

https://dspace.org/

Meaning in Cezanne's still-life paintings.

Jersky, Michelle

1992
https://hdl.handle.net/10539/25662

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

MEANING IN CÉZANNE'S STILL-LIFE PAINTINGS

Michelle Jersky

Degree awarded with distinction 9 December 1992

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of Arts, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, for the Degree of Master of Arts.

Johannesburg 1992

ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines Paul Cézanne's still-lifes and proposes that the interpretation of meaning in these works depends upon the analysis of their stylistic elements.


In Chapter I it is argued that the relationship between meaning and interpretation in the discipline of Art History is a complex one. An examination of the recent theoretical literature offers valuable insights into the ways in which art historians have assessed this relationship and the ramifications not only for the discipline, but for the interpretation of Cézanne's still-lifes.

The different ways in which scholars have interpreted Cézanne's oeuvre (particularly in relation to formalist approaches) are examined in the overview of the Cezanne literature in Chapter II. It is suggested that the existing body of interpretations in the literature forms an important part of a work's meaning and that therefore, the meaning of Cézanne's still-lifes should not be considered in an historical vacuum. Furthermore, it is argued that the formalist interpretation of Cézanne's still-lifes warrants re-evaluation.

In Chapter III selected still-lifes are analyzed. The traditional art historical dichotomy, reflected in the Cézanne literature, between 'form' and 'content', is challenged. The genre of still-life is contextualized in relation to Cézanne's other genres to substantiate the notion of a 'drama of style' evident in the still-lifes. It is argued that a stylistic approach to the still-lifes reveals both the importance of style in the interpretation of meaning in the still-lifes and the notion of artistic process evident in these works.

DECLARATION

I declare that this dissertation is my own, unaided work. It is being submitted for the degree of Master of Arts in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other University.



Michelle Jersky

30th day of April, 1992.

For my parents

Jerry and Hannah Jersky

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Professor Rory T. Doepel, my supervisor, for the endless support and sharing of expertise which he provided in the preparation of this research.

I would also like to thank members of the Department of History of Art, University of the Witwatersrand, and my colleagues at the Johannesburg Art Gallery for their ongoing interest in the progress of this study.

Family and friends not only provided love and encouragement, but offered invaluable assistance with practical matters.

To my husband Keith Kearney, without whose love and understanding this research would not have been possible.

A Human Science Research Council bursary and a University of the Witwatersrand senior bursary provided me with finances necessary for this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Volume I

List of Illustrations I

Introduction 1

Chapter

I. Meaning, Interpretation and the New Art History in the Study of Cézanne 4

II. The Cézanne Literature: An Overview 42

III. Analysis of Selected Still-Lifes 91

Conclusion 144

Volume II

Endnotes: Introduction 1

Endnotes: Chapter I 2

Endnotes: Chapter II 11

Endnotes: Chapter III 25

Endnotes: Conclusion 40

Bibliography 41

Illustrations

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

The sequence of illustrations is consecutive in accordance with the text read in conjunction with the endnotes.

All works listed are by Paul Cézanne. Information is given as follows: title, date, medium, size (in cm, height preceding width), present location and source.

1. Man with a Pipe Leaning on Table, 1895-1900, 92 x 73, oil on canvas, Moscow, Museum of Modern Western Art, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.602, p.113.

2. Woman with a Coffee-Pot, 1890-4 ?, 130 x 97, oil on canvas, Paris, Louvre, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.578, p.112.

3. Two Card Players, 1890-2, 45 x 57, oil on canvas, Paris, Louvre, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.639, p.115.

4. Page of studies (Piece of Cloth and Woman's Head) (detail), 1876-9, 30.5 x 49, pencil drawing, (Chappuis cat. no. 459), History of Art Department Slide Library, University of the Witwatersrand.

5. Vallier Full-Length (The Gardener), 1900-6, 63 x 52, oil on canvas, London, Tate Gallery, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.616, p.114.

6. Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe, c.1870-71, oil on canvas, 60 x 80, Private Collection, Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no. 51, p.172.

7. Pastoral (Idyll), c.1870, oil on canvas, 65 x 81, Musee d'Orsay, Paris, Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no.52, p.174.

8. Paris: the Quai de Bercy-The Wine Market, c.1872, 73 x 92, oil on canvas, Private Collection, Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no.62, p.194.

9. Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne, Father of the Artist, Reading l'Evenement, 1866, oil on canvas, 200 x 120, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Collection of Mr and Mrs Paul Mellon, Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no. 21, p.110.

10. Still life: Sugar Pot, Pears and Blue Cup, c.1866, oil on canvas, 30 x 41, Musee d'Orsay, Paris, on deposit with the Musee Granet, Aix, Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no. 14, p.96.

11. Vessels, Fruit and Cover (The Peppermint Bottle), 1890-4, 65 x 81, oil on canvas, Washington D.C., National Gallery of Art, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no. 781 p. 121.

12. Plaster Cupid and the "Anatomy", 1895, 71 x 57, oil on canvas, London, Home House Trustees, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no. 834, p.124.

13. The Walk, 1871, oil on canvas, 58 x 43, Private Collection, Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no.55, p.180.

14. The Four Seasons, a) Summer, c.1860-62, oil on canvas, 314 x 109, Musee de la Ville de Paris, Petit Palais, b) Winter, c.1860-62, oil on canvas, 314 x 104, Musee de la Ville de Paris, Petit Palais, c) Spring, c.1860-62, oil on canvas, 314 x 97, Musee de la Ville de Paris, Petit Palais, d) Autumn, c.1860-62, oil on canvas, 314 x 104, Musee de la Ville de Paris, Petit Palais, Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no. 1a., b., c., d., pp.68-69.

15. Afternoon in Naples (with a negro servant), c.1866-77, oil on canvas, 37 x 45, Australian National Gallery, Canberra, Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no.27, p.124.

16. The Orgy or The Banquet, c.1867, pencil, black and coloured chalk, watercolour and gouache on thin cardboard, 32.4 x 23.1, Private Collection, Stuttgart, Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no.65, p.200.

17. The Feast (The Orgy), c.1870, oil on canvas, 130 x 81, Private Collection, Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no. 39, p.148.

18. The Rape, c.1867, oil on canvas, 90.5 x 117, The Provost and Fellows of King's College, Cambridge (Keynes Collection), on loan to the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no. 31, p.132.

19. The Murder, c.1867-8, oil on canvas, 64 x 81, National Museums and Galleries on Merseyside, Walker Art Gallery, Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no. 34, p. 138.

20. The Negro Scipion, c.1867, oil on canvas, 107 x 83, Museo de Arte, Sao Paulo, Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no. 30, p.130.

21. Portrait of the Painter, Achille Emperaire, c.1868-70, oil on canvas, 200 x 122, Musee d'Orsay, Paris, Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no. 46, p.162.

22. Old Woman with a Rosary, 1900-4, 85 x 65, oil on canvas, London, National Gallery, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.612, p.114.

23. Plate of Fruit, Sugar-Bowl and Straw-Cased Jar on a Cover, 1895-1900, 60 x 73, oil on canvas, New York, Museum of Modern Art, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.799, p.123.

24. Still-Life with Apple and Peaches (not in Orienti), c.1905, oil on canvas, Washington, Washington National Gallery, History of Art Department Slide Library, University of the Witwatersrand.

25. Wine-Jug and Plate with Fruit, 1895-1900, 53 x 71, oil on canvas, London, Tate Gallery, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.803, p.123.

26. Scene of Violence (also known as The Murder), 1869-72, 14.1 x 18.2, Reed pen, ink, and wash, Basel Kunstmuseum, Paul Cézanne: The Basel Sketchbooks, P.54, p.146.

27. Women dressing, c.1867, 22 x 33, oil on canvas, Insel Hombroich, Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no.28, p.126.

28. Love Play, 1875-6, 42 x 55, oil on canvas, location not known, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat.

no.270, p.99.

29. Love Play, 1875-6, 38 x 46, oil on canvas, New Yor , Harriman Collection, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.271, p.99.

30. Three Women, 1875-7, size not noted, oil on canvas, location not known, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.298, p.100.

31. Five Women, 1885-7, 65.5 x 65.5, oil on canvas, Basle, Kunstmuseum, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.566, p.112.

32. Still life: Bread and Leg of Lamb, c.1866, oil on canvas, 27 x 35, Kunsthaus, Zurich, Cézanne: The E rly Years 1859-1872, cat. no. 13, p.94.

33. Still life: Skull and Candlestick, c.1866, 47.5 x 62.5, oil on canvas, Private Collection, on loan to the Kunsthaus, Zurich, Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no. 12, p.92.

34. Still Life: Skull and Waterjug, c.1868-70, 60 x 50, oil on canvas, Private Collection, Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no. 45, p.160.

35. The Black Clock, c.1870, 55.2 x 74.3, oil on canvas, Private Collection, Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no. 49, p.188.

36. Self-Portrait, c.1866, 45 x 41, oil on canvas, Private Collection, Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no.15, p.98.

37. Portrait of Uncle [illegible]nique (in a turban), 1866, 44 x 37, oil on canvas, Private Collection, Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no.20, p.108.

38. Three Skulls, 1900, 34 x 60, oil on canvas, location not known, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.813, p.123.

39. Pyramid of Skulls, 1900, size not known, oil on canvas, location not noted, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.814, p.123.

40. Three Skulls on Oriental Covering, 1904, 54 x 65, oil on canvas, location not known, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.815, p.123.

41. Glass, Cup and Apples, 1873-7, 41.5 x 55, oil on canvas, location not known, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.186, p.94.

42. Jug, Fruit, Cloth and Glass, 1879-82, 60 x 73, oil on canvas, Paris, Musees Nationaux, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.447, p.107.

43. Apples and Plate of Biscuits, 1879-82, 46 x 55, oil on canvas, Paris, Musees Nationaux, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.450, p.107.

44. Jar, Coffee-Pot and Fruit (Still-Life in Black and White), 1870-2, 63 x 80, oil on canvas, Paris, Louvre, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.129, p.92.

45. Vase, Plate, Ink-Well and Fruit (Blue Vase), 1883-7, 61 x 50, oil on canvas, Paris, Louvre, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.493, p.109.

46. Self-Portrait with a Palette, 1885-7, 92 x 73, oil on canvas, Zurich, Buhrle Collection, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no. 525, p.110. Dorival, B., Cézanne, plate 104.

47. Painter Holding a Palette, 1868-71, 10.3 x 17, pencil and pen, Basel Kunstmuseum, Paul Cézanne: The Basel Sketchbooks, fig.2, p.145.

48. The Painter, 1868-71, 17.1 x 10.3, pencil, Basel Kunstmuseum, Paul Cézanne: The Basel Sketchbooks, fig.3, p.145.

49. Preparation for the Funeral or The Autopsy, c.1868, oil on canvas, 49 x 80, Private Collection, Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no. 35, p.140.

50. A Modern Olympia (The Pasha), c. 1869-70, oil on canvas, 56 x 55, Private Collection, Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no. 40, p.150.

51. A Modern Olympia, 1872-3, 46 x 55, oil on canvas, Paris, Louvre, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.250, p.96.

52. Vessels, Basket and Fruit (The Kitchen Table), 1888-90, 65 x 80, oil on canvas, Paris, Louvre, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.770, p.120.

53. L'Ecorché, Interior with chair, 1887-90, (Chappuis cat. no.980), History of Art Department Slide Library, University of the Witwatersrand.

54. Basket with Apples, Bottle, Biscuits and Fruit, 1890-4, 65 x 81, oil on canvas, Chicago, Art Institute, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no. 779, p.121.

55. Plate of Cherries and Peaches, Vase and Cloth, 188 -7, 50 x 61, oil on canvas, Los Angeles, County Museum of Art, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.472, p.109.

56. Man with Folded Arms (The Clockmaker), 1895-1900, 92 x 73, oil on canvas, New York, Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.598, p.113.

57. Plate with Apples and Cup (Big Apples), 1890-4, 46 x 55, oil on canvas, location not known, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.788, p.123.

58. Fruit-Bowl, Cloth, Glass and Apples, 1879-82, 46 x 55, oil on canvas, location not known, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.452, p.107.

59. Vessels, Fruit and Cloth in front of a Chest, 1883-7, 71 x 90, oil on canvas, Munich, Neue Staatsgalerie, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.470, p.109.

60. Curtain, Fruit-Bowl, Carafe and Plate with Fruit, 1895-1900, 73 x 92, oil on canvas, Paris, Louvre, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.795, p.123.

61. Plaster Cupid, 1895, 63 x 81, oil on canvas, Stockholm, Nationalmuseum, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.835, p.124.

62. River at the Bridge of the Three Springs (detail), 1906, pencil and watercolour, Murphy, R.W., The World of Cézanne 1839-1906, pp.158-159.

63. Receptacles, Fruit and Biscuits on a Sideboard, 1873-7, 75 x 81, oil on canvas, Budapest, Szepmuveszeti Muzeum, Orienti, S., The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, cat. no.205, p.94.

Introduction

In this dissertation it will be argued, in the analysis of selected still-lifes by Paul Cézanne (1), that the stylistic interpretation of these works affords the scholar insights into the artist's work and artistic programme.

