from Paris to the United States. Through their associations with artists, critics and gallery owners, mainly in New York, a newfound interest was generated in the forms of African sculpture. Facilitating the
conveyance of this interest in African art to the United States was Paul Guillaume who, at
the beginning of 1914, began to seek new markets to peddle his wares.

Paris and New York: Seeking New Markets for African Art

By 1914, Guillaume had achieved enough success in selling African art in Paris
that he was encouraged to open a gallery of his own. In February of that year, Galerie
Paul Guillaume opened at 6, rue de Miromesnil (fig. 6), specializing in "tableaux
modernes," such as the work of Picabia and de Chirico, and also "sculptures Nègres." Shortly thereafter, encouraged by recent legislation in France that dropped the taxation on
art shipped abroad, Guillaume began to solicit business in the United States. The advent
of World War I additionally fueled the market for African art by sending American
expatriates home from Paris with a newfound taste for African sculpture. Like many
European dealers during the war, Guillaume looked to the United States as both a safe
haven and a growing market.

Guillaume initially approached Marius de Zayas (fig. 7), a caricaturist and
associate of the photographer Alfred Stieglitz. De Zayas was searching for African
sculpture to feature in an exhibition at Stieglitz's New York gallery. De Zayas had
envisioned mounting such an exhibition as early as 1911, when he first became inspired by
African art while on a scouting trip in Paris for Stieglitz. De Zayas met Guillaume in
May of 1914 and was sufficiently impressed with the young dealer that he wrote to
Stieglitz about their meeting. Later, in a manuscript entitled "How, When and Why
Modern Art Came to New York” written in the late 1940s, de Zayas recounted the origins of Guillaume’s participation in what was to be a momentous exhibition:

Through Picabia I met Apollinaire and Max Jacob, and through Apollinaire I met Paul Guillaume, then a modest but ambitious art dealer and collector, or rather importer, of Negro art. How he imported it will always remain a mystery, but the objects he had were always genuine. When the First World War was declared and desolation reigned among artists and dealers, Paul Guillaume was only too glad to let me have all the African sculpture I could put in a trunk and bring to New York. That was his first contribution to exhibitions of modern art in New York; many others followed - if not with the same intention of making propaganda pure and simple, with the hope of opening a market for them, which was just as legitimate.35

While still in Paris that June of 1914, de Zayas and Guillaume arranged for a number of African sculptures to be sent to Alfred Stieglitz’s Little Galleries of the Photo-Secession at 291 Fifth Avenue in New York for an exhibition.36

“Statuary in Wood by African Savages. The Roots of Modern Art,” featuring eighteen works on loan from Guillaume’s gallery, opened in November 1914 at Gallery 291. The objects exhibited were primarily from the French colonies in Africa, particularly Côte d’Ivoire and the Congo. The works selected were masks and figural statuary, including two Baule “other-world” figures, a Baule mask and a Senufo mask, all of which were from Côte d’Ivoire, Kota and Fang reliquary guardian figures from Gabon and a Bamana female figure from Mali.

The selection of works and their display in the gallery setting diverged sharply from the prevailing ethnographic installations in museums of the time, making this exhibition an historic one. In New York, for example, a quite different display of African material culture could be seen at The American Museum of Natural History. In this installation photo from 1910 (fig. 8), one sees a wide range of object types, including tools
and weaponry. The objects are arranged typologically with a number of similar works presented closely.

The installation at "291" offered a sharp contrast. Designed by Edward Steichen, a photographer and advocate of modernism, the installation emphasized the sculptural characteristics of a select number of the objects (fig. 9). The object types selected narrowed to masks and figural statuary, categories more in line with Western definitions of the fine arts. The singular presentation of these objects suggests that the works are unique, rather than typical. Echoing the exhibition’s title, the relation of African sculpture to modernism was made manifest visually. Steichen placed the works against rectangular panels of yellow, orange and black paper to emphasize the planar elements of the African sculpture, a display technique clearly suggestive of Cubism.

Although presented in relation to modernism through the exhibition title and installation, African sculpture was simultaneously, and contradictorily, advanced as an indication of a savage state. In an introductory note to the catalogue accompanying the exhibition at 291, de Zayas maintained that:

Negro art, product of the "Land of Fright," created by a mentality full of fear, and completely devoid of the faculties of observation and analysis, is the pure expression of the emotion of a savage race - victims of nature - who see the outer world only under its most intensely expressive aspect and not under its natural one.\(^{37}\)

De Zayas was the principal advocate of an aesthetic theory based on racial distinctions that classified African artistic production as "primitive" based on the supposedly inferior intellectual capacities of Africans, a perspective that he would develop more fully in his 1916 publication, *African Negro Art: Its Influence on Modern Art*.\(^{38}\)
Placing African sculpture on the lowest rung of an evolutionary scale, de Zayas denies agency to the African artist. Although the 1914 exhibition ostensibly heralded the artistry of African sculpture, perceived associative qualities of African savagery and primal nature underlay the exhibition’s premise, as articulated by de Zayas. This dualism was further reflected in Steichen’s Cubist-inspired installation, which simultaneously evoked, according to Camera Work, “a setting of crude and violent color.”

De Zayas and Stieglitz were quick to capitalize on the interest in African art that had arisen in the United States. Both together and individually, they sponsored a number of exhibitions promoting this “new” art form. At de Zayas’s short-lived Modern Gallery (October 1915 - April 1918), African sculpture was featured in at least four exhibitions. Like Guillaume, De Zayas was keenly aware of the market potential for his new gallery. He directly addressed the issue in Camera Work, announcing the gallery’s opening: “To foreign artists our plan comes as a timely opportunity. Their market in Europe has been eliminated by the war. Their connections over here have not yet been established.”

Although most of the African art exhibited at de Zayas’s Modern Gallery came from Guillaume, rarely was his name mentioned in press reviews of these shows. Thus, while Guillaume’s objects generated a considerable amount of attention and became well-known, the dealer himself did not assume a vocal presence among the artistic circles of New York. Guillaume seems to have been content to quietly build his reputation in the United States while maintaining his gallery in Paris. In addition to soliciting the New York galleries, Guillaume also approached ethnographic museums in order to establish himself. For example, he donated a weaving loom from Ivory Coast and an Akan goldweight to
the American Museum of Natural History. Although the war years were profitable ones for Guillaume in the United States, as a dealer he remained very much behind-the-scenes.

At home in Paris, however, Guillaume was becoming increasingly well-known as a dealer in African art through his sponsorship of a number of exhibitions. In 1916, he organized an exhibition at “Lyre et Palette,” located at 6 rue Huyghens, held between November 19 and December 5, 1916. The exhibition included 35 works by Kisling, Henri Matisse, Amadeo Modigliani, Ortiz de Zarate and Picasso and 25 African sculptures from Paul Guillaume's own collection. An accompanying catalogue included a brief preface on “Art Nègre,” written by Guillaume Apollinaire, which emphasized that the works were displayed for the first time in Paris for their artistry and not for ethnological interest.

According to brief checklist in the catalogue, the exhibition included not only works from Africa (primarily from Guinea, Ivory Coast, the Western Sudan, Gabon and the Congo), but also several Oceanic sculptures. The inclusion of both African and Oceanic works under the category of l’art nègre was typical, pointing to the indeterminate nature of “African art” at this time.

Guillaume and Apollinaire collaborated again in 1917 on the publication of Sculptures Nègres. The book was primarily designed as a photographic album and featured twenty-two objects from both Africa and Oceania. Apollinaire contributed a short essay, “A Propos de l’art des noirs,” one of the first to treat the subject of African artistry at any length. In it, Apollinaire struggles with the lack of data concerning the production of African sculpture. Unlike the masterpieces of European art, most African works, he notes, cannot yet be classified by schools or artist. Apollinaire relies on the
purported antiquity of African sculpture to validate it as an established art form, maintaining that while dates haven’t been fixed, many African pieces are definitely ancient. He reasons that, in the absence of any verifiable contextual information, the works must be judged purely on aesthetic grounds. Referring to the artistic appreciation of African sculpture as an “audacity of taste,” Apollinaire proposes that the publication will open eyes to the grandeur, beauty and passion embodied in African artistry. He concludes:

“C’est par une grande audace du goût que l’on est venu à considérer ces idoles nègres comme de véritables œuvres d’art. Le présent album aidera à reconnaître que cette audace n’a pas dépassé son but et qu’on se trouve ici en présence de réalisations esthétiques aux-qualles leur anonymat n’enlève rien de leur ardeur, de leur grandeur, de leur véritable et simple beauté.”

Yet although the book’s primary emphasis, as articulated by Apollinaire, is a purely artistic appreciation of African sculpture, this formal approach is not consistently maintained nor is it the sole perspective informing the text. In striving to present the objects as art, Apollinaire does advance certain aesthetic judgments concerning African sculpture, stating that the works strongest sculpturally derive from the “Abés” (possibly referring to the Yaure), the “Tomas” (Bamana), the “Baoulés” (Senufo), “Pahouins” (Fang) and “Bakoutas” (Kota), while works from Dahomey are aesthetically weak. Yet he offers few specifics for the stylistic elements characteristic of the regional genres that he lauds in the text. Similarly, while an emphasis on the formal aspects of African sculpture is promoted through full-page photographic reproductions that deliberately decontextualize the works, most of the accompanying captions provide contextual information, such as ritual use, in addition to the geographic and ethnic provenance of work. A Fang mask
from Gabon (fig. 10), for example, is described as serving a secret society whose membership is comprised of the aristocratic segment of the population.\textsuperscript{47}

Guillaume’s role in the production of this text also reveals the multiple interests informing the presentation of African objects as “art.” Despite the lofty intentions expressed by Apollinaire in the book, one cannot ignore the market implications of its publication. \textit{Sculptures Nègres} was, in fact, created to inaugurate the August 1917 opening of Guillaume’s new gallery in Faubourg Saint-Honoré. And although Guillaume remained in the background for the design and writing of the catalogue,\textsuperscript{48} his collection was given a very prominent position. Five of the works reproduced were expressly labeled “Collection Paul Guillaume.”\textsuperscript{49}

As expected, Guillaume’s reputation as a dealer increased with the publication of \textit{Sculptures Nègres}. His new gallery, located in Faubourg Saint-Honoré, clearly speaks well of Guillaume’s success and upper-crust clientele. Jean-Louis Paudrat has stressed the importance of this, Guillaume’s third gallery, as “one of the few active centers of Parisian artistic and literary life,” maintaining connections between Paris, New York and Zurich.\textsuperscript{50} Solidly established now on both sides of the Atlantic, Guillaume at last seemed ready to adopt more active role in the promotion of African art.

\textbf{From Dealer to Promoter: A Voice for l’Art Nègre}

In 1918, Guillaume began to publish his own periodical devoted to avant-garde expression as well as “l’art nègre.” Intended as a monthly review but published intermittently with only twenty-one issues from March 1918 until June 1935, \textit{Les Arts à
Paris likely was intended to capture the same spirit as Apollinaire’s review, _Soirées de Paris_. Indeed, the first few issues seem to be heavily influenced by the poet, and again reflect little of Guillaume’s own opinions. Issues No. 1 (March 15, 1918) and No. 2 (July 15, 1918), for example, are largely devoted to retracing gallery life and art market during the war, with an emphasis on the efforts of Apollinaire. The periodical also included contributions by Apollinaire himself, published under a variety of pseudonyms.

One of Apollinaire’s essays, “A Propos d’Art Nègre,” written under the name Paracelsus, generally restates his earlier observations in _Sculptures Nègres_. The article again stresses the antiquity of African art, noting that while exact dates have not been fixed, the current research indicates that some work was created before the Christian era. More importantly, however, the essay hints at a broader purpose for the nascent periodical: the establishment of Paul Guillaume as the premier dealer of African art in Paris. Apollinaire concludes his essay with an exaltation of Guillaume’s gallery, which he deems to have “la collection la plus important, la plus riche et la plus belle des statues nègres de toute sorte.”

In subsequent issues, _Les Arts à Paris_ clearly reveals Guillaume’s keen sense of marketing himself and his gallery through the review. Colette Giraudon has observed that one of Guillaume’s strategies was to present himself not only as a dealer, but as a collector as well. The caption “Collection Paul Guillaume” would therefore be added to reproductions of African sculpture published in the review, with the intent of increasing the cachet of the object through its association with the preeminent dealer. For example, Issue No. 2 (July 15, 1918) includes a reproduction of a Fang reliquary guardian figure
from Gabon, captioned “Art nègre - divinité Dzembé. Coll. P. Guillaume” (fig. 11) that was previously published in *Sculptures Nègres*.

At the same time, Guillaume did not demonstrate a particularly strong aesthetic sensibility in African art. In fact, in a 1917 letter to Marius de Zayas, Guillaume states that he only wants to focus on works that sell fast and well. His reluctance to become a voice for African art seems to have been jolted by the sudden death of his longtime friend and supporter Apollinaire. On November 9, 1918, Apollinaire died, a victim of the “Spanish” flu pandemic. Guillaume openly mourned the loss of his friend in an essay for Issue No. 3 of *Les Arts à Paris*, published December 15, 1918. In “Guillaume Apollinaire Est Mort,” Guillaume pays homage to the late poet and stresses Apollinaire’s promotion of Western modern and African art.

Guillaume, who had long been aided, if not guided, by Apollinaire in the promotion of African art, was now on his own. He remained focused on developing a market for African art, organizing in the spring of 1919, with the assistance of collector André Level, the “Première Exposition d’Art Nègre et d’Art Océanien.” The exhibition was held from May 10 until May 31 at Galerie Devambez and featured 147 works, drawn primarily from the collections of the organizers, including 38 from André Level and 47 from Paul Guillaume. Once again, although Guillaume’s collection was prominently exhibited, his voice was lacking from the accompanying catalogue, which featured an essay by Henri Clouzot and André Level entitled, “L’Art Sauvage,” as well as Apollinaire’s “A Propos de l’Art des Noirs,” reprinted from his 1917 book with Paul Guillaume. 56
As in earlier publications, the definition of “African art” was not very restrictive. The majority of works exhibited were figural statuary and masks,\(^{57}\) selected to demonstrate how the Western classical tradition of figural representation is transformed in Africa. Yet there were also a sizable number of cups, utensils, and other more utilitarian objects that were included for their rich decoration.\(^{58}\) Similarly, African artifacts were presented from both formal and contextual perspectives. While the accompanying essays emphasize that the objects should be viewed from an artistic standpoint, this perspective is again not reflected in the exhibition checklist, which focuses on ritual description. Figural works are thus presented as “Fetiche d’initiation d’une sorcière du Baoulé,” as in catalogue no. 2, or “Divinité agraire du Soudan,” referring to catalogue no. 25. There is no effort made to group works together stylistically and they are arranged rather haphazardly, with both African and Oceanic works mixed together.

The Galerie Devambez exhibition was a focus of the fourth issue of Les Arts à Paris, published May 15, 1919 to coincide with the exhibition. Guillaume used the occasion of the Devambez exhibition to include his first published writings on the subject of African art, an essay entitled “Une Esthétique Nouvelle: l’Art Nègre.” Rather than being an aesthetic analysis of the formal characteristics of African sculpture, as suggested by the title, the essay recounts a history of Western interest in l’art nègre. In this history, Guillaume himself plays a key role. He claims to have first become interested in African art in 1904, when he would have been a mere fifteen, when he saw a “Bobo-Dialousso” figure. Crediting Apollinaire as an early influence, Guillaume relates how he also saw African art while visiting the studios of artists, such as Haviland, Matisse, Vlaminck, and
Derain. He maintains that he began to study African culture at the Trocadero library but then abandoned his research to focus on displaying works, founding the Société d'archéologie nègre. Most significant, however, in terms of Guillaume's later development as a critic is his postscript to the essay in which he argues for the antiquity of African art and vows to publish a book on the subject someday.

On the heels of the Exposition that spring, Guillaume organized another event that reflected the current craze for things African and, not incidentally, also promoted his gallery. A "Fête Nègre" was presented at the Comédie des Champs-Élysées on June 9, 1919. Sponsored by Les Arts à Paris, the "Fête" featured African-inspired dance, music and poetry, with performers dressed in elaborate costumes and body decorations intended to be "tribal." In his introduction to the evening performance, Guillaume emphasized the exotic nature of the spectacle, assuring the audience:

Nous vous promènerons ce soir au pays des palétuviers et des fièvres, parmi ce monde étrange des sorciers, des grands chefs, des féticheurs, des guérisseurs, des N'gils, de toute cette magistrature mystérieuse dont nous avons dégagé le pittoresque essentiel. Vous assisterez à des fêtes prestigieuses, car chez ces peuples purs, uniquement soucieux de phénomènes surnaturels, le temps se passe à cultiver la sympathie des esprits redoutés.  

The following issue of Guillaume's periodical, no. 5 (November 1 1919) published selections from twelve reviews of the exhibition and seven reviews of the "fête." Not surprisingly, these were largely laudatory.

The 1919 exhibition and accompanying "Fête Nègre" would be the last major exhibition of African art in Paris until 1923, when the exhibition "Art Indigène des Colonies Françaises" was held at the Pavillon de Marsan. African art, however, remained a topical subject in publications. In April of 1920, the Paris journal Action published...
“Opinions sur l’Art Nègre,” which consisted of a number of responses solicited by the magazine. The commentary reflected the breadth of Western responses to African art at the time. Reactions ranged from dismissive, such as Jean Cocteau’s statement that “le crise nègre” had grown tiresome, to commendatory, as in Juan Gris’s crediting of African sculpture for introducing anti-idealist art. As might be expected, Guillaume offered high praise for the subject, deeming African art to be the “sperme vivificateur du XXe siècle spirituel.”

Although there was no consensus as to its value and worth, African art had been sufficiently well established in Paris by 1920 that critic Lucie Cousturier was moved to write a laudatory article on the merits of African art for Bulletin de la vie artistique. She emphasized the composition and seriousness of African sculpture, likening the curving line between nose and brow of a Baule mask to the arches of Roman windows. She concludes: “La beauté type, dans les arts, n’est qu’un idéal d’empailleurs; les dieux égyptiens, les moines de Giotto et des sculpteurs gothiques, les Baigneuses de Renoir ne comptent que par ce qui les apparente à l’art nègre et non pas par ce qu’ils doivent aux canons.” Thus, in a few short years, African artistic traditions had been transformed in Western eyes from products of a savage state to the aesthetic foundation upon which the work of subsequent generations of artists had been built. Guillaume, through exhibitions and publications, had clearly contributed toward the appreciation of such objects.

In his own periodical, Guillaume continued to promote African art, but through reproductions instead of his own writings. Issue no. 6 of November 1920, for example, reproduced a “Tête d’Idole Pahouinne,” which was not a new work but a close-up of the
full figure previously published in issue no. 2. The periodical ceased publication with this issue and did not resume until 1923, after Guillaume was associated with Barnes. Giraudon has suggested that Guillaume, like many galleries in Paris at the time, was suffering financial difficulties.63

Yet toward the end of 1920, Guillaume's most clearly expressed his views in Bulletin de la Vie Artistique. The periodical had approached twenty notables, including artists, ethnographers, dealers, critics and collectors, to comment on whether African, Oceanic and Native American art should be included in the Louvre. The responses, compiled and published under the heading “Enquête sur des arts lointains: Seront-ils admis au Louvre?,” were in three successive issues of the periodical: November 15, December 1, and December 15, 1920. The contributors, which included artists Kees Van Dongen and Angel Zarraga, dealer Joseph Hessel, collector Paul Rupalley, and curator Salomon Reinach, were each introduced by a brief editorial note.

Guillaume's contribution to the survey reveals a man ready for change, no longer fully satisfied with his roles of dealer and connoisseur. An editorial note introducing Guillaume observes that while the dealer had edited the 1917 Sculptures Nègres and published some notes in Les Arts à Paris, Guillaume's support for African art was manifest primarily through the displays in his gallery. In his published remarks, Guillaume vowed that that was to change, revealing that he planned to begin writing an important work on African art.64 He also advocated maintaining a hierarchy within art nègre, arguing vigorously for the preeminence of African over Oceanic and Native American art. Guillaume's response demonstrates his desire to develop a stronger critical voice with
regard to African art. It also offers an indication of the larger, more significant role he would assume during the 1920s, in collaboration with Dr. Albert Barnes, as a major influence on Western taste in African art.
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Chapter Two:

ALBERT BARNES, PAUL GUILLAUME, AND THE FORMATION OF A COLLECTION

I strongly advise you to take seriously what I have told you about the great opportunity you have to make a lot of money on Negro art, merely by keeping your best pieces on exposition as your private collection in Paris. If collectors wish to buy those pieces you should sell them only at a very high price. When the Foundation opens Negro art will become one of the most important art values of the world.  

— Albert Barnes to Paul Guillaume

In late 1921, Dr. Albert C. Barnes, already a widely respected collector of modernist paintings, returned to Paris on his first purchasing trip since before World War I. It was during this trip that he likely met the Paris dealer, Paul Guillaume. By the next summer, Barnes began purchasing large quantities of African art from Guillaume, eventually acquiring almost 100 works of African sculpture in less than two year’s time.

Barnes purchased virtually his entire collection of African art from Guillaume’s gallery, and the frequent correspondence between the two men during these years provides an astonishingly comprehensive picture of the development of his collection.

This chapter focuses on Barnes as a collector and explores the formation of the Barnes Foundation collection of African art. I first examine Barnes’s early collecting practices, considering the factors and motivating forces that led to his later appreciation of African sculpture. Having thus grounded my study, the greater part of this chapter will analyze the collaboration between Barnes and Guillaume in forming a collection of African art. I present a detailed portrait of Barnes’s purchases, discuss the development of his aesthetic criteria, and place his collection within the context of other public and private
collections and the rise in interest in African art in the United States. I conclude by considering the promotion of the Barnes's African art collection prior to the opening, in 1925, of the Barnes Foundation in Merion, Pennsylvania.

The Evolution of a Collector

Born January 2, 1872, Albert Coombs Barnes (fig. 12) was the third son of Lydia A. Schaffer and John J. Barnes. Like Paul Guillaume, Barnes was a self-made man who struggled to rise above his impoverished childhood in a rough section of Philadelphia referred to as "The Neck." Barnes attended Central High School in Philadelphia, receiving a B.S. degree from there in 1889, and graduated from the University of Pennsylvania medical school in 1892, at age twenty. Moving to Europe for a few years, he worked at the University of Berlin and, in 1900, studied pharmacology at Ruprecht-Karls-Universitat in Heidelberg.

In 1902, Barnes established a pharmaceutical company with partner Herman Hille. Among the pharmaceuticals that they manufactured was the silver compound Argyrol, used to fight infections in the eyes of newborns. The highly effective compound soon became a medical necessity and an immensely profitable enterprise for Barnes and his partner. Five years later, Barnes bought out Hille and, in 1908, established the A.C. Barnes Company with factories in Philadelphia, London and Australia.

Though he became a millionaire through his production of Argyrol, Barnes did not form his art collection as a visible manifestation of his newfound wealth. His interest in art actually dates from his early years in Europe, when he purchased a few landscape
paintings while in Germany. Barnes also attempted to become a painter himself but gave it up because he felt he lacked artistic talent. According to Pierre Cabanne, Barnes viewed the end of his nascent painting career in favor of collecting as merely a shift in his artistic energies. He reportedly stated, "I believe I am capable of developing enough taste and discernment to devote myself to seeking out the talents of others. Collecting pictures, done in the right way, can become almost a creative activity."³

Sometime after 1905, Barnes began to visit galleries in New York, buying paintings primarily by Barbizon School artists and their followers.⁴ Around 1910 or 1911, Barnes apparently became more dedicated to developing an art collection, probably enabled by his recent business success. He sought the advice of an old friend, the artist William Glackens who had, along with fellow artist John Sloan, attended Philadelphia’s Central High with Barnes.⁵ Glackens was sent to Paris by Barnes in 1912, where he purchased for Barnes twenty paintings, including works by Cézanne, van Gogh, Picasso, and Renoir.⁶

Barnes, initially skeptical of Glacken’s modern selections, soon became a convert. Barnes went to Paris himself in 1912 and educated himself in art while there.⁷ He also met other influential collectors like the Steins, developing a particularly close relationship with Leo Stein. While he continued to confer with Glackens, Barnes assumed the reins in the formation of his collection of modernist paintings. He bought modernist works from a number of Paris galleries, including Ambroise Vollard, Durand-Ruel, and Bernheim-Jeune, and his purchasing trips soon became legendary.⁸ Barnes’s intense and focused process of selection was described by dealer Ambroise Vollard: "Mr. Barnes comes to see you. He
gets you to show him twenty or thirty pictures. Unhesitatingly, as they pass before him, he picks out this one or that one. Then he goes away.”

By 1913, Barnes’s collection of modernist paintings was sufficiently well-known that he was invited by Arthur Davies to participate in the New York’s historic Armory Show by loaning works by Cézanne and Gauguin. Barnes declined this invitation, an act foreshadowing the policies later developed by Barnes for his foundation. Writing to Davies, Barnes stated:

If you knew what those paintings meant to me, I am sure you would not put me in the position where I appear selfish or unsympathetic in refusing the loan. They are with me not an incident or pieces of furniture - they are simply my daily life itself and I could no more be without them for a month than I could go without food for a like period.\(^{10}\)

Barnes attended the Armory Show but only bought one painting by Vlaminck.\(^{11}\) He did, however, recognize the importance of the event, writing to Leo Stein on March 30, 1913: “At New York [the Armory Show] was the sensation of the generation...Academic art received a blow from which it will never entirely recover.”\(^{12}\)

Around the time of the Armory Show, Barnes may have met a fellow collector of modernist art, New York attorney John Quinn, a man who would become Barnes’s lifelong foe.\(^{13}\) Quinn had a significant role in the staging of the Armory show, serving as legal counsel, chief lender and primary purchaser for the exhibition. Quinn’s patronage of modern art fostered amicable relations with other collectors of similar tastes, including Albert Gallatin and Lillie Bliss.\(^{14}\) Barnes, however, considered Quinn to be a fierce rival and the Philadelphia collector remained at arm’s length from this select circle. As Kristian Romare has observed, in relation to the larger modernist art world in the United States,
Barnes “seems to have been at the same time respected by and in many ways isolated from its main acting agents.”

