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Berthe Morisot is indeed an interesting case. Her life was one of negotiated boundaries and exceptions that included only herself: a woman artist when that was not socially possible, a working mother when the term did not exist, a modern woman confined to certain private spaces, a founding, cutting-edge member of the Impressionist movement, a model for Manet. She continues to negotiate boundaries today: Is she forgotten because of sexism or because she did not have a talent or output similar to Manet or Degas? She was/is limited by who she was, who she knew, what she painted, how much those paintings sold for and to whom. We may never know the truth about Morisot or how she felt about crossing these boundaries, overcoming the limitations of her sex, class, and her place in history, but an exploration of them will lead to a more complete portrait of Berthe Morisot and her world.

Considering the character of your daughters… my teaching will not endow them with minor drawing room accomplishments; they will become painters. Do you realize what this means? In the upper class milieu to which you belong, this will be revolutionary, I might almost say catastrophic. Are you sure you will not come to curse the day when art, having gained admission to your home now so respectable and peaceful, will become the sole arbiter of the fate of two of your children? (Rouart 14)

Joseph Guichard, the second teacher of Berthe and Edma Morisot, was not entirely correct when he wrote to Mme Morisot. One daughter would escape the clutches of knowing too much about art for her own good through marriage. However, Berthe Morisot would remain entangled in the art world for her entire life, and, in fact, her mother would curse her daughter’s talent in and involvement with this world. Morisot was a woman painter in a time when the phrase was an oxymoron. One of the few paintings that portray a working woman artist from the time is Edma’s Berthe Morisot Painting. In it, Berthe Morisot confronts a canvas with dirty brushes and an intense glare. She is a painter, not simply a woman painting. It is a picture quite unlike Manet’s Portrait of Eva Gonzalès, painted only a few years later, which portrays Eva Gonzalès, a contemporary painter, looking out from the canvas dressed in a sitting gown and painting a picture already framed and decorated. A woman could not be a painter and a painter could not be a woman in early nineteenth century France. Clearly, not even the wardrobe was the same. However, Berthe Morisot lived the duality. What were the societal circumstances that made the idea of a woman artist impossible? How did Morisot negotiate this line, one that seemed to be so clearly drawn, but which she continually crossed and recrossed?

First, upper-class society had clearly drawn boundaries between male and female, separating the two genders into entirely distinct spheres. Men did not negotiate the domestic sphere and women did not enter the public sphere. The cult of true womanhood valued piety, domesticity, and purity. Though men held the knowledge of society and were rational, precise beings, women were expected to be the moral foundation of the home and were almost entirely controlled by their emotions, good only to be mothers and wives. A woman’s primary duty to herself, her parents, and society, was to get married. She was, of course, good for little else. Society looked to science to support these divisions, seen as natural and unavoidable.

In nineteenth-century France, women were widely considered to be psychologically less capable of rational thought than men and also to be more given to emotionalism and superficiality. Also biologically determined, it was believed, was woman’s “natural” bent toward humility and obedience, a condition that explained her lack of originality, determined her imitative rather than creative abilities, and inevitably undermined any effort that she might make as an artist. (Broude 152)

Scientific experiments proved that white men’s brain cavities were the largest of both genders and all races, and that their frontal lobes, where rationality supposedly originated, were “much more beautiful and voluminous” (Broude 152). Medical studies found that if women were educated, their constitutions would weaken or they would become barren because their brains had been overdeveloped. The “indisputable organic inferiority of feminine genius … [had] been confirmed by decisive experiment, even in the fine arts, and amidst the concurrence of the most favourable circumstances” (Broude 153). Other aspects of society also were easily divided into masculine and feminine spheres. Nature and science were dichotomized. The feminine nature was “to be unveiled, exposed, and penetrated even in her ‘innermost chambers’” by the masculine science (Broude 152). Thus, women could not be creative because it was not biologically possible.

