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Without clear articulation of their insights, except in painted copies of and citations from his works, various modern artist seem to have recognised that formally El Greco’s late paintings are mental constructs, representing only a schematic version of reality. El Greco changed the communicative function of painting from commenting on reality to constituting a reality. It is proposed that modern artists in a quest for a new approach to painting found El Greco’s unprecedented manner of figural expression, extreme degree of anti-naturalism and compositional abstraction a source of inspiration. For various painters that may have been a starting point in finding a new paradigm for art that was at a loose end after the influence of disciples of the French Academy terminated.
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The reason why artists emulate, imitate, quote or copy works by their peers is not merely for the sake of delight as Aristotle maintained, but also to learn about their craft and explore aspects of the history of art. However, not all artists of the past were or are copied in modern times. Therefore, the fact that El Greco (1541-1614), educated as a Byzantine icon painter in his Cretan youth, who migrated to Venice at the age of circa 25, thereafter to Rome, Madrid, and ultimately to Toledo, has received renewed attention, not only from various art historians but also from individual painters during the late nineteenth, throughout the twentieth and also now in the twenty-first century, is worthy of art historical research.1

In a rather remarkable assessment of El Greco, Robert Byron (1964: 38) writes, without further motivation: “In painting, the culminating Byzantine, El Greco, communicated his colour to Vélazquez and [was] a fount of inspiration to the twentieth century.” Byron certainly overstates El Greco’s influence. His categorization of El Greco as the culminating Byzantine painter is not viable and, furthermore, it is difficult to believe that Byzantine painting could have been a source of inspiration for twentieth-century painters. A more accurate assessment of El Greco as a mediator is attempted in this paper, especially regarding the way in which individual modernist painters explored his manner of painting for their own varied purposes, or, conceivably, were commonly in search of a paradigmatic change of style, most probably as a means of escape from the long valid paradigm of naturalistic art.

El Greco produced his most characteristic paintings in Spain from 1578 until his death. He cannot be characterised solely as a religious painter with his roots in Greek Orthodoxy. His oeuvre is varied and includes many secular themes such as landscape and portraiture. During his
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later years he expressed neither the ideals of Western painting, which he laboriously learned in
Italy from 1568 to 1567, nor those of the Byzantine school in which he was educated during his
youth; he achieved an art anchored not in nature but in a worldview initiated by contemporary
philosophers such as Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463-94), Giordano Bruno (1548-1600) and
Tomasso Campanella (1568-1639). While proof cannot be offered that El Greco had read works
by these philosophers, he was nevertheless an educated man, an intellectual in possession of an
extensive library, who would not have been ignorant of contemporary ideas, even in the relative
isolation of Spain. He may not have been informed about the “heretical” ideas of Galileo Galilei
(1564-1642), but he was certainly not ignorant of the Copernican revolution and the demise of
Aristotelian physics. The most acceptable thesis concerning his manner of visual expression
was proposed by David Davies (1990), that in Italy and Spain he followed in the tradition of
Renaissance Neoplatonism. In Rome El Greco became a member of the Academia di San Luca
founded by Federico Zuccaro (1542-1609), who was the president of this painter’s guild at the
time. Hence, El Greco was exposed to Zuccaro’s theories on art, especially his reinterpretation
of the meaning of *disegno*. Zuccaro believed that the term originated from the phrase *segno di
dio in noi*, or “the sign of God in us”, indicating that those skilled in drawing were divinely
inspired. The understanding of reality changed from what can be perceived in the physical world
to what could be conceived in the mind. This late Italian Renaissance development of art theory
influenced El Greco profoundly. In Spain he achieved a manner of painting in which physical
reality was rendered only schematically or omitted completely, while his elongated figures
deviated greatly from anatomical correctness. In his mature works, such as the two versions
of the *Baptism of Christ* (1596-1600 and 1608) the representation of earthly reality becomes
schematised. Thus, near the end of the sixteenth century El Greco turned painting into a mental
construct. After his death his manner of expression (ie *maniera*) was lost on the art world, but
recovered as a valid manner of expression centuries later. Therefore, as Aldous Huxley (1950:
86) remarks, “Not long ago the mysterious Greek was considered a simple lunatic. Now he
appears a giant in art, the forerunner of modern painters.” Why this incredible re-assessment of
his role as a mediator of modern painting? It is as if El Greco achieved a preview of Immanuel
Kant’s so-called “Copernican revolution”, explained by Tsion Avital (2003: 33): “It is not reality
that stamps itself upon the mind but on the contrary, schematism, and organizational categories
that are innate or inherent to reason, are what construct our knowledge and reality.” And one
may add: are what influence all enduring forms of art.