Despite his competition with other collectors, Barnes clearly gained the respect of noted art critics. In 1914, Barnes’s collection was impressive enough to merit the attention of critic Guy Pene du Bois. Writing in *Arts and Decoration*, du Bois criticized the essential conservativism that characterized contemporary taste in art and urged collectors to look beyond realism as a basis of artistic expression. Du Bois lamented that “among our collectors the brave men can be numbered on the finger of one man’s hands and the wise brave ones, generously, on one hand.” Barnes, du Bois contended, was an exception to this unfortunate norm. Describing Barnes’s personal growth as a collector, du Bois noted that although Barnes had begun by purchasing “pictures by subdued Americans” ten years prior, he had transformed into one of the most daring collectors of modern French paintings. Du Bois concluded that Barnes’s assemblage was “probably the most consistently modern collection in America.”

Barnes’s increasing familiarity with art coupled with a growing confidence in his own taste led to his own attempt at art criticism in 1915. Barnes’s “How To Judge a Painting,” published in *Arts and Decoration*, illuminates his early approach to artistic appreciation. Despite its title, the article does not offer a systematic method toward the appreciation of art; rather, it encourages the fledgling connoisseur to study paintings carefully. Barnes’s own method, as he describes it, is
to buy a painting for what I think is in it, to have honest painters in my house and talk to them about my pictures, to lose no opportunity to look at paintings everywhere, to read books on art and not to be discouraged at how little they give to make an artist’s work enjoyable and understandable.
In essence, “How to Judge a Painting” frames the structure for Barnes’s mature aesthetic outlook and “objective” method of art appreciation, developed during succeeding years and ultimately published in 1925 as *The Art in Painting*.19

The Development of Barnes’s Interest in African Art

The now regular purchasing trips Barnes made to Paris were interrupted due to World War I and did not resume until 1921. Barnes’s first visit to Paul Guillaume’s gallery was likely shortly thereafter, although it is possible the two had met briefly before the war. According to Colette Giraudon, the poet Max Jacob notes that Barnes took shelter from the rain at Guillaume’s gallery on rue Miromesnil.20 This would establish their possible meeting sometime between February 1914, when the gallery opened, and January 1916, by which time the gallery had closed. In any event, the sustained relationship between Guillaume and Barnes did not begin until late 1921 or even 1922.

While Barnes never discussed specifically what led him to collect African art after meeting Guillaume, there are a number of motivating factors that could clarify his sudden interest. Barnes’s long-standing fascination with African-American culture has been most frequently offered as an explanation. Barnes’s introduction to African-American culture was a topic that he often discussed, declaring it a pivotal experience in his childhood. Perhaps his most oft-quoted reminiscence on the subject is a 1936 speech at his alma mater, Central High School, in Philadelphia, in which he spoke on “The Art of the American Negro.” Barnes recalled:
My experience with the Negro began when I was eight years old. It was at a camp-meeting in Merchantsville, New Jersey, and the impression was so vivid and so deep that it has influenced my whole life...I became an addict of Negro camp-meetings, baptizings, revivals, and to seeking the company of individual Negroes, who, I soon discovered, carried out in their daily lives the poetry, music, dance and drama which, when exercised by a group, gave the camp meeting its colorful, rhythmic, vivid and compelling charm.21

While reflecting the often paternalistic attitude toward blacks typical of the era, Barnes's description of the religious revivals held by the African-American Methodist Church in Merchantsville reveals an early passion.

Such accounts of Barnes's interest in African-American culture, however, have been offered uncritically as an explanation of Barnes's involvement in "Negro" art. Pierre Cabanne, for example, discusses how Barnes was "well-disposed to the negroes," having suffered similar segregation from society in his childhood poverty. Cabanne continues, noting that Barnes "therefore gave them a privileged position in his Foundation. His interest in them was fortunately shared by Paul Guillaume, who was one of the first to make the general public familiar with their art."22 While Cabanne's references in this passage shift from American blacks to Africans, and more specifically African sculpture, all are subsumed under the larger category of the "negro".

Certainly, Barnes's early experiences of African-American culture are related to his later interests in promoting both African sculpture and African-American artistic expression. Yet, I would argue, the connection is more sophisticated than these writers suggest, as will be demonstrated in Chapter Five. Barnes's interest in the lives of American blacks does not, of course, automatically suggest a later appreciation of African sculpture. Yet Barnes strongly believed in the existence of certain qualities that were
characteristically Negro," a subject he later explored in his widely read essay "Negro Art and America" of 1925. These qualities Barnes traced to the psychological make-up of the "Negro" which resulted in "his daily habits of thought, speech and movement [being] flavored with the picturesque, the rhythmic, the euphonious." Barnes early on perceived these "essential" characteristics in the religious revivals he attended as a young boy. He was especially struck by the intensity of song at these services, which featured the "Negro spirituals" only recently made popular by the Fisk Jubilee Singers. Barnes's interest in the spirituals remained with him throughout his lifetime, and he would later develop a theory on their relation to African sculpture, as will be discussed in later chapters.

While Barnes may have had a cultural interest in blacks as a race from an early age, his visual appreciation of the often-abstract forms of African culture was facilitated by his developing aesthetic sensibilities. As a student in Europe in 1900, Barnes studied philosophy at the University of Heidelberg, analyzing works by Leibnitz, Fichte, Kant and Hegel under the tutelage of Professor Kuno Fischer. When he began seriously collecting art, Barnes made an intense effort to educate himself in aesthetics. He was particularly drawn to the psychological studies of William James, the educational philosophy of John Dewey, and the aesthetic theories of George Santayana and Roger Fry.

These influential writers offered a broad definition of the aesthetic experience. Santayana, for example, in his Sense of Beauty of 1896, explored moral and aesthetic judgments as phenomena of the mind and products of mental evolution. He maintained that the fine arts "are by no means the only sphere in which men show their susceptibility to beauty. In all products of human industry we notice the keenness with which the eye is
attracted to the mere appearance of things." Roger Fry, like Santayana, also sought to locate aesthetic fulfillment within the object of contemplation, that is, the work of art itself. Fry, however, argued further that a work of art need not duplicate nature.

Drawing from all these sources, Barnes published his own educational aesthetic philosophy in 1925 as *The Art in Painting*. Significantly, Barnes was developing the book during the same years that he actively collected African sculpture. Barnes's mature aesthetic outlook advocated a systematic method of formal analysis designed to trace the essential continuity of all great art traditions. According to Barnes, great art does not imitate nature but interprets the experience of seeing nature through "plastic means"—that is, through color, line, light, and space. Barnes's exclusive focus on "plastic form" provided a critical framework that encompassed all visual material, regardless of cultural origin or subject matter. Barnes's aesthetics studies eventually led him to consider African sculpture as the purest expression of three-dimensional form.

While these factors may have paved the way conceptually for Barnes to collect African art prior to meeting Guillaume in Paris, it is unclear whether or not he was actually familiar with the art before 1921. Barnes may have visited some of the New York galleries that exhibited African sculptures while looking for modernist paintings. It is likely, for example, that he visited the De Zayas Gallery, the descendant of Marius de Zayas's Modern gallery, during an exhibition of African art, possibly as early as 1918.

If he was introduced to African art in New York, Barnes might have found a comrade in the dealer Robert Coady, although there is no firm evidence that Barnes ever visited Coady's Washington Square gallery. Like Barnes, Coady was a progressive
thinker and an early champion of African-American cultural contributions. Coady had already assisted John Quinn in developing his collection of modern art, and likely African sculpture as well.\textsuperscript{31} In his short-lived periodical \textit{The Soil}, Coady promoted the idea of an aesthetic relationship between the arts of Africa and African-America, and, by extension, Western modernism, which, he felt, owed its development to the “Negro” contribution. Coady’s activist spirit led him in 1919 to request that Quinn donate a part of his modern art collection to Howard, the prestigious black university.\textsuperscript{32}

Barnes seemingly would have had a close ally in Coady. Indeed, Coady’s own words on the subject of the American “negro” from 1917 presage the later writings of Albert Barnes:

\begin{quote}
The American Negro has contributed to our young culture many of its most valuable qualities. He has given us...the best of our music. I have examples of his painting which I claim the best ever done in this country...the Negro lives a poetic life and he is full of mystery, rhythm...To develop those qualities and fit them into our complicated American life is, as I see it, our “Negro problem.”\textsuperscript{33}
\end{quote}

But by 1919, Coady had closed his New York gallery and two years later, just as Barnes’s interest in African sculpture was beginning to peak, Coady died of pneumonia.

\textit{“The Best Private Collection of Negro Sculpture”}

Regardless of whether or not Barnes had seen African sculpture prior to 1922, he did not collect such objects before that time. Barnes purchased virtually the entire collection of African art through Paul Guillaume, with whom he began corresponding on a regular basis in January 1922. In my documentation of the formation of the collection and of the relationship between Guillaume and Barnes, I have relied extensively on the
prodigious amount of correspondence between the two provided to me by the Barnes Foundation. This archival material has afforded me considerable insights and has been crucial to my analysis, particularly in the absence of Guillaume's own memoirs or collected archival material.

The Barnes collection of African art was assembled through at least five separate purchases from Guillaume's Paris gallery, beginning in the summer of 1922 and continuing through at least December 1923. I will discuss here the content of the collection in general terms, reserving consideration of its specifics for the next chapter. As previously noted, the overwhelming majority of works acquired by Barnes are figural statuary, but there are also a significant number of masks as well. Other objects in the collection include heddle pulleys, cups, tobacco mortars, stools, and headrests. Most of the works collected by Barnes were from the French colonies in Africa, specifically Mali (then the "French Sudan"), Ivory Coast, Gabon and the Congo. Yet there are also objects from the present-day countries of Sierra Leone, the Republic of Benin, and Nigeria.

Barnes's first purchase of African art, in the summer of 1922, was his largest. He bought forty-seven works for a total of 71,025 francs, or approximately $14,205. Over 30 of the pieces in this initial selection were figural, such as the Baule male (fig. 13) from Ivory Coast. Seven masks were also acquired, including an Ivory Coast face mask (fig. 14), probably Senufo or Kulango, with traces of its indigenous pigmentation. The more utilitarian objects purchased by Barnes that summer typically have a figural element, like the small staff top with two figures, probably of Kongo ethnic origin (fig. 15).
On November 6, 1922, the dealer Joseph Brummer opened an exhibition of African sculpture and modern European paintings at his New York gallery at 43 East 57th Street. The works displayed at Brummer’s gallery came from Paul Guillaume and Barnes visited the exhibition three days after its opening:

It seemed like a visit to your shop when I went in to Brummer’s place in New York yesterday. Your Negro sculpture was very familiar and makes decidedly the best exhibition of Negro sculpture we have ever had in this country. I hope Brummer succeeds in selling all of the pieces for you, but if he does not, I think it would be well for you to let some of them stay in this country so that they can in go in my new museum.36

Barnes decided to acquire three works from the exhibition: a mask from Ivory Coast, a “Soudan” figure, and a Fang reliquary figure (fig. 16) from Gabon.37 They were purchased through Guillaume’s gallery, not Brummer’s, for a total of 45,500 francs.

In the winter of 1922, Barnes returned to Paris and purchased an additional 30 works from Guillaume’s gallery for the sum of 131,110 francs or $26,222. Again, masks and figural statuary dominated the selection, with Barnes acquiring a number of Dan masks from Ivory Coast. The most expensive of these, at 6,000 francs, was a Dan mask retaining bits of raffia, beads and cowrie shells from its former life in Africa (fig. 17). Barnes also bought four small Bembe figures from the Congo (fig. 18), described as “petit Sibiti” in reference to their geographic origin. Among the more utilitarian objects in this group were two Baule divination tappers (Côte d’Ivoire), referred to as “marteau musicale.”

During the summer of 1923, Barnes acquired much fewer works from Guillaume. In June, he purchased only two masks, one from the Sudan and one from Côte d’Ivoire, and a reliquary guardian head from Gabon, for 56,250 francs.38 In July, Barnes purchased,
for 7,110 francs, a small stone sculpture, attributed to the Kissi of Sierra Leone, and four objects listed as "Figurine Zouénoula." These latter works are most likely the heddle pulleys in the collection, as in this example (fig. 19), which are attributed to the Guro of Ivory Coast.

There is also documentation, that same summer, of another purchase of a "Collection Lobi," for a total of 65,000 francs. The latter probably refers to a collection of miniature goldweights that were in Mrs. Barnes's collection (fig. 20). She owned at least thirty-six works, mostly miniature pieces in metal and ivory. The collection included twenty-seven bronze miniature castings of animals, attributed to the Lobi culture of Ivory Coast; two small ivory pendant masks, possibly Pende; three figural works attributed to the Kuba peoples; a small Dan wooden mask; a Lele wooden comb; and a pair of ivory bracelets.

In December 1923, Barnes bought, for a total of 79,500 francs, two masks, one of which was Dan, an "idol" from Ivory Coast and the Fon iron figure, referred to as "Dahomey" (fig. 21). This purchase also included the large carved relief door (fig. 22), attributed to the Baule of Côte d'Ivoire, that would later figure prominently at the Barnes Foundation. Barnes appears to have ceased collecting, at least for a while, with this last purchase during his annual winter trip to Paris.

Barnes apparently selected the works himself from Guillaume's gallery during his visits to Paris. Describing Barnes's modus operandi on a typical day, the critic Waldemar George wrote:

We would take in five to ten museums and private collections, going to the Louvre, the Musée Guimet (which houses the art of the Far East), the Musée
Ethnographique (which displays Pre-Columbian, African and Oceanic art) ... Paul Guillaume and his young wife were always with us. Toward eleven o’clock at night Barnes would ask them to open up their gallery on the Rue la Böetie, which had long been closed and which we got into via the service entrance. We stayed there till a late hour of the night looking at the African Negro sculptures and the paintings of Soutine.\(^4^4\)

The first shipment of African art from Guillaume’s gallery was in August 1922, and Barnes began to display the sculpture in his house for the first time shortly thereafter.\(^4^5\)

In acquiring African art, Barnes saw an opportunity to establish a collection of note and he set high goals for himself. A few months after beginning to collect, Barnes announced these lofty aspirations to his dealer. “Please remember,” he wrote Guillaume, “I intend to try to have the best private collection of Negro sculpture in the world.”\(^4^6\)

Barnes’s acquisition of African sculpture remained a priority in his collecting overall. In November 1922, faced with rapidly increasing expenses associated with the establishment of his foundation, Barnes told Guillaume that he would have to limit his purchases. An exception was made for certain aspects of his collection that he wanted to augment. Barnes assured Guillaume that he would “have enough cash to buy the work of men like Picasso, Matisse, Utrillo, etc., and to make my collection of Negro sculpture more complete.”\(^4^7\)

The Barnes Aesthetic

Barnes appears to have developed his standards of aesthetic judgment while in the process of forming his collection. In this regard, Paul Guillaume would certainly seem a strong influence, as Barnes acquired nearly the entire collection through Guillaume’s gallery. Indeed, it has been assumed that the objects Barnes collected reflect the
aesthetic preferences of his dealer. According to William Rubin and Jean-Louis Paudrat, Guillaume typified the “classic” taste in African art, which is characterized as objects stressing “highly refined, often intricate workmanship, beautifully polished or patinated surfaces, and a restrained, stylized realism.” Rubin notes further that this “classic” taste, exemplified by masks of the Yaure, Baule and Guro, was often at odds with the preferences of artists like Picasso, who favored more abstract objects with rougher workmanship.

Many of the objects acquired by Barnes, like the delicately carved Baule mask (fig. 23) in the collection, do reflect these preferences. I argue, however, that this aesthetic reflects Barnes’s taste and not that of Guillaume. In their voluminous correspondence, Barnes rarely, if ever, questions Guillaume about African art or even solicits advice. In fact, from almost the beginning of their association, Barnes does not hesitate to dispute Guillaume’s stylistic attributions. For example, referring to a group of labels Guillaume had made for Barnes’s African pieces, the collector wrote, “One of the labels - for figure number 11 - reads ‘Congo, (Bushongos)’; but the type seems to me pure Congo without any of the characteristics of Bushongo work as I have seen it.” Barnes’s cultural attributions, however, were not always accurate. In the example above, Congo is the region where the Bushongos (i.e., the Kuba ethnic group) reside.

Even if we did not have such strong archival evidence, it can be clearly demonstrated that Barnes’s collection is a selective representation of what was available at the time. Guillaume evidently tried to present Barnes with a range of objects from various cultures in West and Central Africa. In a letter to Barnes dated September
11, 1922 describing some recent purchases, Guillaume wrote that he had “quelques nègres dont un masque bronze Bénin et une belle idole du Gabon - je vous trouverai pour l’année prochaine quelques Dahomey et Congo pas cher.” Barnes, however, usually opted for works which fell into the categories of “good” art he had established.

A comparison between the Barnes collection and that of Han Coray, who also acquired his collection of African art through Guillaume during the same years as Barnes, further suggests that Barnes formed his own African art aesthetic without Guillaume. Coray was a Swiss dealer who sponsored the first Dada exhibition in his Zurich gallery in January 1917. The 1917 show included a number of African objects from Coray’s own collection, purchased the previous year from Paul Guillaume. From 1920 until 1928, Coray continued to buy works from Guillaume’s gallery, eventually assembling an impressive collection of approximately 2,400 works of African art.

As Miklos Szalay has convincing argued, Coray did not define “African art” narrowly. Thus, while his collection did contain figural statuary and masks, it also included numerous examples of objects for everyday use, such as musical instruments, weapons, jewelry and textiles. Some of the types of objects in Coray’s collection were similar to that of Barnes, such as the Bembe mother-and-child figure from the Congo (fig. 24), probably sculpted by the same hand as some examples in the Barnes collection. Yet Coray also selected a number of works from Nigeria, a region whose work did not appeal to Barnes, like the Igbo Janus-faced mask (fig. 25).
The rather select aesthetic of the Barnes collection was, I would argue, the result of Barnes's restricted definition of "African art," which revealed a preference for relatively naturalistic masks and figural statuary from specific cultural regions. As he did with modernist painting, Barnes probably reached his standards of aesthetic judgment by viewing the objects themselves after studying, then dismissing, the available texts. Of the few books on African art, Barnes apparently valued only the work of Roger Fry. Fry, however, does not distinguish between various forms of African art but discusses it more generally. Barnes was also certainly aware of and had likely even read the primary ethnographic texts on African material culture. While these books provided him with a general cultural background upon which he could base his aesthetic standards, it is probable that Barnes also closely studied the works Guillaume offered as well as extant museum collections.

There were several existing collections of African artifacts in American museums at the time. None, however, were dedicated to "art" per se, but were museums of natural history. In New York, the American Museum of Natural History had a large collection of objects primarily from Central Africa acquired from King Léopold of Belgium and from the museum's Congo Expedition in 1909. The Buffalo Society of Natural Sciences (fig. 26), now the Buffalo Museum of Science, owned two extensive collections of African material from the west coast of Africa as well as a collection of carved tusks that were executed during the Pan American Exposition of 1901. In Chicago, the Field Museum also displayed African artifacts in "22 standard cases" on the second floor. Curator B. Laufer characterized the museum's main attractions as "bronzes,
wood and ivory carvings from Benin, of which we have a rather comprehensive and representative collection.”

Closest to Barnes, however, was the African collection at the University Museum (fig. 27) of the University of Pennsylvania in western Philadelphia. Founded in 1887, the museum initially acquired a sizable number of objects from missionaries and explorers in Africa. Its early holdings included a large collection of Fang objects from Gabon presented by Reverend Robert Hamill Nassau in 1891 and about a hundred works from the Kongo peoples in Zaire assembled by Reverend W. H. Leslie. The collection was not developed in a systematic manner, however, until around 1911 when the museum, under the guidance of director George Byron Gordon, began purchasing works from Africa through the British dealer W.O. Oldman, who regularly supplied the museum with non-Western artifacts until his retirement in 1927. Through Oldman, the museum acquired a group of sixty works from the kingdom of Benin, Nigeria that, together with an earlier acquisition from Henry Ling Roth, formed a rather significant collection of objects from a specific region. The museum’s holdings were also particularly strong in works from Gabon and the Congo.

The University Museum in Philadelphia is the only established American museum collection of African art that Barnes consistently wrote about to Guillaume, suggesting that this collection was the one with which he was most familiar. Although Barnes obviously visited the museum to study its collections, it appears that he had made aesthetic determinations prior to his visits. As early as August of 1922, shortly after his first purchase from Guillaume, Barnes reported that:
the collection of Negro sculpture at the University Museum in this city comprises probably 200 pieces, mostly from Benin and Bushongo. They have no Ivory Coast, Sudan, Guinea, Sangha or the other important regions. Most of the pieces they have are not, according to my judgment, of the primitive savage types, but seem to be mixed with European influences.\textsuperscript{61}

In his response to Barnes, Guillaume agreed that the University Museum’s collection was a mixed lot, assembled, he wrote, in the manner of ancient ethnographic collections.\textsuperscript{62}

Guillaume advised that the museum would eventually want to sell off the collection, keeping only those works that were “pur et de premier ordre.”

Barnes continued to visit the University Museum in order to study the collection and compare the works with those he had acquired from Guillaume. On September 22, 1922, Barnes revealed his developing aesthetic sense with regard to African sculpture in a letter to Guillaume:

> Several times since I wrote you I have been to the University Museum to see the Negro sculpture and every time I look at it I realize how much better my pieces of sculpture are. I doubt if Mr. Hall, the man who wrote the articles on negro sculpture in the Museum Bulletin, has any feeling for art but is merely a writer who is familiar with various historical facts about it. The reason I say this is that he has a really beautiful Gabon head, which is listed as a Congo piece, and a rather nice figure which is typically Sudan, which is also listed as Congo.\textsuperscript{63}

Guillaume wrote back to Barnes about the “tête Gabon,” possibly this Fang reliquary guardian head (fig. 28), that Barnes had admired in the University Museum collection, stressing the importance of the object type. He advised Barnes that although technically the object derived from the Congo “l’art est si distinct de la production du vaste Congo qui il est trop sommaire aujourd’hui de designer sous le nom de Congo un objet des Pahouins du Gabon.”\textsuperscript{64}
Barnes eventually met with Henry Usher Hall, the curator at the University Museum. Hall, who approached the collection from the perspective of ethnography, was dismissed by Barnes as a man insensitive to the artistic merits of African sculpture. Barnes had no compunction about correcting Hall's attributions of some of the works, probably those mentioned in an earlier letter to Guillaume, and clearly set an antagonistic tone in his dealings with Hall.

Barnes also maintained a relationship, of sorts, with the curator of the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, Stewart Culin. Culin was assembling a collection of African art for the museum during the same years Barnes was collecting. Interestingly, Culin had previously been director of the University of Pennsylvania Museum from 1892 until 1903. As the first curator of the newly established Department of Ethnology at the museum, now known as the Brooklyn Museum, Culin made African art a priority for his collecting.

Barnes was skeptical of Culin's aesthetic sensibilities and disdainful of the collection of African art he was assembling for the Brooklyn Museum. "I know how highly you esteem [Culin's] rare artistic sensitivity and keen intelligence in all matters relating to negro art," Barnes wrote to Guillaume in a particularly acerbic letter, suggesting that Culin's collection was comprised of fakes: "Especially do I know that you will be interested in learning that he succeeded in obtaining a fine collection of pieces from the Belgian Congo, at a very small price. It would be valuable to know whether the pieces were made in the Congo, in Italy, or in one of the side streets of Paris." Barnes clearly distinguished between his own collecting and that of Culin, which was squarely within the
tradition of ethnographic collecting. As Diana Fane has observed about Culin’s collecting of Native American artifacts, his twin goals were for the collection to be both representative and complete.  

Guillaume, too, was dismissive of Culin’s collection, at least to Barnes. He wrote “pour moi cette collection se résumait à huit pièces,” singling out for praise only a number of decorative weapons that he sketched for Barnes in his letter. Guillaume compared Barnes’s collection to that of Culin, stating that Culin’s collection was merely “documentaires” while those objects Barnes purchased were aesthetic.  

Elaborating on this observation, Guillaume commented that “toutes pièces de haute noblesse qui feront bien lorsqu’elles se rencontreront dans le salon de l’exposition de garder leurs distances avec ces compagnons aux origines et au physique incertains....Mr Culin ne comprend pas la sélection.”  

Selection, that is, the conscious application of aesthetic criteria to the formation of a collection, was now a key issue for both Guillaume and Barnes.

To Culin’s face, however, both Barnes and Guillaume were outwardly respectful. Barnes even initially offered to loan his African art collection to an exhibition that Culin had proposed. One month later, however, Barnes changed his mind about participating in Culin’s exhibition. Barnes felt that Culin was not discriminating enough in the objects selected for the exhibition. On November 9, 1922, he wrote Guillaume, “The pieces [Culin] bought in London and in Brussells [sic] are, as you wrote me, inferior even if genuine; and the last letter he wrote me about making a conglomerate exhibition of all the things he proposed, leads me to think that it would be undignified for either you or me to be identified with that exhibition.” Barnes later declined to participate, stating that the
objects were badly split due to the changes in temperature. To Guillaume, however, Barnes privately confided that he refused the loan to Culin because Barnes believed that the exhibition would "not serve the purpose which you and I believe negro art should serve."  

Culin’s exhibition, “Primitive Negro Art,” opened at the Brooklyn Institute Museum in April of 1923. The collection featured works primarily from the then-Belgian Congo, especially those objects made by the Kuba. Culin emphasized, in the catalogue, that the objects were presented for their artistic properties:

The entire collection, whatever may have been its original uses, is shown under the classification of art; as representing a creative impulse, and not for the purpose of illustrating the customs of the African peoples.

Culin’s definition of “African art,” however, was much broader than that of Barnes. While the exhibition included some figural works and masks, as seen in this installation photograph (fig. 29), it also presented weapons, utensils, game boards (a special interest of Culin’s), clothing and objects of personal adornment (fig. 30). Barnes evidently had little regard for Culin’s broad definition of African art.

Barnes also dismissed American dealers of African art and fellow collectors with similar interests. As previously noted, Barnes was not the first American collector of African art. In fact, his nemesis John Quinn began collecting African art as early as 1914, through dealers like Alfred Stieglitz and Robert Coady, and amassed a small collection of about thirty-six African and Pre-Columbian works by 1924. Despite his reservations about Quinn, Barnes was intrigued by the apparent publication, in January 1923, of an “edition de luxe” featuring the African art collection of John Quinn. Barnes describes
the book as a photographic album featuring the photography of Charles Sheeler: "The finest thing is a Gabon head but there are a number of other good pieces and the total number of photographs is twenty-four." 77

Promoting the Collection

In October 1922, Barnes purchased the land for his foundation, an educational institution that would exhibit not only modern art and African sculpture but also, asphrased by Barnes, "older pictures." 78 Barnes was keenly interested in promoting both his collection and his plans for an educational institution based on the collection. In November of 1922, he was approached by Forbes Watson, editor of The Arts, one of the leading art journals in the United States. Watson wanted to feature The Barnes Foundation in the January 1923 issue, and Barnes was quick to respond. Granting The Arts the first public announcement of his project, Barnes sent Watson the plans and elevations for the new building and persuaded Paul Cret, the Foundation’s architect, to write a description.

