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MODERNITY AND THE SPACES OF FEMININITY

Investment in the look is not as privileged in women as in men. More than other senses, the eye objectifies and masters. It sets at a distance, and maintains a distance. In our culture the predominance of the look over smell, taste, touch and hearing has brought about an impoverishment of bodily relations. The moment the look dominates, the body loses its materiality.


INTRODUCTION

The schema which decorated the cover of Alfred H. Barr's catalogue for the exhibition Cubism and Abstract Art at the Museum of Modern Art, New York, in 1936 is paradigmatic of the way modern art has been mapped by modernist art history (Figure 3.1). Artistic practices from the late nineteenth century are placed on a chronological flow chart where movement follows movement connected by one-way arrows which indicate influence and reaction. Over each movement a named artist presides. All those canonized as the initiators of modern art are men. Is this because there were no women involved in early modern movements? No. Is it because those who were, were without significance in determining the shape and character of modern art? No. Or is it rather because what modernist art history

celebrates is a selective tradition which normalizes, as the only modernism, a particular and gendered set of practices? I would argue for this explanation. As a result any attempt to deal with artists in the early history of modernism who are women necessitates a deconstruction of the masculinist myths of modernism.5

These are, however, widespread and structure the discourse of many counter-modernists, for instance in the social history of art. The recent publication The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and his Followers, by T.J. Clark, offers a searching account of the social relations between the emergence of new protocols and criteria for painting—modernism—and the myths of modernity shaped in and by the new city of Paris remade by capitalism during the Second Empire. Going beyond the commonplace about a desire to be contemporary in art, ‘il faut être de son temps’, Clark puzzles at what structured the notions of modernity which became the territory for Manet and his followers. He thus indexes the impressionist painting practices to a complex set of negotiations of the ambiguous and baffling class formations and class identifications which emerged in Parisian society. Modernity is presented as far more than a sense of being ‘up to date’—modernity is a matter of representations and major myths—of a new Paris for recreation, leisure and pleasure, of nature to be enjoyed at weekends in suburbia, of the prostitute taking over and of fluidity of class in the popular spaces of entertainment. The key markers in this mythic territory are leisure, consumption, the spectacle and money. And we can reconstruct from Clark a map of impressionist territory which stretches from the new boulevards via Gare St Lazare out on the suburban train to La Grenouillère, Bougival or Argenteuil. In these sites, the artists lived, worked and pictured themselves5 (Figure 3.2). But in two of the four chapters of Clark’s book, he deals with the problematic of sexuality in bourgeois Paris and the canonical paintings are Olympia (1863,

Figure 3.2 Gustave Caillebotte Paris, a rainy day (1877)

Paris, Musée du Louvre) and A bar at the Folies-Bergère (1881–2, London, Courtauld Institute of Art) (Figure 3.3).

It is a mighty but flawed argument on many levels but here I wish to attend to its peculiar closures on the issue of sexuality. For Clark the founding fact is class. Olympia’s nakedness inscribes her class and thus debunks the mythic classlessness of sex epitomized in the image of the courtesan.6 The fashionably blasé barmad at the Folies evades a fixed identity as either bourgeois or proletarian but none the less participates in the play around class that constituted the myth and appeal of the popular.7

Although Clark nods in the direction of feminism by acknowledging that these paintings imply a masculine viewer/consumer, the manner in which this is done ensures the normalcy of that position leaving it below the threshold of historical investigation and theoretical analysis.8 To recognize the gender
specific conditions of these paintings’ existence one need only imagine a female spectator and a female producer of the works. How can a woman relate to the viewing positions proposed by either of these paintings? Can a woman be offered, in order to be denied, imaginary possession of Olympia or the barmaid? Would a woman of Manet’s class have a familiarity with either of these spaces and its exchanges which could be evoked so that the painting’s modernist job of negation and disruption could be effective? Could Berthe Morisot have gone to such a location to canvass the subject? Would it enter her head as a site of modernity as she experienced it? Could she as a woman experience modernity as Clark defines it at all?*