In chapter one, an examination of some of the ways in which art historians have approached the issues of meaning and interpretation will be outlined, as well as recent developments in the 'New Art History'. It will be argued that the art historian's role in accessing the meaning of a work of art is an intricate process. The complex way in which the art historian constructs meaning in relation to her object of study will be critically examined. As E.H. Gombrich has suggested,

> Because works of art so perfectly reflect their age, we should also add that like mirrors they will reflect different facts about the age according to the way we turn them, or the standpoint we adopt, not to mention the tiresome tendency of mirrors to throw back our own image. ...The history of art is one strand in the seamless garment of life which cannot be isolated from the strands of the economic, social, religious, or institutional history without leaving any number of loose threads. Where he makes these cuts and how he constructs his narrative will depend for the art historian ... both on what he wants to know and on what he thinks he can find out. (2)

The different ways in which Cézanne scholars have constructed paradigms for the interpretation of the meaning of Cézanne's oeuvre is examined in an overview of the Cézanne literature, with particular reference to the tradition of formalism (chapter two). This survey elucidates the varied and often conflicting ways in which Cézanne's still-lifes have been interpreted, in relation to the two major trends in Cézanne scholarship namely, formalism and iconographic studies. The New Art History is also discussed and although it is acknowledged that major contributions by its practitioners have been made, both in the discipline as a whole and with specific reference to Cézanne, the important activity of visual analysis in this latter approach is neglected.

In chapter two the analysis of particular Cézanne scholars reveals how meaning is dealt with in the Cézanne literature and facilitates an understanding of the underlying structures that have informed Cézanne scholarship. The literature on Cézanne is extensive and this will not be a detailed analysis of every aspect of the literature. Rather, I will attempt, through an analysis of selected authors, to isolate the concerns of these authors and thereby establish how these concerns inform their respective interpretations of Cézanne's oeuvre and subsequently colour our 'reading' of the oeuvre generally and of the genre of still-lifes specifically.

In chapter three, the traditional dichotomy between form (on the one hand) and content (on the other) in the Cézanne literature as well as the split between theoretical practice and visual analysis in the dicipline as a whole, will be addressed. The shift away from

visual analysis by recent scholars (referred to above) will thus be challenged. In a 'reading' of selected still-life paintings of Cézanne, a 'revised' formalist approach will be explored in order to test its current validity as an interpretative tool. The overall intention of this dissertation is to reveal the mechanisms that inform the interpretation of Cézanne's work and to assess the validity of the formalist approach to his work in our current context. It will be argued that visual analysis of Cézanne's still-lifes enhances the interpretation of his works and facilitates an understanding of his artistic programme as a whole.

I. Meaning, Interpretation and the New Art History in the Study of Cézanne

In this chapter an analysis of the nature and role of art history and its practitioners will be presented in relation to the ways in which meaning and interpretation is accessed and carried out in relation to the work of art. This analysis will inform the visual analyses of Cézanne's still-lifes, carried out in chapter three. The impact of the New Art History on the discipline of art history and the issues raised by the New Art Historians will be examined. The question of interpreting the literature will be raised in an attempt to clarify how access to the literature is gained and also to determine the relationship between the image and interpretations of that image. Since language is engaged in providing contexts for seeing the art object, the role of language in interpretation will be discussed. Since the issue of intentionality is central to the debates about interpretation this will be addressed in relation to the artist, the art object and the context within which the art work is produced.

The focus of this investigation is informed by issues raised by the New Art History and therefore, a critical analysis of its impact on the discipline with specific reference to Cézanne scholarship will be undertaken. An assessment of the possibilities of the New Art History for the discipline will be examined as well as the problematic areas which it highlights. While for many scholars these relatively recent developments are easily absorbed into the discipline, for others they point to a crisis

in the discipline without whose resolution a new era cannot be heralded. Either way, they cannot be ignored.

It is essential to contextualise the New Art History and its foci in order to understand the present crisis in the discipline. The term 'New Art History' was first publicly used in 1982. (1) According to Rees and Borzello,

> The new art history did not just 'happen' either, a vision revealed to a band of heroic historians to be passed down to their faithful followers. It is a product of the late-sixties tolerance for left-wing and 'continental' ideas which has changed the nature of every academic subject over the last two decades, combined with the expansion of art history as an academic discipline. (2)

The 'continental ideas' referred to above include feminism, Marxism, structuralism, psychoanalysis, and other socio-political ideas. As a result, many scholars whose areas of research were not previously directed towards art history have turned their attention to the discipline. (3) With the distinction between art history and other traditionally separate practices blurred, art critics such as Donald B. Kuspit entered into the debates about the nature of art historical practice and urged that,

> If it is to develop, to get a move on, the distinction between the art-historical and the extra-art historical, what is proper and improper art history, must give way. (4)

He further insists that art history, "...must stop ritualistically doing business as usual, and ask itself what its business is about." (5)

Given the self-consciousness permeating the discipline as a result of the impact of theory, the nature and role of art history and its practitioners have been questioned. While much of the recent literature grapples with issues previously neglected, it should be stressed that,

> In its own time, the tradition against which the new art historians pitted themselves had itself been revolutionary. A product of nineteenth-century European rationalism, art history had wrenched art objects from their religious and aristocratic origins to set them firmly in history rather than myth. To protect itself from what was most feared in art - mysticism and idolatry - it took as its task the imposition of order. Art history was founded by Wölfflin and Riegl on the principle that formal analysis of art was the key to its study. In the 1920s, Edgar Wind and Erwin Panofsky led a campaign against formalism, announcing the importance of the cultural and historical context of art. When the 1930s brought the German scholars in their flight from fascism, their zeal for precise knowledge and intellectual seriousness transformed art history in this country from a connoisseur's pursuit into an academic discipline. (6)

As suggested above, the practice of traditional art history is diverse and caution should be taken against oversimplifying the exact

parameters of the so-called traditional art history. It is interesting to note that one of the effects of the New Art History has been a critical examination and re-evaluation of the writings of art historians such as Erwin Panofsky and Heinrich Wölfflin. (7) This area of new research has clarified the differences in approaches to the art object and methodologies between traditional art historical scholars and has generated and defined a new and interesting area for art historical scholarship.

Stephen Bann, in his article, "How Revolutionary is the New Art History?", stresses that in order to assess the revolutionary nature of the New Art History, a sense of the traditional art history must be understood. He suggests further that a comprehensive definition of what constitutes traditional art history is problematic given its variety and diverse nature. (8)

According to A.L Rees and F. Borzello, joint editors of The New Art History,

> ...the two most distinctive tendencies in the new art history are the interest in the social aspects of art and the stress on theory. (9)

The focus of much of the recent art historical literature examines the theoretical aspects of the practice of art history and arose in response to a shared perception that traditional art history, concerned inter alia with issues of attribution, style and iconography, neglected the important ideological infrastructure at

work in the practice of the discipline and the ways in which art is the product of a social context. This new focus "... is signalled by a different set of words - ideology, patriarchy, class, methodology, and other terms which betray their origins in the social sciences." (10) One of the central problems that arises when assessing the tendencies outlined above is that, "W[illegible]n pushed to extremes, both approaches risk overlooking the art they are investigating." (11)

Given that the so-called New Art Historians have initiated as central to their project a self-reflexive and self-critical approach to the discipline of art history, it is not surprising that as stated above, important issues to fall under their scrutiny include the nature of art historical enquiry itself and the role and practice of art historians, its practitioners. In addition, these new art historians have posed questions about the impact of their methodologies and approaches on their self-designated areas of research.

In addition to generating new areas of research and thereby fundamentally redefining the parameters of the art historians activity, the New Art History has formulated and postulated challenging questions about the traditional practice of interpretation, which remains one of the central tasks of the art historian. Acknowledgement of the need to understand how access to the meaning of the art object via interpretation is gained, has remained a critical issue for the discipline.

As stated previously, in critically evaluating the discipline of art history and exploring the problematic of its methods, scholars from

within the discipline have imported 'foreign' methodologies from disciplines such as aesthetics, literary theory and philosophy, to construct paradigms for analysing the issue of interpretation. The impact of methodologies forwarded by Marxist, feminist and psychoanalytical scholars has been significant. Scholars from disciplines other than art history have turned their attention to the visual arts in an attempt to impact on the perceived crisis in the discipline. This healthy interchange of ideas and methodologies will no doubt continue to have significant repercussions for the discipline of art history.

Understanding the meaning of a work of art involves inter alia description, analysis and interpretation. Interpreting the work of art has traditionally, as for example in Panofsky, been distinguished from the explanation or analysis of the work of art. (12) The question as to whether these terms can be distinguished from one another - and if so in what ways - is an important one and is examined by the New Art Historians. The problem of the distinction, in Panofsky's terms, between formal and iconographic studies, is raised. As a result, the position and validity of formal analysis as an interpretative tool in the understanding of art objects has become a critical issue for art historians today.

One of the factors that determines the focus of the art historian's interpretation is her attitude to the status of the art object. This affects the kinds of issues that will be addressed in any given interpretation. While many art historians see the art object as a repository of an historical moment, as Panofsky does, others see

the art object as a repository for the statement of aesthetic problems and solutions which, though they may be born at a particular historical moment, transcend this particular instance of history. In this latter approach, the art object is viewed as capable of aesthetic import and universal aesthetic validity for all time, as is suggested for example, in the writings of Clive Bell.

Different approaches to the nature and role of art history and the art object reflect different aesthetic attitudes and ideological positions. As recent art historians have commented, the practice of the discipline is carried out under the guise of pursuing and unveiling truth, while in reality it processes information in ways that construct truth. The traditional approach differs significantly from more recent approaches in the following way: the former sets itself up as an unengaged, ideologically neutral activity, while the latter acknowledges the ideological and methodological assumptions that govern their engagement with material culture. In Critical Practice, Catherine Belsey, although dealing specifically with literary texts, comments thus:

> Common sense assumes that valuable literary texts, those which are in a special way worth reading, tell truths - about the periods that produced them, about the world in general or about human nature - and that in doing so they express the particular perceptions, the individual insights, of their authors. (13)

Scholars generally fail to recognize the different ways in which they

are constructors of meaning, rather than decipherers of an alleged, inherent truth of the object of their study. The lack of any self-consciousness in methodological approach necessarily limits the exploration of valid theoretical frameworks within which to view an artistic work.

Svetlana Alpers and David Carrier, in critically examining the practice of art history, have raised important questions about the art historical discipline and the practice of interpretation. Carrier, in "Manet and his Interpreters", (14) poses the following question: "What does it mean to place Manet in his historical context without projecting on to his work some modern theory?" (15) Traditionally, art historians have tended to uphold the view that in placing the artist in an historical context the art historian attains a sense of historical objectivity and hence arrives at the 'truth'. Carrier questions this hypothesis and suggests that the very activity of contextualisation is in itself historically defined and specific.

Carrier's aim in analysing the various interpretations of Manet's work differs from traditional surveys of the literature in that he focuses on the theoretical issues of interpretation, which he carries out in an examination of several interpretations of Manet's work forwarded by various scholars. His is not an overview of the Manet literature, but rather an attempt to confront the very problems involved in assessing and evaluating this literature. Having cited Manet as "the first modernist and/or last old master", (16) Carrier comments:

> The subject in his own time of journalistic writing, by the 1960s Manet's sources and composition were studied in more sophisticated ways. The great New York retrospective of 1983 provided a happy occasion to view the body of his work, and now a number of new texts amplify and criticize these earlier interpretations. (17)

Carrier defines his central concern early on in his article when he poses the following question: "Faced with so many, often opposed commentaries, what lessons about interpretation can be learned?" (18)

In examining the role of the art historian, Alpers in "Is Art History?" stresses that,

> ... as scholars, art historians all too often see themselves as being in pursuit of knowledge without recognizing how they themselves are the makers of that knowledge. (19)

In Alper's terms, Carrier rightly addresses the ways in which art historians are constructors of meaning and knowledge by employing particular methods and appropriately questions how these methods organize knowledge and thereby affect the way in which knowledge is communicated. Carrier, in addition, questions how the processes of interpretation affect the kind of knowledge ultimately communicated by the scholar. Carrier states in his concluding paragraph that,

> ...his aim is not to attack the discipline of art history, nor to import into its domain an alien methodology, but to illustrate how its present practice involves, unavoidably, ncerns about the relativity of interpretation. (20)

As indicated above, the seemingly simple task of interpretation is complex and its aims and methods varied. Issues about the role of interpretation, not only in art history, but in literary studies, aesthetics, sociology and philosophy, continu o be debated.

What remains for the art historian to consider, are the infinite interpretations that accrue in relation to a specific artist's work, which are testimony to this complex enterprise of interpretation. Cézanne's work is no exception, and the many different interpretations of his work that have been forwarded in the literature govern our understanding of his art.

In this dissertation the meaning of Cézanne's art is understood to reside not only in the representational function of the image but also in the ways in which images acquire meaning in relation to factors outside the 'frame'. The dynamic interaction between image and interpretation and the unavoidable symbiosis that occurs in this relationship will be addressed. In addition, the role of language in the construction of meaning will be analysed and seen to affect the interpretation of an artist's work directly.

The spectator gains access to the work of art by several entrances and works of art are open to continual (so ally determined)

recreation. Hence, Cézanne is still the subject of scholarly enquiry today. (21)

As with so many artists singled out as central to the development of modern art, a great deal of scholarly research has been devoted to the artistic output of Cézanne. This literature affirms and creates the central position afforded the artist and his work. One of the central tasks facing the art historian in the interpretation of an artist's work is therefore the body of literature that precedes, surrounds, follows and continually 'invents' and thereby 'reinvents' the artist's work. While the art historian may view this literature in a number of different ways it may always be seen as an indispensable part of the works' meaning. Furthermore, any attempt to interpret Cézanne's artistic work must critically embrace this research, first because it has come to inform the very terms in which we presently contextualise and view his works, and second because in critically evaluating this literature, the meaning of the artistic process in general - and here specifically in relation to Cézanne - is significantly enriched.