The January 1923 issue of The Arts devoted a significant portion to articles featuring the Barnes Foundation. Paul Cret, the architect for the building, contributed a piece on the building’s plan and merits of installation accompanied by an illustration of its front elevation. Forbes Watson produced a lengthy article entitled "The Barnes Foundation." In promoting the Foundation in The Arts, a key issue was the authorship of an article on Barnes’s collection of African sculpture. Forbes Watson had originally planned to have Marius de Zayas review the collection, but Barnes persuaded Watson to
let Guillaume write the article. “An article by him would be something worthwhile,” Barnes wrote, “for he is the man who first introduced negro art to Europe and to him all questions are referred by the mere writers of books on the subject.”

Barnes sent a cable on January 16, 1923 asking Guillaume to submit within three weeks time a “strong authoritative article...on my carvings with photographs.” Although Guillaume sent Barnes an article the following month, Watson ended up publishing “Negro Art” by Marius de Zayas in the March 1923 issue, an article that did not address the Barnes Foundation’s collection. Barnes, stung by his perceived rejection by Watson, dismissed the event as “a characteristic piece of exploitation by that shabby crowd of politicians and commercialists who are prominent in art circles,” referring to Watson, de Zayas, and Charles Sheeler (who had photographed the works in de Zayas’s article).

Coinciding with the announcement in The Arts, an exhibition of “recent acquisitions” by the Barnes Foundation opened at Paul Guillaume’s gallery on January 22, 1923. Guillaume had been named Foreign Secretary of the Barnes Foundation just the previous week. The exhibition included both paintings by European modernists and African sculpture. The latter was prominently promoted through the press release accompanying the show, which was written by Barnes. “There are on exhibition thirty-five (35) pieces of Ancient Negro Sculpture, which altogether makes a better and more representative collection of negro art than is to be found in any museum not excepting the Congo Museum at Brussels, or the British Museum.”
Guillaume also published a special issue of Les Arts à Paris dedicated to the Barnes Foundation. The issue included an article on the educational plans for the Foundation, “La Fondation Barnes, une experience d'éducation,” written by Barnes and translated by Guillaume into French. Guillaume contributed two articles, “Negro Art at the Barnes Foundation,” and “Le Récent voyage du Dr Barnes à Paris,” and Waldemar George wrote, “A Propos des bas-reliefs de Lipchitz à la Fondation Barnes.” Barnes was clearly pleased with the issue, especially the opportunity it provided to have his ideas reach a new audience.

Barnes’s increasing confidence in his own taste and selections, furthered by the excitement generated by the announcement about the Barnes Foundation, resulted in a more authoritative tone in his correspondence with Guillaume. Barnes often advised Guillaume on strategies for selling objects from his gallery in the United States and emphasized the importance of the Barnes Foundation in establishing a market for African art. On March 6, 1923, Barnes wrote Guillaume:

I received the photographs of the fifty-six (56) pieces which you say you have offered to Culin for four hundred ($400.00) dollars. I believe it would pay you better to keep those yourself and sell them in America after a couple of years when negro art will become well-known here through the exhibition of the collection in the Foundation. I am sure you could get more than twice the amount of money you ask for them, and if you wish you may send them to me and I can keep them on storage in my laboratory until such time as there is a demand for negro art among people who have not much money to spend for such objects. I suggest that you send them now because you state that the French government will soon prevent negro sculptures from being sent out of France.84

In Barnes’s own collecting of African sculpture, however noble his intentions, there was clearly an element of “cornering the market.” Barnes had adopted similar strategies with
other works in his collection, most notably his “discovery” of the artist Soutine, as well with his collecting of a large number of late Renoirs.85

Another strategy that Barnes advised Guillaume to adopt was to maintain a selection of high quality African art on exhibit at the gallery as Guillaume’s private collection. The cache of this collection particulière would serve to inflate the value of the objects, which could then be sold at a high price.86

The association between Barnes and Guillaume, begun less than one year prior, had clearly transformed from a collector-dealer relationship into a mentor-tutor one. The announcement of plans for the Foundation, with its surprisingly strong response, seems to have been a catalyst that shifted the dynamics. Somewhat patronizingly Barnes wrote Guillaume:

Your little gallery must be surprised to get so much attention. You will remember that I predicted that it would be a great sensation and that you would be the most talked about man in French art circles. The advertising value will be enormous and I wish you had more fine paintings and more choice negro pieces to sell at high prices to the people who will surely come to the gallery long after the exhibition is closed.87

Barnes clearly saw himself now as not only Guillaume’s advisor in matters aesthetic but also as a promoter of Guillaume’s importance both in Paris and in the United States.

While establishing the Barnes Foundation on an international scale as an art institution of significance was foremost on Barnes’s mind, he also saw an opportunity to enhance the reputation of his dealer. As part of this plan, Barnes encouraged Guillaume to write a book on African art, one that would be definitive. The book, featuring Barnes’s collection of African art, would be published in 1926 as Primitive Negro Sculpture. Though authorship is credited to by Guillaume and Barnes Foundation teacher Thomas
Munro, the publication, as will be demonstrated in the following chapter, truly codifies Barnes's definition of African art.
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Chapter Three:

DEFINING AFRICAN ART

Not until the recent opening of the Barnes Foundation, for purposes of education and research, has there been available a collection representing all the chief schools of negro sculpture, selected entirely from the standpoint of artistic value.¹

— Primitive Negro Sculpture, 1926

In developing a collection of African art that was to be, in Barnes’s words, both “comprehensive” and “representative” the collector was, in essence, defining African art. The objects Barnes selected and displayed, first at his home and then in the galleries of his educational foundation, fostered a particular taste in and way of looking at African art. The aesthetic criteria and ideological perspectives manifest in Barnes’s African art collection are, I maintain, ultimately reflected in Primitive Negro Sculpture, published in 1926 by the Barnes Foundation.

This chapter considers Primitive Negro Sculpture as the codification of Barnes’s aesthetic tenets as applied to African sculpture. Although authorship of Primitive Negro Sculpture is credited to Paul Guillaume and Thomas Munro, archival research reveals the formative role Albert Barnes played in both its evolution and content. I discuss first the origins of the text, evaluating the contributions of Guillaume, Munro and Barnes to the final product, and situate the text within the context of other publications on the aesthetics of African art. I then consider the aesthetic criteria and doctrine advocated in Primitive Negro Sculpture as a reflection of Barnes’s beliefs, comparing the text to the content of Barnes’s African art collection. In particular, the regional traditions and stylistic
characteristics promoted in the text will be analyzed as providing a selective definition of African art.

The Origins of "Primitive Negro Sculpture"

The initial idea of writing a book on African art based on Barnes’s collection appears to have stemmed from the article Guillaume had written, at Barnes’s request, for The Arts in January 1923. Although The Arts ultimately published an article by Marius de Zayas instead of that by Guillaume, as discussed in the preceding chapter, Barnes was determined to see Guillaume’s article in print. In March of 1923, Barnes wrote to Guillaume, proposing that his article be included in a planned book on Barnes’s African art collection:

Your article on Negro Art is so fine that I shall print it in the catalogue of the Foundation which will be illustrated - so you need not regret the fiasco about it with the journal. You have the English translation which you can study at your leisure and see if you wish to change what you have written. The catalogue will not be published for a year or more.”

In the fall of 1923, Barnes began discussing more seriously with Guillaume his plans for a book based on the collection. Construction was well underway on the 24-room gallery and 12-room administration building of the Barnes Foundation. The Foundation, though housing Barnes’s art collection, was designed as an educational institution, not a museum. Barnes therefore needed texts that could be used in conjunction with the collection and that would reflect the approach to art appreciation that he was promoting through the Foundation.
In November 1923, Barnes outlined his ideas for a book on African art. Though he was appealing to Guillaume to write the book, Barnes planned to strongly influence the development of the text. He wrote to Guillaume:

Your position demands that you write a book on negro art. You could do it better than any other person and I should be glad to read your manuscript and incorporate some basic aesthetic, psychological and philosophical principles that would help make the book the authoritative one on that subject. After it is published in France, I would translate it and publish it here as one of the educational books of the Foundation.\(^3\)

As will be demonstrated, the resulting publication, *Primitve Negro Sculpture*, was clearly guided by and reflects the detailed aesthetic analyses of Albert Barnes.

Given the rather lengthy list of books and articles that Barnes did write, both before and after the publication of *Primitive Negro Sculpture*, it might seem odd that Barnes did not seek authorship of his own book on African sculpture. Yet, employing others to write his own analytical observations was not new to Barnes. He had earlier negotiated with the French critic Waldemar George about a history of European painting that George was to write through the lens of Barnes's aesthetic theory.\(^4\)

Barnes's reluctance to author the book may be further explained by his desire to make a name for the dealer Guillaume in the United States. Barnes recognized the important role that Guillaume had played in Europe in drawing public attention to the artistic properties of African sculpture. With Guillaume as author, Barnes felt, the book would augment the young dealer's growing reputation and, at the same time, fuel the market for African art. As Barnes explained to Guillaume:

A book of that kind would give you first position in the world on negro art and would be a demonstration that, as I told Waldemar George, you are only
incidentally a dealer. It would also be of great help to spread your fame among collectors and would increase your sales of both paintings and negro art.\textsuperscript{5}

Not incidentally, by promoting Paul Guillaume's reputation in the United States, Barnes could further the importance of his own collection of African art because it was acquired entirely from Guillaume's gallery.

Although Guillaume had been planning since at least 1920 to write a more detailed book on African art than his 1917 collaboration with Apollinaire,\textsuperscript{6} the dealer apparently took some coaxing to generate a manuscript. Barnes let the matter rest for a few months and then repeated his request more vigorously:

In about ten months the gallery of the Barnes Foundation will contain what is probably the most important collection of Negro Art in the world and we shall have no book descriptive of Negro Art to which we can refer people who wish to learn something about it... since you were the man who did most to bring Negro Art to the attention of the public, nobody but Paul Guillaume should be the author of the book which we desire. If you write such a book I would go over it carefully and put in enough material about the psychological phases and art values of the subject to try to make your book the most important one of its kind that has ever been done.\textsuperscript{7}

Apparently inspired by the urgent tone of Barnes's letter, Guillaume began working on a more extensive manuscript for a book on the Foundation's African art collection in February 1924.\textsuperscript{8}

"Primitive Negro Sculpture" in Context

The proposed text was, of course, not the first book to discuss objects from Africa from an aesthetic viewpoint. In addition to those works, primarily French, that were considered in Chapter One, a number of other publications focused on the artistic appreciation of objects from Africa. The earliest of these was Negerplastik, published in
1915 by Carl Einstein, an influential writer and critic in the German Expressionist movement. The book is generally considered to be the first publication to present a number of objects from Africa entirely from the perspective of art. Einstein addresses the subject with a short introduction followed by 111 photographic reproductions illustrating a variety of African sculpture. His essay discusses the influence of African art on painting, the relationship between religion and art in Africa, and the perception of volume in African sculpture, then focuses on masks and other object types.

Although the textual section advocates the artistic appreciation of African sculpture, an emphasis on form is most evident visually in the photographic reproductions. Presented entirely from a formal point of view, there is no information given for any of the objects reproduced, either in a caption or in an appendix, other than the plate number. Multiple photographic views for several of the objects further encourage artistic appreciation of the objects. For example, a mortuary post from Madagascar surmounted by a male figure and a female figure is featured in five separate views (fig. 31).

A formal perspective also influences the organization of the works themselves in the catalogue section. While certain categories of objects seem to have been grouped according to region, such as reliquary guardian figures from Gabon, others appear to have been arranged according to structural or thematic similarities. A Teke male figure from Congo and a Senufo female figure from northern Côte d'Ivoire are thus juxtaposed in plates 70 and 71, presumably because of their similarly styled crested coiffure (fig. 32).

British critics were also writing about African sculpture. Inspired by a 1920 exhibition of 30 African objects at the Chelsea Book Club in London, Roger Fry wrote his
widely read essay, "Negro Sculpture." Fry had visited the exhibition with Virginia Woolf on April 15 of that year and published his review in *Athenaeum* the following day. In his essay, Fry focuses on two specific aspects of African sculpture: its freedom from representational accuracy and its formal emphases highlighting three-dimensionality.

Fry is enthusiastic, albeit grudgingly, in his praise for African art:

> We have the habit of thinking that the power to create expressive plastic form is one of the greatest of human achievements, and the names of great sculptors are handed down from generation to generation, so that it seems unfair to be forced to admit that certain nameless savages have possessed this power not only in a higher degree than we at this moment, but than we as a nation have ever possessed it. And yet that is where I find myself: I have to admit that some of these things are great sculpture - greater, I think, than anything we produced even in the Middle Ages.12

What Fry believes distinguishes African sculpture from Western traditions is "complete plastic freedom," or an ability to recreate form in three-dimensions. Yet despite his recognition of the creativity of African artists, Fry ultimately concludes that "for want of a conscious critical sense and the intellectual powers of comparison and classification ... the negro has failed to create one of the great cultures of the world."13

Also in attendance at the Chelsea exhibition of 1920 was Clive Bell, who published an essay on African art that reveals a mentality similar to that of Fry concerning black artistic production. Bell's "Negro Sculpture" relates the "discovery" of African art by the European vanguard and debates its relative aesthetic merits. In a tone skeptical of general enthusiasm for *art nègre*, Bell begins by initially conceding that African art may deserve a place among the great art traditions. He maintains, however, that the art of Africa is "no match for the greatest," a category he defines as encompassing Chinese, archaic Greek, Byzantine, Romanesque and early Italian Renaissance art.14 In fact, he
continues, despite the current interest in sculpture from Africa, it should be noted that “perhaps the most perfect achievements of these savages are to be found amongst their textiles and basketwork.”

Bell focuses his essay, however, primarily on African sculpture. Unlike Fry, Bell does not highlight specific formal characteristics such as three-dimensionality. Instead, he argues that while African sculpture may be aesthetically interesting, it cannot be considered great art because its artists are purely instinctual. Bell writes:

At the root of this lack of artistic self-consciousness lies the defect which accounts for the essential inferiority of Negro sculpture to the very greatest art. Savages lack self-consciousness and the critical sense because they lack intelligence.

Bell ultimately concludes that African sculpture is not the product of “creative imagination” but an instinctual form only incidentally achieving aesthetic excellence.

While African artists bear the brunt of his criticism, Bell also discusses the current state of knowledge regarding the objects themselves. He maintains that African sculpture is a dying tradition, arguing that “the production of fine art is apparently at an end.” Regarding those works of African art in collections, Bell contends that the dates and provenance assigned to such objects are merely speculative. He concludes his critique with a rather smug observation concerning the “primitivist” vogue in Western art:

And thus it comes about that, at the present moment, we have in Europe the extraordinary spectacle of a grand efflorescence of the highly self-conscious, self-critical, intellectual, individualistic art of painting amongst the ruins of the instinctive, uncritical, communal, and easily impressed arts of utility.

Barnes was familiar with all of these publications, considered among the more prominent writings on the subject during the first decades of the 20th Century. He had, for example, a brief correspondence with Carl Einstein in 1925, although they did not
discuss African art specifically. Barnes was also initially taken with the aesthetic theories of Clive Bell, whom Barnes cited as an influence in his 1915 article “How to Judge a Painting.” Both Clive Bell and Carl Einstein were later specifically denounced by Barnes as “people who have no real knowledge of the subject and are merely exploiting it to their own egoistic ends.” Bell, in particular, was also singled out for criticism by Barnes’s cronies Laurence Buermeyer, Paul Guillaume and Thomas Munro, among others.

Barnes, at least initially, seems to have reserved the most respect for the art criticism of Roger Fry. In an article published in the May 1924 issue of Opportunity, Barnes describes meeting Fry at Guillaume’s gallery, a place Barnes referred to as “The Temple”:

One summer afternoon when the heat was intolerable outdoors, I called at the temple and found Roger Fry and Paul Guillaume discussing Negro art. I listened for a while and then took possession of Roger Fry and had a talk on Renoir and Cezanne which I shall remember for the rest of my life.

That Barnes would be drawn to Fry’s criticism is certainly understandable. Fry’s formalist approach to African sculpture was similar to that of Barnes, at least superficially, incorporating the same language of visual analysis. Looking at figural works from Africa, for instance, Fry would see “the neck and the torso conceived as cylinders” and “the head conceived as a pear-shaped mass.”

Yet by the summer of 1924, Barnes had largely dismissed Fry’s writings, possibly as a result of the strengthening of Barnes’s own sense of aesthetics. After reading Fry’s Vision and Design, Barnes wrote Foundation teacher Thomas Munro that he was “more than ever convinced that Fry is an academician, and that much of his thinking is a mixture of mush and literature, only sparsely sprinkled with plastic essences.” To Barnes’s mind,
Fry's visual analyses were not focused enough on the specific formal properties of African sculpture. In *Primitive Negro Sculpture*, Fry is only given faint praise, though it is worth noting that he is the only critic accorded any commendation in the book.²⁶

Absent from all of these publications, Barnes felt, was a “scientific” perspective and an extensive discussion of the distinct stylistic properties of individual objects. Barnes was therefore convinced that the book he proposed to Guillaume would be an important contribution, offering more fully developed analyses of African objects as art works than any of the earlier publications. Barnes believed that his approach was unique in its systematic method of aesthetic analysis. He advocated the direct observation of individual objects from which one could derive a clear and “objective” description of formal characteristics. If these observations and analyses were to be codified into a text, Barnes felt, then the text would, in turn, generate increasing public enthusiasm for the art form.

As Barnes later wrote to Guillaume, referring to African art, “I told you a long while ago that as soon as we started to talk about it in America in a scientific and intellectual way that it would begin to get the attention it deserves.”²⁷

**Applying the Barnes Method of “Objective” Analysis to African Art**

Barnes emphasized the importance of his systematic approach to the appreciation of African sculpture, writing to Guillaume in November 1924 that when such a method is applied,

the result is something which is entirely new, not only in the matter of negro art but in the study of sculpture in general. In other words, we have used the basic principle of scientific method which recognizes the fact that in dealing with an objective situation the facts of the particular objects are the most important ones;
but that very important principle seems to have been overlooked heretofore by all the people who have written on negro art.28

Significantly, the “particular objects” to which Barnes refers in this letter are works from his own collection of African sculpture. Thus, the ideal formal characteristics that are outlined in the book are derived entirely from African sculpture that Barnes had selected. The application of an “objective” method of artistic appreciation to objects from Africa, as promoted in the book, may therefore be considered essentially a codification of Barnes’s own aesthetic criteria.

Paul Guillaume sent Barnes his notes for the book on African art on August 29, 1924.29 By his own admission, Guillaume’s essay approached the subject in a conservative manner. In his letter to Barnes accompanying the manuscript, Guillaume said that he had avoided any references that might make easy targets for criticism and had been further constrained by the lack of documentation on African art.30 It was clear, moreover, that Guillaume welcomed Barnes’s contribution to the book. He explained to Barnes that his essay was intentionally brief, so as to highlight Barnes’s aesthetic analyses, which Guillaume said would be the most forceful statement of the book.31

Shortly after he received the manuscript from Guillaume in September of 1924, Barnes brought it to Thomas Munro. Munro had been hired by Barnes the previous April as a member of the educational staff at the Barnes Foundation. Prior to his appointment, Munro had been a faculty member in the Department of Philosophy at Columbia University for four years. Barnes wanted to develop Guillaume’s text, adding structural analyses focusing on individual works from the collection, and Munro was contracted to work on this aspect of the book.
Archival evidence suggests that Munro’s contribution to the book was also fundamentally directed by Barnes. In a number of letters to Guillaume beginning in September 1924, Barnes relates the progress of the manuscript:

I gave your manuscript on negro art to Munro to work into a book illustrated with photographs from our collection. He is very intelligent, is greatly interested in negro art, and I am analyzing negro sculpture while Munro takes notes. Several weeks later, Barnes again describes how he has “gone over with [Munro] the plastic qualities of the objects with considerable care.” Guillaume, in response, reiterates his support for additions to the text that reflected Barnes’s methodology, observing that “il serait plus conform à l’exactitude que votre signature ou la sienne figurait en compagnie de la mienne.”

By November 1924, the proposed book on African sculpture included not only the formal analyses of individual objects provided by Barnes, but also a historical and ethnological account as well as a chapter on the artistic qualities of African sculpture, all of which were evidently written by Munro. Barnes had decided by then that Guillaume should no longer be listed as sole author, as had been the original plan. Guillaume’s contributions to the text, while interesting, were neither comprehensive nor sufficiently “objective,” according to Barnes. Barnes, however, still wanted to credit Guillaume as an author, mostly because Barnes felt Guillaume’s name carried considerable weight. As Barnes explained in a letter to Munro in November 1924:

The book is sure to get international attention because Paul’s name is inseparably identified with the subject of negro art and he is in close touch with practically every museum and important collector in the whole civilized world - even in Japan.
In light of Munro’s contributions and the expanded text, however, it was ultimately decided that the book, *Primitive Negro Sculpture*, would be published jointly authored by Paul Guillaume and Thomas Munro.

**Defining African Art**

As previously argued, Barnes’s strong role in the development of *Primitive Negro Sculpture* encourages a reading of the book as a codification of Barnes’s aesthetic criteria for African sculpture. The “Introduction” clearly reveals the book’s origins as a text for the Barnes Foundation, noting that “the method employed has been in active use for several years in courses of art appreciation, based on the collection of ancient and modern sculpture and painting of which the examples shown in this book are a part.”

Even if we did not have such strong evidence of Barnes’s role in *Primitive Negro Sculpture*, however, a comparison of the aesthetic tenets set forth in the book with the content of Barnes’s collection of African art further underscores this point. Though the book is intended as a general introduction to African art, its definition of African “art” is clearly based on objects from the Barnes Foundation collection.

Like the earlier works by Einstein, Apollinaire, Fry, Bell, and others, *Primitive Negro Sculpture* defines African artifacts as “fine art” within a Western aesthetic framework. The text also enters contemporary debates on authenticity, antiquity and the place of African sculpture within artistic evolution. The book differs from earlier publications, however, in providing clearly developed aesthetic criteria for an appreciation of African sculpture. *Primitive Negro Sculpture* not only distinguishes art from artifact in
general, but also specifies ideal formal properties for African sculpture and delineates African "style regions" based on shared stylistic characteristics. In addition, *Primitve Negro Sculpture* offers detailed structural analyses of individual works, all from the Barnes Foundation collection, that are illustrated in the book. As the first text to render specific formal criteria for African sculpture, *Primitve Negro Sculpture* provides considerable insight into modernist interest in objects from Africa and, in particular, Barnes's own aesthetic preferences and biases.

**Antiquity, Authenticity and "Pure" African Art**

Among the contemporary debates surrounding African art that *Primitve Negro Sculpture* engages is the issue of the purported antiquity of African artistic traditions. *Primitve Negro Sculpture* clearly seeks to establish African sculpture as an ancient art form. Indeed, the book apparently was originally titled *Ancient Negro Sculpture*.41 Objects from the Barnes Foundation illustrated in the book are given dates that range from the fifth to the nineteenth century. As also seen in earlier publications, the book additionally suggests that art production long since ceased in Africa.42 African sculpture is therefore defined not only as an ancient tradition, but also as a rare commodity. Ironically, most of the objects that Barnes had collected were likely created no earlier than the late nineteenth century.43

Though he may not have taken an aggressive stance in his essay for *Primitve Negro Sculpture*, Paul Guillaume was very influential in this aspect of the book. He is specifically credited with providing attributions and dates for all the works illustrated in the
text. Guillaume had realized, early on, the importance of “antiquity” to collectors of African art. His mentor Guillaume Apollinaire had, in fact, focused on establishing dates for African art. The Barnes Foundation collection, Guillaume maintained, presented a specific chronology for African art in which “the epochs have been for the first time definitely fixed.”

The accuracy of Guillaume’s dating of the works was questioned by Barnes prior to the book’s publication. Informed by Munro that current archaeological research placed the earliest date for African art at around 1600, Barnes asked Guillaume to secure the accuracy of the dates he had proposed for objects in the Foundation’s collection. The intense correspondence between the two regarding the issue of dating reveals a rarely seen side of Guillaume, in which his opinions are stated forcefully. Guillaume vigorously defends his dating of the works, asserting that only the cowardice of archaeologists prevented them from designating African art prior to 1600. Distinguishing between style and era, Guillaume argues for at least the possibility of the existence of African art before the 16th century. While he concedes that the conservation of wooden sculpture in a tropical climate was extremely difficult, Guillaume nevertheless staunchly defends his chronology. Questioning the infallibility of science, Guillaume vaguely suggests that his own familiarity with the art had allowed him to deduce the dates of individual objects. Surprisingly, given his proclivity to objective and scientific reasoning, Barnes readily accepted Guillaume’s explanation.

While Primitive Negro Sculpture advocated the antiquity of African artistic traditions, the book did not suggest, as had earlier writers, that the art form represented
the origins of humankind’s artistic traditions. Many critics, following the nineteenth-century theorist Gottfried Semper, saw African art in evolutionary terms, maintaining that the abstraction of African artistry reflected the beginnings of art, or the “primitive” (i.e., the arts of non-Western peoples), that eventually evolved into naturalism, or the “civilized” (i.e., Western arts from the Renaissance on). This perspective is firmly articulated in the criticism of Marius de Zayas. Writing in The Arts in 1923, for example, Marius de Zayas proclaims: “African negro sculpture can be considered as being one of the first styles of art that man ever created . . . because it belongs to a people whose mentality is taken as corresponding to the primary state of man’s intellect.”

In contrast to this clearly racist view, Primitive Negro Sculpture offers a fairly radical reinterpretation of the place of African sculpture within the evolution of form. Despite its title, the book tacitly proposes that African art is not “primitive” at all, but rather a forward-thinking artistic tradition:

Where they seemed to be misshapen, badly proportioned, they were really fashioned with consummate skill to achieve effects that Europeans had not been able to see or appreciate. Instead of the beginnings of art, valuable only as historical relics, they were perhaps a stage in advance of European evolution, and valuable as ideals. Most significantly, in its discussion of African artistry, Primitive Negro Sculpture accords the African artist creative agency, thereby refuting the criticism of Fry and Bell, who proposed African art as a product of instinct.

