

# Dickinson College Archives & Special Collections

<http://archives.dickinson.edu/>

## Documents Online

**Title:** Tchelitchew and Neo-Romantics by Allen Tanner

**Date:** Undated

**Location:** MC 2013.3, B4, F44

### Contact:

Archives & Special Collections  
Waidner-Spahr Library  
Dickinson College  
P.O. Box 1773  
Carlisle, PA 17013

717-245-1399

[archives@dickinson.edu](mailto:archives@dickinson.edu)

# THE LABEL = "Neo-Romantic"

The group now ~~classified~~ <sup>known</sup> as the "Neo-Romantics" - did not have its inception in a coherent ~~artistic~~ <sup>artistic</sup> movement <sup>of rebellion</sup> ~~resulting in~~ <sup>the</sup> new tendencies in painting. They did not follow a common "idea" - ~~prescribing~~ <sup>which prescribes</sup> the manner - the approach - even the subject matter <sup>as</sup> ~~the~~ Surrealists. They were not a "reaction against Cubism" as some have alleged - nor even Dadaism - which <sup>in truth</sup> was the "movement" <sup>which</sup> directly preceded them.

They were simply <sup>in the beginning</sup> a group of young men - thrown together <sup>through their</sup> social rapport - and <sup>the general</sup> cultural interests <sup>at the early 20's</sup> - in their early work - ~~but~~ <sup>but</sup> ~~not~~ <sup>not</sup> ~~subjected to~~ <sup>subjected to</sup> the "senior" influence of a personality <sup>already</sup> ~~who~~ <sup>and whose</sup> work <sup>had</sup> ~~been~~ <sup>been</sup> a strong statement ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~artistic~~ <sup>artistic</sup> ~~direction~~ <sup>direction</sup>.

~~They~~ They gradually took their direction from this influence - and so became "related" <sup>at the</sup> in their approach - ~~the~~ ~~extremely~~ ~~subjective~~ ~~relationship~~ ~~between~~ ~~the~~ ~~painter~~ ~~and~~ ~~the~~ ~~object~~ ~~which~~ ~~has~~ ~~been~~ ~~defined~~ ~~as~~ ~~the~~ ~~fundamental~~ ~~principle~~ ~~of~~ ~~Impressionism~~. Tchelitchev had already been painting for a couple of years - ~~before~~ <sup>before</sup> they met - and had already <sup>to do</sup> formulated the image of what he was ~~doing~~ <sup>doing</sup>. ~~For~~ <sup>For</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~others~~ <sup>others</sup> ~~had~~ <sup>had</sup> ~~not~~ <sup>not</sup> ~~yet~~ <sup>yet</sup> ~~formulated~~ <sup>formulated</sup> what they wanted to do. E. Berna ~~when~~ <sup>when</sup> he met Tchelitchev was painting

The Labels  
New Remnants

in a rather "Chardin-esque" manner - and Ch Beard's work

was still in ~~an~~ <sup>an</sup> ~~accidental~~ <sup>and inchoate</sup> state.

So the ~~units of style~~ <sup>which finally acquired</sup> the ~~subset~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~was~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>influence</sup> ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~Tchech~~

had given them <sup>Bernma and Gerard were the first</sup> to adopt <sup>both Tch's choice of subject matter</sup> the ~~subset~~ <sup>unit</sup> of style

the resemblance which did perhaps set in <sup>the result of a common</sup> was not so much a revolt against <sup>former concepts</sup> as much as a simple need to <sup>adopt</sup> find a new way <sup>of painting</sup> ~~themselves~~ - subjectively.

Finally Bernma and Gerard began to show strong influence - in

Tchech's work <sup>both in the subject matter</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>use of restrained color</sup> which was almost not color ~~at all~~ <sup>as their "point of departure"</sup>. Their works

<sup>naturally</sup> began to ~~take~~ <sup>take</sup> ~~shape~~ <sup>shape</sup> ~~as a~~ <sup>as a</sup> "resemblance". The came <sup>so frequently</sup> to his house - to see his work - <sup>he can think of pointing his</sup> ~~to see~~ <sup>to see</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>to see</sup> ~~people~~

to his <sup>course was</sup> ~~house~~ <sup>mentable</sup>. And their relationship towards <sup>each other</sup> ~~was~~ <sup>as</sup> "friendly rivals", when they were <sup>finally</sup> ~~joined~~ <sup>joined</sup> together - in