In this section, I will examine how 'meaning' is 'constructed' in the Cézanne literature and how the relationship between the image and the literature constitutes an important level of meaning in the work of art. While select, specific references to authors will be made where necessary, the literature will be viewed more generally as a body of interpretation that in its use of particular art historical constructs affects the way access to the meaning of Cézanne's art is afforded. The literature as a mechanism for meaning will be the

main focus of enquiry.

The writings of and about Cézanne will be shown to have direct bearing on any understanding of Cézanne's art, and thus constitute an intricate and essential level of meaning in his works. It will be argued, that in accessing the meaning of Cézanne's art, the works cannot be divorced from readings of them. The use of the word 'reading' is intentional, for the study of art is inextricably linked to the study of language. Any interpretation of Cézanne's art must be situated within the discourse of language, and should be sensitive, not only to the visual language of his work, but also to the discourses of the written word that inform any understanding of his art. Implicit in the word 'reading' is the idea of narrative. All interpretations in art historical enquiry are inscribed with the narrative form and they are subsequently characterized by qualities of temporality, continuity, sequentiality and history. Therefore, the literature always reflects the subjectivity of the time within which it is written. While this historicity seems unavoidable, the scholar attempts nonetheless to sustain an element of objectivity in her research, insofar as this is possible.

The ways in which the literature 'represents' Cézanne will be understood to inform both the way we see his works and ultimately construct their meaning. To put it another way: while perception informs and guides interpretation, it is also informed by the conceptual processes of interpretation. This complex relation between the conceptual and the perceptual processes of interpretation is usually not accounted for in the literature. The

work of art is often seen to exist in a sealed space, finite and closed as a signifying system - to be penetrated by an objective and distanced scholar. In this dissertation the relationship between the nature of the work of art and its relation to the engaged scholar and her interpretation/s of the work of art is viewed as symbiotic. (22)

This symbiotic relationship between the art object and interpretations of it, consists in the subtle relationship that is at play in the art historical discourse between words and images. In that this dynamic interaction between the image and interpretation form part of the process in which images acquire meaning, a study of the literature is seen as essential to an examination of the art object and will lead to a richer, rather than depleted, understanding of it. In considering the literature (seen as the mechanism for the interpretation of works of art) as central to the work's meaning, the fundamentalist view of the autonomy of art is challenged, without failing to recognize and defend the need to evaluate the art object as an individual construct. This latter aspect will be explored in the analysis of specific still-lifes in chapter three.

In that the 'meaning' of a work of art is accessible to the interpreter through processes of decodification signified in language itself, attention to the use of language is of paramount importance, whether in describing, analysing or interpreting the art work.

It may be argued that, whether in the assessment of the reliability of particular accounts of the artist's life, or in the evaluation of the analyses of individual works or genres, the literature should always

be interpreted rather than read. This research therefore, enters at the outset into a dialogue with both the existing body of interpretation on Cézanne as well as his works of art. The 'historical present' from which this dissertation is written is historical in the sense that the subject of study is from a time passed, and present in the sense that this historical perspective is viable only through the present research that is continuous with that past.

It is important for the scholar to ask how the spectator is able to respond to works of art from earlier periods in their own terms. On the one hand the scholar can familiarize herself with the historical terms within which the works under analysis were made, but it is problematic to assume that the scholar can respond emotionally to these terms given the fact that the historical periods will differ so significantly. Given that a particular age is informed by a specific symbolic order, it is difficult for the spectator to share that historical symbolic order completely. As a result, the spectator is forced to respond to works of art in terms of her own cultural context, albeit informed by a reconstruction of that period's historical terms. (23)

The scholar, in attempting to interpret the works of Cézanne, is simultaneously the decoder of the artist's visual language and the numerous verbal and written manifestations that comment on his artistic production. Baxandall, affirming the centrality of language in the interpretative enterprise, states that,

> We do not explain pictures: we explain remarks about pictures - or rather, we explain pictures only in so far as we have considered them under some verbal description or specification. (24)

Baxandall in his study of how access to a work's meaning is gained, stresses that

> ...though 'description' and 'explanation' interpenetrate each other, this should not distract us from the fact that description is the mediating object of explanation. (25)

In the terms outlined above, the study of art is seen to be intrinsically linked to the study of language. These terms are defined by the discipline of art history itself, which is as much about looking as it is about writing. In order for an interpreter of Cézanne to add to the literature she must situate herself within the literature which is essentially a discourse of language. This discourse of language is balanced by a process of visual engagement with images.

Thus, interpreting an image is not only a matter of looking at an image and defining or describing its constituent parts. In recognizing these parts and naming them, the art historian enters not only into a dialogue with the image but also with the literature that surrounds the image. As Judith Wechsler notes,

> We do not see Cézanne with an unbiased eye but through a

> filter of interpretations which have accrued to his work and have become part of the conditions of our seeing. (26)

The art historian, in dealing with the image and interpretations of that image, must take cognizance of the underlying methods that contribute to the arrangement, organization and communication of ideas manifest in the literature. The New Art History has focused attention on this aspect of the discipline and has made significant contributions to these parameters of enquiry.

Central to the art historical task is the analysis and examination of images. It has been argued that the meaning of Cézanne's art is understood to reside not exclusively in the representational function of the image but also in the ways in which images acquire meaning in relation to factors outside the 'frame'. The process in which Cézanne's works come to acquire meaning assumes that we may artificially distinguish between the art work as it 'really' is from that work as it is interpreted. However, this distinction is illusory and problematic. The mediating function of language in interpretation is central here.

The meaning of a work of art is accessible through a process of decodification. While the visual language of art is by definition intrinsic to the work of art, at its inception, the unit we call the work of art, is already part of a greater whole. This greater whole is made up of a system articulated in both verbal and written language. These languages define and encircle the parameters within which the practice of art is facilitated. These parameters

include the category of visual arts generally, of artists who practice the discipline of art making, of the status of art practice in that particular society, to mention but a few. In accessing the meaning of a work of art, this complex language system must be acknowledged. (27)

An artistic style is not an innocent reflection of reality and is therefore always mediated through language. This is particularly pertinent in relation to Cézanne and will therefore be discussed in greater detail in chapter three. Since language is historically defined and reflects the ideological leanings and symbolic codes of a particular society, it too must be interpreted. The articulation of experience through the mediation of language foregrounds the importance of language as a means of exploring the world. How we articulate our world, determines how we arrive at what we call 'reality'. The 'lie' of language consists in the pretence that language can offer us 'true' knowledge of 'reality'. Commenting on the complex relationship between language and the work of art, Tom Gretton argues that,

> ...aesthetic criteria have no existence outside a specific historical situation; aesthetic values are falsely taken to be timeless. In the circumstances the category 'art' cannot be taken to have an absolute existence. Rather it is the name of a social relationship, in the first place between people and objects, but ultimately between people and people, a relationship which is disguised by its reification. (28)

An acknowledgement and understanding of the interrelatedness of the work of art and the practice of interpretation foregrounds, unlike previous positions, that the life, perhaps even the existence, of the work of art depends upon the active and engaged spectator. Many previously held positions indicated the limitations of language in capturing the meaning of a work of art and all efforts to concretize this meaning through language were viewed as approximate and deficient. This approach assumed that the meaning of a work of art could be isolated from the context of language and that the work's meaning existed solely within the context of the 'frame' and in the material parts of the work. This aspect will be explored in relation to formalism and also in the visual analyses of Cézanne's still-life paintings undertaken.

Both Richard Shiff and Judith Wechsler have made significant contributions to Cézanne scholarship. An examination of their writings highlights the similarities and differences in their approaches to the Cézanne literature.

Both Wechsler and Shiff attempt to account for the fact that the work of Cézanne has produced a great deal of interest in art historical scholarship. For Wechsler, this is evidenced in an historiographical study of the literature which maps out the development of the different concerns of Cézanne scholarship. This diachronic approach reflects the different attitudes to Cézanne's work through history and to some extent, accounts for the shifts that occur in the Cézanne literature. It reflects the shifting concerns and interpretations of Cézanne scholarship and reveals a great deal

about the preoccupations of the writer's own historical context. In addition, it reveals the way in which these preoccupations govern and direct specific readings of particular works of Cézanne. Shiff on the other hand, while referring throughout his text to the numerous literatures on Cézanne, focuses on the effects that these literatures have on constructing any 'original' meaning in Cézanne's work. The projects of these two scholars are fundamentally different in both the tasks they set themselves and the methodologies they employ to carry out their respective tasks.

Two publications by Judith Wechsler that have contributed to the Cézanne literature will be critically examined: Cézanne in Perspective (1975) and The Interpretation of Cézanne (1981). (29) These two publications are a useful starting point as they deal with a wide range of critics' and art historians' responses to Cézanne's work.

Wechsler's Cézanne in Perspective is published as part of The Artist's in Perspective Series (General Editor H.W.Janson), whose aim is thus defined:

> The Artist's in Perspective Series presents individual illustrated volumes of interpretive essays on the most significant painters, sculptors, architects, and genres of world art. Each volume provides an understanding of art and artists through both aesthetic and cultural evaluations. (30)

From the outset, and within the parameters of the stated aims of

the series within which Wechsler's book is published, little concern is given to the theoretical problem of interpretation itself. The scholar, accepting the privileges of historical distance and academic objectivity, sets about constructing a history of Cézanne scholarship.

Wechsler's Cézanne in Perspective is divided up in the following way: Preface, Introduction, Reactions of Some Contemporary Painters and Critics: 1874-1907, Reflections of Some Major Painters: 1908- 1943, Biographical Data, Notes on the Editor and Contributors and a Selected Bibliography. In the Introduction, Wechsler particularizes the above divisions: Cézanne's first critics, Neoclassical critics, Cubist views of Cézanne, Roger Fry and Formalist critics, New factors in Cézanne research, New considerations of Cézanne's perception and composition of space, Meyer Schapiro: New criteria for interpretation, Cézanne research since 1952.

It is interesting to note that the very way in which Wechsler organizes her material is a level of interpretation imposed on historical 'facts'; evidence (in Alper's terms) of the way in which art historians are themselves "makers of knowledge". (31)

Dawn Ades explores the problem of the issue of interpreting historical facts in "Reviewing Art History", in the following terms:

> The assumptions, however, that we have made about history, that it is (or can be) objective, impartial, scientific

> and true, have begun to fade. We all know that local (national) versions of events in political history tend to differ. But, as Levi-Strauss argues, the writing of total history would be impossible; it would present us with chaos. (32)

Wechsler rightly insists in her Introduction that,

> To claim that one can bypass the critics in an attempt to see Cézanne 'as he really is' ignores the extent to which all of us have a perceptual bias, whether or not we are critics. The interpretations which have accrued to Cézanne's work have become part of the conditions of our seeing. The literature on Cézanne reflects not only the need to explain his paintings, but is also a response to previous interpretations of his work. The interpretations are linked one to another in a historical network. (33)

While Wechsler clearly acknowledges the interconnectedness between the art object and its literary baggage she does not address the implications of this for the practice of interpretation itself. As stated above, this is where Shiff begins in his analysis of Cézanne. Wechsler insists that,

> We must ask whether the bias of a critic in singling out a particular aspect of Cézanne's work throws the whole perspective of his painting out of balance, or whether in elucidating a selected aspect the critic illuminates his work as a whole. By restricting the domain of investigation to a

> narrow band, the knowledge that is proved does not always correspond to the reality experienced. The critic's need for certainty may preclude speculations which are by nature more far-reaching and profound. (34)

Wechsler states that, "To be sure, many major figures in art and literature have evoked multiple interpretations bound to aesthetic biases." (35)

Elsewhere she notes:

> In their response to Cézanne's work successive generations of painters and critics have consciously or unconsciously reflected the aesthetic attitudes and experiences of their own intellectual and artistic milieu. What was visible to observers of Cézanne's art depended, at least in part, on what they could see as a function of their particular period. For example, the Impressionist's prepared the critics to see Cézanne's colour, but their frame of reference did not prepare the interpreters for a sympathetic understanding of Cézanne's use of line or his deviations from traditional perspective. (36)

While Wechsler asserts the ideologically determined and historically specific interests of the various interpretations of Cézanne's work, she does not choose to examine the implications of these insights from a methodological point of view, or to situate herself within this complex network of meanings. Her position, indicated by several statements, is constructed as an outsider whose

'objectivity' is guaranteed by the notion afforded by historical perspective. She states in her Preface, for example: "Cézanne was a revolutionary painter. The complexity of his art has led to a considerable literature in the past one hundred years." (37)

Neither the 'revolutionary' status granted Cézanne, nor the 'complexity' of his art are viewed as problematic. Rather, Wechsler used these concepts as neutral descriptions of seemingly empirical data. It is as if Wechsler, in another instance, while recognizing the limits of a formalist approach to Cézanne's works, and insisting on the importance of his subject matter (vis à vis Meyer Schapiro) argues for a synthesis of the two approaches. She states, "Generations of Cézanne's critics focused on how Cézanne painted and ignored the questions of what he painted and why." (38) She says elsewhere that

> One of the most serious conflicts in twentieth century criticism is apparent in the Cézanne literature - the conflict between formalist and humanist interpretations. The formalist approaches consider primarily the intrinsic problems of Cézanne's composition and formal inventions. The humanistic interpretations regard Cézanne's composition in relation to his subject matter in the light of his personal, social, historical and even spiritual context. Cézanne is almost unique among nineteenth-century painters in catalysing both the most exacting formal analyses and psychoanalytic, existentialist, phenomenological investigations. While Cézanne's painting invites a formalist approach, it also reveals the insufficiency

> of it. What is unique to the Cézanne literature is that it marks a shift in mid-twentieth-century criticism from a predominantly formal trend to a humenistic one. (39)

Consideration of Wechsler's publication The Interpretation of Cézanne (1972, 1981) is important. In her Preface and Acknowledgements, she states that in The Interpretation of Cézanne, a doctoral thesis completed in 1972 under the supervision of Professor Linda Nochlin, few changes are made. She says, "It's argument is substantially unchanged and its review of the historical literature since 1972 is limited." (40)

Wechsler's introduction to The Interpretation of Cézanne is a substantially shorter version to that of Cézanne in Perspective. There are seven parts to her book: 1. Cézanne criticism and Interpretation, 1865-1907; 2. Cubist Interpretations of Cézanne; 3. Roger Fry on Cézanne; 4. Lionello Venturi, Fritz Novotny, Erle Loran; 5. Meyer Schapiro on Cézanne; 6. The Interpretation of Cézanne since 1952: Kurt Badt and Theodore Reff; and finally a Summary and Conclusion.