In determining what constitutes African art, Primitive Negro Sculpture advocates a restrictive racially-based definition in accordance with contemporary ideology. The text limits “negro sculpture” to the art of west and central Africa, excluding the rest of the
continent. A map, entitled “The Country of Negro Art” (fig. 33), illustrates the point visually. “Negro sculpture” is further defined as “pure,” meaning that a work should exhibit no Western influences. The “art-producing negro,” according to Primitive Negro Sculpture, “was the negro untouched by foreign influences.” The notion of racial and cultural purity as applied to African artifacts was, however, largely a product of Western categorization. Most objects collected during the early twentieth century were likely created nearly a generation after the advent of European colonialism.

One art tradition that was considered by Barnes, and others of his era, to be “tainted” with Western influences was that of Benin. The kingdom of Benin, in present-day Nigeria, was established around 1200 and grew powerful through trade with Portugal and Holland, beginning in the late fifteenth century. Renowned for their intricate brass-cast works produced for the court, Benin artists depicted their surroundings in their art, including scenes of the palace as well as foreign soldiers and traders. The inclusion of European iconography led many to suggest that art from Benin was not a “pure” tradition. Guillaume echoed this position in a 1923 letter to Barnes, in which he claimed that post-16th century works from Benin were not truly African.

The Aesthetics of African Sculpture

Beyond considering questions of antiquity and authenticity, the primary purpose of Primitive Negro Sculpture was to analyze the formal properties of African sculpture from an aesthetic viewpoint. Einstein had proposed earlier, in Negerplastik, that an understanding of content and context was unnecessary to artistic appreciation of African
sculpture. "Primitive Negro Sculpture" advocated a similar approach, arguing that such knowledge would hamper appreciation of the "plastic" qualities of African sculpture. The book did, however, concede that cultural factors did influence the form of an art work. 58 For that reason, it included a section, "Chapter I: Its Relation to African Life," that sketched the racial, geographic, social and religious backgrounds of African artistry. The majority of "Primitive Negro Sculpture," however, is devoted to the formal analysis of African sculpture in two separate chapters, "Chapter II: Its Artistic Qualities" and "Chapter III: Its Chief Traditions."

"Primitive Negro Sculpture" distinguishes first between aesthetics and art. The "aesthetic impulses" of the African artist, the book contends, may be seen not only in sculpture but also in song, dance and story-telling. 59 Utilitarian objects, as well, may be "treated with surface ornament or shaped into structures which are pleasing by their basic form." 60 Yet the book separates art from artifact, maintaining that "by far the most important as art of all the objects of negro manufacture are the masks and fetishes." 61 As discussed in the preceding chapter, this aesthetic bias is reflected in the composition of Barnes's collection. Approximately two-thirds of the works are either masks or figural works. The remaining objects include heddle pulleys, cups, utensils, staff tops, whistles, and musical instruments, some of which are reproduced "Primitive Negro Sculpture" as "Carved Utensils" (fig. 34). As may be seen from the photograph, most of the "utilitarian" objects still feature a figural element.

"Primitive Negro Sculpture" maintains that African art most significantly differs from other forms of artistic expression in its sculptural qualities or "three-dimensionality," as
Fry had noted earlier. Barnes observed in his 1925 publication, *The Art in Painting*, that the aesthetic interest of African art lay in its successful execution of three dimensions:

In architecture and sculpture, where space is actually present, there is the same distinction between a vital, personal arrangement of spaces which gives the feeling of depth or extensity [sic], and the inability really to conceive the object in three-dimensional terms. Primitive Negro art shows this power of conception in three dimensions, while in much of Greek sculpture it is comparatively lacking. 62

While Fry went no further than observing the sculptural force of African art in general terms, *Primitive Negro Sculpture* advances the formalist approach by considering how the African artist explores three-dimensional form in figures and masks.

The book emphasizes in particular the restructuring of the human body in the interest of design. The distortion from natural proportions perceived in African sculpture had been previously noted, beginning as early as 1894 with the second edition of Friedrich Ratzel's *Völkerkunde*. 63 Roger Fry, too, had observed that the African artist's "plastic sense leads him to give its utmost amplitude and relief to all the protuberant parts of the body, and to get thereby an extraordinarily emphatic and impressive sequence of planes." 64

The assumption that African figural sculpture distorts natural proportions belies a Western aesthetic bias for, as Susan Vogel has observed, "because it does not seek to duplicate nature, African art does not distort the forms of nature. On its own terms, African art never exaggerates." 65

Reflecting this perspective, *Primitive Negro Sculpture* discusses the exaggeration and distortion of form in African sculpture. Yet, the book goes one step further, stressing the division of the body into distinct units of sculptural design as an important characteristic of African figural sculpture. These units, the text maintains, establish a
formal theme that unites the whole through the repetition of similar lines, planes, and masses punctuated by contrast and variation:

So distinguished and usually marked off by a surrounding groove or hollow, each part can be moulded into a variation of some chosen theme - a sharp, slender projection, or perhaps a smooth, bulbous swelling - never exactly the same as its neighbors, for that would be monotonous; never too far from nature, or completely abstract, for that would destroy its interest as representation... In the same figure an artist may introduce two or more radically different shapes, perhaps repeating and slightly varying each one.66

An example of this from Barnes's collection could be the seated female figure (fig. 35) attributed to the Senufo of northern Ivory Coast. Here, there is a thematic repetition of a conical motif, evident in the coiffure, head, and breasts, that is varied through shifts in size and shape. An additional theme, a series of "slashing horizontal curves" throughout the length of the figure, is seen in the line of the chin, the arms and the thighs, and is contrasted with the "vertical rods" of the neck, torso and chair legs.

The language of formal analysis employed in Primitive Negro Sculpture deliberately evokes comparisons with music. The success of sculptural design, and therefore the aesthetic pleasure derived from its contemplation, is to be found in the rhythmic repetition and variation of these distinct units. This analogy to music is directly addressed in the book:

To the eye, to the hand, to both together moving over the surface, the statue is like music in its succession of repeated and contrasting sensuous forms, its continuities and subtle alterations of a theme. Or rather it is the material for music that one may compose at will, proceeding always in a new order from line to line and mass to mass, singling out and reorganizing the elements, perceiving always some new relationship that had never presented itself before.67

The employment of musical analogies to visual art traditions was not new. Indeed, as Judith Zilczer has demonstrated, the synaesthetic comparison of the visual arts with music
had emerged as a central theme in progressive American criticism since at least 1913. Yet Barnes would push the analogy further, proposing an aesthetic relationship between African-American spirituals and African sculpture, as will be discussed in a later chapter.

Masks, according to Primitive Negro Sculpture, offered a particular challenge to the African artist in their creation. There are, the book proposes, inherent limitations to the art form. The mask must use only the face for its “theme,” needs to be close to natural size in order to be worn, and cannot be fully realized sculpturally in three-dimensions. Therefore, the artist’s “plastic problem is to produce, within these limitations, a design out of a few given elements.”

Masks comprise a significant portion of Barnes’s collection, totaling at least twenty-five works. As Primitive Negro Sculpture suggests, they appear to have been selected to provide a sense of the variety of formal solutions. There are, for example, at least nine masks attributable to the Dan of Ivory Coast and Liberia. They range from those works exhibiting more realistic facial features, as in this example (fig. 36), to those featuring greater abstraction, like this mask (fig. 37). Other masks in the collection are embellished with “accessory ornaments,” remnants of their former lives in Africa. A Senufo mask (fig. 38) from northern Ivory Coast, for example, retains some of its blue, gold, red and buff-colored pigments. Similarly, another Dan mask (fig. 39) has bits of raffia, beads and cowrie shells attached to its perimeter. Unlike most collectors who stripped works of any reference to their indigenous functions, Barnes seems to have kept these elements for their expression of aesthetic sensibilities.
After proposing the general characteristics of African sculptural design, *Primitive Negro Sculpture* outlines a method whereby to distinguish between successful and unsuccessful sculptural form. This, Barnes felt, was necessary in order to gain an appreciation of art. The book considers two examples of African sculpture that, in their formal design, embody the essential characteristics of African sculpture, as defined by *Primitive Negro Sculpture*: dissociation of the body into units, rhythmic repetition, and contrasting themes. The works, referred to in the book as “Guinea,” are more likely from the Lagoon region of southern Ivory Coast. The first figure (fig. 40), smoothly finished with a greater emphasis on technical skill, is considered to be uninspired, carrying “the principle of repetition almost to the point where it becomes monotonous and uninteresting.” In contrast, the other work (fig. 41), of less refined workmanship, is characterized as “ungainly, but full of life; its rhythms are direct, impulsive, irregular and strong.” According to the book, neither work represents sculptural excellence but rather are “at opposite poles of negro sculpture, and indeed of all art.”

The Stylistic Characteristics of Regional Traditions

In addition to this general discussion of the formal aspects of African sculpture, a primary concern of *Primitive Negro Sculpture* is the classification of African sculpture stylistically by geographic area. The text was pioneering in this regard, preceding the four-volume work of Carl Kjermeier, *Centres de Style de la Sculpture Nègre Africain* of 1935-38. Kjermeier’s study, admittedly less selective and more detailed than *Primitive Negro Sculpture*, is widely credited with introducing the concept of African “style
regions.” These “style regions” were geographically contained units, usually corresponding to specific African cultures, whose art work exhibited shared stylistic characteristics. A decade before Kjermeier, *Primitive Negro Sculpture* introduced stylistic regions, though this contribution has been largely overlooked by Africanist art historians.  

According to *Primitive Negro Sculpture*, the “major” African art traditions derive from four regions: Sudan, Ivory Coast, Gabon and the Congo. Over 100 of the approximately 120 works in the collection come from these four regions. Minor traditions are listed as Benin (Nigeria), Dahomey and Guinea, of which there are six examples in the collection. Absent from Barnes’s collection, and from discussion in the text, are works from other regions of Africa typically represented in Western collections of the time, including those from Ghana, Nigeria (other than Benin), and Cameroon.  

Paul Guillaume had, in fact, introduced ethnic classifications for African art slightly earlier in his article, “African Art at the Barnes Foundation,” published in 1924. Guillaume proposes that the art-producing peoples of Africa derive from three main “stocks.” In the northwest there are, according to Guillaume, the “Nigers, Bobos, the Baoules, the Agni, the Aigu, the Gourcs and the Dan;” to the southwest, the Fang (“the most beautiful of the Pahouins”); and inland on the equator, the “Bushongos” with their sub-groups. Guillaume’s regional distinctions correlate, in general, with those in *Primitive Negro Sculpture*, with the northwest comprising both “Sudan” and “Ivory Coast,” the Fang situated in Gabon; and the “Bushongos” in the Congo. Yet, Guillaume does not continue to specify shared formal characteristics for these classifications, commenting only that “the
collection of Negro art in the Barnes Foundation is rich in works coming from races of these different sources.  

**Primitive Negro Sculpture**, in contrast, does define stylistic characteristics of "major" and "minor" traditions. The descriptions of "typical" works from each of these regions are actually quite restrictive. According to the book, the typical Sudan work is, for example:

slender, elongated, angular, making frequent use of straight lines, pointed projections, flat planes and sharp edges. Its frequent awkwardness of attitude and crudity of surface tend to augment the total effect of sharp staccato force or wiry suppleness.

In the Barnes collection, the Sudan "style" is represented by selected works from three ethnic groups: the Bamana and Dogon of Mali, and the Senufo of northern Côte d'Ivoire. Approximately one-tenth of the Barnes Foundation collection falls into this stylistic category. It consists of several Bamana *n'tomo* masks, such as this example (fig. 42) and Senufo and Dogon figural sculpture, including the well-known Dogon "couple" (fig. 43).

The art of the Ivory Coast, according to *Primitive Negro Sculpture*, is:

characterized by a tendency to surface ornament and richness of detail, rather than by a rigorous pairing down to structural essentials. Yet its ornamentation is not merely superficial, since the structural basis is itself strongly conceived in terms of design, and the ornamental elements intimately correlated with it.

Nearly one-third of the Barnes Foundation collection falls into this category. The works derive primarily from two separate artistic traditions, the Dan and the Baule/Guro/Yaure complex. There are at least twelve Baule figural works, such as this female figure (fig. 44), and a fair number of Dan, Baule, and Guro masks. Surprisingly, this category includes a more recent example of Baule art, a bust of a female (fig. 45), possibly
produced by a workshop active in the 1920s. Other objects from this region in the collection, but not categorized as "art" by Barnes, would be the Baule divination tappers, and Baule and Guro heddle pulleys.

Art from Gabon is defined as having a tendency:

toward a bulbous or pear-like shape, or a repetition of such shapes, with a flow of curving planes that rise from hollows into smooth swelling surfaces. It is comparatively plain and simple, lacking in accessory ornament, depending for its effect on the rhythm and contrast of the masses composing its basic structure.

This definition is the most restrictive of all the "style regions" proposed by Primitive Negro Sculpture, applicable only to Fang statuary, as in this example (fig. 46). The description does not fit other works from Gabon in the collection, such as Kota reliquary figures (fig. 47), and the Punu mask, figure, and bell. Approximately sixteen works in the collection are from Gabon, though only seven of these are of Fang origin.

Primitive Negro Sculpture maintains that the broadest aesthetic variety may be found in the art of the Congo, although it is described as only occasionally exhibiting artistic excellence. The book notes that:

...pieces of considerable force and fine draftsmanship are occasionally found, in which faces often have a portrait-like naturalism, along with distortion in other parts, and a thoroughly worked out total design. But there is sufficient variety in the designs to point to the existence of many different traditions, rather than a single prevailing one.

This variety is reflected in the works Barnes collected for the Foundation, which include Luba caryatid stools, Kuba cups (fig. 48), Kongo figures, a number of small Bembe works, and a Lulua figure (fig. 49). Although the book singles out for derision the nkisi figures found throughout the region which are described as crude workmanship.
"concealed by a profusion of nails and bits of cloth," the Barnes collection does include one of these power figures, attributed to the Teke (fig. 50).

Some of the examples in the Barnes Foundation collection that fall into the category of "Minor traditions," being works from Benin, Dahomey or Guinea, appear to have been selected by Barnes because of unique characteristics that distinguish them artistically. As discussed earlier, Benin is problematic, according to Primitive Negro Sculpture, because "it is a hybrid art, weak but yet distinctive form, combining both African and European elements." The sixteenth-century cast bronze messenger figure (fig. 51) in the collection, with its cross pendant and helmet of possible European derivation, was likely selected as an example of this hybridity. In contrast, the small bronze pendant representing a face (fig. 52) was possibly included for the "distinctive pattern" found in the rhythm of its enlarged features. Ironically, Africanist art historians today would characterize the messenger figure as a masterpiece and assign a provincial attribution to the smaller work.

Primitive Negro Sculpture concludes with a brief chapter relating African art traditions to modern Western art. This final section of the book was, again, significantly influenced by Barnes. In November of 1924, Barnes had suggested to Thomas Munro that such a chapter be included. "One very important fact about negro sculpture," he wrote, "is its considerable influence upon contemporary painting for the last seventeen years and that fact should be noted in considerable detail in a special chapter." To guide Munro's writing on the subject, Barnes sent a manuscript that he had authored along with copies of Alain Locke's "A Note on African Art," and Barnes's "The Temple," both of
which had been published in the May 1924 issue of *Opportunity.* Barnes declined to be credited with authorship, stating that "since the fact of the influence is known there is no occasion for anybody’s name to be used in connection with the matter, not even mine." 

The chapter begins by considering artistic developments in the West that paved the way for an aesthetic interest in African art. African sculpture, the book proposes, intrigued modernist artists because it challenged classical form. In the exaggerated forms of African figural work, contemporary artists found a confirmation of their aesthetic beliefs. This perceived distortion from nature seen in African sculpture, while perhaps new to modernism, was part of a larger history of form, according to *Primitive Negro Sculpture.* Thus, Cézanne, like the African artist, "did not hesitate to stretch an arm as the early Greek vase-painter had done, as El Greco had done, in order to emphasize a curve more forcibly and to integrate a design."  

This perspective on the relation of African art to past art traditions and, in particular, to modernism is reflected in Barnes’s own writings on the subject. In his 1925 *The Art in Painting,* for example, Barnes highlighted the influence of African sculpture in the work of Picasso, Modigliani, and Soutine. In his later work on Matisse, Barnes developed this analysis, highlighting “circumscribing grooves” and “the mask effect” in his discussion of African influences in the work of Matisse. The painter, Barnes argued, drew from this three-dimensional tradition and reorganized it into “exotic pictorial conceptions which embody characteristics representative of European traditional forms, such as those of the Venetians and Cézanne.” The fullest expression, however, of Barnes’s ideology concerning African art and its relation to modernism may be seen
visually in the arrangement of the collection at the Barnes Foundation, as will be discussed in the next chapter.
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Chapter Four:

THE TRIUMPH OF L'ART NÉGRE: AFRICAN ART AT THE BARNES FOUNDATION

It will be the glory of a few men endowed with certain prophetic vision to have inscribed in the history of the beginning of the Twentieth Century the revelation of the primitive statues of the African black race. Among these men Dr. Barnes appears with a radiance quite particular . . . Perfectly certain of the high value of the joy and instruction offered by Negro art, he makes a place for it in The Barnes Foundation and his idea is to give it a place of honor; its role in that manner is enlarged, since he does not hesitate at the outset to place African sculpture on the same plane as the incontestable masterpieces of contemporaneous art. ¹

-- Paul Guillaume

The Barnes Foundation opened to the public in the spring of 1924.² It was the first permanent installation in the United States to present objects from Africa as fine art. As with his selection of the collection, Barnes applied his educational aesthetic theory to its presentation, dissociating African artifacts from an ethnographic context and situating them within a Western aesthetic framework. The objects were arranged by Barnes to visually emphasize the specific formal elements he valued and to encourage a formal comparison of various regional traditions. At the same time, Barnes situated African sculpture within a continuum of form as a catalyst for Western modernism. Presented simultaneously as the inspiration for modernism and as the object of modernism’s formalist vision, African art was clearly intended by Barnes to be an integral part of the Foundation’s educational mission.

While the previous chapter considered the codification of Barnes’s aesthetic theory and its application to African sculpture in textual sources, this chapter examines
how these critical evaluations are reflected visually, in the installation and photography of
African art at the Barnes Foundation, and didactically, in the Foundation's educational
programs. Central to this is an analysis of the visual narrative created through strategies of
display and representation and of the framing devices employed by Barnes to elucidate
specific aspects of the objects. More than an expression of one man’s beliefs, the display
at the Barnes Foundation had significant impact on those students and visitors at the
Foundation. Recent scholarship has recognized the power of installations in defining
objects. As Françoise Forster-Hahn has observed: “If we understand ‘display’ as the
material representation of philosophical thought and ideological discourses, then displays
do not merely reflect or mirror society and a particular historical moment, but actively
function as agents that shape the historical process itself.”

I consider first the origins of the educational institution and focus on the
development of plans for the building of the Barnes Foundation. The use of African
motifs in the architectural design of the Foundation’s gallery will be analyzed and related
to the arrangement of the African art collection inside the building. I then address the use
of the African art collection in Foundation classes and lectures. Particular attention is paid
to the Foundation’s concerts of “negro spirituals,” which presented, according to Barnes,
an aesthetic structure similar to African sculpture. The chapter concludes by considering
how the aesthetics of representation demonstrated by the Foundation installation are
paralleled in photography of the collection by Willard and Barbara Morgan, sponsored by
the Foundation.
Art and Education: The Origins of the Barnes Foundation

By the time the Barnes Foundation was officially dedicated on March 19, 1925, the collection was already fairly well known to many art lovers in both America and Europe. In contrast to its later reputation for exclusion of the public, the Barnes Foundation's beginnings were open and inclusive. When Barnes was assembling his collection early on, he frequently played host to the many visitors who desired to see his modern art. Among the earliest visitors to the collection in Barnes's home were Bernard Berenson and Leo Stein, the latter of whom visited sometime after 1915.4

As his collection expanded, Barnes began making plans to construct a new building to house his art. His idea was not to create another, larger residence in which to house the collection, but to build an educational institution open to the general public. Barnes sought to create an environment in which he could promote his nascent aesthetic educational theories using the collection as a primary resource. He wanted to, in effect, teach the public to see through the lens of his "scientific" method of art appreciation. In 1922, Barnes succinctly described the educational aims of his proposed foundation in a letter to Forbes Watson:

The educational feature will be an effort to put into practical effect the work of those men - William James, George Santayana, John Dewey, Bertrand Russell - which seems to me to represent the soundest thinking for the development of human beings along the lines of democracy and education. Primarily, the hope is that every person of whatever station in life will be allowed to get their own reactions to whatever the Foundation has to offer, that means that academism, conformity to out-worn conditions, counterfeits in art, living and thinking, can have no place in the intended scope of the Foundation.5

Shortly after writing to Watson, Barnes formalized his plans and chartered The Barnes Foundation on December 4, 1922.
The origins of the Barnes Foundation may be traced to a 1917 "experiment" Barnes conducted with workers in his chemical factory in which he applied the ideas of John Dewey. Barnes had become interested in the writings of Dewey and enrolled in 1917 in a seminar at Columbia University in New York taught by Dewey. Barnes was to become one of Dewey's most ardent champions, commuting from Philadelphia to New York once a week for three years to take Dewey's classes. Barnes was particularly drawn to the democratic possibilities inherent in education and its application to human experience. As Barnes later explained:

John Dewey's philosophy of education rests on the axiom that the indispensable elements of the democratic way of life - scientific method as intelligence in operation, art, education - are all bound together in a simple organic whole. To put the matter in other terms, all genuine experience is intelligent experience, experience guided by insight derived from science, illuminated by art, and made a common possession through education.

Barnes applied Dewey's ideas in this 1917 "factory experiment," setting aside two hours a week for informal discussions with his employees. Since most of his employees were black, Barnes directed his systematic study toward "problems intimately related to the Negro's life, both economic and personal." In these sessions, the group initially explored psychological and social conditions, then the application of a scientific method to education, moving on to a study of the aesthetic experience in everyday life, and finally an analysis of art itself. Describing this early experiment, Foundation teacher Mary Mullen later recollected that, "At first the discussion was dominated rather by feeling than intelligence: imagination constantly tended to encroach upon the sphere of reflection. The leader of the group did not repress feeling and imagination but analyzed them when they intruded in the wrong place."
The Barnes Foundation was chartered by Barnes to continue the experiment begun earlier among his factory workers. Early on in its development, Barnes hired several notable figures to run the educational program. In addition to his now good friend, John Dewey, who was set from the start to serve as director of education, Barnes also appointed Laurence Buermeyer as associate director of education in the Spring of 1923. Barnes described Buermeyer to Paul Guillaume as “the most important young intellectual in America.” Thomas Munro, who developed Foundation courses in conjunction with the University of Pennsylvania, was hired on to the educational staff in April 1924 from Columbia University, as discussed in the preceding chapter. The Barnes Foundation was to be a radical new direction for arts education, one that would be, according to Barnes “surely the most important institution for art education that has ever been started.”

**Building the Foundation: “The Triumph of l’Art Nègre”**

In 1922, Barnes contracted Paul Philippe Cret, a professor of design at the University of Pennsylvania, to draw up plans for the Foundation buildings. Cret designed three separate buildings: the gallery, administration building, and service building. All are two-story French limestone structures with Spanish Mission clay-roof tiles. The Gallery (fig. 53) is the largest building with 16,000 square feet of exhibition space. Inside, the building features a two-story open central gallery with an 18-foot ceiling and twenty-two smaller rooms on two levels (fig. 54). On the first level, the central room is flanked on either side by six rooms and on the second level, by five rooms.
In an article on the Foundation published in *The Arts* in January of 1923, Cret included a preliminary study of the building's front elevation (fig. 55) and related his primary concerns in developing his design:

In planning the gallery that will receive the Barnes collection, the first care has been to secure those conditions that the painter could wish for the display of his work. This means to avoid crowding too many paintings in a single room, and to place these paintings in a light similar to that in which they were painted. Thence two rules: small rooms and studio lighting, instead of the usual toplit gallery.14

Cret stresses, then, numerous rooms of moderate size providing an ample amount of hanging space, and adequate light. Though the interior plans are discussed at some length in his essay, Cret is not nearly as expansive about his plans for the building's exterior. He describes it only as “built of a French stone of beautiful texture” and having an appearance dependent “on the carefully studied proportion of its elements and combination of materials.”15

Barnes, however, focused closely on details of the design for the exterior of the building. In developing his plans, Barnes envisioned the African collection as having particular significance. Though Cret, in his preliminary drawing, had planned on a typical classical vestibule with columns, Barnes decided that the entrance should feature African sculpture. This, Barnes felt, would visually proclaim his intense appreciation of African sculpture and announce the importance of its presence in his collection.16 In a March 1923 letter, Barnes referred to his plans for the tile decoration of the entrance, pledging to Guillaume, “You will see that L’Art Negre [sic] triumphs.”17 Later that year, Barnes vowed that the Foundation would firmly establish African sculpture in the realm of the fine
“When the Foundation opens,” he wrote, “negro art will have a place among the great art manifestations of all times.”

Barnes’s ideas for the entrance vestibule were realized by the Enfield Tile and Pottery Company (fig. 56). Barnes specified individual works of African art, largely from his own collection, that were to be replicated in tile mosaics and low-relief terracottas. The proposed design, submitted by Enfield, was estimated at $3,130. It was to be executed by a Mr. Allen, whom Barnes deemed “a real artist.” Allen apparently created the design from photographs of the objects provided by Barnes. Clearly pleased, Barnes described plans for the entrance in a March 1924 letter to Guillaume:

The most interesting news I have for you is that Mr. Allen, the American ceramicist, has made a wonderful plan for the entrance, just outside the front door of the gallery. A frieze at the top has two central figures (Soudan) and on each side there are figures of Gabon, Ivory Coast, Sibiti, and Soudan. All of these figures are reproductions from my collection and the central ones are about 85 centimetres high. Below the frieze there are reproduced 8 negro masks (full-size), all different and all from my collection. Still lower down, set in ceramic panels on each side of the door, is a reproduction of the temple door (full-size) I got from you last visit. The colors of the figures are natural and they are set in surroundings of brilliant colors, reds, yellows, greens, etc. All this work is in tile and I expect it to be wonderful because Allen is a real artist and he has become so infatuated with negro art that it has inspired him to really create a work of art.

