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Introduction
A case can be made that both business and art are driven by innovation (Robertson 1967; Mullins et al. 2005; Aloini et al. 2013; Glaneson 2008; Monger 2015; Varbanova 2013). Innovation in art provides diversification, new techniques, and new symbols from which to view the world (Fisher 2013). From a business point of view, innovation, as the application of invention, holds the potential to provide competitive advantage both via improved methods for accomplishing a practical goal and via aesthetically improved physical appearance (Cagan and Cagan 2012). From a fine arts point of view, innovation creates new symbols from which to view the world, new ways to promote new ideas, and new stimulations to emotions (Fisher 2013). However, innovations can be disruptive to current experiences in the world and the structures by which products and aesthetic orientations are made accessible to, and accepted, by the general market.

Drawing on Robertson’s (Journal of Marketing 1967) concepts of “continuous innovation,” “dynamically continuous innovation,” and “discontinuous innovation,” this paper briefly reviews shifts in the art market from the High Renaissance and Mannerism periods, to the Classical and Baroque periods, and then French Impressionism and finally Cubism to illustrate the Robertson typology. In this paper, the concept of “continuous innovation” is illustrated by considering works of the great masters of the High Renaissance and Mannerism periods from approximately 1490 to 1580, the Baroque period from approximately 1600 until 1750 (Gardner 1979, p. 624-712, Gardner et al. 2005), the Classical (also referred to as neo-Classical) and Romantic periods of the late 18th century and mid-19th century (Janson 1962, pp. 491-513). We then consider the process by which the French Impressionist school of the mid to late 19th century came to be embraced by art consumers as an illustration of “dynamically continuous innovation.” Last, we consider the Cubist school of the late 19th and early 20th century (perhaps the leading element of Modernism (Apollinaire 1913; Wikipedia 2017a,b; 2014; 2013 ambo) as an illustration of “discontinuous innovation.”

Our objective is limited. We do not suggest that our observations are in any way a history of these periods and movements in the visual arts. Several such histories are available such as those by Fichner-Rathus (1998), Gardner (1979; Gardner et al. 2005), Janson (1962), and Johnson (2003, pp. 580-607), among others, and we have drawn from these. Instead, our objective is only to use key figures in the development of these noted European art schools from the late 1400s until the 1920s to illustrate Robertson’s innovations typology so as to aid in understanding the development and acceptance of innovations.

A Typology of Innovations from a Marketing Perspective
As noted, Robertson in 1967 in the Journal of Marketing introduced the typology of “continuous innovation,” “dynamically continuous innovation,” and “discontinuous innovation.” Continuous innovation refers to small, incremental changes introduced in new products. Because such changes are small and incremental, but noticeable, while improving the products functionality or the user’s experience, they encounter little resistance from either the distribution channel or the user community and so do not require efforts to educate the distribution channel or the market except to emphasize the new benefits the product offers without changes in usage patterns. Dynamically continuous innovations may encounter more resistance from buyers and so may require marketers to devote more effort to educate the distribution channel and consumers as to the small changes in usage or experience patterns and the benefits of the innovation that justify the small effort required to adapt to the new features of the product. More significant are the changes in the user experience brought about by a discontinuous innovation. With a discontinuous innovation, the buyers’ usage patterns and experiences must change substantially for the product to be accepted. The buyer must be taught significant new ways to use or experience the product because the change introduced by the innovation requires new approaches that the consumer has not experienced before.
It might be said that the innovation introduces new symbols into the world view of the consumer and these new symbols require re-education of the market. Consider the difference in preparing food on a conventional stove compared to cooking with a microwave oven. In the case of Cubism as a discontinuous innovation in art, the writings of Gleizes and Metzinger (1912), Salmon (1912), and Apollinaire (1913), illustrate the importance of explaining new artistic innovations to the art marketplace. While this may in some cases be a role for the artist (or the inventor of an innovation), it is a role that must often be played by the marketing facilitators and the intermediaries in the distribution channel. Examples of these roles of art dealers, critics, and museums abound, although with mixed reviews, understandably, given the aesthetic and opaque nature of art and its valuations (Hook 2017; Kazakina 2016; O’Hare 2015; Schjeldahl 2015; Wikipedia 2013a,b).