In Wechsler's introduction to The Interpretation of Cézanne she begins her study with the following quotation: "The content of our truth depends upon our appropriating the historical foundation." The quotation comes from Karl Jaspers, "On My Philosophy" originally published in 1941. (41)

Given that the work of art is a complex unit, multi-layered and

multivalent, the art historian's search for any singular meaning in art is somewhat problematic and in some senses an anomaly. Perhaps the search for singularity has more to do with the scholars own self-invention through critical practice than with the work of art which is her subject. The way in which the scholar is both maker of meaning and finder of meaning will be explored throughout this research. It is noteworthy that Wechsler's approach to the Cézanne literature does not take into account the problems outlined earlier by Carrier. Wechsler's surveys of the literature in both her publications on Cézanne aim to relate information 'neutrally'. In Carrier's terms, this is seen to be problematic in that a art historian is acknowledged to be both a decipherer of meaning and a constructor of meaning.

Throughout both Wechsler's publications her attention is devoted to the interpretations that have accrued in relation to Cézanne's work, but little is said of the theoretical preconditions that facilitate interpretation or indeed her research. As a result, Wechsler's publications are valuable largely for making readily accessible, articles and documents often difficult for the scholar to locate.

In contrast to Wechsler's aim, Richard Shiff, in Cézanne and the End of Impressionism, attempting to grapple with the meaning of Cézanne's art, states the focus of his research thus:

> ...I am concerned with the meaning of the layers of interpretation superimposed on Cézanne's art as much as with any 'original' meaning that might be ascribed to his

> work. These added layers affect what one sees even after they have been identified and have seemingly become transparent. To use a different, but equally familiar, metaphor: my understanding of Cézanne is both constrained and enhanced by an interpretive discourse already in play, a discourse to which the painter himself is but one of many contributors. (42)

Shiff's statement highlights the problem, at the outset of his research, of the difficulty and complexity in interpreting Cézanne's art. As a result, the intricate issue of how the scholar gains access to the meaning of a work of art in the interpretive enterprise, is also highlighted. Central to Shiff's investigation of the meaning of Cézanne's art is the premise that meaning is located both within the confines of the picture frame and beyond. Shiff's concern, in his study of Cézanne, can be clearly located within the parameters of the New Art History, in his focus on the theoretical practice of the discipline and the effects of it's methods on interpretation. (43)

In attempting to reconstruct the 'original' meaning of Cézanne's art, the scholar must account for the historical dimension inscribed in the work of art by way of an investigation of the aesthetic properties that govern its making. The artist's creative process itself warrants exploration (albeit problematic and at times seemingly impossible) and affords the scholar insight into the first spectatorship, in a series of spectatorships, in which the artist is the first interpreter of his own work.

Traditionally, the artist is seen only in the role of the creator of the work of art and not in the role of the spectator of the work, traditionally ascribed to, and the sole privilege of the viewer. This notion is examined more fully later on in the text. Although Shiff's methods can be related to the work of earlier art historians, most notably Erwin Panofsky, in his insistence on the contextual approach to art, an important distinction must be made: while earlier art historians insisted upon the meaning of the work of art as singular and monolithic, Shiff offers the work a diversity of readings that are not necessarily reducible to any one dominant meaning. Because the work of art is a galaxy of signifiers, not a structure of signifieds, the meaning of the work of art is continually being redefined and at no point can be said to have a clearly fixed meaning. In addition, a work of art is a structure of significations whose interrelatedness must be understood. The work of art in the context of Shiff's practice of art history is thus inscribed with a dimension of process usually denied it.

It has been argued that language plays a significant role in the literature and that the literature is the mechanism by which an artist's work is interpreted. In examining the ways in which art historians access the meaning of a work of art, it is essential to consider the specific language structures that operate within interpretation.

The interpretative enterprise is made up of a tripartite structure, namely, the artist, the art object and the spectator. These three elements (or language structures) that make up interpretation, must

be seen as broad components each with their own context and without definite boundaries. Scholars may focus their attention on any one of these aspects, or they may combine, in their analysis of a specific artist's work, any number of these components and/or contexts. In all instances of interpretation, the art historian's focus on any one of these components will determine, to some extent, the purpose of their enquiry and the nature of their interpretation.

It is noteworthy that in analysing these three contexts for interpretation, two different methods are necessarily employed: a synchronic method which outlines a constructed and artificial paradigm within which art historians categorize and organize information and a diachronic method which accounts for the historical dimension that shifts and alters these seemingly static contexts. In addition, it should be stressed that this triad of the contexts of artist, art object and spectator are rarely fixed in interpretation, and more often interpenetrate one another.

The meaning of Cézanne's art has depended, to some extent, on these specific contexts, within which interpretation is facilitated and meaning ascribed. Although the meaning of his art is context bound, with regard to the broad historical period within which he worked, the contexts are boundless and scholars have focused on a myriad of aspects that inform our present understanding of his art. Since meaning ascribed to Cézanne's art is informed by the various contexts within which scholars situate his artistic enterprise, the overview of the Cézanne literature undertaken in chapter three will highlight how these contexts, evident in the

literature, govern the differing concerns of Cézanne scholars.

In addressing the complexities of the relationship in the interpretative enterprise, between the artist, the art object and the spectator, the scholar must therefore consider what the art historian's activity and function are in relation to her material, as well as the methods she may use in fulfilling this defined function and finally, the effects of these methods in determining (and acting upon) the nature and status of the material studied. Central to this consideration and linked to the enterprise of interpreting meaning in the visual arts, is the much debated concept of intentionality.

The concept of intentionality can be applied to any one of the aforementioned structures that constitute the interpretative enterprise; namely, the artist, the art object and the spectator. Common to all the literature is the desire to recuperate the intention of either the artist, the art object or the spectator. In the latter case the spectator may include a consideration of the historical conditions within which a particular work of art was produced and understood by a spectator contemporaneous with the work in question, that is to say, the intentionality of a particular context. In addition, the context of the spectator may also consider the role of subsequent spectators of a work of art.

Common to the way in which historians have approached these three contexts is the tendency to unify often fragmentary aspects. Within the context of the artist, for example, the scholar may view the artist's biography, his personal history, his letters and his

psychological personality, viewed as a totality of factual information. (44) Similarly, in analysing the development of an artist's work, the scholar may describe this development as a linear progression which unfolds naturally and logically. Finally, the development of art history, within which the artist's work may be meaningfully understood, is often viewed, as indicated above, as a logical unfolding, seemingly unaffected by the dynamic and continually changing aspect of history. In the latter case, the apparent stasis of history is the luxury of hindsight, afforded the scholar by historical perspective. Aspects of this tendency to unify the diversity of either the artistic persona, his output or his historical context, will be referred to in chapter two.

The interpreters attitude to the notion of intentionality will directly influence the kind of values ascribed to the artist, the art object or the spectator. The different interpretations of Cézanne can in part be attributed to the different ways in which art historians have reconstructed Cézanne's intentions.

The relationship between Cézanne and his works is often defined as homogeneous in the literature and this, as well as facilitating an approach to the intention of the artist as existing prior to the work, undermines the dynamic concept of artistic process. An examination of the artist's intentions in this homogeneous view is seen to clarify the interpretation of the work itself. It is against this prevailing attitude that the literary scholars, Wimsatt and Beardsley, cited below, forwarded their ideas. Since the concept of intentionality is debated in art history, as well as other related

disciplines, references will be made to the contributions of writers in the related fields of aesthetics and literary studies. In all these disciplines, including art history, the intention of the artist (author) is central to the task of interpretation. As M.H. Abrams, the literary critic has remarked in relation to literary texts,

> all criticism has to deal with the interrelationship between the work of art, its creator, and its audience, but the endeavour of much modern criticism from Eliot and Richards in the twenties to the American New Critics in the forties and fifties, was to achieve an 'objective' criticism in which attention would be focused upon the meaning of the work itself, undistracted by inquiries into its origins in personal experiance or effects on particular individuals. The essays of Wimsatt and Beardsley constitute the most uncompromising theoretical statement of this position. (45)

As stated previously, critics at different times of history have privileged different aspects of the interpretative enterprise. When Wimsatt and Beardsley published their seminal essays "The Intentional Fallacy" (1946) and "The Affective Fallacy" (1949), critics at the time were concerned primarily with the meaning of the text as mediated through the explanation of the intentions of the author, or by reference to the effect of the text on the reader. Within this context they wrote:

> The Intentional Fallacy is a confusion between the poem and its origins, a special case of what is known to philosophers

> as the Genetic Fallacy. It begins by trying to derive the standard of criticism from the psychological causes of the poem and ends in biography and relativism. The Affective Fallacy is a confusion between the poem and its results (what it is and what it does), a special case of epistemological scepticism, though usually advanced as if it had far stronger claims than the overall forms of scepticism. It begins by trying to derive the standard of criticism from the psychological effects of the poem and ends in impressionism and relativism. The outcome of either Fallacy, the Intentional or the Affective, is that the poem itself, as an object of specifically critical judgment, tends to disappear. (46)

Their position can be seen as representative of the so-called anti-intentionalists, and as such is valuable for the clear position it articulates against intentionality. The formalist critics, Bell and Fry, share many of the ideas forwarded by Wimsatt and Beardsley. In the same way that the formalist critics of the early twentieth century opened new ground for the interpretation of Cézanne so too did the insights of Wimsatt and Beardsley. However, once these approaches had been explored and adopted by academic institutions, they tended to limit the parameters of enquiry in subsequent generations of interpreters.

For Wimsatt and Beardsley the poem itself is the sole aspect toward which the critic should address her attention. In that the poem is in itself evidence of the poet's intention, they maintained that the need to go outside the poem was irrelevant. They argued

that since the meaning of the poem was generated by the poem, the scholar need not turn to information that was considered by Wimsatt and Beardsley to be external to the poem itself. The role of the critic was to examine the internal workings of the poem only and her aim as a critic was to thus arrive at the poem's meaning.

The relationship between the artist and his life is often the core around which art historical enquiry is developed. As a result, it is important to analyze the way in which this relationship is specifically reconstructed in the literature and the implications for interpretation in general. Factors governing the interpretation and explanation of an artist's work include notions of intentionality, biography, psychology, historical and social milieu, psychoanalysis and the artist's letters. All these elements contribute to an understanding of the artist, which forms part of the tripartite structure mentioned above. Depending on the scholar's approach to the construct 'artist', the interpretation that takes place will be affected. The construct 'artist' is the one constant element in the tripartite structure of interpretation. However, it should be noted that the stable position of the construct 'artist', shifts subtly in relation to the other two parts of the triad. The idea that at any one particular moment this triad is fixed and immovable is of course a myth.

Related to debates about the importance of the artist's intentions in interpretation, scholars have come to question the exact nature of the persona we term the 'artist'. In questioning this persona, scholars have posed questions about the implied meaning

suggested by this term. The term 'artist' is assumed to be accompanied by a context whose analysis affects interpretation and it is for this reason that scholars have insisted that the context of the artist warrants analysis. Although the art historian uses the term frequently, some articulation of the concept is necessary in order to understand fully the way in which the idea of the artist operates in art history. Simply put, the question of who the artist is, needs to be asked.

Roland Barthes' article on the subject is useful, for it provides a valuable formulation of the construct of the author/artist. (47) Because this article appears within the context of literary studies, the term 'author' is employed, rather than the term 'artist'. Given the parameters of the enquiry forwarded here, the term 'author' will be considered to be interchangeable with that of 'artist'. Where differences are significant, this will be noted.

Barthes, in "The Death of the Author" (published in 1977) examines the way in which meaning in the literary text is invested in the persona we call the author.

