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Abstract – This paper applies the marketing innovation concepts of continuous innovation, dynamically continuous innovation, and discontinuous innovation to the fine arts to suggest challenges artists face in gaining acceptance of new styles. This paper reviews shifts in broad visual arts styles from the High Renaissance to Cubism in order to illustrate these marketing innovation concepts and to indicate the roles that marketing might play in generating market acceptance of new artistic styles. These marketing roles, as suggested by the four “Ps” of marketing (product, place, promotion, and price) become particularly evident with the development of Impressionism as an illustration of dynamically continuous innovation and by Cubism as an illustration of discontinuous innovation and a precursor of modern art.
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Relevance – This paper provides a helpful method for illustrating concepts of degrees of innovation in the marketing classroom while providing arts marketing practitioners with historical guidance for generating market acceptance of new art styles.
Introduction

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, pp. 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). The process by which the French Impressionist school of the mid to late 19th century came to be embraced by art consumers is then considered as an illustration of “dynamically continuous innovation.” Last, 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), is then considered as an illustration of “discontinuous innovation.”

The objective is limited. It is not suggested that these 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 these have been drawn on here. Instead, the current 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.

Justification – 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. Marketing plays a critical role in gaining market acceptance of new technologies (Mohr, Sengupta, and Slater 2005), and marketing also plays an important, but sometimes overlooked, role in fine arts (Marshall and Forrest 2011). By noting the role that marketing has played in the acceptance of artistic styles over the past several centuries, this paper may provide guidance to artists today facing the challenges of market acceptance.
A Marketing Typology of Innovations

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 difficulties introducing discontinuous innovations, such innovations can provide the marketer and the producer of the “enhanced” product with competitive advantage and greater profit over producers that do not incorporate the 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; Morgen 2015, pp. 122–132). As will be seen, 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 the 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

Beginning with the Italian High Renaissance in the late fifteenth century, and lasting through the late-nineteenth century, a variety of European painting styles flourished in succession, notably in Italy, France, Spain, and the Netherlands. This section identifies some of the important styles and artists and the characteristics of their art to illustrate the innovation concepts.

The High Renaissance and Mannerism Periods

The High Renaissance (1490–1530) saw the rise of the visual arts in Italy, especially in the Papal States and Rome, with the rediscovery of classical Greek and Roman traditions. The best artists the period benefited from papal commissions to decorate the Vatican. Examples include Raphael’s “The School of Athens” (1511) from the Vatican’s Room of the Signatura (see Appendix Illustration 1). This painting that represents the ancient Greek philosophers is, possibly, Raphael's 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, as is Leonardo da Vinci’s mural painting “The Last Supper” (1498) commissioned by Ludovico Sforza, Duke of Milan, for the Santa Maria delle Grazie Convent in Milan.

The High Renaissance style was followed by Mannerism, a style that lasted until about 1580 in Italy, and until the early seventeenth century elsewhere in Europe (Freedberg, 1971, p 483). Whereas the High Renaissance style exhibited balance, clarity of composition, and harmony, Mannerism was often characterized by compositional tension and instability, slight distortion of the human figure (Finocchio, 2003), and lack of clear perspective. El Greco and Tintoretto represent the style. El Greco's “The Burial of the Count of Orgaz” is illustrative (see Appendix Illustration 2). Mannerism’s characteristics distinguish its works from the High Renaissance works, but the differences are slight and do not require the viewer to adjust significantly to the new work, thus suggesting continuous innovation.

