Romantic and neoclassic artwork

Art & Culture, Artists



December 26, Romantic and Neo ic Artwork The nineteenth century was characterized with emergence of different types of art which included Romanticism and Neoclassicism. While neoclassic artwork aimed at portraying the absolute truth about life through reflection of the rational way of thinking with the intellectual movement giving emphasis on reason that was mainly borrowed from classical Greek and Roman style, romantic artwork mainly focused on depicting reality by employing the use of wild and raw emotions which gave emphasis on the individual as opposed to the society. It is evident that the two artwork bore stark differences which often resulted into heated debates (Litvak 35).

While neoclassical artwork mainly focused on the Roman history with the elevation of Roman heroes and emphasis on rules and order, romantic artwork on the other hand arose during the age of passion gave the perception of being a reaction to the classical and the Neoclassical artwork which were contemplative in nature (Litvak 35). While neoclassical artwork was mainly identified from their classical themes with the use of archaeological settings and the use of classical costumes, romantic artwork was mainly identified by their bold and dramatic paintings with the main themes being on heroism, exoticism, individualism and increased nationalism. Consequently, it was evident that while neoclassical art was all about logic, reason and attempted objectivity, romantic art could be more associated with intuition, imagination and emotion, and mostly accepted subjectivity. And while romantic art bold and dramatic art characterized romantic art, neoclassical art was mainly characterized with portraits and paintings without emotions.

Neoclassic artwork

Adelaide Labille-Guiard, Self-Portrait with Two Pupils, 1785.

Romantic Artwork

Jean-Auguste Dominique Ingres, Large Odalisque, 1814.

Works Cited

Litvak, Olga. Haskalah: The Romantic Movement in Judaism. New Brunswick,

N. J: Rutgers

University Press, 2012. Print.