Despite the difficulties in introducing a discontinuous innovation, discontinuous innovations can provide the marketer and the producer of the “enhanced” product with competitive advantage and greater profit over other producers that do not incorporate the discontinuous innovation. Accordingly, producers seek opportunities for innovations in products to be brought to the market including continuous, dynamically continuous, and discontinuous innovations in both business and the arts (Hones 2016; Aloini et al. 2013; Galenson 2008; Bradshaw 2010; Aznar and Guijarro 2007; Cagan and Cagan 2012; Wylant 2008; Varbanova 2013; Veith 1995; Morgner 2015, pp. 122-132). As we shall see, often the structure of the marketplace might restrict exposure of innovations, particularly in the visual arts (Fisher 2013; Veith 1995). Given the marketing challenges of introducing innovations, particularly dynamically and discontinuous innovations, it is especially interesting to consider factors that influenced the acceptance of innovations in the visual arts during the movement from High Renaissance period of the late 15th century to Cubism in the early 20th century.

**Historical Overview**

**Traditional Art from the High Renaissance to Impressionism.**

Starting with the Italian High Renaissance in the late fifteenth century, and lasting through the mid nineteenth century, a variety of painting styles flourished in succession in several European countries, most notably in Italy, France, Spain, and the Netherlands. This section identifies some of the most important styles, their most famous artists, and succinctly describes their characteristics, without pretending to be exhaustive.

**The High Renaissance and Mannerism Periods.** The High Renaissance (1490-1530) saw the culmination of the visual arts in Italy, especially in the Papal States and Rome, with the rediscovery of the classical Greek and Roman traditions. The best artists of the time benefited from commissions by the Pope to decorate the Vatican. For example, Raphael’s “The School of Athens” (1511) (for this painting see https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/thumb/9/94/Sanzio_01.jpg/1024px-Sanzio_01.jpg) in the “Room of the Signatura”, representing the ancient Greek philosophers, is, possibly, his most famous fresco. Raphael’s style is celebrated for his elegance and clarity of composition. Similarly, Michelangelo’s “The Creation of Adam”, as part of the decoration of the Sistine Chapel ceiling, is among the most replicated religious paintings of all time, and so is Leonardo da Vinci’s “The Last Supper” (1498) in the Santa Maria delle Grazie Convent in Milan, mural painting commissioned by Ludovico Sforza, Duke of Milan.

The Baroque Period. The Baroque Style appeared in Rome and Italy around 1600 and lasted throughout the 17th
century, spreading to many other countries in Europe (Fargis, 1998, p. 262). It is thought to have developed largely as the result of the Council of Trent (1545-1563) by the Roman Catholic Church, which, as part of its efforts to counter Protestantism, had decided that works of art with religious themes should generate direct and emotional involvement (Gardner et al., 2005, p. 516). Baroque paintings typically exhibit much drama, the use of rich and deep colors, and striking contrast between light and darkness, the latter known as chiaroscuro. The purpose was to reassert the strength of the Catholic faith by playing on emotions, and to glorify church and monarchy (Hunt et al. 2010, p. 469). It should be noted however, that Dutch Golden Age paintings, while considered Baroque in style, also included still life, everyday scenes, and landscape pictures. Similarly, in France, Baroque paintings showed more restraint, due to the inclusion of classical elements, which resulted in a somewhat different overall mood.