The African-inspired entrance of the Barnes Foundation clearly demonstrates the significance of African art to Barnes and his vision of the collection as a whole. The tile and low-relief designs present a canon of African art according to Barnes’s aesthetic standards and serve as an introduction to the African sculpture inside. The sign above the entrance is flanked by replicas (fig. 57) of the Senoufo seated female figure in profile, discussed in the previous chapter. On either side of the doorway, are figures representing the four regional traditions that Barnes found most important artistically, Sudan, Ivory
Coast, Gabon, and the Congo. Below there is a frieze of mask-like faces, also drawn from these four regions, interspersed with small animals figures based on Akan and Lobi goldweights (fig. 58). The Baule granary door from Ivory Coast, reproduced in chapter two, is replicated in multi-color tiles on either side of the doorway (fig. 59).

I would like to now focus on the four figures of the upper frieze to discuss the prototypes Barnes used. To the far left of the doorway, if one were facing the entrance, there is a reproduction of a Bamana figure from Mali, the region Barnes refers to as “Soudan” (fig. 60), based on a work displayed on the south wall of room 22 (fig. 61). Next to it, there is a replica of a Fang reliquary guardian figure from Gabon (fig. 62), based on a figure in Paul Guillaume’s collection, published in the 1917 Sculptures nègres (fig. 63). To the right of the doorway is a reproduction of a Baule male figure from Ivory Coast (fig. 64), located on the north wall of room 21 (fig. 65). Next to that is a replica of a Bembe figure from the Congo, designated “Sibiti” in Barnes’s letter (fig. 66). This work is based on a small figure displayed on the west wall of room 21 (fig. 67).

Barnes evidently selected these works, representative of his four “major traditions,” because they were especially interesting from an aesthetic perspective. Both the Baule and the Bembe figure reproduced in the entranceway were singled out for praise in *Primitive Negro Sculpture*. The Baule male figure, for example, is said to combine “with unusual success a powerful integration of masses with richness of surface ornament.” Particular attention is directed in the text to the dissociation of the body into three masses (the head and neck, the trunk, and the legs) that establish a fundamental rhythm in the similarity of their size and shape. The Bembe female figure, too, is singled
out from among other Bembe works because the repetition of points, angles and curves in
the work creates an "interesting mass design."²⁵

The integration of African motifs into the architectural design is continued
elsewhere in and around the Foundation building. A Senufo mask from Ivory Coast is
positioned between Greek urns and other classical decorative motifs in the metalwork
gates and sills outside the Foundation (fig. 68). Inside, in the two-story central gallery, an
abstracted triangular design based on Kuba patterns is interspersed with an abstracted face
of an eastern Bembe figure (fig. 69). The latter design was one that, according to
Primitive Negro Sculpture, was typical of the Sangha region of the Congo. It is based on
a specific figure in the collection (fig. 70) whose "pattern of mouth and drooping eyes,
arranged as three similar ellipses about the nose" appears "simply and emphatically."²⁶

Barnes clearly intended the entrance to make a visual statement about the
importance of African art to the Foundation and highlight specific works he found
aesthetically pleasing. Yet in addition to introducing objects from Barnes's collection, the
siting of African motifs in the classical vestibule reveals the place of African sculpture
within Barnes's aesthetic philosophy. Richard Wattenmaker has suggested previously that
the juxtaposition of Doric columns and African motifs subverts the traditional role of the
museum as a monument to classicism.²⁷ I propose that, in addition to challenging the
hegemony of Greco-Roman art traditions, African sculpture is specifically presented
within an historical continuum as a catalyst for modernism. The positioning of elongated
and anatomically distorted figures in place of the idealized forms of Greek caryatids
highlights the role of African sculpture in liberating Western art from the constraints of
classical representation. The debt of modernism to African art is thus acknowledged and
celebrated.

That Barnes intended such a reading of the entrance to his Foundation is
supported by his own writings. In The Art in Painting, published in 1925, Barnes
compares the plastic achievements of classical and African statuary:

Negro sculpture has enriched contemporary painting to a great extent. In the early
periods of Greek sculpture figures were conceived as combinations of back, front,
and side bas-reliefs. Design was too often encumbered by representation, so that
the arrangement of masses - head, trunk, and limbs - which would have made the
most effective ensemble, is rarely found. Literature, in other words, stood in the
way of plastic form. With Negro sculpture, the literary motive is submerged in the
artist's distribution of masses in accord with the requirements of a truly sculptural
design. . . Freedom from the adventitious or meaningless gives Negro art a
sculptural quality purer than that of the majority of the best Greek work or of
Renaissance sculpture, which is Greek in another guise. 28

The theme is reinforced by further references to modernism in the exterior design.
Surrounding the building are seven "Cubistic" bas reliefs, designed in 1924, at Barnes's
request, by Jacques Lipchitz (fig. 71). Lipchitz was an artist whose work, Barnes felt,
owed a debt to African sculpture in its "emphasis upon selected planes." 29 Even Barnes's
specifications for colors in the entrance design reflects its underlying ties to modernist
paintings. Barnes wanted tiles that contrasted with the buff-colored stone of the building,
suggesting "a Persian blue" which, he felt, would "give an effect something like a late
Matisse in color combinations." 30

Inside the Foundation: African Art and Barnes's "Wall Ensembles"

As with the exterior design, Barnes paid especially close attention to details of the
interior, arranging his entire collection in "wall ensembles" that were designed to facilitate
aesthetic appreciation. As Carl McCardle relates, "Barnes personally arranged the pictures in the gallery and he did it according to an original scheme he had evolved to demonstrate that the modern artists had considerable in common with the hallowed old masters." Barnes installed African sculpture from his collection in the gallery in the fall of 1924, initially grouping the works in five separate vitrines. The collection of African sculpture at the Barnes Foundation was situated on the second floor, where it remains today. Several objects are displayed in the hallway overlooking the large central room and the majority of the collection is installed in rooms 20, 21, and 22. In examining the display of the collection, we will focus on one such "wall ensemble," looking first at individual works within a vitrine, then moving to a consideration of the arrangement as a whole and finally analyzing the significance of African sculpture within the larger ensembles. A complete inventory of the African art collection at the Barnes Foundation is listed in an Appendix to this text that includes information on provenance, collection and publication history and current location in the Barnes Foundation.

The display of African sculpture on the south wall of room 22 may be analyzed as representative of the strategies of presentation employed by Barnes (fig. 72). This vitrine contains, on two shelves, seven masks and six figures of wood, four small ivory figures and an ivory horn. The objects were carefully mounted on dark wood bases designed by Paris-based craftsman Inagaki. Focusing the viewer's attention on the aesthetic merits of individual pieces, the presentation asserts the object's autonomy as "art" through an emphasis on form.
The aesthetic philosophy governing the overall display within the central case is similar to Barnes’s analysis of individual pieces, as discussed at length in the previous chapter. The symmetrical arrangement of mask, figure, mask, figure, establishes a thematic repetition. Within this uniting harmony, the differing lines, textures, and contours of the masks and figures provide the necessary contrast. Some are smoothly polished and radically distilled into essential elements, as in the Dan mask on the bottom left. Others are embellished with a profusion of surface detail, for example, the Guro mask on the bottom, third from left. Figural sculptures may be angular and somewhat rough, like the Bamana figure that serves as a prototype for the entrance and is displayed here on the top right. In contrast, other figures are shiny and rounded, as is the case in the Fang reliquary guardian figure at the bottom, second from the left. Overall, the vitrine demonstrates numerous and varied formal solutions to the central theme of figural and physiognomic representation.

Through display, the collection offers a comparative stylistic analysis intended to highlight works Barnes considered most important artistically. As with the entranceway, the arrangement is meant to highlight the four regional traditions that Barnes felt were superior. Thus, the “better” works from the Sudan, Ivory Coast, Gabon and Congo, which are the majority in this case, may be contrasted with the “lesser” works, such as the small Pende and Lega figurines on the top shelf. The Barnes method stipulated that in order to gain an appreciation of art, one must be able to distinguish between successful and unsuccessful forms. The “lesser” examples could therefore also elicit comparisons with “good” sculptural design. Such an arrangement of the collection reflects its
ultimately didactic purpose and radically reinterprets the role of the museum. Recent scholarship on museum display reveals Barnes's prescience. As Richard Brettell notes, regarding Impressionist and Post-Impressionist installations in American art museums, "if the museum is to exhibit in optimal conditions only the best of its collections (as defined by curators and scholars alike), then other scholars and the public are not in a position to judge the installation."36

The vitrine of African sculpture on the south wall of room 22 is, as with the other vitrines at the Foundation, integrated with other works from the collection. Barnes's intent in such an arrangement was to situate the art form within an historical continuum of great art traditions. Barnes believed that all successful art forms expressed what he termed "basic human values" revealed through plastic means. His arrangements sought to demonstrate interrelationships between works of different cultures and periods by revealing these "universal attributes." In this wall ensemble, a comparison could be made between the surface detail of certain African works and the medieval triptych on the wall, or in the shape and sheen of the Fang head, in the top center, with the metal pitcher directly above.

To Barnes, the particular significance of African art within this historical continuum of form lay in its relationship to modernism. The pairing of African sculpture with modernist painting was, of course, not a new idea. Private collectors of both African and modernist art often arranged the two together to evoke comparisons. The Arensbergs, for example, interspersed both in their New York City apartment, placing, for example, Brancusi's Prodigal Son (1915) and a Fang reliquary figure from Gabon on
opposite sides of a mantelpiece to evoke comparisons (fig. 73). 37 Yet Barnes’s arrangement reveals a quite deliberate exercise in aesthetic contemplation, perhaps even more calculated than the arrangement of African sculpture in his home prior to the opening of the Foundation. 38 On the south wall of room 22, for example, Barnes has included paintings by Amadeo Modigliani and Pablo Picasso as well as watercolors by American artist Charles Demuth.

Barnes encouraged a specific comparison between the African sculpture and the works by Modigliani and Picasso. The arrangement in room 22 relates the exploration of facial physiognomy in the vitrine to the depiction of the human face in the paintings. The incorporation of Bamana masks and Kota reliquary figures on either side of the wall reinforces the presence of African sculpture in the central vitrine. In the wall ensemble, the angular Bamana mask (fig. 74) is related to Modigliani’s Woman in White from 1919 (fig. 75), because it exhibits the “distorted, elongated, oval face” that Barnes considered characteristic of African sculpture. 39

In relating African sculpture to modernist painting, Barnes very clearly distinguished between inspiration and imitation. While Barnes considered artists like Matisse and Modigliani to have been inspired by African sculpture, he argued that their painting was not an attempt to reproduce the three-dimensional aspects of the art. Rather, “what is taken over is rendered in terms proper to painting ... Matisse, Modigliani and Soutine avail themselves of the essential feeling, the spirit of Negro art, and give it force in a new setting.” 40 In contrast, Barnes considered Picasso’s paintings of the period around 1907 to be “really pictorial reproductions of the sculptural values of Negro carved figures.
and masks." On the wall in room 22, Picasso’s paintings, as in his study of a head from 1907 (fig. 76), are hung next to Kota reliquary figures to effect Barnes’s point.

The placement of African sculpture within wall ensembles composed primarily of paintings and drawings also served to highlight the “three-dimensionality” of African sculpture. Barnes had emphasized the importance of this characteristic, writing that “Negro art, in exhibiting a form which is in the fullest sense sculptural, has enforced a sharper distinction between the possibilities inherent in painting and sculpture, respectively, and it has also put at the disposal of painting a new source of inspiration.” While a full appreciation of the sculptural aspects of African art was limited by the placement of the works in vitrines along the walls, several works were highlighted in cases in the centers of the rooms. These included a Luba caryatid stool in room 20, a Senufo seated female in room 21, and the Dogon male and female “couple” in room 22. These works, considered by Barnes to be masterpieces, were arranged to allow the viewer to observe them from multiple perspectives. In so doing, a full appreciation of sculptural design could be attained for “as one walks around such a statue, its lines and masses flow constantly and infinitely into new designs and equilibria, with no hiatus or weak interval between”

African Art and the Barnes Foundation’s Educational Programs

Barnes was also eager to share his systematic method of art appreciation with others and foresaw great opportunities by connecting the resources of his art gallery with the university system in the United States. Teaching the aesthetic appreciation of African
sculpture was a central aspect of his promotion of African art. Shortly after the Foundation opened, Barnes was pleased to play host to a visit from a group of graduate students at the University of Pennsylvania who had requested to see his collection of African art. Barnes himself lectured to the students, thrilled because he believed it “the first time an important institution of learning in America has given any attention to the subject officially.”

From its inception, the Barnes Foundation sought to collaborate with American universities in the teaching of art appreciation. In November 1923, Barnes wrote to Guillaume that he had “perfected plans by which the Foundation becomes a part of the art educational courses of the most important universities in America.” While Barnes did not specify in this letter those participating, he noted that the universities were collectively attended by at least 75,000 students, several hundred of which, he surmised, would be interested in learning about art. Most significantly, Barnes asserted that the universities had agreed that the Barnes Foundation would be able to specify the method of instruction in their art courses. As Barnes noted proudly to Guillaume, “you can see what a tremendous power that gives us over the future of art knowledge in America.”

To this end, Barnes hired Thomas Munro, the co-author of Primitive Negro Sculpture. As noted in the preceding chapter, Munro was appointed to the educational staff of the Barnes Foundation in April 1924, having previously taught in the Philosophy Department at Columbia. In an undated typewritten manuscript entitled “The Barnes Foundation and the Teaching of Art,” Munro describes the Foundation’s mission and method:
...the major part of the Foundation's educational work is devoted to showing the
descent with modifications of the chief traditions in painting and sculpture.
Constant use is made of its own collection of ancient Egyptian, Greek, Negro,
Persian, Chinese, and Renaissance works of art, in order to learn the essential
features of these traditions.47

The Barnes Foundation began offering a course in art appreciation in the spring of
1925. The Foundation’s first class was apparently fairly small. As described in a letter
from Barnes to Guillaume: “There are six people in our class, all of them with good
psychological background and our object is to train people to become teachers and thus
establish intelligent art instruction in colleges, etc.”48 Classes were taught during the week
by Thomas Munro, Mary Mullen and Sara Carles, and Barnes himself lectured on Friday
and Sunday mornings.49 That semester, Munro also offered a course in modern art at the
University of Pennsylvania, held in conjunction with the Barnes Foundation, and had
thirty-five students. The course included a component on African sculpture and its
relation to modernist painting.50

The following fall, the Barnes Foundation broadened its educational program. A
course on modern art was offered through Columbia University in New York, attracting
an “especially large” number of students.51 At the Foundation itself, however, admittance
policies were becoming more restrictive. In a letter to Guillaume, Barnes complained,
“We were bothered so much last season by curiosity-seekers that we have decided to
admit practically nobody except those people who are willing to become a member of one
of the classes and pursue systematic study.”52

The “systematic study” taught by the Barnes Foundation included African
sculpture. Barnes himself would lecture on the subject, advancing his aesthetic criteria for
African art and situating it within a history of "great form." He described one of his lectures to Guillaume:

Last Sunday we had a fine meeting at the gallery before a distinguished audience of painters, writers, musicians, etc. I talked on Negro sculpture, demonstrated its sculptural characteristics, and showed the difference between it and Greek, Chinese and Egyptian sculpture. I never had a more attentive and appreciative audience: many, many people thanked me and said that they could see why negro sculpture was important. 53

One of the more innovative uses Barnes made of the African art collection was his presentation of concerts featuring "negro spirituals." Since he was a child, Barnes had been impressed with the power of African-American spirituals, and he even shared his enthusiasm with Guillaume, singing for him when Barnes visited Paris and sending songs to the dealer from his boyhood memories. 54 African-American spirituals had been introduced to white American culture as early as 1871 with the renown of the Fisk Jubilee Singers. By the early 20th century, there was established a growing literature on Negro spirituals which, as Nathan Huggins has observed, served to define African-American culture for the majority white population. 55

Barnes had always seen a strong relationship between music and the visual arts. Indeed, at the Foundation's dedication ceremony in March 1925, the conductor Leopold Stokowski had "accepted" on behalf of the artists of America. 56 In his book, The Art of Henri Matisse, Barnes discussed the similarity in composition of Matisse's painting, African sculpture and the music of Stravinsky. Moreover, Barnes observed how Stravinsky's musical patterns had African sources: "The character of Stravinsky's pattern, in some of its phases, is a direct result of his use of the primitive traditions, e.g. the complex rhythmic forms and the tom-tom beat of African tribal chants and music." 57
Barnes began to hold concerts of negro spirituals in 1925, featuring that year a quartet of singers. In March 1926, however, Barnes was introduced to the Bordentown School choir through Charles S. Johnson, editor of the journal Opportunity, a publication of the National Urban League. The chorus was trained by Frederick Work, the brother of John Work, a man widely known for his published collection of spirituals. Barnes was immensely pleased with the Bordentown singers and began hiring them on an annual basis to sing at the Foundation. The choir would sing “in groups of about five songs” and then pause between groups, at which time Barnes would lecture on the relationship between African-American spirituals and African sculpture. The yearly concerts of the Bordentown choir eventually became such an important feature of the Barnes Foundation’s educational program that Barnes’s only lecture of the year was reserved for their visit.

Barnes believed the “negro spirituals” were a truly great art form, calling them “America’s only great music.” He considered the spirituals to be a poetic expression of religion, describing them beginning as “a song or wail which spreads like fire and soon becomes a spectacle of a harmony of rhythmic movement and rhythmic sound.” The underlying rhythm of spirituals was, according to Barnes, reflected in the life of the “negro” in general: “His daily habits of thought, speech and movement are flavored with the picturesque, the rhythmic, the euphonious.” The spirituals were therefore an important contribution because, Barnes felt, they were a distinctively “Negro” art.

Barnes explored the relationship between African sculpture and African-American spirituals at length in a 1926 article for Les Arts à Paris entitled “La Musique nègre
américaine." The essay is based on a lecture Barnes delivered at the Foundation on April 4, 1926, likely in conjunction with a visit from the Bordentown Choir. Barnes emphasizes the fact that both the spirituals and African sculpture are characteristically "Negro" art forms, a faithful reflection of their culture. The uniting harmony of rhythm found in the spirituals is, Barnes contended, also to be found in the greatest sculptural designs of African art. Great sculptural form consists of the varied repetition of certain themes punctuated by contrast, a formal structure that is replicated musically in negro spirituals.

Re-presenting Form: Photographing the Barnes Foundation Collection of African Art

While the educational programs of the Barnes Foundation served to make Barnes's collection and aesthetic viewpoint well known to certain groups of individuals, the photography of the art works furthered promoted their prominence. Nowhere is this more evident than in a corpus of photographs and lantern slides featuring the collection, produced in the 1930s by Barbara and Willard Morgan, that reflect Barnes's aesthetic. Since before the Foundation opened, Barnes had recognized that there would be a demand for photographs of the collection. When The Arts engaged Charles Sheeler to photograph paintings in the collection for their January 1923 issue, Barnes had offered to let Sheeler photograph the entire collection to be published as a catalogue. As Barnes explained to Guillaume, "I don't want to sell anything at the Foundation, but somebody will have to sell photos and catalogues because there will be a big demand for them." The photographic set by Sheeler was never produced, probably because of the falling-out Barnes had with Sheeler over prices the photographer was charging. Barnes did not pursue the idea again until 1930, when he was approached by Barbara and Willard
Morgan. Willard Morgan was a photographer who was the first to create 35 mm. Lantern slides and who introduced the Leica as a serious camera. His wife, Barbara, then a painter and member of the faculty at UCLA, later became a prominent photographer. The Morgans had met Barnes out in California through their mutual friend, John Dewey, who was lecturing at UCLA. In 1930, the Morgans moved to New York City, making a stop en-route to photograph the Barnes Foundation collection in Merion.

The Morgans returned in September 1931 to continue photographing the collection. In addition to French masters such as Cézanne, Renoir and Matisse, the Morgans also focused on African sculpture in the collection. They made detailed photographic studies of aspects of the collection they found significant from an artistic standpoint. For example, the structure of a Fang sculpture particularly appealed to Barbara Morgan. She noted on a photographic proof of the work that “the full convex and the following concave expresses one of the real negro findings of form to me.” Many objects were photographed from multiple viewpoints. Referring to a small Pende pendant head, Barbara Morgan wrote, “This looks so different each time you change the viewpoint the least bit, an entirely different spirit to it.”

The Morgans, and Barbara Morgan in particular, shared similar perspectives on art as Barnes. In a 1927 article, Barbara Morgan emphasized the significance of “aesthetic essences,” believing that an artist’s role was “to extract the most significant, most moving aspects - to refine and essentialize them, to get rid of the unnecessary, and to articulate the subtlest, most intense, most profound expression possible.” Morgan characterized the central concept which effected all her artistic efforts as “Rhythmic Vitality.”
Understandably, this concept of presenting “essences” appealed to Barnes’s aesthetic sensibilities.

When the Morgans had completed their photography of the collection, they presented the proofs to Barnes for his approval. He was extremely pleased with the final product. In fact, Barnes formulated a plan whereby the Morgans’s photographs would be sold to prominent art institutions with the ultimate goal of “promoting the understanding of art through the medium of reproduction by photographs and lantern slides.”

Outlining his “General Plan,” Barnes suggested that the Morgans first obtain the cooperation of important museums, such as those in Boston, Chicago, and New York. He advised the Morgans to then publish a “booklet which shall be at the same time a prospectus and a catalogue of what you have to offer.” This booklet, Barnes suggested, should be distributed to those institutions “in which appreciation of art is attempted” accompanied by a letter of endorsement from the Barnes Foundation.

The letter of endorsement that Barnes prepared for the Morgans stressed the didactic aspects of their work, which Barnes deemed “a definite contribution to the advancement of education in art.” The letter clarifies Barnes’s position on photographing works from the collection. He endorsed the Morgans’s work because he believed that they had produced a visual translation of Barnes’s formal approach to art appreciation, reproducing the “essential” qualities of the work of art. “In your reproductions of our works of art,” he wrote, “you have succeeded in obtaining in your slides the qualities of the object and a series of intricate relationships between those qualities which give the picture or piece of sculpture its identity as an art form.”
The catalogue that was produced was presented as first in a series of bulletins listing photographs and lantern slides by the Morgans. Dated May 1933, Bulletin No. 1 featured selected works from the Barnes Foundation collection. The Morgans provided an overview of their photography, emphasizing the careful processing and quality of their slides and photographs. Although the photographs were sold to institutions, the Morgans stipulated that they were not to be copied or reproduced "in order to maintain the original quality." While the catalogue itself was extensive, listing over 300 photographs, it apparently included less than sixty percent of the total number of negatives made by the Morgans. The section on African sculpture was substantial, offering 145 photographs of 97 objects.

Detailed photographic studies were available for several of these works, including a Luba stool supported by a female caryatid ("Congo XVII Cent. Kneeling figure supporting seat or table, 23"; 1012-1019), a Fang figure ("Gabun Pahouin X Cent. Standing figure", 17 ¼", 1044-47, and a female figure from the Ivory Coast ("Tall standing female figure," 1078-85). I would like to compare here several of the Morgan photographs of the Luba stool, highlighted by Barnes in a central case in room 20, with its structural analysis as published in Primitive Negro Sculpture. Such a comparison reveals how the Morgan photographs may be read as a visual interpretation of Barnes’s aesthetic interest in these objects.

Photograph number 1012 (fig. 77) is a partial front view of the stool, shot at an angle slightly above the work. The object is arranged so that the form of the female caryatid is clearly outlined so as to emphasizes certain shapes:
... the dominant theme is once more an egg-shaped mass. It is stated most forcefully by the full and prominent breasts, and each other major part of the design is a varied repetition of these oval masses. The table-top and base tend to squeeze the figure together until it bursts into a heavy, laboring zigzag contour.  

The "egg-shaped" masses and "zigzag contour" clearly are emphasized in this photographic perspective.

Turning now to photograph number 1018 (fig. 78), a side view of the figural stool, the description continues:

... the thin, stiff arms and fingers and the sharp chin serve as minor contrasting notes to accentuate the short, bulging fatness of the other parts, although as mounds and cones they are in harmony with the prevailing ovoid theme. The rounded points at chin, ears, elbows, nipples, navel and knees are felt as rhythmic repetitions, and as protuberances into which flow the soft swelling planes and the full, distended mass within them.

Again, the photograph highlights the silhouette of the figure, drawing attention to the "rounded points" of the work, particularly the nipple and navel. The side view also emphasizes the verticality of the arms and fingers, their rigidity contrasted with the downward-flowing masses of the figure, as described in the text.

Photograph number 1014 (fig. 79) is a close-up of the head and torso of the female figure, closely cropped to exclude even the suggestion of forearms. The description of the work in *Primitive Negro Sculpture* accents the repetition of the "lines and planes" in the features. The text observes further, "A feeling for surfaces appears in the strong contrast between the rough, hair-covered planes and the smooth, rippling patine (sic) elsewhere." This close perspective of this photographic view stresses this contrast, focusing the viewer's attention on the face, breasts and hair of the figure. The lighting of the object further enhances the sheen of its smooth surfaces.
The Morgan photographs were specifically promoted as study aids accompanying Barnes Foundation publications and, in fact, were reproduced in such texts, a fact which clearly demonstrates that the works were in accordance with Barnes’s aesthetic beliefs. Both The Art of Renoir, by Albert Barnes and Violette de Mazia (1935) and The Art of Cezanne also by Albert Barnes and Violette de Mazia (1939) each included twenty-five Morgan photographs. Moreover, the reproductions in John Dewey’s 1934 Art and Education all came from the Morgans. The photographs published in the book included three views of the Dogon male and female figure, as an example of “negro sculpture” (fig. 80).

Interest in the Morgan slides and photographs, however, was not limited to those associated with the Barnes Foundation. As Barbara Morgan later recounted in a letter to Barnes, “During the first years we supplied Fogg, Metropolitan, Museum of Modern Art, Chicago Art Institute and many other institutions with slides and photographs, in response to the original catalogue sent out with your letter of endorsement.”82 For many of these institutions, the photographs ordered from the Morgans were seen as “representative” examples of African sculpture. Among the 100 lantern slides ordered by the Museum of Modern Art, for example, were photographs of a Kota reliquary, a Benin bronze mask, two Baule figures, a Bamana mask, and multiple shots of the Luba caryatid stool, a Fang head, and the Senufo seated female.83 The range of institutions that expressed an interest in the Morgan slides and photographs was extremely broad. The Michigan Board of Education in Grand Rapids, for example, requested one 8x10 photo of the Foundation’s African art collection “which is very typical of negro sculpture and excellent for art
education purposes in schools.\textsuperscript{84} Thus, through the distribution of the Morgan photographs and lantern slides from 1933 on, the prominence of the Barnes Foundation collection was further established and the particular aesthetic perspective advocated by the Foundation shared with many others.
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Chapter Five:

ALBERT BARNES, AFRICAN ART AND THE "NEW NEGRO"

Soon primitive Negro art will invade this country as it has invaded Europe . . . And there will come with it a new valuation of the contribution of Negroes, past and yet possible, to American life and culture. It is on this certainty that Dr. Barnes has quietly combed Europe for the choicest of the specimens brought from Africa, and is even now urging serious study and exclusive research into the field, still uncharted, by competent and interested Negro students.  