Pacheco (1956), the sixteenth-century Spanish art critic, was right in saying that El Greco
had no imitators, and art historians would agree that no artist ever imitated his characteristic
manner of painting which evolved during his later years. Most probably he had no imitators
during the centuries following his death, with the possible exception of Vélazquez who was
aware of his predecessor’s art. The reason is that naturalism remained the norm in Western
painting until the early decades of the twentieth century. Then the mostly forgotten painter,
often maligned as a madman with an eye problem emerged from obscurity. His fame grew
to the extent that his *Burial of the Count of Orgaz* (figure 4), is now ranked, together with the
*Dos de Mayo* (Madrid, Prado) by Goya and *Las meniñas* (Madrid, Prado) by Vélazquez, as
one of the three greatest Spanish paintings. Several retrospective exhibitions and conferences
in El Greco’s honour have been held in the late twentieth century and the early years of this
century, while art historians have devoted thousand of publications to interpret his “enigmatic”
paintings.

The question at issue here is why various modern artists copied paintings by El Greco, or
quoted various details from them. Copies by Paul Cézanne and Jackson Pollock are known,
while the fact that Pablo Picasso based his most experimental Cubist work on the structure of an
El Greco painting is also now generally acknowledged. Other artists discussed here may come as a surprise to readers.

As a matter of routine late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century artists, like their predecessors through the ages, made copies of masterworks. In Italy, before El Greco’s arrival, Renaissance painters could, in addition to studying nature, could study finished works of art, especially sculpture. Leon-Battista Alberti (1404-72) understood that studying living bodies could tax artists’ patience, whereas works of art stood still. He stated:

If perhaps you prefer to copy the work of others, because they have more patience with you than living things, it would please me more to [have you] copy a mediocre sculpture than an excellent painting. Nothing more can be acquired from paintings but the knowledge of how to imitate the; from sculpture you will learn to imitate it and how to recognize and draw the lights (Alberti 1969: 94-5).

According to Alberti painting should be mediated by copying from sculpture. A generation later Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519) refutes this idea by declaring that the painter will produce pictures of little merit if he takes the works of others as his standard; but if he will apply himself to learn from the objects of nature he will produce good results. This we see was the case with the painters who came after the time of the Romans, for they continually imitated each other, and from age to age their art steadily declined (Leonardo 1923: 164).

Copying is “understood as the intentional reproduction of a work of art either immediately or at some remove in time” (Ridgway 1989: 15), a practice that has presently become controversial. The intent behind this varies from artist to artist. In early youth it could be part of artists’ education and training, that is emulation – using models to guide students’ initial efforts until they have mastered their craft. Later in artists’ careers emulation of a model should amount to recreating an existing work on their own terms.

While El Greco learnt his craft by copying works by Italian Renaissance artists, no artist would be able to learn to draw in a traditional naturalistic way by copying his later paintings. On the other hand, it is not strange that young twentieth-century artists, in a quest for a new approach to art, would find of El Greco’s unprecedented manner of figural expression, extreme degree of anti-naturalism and compositional abstraction a source of inspiration, since modern artists began to seek a divergence from, as John Richardson (1995: 130-31) so succinctly puts it, “the principled march of reason, from baroque classicism through the neoclassical manner of Jacques Louis David and his disciples in the Academy”. It is also notable that, as A.C. Sewter (1950: 33) explains, that

A relationship always exists between the critical appreciation of the older masters and contemporary creative work. The period which saw the sudden and impressive rise to popularity of El Greco was the period 1908-1920 (1908 was the year when Cossio’s biography, the foundation of all modern criticism of him was published and the year of Meier-Graefe’s Spanish Journey).

