emphasize the world around him.

Rubin challenges the conventional view that Picasso fathered cubism in the early 1900s and that Braque merely helped him refine it. He has demonstrated that back in the late 19th century, Cézanne employed a technique of overlapping and linking geometric planes in steplike configurations, called *passage*, that violated fundamental rules of perspective. This technique ultimately became a pillar of cubism. *Passage* was absent in Picasso's works as late as 1908 but appeared in paintings by Braque, whom most scholars agree was influenced by Cézanne.

Donnell-Kotrozo, an Arizona State University art historian, disputes this portrayal of Cézanne as protocubist. To be sure, Cézanne found the strict "model-copy" relationship of the 18th- and 19th-century naturalists inadequate, she writes. He believed that faithfulness to Nature's every detail prevented a painting from fusing into a coherent whole. His reorganization of nature—his omissions and simplifications—represented an effort to transmit nature's effect on him to the viewer, not a rejection of the world around him.

At the core of the Cézanne controversy is a philosophical dispute over the nature of progress in art, says Donnell-Kotrozo. Rubin and his adherents imply that the greatest artists *consciously* contribute to some "preordained pattern of evolution." Alternatively, she suggests, every stylistic invention may be viewed as "a probe that reaches to the limits" of an artist's imagination. By allowing hindsight to color their theories, art historians belittle the motives and personal achievements of the unsuspecting artist.

Tastefully Tacky

"The Movie Palace and the Theatrical Sources of its Architectural Style" by Charlotte Herzog, in *Cinema Journal* (Spring 1981), Film Division, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 60201.

During the 1920s, when motion pictures became America's favorite entertainment, the ultimate in movie-going was the movie palace. Built between 1913 and 1932, these palaces typically seated 1,800 to 2,500 viewers and featured plush interiors, doormen in resplendent uniforms, and sometimes stage shows and orchestras. The palace was a uniquely American contribution to show business architecture, writes Herzog, an art historian at William Rawley Harper (Illinois) College. But it reflected its ancestry—the vaudeville theaters, traveling shows, and penny arcades where movies snared their first skeptical audiences during the 1890s.

The first movie exhibitors thought that they were taking a chance on a "new-fangled invention." Most of them hedged their bets by retaining their stage attractions. Even proprietors of the first full-time movie theaters adopted a low-risk strategy, keeping alterations in their converted stores to a minimum. To lure pedestrians inside, they borrowed the circus technique of displaying flashy banners and posters outside.

ARTS & LETTERS

By around 1903, it was clear that the movies would make it, and fancier showplaces—nickelodeons—evolved. Their owners covered the theater's exterior with shiny pressed tin and copied the electric light displays of penny arcades—the first marquees. They brought the box office out to the customer on the street. And by moving the theater's front doors back from the sidewalk and under the marquee, they subtly drew pedestrians inside.

Yet glitter was not enough. Movie proprietors wanted to cultivate a movie-going habit among middle-class Americans. Thus, palace owners emulated the designs of vaudeville and the legitimate theater. They built plaster and terra cotta exteriors, which conveyed a sense of permanence and "culture" when molded into Roman arches and arabesque balustrades. (The Roxy Theater in New York, for example, fused Gothic, Moorish, and Renaissance styles.) Moreover, by the 1920s, movies were no longer a novelty that could keep customers inside a dreary theater. Foyers, promenades, and lounges offered not only comfort but also a certain touch of "class."

The most pretentious palaces never lost the brashness of the early huckster days. They combined their interior marble pillars and monogrammed drapes with flashing marquees and lurid posters to create the "refined vulgarity" that became their trademark.

Fallen Heroines

"British Seduced Maidens" by Susan Staves, in *Eighteenth-Century Studies* (Winter 1980/81), AMS Press, 56 East 13th St., New York, N.Y. 10003.

Troubled by the "decline of the family," late-18th century English novelists focused on one of literature's most touching—and tragic—stock characters: the seduced maiden.

According to Staves, a professor of English at Brandeis, such fictional maidens were typically 15- to 18-year-old village girls; their seducers were dashing, wealthy cads in their late 20s. Like Olivia Primrose of Oliver Goldsmith's *The Vicar of Wakefield* (1766), they surrendered only after a protracted siege and acted out of love, not lust. They were not so virtuous as to be unseducible, but they were delicate and morally upright; most bore illegitimate children and died young.

Why did these sweet, star-crossed girls intrigue 18th-century novelists? Staves writes that their plight symbolized the decline of parental power precipitated by the secularization of English society.

After the English Revolution of the mid-17th century, the Puritan theocracy's civil courts steadily expanded their jurisdiction to cover morals charges (such as fornication) previously decided by unpopular ecclesiastical courts. Parents liked the new courts' willingness to award monetary damages for seduction—often for the loss of a pregnant daughter's household labors. Yet they forfeited the exclusive power to discipline their offspring, which the church courts had tacitly allowed.