* While accepting that paintings such as Olympia and A bar at the Folies-Bergère come from a tradition which invokes the spectator as masculine, it is necessary to acknowledge the way in which a feminine spectator is actually implied by these paintings. Surely one part of the shock, of the transgression effected by the painting Olympia for its first viewers at the Paris Salon was the presence of that ‘brazen’ but cool look from the white woman on a bed attended by a black maid in a space in which women, or to be historically precise bourgeois ladies, would be presumed to be present. That look, so overtly passing between a seller of woman’s body and a client/viewer signified the commercial and sexual exchanges specific to a part of the public realm which should be invisible to ladies. Furthermore its absence from their consciousness structured their identities as ladies. In some of his writings T. J. Clark correctly discusses the meanings of the sign woman in the nineteenth century as oscillating between two poles of the fille publique (woman of the streets) and the femme honnête (the respectable married woman). But it would seem that the exhibition of Olympia precisely confounds that social and ideological distance between two imaginary poles and forces the one to confront the other in that part of the public realm where ladies do go – still within the frontiers of femininity. The presence of this painting in the Salon – not because it is a nude but because it displaces the mythological costume or anecdote through which prostitution was represented mythically through the courtesan – transgresses the line on my grid derived from Baudelaire’s text, introducing not just modernity as a manner of painting a pressing contemporary theme, but the spaces of modernity into a social territory of the bourgeois, the Salon, where viewing such an image is quite shocking because of the presence of wives, sisters and daughters. The understanding of the shock depends upon our restoration of the female spectator to her historical and social place.
hierarchy. They are historical simultaneities and mutually
inflecting.

So we must enquire why the territory of modernism so often is
a way of dealing with masculine sexuality and its sign, the bodies
of women — why the nude, the brothel, the bar? What relation is
there between sexuality, modernity and modernism. If it is nor-
tmal to see paintings of women’s bodies as the territory across
which men artists claim their modernity and compete for leader-
ship of the avant-garde, can we expect to rediscover paintings by
women in which they battled with their sexuality in the represen-
tation of the male nude? Of course not; the very suggestion seems
ludicrous. But why? Because there is a historical asymmetry — a
difference socially, economically, subjectively between being a
woman and being a man in Paris in the late nineteenth century.
This difference — the product of the social structuration of
sexual difference and not any imaginary biological distinction —
determined both what and how men and women painted.

I have long been interested in the work of Berthe Morisot
(1841–96) and Mary Cassatt (1844–1926), two of the four
women who were actively involved with the impressionist
exhibiting society in Paris in the 1870s and 1880s who were
regarded by their contemporaries as important members of the
artistic group we now label the Impressionists.9 But how are we
to study the work of artists who are women so that we can
discover and account for the specificity of what they produced as
individuals while also recognizing that, as women, they worked
from different positions and experiences from those of their
colleagues who were men?

Analysing the activities of women who were artists cannot
merely involve mapping women on to existing schemata even
those which claim to consider the production of art socially and
address the centrality of sexuality. We cannot ignore the fact that
the terrains of artistic practice and of art history are structured in
and structuring of gender power relations.

As Roszika Parker and I argued in Old Mistresses: Women, Art and
Ideology (1981), feminist art history has a double project. The
historical recovery of data about women producers of art co-
exists with and is only critically possible through a concomitant
deconstruction of the discourses and practices of art history
itself.

Historical recovery of women who were artists is a prime
necessity because of the consistent obliteration of their activity
in what passes for art history. We have to refute the lies that there
were no women artists, or that the women artists who are admit-
ted are second-rate and that the reason for their indifference lies
in the all-pervasive submission to an indelible femininity —
always proposed as unquestionably a disability in making art.
But alone historical recovery is insufficient. What sense are we to
make of information without a theorized framework through
which to discern the particularity of women’s work? This is
itself a complicated issue. To avoid the embrace of the feminine
stereotype which homogenizes women’s work as determined by
natural gender, we must stress the heterogeneity of women’s art
work, the specificity of individual producers and products. Yet
we have to recognize what women share — as a result of nurture
not nature, i.e. the historically variable social systems which
produce sexual differentiation.