The early twentieth century art scene was dominated by formalistic critics, most notably Roger Fry who appreciated El Greco for the formal qualities of his paintings. On the occasion of the National Gallery’s acquisition of El Greco’s Agony in the Garden in 1920 Roger Fry wrote an essay on the artist in The Athenaeum, subsequently reprinted in his volume Vision and Design, in which his assessment of El Greco’s impact on modernist artists is purely in terms of formal qualities. He avers that “very few artists of today have ever realised for a moment how unsympathetic to them is the literary content of an El Greco. They simply fail to notice what the pictures are about in the illustrative sense” (Fry 1920: 169). Ironically, this could well be true because in the investigation of works by artists who found El Greco worthy of emulation it appears that his “literary content”, which Fry refers to, is changed. What was religious in the master’s works is secularised or even profaned, as will be noted later in the discussion.
Diego Vélazquez (1600-1660) and Francis Bacon (1909-92), via El Greco

El Greco’s *Cardinal Niño de Guevara* (figure 1) clearly influenced Diego Vélazquez when he painted the *Portrait of Pope Innocent X*. In his turn, Francis Bacon was fascinated by Vélazquez’s *Portrait of Pope Innocent X*. As proof of this fascination Bacon collected reproductions of the *Portrait*. In this regard Martin Harrison (2005: 14) quoted Bacon as saying in the early 1970s: “I became obsessed by this painting and I bought photograph after photograph of it. I think really that it was my first subject.”
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*Figure 1*

*El Greco, Cardinal Niño de Guevara, circa 1600, oil on canvas, 170.8 x 108 cm, New York, H.O. Havemeyer Collection, The Metropolitan Museum of Art (source: free internet).*
Bacon may not have known about Vélazquez’s admiration for El Greco, but Harrison (2005: 61) nevertheless makes an insightful remark about Bacon’s interest in El Greco:

Although Bacon’s radical transformation stood outside the tradition of artists learning by imitating masters, he was not the first to paraphrase Old Master paintings. In February 1939 several artists of his acquaintance participated in “An Exhibition of Paraphrases (Free Copies)” at the Storrans Gallery, 5 Albany Court Yard, London... [But] probably of more significance for Bacon was Graham Sutherland’s painting based on El Greco’s *Agony in the Garden*: if Bacon missed the exhibition, he had many opportunities to see the Sutherland.

Harrison unfortunately does not motivate why Sutherland’s version of the El Greco painting would have been important to Bacon.
It has been noted that Gustave Courbet, when he decided to study painting instead of law, learned by copying the pictures of master artists (Pioch 2009). All the mourners’ portrait heads in Courbet’s painting of *A Burial at Ornans* (figure 5) are on one line, like in El Greco’s *Burial of the Count of Orgaz* (figure 4). The mood of the painting is, unlike, El Greco’s masterwork, completely secular, but nevertheless dignified, sombre and appropriate to the occasion.
Figure 4
El Greco, *Burial of the Count of Orgaz*, 1506-8, oil on canvas, 480 x 360 cm, Toledo, Santo Tomé (source: free internet).

Figure 5
Édouard Manet (1832-83)

Alain de Leiris (1981: 97) refers the critic Thoré who noted the resemblance of Édouard Manet’s *Dead Christ with Angels* which clearly quotes El Greco’s *Pietà*.

The most precise reference to El Greco was made by the critic Thoré in 1964 in his comments upon Manet’s *Dead Christ with Angels* exhibited that year: “In his second painting, the Dead Christ, he has imitated another Spanish master, El Greco, with equal intensity, no doubt as a sort of gibe at the bashful admirers of discreet and tidy painting.” ... Thoré associated the untidy technique and supernatural colors with El Greco, suggesting their revolutionary and unsettling impact on Manet’s public.

De Leiris (1981: 95) formulates Manet’s dialogue with Spanish art as more positive than Thoré:

The composition and the form of Édouard Manet’s painting *le Bal à l’Opera* [figure 6] show evidence of having been based in part on El Greco’s solemn painting *The Burial of the Count Orgaz*. This evidence affirms Manet’s continuing interest in Spanish art in the 1870s, at the height of his personal “impressionist” mode, and invites a new evaluation of Manet’s response to the art of El Greco. The artist’s debt to Velazquez and Goya is firmly established, but the possible ties with El Greco, when acknowledged, have been discussed only in general terms. In *Opéra Ball* these ties are specific. The painting portrays an event of Manet’s time but it is also an homage to El Greco. ...
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Édouard Manet, *The Ball at the Opera*, 1873, oil on canvas, 71 x 90 cm, New York, private collection (source: free internet).