Caravaggio in Italy, Rembrandt in the Dutch Republic, Rubens in the Spanish Netherlands, Velazquez in Spain, and Poussin in France are recognized as among the greatest Baroque painters. Caravaggio, probably the earliest Baroque painter, is considered by many to have had a strong formative influence on Baroque painting (for an example see “The Calling of Saint Matthew,” by Caravaggio in 1600. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Calling_of_St_Matthew_(Caravaggio). His works show great drama via the use of chiaroscuro, as well as psychological realism, describing humans realistically in both their physical and psychological aspects. Rembrandt, widely considered to be the preeminent Dutch painter, was strongly influenced by the Italian masters, the Utrecht Caravaggists, and Rubens. His works describe a wide range of topics, from portraits to historical and biblical themes. Rubens, the most famous artist of the Flemish Baroque tradition, is best known for his altarpieces, portraits, and history paintings of mythological subjects. His Marie de Medici series of paintings perhaps best illustrate the meaning of Baroque art: A Catholic painter glorifying a Catholic patron, Marie de Medici, Queen of France (Wikipedia, 2017c). For an example see “The Disembarkation at Marseille,” Rubens, 1625 (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marie_de%27_Medici_cycle). Velazquez was the leading artist in the court of Philip IV and painted numerous portraits of members of the Spanish royal family, among others, in addition to historical scenes. Finally, Poussin, the leading figure of French Baroque style, also incorporated classical elements in his paintings.

The Baroque style, developing incrementally from the High Renaissance and Mannerism styles, suggests continuous innovation. Continuous innovation in artistic styles of the period is also suggested by the Rococo or Late Baroque styles that prevailed in France from the early to the late eighteenth century. Rococo paintings are more ornate than traditional Baroque, use curves and gold, and tend to depict superficial or frivolous scenes while incorporating classical techniques common to High Renaissance, Mannerism, and Baroque artists. Watteau and Boucher are perhaps the best known French Rococo painters (Wikipedia, 2017d).

The Classical and Romantic Periods. The Classical period lasted from the late eighteenth century to the mid-nineteenth century, and marked a return to the orderliness, austerity, and often manliness of classical paintings, with well-balanced and clear compositions. The style flourished in France and is best represented by the works of David and his pupil Ingres. David painted historical and mythological scenes, perhaps the most famous is the painting “Oath of the Horatii” (see https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jacques-Louis_David#/media/File:Jacques-Louis_David -Oath_of_the_Horatii_-_Google_Art_Project.jp). Ingres’s works, like Rubens’s, incorporated the theme of female voluptuousness. The Romantic style coexisted and competed with the Classical style. It is characterized by an emphasis on intense emotions, a focus on color and movement rather than clarity of outline, and less precise brush strokes (Gombrich, 1995, pp. 504-6). The French artist Delacroix, a major figure of Romantic painting and is best known for his painting “Liberty Leading the People” (1830) painting (see “Liberty Leading the People” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberty_Leading_the_People). This painting is a tribute to the 1830 Revolution which drove King Charles X of France from power.

In terms of degree of innovativeness, as noted previously, it is reasonable to suggest that the painting styles briefly reviewed in the preceding paragraphs, from the High Renaissance to the Classical and Romantic periods, were cases of continuous innovation. While each period introduced some changes - for example, the use of
the chiaroscuro technique by Baroque painters - those changes were generally understood and accepted, and sometimes welcomed by the viewing audience without disruption of the viewing experience. The themes often dealt with religious, mythological, and historical topics, as well as portraits, all of which were familiar to the public and therefore well received. Also, and importantly, single point perspective was used in most cases.