Group exhibiting later <sup>on</sup> - Tchech <sup>was</sup> already <sup>generally</sup> considered to be <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>originator</sup> and

Chef d'ecole - <sup>as</sup> <sup>his</sup> <sup>was</sup> <sup>the</sup> <sup>original</sup> <sup>influence</sup>. <sup>It</sup> <sup>was</sup> <sup>as</sup> <sup>Smeme</sup> - <sup>that</sup> <sup>was</sup> <sup>the</sup> <sup>originator</sup>

Jacques Vit. <sup>who</sup> <sup>later</sup> <sup>in</sup> - in a group that was <sup>defining</sup> ~~and~~ <sup>had</sup> to designate the

Then - for an exhibit - suggested the term "Neo-Romantic" - and so it stuck.

but also his use of color. do frame in the use of color.

New  
Remains  
+  
revised  
re copy  
again



year or so

a couple of years - ~~even~~ before they all met and had already <sup>solidly</sup> formed the image of what he was <sup>going</sup> to do.

P. Berma when he renewed his <sup>former</sup> acquaintance with Tchel - in Paris -

was painting in a "Chardin-esque" manner. Berard's work was still in an <sup>indecisive</sup> state.

The slight "unity of style" which this group finally took on - was therefore <sup>undoubtedly</sup> <sup>and earlier</sup> the direct impetus of this stimulus, <sup>which</sup> <sup>indicated</sup> and the direction it <sup>suggested</sup>.

<sup>causes</sup> ~~causes~~ Berma + Berard were the first to adopt this <sup>direction</sup> - <sup>just</sup> <sup>the</sup> <sup>but</sup> choice of subject matter - <sup>and</sup> above all - <sup>the</sup> <sup>new</sup> <sup>restraint</sup> in <sup>the</sup> use and value of 'color'. They came frequently to Tchel's <sup>unexpounded</sup> house - to see his work + to hear <sup>his</sup> <sup>theories</sup>. It was inevitable.

Finally when they were lumped together - in Group Exhibitions - later on - Tchelitcher was <sup>already</sup> known &

designated as the "Chef d'École" - since he was the original <sup>impetus</sup> ~~impetus~~ <sup>received</sup> which these younger men <sup>received</sup>.

Somebody - probably Jacques Viot - later on - in discussing how to label them as "a Group" - suggested the term Neo Rom - and so - it stuck!



came from the <sup>inner</sup> life of ~~the~~ a

All this ~~face~~ ~~life~~ mind <sup>with</sup> ~~attributes and~~

It's primary + distinctive ~~and~~ ~~perceptual~~ ~~and~~ ~~gaze~~ ~~best~~ ~~in~~ ~~this~~ ~~hour~~ ~~and~~ ~~reverent~~

of the relationships between the dimensions ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~two~~ ~~worlds~~

He was a man who - ~~it is true~~ - ~~did~~ ~~not~~ ~~alternate~~ ~~between~~ ~~inordinate~~ ~~pride~~ ~~and~~ ~~extreme~~ ~~humility~~

He also was besieged by <sup>a</sup> gnawing <sup>which</sup> insecurity - ~~and~~ ~~this~~ ~~made~~ ~~him~~ ~~always~~ ~~strive~~ ~~to~~ ~~be~~ ~~"strawier"~~ ~~than~~ ~~he~~ ~~really~~ ~~was~~ - ~~leaving~~ ~~him~~ ~~in~~ ~~a~~ ~~constant~~ ~~state~~ ~~of~~ ~~psychic~~ ~~strain~~

This he tried to solve by ~~climbing~~ ~~himself~~ ~~to~~ ~~"the~~ ~~top"~~ ~~and~~ ~~seeing~~ ~~that~~ ~~he~~ ~~stayed~~ ~~there~~

As he was a <sup>being</sup> ~~creature~~ of extreme <sup>and</sup> ~~contradictions~~ - he could be as <sup>and</sup> ~~derogatory~~ as he was enthusiastic - as formidable <sup>an</sup> ~~opponent~~ as he could be a <sup>great</sup> ~~devoted~~ friend.