Both the *Opera* and the *Burial* present a contemporary crowd in a frieze arrangement, incorporating a great number of male figures, many of whom, if not all, are portraits. Both artists exploit the colour accent of the black dress of the standing men.

Besides other remarkable correspondences in Manet’s *The Ball at the Opera* (figure 6), all the male portrait heads in Manet’s painting are on one line, like in the *Burial of the Count of Orgaz* (figure 4). That is actually where the visual citation ends. Fry’s note about content is entirely appropriate in this regard, that “very few artists of today have ever realised for a moment how unsympathetic to them is the literary content of an El Greco”. In a straightforward assessment Julius Meier-Graefe called it a *Fleishbörse* [a flesh market]. And the same comment is valid in
regard to Manet’s, *Music in the Tuileries Garden* (figure 7) in which the portrait heads are also in one line on the same height.

It is as if Courbet and Manet followed the shrewd advice Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723-92) gave to his students, to take hints from ancient masters and employ them “in a situation totally different from that in which they were originally employed”.13
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**Figure 7**

**Hilaire-Germain-Edgar Degas (1834-1917)**

Judd Tully (1997: 88) briefly summarises Edgar Degas’ collection that was exhibited at the Metropolitan Museum, New York, from 1 October 1997 to 11 January 1998, under the title “The Private Collection of Edgar Degas”:

> Collectionneur instatiable. Degas était prêt à tous les sacrifices pour acquérir une œuvre qui lui tenait à cœur. Le Metropolitan Museum de New York expose les trésors amassés par le peintre: nombre de ses contemporains, tels Cézanne; Gauguin, Van Gogh, Manet, mais aussi le Greco, Ingres et Delacroix.

Notably, Degas’s collection included two El Greco paintings, a small replica of *Saint Idelfonso*14 and according to José Alvarez Lopera (1987: 55) he also possessed a portrait of *Santo Domingo de Guzman*, “que había pertenecido a Millet”. It is therefore reasonable to infer that Degas had studied works by El Greco and found a detail of a figure stoning St. Stephan in the *Burial of the Count of Orgaz* (figure 4) that more or less conformed to his early style and inserted it into a work entitled *Young Spartans Exercising* (figure 8).

Degas graciously acknowledged his debt to the “great masters” in a statement quoted by Irving Lavin (1985: 100): “There is no art less spontaneous than mine. What I do is the result of reflection and study of the great masters: of inspiration, of spontaneity, of temperament, I know nothing.”

141
Figure 8

Figure 9
El Greco, detail of figure 4.
Paul Cézanne (1839-1906)

According to Alvarez Lopera (1987: 55) Cézanne’s rather unremarkable copy of El Greco’s *Portrait of a Woman with an Ermine Shawl* (figures 10 and 11) was based on an engraving he saw in the *Magazin Pittoresque* (date unknown). Other references to El Greco need to be inferred. However, it could well be that Cézanne was acquainted with El Greco’s *View of Toledo* (figure 12). He famously said that he wants to do the master works over from nature, but at the same time, “Cézanne apprende del Greco su abstracción cromática” (Alvarez Lopera 1987: 55). Also in his *Bathers* (figure 13) there is a feint echo of El Greco’s *Opening of the Fifth Seal* (figure 14) that would later influence Picasso profoundly.

Figure 10

*El Greco, Portrait of a Woman with an Ermine Shawl [Dama del armiño], late 1570s, oil on canvas, 62.5 x 58.9 cm, Glasgow Museums, Art Gallery & Museums Kelvingrove, The Stirling Maxwell collection, Pollock House* (source: free internet).
Figure 11
Paul Cézanne, Copy of *Portrait of a Woman* [*La femme au sao*], 1883, Collection Pellerin (source: free internet).