-- Opportunity, May 1924

In 1925, philosopher Alain Locke issued a call to African-Americans to draw inspiration from their African heritage in the visual arts. For many, that inspiration was to be found in the African art collection of Albert Barnes. African sculpture from the Barnes Foundation was featured in several key publications of the Harlem Renaissance, including the movement’s founding text, The New Negro (1925), issues of Opportunity magazine focusing on “Negro” art (May 1924 and May 1926), and the special edition of Survey Graphic devoted to the Harlem Renaissance (March 1925). Visitors to the collection of the Barnes Foundation involved in the “New Negro” movement included Alain Locke, Charles Johnson, and Aaron Douglas, among others. Most significantly, however, Barnes himself advanced the artistic importance of African art and its relation to the “New Negro” through numerous speeches and published writings geared to an African-American audience.

This chapter reevaluates Barnes’s role in the “New Negro” movement, arguing for the importance of Barnes and his collection of African art to the development of the movement. Despite the prominence given both his writings and collection during the
Harlem renaissance, Barnes has been either ignored by scholars, or dismissed as a peripheral figure whose ideas were merely indulged by the movement’s leaders in order to maintain his patronage. I propose instead that Barnes played a significant role both in introducing African art to the African-American community and in his evaluation of Africa’s contributions to artistic expression. Central to my examination of Barnes’s impact on the “New Negro” movement is a discussion of his relationships with two of the movement’s leaders, Alain Locke and Charles Johnson, in light of new archival evidence from the Barnes Foundation.

Albert Barnes and Alain Locke: Conflicting Perspectives on African Art

Although Barnes, as previously discussed, had a long-standing interest in African-American culture, his specific involvement in the “New Negro” movement began with his introduction to Alain Locke (fig. 81) in Paris in January 1924.2 The two men had much in common. Locke had graduated from Barnes’s alma mater, Philadelphia’s Central High School. He was a Rhodes scholar at Oxford and had earned a Ph.D. in philosophy from Harvard. Like Barnes, Locke had been deeply influenced by the writings of James, Santayana, and Dewey.3 Their meeting evidently made an impression on Barnes, because he contacted Locke at Howard University upon his return. Locke responded with a request to visit Merion, writing, “I am most anxious to see your collection and continue our conversations, and hope I may be able to arrange to do so some week-end of your convenience.”4
Barnes and Locke did not meet again in person until March 1924, not in Merion but in New York City. Locke had invited Barnes to a dinner sponsored by Opportunity magazine at the Civic Club in New York. This event, held to honor black writers, is widely considered the formal launching of the Harlem Renaissance. Organized by the editor of Opportunity, Charles Spurgeon Johnson, the March 21 dinner was emceed by Alain Locke and included speeches by a host of prominent intellectuals, both white and black.

Barnes was one of the presenters, and he spoke to the group on the subject of African sculpture, which Barnes referred to as "Negro" art. The speech was apparently well-received, and Barnes provided an account of the evening, highlighting his own participation, in a letter to Guillaume:

A number of speeches were made and Mr. Locke asked me to talk to them about negro art. Of course I could not say much about it except to emphasize its importance by comparison with the great art movements of the past and its strong influence upon the movement in modern art. I denounced such men as Einstein and Clive Bell as people who have no real knowledge of the subject and are merely exploiting it to their own egoistic ends. After the dinner at least twenty people came and talked to me and wanted to know more about negro art...In addition to all this several of the leaders in American life have become so much interested in the matter of negro art that they have asked me to act as a guide in having the subject presented intelligently to the readers of the principal journals.

The Civic Club dinner had, Barnes felt, profound consequences for his promotion of African art. Barnes predicted that the evening's events would ultimately result in Paul Guillaume's name becoming "known all over America," African art being recognized widely by the American public, and other critics of African art being discredited.

Thrilled at the enthusiastic reception of his ideas at the Civic Club dinner, Barnes hosted a conference at the Barnes Foundation on the weekend of April 5, 1924 to discuss
plans for educational work among African-Americans. Both Barnes and Locke addressed a group primarily consisting of African-Americans, including some of Barnes’s factory workers, on the subject of the “negro cause.” Locke’s visit to the Foundation also included a tour of Barnes’s collection of African sculpture. Locke had been desirous of seeing the collection for some time, earlier writing to Barnes about his intent to write about it for Opportunity. Barnes, however, found Locke wanting in his knowledge of the various forms of African art. As he related to Guillaume, “Locke stayed two whole days at my house. When he came he did not know one piece of African art from another and I spent a great deal of time in showing him the difference between works of various tribes and in pointing out the influence of negro art upon such men as Picasso, Lipchitz, Modigliani.” Locke, for his part, called Barnes’s lecture “the most stimulating and educative experience I have had for years.”

Locke completed a manuscript on African art shortly after visiting the Foundation. Clearly feeling some need to justify why he, instead of Barnes, was authoring the article, Locke explained, “Partly because I had promised it to [Charles Johnson] for this particular issue, and partly because of a vain conceit to show what I can do on less than ‘six months study’ (thanks to my tutor, - to whom due acknowledgement will be made) I am doing a short Note on African art. I hope not to be excommunicated for it.” Locke’s essay, “A Note on African Art,” was published in the May 1924 issue of Opportunity.

Locke’s first attempt at African art criticism, “A Note on African Art” sows the seeds of Locke’s approach to African art that he would develop in later writings. The
essay begins by distinguishing between the aesthetic meaning and the cultural significance of African art:

What it is as a thing of beauty ranges it with the absolute standards of art and makes it a pure art form capable of universal appreciation and comparison; what it is as an expression of African life and thought make it an equally precious cultural document, perhaps the ultimate key for the interpretation of the African mind.  

Locke’s contention was that African art should be evaluated first as art, but then interpreted for its historical meaning. Unlike Barnes, who leaves issues of cultural context to anthropologists, Locke cites specific works that reveal the “most promising lines” of ethnographic interpretation. Barnes was later to develop a serious rift with Locke over issues of aesthetics and context. Yet Locke’s interest in the cultural background of African art is aimed ultimately at establishing a goal similar to that of Barnes. Locke views ethnographic interpretation as helping to combat the notion of the “primitive” by providing evidence of technical mastery, thus establishing African sculpture as a mature artistic tradition. Barnes, too, saw African art as a self-conscious and deliberate act of artistic creation, as discussed in Chapter Three.

While they may have shared a common perspective regarding the artistry of African objects, Barnes dismissed Locke’s article as “pretentious and superficial erudition” that drew primarily upon the work of others without offering its own insights. Barnes was stung by Locke’s failure to credit him, as Locke had promised, and privately Barnes accused Locke of plagiarism. Although there is no evidence that Barnes directly confronted Locke, Barnes’s accusations were relayed to Locke through Guillaume who, having heard about the event from his friend, snubbed Locke during a visit to his gallery that August.
Barnes disagreed with Locke over the “purpose” to which African art should be put. While he admitted that Locke’s essay had “a grasp of the essential aesthetic and intellectual principles that goes with first-hand or high-grade experience,” he felt that it did not sufficiently advance the “negro cause”:

Negro art is so big, so loaded with possibilities for a transfer of values to other spheres where negro life must be raised to higher levels, that it should be handled with the utmost care by everybody. From that standpoint Locke’s article leaves much to be desired on the part of those who have decided that negro traits as revealed by their activities are worthy of study by scientific methods in order to bring them to their desired place in world culture.22

While Locke was concerned with ridding the “primitive” of its negative connotations, Barnes apparently had a more activist vision of the possibilities of African art in combating racial bias.

Barnes may not have been satisfied with Locke’s contribution, but the remainder of the May 1924 issue of Opportunity should have pleased him. An article that he had mailed to Locke in early March entitled, “The Temple,” was included, as was Paul Guillaume’s previously published essay, “African Art at the Barnes Foundation,” devoted to the subject of “Negro” art. Barnes’s essay is, essentially, an ode to Paul Guillaume’s Paris gallery for having rescued “the obscure ancient Negro art from its obscure significance and converted it into a well of unsuspected spiritual richness from which the whole modern movement in art has drunk deeply.”23 Its publication in Opportunity seems geared toward Barnes’s stated goal of making a name for Guillaume in the United States. Similarly, Guillaume’s article was a paean to Barnes’s collecting of African art, which Guillaume remarked was an “act of artistic audacity . . . [that] will have a world-wide significance of which it is not now possible to calculate the consequences. . .”24
Further praise is heaped on the collector in an editorial entitled “Dr. Barnes,” in which Barnes is celebrated for an “uncanny foresight that drew into his possession many of the best pieces of this African art.” All six of the illustrations for this issue are of objects from Barnes’s collection, five of which are African sculpture. As a collector, the editorial notes, “[Barnes] was the first and is distinctly the last word in Primitive African Art and his pieces, the rarest of their kind - exquisite, exotic, distinctive, - once casually valued at fifty thousand dollars, are becoming invaluable.”

The importance of the inclusion of objects from Barnes’s African art collection in this issue cannot be overstated. This was the first time a major African-American periodical had devoted an issue to the subject of African art. Although Locke might have had his say on its significance, it was Barnes’s collection that offered examples for the numerous readers of the magazine. All of the examples were selected from the four regional traditions Barnes found aesthetically significant. Additionally, the works are given dates, presumably by Guillaume, that establish them as ancient traditions. Thus, a “Soudan-Niger” mask, more accurately a Bamana work from Mali, is assigned a 10th century date (fig. 82). Similarly, a Guro heddle pulley, identified as “Zouenouia,” is dated to the 13th century (fig. 83).

The editorial in Opportunity concludes by noting that Barnes is “urging serious study and exclusive research into the field, still uncharted, [of African art] by competent and interested Negro students.” The study and research referred to was Barnes’s plan for an “intelligent constructive programme for the negro cause . . . to be conducted under the auspices of the Foundation.” He wanted to sponsor a young African-American to
study and interpret African art at his Foundation. While Barnes’s proposal was primarily motivated by his desire to help the “negro cause,” he also realized that interest on the part of African-Americans would be a strong catalyst in promoting African art. Noting the market potential fueled by the “New Negro” movement, Barnes advised Guillaume to “buy all the good pieces of Negro Art which are to be had anywhere because within a year or two it will be recognized as very important.”

The suggestion to sponsor a researcher had been warmly received by Alain Locke, who told Barnes that he would quickly draft a scholarship foundation “scheme” with the help of James Weldon Johnson and Walter White. Locke further proposed that Arthur Huff Fauset, a folklorist and teacher in Philadelphia’s public schools, might be suitable for the research. Locke wrote to Barnes that Fauset “may turn out to be sensitive enough to develop quickly an aesthetic reaction to an art with which he has had up to the present little contact.” Fauset, who had attended the initial April 5-6 conference, came to a follow-up meeting at the foundation on April 14. While there, he spoke of “the necessity of the negroes working together to get the things they need from politicians, such as schools, etc.”

The drive to establish this program appears to have waned after this meeting, quite possibly due to Barnes’s falling-out with Locke over “A Note on African Art.” Ironically, Locke’s “note” highlighted the proposed research at the Barnes Foundation and its relevance to the study of art in general:

It is one of the purposes and definite projects of the Barnes Foundation, which contains by far the most selective art collection of Negro art in the world, to study this art organically and to correlate it with the general body of human art. Thus African art will serve not merely the purpose of a strange new artistic ferment but
will also have its share in the construction of a new broadly comparative and scientific aesthetics.\textsuperscript{34}

Barnes, however, seems to have turned his attentions elsewhere for the moment, possibly to the publication of "Negro Art and America," his first extensive development of the subject of African sculpture and its relation to African-American artistic expression.

"Negro Art and America" was published in 1925, first in the March issue of \textit{Survey Graphic} and then later that year in the anthology edited by Alain Locke, \textit{The New Negro}. Both publications derived directly from the March 21, 1924 Civic Club dinner. Inspired by the speeches at the dinner, the editor of \textit{Survey Graphic}, Paul Kellogg, began making plans for a special issue to be titled "Harlem: Mecca of the New Negro." The magazine had a particular interest in "race growth and interaction through the shifting outline of social organization and by the flickering light of individual achievement."\textsuperscript{35}

Having previously addressed socio-political emergences in Ireland, Russia and Mexico, \textit{Survey Graphic}'s title page introduction to this issue notes that "a dramatic flowering of a new race-spirit is taking place close to home - among American Negroes, and the stage of that new episode is Harlem."\textsuperscript{36} The issue, read by 42,000 people, provided significant impetus to the fledgling movement.

Albert Barnes's "Negro Art and America," was likely based on his speech at the Civic Club dinner. While Barnes's earlier article, "The Temple," did little more than promote Guillaume's gallery, "Negro Art and America" is an important essay for it offers a is the first written expression of Barnes's perspective on the relationship between African sculpture and African-American artistic expression.\textsuperscript{37} Barnes's definition of "Negro art" in America in this essay is fairly broad, embracing not only the work of well-known African-
American artists but also artistic expression that he saw as inherent in the everyday life of the "ordinary, unknown negro."\textsuperscript{38} There was, Barnes maintained, a relationship between the two, the only difference being "not so much in kind, but in degrees of manner of expression."\textsuperscript{39} Both have, according to Barnes, a similar "psychological complexion" which he characterizes as having "tremendous emotional endowment, luxuriant and free imagination" and a truly great power of individual expression.\textsuperscript{40}

Barnes's essay is said to have "dismayed" black leaders, in particular Alain Locke, who found the tone of the article to be patronizing and the content primitivizing.\textsuperscript{41} To be sure, like many whites of his era, Barnes's praises of "negro character" were often laced with racist stereotypes. Locke likely took issue with Barnes's assessment of the fundamental emotionality of "Negro" art. As George Hutchinson has observed, Locke, while not abandoning the term "primitive" in his writing, seemed determined to strip it of its connotations. Locke's own contribution to \textit{Survey Graphic}, therefore, stresses again the technical skill of African artists. "Masterful over its material," he writes, "in a powerful simplicity of conception, design and effect, it is evidence of an aesthetic endowment of the highest order."\textsuperscript{42} Barnes, however, did not equate his view of the African's "free imagination" and "emotional endowment" with the primitive, proposing instead that "what the Negro has achieved is of tremendous civilizing value."\textsuperscript{43}

The objects chosen to represent African art in this widely read periodical again derived entirely from the Barnes Foundation's collection. There were eight photographic reproductions of African sculpture, two of which had been published previously in the May 1924 \textit{Opportunity}.\textsuperscript{44} All of the works were labeled with cultural regions. Five of
them were from the Ivory Coast, such as the Baule face mask with the bird superstructure (fig. 84). Two others were from the “Sudan” and one of Barnes’s “minor” traditions, a Fon bronze figure from Dahomey, was also included. The photographs of Barnes’s African art illustrated Locke’s brief entry, “The Art of the Ancestors,” and Countee Cullen’s poem, “Heritage.”

While the tone of Barnes’s “Negro Art and America” may have disturbed Locke, he still included it in the The New Negro, his edited anthology which was to become the founding text of the “New Negro” movement. Some scholars have suggested that Barnes’s involvement in key Harlem Renaissance publications like The New Negro was motivated primarily by the desire to appease the wealthy collector. The decision to include photographs from Barnes’s African art collection, however, cannot have been mere accommodation. Indeed, Locke’s own contribution to Survey Graphic directs attention to the importance of examining specific examples of African art:

It is for the development of this latter aspect of a racial art that the study and example of African art material is so important. The African spirit, as we said at the outset, is at its best in abstract decorative forms. . . And if African art is capable of producing the ferment in modern art that it has, surely this is not too much to expect of its influence upon the culturally awakened Negro artist of the present generation. So that even if the present vogue of African art should pass, and the bronzes of Benin and the fine sculptures of Gabon and Baoule, and the superb designs of the Bushongo should again become mere items of exotic curiosity, for the Negro artist they ought still to have the import and influence of the classics in whatever art expression is consciously and representatively racial.

The New Negro, therefore, is illustrated throughout with six objects from Barnes’s collection, all of which had been previously published in Survey Graphic. The text additionally illustrates three works from ethnographic museums: a Kuba ndop or king figure, a bronze head from Benin, and a Punu mukudji mask.
Locke’s essay for The New Negro, entitled “The Legacy of the Ancestral Arts,” is a more developed version of his article in Survey Graphic that also incorporates some of the ideas published earlier in his “Note on African Art.” Bruce Kellner has suggested that the essay was motivated by his unhappiness over Barnes’s article.48 While it is possible, the ideas presented by Locke seem to more an extension of beliefs expressed earlier, rather than a personal reaction to Barnes. Like Barnes, Locke connects the arts of the “American Negro” with that of his African ancestors through “the remarkable carry-over of the rhythmic gift.”49 Yet, while Barnes characterizes both the African and African-American as having a similar psychology, Locke maintains that the “emotional temper” of the black American is radically different from that of the African. Locke explains:

The characteristic African art expressions are rigid, controlled, disciplined, abstract, heavily conventionalized; those of the Aframerican are free, exuberant, emotional, sentimental and human. Only by the misinterpretation of the African spirit, can one claim any emotional kinship between them . . . 50

Again, Locke seems primarily motivated by a desire to combat the perception that African sculpture is primitive. Thus, as he had done in his earlier “Note on African Art,” Locke again stresses the technical mastery of African sculpture. The African-American artist may therefore gain from African artistry not cultural inspiration, but “the lesson of a classical background, the lesson of discipline, of style.”

Locke was later to come to a personal resolution of the tension he perceived between the aesthetic and cultural appreciation of African sculpture. In 1927, Locke organized his own exhibition of African art held at the New Art Circle in New York from February 7 until March 5. The exhibition featured a collection of over 1,000 works from the Congo assembled by the Belgian dealer Raoul Blondiau and purchased by Theatre
Arts magazine. In an essay Locke wrote for The Arts in February 1927, he discussed the importance of the collection, which, he felt, satisfied both scientific and artistic interest:

To possess African art permanently and not merely as a passing vogue, we shall have to go beyond such reflected values and their exotic appeal and study it in its own context, link it up vitally with its own cultural background, and learn to appreciate it as an organic body of art. Toward this, the prime pre-requisite is the availability of the original material in collections sufficiently extensive to present a representative unit yet selective enough to make an exclusive appeal as art.  

Locke felt that the Blondiau-Theatre Arts Collection, as it came to be called, was also important because it came from the Congo, which according to Locke, “epitomizes Africa [in] that its culture is one of the oldest and most typical and that nowhere else do we find an equivalent or more characteristic flowering of the several handicrafts.”

The “several handicrafts” mentioned by Locke refer to the collection’s inclusion of metalwork, weapons, weaving and pottery, in addition to figural sculptures of masks. Not surprisingly, Barnes was disdainful of the collection, which, he felt, made no attempt to distinguish between art and artifact. The collection itself was reviewed - unfavorably - in an article by Thomas Munro entitled “Good and Bad Negro Art,” published in 1927 in The Nation. While there is no evidence that Barnes was directly involved in Munro’s assessment of the collection, Barnes gleefully summarized the article for Guillame: “He [Munro] condemned it as inferior and an attempt at cheap exploitation of the renown which negro art is steadily gaining in America.”

Barnes and Charles Johnson: Advancing the Cause

Although Barnes was never to resolve his differences with Locke over African art, Barnes had a more sustained relationship with Charles Spurgeon Johnson (fig. 85), the
editor of Opportunity, in which the two explored ways that African art could advance the "negro cause." Johnson was a sociologist who, like Barnes, advocated the idea of racial advancement through artistic creativity. Although the two had known each other since at least 1924, when Barnes spoke at the Civic Club dinner sponsored by Johnson's periodical, they were not in frequent contact until 1926. That spring, Johnson was involved with arrangements for a lecture Barnes was to give before the Women's Faculty Club at Columbia University. Barnes wanted to have his lecture accompanied by the singing of spirituals, and John Dewey's wife, who was apparently organizing the lecture, turned to Johnson for suggestions. Johnson wrote to Barnes recommending the Bordentown School choir, trained by Frederick Work, and Barnes enthusiastically supported his idea.53

Barnes subsequently invited Johnson to Merion on April 4, 1926 to hear a lecture by Barnes on "negro art both in that phase which Paul Guillaume has been so influential in developing, and for the contribution which the negro has made to the enrichment of American life."54 Guillaume, who would be visiting the Foundation for a week, was also scheduled to talk on the influence of African art on contemporary painting, music and poetry.55 Johnson attended the lectures and was so taken with the subject that he contacted Barnes about publishing the speeches in a special issue of Opportunity:

"Altho [sic] what you and Paul Guillaume have said recently on the subject of Negro art will reach the public in some form, thru [sic] the varied interpretations of those who heard your lectures, it has been a passion with me, to see these discussions made available and coldly authenticated in type, for the benefit of those who want to learn about these things at their source, and as a safety check upon those who would talk wildly about them simply because they are enjoying some vogue at the moment...It will get our best efforts here and a wide circulation. This material now is much in demand."56

165
Barnes was apparently contracted by the periodical to develop this special issue, and thus, the May 1926 *Opportunity* was a veritable product of The Barnes Foundation. The issue included Guillaume’s essay, “The Triumph of Ancient Negro Art,” based on a transcript of his address at the foundation. “The Triumph of Ancient Negro Art” essentially relates the history of the modernist “discovery” of African art, highlighting Guillaume’s own contributions. Barnes’s essay, “Negro Art, Past and Present,” was a conflation of his address to Columbia University in March and his April 4 lecture at the Barnes Foundation.

In addition to these articles, Barnes proposed several others for inclusion. “Negro Spirituals and American Art,” by Foundation Teacher Laurence Buermeyer, was a call for greater appreciation of the spirituals in which Buermeyer maintained that their difference in “fundamental music quality” - the emphasis on rhythmic organization as opposed to melody - contributed to their neglect as an art form. Mary Mullen described “An Experiment in Adult Negro Education,” which essentially related the origins of the Barnes Foundation in Barnes’s 1917 experiment among his factory workers. Barnes also sent Johnson a translation of the “The Legend of Ngurangurane,” taken from Blaise Cendrars’s *Anthologie Nègre*. He deemed it “one of the most beautiful legends in the folklore of any people and shows why negro art is great.”

The illustrations accompanying the articles were from photographs Barnes provided of African art in his collection. He sent Johnson fifteen photographs, advising him to select as many as space permits for Munro’s essay. Barnes recommended the use of photograph of his Baule granary door, an object given the rather grand title of “the
Temple Door, of the 16th Century,” for the cover design. Johnson agreed with Barnes’s choice, observing that the door was “one of the most striking of the African designs” and he used it on the cover (fig. 86). 63 Nine of the other photographs were used to illustrate the articles, none of which had been previously published in Opportunity, Survey Graphic, or The New Negro. Other than the “Temple Door,” Barnes did not specify the placement of any of the illustrations. 64 All the works, however, derived from the “major traditions” proposed by Barnes and had captions, at Johnson’s request, identifying them by culture and date. 65 The “oldest” object illustrated was a carved ivory horn, possibly Kongo, referred to as “Mossendjo-Bandjabis, before 10th century” (fig. 87). Other works included a Baule male figure (fig. 88), dated to the 14th century, and a “nineteenth century” Senufo female figure (fig. 89).

Barnes was very pleased with the final product and praised it highly in a letter to Johnson:

I can see in the journal, abounding evidence of the high intellectual and aesthetic status of the negro. Moreover, I see it presented and arranged in a way that is sure to get the commendation of discriminating readers of both races as a milestone a long way ahead of the last one on the road to the high conception of intelligence and culture that is the goal of all fine living. 66

Johnson, too, felt the issue was a success, stating that “the grouping of four or five of the dominant authorities and personalities connected with African art has made a measurable impression.” 67 Barnes took an active role in promoting the publication, distributing the journal to an estimated 2,000 people who had previously purchased the foundation’s books or subscribed to its journal. “Most of these people,” Barnes asserted, “may be said
to be the leaders in art and intellectual circles in America and many of them occupy teaching positions in universities and colleges.\textsuperscript{68}

Although Barnes and Johnson remained friends after their collaboration on the special issue of \textit{Opportunity}, they did not appear to have worked together again until 1928. In March of that year, Johnson asked Barnes, rather hesitantly, to participate in a radio broadcast sponsored by \textit{Opportunity} on March 22. Johnson felt Barnes’s participation would be valuable, citing “the need for more people knowing the influence which African art has had upon modern art.” The broadcast, as described by Johnson, would feature music and also readings by five young African-American poets, including Gwendolyn Bennett, who was on a fellowship at the Barnes Foundation. Addressing Barnes, Johnson wrote, “I should like the person who knows most about this African art to talk about twelve minutes on it.”\textsuperscript{69}

Barnes eagerly agreed to participate, believing that such a speech “would be very valuable not only for the negro cause but for everybody who is interested in the modern movement.”\textsuperscript{70} At the same time, he was keenly aware of the opportunities that the radio broadcast presented for the widespread dissemination of his ideas. “I suppose you know,” Barnes wrote to Guillaume, “the popularity of the radio in America - nearly every family has an apparatus, so you can see how widely scattered will be what I have to say about the subject.”\textsuperscript{71} Barnes submitted a manuscript to Johnson within two weeks. Johnson was very pleased with the text of Barnes’s prepared speech, which he called “the clearest statement of the subject that I have yet read,” and requested Barnes’s permission to publish the essay after his speech, in the May 1928 issue of \textit{Opportunity}.\textsuperscript{72}
"Primitive Negro Sculpture and Its Influence on Modern Civilization" was delivered by Barnes over station WABC in New York City. Although Barnes continues to use the term "primitive" in describing African art, he, like Locke, strips it of its negative connotations. African art, Barnes maintains, was not "the work of savages" but rather "the manifestation of a life which was a stable organization, thoroughly adjusted to its surroundings and therefore able to find natural, authentic expression." In his lecture, Barnes summarizes the aesthetic criteria for great sculptural design in African art using language derived verbatim from Primitive Negro Sculpture. He concludes, suggesting that greater knowledge of African art will ultimately result in improved race relations in America:

Appreciation of this sculpture has been rare, and indeed the Negro spirituals were not properly valued until recently; but as this knowledge of the great art achievements of the Negro becomes more generally diffused there is every reason to look for an abatement of both the superciliousness on the part of the white race and of the unhappy sense of inferiority in the Negro himself, which have been detrimental to the true welfare of both races.