These ideas about women’s brains and their biological dispositions manifested themselves in the education of both sexes.
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sponsibility, motherhood, appropriate servitude, piety, and gentle accomplishment in those arts deemed suitable, such as needlework, watercolour, and singing — _les arts femmes_. (Adler and Garb 10)

Girls were educated, but not about things that would tax their brains or encourage them in fields deemed unsuitable for those who were to become wives, mothers, and hostesses. Too much learning, according to contemporary opinion could "only serve to detract from [a woman's] happiness and the happiness of those around her" (Higonnet, *Berthe Morisot* 78). Art education, though, was encouraged in certain fields. It was acceptable for girls to learn watercolour, among other arts, to have a drawing room skill as long as it did not "take precedence over the sacred obligations of woman" (Higonnet, *Berthe Morisot* 78). It was not acceptable for a woman to aspire to do more than paint little pictures for her own home, and the exclusion of women from formal systems of art education prevented public success. There was a "systematic exclusion of women from proper artistic training, whether through the apprenticeship system or within the academy, and the crucial prohibition against women drawing the nude model" (Stapen 87). The Ecole des Beaux-Arts, the art academy in Paris, did not accept women. The only way around such social conventions was to hire a private tutor, and even then, "only those whose private tutors regarded such study as suitable [a classical education]... would have been schooled in that range of material from which much of the subject matter of art was drawn" (Garb 6). Thus, women could work around the prohibitions, but only if their social class allowed them this option.

This was the social climate that Berthe Morisot somehow managed to negotiate. Her parents were surprisingly supportive of their daughters' forays into art. In fact, the first lessons were intended to produce a sketch for each girl to give their father. Though Yves Morisot, the oldest Morisot daughter, stopped taking lessons, Berthe and Edma continued to do so. They progressed through several teachers, copied paintings in the Louvre, and exhibited at several Salons. The two sisters were a team devoted to careers in art in time when "[s]ingle women were 'excess' human beings who had not fulfilled their womanly destinies" (Higonnet, *Berthe Morisot* 51). Finally, in 1869 at the age of thirty (late for the time), Edma married and broke the support system that both sisters had depended on. This began a tumultuous period in Morisot's life. Both sisters were torn about the marriage which took Edma away from the family home. Berthe felt, for the first time, alone in the world with her art. The separation started a flurry of correspondence that clearly demonstrates the norms of the time period. Edma missed Berthe and their artistic life: "I am often with you, my dear Berthe. In my thoughts I follow you about in your studio, and wish that I could escape, were it only for a quarter of an hour, to breathe that air in which we lived for many long years" (Rouart 27). Berthe replied: "Come now, the lot you have chosen is not the worst one. You have a serious attachment (sic), and a man's heart utterly devoted to you. Do not revile your fate. Remember it is sad to be alone; despite anything that may be said or done, a woman has an immense need of affection" (Rouart 28). And again, conflicted about which path is best, but coming down eventually on the side of marriage: "Men incline to believe that they fill all of one's life, but as for me, I think that no matter how much affection a woman has for her husband, it is not easy to break with a life of work... Do not grieve about painting. I do not think it worth a single regret" (Rouart 29). However, Berthe missed her sister extremely and at every occasion painted her as if to fix Edma within her mind's eye, and perhaps give her the freedom she could not take for herself.

At this time, Mme Morisot began to push Berthe to get married as well. Though she had always been supportive of Berthe's art and had encouraged her daughter and chaperoned her to lessons and the Louvre, a societal necessity at the time, now, Berthe wrote that her mother "had no more confidence in my talent and she believed me incapable of ever doing anything serious" (Higonnet, *Berthe Morisot* 82). Berthe continued to paint and continued her relationships with other Impressionist painters, including Manet and Degas. However, as time passed, Mme Morisot became more insistent and even began providing suitors for Berthe. After a bad evening with Berthe rejecting one of these suitors, Mme Morisot wrote to Edma:

_“Everyone thinks it is better to marry, even making concessions, than to remain independent in a position that is not really one. We must consider that in a few more years she will be alone, she will have fewer ties than now; her youth will fade, and of the friends she supposes herself to have now, only a few will remain.”_ (Rouart 65-66)

Berthe did not marry one of the men her mother paraded before her, but in 1874 (when she was thirty-three) Eugène Manet, brother to her celebrated and controversial friend Édouard Manet, courted her. In December of that same year, they were married. The Manets and the Morisots had been mingling in the same social circle for years, and so one wonders at the motivation for Berthe's marriage. We can only assume it was a positive one from Berthe's own words. She wrote to her younger brother that she had "entered the positive stage of life" with her marriage (Rey 58). She also stopped painting Edma. Virtually no paintings of her sister are found after Berthe's marriage (Kessler 28). Finally, she had fulfilled part of society's expectations for her and could maybe have a moment's rest.