He could destroy as effectively as he could build - ~~but~~ ~~at~~ ~~times~~ ~~was~~ ~~as~~ ~~deliberately~~ ~~disloyal~~ ~~as~~ ~~almost~~ ~~always~~ ~~ferocious~~ ~~loyal~~ ~~but~~ ~~if~~ ~~we~~ ~~shared~~ ~~his~~ ~~love~~ ~~and~~ ~~interest~~ ~~he~~ ~~could~~ ~~be~~ ~~as~~ ~~fanatically~~ ~~loyal~~

When the tragic moment struck -  
for him to relinquish ~~his~~ his  
precious life - and creative force -  
this moment found him an  
~~unusually~~ <sup>unusually</sup> progressed human being -  
and <sup>a speaker</sup> illumined Artist.

And if I were <sup>again</sup> asked to the  
describe the sound of an activity -  
which would best <sup>depict</sup> ~~express~~ him <sup>in his</sup>  
I would say the <sup>incessant</sup> ~~sound~~ <sup>of his</sup> ~~life~~ <sup>daily</sup>  
pen - on <sup>the</sup> drawing - paper - the sound  
of a <sup>frantic</sup> <sup>industry</sup> ~~practice~~ <sup>of constant</sup> practice and  
<sup>experimentation</sup> ~~in~~ <sup>which</sup> ~~took~~ <sup>place</sup> ~~in~~ the laboratory of his thought and  
and <sup>his</sup> ~~its~~ creative processes - All  
~~of~~ which turned out <sup>therein</sup> - incessantly -  
an <sup>overwhelming</sup> volume of results - <sup>that</sup> which never  
failed to be exciting - new -  
curious and always admirable.

This has  
been revised &  
submitted to  
Parker

"Impression of  
Pavel  
Tschelitschky  
by  
Allen  
Tanner

[Tchelitchew and Neo-Romantics by Allen Tanner]

[Page 1]

THE LABEL = “Neo-ROMANTIC”

The group now ~~classified~~ known as the “Neo-Romantics”—did not have its inception in a coherent ~~rebellious~~ movement of rebellion thereby resulting creating new tendencies—in Painting. They did not follow a common “idea”—~~prescribing~~ which prescribes the manner—the approach—even the Subject matter—as [for instance?] the Surrealists. They were not a “reactors against Cubism” as some have alleged—nor even Dadaism—which—in truth would have been more logical—as Dadaism was the “movement” which directly preceded them.

They were simply—in the beginning—a group of young men—Thrown together—primarily through their social rapport—and the general cultural interests of the early 20’s. Disparate—in their early work—but subjected to the “senior” influence of a personality—already well formed and whose work had a strong statement. They gradually took their direction from this influence—and so became ~~related~~ alike in their approach. Tchelitchew had already been painting for a couple of years before they all met and had already formulated the image of what he was to do. E. Berman when he met Tchelitchew was painting

[Page 2]

The label  
Neo Romantics

[Page 3]

in a rather [“Chardinesque”?] manner—and Ch Berard’s work was still in an inchoate state. So the slight “unity of style” which formed & acquired—was due to the direction and impetus stronger personality—of Tchelit—had given them. Berman & Berard were the first to adopt not only Tch’s choice of Subject matter but also his abstraction the use of color.

[Scribbled over:] So the trend—the unity of style the resemblance—which did perhaps set in later was not so much the result of a common revolt against former conceptions—as much as a simple need to adopt a new way of Painting—subjectively

[Scribbled over:] Finally Berman—and Berard began to show strong influence—from Tchelitchew’s work both in the subject matter the restrained use of color which was almost not color. Taking this as their “point of departure” their works naturally began to look alike take on a “resemblance”. [No longer scribbled over:] They came frequently to his house—to see his work & hear him expound his theories. So this of course was inevitable. And their relations towards him took on the aspect of “friendly rivals”, when they were finally banded together—in Group exhibitions later on—Techlitchew was

already generally considered to be the [illegible] and Chef d'Ecole—as it was known that his was the early originating influence. Someone—probably Jacques Viot, later on—in [a group?] that was [illegible] how to designate them—for—an exhibition—suggested the term “Neo-Romantic”—and so it stuck.