**French Impressionism.** Impressionism, as a new painting style that first appeared in Paris, France in the 1860s (Wikipedia 2017f), illustrates dynamically continuous innovation in that its acceptance required some adjustment in the experience of the art consumers of the period. An example is Monet’s 1872 painting “*Impressionism, Sunrise*” (see https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Impressionism). This painting may be compared to the previous examples of styles from the High Renaissance to the Baroque and Classical and Romantic periods. The group of artists associated with this movement (Claude Monet, Pierre-Auguste Renoir, Alfred Sisley, Frederic Bazille, Edouard Manet, Camille Pissarro, and Edgar Degas, among others) at first encountered strong resistance to their works. The techniques used by these artists were innovative and unconventional and perceived as violating the generally accepted official standards established by the Academie des Beaux-Arts (Academy of Fine Arts), a government-sponsored organization. Therefore, the Academie rejected the works submitted by the Impressionists, thus preventing them from gaining exposure. Yet by the end of the 1890s, the Impressionists’ works were widely accepted and appreciated. Wealthy art collectors purchased them, and today they are considered masterpieces worth millions or tens of millions of dollars. The dramatic change in the acceptance of Impressionism can be explained by marketing techniques used by the artists and intermediaries to promote this new and promising painting style. Drawing on the four-Ps of marketing, the following paragraphs briefly summarize these marketing techniques and illustrate the adaptations that were necessary for Impressionism, as a case of “dynamically continuous innovation,” to be accepted.

**Product.** The painting techniques used by Impressionists were novel and unconventional. They included the use of short, yet visible, brush strokes that took precedence over lines and contours, thus capturing the essence of the subject to create an impression in the mind and experience of the viewer, rather than emphasizing the details of the object being depicted. Seen from a distance, the combination of brush strokes merges to form the picture (Shafa 2017). The Impressionist artists also placed colors side by side, rather than mixed them, leaving it up to the viewer to achieve the mixing effect. The bright colors used on the canvases were shocking for viewers familiar with the more sober hues characteristic of the works accepted by the “Academie” (Samu 2004). In addition, the importance given to light and its changing qualities was prominent. Impressionists also often painted “en plein air” (outdoors) giving their works a sense of freshness not previously seen. Moreover, the traditional separation between the main subject and the background was relaxed, conveying the impression of a snapshot of a scene or landscape, as captured by the then nascent photography, combined with a sense of subjectivity introduced by the artist. In addition, the topics selected were very different from those depicted by artists accepted by the Academie, which focused mainly on historical or religious themes. In contrast, the Impressionists painted scenes of everyday life, often depicting the leisurely activities of the relatively prosperous Parisian middle-class of the time.

**Place.** Because the Impressionists’ works were consistently rejected by the Academie, which held a virtual monopoly on the distribution of works of arts through its annual Salon, the Impressionist painters formed their own associations and shows to exhibit and sell their works. Eight shows were held between 1874 and 1886 as the Impressionist painters sought open-minded collectors and art dealers who would be willing to take a chance on new artists (Willette 2010). After 1886, as Impressionist painting became fully accepted and in demand, gallery dealers took over distribution activities (Gersh-Nesic 2017).

**Promotion.** The role of gallery dealers in promoting the works of Impressionists and creating a market must be stressed to understand the success of this dynamically continuous innovation. Paul Durand-Ruel was central to the eventual success of Impressionism. This dealer allowed the artists to hold their second exhibition in 1876 at his own gallery (the Durand-Ruel Gallery) and used shrewd marketing techniques to gain acceptance of the works by the public. For example, he displayed the works of each artist on a separate panel to create a strong
identity for each artist. He carefully included more conventional works in his exhibitions, and displayed them in the first room of the gallery, reserving the second and third room for the Impressionists’ creations. This was a way to soften possible negative initial reactions of gallery visitors who were unfamiliar with this innovation in painting. In addition, he displayed works that were not for sale, but were lent by well-known collectors who had purchased them, thereby increasing the credibility and respectability of the Impressionists (Regan 2004, pp. 11-13). Moreover, everything was done to create an intimate atmosphere reminiscent of the visitors’ bourgeois home interiors so that they could imagine how the paintings would look in their homes. This was very different from the official Salon practices where works where stacked in large spaces from floor to ceiling (Regan 2004, p. 18).