How did Morisot's painting survive her marriage when it did not survive Edma's? One can do little more than speculate, but Morisot continued painting and Eugène was a strong supporter of her efforts. At one point in her career, the family was in Italy vacationing and Julie, the couple's only child, became ill and could not be moved back to France. This happened right around the time of an Impressionist exhibit. Eugène boarded the train and went back to Paris himself to organize her selections and supervise their hanging. This devotion to his wife's artistic career is surprising for a man of his time, but Morisot certainly could not have had it any other way.

The marriage between Eugène and Berthe was a good one for both of them. Soon after they were married, Berthe began to long for a child. Though protected now by marriage, the idea that Berthe could be a mother and an artist was again a foreign one. Surely after the birth of a child, she would stop her foolish painting. Julie Manet was born in November 1878. Though she did not exhibit in the Impressionist show of 1879, Morisot's most frequent model became her daughter. Far from slowing Morisot's work, Julie seemed to push it to a new level. Morisot had painted pictures of mothers and children before, frequently of Yves and Edma with their children. These por-
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trayed seemingly traditional ideas about motherhood. In *The Cradle*, Edma seems absorbed in her new daughter, even imitating her position, hand resting by her ear. Mother and daughter are clearly connected although there is no physical touch exchanged. Edma simply watches her daughter sleep, intrigued. For Morisot and Julie it would be different.

One of the first pictures illustrates this: *The Wet Nurse Angele Feeding Julie Manet*. One of the first, obvious differences is that Morisot, the mother, is not in this picture. She is making the picture, a working mother. The woman in the picture, feeding Julie in a traditionally maternal pose, "mother" and infant joined physically, is a "secondé mère or wet Nurse," but she is not the mother (Nochlin 237). She is performing this mothering "as work, for pay, in a way that is eminently not natural but overly social in its construction" (Nochlin 235). Her dress and cap, the hat with ribbons, the only part of the painting that grounds us in some plane, all signify her status as employee. Morisot makes it clear that she, the painter, is the mother.

The way the painting is composed can lead one to consider Morisot's situation. She is a working mother in a world where children are the only work women should do, where traditional images of mothers and children show physical connection, two as a connected one. How would she deal with this, something she could never show for herself and Julie, even in the two self-portraits that contain her daughter where mother is holding a sketch pad, not the child? Here one could look at the picture and comment on its disjunction, the way the figures seem to melt into each other. The woman's face is obscured by the short brushstrokes. The woman, in fact, is barely there. Several critics comment on Julie, that "only the round and rosy Julie coheres," but I do not agree with that (Higonnet, *Berthe Morisot* 159). She too melts into the nurse, their dresses are seemingly one, and her other arm is absorbed into the woman. This reflects the confusion Morisot felt. Her daughter, her painting could in no way equal the set images of physical closeness of mother and child. Mother and daughter had to be two separate beings, but throughout the rest of Morisot's painting career, we see that the two remained close. This painting began "the most extensive and profound visual exploration we have of a mother-daughter relationship" (Higonnet, *Berthe Morisot* 160). Julie was Morisot's favorite model.

A similar painting, *Julie with her Nurse*, made later the same year, does focus on Julie. Here her face has distinct characteristics while the nurse blends into the background. One could say that this painting focuses on the "round and rosy Julie," as would a majority of the paintings done by Morisot for the rest of her life. These include images of the father-child bond (another infrequent subject) in *Eugène Manet and his Daughter at Bougival* and *Eugène Manet and his Daughter in the Garden*, as well as images that chronicle Julie's development into womanhood, ending with *Julie Manet and her Greyhound Laertes*, one of the last paintings Morisot painted. Morisot was able to paint and be a mother because she allowed there to be adjustments to the relationship. Her upper class status also helped because she could hire a wet nurse to help her take care of Julie. Morisot did not set out to change the world of motherhood, she simply adjusted it to fit her situation. She made herself an exception, just as she had when she married Eugène. Being married and painting was not acceptable; being a mother and painting was not acceptable. Berthe Morisot did both.