This leads to a major aspect of the feminist project, the
theorization and historical analysis of sexual difference. Differ-
eece is not essential but understood as a social structure which
positions male and female people asymmetrically in relation to
language, to social and economic power and to meaning. Feminist analysis undermines one bias of patriarchal power by
refuting the myths of universal or general meaning. Sexuality,
modernity or modernism cannot function as given categories to
which we add women. That only identifies a partial and mascu-
line viewpoint with the norm and confirms women as other and
subsidiary. Sexuality, modernism or modernity are organized by
and organizations of sexual difference. To perceive women’s specificity is to analyse historically a particular configuration of difference.

This is my project here. How do the socially contrived orders of sexual difference structure the lives of Mary Cassatt and Berthe Morisot? How did that structure what they produced? The matrix I shall consider here is that of space.

Space can be grasped in several dimensions. The first refers us to spaces as locations. What spaces are represented in the paintings made by Berthe Morisot and Mary Cassatt? And what are not? A quick list includes:

- dining-rooms
- drawing-rooms
- bedrooms
- balconies/verandas
- private gardens (See Figures 3.4–3.11.)

The majority of these have to be recognized as examples of private areas or domestic space. But there are paintings located in the public domain, scenes for instance of promenading, driving in the park, being at the theatre, boating. They are the spaces of bourgeois recreation, display and those social rituals which constituted polite society, or Society, *Le Monde*. In the case of Mary Cassatt’s work, spaces of labour are included, especially those involving child care (Figure 3.10). In several examples, they make visible aspects of working-class women’s labour within the bourgeois home.

I have previously argued that engagement with the impressionist group was attractive to some women precisely because subjects dealing with domestic social life hitherto relegated as mere genre painting were legitimized as central topics of the painting practices. On closer examination it is much more significant how little of typical impressionist iconography actually reappears in the works made by artists who are women. They do not represent the territory which their colleagues who were men so freely occupied and made use of in their works, for instance bars, cafés, backstage and even those places which Clark has seen as participating in the myth of the popular – such as the bar at the Folies-Bergère or even the Moulin de la Galette. A
range of places and subjects was closed to them while open to their male colleagues who could move freely with men and women in the socially fluid public world of the streets, popular entertainment and commercial or casual sexual exchange.

The second dimension in which the issue of space can be addressed is that of the spatial order within paintings. Playing

with spatial structures was one of the defining features of early modernist painting in Paris, be it Manet’s witty and calculated play upon flatness or Degas’s use of acute angles of vision, varying viewpoints and cryptic framing devices. With their close personal contacts with both artists, Morisot and Cassatt were no doubt party to the conversations out of which these strategies emerged and equally subject to the less conscious social forces which may well have conditioned the predisposition to explore spatial ambiguities and metaphors. Yet although there are examples of their using similar tactics, I would like to suggest that spatial devices in the work of Morisot and Cassatt work to a wholly different effect.

A remarkable feature in the spatial arrangements in paintings by Morisot is the juxtaposition on a single canvas of two spatial systems – or at least of two compartments of space often obviously boundaried by some device such as a balustrade, balcony, veranda or embankment whose presence is underscored.
Figure 3.7 Mary Cassatt Young girl at window (1883)

Figure 3.8 Mary Cassatt Lydia seated at an embroidery frame (c. 1881)

Figure 3.9 Mary Cassatt Lydia crocheting in the garden at Marly (1880)
by fracture. In The harbour at Lorient, 1869 (Figure 3.12), Morisot offers us at the left a landscape view down the estuary represented in traditional perspective while in one corner, shaped by the boundary of the embankment, the main figure is seated at an