Durand-Ruel also provided financial support to the Impressionists by purchasing their works and giving them a monthly stipend, thus providing a strong incentive to continue their efforts and played a key role in introducing Impressionism to America. He was approached in the mid-1880s by the American Art Association to hold an exhibition in New-York, which was done in 1886. The show then moved to the National Academy of Design, where Impressionist works purchased by prominent American collectors were added, thereby helping again to establish the credibility and acceptance of this dynamically continuous innovation. Durand-Ruel was aware of the vital role played by the American public in ensuring the success of Impressionism. Two of his quotes are included here to illustrate this point: “The American public does not laugh. It buys!” (Mendelsohn and Dailey. 2009) and “Without America, I would have been lost, ruined, after having bought so many Monets and Renoirs. The two exhibitions there in 1886 saved me. The American public bought moderately . . . but thanks to that public, Monet and Renoir were enabled to live and after that the French public followed suit.” (Durrant, 2015).

Price. Here too, Paul Durand-Ruel played a key role. He would sell the works of an established school (in this case the Barbizon School, which had influenced the Impressionists) to finance his purchases of Impressionist paintings. Also, he was one of a handful of dealers to act as experts at the Hotel Drouot, the state-sponsored auction house. He was thus able to buy at auction and to maintain the prices of his artists at a high level through his bids (Regan, 2004).

There is no doubt that the novel painting techniques used by the Impressionists, and their resulting new to the world pictures, were not well understood at first because the style was unfamiliar to the art critics, art collectors, and the public at large. While Impressionist works were not revolutionary to the extent that they continued to use single-point perspective, they were nevertheless sufficiently different from anything created up to that point that it was critical to educate the viewing public and communicate the artistic value of such paintings. In other words, Impressionism was a case of dynamically continuous innovation. A significant amount of learning had to take place before people would consider buying such works. Fortunately, art dealers, foremost among them Durand-Ruel, were able to play effectively the roles of educators and promoters, thereby ensuring the ultimate success of Impressionism.

Cubism and the Beginning of Modern Art.
Impressionism was followed by other new painting styles, which were an even more radical departure from the then dominant standards established by the Academie des Beaux-Arts (Academy of Fine Arts) sponsored by the French government. A succinct identification of the most important new painting styles following 1886 would include, in chronological order (with some temporal overlap), Post-Impressionism, Fauvism, Cubism, Neo-Classicism, and Surrealism, among others. Taken together, these styles are referred to as Modernism, keeping in mind that this last term is much broader in scope, since it includes, besides new forms of art, many other areas of human endeavors, and has been the subject of endless debates about its proper definition. For the purpose here, Modernism refers to the new painting styles just noted and the activities associated with marketing such styles. Overall, these new styles presented the viewer with such significant differences in viewing experience that we consider Modernism overall, and Cubism in particular, as illustrative of Robertson’s (1967) concept of discontinuous innovation.

As was true for Impressionist painters, artists developing these new styles had difficulty gaining exposure for
their works. Paintings submitted to the Académie, then still the primary distribution channel, were rejected. This situation again forced artists to seek new channels and to rely heavily on a then developing network of more independent dealers and collectors receptive to new styles. In part due to the acceptance of Impressionism through new distribution channels and a broader public for art purchases, the monopoly held by the Académie was being progressively replaced by market forces. The result was the opening of opportunities for significantly new, and disruptive artistic styles and talented artists willing to experiment. The foremost example of the new styles was, and perhaps remains today, Cubism, on which we will focus to illustrate discontinuous innovation.

Cubist artists were strongly influenced by the ideas of the Post-Impressionist painter Paul Cézanne (Wikipedia 2017e), who wanted to “treat nature by the cylinder, the sphere, the cone” and represent objects as if they were seen from different angles simultaneously, in contrast to the traditional ideals of perspective,” namely single-point perspective (Wikipedia 2017b,g). The works of Metzinger and Picasso often serve as examples of the Cubist style. One example of Metzinger’s paintings would be “Le Gouter (Tea Time)” created in 1910 (see https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Le_go%C3%BBter_(Tea_Time)). Picasso’s “Girl with a Mandolin” (see https://www.pablopicasso.org/girl-with-mandolin.jsp) is one example of his early cubist style.