The broadcast apparently received a fair number of letters praising Barnes's speech. One response, from a Mr. Melville Charlton, suggested that Barnes's speech be published and widely distributed:

Thousands of copies of the lecture should be made with pictures of Negro art and some specimen pictures of the European art influenced by the black man. These copies should be distributed to students of all races, to libraries and to the mighty press of America and Europe.

Although the article was already going to be included in the May Opportunity, Johnson liked the suggestion of having reprints made of Barnes's speech for distribution. He made plans to have the article printed "on special paper and with a somewhat unique
attractiveness” for mass distribution at African-American group meetings throughout the country. 77 Barnes enthusiastically endorsed the idea, writing to Johnson: “I know of no better possible source of good than to make known to the negro race generally their contributions to civilization.” 78 Although there appears to be no documentation as to the ultimate use of the reprints, they were apparently distributed by the Newark Museum in 1928 in conjunction with an exhibition there of African art. 79

Johnson resigned as editor of Opportunity in September 1928, and was honored at a Testimonial Dinner held on Sept. 14, 1928 at the Café Boulevard. The new editor of Opportunity, Elmer A. Carter, sought to maintain Barnes’s involvement with the periodical in the absence of Johnson. Writing Barnes shortly after he had assumed the position, Carter stated, “I hope to have the privilege of seeing your collection, and I hope that in the future OPPORTUNITY will not be deprived of a contribution from your pen.” 80 He later asked Barnes to review Franz Boas’s Primitive Art, referring to Barnes as “the most competent and available authority on such a work.” 81 Barnes read the book but found it lacking “even the most elementary principles of psychology and art.” 82 Exhibiting uncharacteristic restraint, however, Barnes declined to review the book, writing Carter that Boas was “a highly respected anthropologist, quite an old man, and I think it would be neither wise nor kind to publish such a review.” 83 Although Barnes never published in Opportunity again, he maintained a correspondence with Johnson during the years that Johnson taught at Fisk University.
The above exploration of Barnes's relationships with two key leaders of the "New Negro" movement, Alain Locke and Charles Johnson, suggests that Barnes was much more deeply involved in both the textual and visual productions of the Harlem Renaissance than is generally acknowledged. The publication of African art from the Barnes Foundation in key texts of the "New Negro" movement undoubtedly provided a source of inspiration for the many that heeded Locke's call to look to their African heritage. The question remains, is that inspiration reflected visually in the art of African-Americans from the period?

I would like to conclude this chapter by briefly evaluating the influence of Barnes and his collection in the work of Aaron Douglas (fig. 90), perhaps the most celebrated artist to emerge from the Harlem Renaissance. From his hometown in Topeka, Kansas, Douglas was alerted to the ideas of the "New Negro" movement through the March 1925 issue of Survey Graphic, which he later deemed "the most cogent single factor that eventually turned my face to New York." Moving to Harlem in 1925, Douglas was introduced to Charles Johnson and began studying with the German-born artist Winhold Reiss. Reiss encouraged Douglas to incorporate the "techniques of African art" in his work. Douglas's success at the new visual language that fused modernism with African design was rapidly validated by the publication of The New Negro, which featured Douglas's drawings throughout.

Barnes was introduced to Douglas in March of 1926, through Charles Johnson. Their meeting likely occurred during Barnes's visit to Harlem accompanied by Paul
Shortly after this, in April 1926, Douglas made his first visit to the Barnes Foundation. He spent a day there at the Foundation, where he observed that Barnes "undoubtedly has the largest single collection of modern paintings in America and certainly the finest collection of Negro sculptures." Douglas undoubtedly had been introduced to some of these works previously, through the inclusion of photographic reproductions of African art from Barnes's collection in Opportunity, Survey Graphic, and The New Negro. Two years later, Douglas had the opportunity to study these works in depth, as he was awarded a one-year fellowship in 1928 to study art and attend courses at the Barnes Foundation.

While few scholars of the Harlem Renaissance even mention Barnes in their discussion of Douglas's work, the recent work of Amy Kirschke acknowledges the importance of Barnes's African art collection in offering prototypes for Douglas's art. Kirschke suggests several instances in which Douglas's work seems to be influenced by specific objects in the collection. For example, she relates the "typical profile Douglas face with slanted" eyes (fig. 91) to a Guro mask in Barnes's collection (fig. 92), published as "Bushongo" in both Survey Graphic and The New Negro. Yet at the same time, Kirschke is dismissive of the influence of the fellowship at the Barnes Foundation on Douglas's subsequent development as an artist, arguing that his style was already firmly developed.

While Barnes's art collection may have served as inspiration for certain formal devices that Douglas employed, Barnes's ideas may have proven more influential. Douglas was clearly familiar with Barnes's "Negro Art and America," having avidly read
Survey Graphic and contributed to The New Negro. Therefore, he was almost certainly aware of Barnes’s assertion that the counterpart to African sculpture could be found in the spirituals of African-Americans. In 1926, Douglas was contracted to illustrate James Weldon Johnson’s book of poems, God’s Trombones. In evocative works in this series, such as The Crucifixion (fig. 93), Douglas’s incorporation of syncopated circles and tonal variations sets up an underlying rhythm that unites the work formally.92 As David Driskell has observed, Douglas’s “language of form [was] . . . commensurate in spirit with the verbal language of the Negro spiritual.”93

It is possible, then, that the legacy of Albert Barnes in the art of Harlem Renaissance artists like Douglas is not a visual one, but a conceptual one. Douglas obviously would have been aware of the significance of the Negro spirituals through writings of the period, not only by Barnes but by many others who similarly lauded their artistry. Yet Douglas’s employment of formal devices that summon such musical associations may have an added level that links them, following Barnes’s ideology, to African sculpture. The art of Aaron Douglas may therefore evoke, not in form but in spirit, that rhythmic structure that Barnes perceived in African art and taught to his students at the Barnes Foundation.
NOTES FOR CHAPTER FIVE:

1 “Dr. Barnes,” *Opportunity* 2, no. 17 (May 1924): 133.

2 Barnes refers to his meeting Locke at Guillaume’s gallery in a February 8, 1924 letter to Locke. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

3 George Hutchinson discusses at length the influence of pragmatist aesthetics on both Alain Locke and Charles Johnson in *The Harlem Renaissance in Black and White*, 42-60.

4 Letter from Alain Locke to Albert Barnes, February 5, 1924. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

5 Locke wrote Barnes on March 12, 1924, “I do hope you can come, as an attempt is being made to really get our younger creative group together, and to get them in touch also with those who have vision enough to appreciate the significance of their work for America and present-day culture at large.” Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

6 *Opportunity* began publication in 1923 and was sponsored by the Urban League. It was one of two leading African-American periodicals of the time, the other being *The Crisis*, founded in 1910 by the NAACP and edited by W.E.B. DuBois. Of the two, *Opportunity* was more oriented to black culture while *The Crisis* had a greater political content.

7 I did not locate a transcript of this speech in the archives of the Barnes Foundation, but the content almost certainly is that in Barnes’s “Negro Art and America,” published in March 1925 in *Survey Graphic*, which will be discussed later in this chapter.

8 Letter from Albert Barnes to Paul Guillaume, March 28, 1924. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

9 Letter from Albert Barnes to Paul Guillaume, March 28, 1924. Archives of The Barnes Foundation. In the letter, Barnes predicts, “Within the next few weeks I expect several important things to happen.” He specifies the critics to be discredited, writing that, “the pretenders like Einstein, De Zayas, Clive Bell and Culin will have no opportunity to continue their game of bluff.”

10 “Last Saturday and Sunday we had meetings of negroes in our building. Alain Locke, whom you know and who is Professor of Philosophy at Howard University, Washington, D.C. made an address to them. I also spoke and the enthusiasm for the
plan for educational work among them, which we have in mind, was tremendous.”
Letter from Albert Barnes to Paul Guillaume, April 11, 1924. Archives of The Barnes
Foundation.

11 “I would like permission to do an article on [the African art collection] for
“Opportunity,” one of our progressive journals.” Letter from Alain Locke to Albert
Barnes, February 5, 1924. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

12 Letter from Albert Barnes to Paul Guillaume April 29, 1924. Archives of The
Barnes Foundation.

13 Letter from Alain Locke to Albert Barnes, April 9, 1924. Archives of The Barnes
Foundation.

14 Locke did have a draft prior to his visit but wrote to Barnes, “I musn’t finish it until
I’ve seen the Barnes Foundation collection.” Letter from Alain Locke to Albert
Barnes, March 7, 1924. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

15 Letter from Alain Locke to Albert Barnes April 9, 1924. Archives of The Barnes
Foundation.


17 Locke, “A Note on African Art,” 135. He mentions the work of Joyce and Torday,
as well as A.A. Goldenweiser’s Early Civilization.

18 “None of the data in his article comes from experience or from first-hand
information but is what anybody accustomed to consulting books could obtain.
Locke has simply taken what he got from me and from various books and has
combined them in an article which gives the impression it was written by a man who is
both a scholar and has had practical experience with negro art... Fortunately, it will
do no harm to the cause but it should be a lesson to both you and me not to fall too
easy victims to people who would exploit it principally for their own
aggrandizement.” Letter from Albert Barnes to Paul Guillaume, April 29, 1924.
Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

19 Letter from Albert Barnes to Paul Guillaume April 29, 1924. Archives of The
Barnes Foundation. Barnes also typed up an analysis of Locke’s essay, in which he
dissects the article paragraph by paragraph, citing specific instances of plagiarism. It
does not appear that Barnes circulated this “analysis,” and it is possible he wrote it for
his own amusement.
On the contrary, Barnes replied to Locke that he “did like the African art issue very, very much and it did, as you say, spread out the subject nicely.” Letter from Albert Barnes to Alain Locke, May 7, 1924. Archives of The Barnes Foundation. Barnes also wrote Guillaume, “I do not intend to say anything to Locke about his failure to acknowledge his indebtedness to me and I ask you kindly not to mention it to him.” Letter from Albert Barnes to Paul Guillaume, April 29, 1924. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

Barnes seemingly was so pleased with Guillaume’s response to the situation that he wrote up an English translation of Guillaume’s original letter in French: “Locke came yesterday. He said he had been in England and Holland informing himself about negro art and seemed highly excited. I interrupted his confidences to tell him what I thought of his behavior toward you in his article in Opportunity.” Translation by Barnes of a letter from Paul Guillaume to Albert Barnes, August 29, 1924. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

Typescript entitled “Analysis of ‘A Note on African Art’ by Alain Locke,” written by Barnes, no date (1924). Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

Albert Barnes, “The Temple,” 139.


“Dr. Barnes,” Opportunity, 133.

The only non-African work illustrated is a stone sculpture by Modigliani.

“Dr. Barnes,” Opportunity, 133.

Ibid., 133.

Letter from Albert Barnes to Alain Locke, April 12, 1924. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

Letter from Albert Barnes to Paul Guillaume, April 11, 1924. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

Locke wrote Barnes on March 24, 1924, “Your suggestion about having a clever young man study and interpret Negro Art is capital. We must all concentrate on it and bring it to early fulfillment.” Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

Letter from Alain Locke to Albert Barnes, April 9, 1924. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.
The description of Fauset’s talk is provided by Mary Mullen who, at Barnes’s request, wrote a letter to Locke summarizing the evening’s events. Letter from Mary Mullen to Alain Locke, April 15, 1924. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.


Survey Graphic 6, no. 6 (March 1925)

Survey Graphic 6, no. 6 (March 1925)

The essay seems to have first appeared in January 1925 in the German publication Der Querschnitt.

Letter from Albert Barnes to Alain Locke, February 8, 1924. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

Ibid.

Barnes, “Negro Art and America,” Survey Graphic 668.


Barnes, “Negro Art and America,” 669.

These were the Bamana mask, labelled “Soudan-Niger” on page 673 and the Guro mask, identified mistakenly as “Bushongo,” on page 674.

Most recently, Amy Kirschke writes, “The position of Barnes’s article in both collections was clearly meant as a sign of honor for this eccentric white art collector and critic, a token of respect that had more to do with Barne’s power and connections than with quality of the essay.” Kirschke, Aaron Douglas 106.


These works are identified in the text as, respectively, a “Congo Portrait Statue” from the Tervuren Museum, a “Benin Bronze” from the Berlin Ethnological Museum, and a “Ceremonial Mask - Dahomey” from the Frankfort Museum.


52 Letter from Albert Barnes to Paul Guillaume, March 15, 1927. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

53 Letter from Charles Johnson to Albert Barnes, March 10, 1926. Archives of The Barnes Foundation. Barnes subsequently hosted the Bordentown Choir at the Barnes Foundation every spring for a concert, as discussed in Chapter Four.

54 Letter from Albert Barnes to Charles S. Johnson, March 11, 1926. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

55 Ibid.

56 Letter from Charles S. Johnson to Albert Barnes, April 7, 1926. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

57 In a letter to Johnson accompanying the final articles for inclusion, Barnes wrote, "This finishes my part of the contract to give you a special number of Opportunity. I hope you are satisfied with the quality of the material furnished." Letter from Albert Barnes to Charles S. Johnson, April 14, 1926. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

58 The transcript of Paul Guillaume's speech is in the Barnes Foundation's archives. Guillaume's essay is a literal transcription of the speech, lacking only four lines in which the subject is introduced to the audience. The omission was suggested by Johnson, who wrote to Barnes asking if it "could be eliminated in order that it may have the full aspect of an article." Letter from Charles S. Johnson to Albert Barnes, April 12, 1926. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

59 As Johnson observed, "Your article packs into a brief nine pages the substance, not only of your Columbia University address, but many of the things which you said at the April 4 meeting." Letter from Charles S. Johnson to Albert Barnes, April 12, 1926. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.


61 Letter from Albert Barnes to Charles S. Johnson, April 10, 1926. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.
Barnes wrote to Johnson, "It is of no practical importance which particular illustration accompanies my article; so I leave with you the placing of all illustrations as fits in best with the make-up." Letter from Albert Barnes to Charles Johnson April 17, 1926. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

On April 15, 1926, Johnson wrote Barnes requesting a "descriptive name and Century" for each work. Letter from Charles S. Johnson to Albert Barnes, Archives of The Barnes Foundation.


Letter from Charles S. Johnson to Albert Barnes, May 10, 1926. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

Letter from Albert Barnes to Charles S. Johnson, April 10, 1926. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

Letter from Charles Johnson to Albert Barnes, March 9, 1928. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

Letter from Albert Barnes to Paul Guillaume, April 12, 1928. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

Letter from Charles Johnson to Albert Barnes, March 20, 1928. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.


Barnes, "Primitive Negro Sculpture and Its Influence on Modern Civilization," 147.
Charles Johnson, in a March 23, 1928 letter to Barnes related the effect of his speech on some African-Americans, “One Mr. Douglas (not Aaron) insisted that it taught him how to be a Negro with pride and a Dr. Charlton observed that it ‘flowed in an exalted vein.’” Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

Undated (1928) commentary entitled “Dr. Albert C. Barnes,” by Melville Charlton, copy enclosed in a letter from Charles Johnson to Albert Barnes April 18, 1928. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

Letter from Charles S. Johnson to Albert Barnes, April 18, 1928. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

Letter from Albert Barnes to Charles Johnson April 21, 1928. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

Johnson writes, “The Newark Museum is arranging to take over a group of [the reprints] to use in connection with its exhibition of Negro art.” Letter from Charles Johnson to Albert Barnes July 2, 1928. Archives of The Barnes Foundation. I have not located any copies of the special reprint of Barnes’s essay.

Letter from Elmer A. Carter to Albert Barnes September 22, 1928. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

Letter from Elmer Carter to Albert Barnes, October 10, 1928. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

Barnes wrote, “African art is ignored except for the statement of a few banalities buried in a mass of other data irrelevant to art values,” Letter from Albert Barnes to Elmer Carter, October 25, 1928. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.


Kirschke, Aaron Douglas, 13.

Huggins, The Harlem Renaissance, 187.

Johnson hosted Barnes and Guillaume for an evening in Harlem. The itinerary for the evening schedules a meeting with Douglas. Letter from Charles S. Johnson to Albert Barnes, March 29, 1926. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

“Aaron Douglas was at the Foundation on Monday and drank in those things until his day was up. But he was so extraordinarily timid about approaching your
presence, that he missed entirely any opportunity to see you.” Charles Johnson to Barnes, April 7, 1926. Archives of The Barnes Foundation.

88 In Kirschke, Aaron Douglas, 107.

89 Nathan Higgins, for example, who characterizes Douglas as the most promising African-American artist of the postwar period, makes no mention of Barnes in his book, Harlem Renaissance.

90 Amy Kirschke, Aaron Douglas, 83. Another example Kirschke provides is an illustration for Paul Morand’s book, Black Magic, in which Douglas’s composition resembles a Fang reliquary guardian figure. See Kirschke, Aaron Douglas, 103.

91 Kirschke, Aaron Douglas, 108. She also notes that Douglas, “wrote very little about his time in Merion and never mentioned it as a major influence on his career in subsequent interviews. He did not write about receiving any inspiration from viewing the Barnes collection or attending lectures.” Ibid., 108.


Conclusion:

THE LEGACY OF A COLLECTOR

Of course to show off one’s possessions may seem like boasting, but then the collector did not invent or fabricate these things, he is but their humble servant. He does not praise himself in exhibiting them, he offers them humbly for the admiration of others. . .building a collection, the anxious activity of inventing one’s own inheritance, frees one from the obligation of reticence. For the collector to show off his collection is not bad manners. Indeed, the collector, like the impostor, has no existence unless he goes public, unless he shows what he is or has decided to be. Unless he puts his passions on display.¹

-- Susan Sontag

This study has set out to examine the role played by Dr. Albert C. Barnes in fostering a wider appreciation of African art in the United States and contributing to the canon that ultimately developed. An important component of this has been a reevaluation of Barnes’s involvement in the formation of his collection of African art. Previously thought to be solely a reflection of the taste of Barnes’s dealer Paul Guillaume, I have sought to demonstrate that Barnes was the one who determined its content through selective acquisition. I have also considered the dynamics informing the formation of the collection. Barnes’s self-generated competition with other collections of African art, both public and private, and his equal concern for inflating the market value of African sculpture, contributed to its development as did his increasingly assured sense of aesthetics.

The Barnes Foundation collection of African art became more widely known to the general public through the publication of Primitive Negro Sculpture in 1926. The book also advocated a certain way of viewing African sculptural design that was highly influential to its audience, many of whom read the book as a general introduction to the
subject. In my analysis of this text, I have emphasized the role of Barnes in its conception, development and ultimate production. Until now, Paul Guillaume has been considered the defining force behind *Primitive Negro Sculpture*. Drawing from archival sources and comparing the text itself to the Barnes Foundation collection, I have proposed that *Primitive Negro Sculpture* be read as a codification of Barnes's aesthetic criteria for African art.

I have also tried to address the relation of African art to Barnes's larger vision of his education foundation, restoring its significance to the whole. With its symmetrical design and recessed entrance portico, the Barnes Foundation may appear to be, from a distance, just another classic temple devoted to the worship of Western art. Yet behind the imposing Doric columns, the African figures and masks are testimony to Barnes's abiding commitment to African sculpture. Inside the galleries, African art is interspersed with modernist paintings to demonstrate not only their formal similarities but to situate African artistic production within the larger historical continuum of form. While Barnes's emphases on such "universal attributes" clearly derive from an exclusively Western aesthetic framework, the strategy was ultimately successful, in its time, in "elevating" African artifacts to the status of fine art.

Finally, this study examines Barnes's interest in African art as a force for social change in relation to the "New Negro" movement. Addressing the general omission of Barnes from this movement, I reevaluate his influence through a close examination of his associations with two of the leaders of the Harlem Renaissance, Alain Locke and Charles Spurgeon Johnson. I assess Barnes's perspective on African art and its relation to
African-Americans in comparison with the views of both Locke and Johnson. The numerous periodicals and texts which included African art from Barnes’s collection are also detailed as a means of demonstrating the familiarity of certain objects to a broad and diverse public.

What can we ultimately determine about Barnes’s influence in promoting a wider appreciation of African and the influence of the collection itself on the history of taste? I would like to conclude this study with a look at historic 1935 exhibition, “African Negro Art,” organized for the Museum of Modern Art in New York by curator James Johnson Sweeney. This was the first museum exhibition in the United States to present a group of African artifacts, drawn from diverse geographic regions, as fine art in a Western aesthetic sense. Although Barnes did not contribute any of his works for the show, his influence is felt, diffusely, in many ways in this groundbreaking exhibition, standing as an apt metaphor for his broader contributions to the appreciation of African art.

Plans for “African Negro Art” began in the fall of 1934, when the museum’s director, Alfred Barr, contacted James Johnson Sweeney to curate an exhibition of African art. One of the first collectors Sweeney wrote to was Albert Barnes. Sweeney had introduced himself to Barnes several years earlier, in 1927, writing that he was “intensely interested in modern painting and all related to it, [and] for some years I have listened to mention made of your collection on every side with a mixture of envy and awe.” Sweeney soon became a regular visitor to the Barnes Foundation and an interested student of Barnes’s method of artistic appreciation. He later credited Barnes and the Foundation with determining his entire outlook on art.
During the time he was planning the exhibition for the Museum of Modern Art, Sweeney was also writing a small text entitled Plastic Redirections in 20th Century Painting. The book discusses the influence of African sculpture on European modernism. Significantly, Sweeney’s analyses of individual works of African sculpture borrow heavily from Barnesian aesthetics. A seated Dogon figure, for example, is described “angular, staccato in its rhythms, contrapuntal in its delicate network of forms,” echoing the visual analysis of a Dogon work in the Barnes Foundation collection, as articulated in Primitive Negro Sculpture.

Sweeney evidently knew Barnes’s position on loaning to exhibitions for he approached the collector gingerly with a request to loan works to “African Negro Art.” Recognizing that such a loan would “entail definite and important sacrifices of illustrative materials for the courses at the Foundation,” Sweeney nevertheless asked Barnes to consider the request. “Without a representation of your pieces,” Sweeney wrote to Barnes, “I would always feel a serious lack, as would everyone who knows Negro art.”

Barnes sent a brief and bombastic note in return, stating, “if I were interested in pushing the propagators of hooey I need not go to New York for opportunities: the museum parasites here are quite the equal in stupidity, brass and bluff to anything over there.” Sweeney replied immediately, observing contritely that he was aware of Barnes’s sentiments toward museums and had merely hoped that Barnes “might be sympathetic purely toward the idea of an exhibition.”

Although Sweeney was unable to secure Barnes’s participation, he did include African art from several collectors who had been influenced by Barnes. One such
collector was Philadelphia artist, Earl Horter, who had attended courses at the Barnes Foundation in 1926. Like Barnes, Horter's collection included both modernist art and African sculpture. In a 1931 interview, Horter directly credited Barnes as a major influence not only in developing his own taste but in fostering a wider appreciation of African art:

"Until about ten years ago," he explained, "Negro sculpture was regarded only as an archaeological find but now it has been recognized, as it should be, as an exquisite form of art...Barnes - you know, the Barnes Foundation man, was with me in Paris. He has one of the finest collections of Negro sculpture in this country, and he helped me buy my pieces." 12

Horter loaned a Bamana ntomo mask from Mali (fig. 94), a piece quite similar to the Bamana masks in Barnes's collection. 13 Another Philadelphia collector who also knew Barnes was Caroll Tyson, who loaned a Guro mask from Ivory Coast to the exhibition. 14 Even Frank Crowninshield, editor of Vanity Fair and member of the Board of Directors at the Museum of Modern Art, had come into Barnes's orbit as a fellow collector of both modern and African art. 15 Crowninshield, who loaned a number of works to the exhibition, had visited the collection as a guest of Horter in the late 1920s. 16

Sweeney's exhibition was groundbreaking, for museum exhibitions of the era, in its intent to accord "the art of Negro Africa...its place of respect among the esthetic traditions of the world." 17 Reflecting Barnes's views, Sweeney too stressed the "plastic qualities" of African sculpture, maintaining that that was what made it interesting as an art form. He noted, "Picturesque or exotic features as well as historical and ethnographic considerations have a tendency to blind us to its true worth." 18 His perspective reached a large audience through the exhibition itself. During the run of "African Negro Art" at the
Museum of Modern Art, attendance averaged 1000 visitors a day, an increase of almost 6% from regular attendance.¹⁹

While the 1935 Museum of Art exhibition was undoubtedly influenced by Barnes in terms of the overall appreciation of African art, the strategy of display differed significantly from that found at the Barnes Foundation. The works, primarily sculpture in wood, were set against the spare walls of the museum and highlighted in vitrines (fig. 95). An anonymous reviewer commented on the effectiveness of the installation: “Against a background of dead white these 600 objects, selected from leading European and American art collections, are arranged with ample space around them, so that the idols and masks may be seen without conflicting with the glass display cases of smaller objects. So well assembled is the collection that on one of the upper floors an entire wall is given to a single head.”²⁰

Sweeney’s display technique became, for many years, the standard approach to the exhibition of African art. Its influence is still felt in recent exhibitions, such as the 1996 “Africa: The Art of a Continent,” at the Guggenheim Museum in New York. Originating at the Royal Academy in London in 1995, the exhibition was intended as “the first major survey of the artistic traditions of the entire continent.”²¹ The exhibition was broader in scope than that of its predecessor at the Museum of Modern Art, encompassing not only western and central African art traditions, but also those of the northern, eastern, and southern areas of the continent. The Guggenheim exhibition also differed from the earlier exhibition in its professed goal of situating objects from Africa within their cultural contexts. Even so, a clear preference for sculpture was revealed by merely gazing across
the figural works facing out from the spiraling ramp of the dramatic Frank Lloyd Wright building (fig. 96). The installation itself, like the 1935 exhibition, maintained an emphasis on the visual impact African artistic expression by using the curvilinear and angled architecture to both harmonize and contrast with the three-dimensional aspects of the objects.

Although Barnes's strategies of displaying African art may not have been influential as that of the historic Museum of Modern Art exhibition, objects from his collection assumed a canonical position even in his day. In assembling the collection of African art for the Museum of Primitive Art in New York during the 1940s, René d'Harnoncourt created a notebook which may be viewed as a veritable "wish list" for collecting.22 D'Harnoncourt listed "key" ethnic groups and compiled a group of drawings of ideal object types from well-known collections. His drawings included two works from the Barnes Foundation: the Dogon seated couple (fig. 97) and the wrought iron figure from Dahomey (fig. 98). The museum subsequently purchased a Dogon seated couple from the same workshop as that of the Barnes Foundation (fig. 99), a work that now, too, is considered canonical.