Barthes states at the outset that,

> The explanation of a work is always sought in the man or woman who produced it, as if it were always in the end, through the more or less transparent allegory of the fiction, the voice of a single person, the author 'confiding' in us. (48)

Barthes goes on to question the idea that the author is the sole creator of the literary text, and argues that meaning in the literary text is created and sustained by the reader who emerges, "...at the cost of the death of the Author", as the active participant in the reading of literary texts. (49) Interestingly, the tyranny of the 'author' in Barthes model is replaced in Michel Foucault's model by the tyranny of the reader. (50)

In their attempts to centralise the importance of the position of the artist in the interpretation of a work of art, scholars have often turned to the written documentation (as opposed to the visual works) of an artist, to justify an approach to or interpretation of her/his work. The artist's letters form part of the written documentation which scholars address in their attempts to define the artist's intention. Other written documentation includes, for example, manifestos and articles written on the philosophy of art. These written documents, extrinsic to the work of art, are often seen to shed light on the works' meaning. This extrinsic information is often understood to depend neither on the role of the art historian as mediator nor on her interpretative skills. It is proposed that these extrinsic factors need to be decoded in order to understand how they facilitate interpretation.

Herschel B. Chipp, in Theories of Modern Art: A Source Book by Artists and Critics, correctly states that

> ...the writings and statements of painters and sculptors as well as of critics and poets are valid source materials for a

study of ideas and doctrines of modern art. (51)

Certainly the documents, writings and statements of artists may give the scholar access to the artist in ways that the object may not, but it is essential to consider, as Chipp does, how the scholar processes such information.

Chipp forwards the idea that in order for the document to be of greatest value to the scholar, and to avoid frequent instances of misquotation and misinterpretation, it must be seen within the various contexts that form part of its function and meaning. (52)

Chipp's contextual approach to the document, while it minimizes the instances of misinterpretation, does not fully acknowledge how, despite the consideration of these contexts, a plurality of meanings is nonetheless generated by different readings of the letters. The issue of intentionality is pertinent here. The scholar in this contextual approach, while she may not ascribe or locate the artist's intention within the document itself, seeks the intention in the various contexts suggested by Chipp.

While Chipp rightly insists upon the importance of analysing extrinsic information to the letters, he sees this extrinsic information as readily accessible to the scholar and fails to acknowledge that, in order to gain access to these contexts, the scholar must interpret them. In so doing, the scholar ascribes meaning to the various contexts proposed by Chipp, in a similar way as she may do to the artists letters. Implicit in Chipp's system

is the functioning of the scholar's objectivity in the interpretation of extrinsic information. This needs to be questioned, and one may ask whether the scholar can ever step outside of the interpretative enterprise and view her terrain objectively.

While an examination of the artist's intention facilitates an explanation of the work of art which is part of the historical enterprise, it is important to stress that the artist's intentions as understood to be expressed in his letters, need to be interpreted. In the same way that the work of art warrants interpretation, so too the letters. While the art historical activity of explanation is directed toward locating and isolating the reasons for the appearance of a particular work (or works), the interpretation of the work of art seeks to understand, through visual analysis, the effects of the artist's visual language, in all its complexity, on the spectator and the ways that the artist's visual language communicates meaningfully. Interpretation therefore, unlike explanation, does not seek to reconstruct the artist's intention through visual analysis.

Thus far it has been suggested that the literature is an essential index to the meaning of a work of art. As such, in specific relation to Cézanne, the analysis of the literature affords the scholar valuable insights into the shifting concerns of Cézanne scholarship and the ways in which these govern our understanding of Cézanne's art.

In the following chapter, the precise ways in which the literature on

Cézanne has defined the paradigms for interpretation will be investigated.

II. The Cézanne Literature: An Overview

In chapter one an analysis of the ways in which meaning is constructed in the interpretation of the art object was presented. References to selected theorists indicated that the process of interpretation was both a complex and ideologically encoded practice. In addition, it was argued that the literature informs the meaning of a work of art in significant ways and therefore warrants both consideration and analysis.

In this chapter, traditional approaches to Cézanne's work will be examined and critically evaluated and thereby, existing paradigms for Cézanne scholarship will be outlined. In addition, the implications of new approaches for Cézanne scholarship will be evaluated.

As previously suggested, the dynamic interaction between the image and interpretation form part of the process in which images acquire meaning. An examination of the literature offers insights into the reception, interpretation and historical position of the art object.

A great deal of literature has been devoted to Cézanne from the first written account of his work in 1865 to the most recent publications. This in itself is testimony to the importance accorded the artist in the art historical literature. While many art historians have contributed to the literature, important contributions have also

been made by art critics, philosophers, psychologists, linguists and historians. Cognizance of the status of the writer when discussing her contribution will be taken into account, as this situates her within a particular language construct, which defines in turn, the parameters within which interpretation takes place. For example, the role and function of the art critic may differ in purpose to that of the linguist or art historian and thus, affect interpretation.

Certain interpreters of Cézanne will be examined in greater depth than others, in order to draw attention to specific theoretical constructs that inform the activity of interpretation, with particular ramifications for Cézanne scholarship. Furthermore, it will be shown how the 'meaning' of Cézanne's art is linked to interpretations of it.

In broad terms, two main tendencies in the Cézanne literature can be isolated; namely, interpretations concerned with the formal aspects of Cézanne's work and those concerned with the subject-matter or thematic content of his work. In this examination of the shifting concerns of the Cézanne literature, the terms 'form' and 'content' are used to indicate the emphasis of particular writers' interpretations. In all instances the word 'content' is understood to be coterminous with the words subject-matter and theme.

It was not until the 1950s, with Meyer Schapiro's study of Cézanne (1952), that the formalist tradition prevalent in the Cézanne literature, was challenged. As Wechsler affirms,

> What is unique to the Cézanne literature is that it marks a shift in mid-twentieth century criticism from a predominantly formal trend to a humanistic one. (1)

This shift, that occurred after the Second World War with the writings of Meyer Schapiro, Maurice Merleau-Ponty and others, altered the terms of Cézanne scholarship for the next generation. These writings challenged the formal emphases in the Cézanne literature and began to forward the importance of examining Cézanne's content as an appropriate index to the meaning of his art.

It is important to stress at the outset that these two streams of criticism emerged at particular moments in history and that the historical context, to some extent, governed the direction of their enquiries. In addition, writers often articulated their particular emphases in the interpretation of Cézanne's work, and thus, justified their theoretical positions which often explains their neglect in either their attention to formal issues or those of content.

An examination of the nineteenth century context and the early criticism on Cézanne will be carried out, as well as the conditions that facilitated the emergence of Formalist criticism at this time. Given the significance and dominance of the trend of Formalism in the Cézanne literature, the important Formalist contributions of Clive Bell, Roger Fry and Clement Greenberg will be analyzed. In addition, an analysis of the status of Cézanne's letters in the interpretation of his art will be conducted. While the important

contributions of scholars concerned with the subject matter of Cézanne's work as opposed to the formal aspects of his work, such as Maurice Merleau-Ponty and Meyer Schapiro, will be examined, their ideas will also be referred to in chapter three. Finally, an examination of the ways in which recent scholarship has redressed some of the inadequacies of the Cézanne literature will be undertaken.

In addition to the analysis of specific Cézanne scholars, reference to different types of art historical literature, for example the monograph and the catalogue raisonné, will be made throughout. It will be argued, that these types of literature organize information that affects the ways in which Cézanne's works are ultimately interpreted.Similarly, art historical concepts such as 'development' (as applied to the arrangement of an artist's work into specific periods, particular genres, and in relation to the development of movements within the narrative of the discipline of art history), affect interpretation.

Any study of the literature on Cézanne, as well as offering insights into the different perspectives on the artist and his work, is also a study of the shifting methods and concerns of art history as a discipline, from the late nineteenth century to the present day. Recent developments examined in the New Art History, and outlined in the previous chapter, have highlighted both the unavoidability of an ideological position for the art historian in interpreting her subject as well as the importance of decoding these positions in the history of the discipline.

A survey of the literature is valuable because it indicates how particular historical moments informed the writings on Cézanne. It will be shown that one cannot read the literature meaningfully without contextualising its concerns historically and furthermore, that what is possible to say about Cézanne, is defined by the parameters of history. Given the above, this survey of the literature inevitably reflects the preoccupations of the present writer's own historical context as reflected in both the 'reading' of the literature and the 'reading' of Cézanne's visual language.

The importance of the early criticism that emerged during Cézanne's own lifetime lies in the various ways in which it defined the terms and parameters for writing about Cézanne during this time, but equally, for the ways in which subsequent interpreters of Cézanne internalized these parameters and perpetuated them in subsequent interpretations of his work. Central to an understanding of this early literature is the historical context of the nineteenth century within which this body of literature emerged and functioned. Failure to contextualise these writings historically distorts the pregnant moment that defines this period.

The first printed mention of Cézanne's work, cited in Wechsler, is made by the art critic Marius Roux in 1865. He stated that Cézanne, " '...belongs to a school which has the privilege of provoking criticism.'" (2) Roux's statement does not attempt to comment directly on any aspect of the man or his works; rather, he anticipates the unfolding of a narrative of commentaries on Cézanne. Interestingly, the early literature was to be the domain of

the art critic, and it was only much later that other writers began to enter into the existing dialogue on Cézanne. From the first mention of Cézanne in print, all subsequent interpretations of Cézanne's work may be seen to build upon an existing discourse. Generations of scholars would situate themselves in relation to previous commentary, whether in sympathy with it or not.

It would be historically inaccurate to suggest, for example, that the aesthetics of Bell and Fry were not part of an already immanent tendency in the appreciation of Cézanne. Looking at their aesthetics suggests in fact that the issues raised therein are linked very much to the nineteenth and early twentieth century debates about art.

In other words, the issues raised by Bell and Fry, were a continuation of the debates initiated in Cézanne's own lifetime. Indeed the strong formalist tradition in the Cézanne literature was a product of this period. The implications of the formalist approach for Cézanne's painting are reformulated and reiterated in the formalist approaches to his work in the early part of this century.

Since Cézanne's earliest critics were concerned primarily with the formal qualities of his work, it is important to question briefly why the formalist approach to Cézanne's paintings was inaugurated by his earliest critics and furthermore, to question why this approach seemed so readily appropriate to the reception of his work at this time. In addition, it is important to establish what, if any, impact this had on subsequent interpretations of Cézanne's work.

An analysis of these early critics serves to contextualise Cézanne as an artist of his time, rather than as is often suggested, the solitary 'genius' and singlehanded precursor of Modern art.

The early reception of Cézanne's works was characterized by difficulty, and Cézanne's earliest critics, according to Hamilton, set about creating a language with which to confront this new painting. These early nineteenth century critics sought to invent a critical language with which to evaluate and make sense of those artists allied to an emerging avant-garde. In so doing they facilitated a constructive and empathetic role for critics at the turn of the century. (3)

Critics who attacked Cézanne's art in the nineteenth century context did so in relation to the expectations and standards set and fulfilled by academic artists and academies. These critics saw in Cézanne's art an inability to sustain those skills necessary to draw and paint well as defined at this time. Cézanne's art was not seen as a rejection of the representational function of art, which belongs to a specifically twentieth century view of his art. Instead, his art, in it's disregard for the traditional standards of excellence associated with the Academies, and seen to be upheld by them, was seen as incompetent.

Critics who viewed Cézanne's works in a positive light used the same kind of language as those critics who were disdainful of it. The context within which such words as 'primitive' and 'naive' occurred, defined the critics' attitude to Cézanne. The shock value

with which his works were met is difficult for the twentieth century viewer to appreciate. The challenge of Cézanne's art is perhaps commonplace to the twentieth century spectator who has witnessed the 'demise' of the representational and figurative function of art, with movements such as Cubism, Abstract Expressionism and Conceptual Art.

Cézanne's positive critics at the time, spoke of his paintings in terms of their innovations in pictorial language; others criticized and attacked these innovations. The latter critics initiated issues about Cézanne's work which are still debated in the literature today. An example of this is the apparent 'incompleteness' of his paintings, which, in the nineteenth century context was unacceptable in relation to standards set and fulfilled by academic painters operating within the rigid framework of the Academies.

Hamilton points out that,

> in 1891, Bernard had introduced a concept which above all others was to prove helpful for the ultimate resolution of the critical difficulties presented by this new painting. (4)

Emile Bernard said the following about Cézanne:

> As a painter, before everything else he is a thinker, and a serious one at that; he opens for art this astonishing portal: painting for itself alone. (5)

In this statement Bernard gives credibility to the pictorial character of Cézanne's art. Hamilton remarks further that the concept of 'pure painting'

> was of help through the 1890s for the analysis of Cézanne's innovations. If the critic could convince the spectator that the purely pictorial values were of primary importance, the latter's attention might then be diverted from the distortions, the exaggerated perspective, or the artist's disregard for subject matter. (6)

The artist's apparent disregard for subject matter was judged by unfavourably disposed critics in relation to a hierarchy of genres institutionalized in nineteenth century academic painting. Hamilton, in his "Cézanne and his Critics" quotes Natanson's 1895 comment thus:

> 'In comparing Cézanne's still lifes with the customary academic article designed to whet the appetite of the gourmand and the sensualist, he remarked that what academic painting lacked was 'the essential, impenetrable, and most precious (element)...everything left over, which is nothing but painting'. (7)

The idea of 'pure painting' that emerges in the early criticism was an attempt to respond positively to an emerging new pictorial language and thereby offer alternatives to the penchant for literary allusions prevalent in academic painting of the time, both in France

and in England. When the idea of 'pure painting' was thus viewed it was seen as a corrective to the prevalence of literary subject matter in academic painting.