This led to the development by Pablo Picasso, arguably the greatest modernist painter of the twentieth century (Galenson 2008) and of an early form of Cubism, perhaps best seen in his 1907 painting “Les Demoiselles d’Avignon.” Picasso then worked closely with George Braque, considered by many to be the first Cubist painter. Together, they developed analytic Cubism (1909-1912), with works using monochrome and neutral colors, such as “Girl with a Mandolin” (1910) (see https://www.pablopicasso.org/girl-with-mandolin.jsp). This was followed later by synthetic Cubism (1912-1919), where pieces of paper and other materials were incorporated into the pictures.

As a discontinuous innovation, Cubism needed both the support of an innovative distribution channel and opportunities for market education. Both Picasso and Braque were members of the “Kahnweiler stable” (Assouline, 1990), after the name of the famous art dealer Daniel Henry Kahnweiler who played a critical role in supporting early Cubist and other Avant-Garde artists and promoting their creations. In his Kahnweiler Gallery on rue Vignon in Paris, Kahnweiler was not solicitous, letting visitors look at the pictures undisturbed and patiently answering their questions about what they saw, and in the process educating their tastes. The question of money came up only afterward, almost as if it were a necessary evil. The visitors were reassured: the dealer was not trying to place his paintings (Assouline, 1990).

It should be emphasized that other Cubist artists, not affiliated with the dealer Kahnweiler, also played a major role in the development of this style. These included, among others, Jean Metzinger, Albert Gleize, Fernand Leger, Robert Delaunay and Henri Le Fauconnier (Green, 2009) who are sometimes referred to as the Salon Cubists, because, in contrast to Picasso and Braque who did not exhibit in Salons, these Cubists promoted their works primarily through the Salon des Independants and the Salon d’Automne, major non-academic Salons in Paris. These artists held the first organized group exhibition by Cubists at the “Salon des Indépendants” in Paris in the spring of 1911 in a room called ‘Salle 41’; it included works by Jean Metzinger (Wikipedia 2017e) and Albert Gleizes.

Given the revolutionary nature of Cubism, with its suppression of single-point perspective, it was vital to “teach” potential buyers the intrinsic artistic value present in these pictures. Commenting on the 1911 Salon des Independants exhibition, Louis Vauxcelles, an influential critic at the time, referred to these artists as “ignorant geometers, reducing the human body, the site, to pallid cubes” (Robbins 1985, p. 9-23). Clearly, education of art critics (marketing facilitators) and consumers was needed for this discontinuous innovation to be accepted. Such education was significantly facilitated by Gleizes and Metzinger (1912), the authors of the first major treatise on this new art form, called “Du ’Cubisme’”, published in 1912 and endorsed by both Picasso and Braque (Wikipedia 2017b,e), and by Apollinaire (1913) who in 1913 published “Les Peintres Cubistes (The Cubist Painters).” Both publications helped to educate the market and legitimate this new art form. Patience and perseverance were
Summary and Conclusions
In this brief review of the development of Western art from the High Renaissance to the early 20th century we have explored broad trends in artistic styles to illustrate Robertson’s (1967) typology of innovations. We have suggested that the trends from the High Renaissance until the mid-19th century depict “continuous innovation” suggesting generally subtle innovations in style. We then suggested that the introduction of Impressionism represented “dynamically continuous innovation,” with a sufficiently significant divergence from earlier styles as to require some degree of distribution channel and consumer education to understand and accept the new viewing experience, but not so radical a change in perspective as to require a significant change in comprehension. Last, we considered the emergence and eventual acceptance of Modernism in the early 20th century, as represented by Cubism, as an illustration of “discontinuous innovation” requiring endorsement by influential artists, marketing facilitators (critics), and marketing intermediaries (galleries). Certainly, such a brief review is not to be taken as an adequate treatment of the history of Western art, or even a full treatment of the art schools and styles considered here. It is our hope that our use of art styles in historical perspective will help marketers better visualize Robertson’s typology, and help members of the art community consider factors that influence acceptance of new styles, new symbols, and new ways of presenting the world.
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