Morisot then fit into the personal world of marriage and motherhood by making an exception for herself. She did not set out to change what was social practice at the time, but "worked within these structures and used them to [her] advantage" (Edelstein 38). Morisot, along with other women painters, also adjusted the ideas about modernity that were widespread in art and literary circles. The epitome of the modern man was the flâneur, invented by Charles Baudelaire. The flâneur was to inhabit the world, his only job to absorb and experience the modern. He was to walk the streets, sit in the cafes, talk with the people, experience the daily, hectic pace of the modern life. He had money and freedom and, most importantly, he was always male. The modern artist was to express the life of the flâneur in his painting. The modern scenes were the public ones (Adler and Garb 80). What was woman to Baudelaire, definer of the modern? "[A] kind of idol, stupid perhaps, but dazzling and bewitching" (Broude 149).

For Morisot, because of her class and gender, the modern as defined by Baudelaire was not accessible. She had to be chaperoned constantly. Mme Morisot had accompanied her daughters to their lessons and to the Louvre. Later Eugène accompanied Berthe. An unescorted woman had questionable morals. Plus, the social spaces defined as modern, bars, cafes, the streets, were not accessible to women of Morisot's social class ever, even escorted. Modern spaces were simply not spaces that Morisot had access to. Women were cut off from the modern, the city. Morisot's images of the modern then, are images of an upper class feminine modern and illustrate this separation.

*On the Balcony* is one painting that illustrates the concept of the woman and child removed from modern spaces. In it a woman and a child, Edma or Yves and Jeannie or Paule, stand at a railing overlooking a city. The woman is absorbed in her own thoughts and seems to be looking at her child. The little girl stands, hands on the bars of the railing, staring out to the city beyond. In *Artist's Sister at a Window*, Edma sits in a chair before an open balcony door which reveals other balconies and a railing. She is not looking outside, however, but is absorbed in her own thoughts, playing with the fan on her lap. In both paintings, woman is literally removed from the city and barred from entering it. It does not even occupy her thoughts. Morisot shows that the woman's modern space is not the city. Instead, Morisot found her modern in the midst of her own life. Modern was gardens, public and private, and vacation homes removed from the city.

A popular modern woman's image of the time was the woman at the ball. Various artists portrayed upper class women in loges or waiting dressed in spaces that could be theatres. Morisot has these images too, but they are clearly situated not in the public view, but in the home. In *Woman in Black* and *Young Woman Dressed for the Ball*, both models are clearly dressed up to be going to social, public spaces. However, the backgrounds situate them within a home still. Morisot paints them waiting to go to the ball or theatre, not already there. She removes the woman from the public gaze, the male gaze, and instead places her in her own space, the space of the home, the private areas of modern life. Morisot's images were what she saw in her everyday life. Though
critics “repeatedly suggested that Morisot’s work suffered from exhibition and belonged instead to a secluded domain” because her subjects was the woman’s private sphere, Morisot insisted on her version of the modern and continued to show her works (Higonnet, “Imaging Gender” 150).

In a society where women were discouraged from entering the art world, Berthe Morisot was part of the founding group of a new movement: Impressionism. This new movement in art flouted the convention of the time, and without meaning so, partially enfranchised women in their movement. They rejected the École des Beaux-Arts which would not admit women. They rejected classical painting which valued the nude that women could not paint. They made the equipment smaller and portable to work out of doors; now women could carry it or put it in a closet. The paintings were made to hang on the walls of homes, not churches or palaces which did not recognize women as painters. The Impressionists “had changed the definition of ‘high art’ in a way that included—just barely—the way women worked” (Higonnet, Berthe Morisot 100-101). Of course there were still boundaries for Morisot to work around, including the flaneur concept and the public modern spaces. However, she was a better fit for Impressionism than most of the men in the movement, at least according to critics.

Teodor de Wyzewa [a contemporary critic], for example, claimed that the marks made by Impressionist painters were expressive of qualities intrinsic to women. He saw the use of bright and clear tones as a parallel to the lightness, the fresh clarity, and the superficial elegance which make up a woman’s vision and declared: “Only a woman has the right to rigorously practice the Impressionist system, she alone can limit her effort to the translation of impressions.” (Adler and Garb 64)