Figure 12
El Greco, *View of Toledo*, circa 1597-9, oil on canvas, 121.3 x 108.6 cm, H.O. Havermeyer Collection, New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art (source: free internet).
Jens Ferdinand Willumsen (1863-1958)

The influence of El Greco on Willumsen, a Danish artist who’s oeuvre evolved from Symbolism to Expressionism is described briefly on the Willumsen Museum website: “I det følgende årti fik Willumsens rejser i Middelhavslandene stor betydning sammen med hans studier af malerierne af den grææsk-spanske kunstner El Greco (1541-1614).”

At the Musée d’Orsay a retrospective exhibition (27 June to 17 September 2006) was held of Willumsen’s artistic output, entitled “Willumsen: Du Symbolisme à Expressionnisme”, in the catalogue of which it is stated under the heading “L’influence du Greco”:

Au début des années 1920 l’art de Willumsen connoit un tournant décisif avec la découverte du Greco, auquel d’ailleurs le peintre consacera un ouvrage en 1927. Les couleurs s’intensifient, les contrastes se renforcent; a lumière se dramatise, les figures se distordent, aboutissant aux effets théâtraux extrêmes de la Soupe du soir, mettant en scène in seconde épouse et les deux filles de l’artiste, ou encore des vues nocturnes de Venise réalisées dans les années 1930.
Oscar Kokoschka (1886-1980)

Edith Hoffman (1947: 20) remarks that landscapes by Kokoschka recall El Greco’s View of Toledo (figure 12) and that his figural art also shows an acquaintance with his paintings:

Kokoschka may be said to have something of the spirit of the Old Master, who was incidentally greatly admired by the Expressionists: the temperament and emotionalism that distinguished El Greco are also characteristic of Kokoschka, and Kokoschka has the same power of animating a natural scene as well as a human figure with the passions that fill his own mind.

Hoffman’s insight, stressing El Greco’s emotionalism is the exact opposite of Fry’s belief that only the form of his paintings was relevant to modernists.

Pablo Picasso (1881-1973)

Picasso’s passion for El Greco is explained by Richardson (1987: 42). This passion dated back to 1897,

his sixteenth year, when he had gone to study at the Royal Academy of San Fernando in Madrid. ... Picasso produced very little work during his nine months in Madrid, but he painted at least one copy of El Greco: a portrait. ... The fact that El Greco was still perceived by most of the art establishment in Spain as a freak or madman only increased Picasso’s enthusiasm for the artist. In this spirit he went to Toledo to copy the Burial of the Count Orgaz, but contempt for his teachers prevailed over admiration for the master. After first identifying the old master with his father, Picasso evidently came to identify El Greco with himself. No wonder his work of 1899 ... includes so many pastiches of El Greco’s portraits.

Proof of Richardson’s explanation is a burial scene of a childhood friend (not found for reproduction) by the youthful Picasso in which emulated El Greco’s Burial of the Count of Orgaz. Then, at the midpoint of his career, Picasso, in 1907, once again turned to El Greco for inspiration. John Golding (2001: 19-20) explains El Greco’s influence on Picasso’s most innovative work, Les demoiselles d’Avignon (figure 14), announces a change of style:

The relevance of a particular El Greco, The Vision of Saint John (now in the Metropolitan Museum, New York [figure 15]), known until recently as The Seventh (sic!) Seal (and to Picasso himself probably and most importantly as Profane Love) was first pointed out by Ron Johnson in 1980 and then elaborated on, at the same time and entirely independent by Rolf Laessoe and, in even greater depth, by John Richardson. The affinities between this El Greco and the Demoiselles are so striking, not only at a multiplicity of visual levels, but also spiritually and psychologically, that it is hard not to believe that Picasso began the actual execution of the Demoiselles under its direct stimulus. Picasso had known and consulted El Greco’s work for some time past, and he had almost certainly often seen this particular work, which belonged to the Spanish painter Zuloago, then resident in Paris. But as so often with Picasso, revelation seems to have struck at precisely the appropriate moment, and maybe this faculty is one of the attributes of true genius. It is hard to see much of El Greco in the surrounding studies. The presence of this singularly apocalyptic El Greco behind the Demoiselles helps to explain why Breton, for one, viewed the painting of the interior of a whorehouse as a mystical experience.