In relation to academic painting, the still-life genre could facilitate an exploration of pictorial problems without attention to literary and philosophical subjects. However, if this was the impetus for the rise of still-life painting, it is nonetheless not a logical step to insist, as scholars have done, upon the neutrality of subject matter in Cézanne's still-lifes. This idea will be further explored in the analysis of still-lifes in chapter three.

In the same way that early critics reacted against the prevailing and prescriptive attitudes to all aspects of art, including the established expectations of particular hierarchies in relation to genre, so too the early formalist critics within the context of English art and art criticism.

Closely related to the notion of 'pure painting' was the re-emergence in the nineteenth century of the genre of still-life. Traditionally the academy regarded the still-life genre as the lowest genre in a hierarchy of genres, while history painting was one of the most highly valued genres. Noteworthy in this regard, is the fact that the very reasons that relegated the still-life genre to the lowest position in the academic hierarchy of genres, were the very same reasons that it seemed an attractive vehicle for the painters and critics who heralded the notion of 'pure painting' witnessed in the new painting. The idea of 'pure painting' was seen to be most

easily rendered in a genre like still-life, which was not overburdened by literary, historical and moral subjects, and in which the artist could readily experiment with the new forms and painting values articulated by their small band of supportive critics. From the 1840s to the 1870s, still-life became increasingly important and this seems partly accountable for, by the shifting values that occurred at this time. Bettendorf notes that, in addition to the above, the revival of interest in Chardin's work in the nineteenth century, which reached a peak under the influence of Realist painters, resulted in the re-evaluation of the traditional values within the category of still-life. (8)

It is ironic that the perceived potential for neutrality in the genre of still-life in the nineteenth century was subverted in later criticism that addressed the issue of the importance of subject matter in art. These latter critics, in their investigations into Cézanne's themes and subjects reinvested the still-life genre with literary, moral and historical import.

The impact of formalist criticism on the Cézanne literature cannot be underestimated; from the earliest manifestations during Cézanne's own lifetime to the writings of the twentieth century critic, Clement Greenberg. The formalist criticism that emerges in the late nineteenth century and the conditions for its emergence, differs markedly from that of the early twentieth century, as evidenced in the writings of Clive Bell and Roger Fry. By the time Greenberg published his writings on Cézanne the art world was fully entrenched in the notion of Modernism, within which

Greenberg's aesthetic must be understood.

At the turn of the century formalism can be viewed as a liberating approach to art in that it facilitated an exploration of the importance of new forms in pictorial language. However, as formalism as an approach to art became entrenched, and the new language of criticism that it facilitated was accepted, the parameters of formalism seemed to negate other aspects of this art which by the 1940s and 1950s could be opened up for researchers and explored. On the other hand, the responses to formalism were not a rigid rejection of formalist concerns, but rather, a balancing of these concerns with others, forwarded by post-war scholars. Erle Loran, although he researched new material in the Cézanne literature, may be called a more traditional formalist than say, Meyer Schapiro, who brought new insights to his analysis of Cézanne's subject matter through the essentially formal consideration of his style.

No attempt is made here to comprehensively study the formalist tradition, and any comprehensive definition of formalism necessarily negates the subtly differentiated positions that its exponents articulate. (9) Light cautions that,

> A hybrid of disparate theories, formalism has no precise set of principles. Indeed problems of consistent interpretation arise even within the confines of any one of its thinkers. Bell, especially, is noted for the informality of his argument; while Fry, a more rigorous thinker, altered his position over the years. (10)

Rather, the insights brought to bear on the interpretation of Cézanne's still-life paintings in the formalist tradition, will be critically evaluated.

Risking a reductionist view, it is possible to state that, common to all these formalist permutations, is the preoccupation with, and emphesis on the form and formal elements of the art object. Broadly speaking, critics that privilege 'form' over 'content' may be called formalists, although, this distinction is an artificial and often illusory one. (11)

The formalist tradition in the Cézanne literature, as initiated by Cézanne's earliest critics, canonized specific principles, which have affected the way in which Cézanne's still-lifes, as well as his other genres, have been interpreted. The critique of formalism manifests itself in the various responses to the formalist position. In the following examination of the aesthetic positions of Clive Bell, Roger Fry and Clement Greenberg, the development of the formalist tradition will be critically evaluated. The choice of these critics is not entirely arbitrary and warrants some justification.

On the most elementary level, the fact that Bell and Greenberg were both art critics, gives them a certain coherence. The importance of the critics role as mediator between the artist and the public facilitates an assessment of the historical conditions that gave rise to these arbiters of taste. The nineteenth and early twentieth century contexts inform the issues raised by Bell and Fry, while the later twentieth century context informed those issues

debated by Greenberg. The nature of these critics' aesthetic positions is partly moulded by the art that they responded to and defended. Both English critics, Bell and Fry were instrumental in bringing the New French art to the attention of the English public.

In assessing the contributions of Bell, Fry and Greenberg to the tradition of formalism and to the Cézanne literature, the following elements of their writings will be considered. First, an analysis of Bell's concept of 'significant form', introduced in his book Art (first published in 1914), will be undertaken. The term is problematic and its analysis serves to concretize several issues that are central to the enterprise of formalism. Second, Fry's authoritative and influential monograph on Cézanne (published in 1927), which encapsulates many formalist attitudes that are reiterated in the subsequent literature, will be examined. The term 'Post-Impressionism' coined by Fry in 1910, will be analyzed further on in relation to the writings of Richard Shiff. Finally, Clement Greenberg's essays on 'Cézanne' (1951) and 'Modernist Painting' (1965) which suggests the relationship between Cézanne, the formalist tradition and Modernism, will be examined. The appropriation in the literature, of Cézanne as the precursor of many modern movements, is an instance in which the above relationship is brought into play.

For Cézanne's early critics that initiated the formalist debates about Cézanne's art, and for Bell, Fry and Greenberg, form is the privileged carrier of the work's meaning. All these critics privileged form over content as the appropriate index of meaning in works of

art, although they articulated this privileging in very different ways. What becomes clear in the analysis of the aesthetics of Bell, Fry and Greenberg, is that from the outset, their assumptions about art are motivated by very specific convictions about the nature and purpose of art.

Bell (who was part of the Bloomsbury Group) went to Paris in 1910 with Fry and Desmond McCarthy, to select pictures for the first Post-Impressionist exhibition in London, held at the Grafton Gallery. In 1914 Bell published his influential book entitled, Art, in which he posed the following question in his chapter on 'The Aesthetic Hypothesis':

> What quality is common to Sta.Sophia and the windows at Chartres, Mexican sculpture, a Persian bowl, Chinese carpets, Giotto's frescoes at Padua, and the masterpieces of Poussin, Piero della Francesca, and Cézanne? (12)

Bell's answer was articulated in the form of the concept he developed, namely, 'significant form'. He considered 'significant form' to be the common denominator of all aesthetic experience. In support of this idea he suggested that in each of the works of art mentioned above:

> lines and colours combined in a particular way, certain forms and relations of forms, stir our aesthetic emotions. These relations and combinations of lines and colours, these aesthetically moving forms, I call "Significant Form"; (13)

The reasons why certain formal arrangements move the spectator is, according to Bell, because form "...expresses the emotion of its creator." (14) The art at the turn of the century challenged traditional notions of beauty and any aesthetic position that centralized the notion of beauty could not accommodate this art in its paradigm. The fact that Bell's concept of significant form did not depend upon traditional values of beauty made it an attractive concept for Fry and others who wished to develop a language of criticism in sympathy with new developments in art.

As Solomon Fishman has suggested, the idea of significant form

> ...served as a talisman for explaining the powerful yet disturbing effects of the new art, often achieved by ignoring or violating notions of beauty. (15)

In Bell's differentiation between 'material beauty' (butterfly's wings) and the work of art, he concedes that, though both may move the spectator 'material beauty' or 'beautiful form', "...does not move us aesthetically." (16)

Bell comments that,

> It is tempting to explain the difference between 'significant form' and 'beauty'- that is to say, the difference between form that provokes our aesthetic emotions and form that does not - by saying that significant form conveys to us an emotion felt by its creator and that beauty conveys nothing. (17)

Another seminal distinction that Bell makes is that between 'form' and 'representation'. He asks that,

> no one imagine that representation is bad in itself; a realistic form may be as significant, in its place as part of the design as an abstract. But if a representative form has value, it is as form, not as representation. The representative element in a work of art may or may not be harmful; always it is irrelevant. (18)

This distinction forms the basis of challenges by later anti-formalist critics who argued for the intimate relation between what is represented, and how this representation conveys meaning.

While Bell's focus is more on the nature of art generally, Fry's criticism addresses both general aesthetic issues and Cézanne's genre of still-life specifically. His observations on the still-life genre are informed by Bell's distinction between 'form' and 'representation'. He states that,

> the still-life...guards the picture itself from the misconstructions of those whose contact with art is confined to its effect as representation. In still-life the ideas and emotions associated with the objects represented are, for the most part, so utterly commonplace and insignificant that neither artist nor spectator need consider them. (19)

For Bell the notion of quality is a distinguishing feature of

'significant form'. He discusses this in relation to the idea of the original work of art and the copy thereof. His formulation of the differences between the two is thus reflected:

> The two visible objects, the original and the copy, differ because that which ordered the work of art does not preside at the manufacture of the copy. That which orders the work of art, I suggest, the emotion which empowers artists to create significant form. The good copy, the copy that moves us, is always the work of one who is possessed by this mysterious emotion. ...The power of creating significant form depends, ...on some curious mental and emotional power. (20)

In his conception of form, Bell does not consider the role of technique as an important one. He insisted that the purpose of art "...is not how it is painted, but whether it provokes aesthetic emotion." (21) Bell argues that although, "Certainly Cézanne invented a technique, admirably suited to his purpose, ..." (22) the painters showing at the Salon d'Automne or Les Independants, who adopted the Post-Impressionist techniques were...quite worthless." (23) What emerges from this aspect of Bell's aesthetic is insistence that, in order

> to appreciate a work of art we need bring nothing from life, no knowledge of its ideas and affairs, no familiarity with its emotions. Art transports us from the world of man's activity to a world of aesthetic exaltation. (24)

Art, that possesses 'significant form', in its transcendence of phenomenal reality, signifies and resembles transcendent reality. In this way, Bell's definition of art, is, finally a metaphysical one.

Despite the obvious appeal that Bell's concept of 'significant form' had in the early part of the twentieth century, the tautological nature of his argument cannot pass unnoticed. Bell states emphatically that 'significant form' communicates to the spectator and induces in her an aesthetic emotion, but he does not adequately elaborate on or further explain this process of interchange between the spectator and the work. Bell's metaphysical interpretation of art focuses exclusively on the formal properties that evoke in the spectator some kind of aesthetic thrill. He fails to analyze, or even point to, the subject matter of the work of art, its moral message or anecdotal content. For him, the notion of artistic intention is not problematic, and the work of art, not dissimilar to an iconic image, communicates magically. The apparent naturalness of the way in which this occurs is never questioned by Bell.

A significant difference between Fry and Bell is Fry's attempt to analyze the specific properties of individual works of art. According to Wechsler, it was Fry's intention "...to do for the understanding of contemporary art what Wölfflin had done for the Italian Renaissance." (25) Bell, who maintained that he could recognize the presence of 'significant form' by its affect on him, was unable to discuss form as an objective phenomenon and spoke generally about Cézanne, Post-Impressionism and other art.

In Fry's monograph on Cézanne: a study of his development, Cézanne's art is roughly divided into four stages: an early stage, an impressionist stage, a constructive stage and a mature stage. Fry's influence on this aspect of Cézanne's art is substantial and scholars such as Schapiro, Reff, Klimova, Orienti accept this linear perception of Cézanne's stylistic development, and interestingly, all use similar words to describe the various periods. Fry says of the early period that is was, 'hallucinatory', 'reckless', 'intensely personal', 'baroque', and that "...they were the result of Cézanne's invention rather than his direct observation of nature." (26) Other scholars such as Schapiro (27) and Klimova (28) have also remarked on these qualities of the early period.

Although Fry's categories or periods were adopted by later Cézanne scholars, Fry himself was aware of too rigid a conception of development. He suggested that stylistic change was neither gradual,

> Nor is it so regular that we can trust to it altogether to fix the exact date of any given work. There are returns to the old impasto, but thin painting certainly predominates toward the end of the century. (29)

It is noteworthy that Fry's formalist position was articulated in response to a prevailing literariness in British academies and paintings of the time. Fry heralded the new French art in response to a strong narrative, literary and moral English art; as for example, Hogarth, Millais and Ford Madox Brown. Solomon Fishman

suggests that,

> Since Fry was combating during a large part of his career the prevailing attitude toward painting which placed primary stress on its illustrative content and its literary associations, he tended toward the opposite extreme - an aestheticism which isolated art from human experience. He did succeed in establishing, if not the idea of the autonomy of form, the primacy of form in the fruitful investigation of visual art. (30)

Fry's formalist interpretations of Cézanne's still-life paintings disregards the relevance of subject matter and theme. Fry and Bell, in their disregard for the subjects depicted by Cézanne, do not explore the thematic content of his art. No consideration is given by Fry to the various types of objects found in Cézanne's many still-life paintings; depictions of apples, skulls, fruit dishes, baskets, vegetables, statues are all lumped together. This line of investigation was to flourish later with the introduction of psychological and psychoanalytical methods into art history in which the latent symbolism of particular objects was investigated. Fry states that, "...for Cézanne...a skull was merely a complicated variation upon the sphere." (31) Nowhere does Fry relate the skull to the established vanitas tradition in still-life painting. This more obvious omission indicates the extent to which the consideration of formal issues was privileged in Fry's aesthetic.