In fact, Morisot was the perfect Impressionist: a female painter practicing a feminine art. Her paintings were “constantly praised by critics of her period for qualities that these same critics objected to in the work of her male colleagues” (Broude 151). This placed Morisot in a precarious position. Because the techniques of Impressionism were considered feminine and because she was considered the perfect fit for Impressionism, she was frequently thought to have little talent because the qualities were intrinsic to her nature as woman. Her transient moments, quick brushstrokes, light colors, and subject matter, although techniques for others to master and demonstrate, were innate, and not a talent. Paul de Charry, a contemporary critic, declared in 1880 that her interest in not finishing a painting to academic standards was understandable because she “is a woman, consequently capricious; unhappily she acts like Eve by biting the apple and finding it unpleasant too soon” (Lindsay 14). This idea that woman was the perfect Impressionist/impression was also dangerous because it allowed the woman to become the painting, removing even more purpose and direction from her art. In 1902, critic André Fontainas wrote of Morisot’s work:

The woman displays no belief in superiorities; indeed she has confronted nothing, except herself. By an intuition, rather than by a usurping will, her brush ingeniously attracts to itself every delicate universal marvel, and we know, henceforward, that the palpitating pulp of flowers, the murmuring fronds, and the silences of water in summer gardens, the shivering atmosphere of calm clear days, equal in ecstasy... the frail colored radience of her face and eyes, the sighing inflexions of her supple voice, her gazes, the trembling agitation of her splendid bosom. She is, in festive nature, the inevitable center, luminous and divine. (Higonnet, “Imaging Gender” 151)

Was this, or any of the other comments, praise? The critics discounted Morisot’s work because she was a woman. She did not have talent, she simply had control of the intrinsic female qualities that every woman had. Her painting was simply an expression of that, not of talent, hard work, or accomplishment.

To seek to explain the stylistic characteristics of Impressionism with reference to “femininity” is to imply that Morisot did not exert a sufficient degree of conscious control over her working practices, and that her “style” is the unconscious expression of self. In the case of her male colleagues, however, due recognition is given to their exploration of certain aesthetic and political choices, which resulted in a particular way of knowing. (Adler and Garb 64)

Thus Morisot fit Impressionism and Impressionism fit Morisot, but it also was a way for critics to discount her work, to negate another woman artist because of special circumstances. Still, Morisot seemed to care little for what critics said. She exhibited in every Impressionist exhibit but one; sold her work with the other artists through dealers and the Impressionist auction and continued to paint almost until the day she died. Morisot thought of herself as an Impressionist and she fit right into their circle.

From almost the beginning of her artistic career, Morisot knew the circle of Impressionists and was accepted socially by them. She met Manet in the Louvre and eventually married his brother. Monet, Renoir, and Degas all knew her. She was involved in the establishment of the first Impressionist exhibit and considered a major part of the group and a founding member. Although she could not join them in the cafes and boulevards of Impressionist life, “[t]he regular salons held in haut bourgeois circles served as a bridge between two worlds generally conceived of at this date as being entirely separate, the ‘woman’s’ world of the home and the ‘man’s’ world of business and commerce” (Adler and Garb 29). Edma wrote to Berthe after she had married, “Your life must be charming at this moment, to talk with M. Degas while watching him draw, to laugh with Manet, to philosophize with Purvis [Pierre Purvis de Chuvannes, a veteran Salon artist]” (Stuckey 28). However, no matter how much she was a part of their world, she was not portrayed as such. She is not seen in Henri Fantin-Latour’s The Batignolles Studio nor his Homage to Delacroix, though she was acquainted with almost everyone in the picture. She was a woman, after all.

Morisot and Manet had a relationship that was often speculated about. She was known more as a model for several of his paintings before she was known as a painter in her own right. Le Repos and The Balcony were seen as risqué at the time, although not as risqué as Manet’s Olympia, because of the popular beliefs about models and because of Morisot’s social class. No one knows how these paintings were done, but one can assume that Morisot was chaperoned. Still, some believe that Manet and Morisot were more than friends and professional acquaintances. Le Repos was particu-
larly risqué because of Morisot's pose. A woman reclining in such a comfortable way should not have been portrayed in a painting. It was thought that such relaxation should only be seen by one's husband or family. Morisot was perceived as dirty and of low morals by critics. She was also looked down upon for her gaze in *The Balcony* because it was too direct and sultry for a young middle-class woman (Adler and Garb 28). Morisot is also often thought to be a pupil of Manet's, but there is no proof of this. Though some insist that Morisot was strongly influenced by Manet, "it remains unclear who influenced whom" (Stuckey 41). This idea is possibly one perpetuated because a woman artist of the time would certainly never have been able to influence a male artist. However, it is more likely that they influenced each other. Morisot and Julie were also painted by Renoir and Eugène was painted by Degas, possibly as a wedding present for the couple. All Impressionists admired Morisot's work and wanted to own it. Manet, Monet, Degas, Renoir, and Cassatt all purchased something by Morisot at some point in her career (Rey 24). Even in death they cared for her; her memorial exhibition in 1896 was supervised by Claude Monet, Pierre-Auguste Renoir, Edgar Degas, and Stéphane Mallarmé (Stuckey 15).