Bülent Atalay (2006: 93) has the following interpretation about Picasso’s change of style and his view of women: “Picasso’s celebrated Les Demoiselles d’Avignon represents an abstract look at women, reflecting the essence of their appearance.” One may comment that Picasso certainly presented the viewer with an abstraction of female figures that is reminiscent of El Greco’s influence, but the statement that the figures in the whorehouse reflect the “essence” of women’s appearance cannot be sustained, because the essence of women is certainly not to resemble distorted prostitutes. Breton’s viewing of the painting of the interior of a whorehouse as a “mystical experience” is also suspect, since carnal indulgence in sex for sale and the spirituality of mysticism are not on par.
With the influence of African masks, blended with El Greco’s elongated resurrected figures, Picasso’s painting is a baffling visual experience. It also leaves the art historian with the unsurmountable problem of interpreting the distorted figures in the whorehouse as evidence of the psychological view of women. Nevertheless he created a painting that is rated as a key work of modernism.

Figure 14
Pablo Picasso, Les demoiselles d’Avignon, 1907, oil on canvas, 234.9 x 233.7 cm, New York, Museum of Modern Art (source: free internet).

What was noted about Manet’s citation of a stylistic device from El Greco is also true about the way in which Picasso turned his reference to an apocalyptic scene into what Meier-Graefe would also have called a Fleishbörse. Intuitively he followed the advice (quoted above) that Reynolds gave his students. The echo of El Greco’s religious work in which naked bodies are resurrected and clothed in pure white garments in Picasso’s most banal presentation of a whorehouse in which naked bodies seem to change into demonised masked figures is rather remarkable. If there is some mystical element present in Les demoiselles d’Avignon it is the
potential of El Greco’s model as “a vehicle for ... mystic nihilism”, according to Richardson (1987: 41). No doubt, the transmogrification of El Greco’s sublime work was meant as a form of homage to the innovative sixteenth century master.

Figure 15

Jackson Pollock (1912-56)

In the anteroom to the El Greco exhibition in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, 7 October 2003 to 11 January 2004, Jackson Pollock’s copies of the master’s works were featured in the adjacent Robert Wood Johnson, Jr. Gallery. Philippo de Montebello, Director of the Museum stated: “The work of El Greco was decried for its extravagance until 19th-century Romantics and such artists as Vincent van Gogh and Paul Gauguin renewed an emphasis on individual expression. More recently. El Greco exerted a profound influence on major proponents of 20th-century modernism, including Jackson Pollock, who, three centuries after
the Spanish Mannerist’s death, was so moved as to have made drawings after the great master.”16 The reason for Pollock’s fascination with works by El Greco that the young artist viewed in American collections since 1937 is explained by Albert Boime (2003: 443) as an understanding of freedom of expression: “Lo que había empezado como expresión de triunfo del espíritu sobre la fuerza bruta terminó siendo un ejemplo de la liberación del espíritu de la esclavitud de todas las limitaciones quo uno se impone a sí mismo, ya dean físicas o de cualquier otro tipo.”

Conclusion

Having reviewed the art historians’ survey of a selection of modern artists’ fascination with El Greco, the information gathered still raises the question: why was El Greco a source of inspiration to them? If Byron’s assessment of El Greco (quoted at the beginning of this paper) is unacceptable, the question remains, how one may assess El Greco’s “influence” on modernism more convincingly. No doubt, El Greco’s oeuvre has become “canonical”, a term that Anita Silvers (1991: 211) explains:

No artwork [oeuvre] attains canonical status totally independently of its ability to inspire enduring aesthetic admiration. No one can know at a work’s [oeuvre’s] point of origin, before it has had time to demonstrate its influence, whether it possesses this power.

Independent assessments of El Greco’s influence attest to the “power” of his oeuvre. The aesthetic admiration that Silvers refers to lapsed after El Greco’s death; he only found a new audience during the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century. “Modern” traits such as the expressive distortion of forms were recognised in El Greco’s work which redeemed the traditional view of him as “a madman”. Thus H.L.C. Jaffé (1953: 122) argues: “Inderdaad zijn vele van de kenmerken, die Greco’s werk ... kenmerken, in de moderne kunst weer te vinden, en wel juist in die jaren omstreeks 1908... .” It seems that twentieth-century artists who realised that the naturalistic paradigm in painting had run its course and were seeking for a renewal sensed or intuitively understood that El Greco’s late paintings offered a point of departure for renewal. Whether they were successful is a moot point. Most notably, Arnold Whittick (1971: 147) asks: “Are the abstract patterns of modern artists more symbols of inner reality or of the artist’s personality than the chiaroscuro of Leonardo da Vinci or Rembrandt or the rhythms of Rubens or El Greco?” And replies: “The best works of these masters have generally a higher abstract value than the works of modern masters.”