In the end, then, Barnes as a collector of African art offers a paradox. On the one hand, he viewed African sculpture as a complete mastery over form and considered African artists to have approached their subject in a deliberate and self-conscious manner. Yet he also adopted a "primitivist" ideology in attributing the success of African art as sculptural design to the innate rhythm of the "negro." Barnes adamantly advocated the
appreciation of African art from a purely formal perspective, yet contributed to the concept of regional “style zones,” thus acknowledging cultural background. He advocated altruistic policies, like the advancement of the “negro cause,” but was equally concerned with the market implications of African art. And, although he established the Barnes Foundation to promote African art and advance knowledge about it as an art form, the Foundation closed its doors to the wider public and the collection of African art inside has long been neglected.

Recently, the Barnes Foundation reopened to the general public after a lengthy renovation.23 Because the collection is still actively used as a tool for teaching Barnes’s systematic method of formal analysis, the Foundation has carefully maintained the appearance of the galleries as they were at the time of Barnes’s death in 1951. Without providing any ethnic attribution or cultural information, as is contemporary museum practice, African sculpture is isolated formally and integrated conceptually with other works in the collection. While perhaps an anachronism in today’s more culturally sensitive art world, the Barnes Foundation nonetheless offers an unconventional aesthetic experience and a window into one collector’s role in shaping Western perceptions of African art.
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Figure 93. Aaron Douglas, *The Crucifixion* (1927), oil on board, 48 x 36". Collection of Mr. and Mrs. William H. Cosby. (Harlem Renaissance: Art of Black America)
Figure 94.  Mask, Mali (Bamana), formerly in the collection of Earl Horter. (Philadelphia Museum of Art)
Figure 95. Installation view of "African Negro Art," held at the Museum of Modern Art in New York in 1935.
Figure 96. Installation view of “Africa: The Art of the Continent,” at the Guggenheim Museum in New York, 1996.
(Art Journal, Spring 1997)
Figure 97. Drawing by René d'Harnoncourt of Dogon male and female figure from the Barnes Foundation collection.
Figure 98. Drawing by René d’Harnoncourt of a Fon iron figure in Barnes Foundation collection. Catalog and Desiderata, Collection of African Negro Art, Photographic Department of the Arts of Africa, Oceania, and the Americas, Metropolitan Museum of Art.
Figure 99. Seated male and female figure, Mali (Dogon)
Collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, formerly in the
Museum of Primitive Art.
Appendix:

INVENTORY OF THE COLLECTION OF AFRICAN ART,
THE BARNES FOUNDATION, MERION, PA.

This inventory, organized according to placement of the African art collection in the galleries at the Barnes Foundation, is based on a personal examination of nearly all of these objects in August 1994 in Merion, Pa. The Barnes Foundation did not have at that time (or ever, to my knowledge) information on attribution, provenance, and publication history for the African art collection. I have provided the information below to the Barnes Foundation.

When known, I have included the material/s, height (approximate), and Barnes Foundation inventory numbers for each work. I am also including information, whenever possible, on when the objects were purchased based on my comparison of numbered sales receipts with number or number fragments (typed on paper, drawn in wax or paint, etc.) remaining on object itself. Unless otherwise noted, all works come from the gallery of Paul Guillaume in Paris. Finally, I have included a publication history that, while not necessarily complete, documents various reproductions of the works during the first half of the 20th century.

ROOM 20

North Wall

In vitrine, top shelf, left to right:

**Mask, Liberia or Ivory Coast (Dan)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A128
Wood, 8 in.
Purchased: December 1922, no. 23 "Masque Cavally," 6000 fr.
Published: Survey Graphic (March 1925): 673
The New Negro (1925), 258

**Figure, Democratic Republic of the Congo (eastern Hemba)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A273
Wood, 10 in.
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 17 "Divinité Sangha" fr. 900
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 35: "Congo figure; Sangha, XIVth century"

**Mask, Ivory Coast (Guro)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A278
Wood, pigment; 11 in.
Published: Opportunity (1926): 152: "Zouenoula, 14th century"

**Figure, Mali(?)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A270
Wood; 12 in.
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 22 "Fetiche Soudan-Niger" (no price listed)
Mask, Liberia or Ivory Coast (Dan)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A271
Wood, pigment, raffia, cowries, cloth; 10 in.
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 8: "Ivory Coast mask; Dan-Yabousas, Xllth century"

Divination tapper, Ivory Coast (Baule)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A275
Wood; 11 in.
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 4: "Fetish (Upper Ivory Coast, Xllth century) and utensils"

Cup, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Kuba)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A274
Wood, cowrie; 12 in.
Purchased: December 1922, no. 4 "Coupe Bushongo," 1800 fr.

Mask, Liberia or Ivory Coast (Dan/Wee)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A277
Wood; 9 in.
Purchased: December 1922, no. 28 "Masque Yabousas," 6000 fr.
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 30: "Ivory Coast mask; Dan-Yabousas, Xllth century"

Figure, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Kuba)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A272
Wood; 12 in.
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 11 "Fetiche Congo," 500 fr.
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 31: "Congo figure; Bushongo, XIVth century"

In vitrine, bottom shelf; left to right:

Mask, Ivory Coast (Yaure)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A281
Wood, pigment; 14 in.
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 18 "Masque Côte d'Ivoire Mossi," 3,250 fr.

Mask, Ivory Coast (Guro)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A285
Wood, pigment; 13 in.

Female figure, Ivory Coast (Baule)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A280
Wood; 14 in.
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 5 "Idole Côte d'Ivoire," fr. 1200
Mask, Ivory Coast (Senufo or Kulango)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A284
Wood, pigment; 13 in.

Figure, Marquesas Islands, Oceania (NOT AFRICAN)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A286
Wood; 14 in.
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 19 "Tiki' des Marquises," fr. 800

Mask, Gabon (Punu)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A282
Wood, pigment; 12 in.
Purchased: December 1922, no. 27 "Masque MPongwe (Congo-Gabon)," 4250 fr.
Published: Photographed by Man Ray, early 1920s
Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 7: "MPongwe mask, XVth century"

Seated male and female figures, Ivory Coast (Baule)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A276
Wood; 14 in.
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 29 "Idole double Côte d'Ivoire," 8,000 fr.

South Wall

In vitrine, top shelf, left to right:

Heddle pulley, Ivory Coast (Baule)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A265
Wood; 4 in.
Purchased: probably July 1923, "Figurine Zouénoüla"

Ivory figure, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Lega)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A264
Ivory; 4 in.

Heddle pulley, Ivory Coast (Guro)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A269
Wood; 7 in.
Purchased: probably July 1923, "Figurine Zouénoüla"
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 4: "Fetish (Upper Ivory Coast, XIth century) and utensils"

Figure, Sierra Leone (Kissi)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A257
Stone; 1 ½ in.
Purchased: Possibly July 1923, "Pierre Kissie (Guinée)" 1,500 fr.
Figure, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Bembe)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A252
Wood; 6 in.
Purchased: December 1922, no. 7 "Petit Sibiti (Congo)," 350 fr.
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 37: "Congo figures; Sibiti, XVIIth century"

Cup, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Kuba)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A253
Wood; 8 in.
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl 34: "Congo cup; Bushongo, XIIIth century"

Tobacco mortar, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Luluwa)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A256
Wood; 6 in.
Purchased: Possibly Summer 1922, no. 26, “Petite Idole Soudan” 300 fr.

Pendant, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Pende)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A259
Ivory; 1 in.
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 3: "Carved utensils," second from left

Heddie pulley, Ivory Coast (Guro)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A258
Wood; 7 in.
Purchased: Probably July 1923, "Figurine Zouenoula"
Published: Opportunity (May 1924): "Zouenouia - 13th century"

Cup, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Kuba)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A255
Ivory; 5 in.
Purchased: December 1922, no. 16 "Statuette Ivoire Bushongo," 3,500 fr.

Cup, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Kuba)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A250
Wood; 6 in.
Purchased: December 1922, no. 2 "Coupe Bushongo," 1500 fr.
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 3: "Carved utensils," second from right

In vitrine, bottom shelf, left to right:

Figure, Gabon (Fang)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A262
Wood
Purchased: December 1922, “Gabon - Pahouins idole,” 8,500 fr.
Figure, Gabon (Kota)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A263
Wood, metal
Purchased: December 1922, no. 29 "Bakoutas (Congo)," 3750 fr.

Male figure, Ivory Coast (Baule)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A267
Wood; 20 in.
Published: Almanach Scientifique (Paris, 1922)
Opportunity (May 1926): 148, "Baoulé - 14th Century"

Mask, Ivory Coast (Baule)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A192
Wood, pigment
Purchased: November 1922, “Masque Côte d’Ivoire,” 4000 fr. (exhibited at Brummer gallery in NY)
Published: International Studio (November 1922): “A ritual mask from the Côte d’Ivoire”

Female figure, Ivory Coast (Baule)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A261
Wood; 17 in.
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 12 “Idole Côte d’Ivoire,” 4000 fr.
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl 25: “Ivory Coast figure, Xith Century”

Figure, Gabon (Kota)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A268
Wood, metal
Purchased: December 1922, no. 21 "Bakoutas," 2,750 fr.

Caryatid stool, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Luba)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A266
Wood

Central Case

Caryatid stool, Zaire (Luba)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A185
Wood
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 27 "Grand Siège Congo," 800 fr.
Published: Almanach Scientifique (Paris, 1922)
Opportunity (1926): “Congo - 17th Century”
Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 33: “Congo figure, supporting table; XVIIth century”
North wall

In vitrine, left to right:

**Male figure, Democratic Republic of the Congo (?)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A251
Wood; 28 in.
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 6: "Congo fetish; Bushongo, Xth century"

**Male figure, Ivory Coast (Senufo)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A254
Wood; 24 ½ in.
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 19: "Sudan-Niger mask (Xth century) and two figures (XIXth century)"

**Female figure with child, Democratic Republic of the Congo (?)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A223
Wood; 24 in.

**Mask, Mali (Bamana or Marka)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A220
[NOTE: This object and the one below are given the same inventory number]
Wood, metal, encrustation; 28 in.
Published: Opportunity (1924): 141; “Soudan-Niger”
The New Negro (1925), 257; “Soudan-Niger”
Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 19: "Sudan-Niger mask (Xth century)"

**Male figure, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Luluwa)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A220
Wood; 27 in.
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 36: "Congo figure; Bushongo-Baluba, XIVth century"
Opportunity (1926): 159 “Bushongo-Baluba, 14th Century”

**Female figure, Ivory Coast (Senufo)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A228
Wood; 24 in.
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 19: "Sudan-Niger mask (Xth century) and two figures (XIXth century)"
Male figure, Ivory Coast (Baule)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A221
Wood; 27 in.
Purchased: possibly November 1922 through Brummer exhibition; "Ivory Coast,"
1,500 fr.
Published: International Studio (November 1922) "A wooden figure of a Baoule
Divinity (Coll. Of Paul Guillaume)"
Opportunity (1924): 138
Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 21: "Ivory Coast figure; Baule, XIVth
century; side view" and pl. 22 "The same, front view"

West wall

In vitrine, top shelf, left to right:

Male figure, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Bembe)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A198
Wood; 7 in.
Purchased: December 1922, no. 6, "Petit Sibiti" 450 fr.
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 37: "Congo figures; Sibiti, XVIIth
century" [far left]

Male figure, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Bembe)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A182
Wood; 4 in.
Purchased: December 1922, no. 8 "Petit Sibiti" 550 fr.
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 37: "Congo figures; Sibiti, XVIIth
century"

Headrest supported by female figure, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Luba)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A187
Wood; 5 in.
Published: Guillaume and Munro, pl. 3: "Carved utensils" [far left]

Spoon with female head, Gabon (Punu)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A183
Wood; 5 in.
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 3: "Carved utensils"[far right]

Heddle pulley with female head, Ivory Coast (Guro)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A180
Wood; 7 ½ in.
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 4 "Figurine Côte d'Ivoire," 900 fr.
Staff top with two heads, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Luba)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A179
Wood; 6 in.
Purchased: Probably summer 1922, no. 22b “Fétiche double Congo,” 100 fr.
Published: Einstein, Negerplastik (1915), pl. 72
deZayas and Sheeler, African Negro Wood Sculpture (1918) two photos
Clouzot and Level, L'Art Nègre et l'Art Océanien (1919), pl. XVI
"Fétiche double, mâle et femelle (Côte d'Ivoire),” listed as collection Paul
Guillaume
Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 4: "Fetish (Upper Ivory Coast) and
utensils"

Female figure, Ivory Coast (Baule)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A199
Wood; approx. 8"
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 7 "Statuette Côte d'Ivoire," 500 fr.

Comb with head, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Yaka)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A173
Wood; 6 in.

Female figure, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Bembe)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A172
Wood; 7 in.
Purchased: December 1922, no. 5 "Petit Sibiti," 290 fr.
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 37: "Congo figures; Sibiti, XVIIth
century" [second from left]

Figure, Democratic Republic of the Congo (possibly Kongo)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A178
Wood; 4 in.

Male figure, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Bembe)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A175
Wood; 6 in.

In vitrine, middle shelf, left to right:

Figure, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Kongo)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A211
Wood; 10 in.
Purchased: Summer 1922, no 16 “Petit dieu Congo” 900 fr.

Divination tapper, Ivory Coast (Baule)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A217
Wood; 10 in.
Mask, Liberia or Ivory Coast (Dan)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A214
Wood; 6 in.

Female figure, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Bembe)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A212
Wood; 6 in.

Male figure, Gabon (Punu)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A195
Wood, pigment; 10 in.

Divination tapper, Ivory Coast (Baule)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A193
Wood; 11 in.
Purchased: December 1922, no. 3 "Marteau musical orné Côte d’Ivoire," 1800 fr.

Male figure, Ivory Coast (Baule)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A191
Wood; 9 in.
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 8 "Statuette Côte d’Ivoire" 300 fr.

Heddie pulley with female head, Ivory Coast (Guro)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A176
Wood; 7 in.
Purchased: Probably July 1923, “Figurine Zouénoula”
Published: Survey Graphic (March 1925): 675 “Zouénoula”

Male figure, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Bembe)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A194
Wood; 10 in.

In vitrine, bottom shelf, left to right:

Figure
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A225
Stone; 8 in.

Mask, Liberia or Ivory Coast (Dan)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A229
Wood; 11 in.
Pendant head, Nigeria (Bini)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A213
Bronze; 4 in.
Purchased: December 1922, no. 18 "Petit masque Bénin," 950 fr.
Published: International Studio (1922): 145 "A mask in black bronze from Benin (collection Bela Hein)"
Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 38: "Benin mask, XVth century"

Female figure, Gabon (Fang or related group)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A226
Wood; 10 in.
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 13 "Divinité des Pahouins" 2,500 fr.

Fork, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Kongo?)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A222
Wood
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926) pl. 3: "Carved Utensils"

Spoon, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Kongo?)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A218
Wood
Published: Guillaume and Munro, pl. 4: "Fetish and utensils"

Female figure, Gabon (Ntumu)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A210
Wood, metal; 12 in.
Published: The Dial (Sept. 1923): "Negro Sculpture (Pahouin), Courtesy of M Paul Guillaume"
Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 13: "Gabon figure; Pahouin VIII - Xth century"

Pendant, Nigeria (possibly Ijebu Yoruba)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A227
Bronze; 4 in.
Published: International Studio (1922): 143 "A Mask in Black Bronze from Benin (collection of A. A. Feder)"

Mask, Liberia or Ivory Coast (Dan/Wee)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A219
Wood, metal, encrustation; 8 in.
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 1: "Ivory Coast mask; Dan, XIIIth Century"

Figure, Liberia (Kissi)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A216
Stone; 4 in.
On wall:

**Figure, Gabon (Kota)**
Wood, metal

**Figure, Gabon (Kota)**
Wood, metal

**Center of room**

**Seated female figure, Ivory Coast (Senufo)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A209
Wood
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 31 “Grande divinité Soudan” 4000 fr.

ROOM 22

**North wall**

In vitrine, top shelf, left to right:

**Female figure, Ivory Coast (Baule)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A136
Wood; 12 in.
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 14 "Idole Côte d'Ivoire" 1,000 fr.

**Mask, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Lega?)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A132
Wood; 9 in.

**Figure, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Teke)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A138
Wood; 11 in.
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 20 "Fétiche Congo"
Published: de Zayas and Sheeler, *African Negro Sculpture* (1918)

**Pendant head, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Pende)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A126
Ivory; 2 in.

**Female bust, Ivory Coast (Baule)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A135
Wood; 12 in.
Published: *Almanach Scientifique* (1922)
*Opportunity* (May 1926): 151 “Baoule 19th Century”
Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 23: “Ivory Coast head; Baule, XIXth Century”
Pendant, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Pende)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A133
Ivory; 1 in.

Female figure, Ivory Coast (Attie/Lagoon area)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A127
Wood; 10 in.
Published: de Zayas and Sheeler African Negro Sculpture (1918)
Guillaume and Munnro (1926), pl. 41: “Guinea figure, XVth Century”

Mask, Liberia or Ivory Coast (Dan)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A279
Wood; 7 in.

Female figure, Ivory Coast (Baule)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A117
Wood; 12 in.
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 6 "Idole Côte d’Ivoire," 1200 fr.

In vitrine, bottom shelf, left to right:

Head, Gabon (Fang)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A150
Wood; 12 in.

Mask, Ivory Coast (Kulango?)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A156
Wood, pigment; 13 in.
Purchased: November 1922 from Brummer exhibition, “Masque Canaque” 1,000 fr.
Published: Opportunity (May 1926): 147, “Kong Empire, 14th Century”

Figure with bell, Gabon (Punu)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A154
Wood, pigment, metal; 14 in.
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 33 "Gabon Figurine Fénéon," 500 fr.

Mask, Ivory Coast (Guro)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A147
Wood, pigment; 13 in.
Published: Opportunity (May 1926): “Toumodi, 12th Century”

Male figure, Ivory Coast (Baule)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A145
Wood; 14 in.
Figure, Republic of Benin (Fon?)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A148
Iron; approx. 14”
Published: Survey Graphic (March 1925): 673, “Dahomey (Bronze)”
Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 39: “Dahomey figure, XVIth century”

Female figure, Mali (Bamana?)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A140
Wood; 16 in.
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 3 “Statue Soudan”
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 14: “Sudan figure, XIth century” and pl. 15, “The same, back view”

Male Figure, Gabon (Fang)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A139
Wood;
Published: Cluzot and Level, Sculptures Africaines et Océaniennes (1923), pl. 24 “Idole pahouine, collection Paul Guillaume”
Guillaume and Munro (1926) pl. 11: “Gabun figure; Pahouin, Xth Century” and pl. 12 “the same, back view”

South wall

On wall, top left:

Mask, Mali (Bamana)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A260
Wood, metal
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 23 “Masque Soudan” 800 fr.
Published: Apollinaire and Guillaume, Sculptures Nègres (1917), pl. 21 “Kénié,” grand fétiche des cultures chez les ‘Tomas’ (Haute-Guinée). Les Tomas lui demandent aussi le succès dans leurs entreprises et la gloire dans les combats”
de Zayas and Sheeler, African Negro Sculpture (1918)
Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 20: “Sudan mask, XVIIIth Century”

bottom left:

Figure, Gabon (Kota)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A202
Wood, metal

top right

Mask, Mali (Bamana)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A101
Wood; 25 in.
bottom right:

**Figure, Gabon (Kota)**
Wood, metal

In vitrine, top shelf, left to right:

**Figure, Ivory Coast (Lagoon area?)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A158
Wood, metal; 11 in.
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 24 "Idole Guinee," 1000 fr.
Published: De Zayas and Sheeler, *African Negro Sculpture* (1918)
Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 40: "Guinea"

**Figure, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Pende)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A105
Ivory; 3 in.

**Mask, Ivory Coast (Yaure)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A141
Wood; 11 in.
Purchased: Possibly Summer 1922, no. 34 "Masque Gouro," 4000 fr.

**Figure, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Lega)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A151
Ivory; 7 in.

**Female figure, Ivory Coast (Baule)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A157
Wood; 12 in.
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 15 "Idole Côte d'Ivoire," 1500 fr.

**Head, Gabon (Fang)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A13
Wood; 11 in.
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 9: "Gabun head; Pahouin" and pl. 10
"the same, side view"

**Figure, Ivory Coast (Baule?)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A139
Wood, beads; 12 in.
Purchased: December 1922, no. 10 "Petite Idole Côte d'Ivoire," 3000 fr.
Published: de Zayas and Sheeler, *African Negro Sculpture* (1918)
Guillaume and Munro, pl. 24: "Ivory Coast figure, XVth Century"

**Figure, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Lega)**
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A163
Ivory; 7 in.
Mask, Ivory Coast (Baule)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A189
Wood; 11 in.
Purchased: December 1922, no. 15 "Masque Côte d'Ivoire," 4800 fr.

Figure, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Pende)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A165
Ivory; 4 in.

Female figure, Mali (Bamana)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A123
Wood; 13 in.
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 10 "Divinité du Soudan," 1500 fr.
Published: Apollinaire and Guillaume, Sculptures Nègres (1917) pl. XX “Statue du Soudan. Collection M. De Vlaminck”

In vitrine, bottom shelf, left to right:

Mask, Liberia or Ivory Coast (Dan)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A110
Wood; 8 in.

Figure, Gabon (Fang)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A144
Wood; 13 in.
Purchased: November 1922 from Brummer exhibition, no. 33 "Gabon Figure" 14,000 fr.

Mask, Ivory Coast (Guro)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A192
Wood, pigment; 12 in.
Published: Opportunity (May 1926): 151 “Zouenoula, 14th Century”

Carved horn, Democratic Republic of the Congo (Kongo?)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A130
Ivory; 13 in.
Published: Opportunity (May 1926): 150 “Mossendjo-Bandjabis. Before 10th century”
Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 4: “Fetish (Upper Ivory Coast, XIIth century) and utensils”

Mask, Ivory Coast (Baule)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A160
Wood; 12 in.
Published: Survey Graphic (March 1925): 673 “Baoule”
The New Negro (1925): 244
Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 27: “Ivory Coast mask; Baule XIVth century”
Der Querschnitt 7, 9 (Sept. 1927): “Neger-Maske (Baoule),”
Seated female figure, Ivory Coast (Senufo)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A196
Wood; 17 in.
Purchased: Summer 1922, no. 2 "Statue Soudan" 300 fr.
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 16: "Sudan figure, XVth Century; side view" and pl. 17 "the same, back view"

Mask, Ivory Coast (Guro)
Barnes Foundation inventory no. A106
Wood, pigment; 12 in.
Published: Survey Graphic (March 1925): "Bushongo"
The New Negro (1925): "Bushongo"
Studio (London) 461 (1931): 118 "Mask from the Ivory Coast. Collection of Paul Guillaume"

In corner of room:

Figure, Ivory Coast?
Wood
Purchased: Possibly Summer 1922, no. 18 "Grande Statue Côte d'Ivoire" 1,500 fr.

Center of room

Seated male and female couple, Mali (Dogon)
Wood
Clouzot and Level, "L'Art des Noirs," La Rénaissance de l'Art Français (1922) fig. 1:1 "Groupe. Soudan"
Survey Graphic (March 1925): 674 "African sculpture"
Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 18: "Sudan-Niger figure; Bobo-Dioulasso, VH-Xth century"
Lem, Sudanese Sculpture (Paris: 1949) pl. 1: "Group, in hard wood with its natural patina. Very ancient carving from the region of Hombori...Funeral group, symbolizing male and female elements"

In hallway of second floor:

Door, Ivory Coast (Baule)
Wood, pigment
Published: Guillaume and Munro (1926), pl. 29 "Ivory Coast temple door"
Opportunity (May 1926): cover

Male figure, Nigeria (Bini)
Bronze
I. Primary Sources

Archives

The Barnes Foundation, Merion, Pennsylvania. Archives of the Barnes Foundation.
Correspondence of Albert C. Barnes with:
  Joseph Brummer (1922, 1925, 1931)
  Paul Cret (1924)
  Stewart Culin (1922, 1923, 1927)
  Paul Guillaume (1922-32)
  Juliet Guillaume (1934, 1938)
  H. U. Hall (1925)
  Earl Horter (1925, 1927, 1929-30, 1934)
  Charles Spurgeon Johnson (1926, 1928-32, 1947)
  Alain Locke (1924)
  Thomas Munro (1924-32, 1936-41, 1944, 1946, 1949-50)
  James Johnson Sweeney (1927-47)
  Carl Van Vechten (1933-38, 1940)
  Forbes Watson (1922-23)

  Culin Archival Collection.
  Records of the Office of the Director (W. H. Fox, 1913-33)
  Records of the Office of the Director (P. N. Yountz, 1933-38)
  Records of the Office of the Registrar, Exhibitions.
  Records of the Office of the Registrar, Accessions (Laura L. Barnes bequest)

  Sketchbook and desiderata of Rene d'Harnoncourt.

The Barbara and Willard Morgan Foundation, Dobbs Ferry, New York.

Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, New York Public Library, New York.

Exhibition Catalogues


Sales Catalogues


Books and Articles


---. "Negro Art and America," *Survey Graphic* 6, no. 6 (March 1925): 668-669.


---. Le Cafard après la Fête ou l'Esthétisme d'Aujourd'hui. Paris: Jean Budry et Cie, 1929.


"Dr. Barnes," Opportunity 2, 17 (May 1924): 133.


"Echos, Notes, Inédits: l'Art Noir," *La Vie* 21 (September 1912).


"Une Exposition d'Art Nègre," *Art et Décoration* 57 (March 1930): supp. 5.


--- and Thomas Munro. La Sculpture Nègre Primitive. 1929.


"Neger-Maske (Baoule)," *Der Querschnitt* 7, 9 (September 1927): np.

"Negro Sculpture (Pahouin)," *The Dial* LXXV, 3 (September 1923): np.


---. "La Collection d'Art Primitif de M.G. de Miré," Arts Vivant 155 (December 1931): 666.


—. "Nos Enquêtes: Entretien avec M. Léonce Rosenberg," *Cahiers-Feuilles Volantes* 6 (1927)

Thilenius, G. "La Technique Museographique des Collections d'Ethnographie (Hambourg)," *Mousseion* 27-28 (1934): 55-123.

Thomas, Trevor. "Artists, Africans and Installations," *Parnassus* 12, 1 and 4 (1940)


II. Secondary Sources