If Morisot was involved in the Impressionist circle, a master of Impressionist techniques, a creator of a woman's place in the modern, and able to overcome the constraints of motherhood and womanhood, why isn't she remembered? Why does every memorial exhibition in 1896 was supervised by Claude Monet, Pierre-Auguste Renoir, Edgar Degas, and Stéphane Mallarmé (Stuckey 15).

Morisot was a gifted, original painter; but, although she was too good to belong to the second rank, one cannot place her unreservedly among the company of Manet, Monet and other artists of the first rank. There is nothing in her outlook on a level with the former's broad historical ambition or, in the latter, the willing surrender to the logic of his aesthetic. Nor did her career have the necessary force or staying power required of a great artist. We are easiest with Berthe Morisot if we don't ask her to bear too great a historical burden, and recognize that she is at her best as an artist engaged in a dialogue with, rather than a wholehearted pursuit of the Impressionist aesthetic. (Gibson 24)

However, I cannot agree with this. Morisot was on the cutting edge of the Impressionist movement; she was a founding member. Critics think she may have influenced Manet. She painted and was recognized by the Salon and the Impressionists for close to thirty years. Some blame sexism and praise her talent:

**Why else has Morisot always been considered somehow a secondary Impressionist, despite her exemplary fidelity to the movement and its aims? Why has her very flouting of the traditional "laws" of painting been seen as a weakness rather than a strength, a failure or lack of knowledge and ability rather than a daring transgression? Why should the disintegration of form characteristic of her best work not be considered a vital questioning of Impressionism from within, a "making strange" of its more conventional practices? And if we consider that erosion of form to be a complexly mediated inscription of internalized conflict — motherhood versus profession — then surely this should be taken as seriously as the more highly acclaimed psychic dramas of male artists of the period. (Nochlin 241)**

However, some would argue that with the rise of women and feminists in the art history world Morisot should now be recognized and acknowledged. Perhaps sexism is still controlling the art world. In the first exhibition of Morisot's work in the United States at the National Gallery in 1990, visitors got to see a seductive Morisot before they got to see her work: Manet's *Le Repos* fronted the exhibition (Gordon 110).

All the arguments eventually run together, and we may never know truly why Morisot is not remembered. I tend to think it is a combination of several factors. Sexism has indeed played a role. She was not a true painter of the time because she was a woman. Critics did not linger over her work after her death. Her class played a role. Morisot did not have to sell paintings for her livelihood; her works were not purchased by museums. Friends bought most of them when she died. I think the life Morisot lived played a large role. She was not out on the boulevards; she was not able to attend the meetings that set up the Impressionist exhibits; she was a mother and a wife in a time that meant everything, even her scandals were short-lived. She was a private person because that is what society demanded of her: a French bourgeoise wife, mother, and hostess. She was not canonized with the rest of the Impressionists because critics could write off her talent as innate, because she caused no scandals, because she had no affairs, because she did eventually marry and have a child to fulfill society's expectations. She was not brash and outspoken, single, American, or a supporter of the new feminist movement like Cassatt. It may seem that there is no reason to remember Morisot, except for her paintings, because in a world that lives for scandal, she is not worthy to note.

However, I will remember Morisot because of her devotion to her daughter; because she did not marry until thirty-three and that did not end her career; because even though she was a woman she was also a cutting edge, founding member of the Impressionist movement. I will remember her light colors and quick brushstrokes, her devotion to the Impressionist ideal of the transient moment. I will remember her self-portrait with her palette. One cannot decide why Morisot was not accorded the same place as Manet and Degas and Renoir, but maybe we should remember her among them now.

**Bibliography**