Although Fry does concede that in the history of still-life painting there are exceptions to the "...purely plastic significance of still

life", he insists that by the middle of the 1880s Cézanne had abandoned any dramatic overtones in his manner of painting. He argues that,

> If the words tragic, menacing, noble or lyrical seem out of place before Cézanne's still-lifes, one feels none the less the emotions they arouse are curiously analogous to these states of mind. It is not from lack of emotion that these pictures are not dramatic, lyric, etc., but rather by reason of a process of elimination and concentration. They [illegible] to speak, dramas deprived of all dramatic incident. (32)

Fry does not pursue this aspect of Cézanne's still-lifes or the potential meaning of the narrative content of this 'dramatic incident' nor the meaning of style as opposed to form. The notion of the drama of style and the idea of 'dramatic incident' will be explored in the analysis of specific works in chapter three.

In the same way that the context for the emergence of the formalist criticism of Bell and Fry must be understood as significant, the context of Modernism must be considered in relation to Clement Greenberg's criticism. Greenberg, as the spokesperson for the Abstract Expressionists in the 1940s and 1950s, championed the plight of painters such as de Kooning, Pollock, Kline, Gorky, Barnett Newman, Ad Reinhardt and Mark Rothko. The art that Greenberg responded to may be seen to determine to some extent, the formulation of his aesthetic paradigms.

It is interesting to note that the emergence, history and development of formalism, is closely related to the notion of the avant-garde in art. According to Beverly H. Twitchell, in her study on Cézanne and Formalism in Bloomsbury,

> formalism and avant-gardism often overlap and coincide. Formalism dominated avant-garde art from Manet through Pop Art or Minimalism. This resulted largely from the separation of form from content, but the formalist trend also had three vanguardist characteristics bolstering it; evolutionism, with its accompanying historicism and modernism; the cult of purity which reductivism bred; and the alienation which these other two forces encouraged. Together, these factors encouraged the solipsistic art, especially painting, which became art for art's sake. (33)

Greenberg saw Cézanne as a vital link in the development of painting. In "Cézanne and the Unity of Modern Art" (1951), Greenberg stated the following:

> Thus, Cézanne's efforts to turn impressionism toward the sculptural was shifted, in its fulfilment, from the structure of the pictorial illusion of the configuration to the picture itself as an object, as a flat surface. Cézanne got 'solidity' all right; but it is as much a two dimensional, literal solidity as a representational one. (34)

Greenberg suggests that Cézanne was responsible for the shift

from pictorial illusion to "the picture itself as an object, as a flat surface." (35) Greenberg identifies Modernism

> with the intensification, almost the exacerbation, of this self-critical tendency that began with the philosopher Kant. Because he was the first to criticize the means itself of criticism, I conceive of Kant as the first real Modernist. The essence of Modernism lies, ..., in the use of the characteristic methods of a discipline to criticize the discipline itself - not in order to subvert it, but to entrench it more firmly in its area of competence. (36)

Further on Greenberg states that, "What had to be exhibited and made explicit was that which was unique and irreducible not only in art in general but also in each particular art", (37) and recalls that, "It quickly emerged that the unique and proper area of competence of art coincided with all that was unique to the nature of the medium." (38)

Greenberg suggested that,

> Flatness, two-dimensionality, was the condition painting shared with no other art, and so Modernist painting oriented itself to flatness as it did to nothing else. (39)

Implicit in Greenberg's understanding of Cézanne, is a post-Cubist perspective. Cézanne's concerns and intentions are conflated with those of the Cubists' and other 'moderns'. In this way, Greenberg's

view of Cézanne's art is governed by his belief that his work anticipates the tendencies of later twentieth century styles and movements. Failure to situate Cézanne within a nineteenth century context obfuscates the conditions of Cézanne's 'present', and is one of the central problems of Greenberg's interpretation of Cézanne's artistic enterprise. Although Greenberg highlighted the quality of abstraction and incompleteness in Cézanne's work, Cézanne, in a letter to Emile Bernard (dated 23 October 1905), mentions these qualities, in the following terms and context:

> Now, being old, nearly 70 years, the sensations of colour, which give light, are the reason for the abstractions which prevent me from either covering my canvas or continuing the delimitation of the objects when their points of contact are fine and delicate; from which it results that my image or picture is incomplete. (40)

Whereas in Cézanne's terms this abstracting process and ensuing incompleteness were viewed as limitations, for Greenberg and others they are highlighted as 'evidence' of Cézanne's modernist intentions. Cézanne's method was a process of representing nature, rather than abstracting from nature, as suggested by Greenberg.

Greenberg, and historians working within a similar framework, focused on specific formal qualities of Cézanne's work. They found these qualities to reside particularly in his late work and as a result, do not consider, for example, his early work or those works that he painted in direct relation to the concerns that informed

Impressionism. The idea of the so-called 'mature' artist, and its corollary of 'mature works', is operative in this model of interpretation. Cézanne's watercolours became important for modernist scholars since they seemed more readily to reflect the 'spontaneous' quality of Cézanne's method. The 'unfinished' quality of the watercolours and some of his later works was said to draw attention to the modernist principle of 'painting as painting'. Since the alleged subject of modernist painting was thought to be its surface (and the way in which the surface in modernist painting was both the signifier and the signified), Cézanne's watercolours and late works in their affirmation of the painted and flat surface, were privileged by modernist scholars.

As indicated in the above analysis, scholars privileged different aspects of Cézanne's oeuvre at various points in the development of formalism. The critical response to the tradition of formalism, while it addressed many of the imbalances of this formalist approach to Cézanne, did not forward an enriched formalism that could suggest new ways for an expanded reading of Cézanne's visual language. In chapter three new possibilities for formalism in the interpretation of Cézanne will be investigated.

One of the limitations of formalism is its failure to discuss the theme or subject matter of a work so that what is represented is not seen as integral to a painting's meaning. In addition, how an image is represented, that is the technique employed by the artist, is not seen as central to the work's meaning. This failure was to be redressed by the so-called Humanist Criticism that emerged with

the significant writings on Cézanne of Meyer Schapiro and Merleau-Ponty in the 1950s.

Although traditionally, the literature is considered to be written interpretation of an artist's work, the artist's own written statements or letters are not considered interpretative in the above sense. In the context of this survey of the literature, Cézanne's letters, particularly those letters in which he expresses his ideas about his own work and the work of other artists, are seen as interpretative. Cézanne's letters can therefore be considered within the context of this survey in two ways; firstly, in relation to the different ways in which scholars have used the letters to interpret Cézanne's works, and secondly, as Cézanne's own written comments about art, both generally and in specific relation to his own work and aesthetic enterprise.

Since their publication, in French "...more than 35 years ago, and in Oxford, in an English translation, in 1941.", (41) Cézanne's letters have played a central role for scholars in the interpretation of the artist's work. In the various attempts to reconstruct the intention of Cézanne's art and to understand, not only the meaning of his work but his personality and life, scholars have turned to the letters of Cézanne. The status of Cézanne's letters in the interpretation of Cézanne cannot be underestimated and it is important in a survey of the Cézanne literature to assess their purpose and function.

Cézanne scholars have turned to the letters in many instances and

for various reasons. (42) The central motivation in all these cases may be seen in the scholars' belief that the artist's biography, evident in the letters and his artistic intentions articulated therein, are of paramount importance.

The monograph, whose art historical purpose is to document the artist's biography, and which studies the relationship between the artist's life and his works, attempts to recreate the artistic personality of Cézanne in order to explain his works. In these studies Cézanne is viewed as the sole originator of meaning in the work of art. The artist is privileged in this approach and his statements about art and his conversations recollected by close friends constitute the source material. Biographical studies also foreground the artist's life as an important index to understanding the artist's work. (43)

Although one may assume that those writings that appeared closer in time to Cézanne's life and death, are more accurate, this assumption needs to be questioned. Common to the earlier and later biographical studies is a shared set of assumptions about the general relationship of art to life, as well as the more specific relationship between the artist and his work. These shared assumptions inform the methodological approach adopted by diverse scholars.

Any examination of Cézanne's letters (as well as recollected conversations by contemporary artists, dealers and friends) as source material for his art must caution against a simplistic

parallelism between his art and his life. The letters reflect a far more complex relation to the artist's life than is often assumed.

The ideas forwarded in chapter one by Herschel B. Chipp, on the validity of the documents, writings and statements of artists, cautioned against an uncritical and decontextualised reading of these important sources. While Chipp acknowledged that these sources could add much to the interpretation of an artist's work, the scholar should never fail to take into account the broad environmental conditions of which the letters form a part. In the case of Cézanne the nineteenth century context in which Cézanne lived and worked should be seen to inform the artist's views and Cézanne's aesthetic vision should not be obfuscated by the notion that the letters provide unmediated access to Cézanne's mind and thoughts about art. (44)

The literature has often viewed the letters in these terms and as a direct means of accessing Cézanne's artistic intentions. While the letters do give the scholar insights into Cézanne's artistic programme, they should not be read as statements of fact. The scholar's access to them should not fall outside of our critical faculties and should be informed by interpretative tools. In this sense, the letters should be seen to form an important part of the body of 'literature' that informs our understanding of Cézanne's art.

Related to the biographical line of research are a number of studies that sought to understand Cézanne's motivation, in psychological terms, for making art. In addition, issues such as artistic

personality, creative process and creativity are explored. In this line of research, initiated by Meyer Schapiro in the 1950s and developed by Theodore Reff in the 1960s (and later by Sidney Geist), the psychoanalytical model is employed in relation to Cézanne and his oeuvre. Although significant contributions to the Cézanne literature have been made by scholars who have focused their attention on the psychoanalytical approach to Cézanne's oeuvre, an analysis of these contributions will not be undertaken in this overview of the literature. (45) While the psychoanalytical model assists the scholar in the explanation of Cézanne's figurative works it is not instrumental in their interpretation. In addition, in its focus on the figurative works, the psychoanalytical model has provided few insights into the interpretation of the genre of still-life.

The letters are particularly valuable in that they offer the scholar an instance in which Cézanne becomes the spectator of both his own work, and works by other artists. In his written articulation of his artistic ideas to practising artists, Cézanne may be seen to articulate his ideas in relation to his role as a spectator. Access to this role of Cézanne as spectator is important, as an analysis of his paintings reveals his interest in the way in which the artist is both creator and spectator of the image. This dialectic in Cézanne's work will be further substantiated in the visual analysis of selected still-lifes in chapter three. In that the scholar is always part of the interpretative enterprise, it is suggested here that the letters should be approached as an aspect of Cézanne's own interpretation of his work (and that of other artists) and as such the scholar should

critically assess them as one would the literature on Cézanne.

In this approach to the letters, Cézanne is seen, not as the revealer of the truth of his paintings, but rather, as an interpreter of his artistic output. The letters become, not the originating explanation of the work, but rather the first instance (aside from the creative process itself), in which interpretation takes place. The letters of Cézanne should be seen as one of several possible interpretations. Not unlike other interpretations of critics and scholars, they should be equally subjected to scrutiny and critical examination.

The validity of the artist's statements as source material for a study of the meaning of their art has received much attention in the recent art historical literature. The role of biography in the analysis of artistic production has been questioned by the growing Marxist literature on the history of art. Marxist historians suggest that, in positing the artist as the exclusive source of meaning of art, these biographic scholars have contributed to the removal of art from its historical context. Art becomes neither public, social, nor a product of wealth. The notion of artistic 'genius' is part of the myth that the artist exists mystically isolated from his context. Although scholars have consulted Cézanne's letters in order to settle disputes about the meaning of his art and his alleged artistic intentions, this consultation, on the contrary, has given rise to a proliferation of often conflicting interpretations. In viewing the letters as one in a series of possible interpretations of the artist's work, a different aspect of the artist emerges, namely, the artist as spectator.

It is worth referring to specific examples in the Cézanne literature where the letters have been unsuccessfully used to settle disputes about the artist's alleged intentions. Cézanne's relation to tradition as well as his 'notorious' influence on subsequent generations of artists will be cited as examples. Both these issues are related to the notion of 'development' and will therefore be discussed in these terms.

The idea of 'development' in art historical scholarship is an artificial construct applied to historical data. It is applied to the arrangement of the artist's oeuvre and to specific periods therein; to particular genres within that oeuvre; and finally, to that body of work in relation to other bodies of work that precede and follow it, namely, in relation to the development of movements within the narrative of the discipline of art history. The idea of 'development' will be seen to facilitate the arrangement of art historical material in the interpretation of Cézanne.

Generally, the history of art and the 'development' of Cézanne's work is described as a linear progression which unfolds naturally and logically. This 'development' is defined causally and always with the hindsight afforded by historical perspective. The New Art History has redressed some of the inadequacies of this model in the Cézanne literature.