[Page 4]

Neo  
Romantics—  
revise &  
recopy—  
again

[Page 5]

The Label: “Neo Romantic”  
Tchelitshev The Animator—

The group—now known as the “Neo Romantics”—did not have it's inception in a coherent “rebellious” movement generating new tendencies in Painting. It's members did not follow a common originating “idea”—precising approach manner—and subject matter—as—for instance—the Surrealists. Neither were they “reactors” against Cubism—as some have alleged—for Cubism was already fairly remote—from them—when they all began their work. Nor against “Dadaism”—which—in truth—would have been more logical—since it was the movement that directly preceded them.

They were—quite simply—in the beginning—a group of young men—barely of the same age—who were thrown together—primarily through social rapport—and the general cultural interests of the 20's. Disparate—at the outset they were subjected to the strong “senior influence—of a personality already well formed—and whose work had already made its statement—and had been [illegible] therefore as they gradually began to take their direction from this influence they became—with time—necessarily—somewhat alike in their creative approach.

Tchelitch had already been painting

[Page 6]

a year or so—before they all met—and he had already solidly formed the image of what he was going to do. G. Berman—when he renewed his Berlin acquaintance with Tchel—in Paris—was painting in a “Chardinesque” manner. Berard's work was still in an indecisive state.

The slight “unity of style” which this group finally took on—was therefore undeniably due to the direct impetus of this stronger, and earlier personality—which they admired—and to the direction of indicated. Berman & Berard were the first—to adapt eagerly this direction—first in the choice of subject matter—but above all—the new theory of

restraint in the use and value of color. They came frequently in Tchel's house—to see his work & to hear him expound his theories. So it was inevitable.

Finally when they were lumped together—in Group Exhibitions—later on—Tchelitchev was already known & designated as the “Chef d’Ecole”—since his was the originating impetus which these younger men received. Somebody—probably Jacques Viot. later on—in discussing how to label them as “a Group”—suggested the term Neo Rom—and so—it stuck!

[Page 7]

Pavel Fyodorovitch Tchelitscheff  
by Allen Tanner

If I (who surely knew him well) were asked to select one word best describing the nature and character of Pavel Tchelitscheff—I would not hesitate to choose the word adjective = “compulsory”. Why?? Because—as I saw him—I beheld—always—a man whose every thought and action were propelled by a the great urge—to be—to know—to do—and—to progress. For behind the noble Spirit—the vigorous mind—and the compassionate heart—there was—always—the push of this anxious energy—which gave a fierce tempo—a desperate grasp—and perpetual aspiration to the very breath and rythm of his daily existence—with it's search after knowledge and experience—and its creative work. And this energy was composed of a constantly self-recharging vitality—lending something of a Phenix-like character—to his existence. Naturally so this so greatly obligated energy drove him also to seek—and find—not only knowledge & wisdom—about life—the world—People—and the Universe—but it also led him towards penetration of that other world beyond reality—where he perceived so clearly—so poetically—and so reverently with the mystical eye of sight—the proximity and alliance of the life of the marvelous—and the miraculous.

[Page 8]

All of this coming from the inner life of a mind—with it's primary & distinguishing attributes and it's perceptive and reverent gaze—clairvoyant appraisal of the holy relationships—between the dimensions of two worlds.

He was a man who—it is true—did alternate between inordinate pride—and extreme humility. He also was besieged by a gnawing sense of insecurity—which made him always strive to be “stronger” than he really was—creating in him a constant state of psychic strain this he tired to solve by climbing always to “the top”—and seeing that he stayed there.

As He was a being of extreme and exaggerated contradictions—he could be as derogatory as he was enthusiastic—as formidable an opponent as he could be a fanatically devoted friend. He could destroy as effectively as he could build—but if one gained his love and interest he could also be as fanatically loyal

[Page 9]

When the tragic moment struck—for him to relinquish his precious life—and creative force—this moment found him an unusually progressed human being—and a greater illumined Artist.

And if I were again asked to describe the sound of an activity—which would best depict him in his daily life I would say the incessant scratch of his pen—on his drawing-paper, the sound of a frantic [illegible]—of constant practice and experimentation—which took place in the laboratory of his thought and his creative processes. And which turned out—therefore—incessantly—an overwhelming volume of results—that never failed to be exciting—new—curious—and always admirable.

[Page 10]

This has  
been revised &  
submitted. to  
Parker

[in box alongside:]  
“Impression of  
Pavel  
Tschelitscheff”  
by  
Allen  
Tanner