Karsten Harries (1968: 66-7) claims that modern art tends towards “silence” and “hermetism”, towards “privacy and incomprehensibility”. Insights into the dilemma of modern artists abound, but what is least explained is why abstract art took centre stage for a long time in the West during the twentieth century. According to Avital (2003) this trend in modern art lead to the dead end of, not incomprehensible, but meaningless “non-art”. Therefore, one may argue that to redeem the confusion of all the -isms generated by modern painters and the lack of content of abstract art, some artists turned their gaze at the masters of previous centuries. With the exception of Wassily Kandinsky (1866-1944) who strived to achieve the “spiritual” in abstract compositions – not in explicit religious themes – abstract artists never clearly articulated what they were searching for.

Without clear articulation of their insights, except in painted copies and quotations from his works, various modern artist seem to have recognised that formally El Greco’s late paintings are mental constructs, representing a schematic version of reality. So doing El Greco changed the communicative function of painting from commenting on reality to constituting a reality.
For various artists that may have been a starting point in finding a new paradigm for art that was at a loose end after the influence of disciples of the French Academy terminated.17

Notes
1. In Spain the influence of El Greco on twentieth-century Spanish artists is being documented extensively. See Lubar (2003).
2. Proof of the fact that El Greco was widely read is the list of books in his extant library. See San Román (1910: 195-7 and 1927a & b).
5. Since “style” is an ambiguous modern term and the fact that the term “maniera”, as used by Giorgio Vasari in his Vite, has been translated as “style” has given rise to various misconceptions about Mannerism, the author prefers to use the Italian term or to translate it as “manner of painting” or “working method”. See Maré (2002).
6. Anstis (2002: 208) recently settled the matter by proving scientifically that “even if El Greco were astigmatic, he would have adapted to it, and his figures ... would have normal proportions. His elongations were an artistic expression, not a visual symptom.”
7. The reassessment of El Greco’s artistic achievement was done by Cossio (1908) Meier-Grafe (1910) and Barrès (1912).
8. During the period he spent in Venice, El Greco assuredly became acquainted with Tintoretto's paintings and working method. Indeed, he sketched one such cast of Michelangelo’s Giorno (Medici Chapel, Florence). Although the date of the drawing is unknown, it is one of the earliest authenticated works by the hand of the Cretan artist.
Also Michelangelo learnt by copying: “Michelangelo’s biographers wrote that his first painting copied a well-known engraving by the German artist Martin Schongauer (1448-1491). Made in about 1487-88, The Torment of Saint Anthony has been known for many years, although it has not always received proper attention due to accumulations of discolored varnish and disfiguring overpaints, which obscured the qualities of the picture’s masterful execution and remarkable color palette.” (Quoted from “Michelangelo’s first painting”, the Special Exhibitions website of The Metropolitan Museum, New York: http://www.metmuseum.org/press_room/full_release.asp?prid=9CE78C41-5241-4F9, accessed 1009/05/31.)
9. 1650, oil on canvas, 114 x 119 cm, Rome, Galleria Doria Pamphili.
10. 1864, oil on canvas, 2170 x 1830 cm, New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art.
11. Circa 1575, oil on canvas, 66 x 48 cm, New York, Hispanic Society of America.
14. 1603-14, oil on canvas, 112 x 65.8 cm, Andrew W. Mellon Collection, Washington, National Gallery of Art. It could not be established which version of this painting Degas had in his possession.
17. An abridged version of this article, under the title “Copying as a didactic tool: the case of El Greco as a role model for modernist artists”, was presented as a paper at the 2009 ANZAAE Conference, Otago Polytechnic, Dunedin, New Zealand, 20-23 April 2009, and a shorter, unillustrated version appeared in the November 2009 issue of Scope (Contemporary Research Topics: Art and Design, Dunedin Polytechnik): 135-43, under the title “Why modern artists copied or quoted El Greco”.
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