The Baroque Period

The Baroque style appeared in Rome and elsewhere in Italy around 1600 and lasted throughout the 17th century, spreading to many other countries in Europe (Fargis, 1998, pp. 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, pp. 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, pp. 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, Velázquez in Spain, and Poussin in France are among the greatest Baroque painters. Caravaggio, probably the earliest Baroque painter, is often considered to have had a strong formative influence on Baroque painting. For example, consider “The Calling of Saint Matthew,” by Caravaggio in 1600 (see Appendix Illustration 3). 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 paintings of mythological and historical subjects. His Marie de Medici series, perhaps, best illustrates the meaning of Baroque art in which a Catholic painter is glorifying a Catholic patron, Marie de Medici, Queen of France (Wikipedia, 2017c). Consider his 1622–1625 work “The Disembarkation at Marseilles” (see Appendix Illustration 4). Velázquez should also be considered in this period. Velázquez, the leading artist in the court of Philip IV, 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, lasting from the late eighteenth century to the mid-nineteenth century, marked a return to the orderliness, austerity, and often manliness of classical paintings, with well-balanced, clear compositions. This style flourished in France and is represented by the works of David and his pupil Ingres. David painted historical and mythological scenes. Among the most famous of these would be the “Oath of the Horatii” (see Appendix Illustration 5). Ingres’ works, like Rubens’, incorporated 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, is best known for “Liberty Leading the People” (1830) (see Appendix Illustration 6). 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 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 such as the use of the chiaroscuro technique by Baroque painters, those changes were generally understood and accepted, and sometimes welcomed by the viewing audiences 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, 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 Appendix Illustration 7). 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). 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 different from the official Salon practices where works were stacked in large spaces from floor to ceiling (Regan 2004, pp. 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: Discontinuous Innovation 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 Académie 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 Modernism overall, and Cubism in particular, is here considered 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, here used to illustrate discontinuous innovation.

Cubist artists were strongly influenced by the ideas of the Post–Impressionist painter Paul Cezanne (Wikipedia 2017e). He sought to “treat nature by the cylinder, the sphere, the cone” and to represent objects from different angles simultaneously. This was in contrast to the traditional ideal of single–point perspective (Wikipedia 2017b,g). The works of Metzinger and Picasso often serve as examples of the Cubist style. An example of Metzinger’s work is “Le Gouter (Tea Time)” created in 1910 (see Appendix Illustration 8).

Pablo Picasso, arguably the greatest Modernist painter of the twentieth century (Galenson 2008), developed an early style of Cubism. This is 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. An example is Picasso’s “Girl with a Mandolin,” created in 1910 (see Appendix Illustration 9). This was followed later by synthetic Cubism (1912–1919), in which pieces of paper and other materials were incorporated in the work.

As a discontinuous innovation, Cubism needed 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 works. In his Kahnweiler Gallery on rue Vignon in Paris, Kahnweiler was not solicitous. He let visitors look at the pictures undisturbed and patiently answered their questions about what they saw. In the process, he educated 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 Cubist artists not affiliated with the Kahnweiler, also played a major role in the development of Cubism. These included, among others, Jean Metzinger, Albert Gleizes, Fernand Leger, Robert Delaunay and Henri Le Fauconnier (Green, 2009). These artists are sometimes referred to as the Salon Cubists, because, in contrast to Picasso and Braque who did not exhibit in salons, these artists promoted their works primarily through the Salon des Independants and the Salon d'Automne, major non–academic Salons in Paris. The first organized exhibition by Salon Cubists was at the “Salon des Independants” in Paris in Spring of 1911 in a room called 'Salle 41' and 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, pp. 9–23). Clearly, education of art critics (marketing facilitators) and buyers was needed for acceptance of this discontinuous innovation. 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. Education, patience, and perseverance were paramount for critics, collectors, and the public to appreciate and purchase the new style. This is to be expected with discontinuous innovation.

Conclusions

This brief review of the development of Western art from the High Renaissance to the early 20th century has explored broad trends in artistic styles to illustrate Robertson’s (1967) typology of innovations. Trends from the High Renaissance until the mid–19th century have been suggested to depict “continuous innovation” with generally subtle innovations in style. Impressionism was then introduced as representing “dynamically continuous innovation,” with such significant divergence from earlier styles as to require a 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 major change in comprehension. Last, the emergence and eventual acceptance of Modernism in the early 20th century as represented by Cubism has been considered 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 hoped that the 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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Appendix

Appendix Illustration 1: *The School of Athens*, Fresco, Raphael, 1509-1511. High Renaissance Style.


Appendix Illustration 4: *The Disembarkation at Marseille*, Rubens, 1625 (Marie de Medici Series). Baroque Style. 

Appendix Illustration 5: *Oath of the Horatii* (second version), David, 1786, Classical Style. 

Appendix Illustration 8: *Le Gouter (Tea Time)*, Metzinger, 1910, Cubism Style. 
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