While the enormous benefits that the catalogue raisonné have for the art historian cannot be over estimated, (46) it must at the same time be acknowledged that the catalogue raisonné presented

the scholar with an artificially constructed documentation of the artist's work. In the same way that the monograph attempts to reconstruct a 'unified' artist in the comparison of the artist's life and his work, the catalogue raisonné presents the scholar with a 'unified' picture of the artist's evolution. The developmental model is used in this type of study to outline the artist's progression from early works to late works. And if the sense of determinacy in style is not made overt, it is always implied in the evolutionary organization of the artist's works. This seemingly logical and linear sequentiality is determined and unavoidably reinforced by the very nature of a text, which progresses uninterrupted, from left to right. This developmental model suggests a linear progression of cause and effect in stylistic changes in the artist's oeuvre. (47)

This linearity is then 'read' in relation to the division of Cézanne's work into clearly defined periods whose interrelations are often obscured. (48) It is interesting to note, as Wechsler has done, that different periods of Cézanne's work have been appreciated and privileged at different times in history. She states,

> In their response to Cézanne's work successive generations of painters and critics have consciously or unconsciously reflected the aesthetic attitudes and experiences of their own intellectual and artistic milieu. (49)

The appropriation of Cézanne as the precursor of modern art movements such as Cubism and Abstract art is the result of

> ...an insidious tendency to infer meanings and to ascribe purpose to great artists in order to clarify, if not create, a coherent theory of stylistic change in art. (50)

In addition, the insistence on viewing the history of art as a development of styles has situated Cézanne in a specifically mid-twentieth century context despite the fact that his work is more appropriately understood within a late nineteenth century/early twentieth century context. As a result, the context within which Cézanne lived and worked is overlooked in the interests of art historical progression. Donnell-Kotrozo terms this construct of an evolutionary progress in style the 'destination theory of style' and suggests that it is intimately linked to the issue of intentionality. (51)

Ackerman puts it in the following way:

> ...Given our habits of hindsight, it is necessary to add that he (the artist) is not aware of the works that will follow his; he knows only the past and the present. He accepts and rejects aspects of what he finds in things about him and he adds something of his own. By this choice and by his contribution he moves a step - sometimes a leap - away from the past. Are we, then justified in saying that he has moved toward the future? (52)

The way in which twentieth century historians and critics have appropriated Cézanne as the precursor of modern art is evidenced

in the ongoing debate in the literature about the relationship between Cézanne and Cubism. In formulating this relationship scholars and critics have accepted the destination theory of style. In Ackerman's terms the tendency to situate Cézanne within a mid-twentieth century context and as direct precursor of Cubism is problematic. While Cézanne's impact on Cubism is undeniable, a conscious awareness of the language of Cubism cannot, therefore, be retrospectively ascribed to Cézanne's artistic programme.

Two statements that Cézanne made about art are frequently quoted by critics and historians of Cubism in justification of their approach. The first is: "I am a primitive of a new art. I am convinced I will have followers." (53) and the second, communicated in a letter to Emile Bernard (dated 15 April 1904):

> May I repeat what I told you here: treat nature by the cylinder, the sphere, the cone, everything in proper perspective so that each side of an object or a plane is directed toward a central point. Lines parallel to the horizon give breadth, that is a section of nature or, if you prefer, of the spectacle that the Pater Omnipotens Aeterne Deus spreads out before your eyes. Lines perpendicular to this horizon give depth. But nature for us men is more depth than surface, whence the need of introducing into our light vibrations, represented by reds and yellows, a sufficient amount of blue to give the impression of air, ..."(54)

There are a numerous misquotations of the above statement in the

Cézanne literature. The selectivity of historians in their (mis)quotations is partly the result of the assumption, referred to earlier in the discussion on Greenberg and Modernism, that aimed to institutionalize Cézanne as the 'father' of modern art. (55) In addition, it is essential to question whether Cézanne in the above letter was forwarding a tenet of his own theory of art, or whether he was advising Bernard about a particular aspect that he considered to be lacking in the latter's work. Given that generally Bernard's work did not explore the issue of volume in space, Cézanne's remarks would have been appropriate.

Cézanne's association in the literature with different movements in art history has consistently occurred. What emerges through an examination of the literature associated with these different movements, are patterns that reveal the ways in which interpreters of Cézanne have selectively traced the artist's lineage to suit their own ends. As generations of painters confronted the work of Cézanne, so attempts emerged to establish connections between their art and that of Cézanne.

Interestingly, many scholars comment on the fact that Cézanne, unlike his contemporaries, did not have any pupils in the traditional sense, nor did his art generate a direct influence in the form of a school of art or disciples. And yet, despite these observations, scholars continue to place Cézanne as the precursor of so many art movements that make up the broad category of Modern Art. It is perhaps because of the fact that Cézanne had no direct followers that scholars are able to make numerous links between his art and

that which followed. (56)

This selectivity can be seen in relation to the way in which scholars have interpreted Cézanne as a romantic artist, inspired by the seminal work of Delacroix, or alternatively as a classic artist, associated with Poussin and the ideals of classical art. In debates of this nature, scholars variously cite either the romantic or the classic sources that Cézanne copied in the Louvre, as well as the artist's statements (in the form of his letters or in the recollections of his associates) to justify their arguments. The art historical construct of 'development' ensures a neat chronological sequence whose purpose is to explain the artists' place in history, by way of an examination of his sources, as well as his importance for future generations, by way of influences. While it is essential to establish the chronology of an artist's life and work for curatorial purposes for example of attribution, caution against the way this neat chronology is used or 'developed' by art historians (as constructors of meaning in Alpers' terms) should be made.

In attempts to reconstruct Cézanne either as the 'romantic' (understood to foreshadow the expressionist tendencies, such as Fauvism, that emerged in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century) or as the 'classic' artist (seen to be linked to the art of nineteenth century neo-classicism as well as the early twentieth century movements of Cubism and Abstraction), scholars have quoted Cézanne's letters. The fact that Cézanne's letters allow for the justification of both these positions is not adequately addressed in the literature. (57)

As Meyer Schapiro has suggested,

> The marvel of Cézanne's classicism is that he is able to make his sensing, probing, doubting, finding activity a visible part of the painting and to endow this intimate, personal aspect with the same qualities of noble order as the world he has imaged. (58)

Cézanne's 'distortions', seemingly 'romantic' or anti-classical elements, and the disruption that these 'distortions' cause in the spectator's expectations in viewing his still-lifes, are interpreted in chapter three. The 'distortions' will be seen to contribute significantly to the notion of a drama of style, evident in the still-lifes.

It is interesting to note Cézanne's own attitude to theory as articulated in his letters and to observe that they are often characterized by reservation and scepticism. In a letter to Bernard (dated 25th July 1904) he stated:

> I don't want to be right in theory, but in front of nature... . In order to make progress there is only nature, and the eye is trained through contact with her. ...therefore institutions, pensions, honours can only be made for certain, humbugs and rascals. Don't be an art critic, but paint, there lies salvation. (59)

And in a letter to Camoin (dated 28th January 1902) he

commented:

> I have little to tell you; indeed one says more and perhaps better things about painting when facing the motif than when discussing purely speculative theories - in which as often as not one loses oneself. (60)

This stance is reiterated in a letter to Bernard dated 26th May 1904. Cézanne states,

> On the whole I approve of the ideas you are going to expound in your next article for the Occident. But I must always come back to this: the painter must devote himself entirely to the study of nature and try to produce pictures which are an instruction. Talks on art are almost useless. The work which goes to bring progress in one's own subject is sufficient compensation for the incomprehension of imbeciles.(61)

This particular letter not only expresses Cézanne's anti-theoretical position, but perhaps more significantly, refers the reader to the fact that Cézanne saw his paintings as a kind of text whose subject was painting itself, and suggests that Cézanne's paintings, to some extent are about the very process of art making itself. This idea will be examined in greater detail in chapter three.

In Wechsler's study, The Interpretation of Cézanne, the works of Lionello Venturi, Fritz Novotny and Erle Loran are explored in a

single chapter.

In commenting on Loran's interpretation of Cézanne she states:

> The richness and complexity of Cézanne's art are done less than justice: unwittingly Loran has created a parody of formalism. (62)

What Wechsler implies in the above quotation is endemic to the formalist enterprise, namely, the tendency to reduce the language of art to a structure of formal devices that are seen as separate from the means by which an artist creates the meaning of his art. Loran, in his analysis of Cézanne's formal language in his book, Cézanne's Composition (first published in 1943), aims to explain the way in which the artist structured the picture surface. His diagrammatic transpositions, albeit with didactic purpose, failed to interpret the ways in which the structuring of the picture surface was intertwined with the meaning of Cézanne's art. Hence, in his analysis the dramatic impact and poetic nature of Cézanne's process are not interpreted.

The didactic purpose of Loran's study governs, to a large extent, the nature of his interpretation of Cézanne. As Wechsler rightly suggests,

> Erle Loran's study, Cézanne's Composition, (1943) had a twofold purpose: to analyze Cézanne's composition and to reform the teaching of painting in the United States through

this type of analysis. (63)

Loran's use of photographs in the analysis of Cézanne's formal organization are used to account for the distortions evident in Cézanne's work. Implicit in this model is the assumption that Cézanne's aim was to reproduce nature, without recording his 'sensations' before nature. Cézanne's concern with the 'realization of his sensations' before nature, articulated in his correspondence with younger artists, suggests that his encounter with nature involved both the representation of the external object, as well as the rendition of internal emotions and feelings generated by this external stimulus. Loran incorrectly assumes that the camera reproduces nature 'exactly as it is'; the camera image, true to life as it may falsely appear, does not reproduce nature 'exactly', because, for example, the eye behind the camera lens (the image maker) is involved in selecting not only the subject captured, but also the view-point of the subject taken. In addition, while the photographic image may be seen as accurate in the recording of nature in its own terms, it may never be seen equated with the human experience and perception of nature. In chapter three Merleau-Ponty's analysis of Cézanne's distortion and his concept of 'lived perspective', will be forwarded to challenge Loran's severely oversimplified account of his distortion. In addition, Loran's analysis of the formal organization of Cézanne's work is dominated by simplified diagrammatic translations of Cézanne's compositions that indicate the directional movements of objects and significantly neglect, for example, to take into account the important role of colour in his work.

Lionello Venturi catalogue raisonné, Cézanne: son art-son oeuvre (first published in 1936), contributed significantly to the accessibility of Cézanne's oeuvre in all media. In the same way that the Cézanne literature was affected by the major contributions of John Rewald via the publication of Cézanne's letters and a catalogue raisonné of Cézanne's watercolours, Venturi's publication impacted on the interpretation of Cézanne's by 'simply' making Cézanne's known work more readily available.

As Wechsler has noted,

> Up to the time of Venturi's catalogue raisonné, Cézanne has been viewed almost exclusively as a precursor of new movements. ... The publication of Venturi's catalogue, and the major retrospective exhibition in 1936 of Cézanne's paintings and drawings, most never shown before, called for the evaluation of Cézanne's work. (64)

The reaction to the formalist tradition in the Cézanne literature forms part of this study, and the following overview indicates the directions that were taken in the post-war years in response to the formalists. Many of the insights afforded us by the significant contributions of Meyer Schapiro and Maurice Merleau-Ponty will be discussed in relation to specific still-lifes in chapter three.

In 1952 Meyer Schapiro stated the following:

> Some will object that the themes of a painter have little to do with the value or character of his art. But I believe it is revealing to consider Cézanne's paintings as images of the real world - in doing so we have the support of his letters in which he often speaks of his joy in the sites he paints and the importance of his sensations and emotions before the bit of nature he selects for painting. The kind of objects that attract him, his point of view in representing them, count for something in the final aspect of the pictures and bring us nearer to his feelings. (65)

Schapiro was one of the first scholars to ascribe significance to Cézanne's choice of subjects. Contrary to previous scholars such as Fry, Schapiro explored the particular meanings of Cézanne's subjects, whether in relation to his still-lifes or landscapes. He stated in his 1952 study of Cézanne:

> The choice of landscape sites by Cézanne is a living and personal choice; it is a space in which he can satisfy his need for a detached, contemplative relation to the world. Hence the extraordinary calm in so many of his views - a true suspension of desire. (66)

He continued, stating,

> ...that Cézanne was able to represent still life and landscape alike shows how deeply he was possessed by this need for painting what was external to man. But in the still life, as in

> the landscape, it is the choice of objects and his relation to them that are important. Here again we discover a unique attitude which is significant for his art as a whole. (67)

Schapiro, in his investigation of Cézanne's 'content' in relation to the formal language of his work, shifted the previously dominant exclusion of considerations of Cézanne's thematic content and his psychological motivations for the choice of particular objects, sitters and views. In his analysis of Cézanne's images, the latent content is revealed.

Merleau-Ponty's interpretation of Cézanne, "Cézanne's Doubt" (first published in 1948), was forwarded within the context of philosophy, namely, French Phenomenology. Wechsler correctly states that,

> Merleau-Ponty saw Cézanne's painting as a paradigm of the balance between objective reality and subjective perception. ..., he explained that Cézanne's way of organizing a painting was predicated not on abstract composition but on the continual struggle to paint the world as it appeared to him... (68)

Merleau-Ponty's important analysis of Cézanne's artistic process and his consideration of the idea that "Cézanne's spatial deviations were perceptually more accurate than those ordered according to an a priori system.", (69) will be considered in chapter three.

While the focus of the research of the preceding scholars was specifically Cézanne and varied aspects of his oeuvre, the research of Carol Donnell-Kotrczo and Richard Shiff, is different in that both examine broader contexts within which to interpret Cézanne's enterprise.

In Shiff's study on Cézanne and the End of Impressionism: A Study of the Theory, Technique and Critical Evaluation of Modern Art (1984), he analyzes both theoretical writings of the period and explores the historical relationship between Impressionism and Post-Impressionism. He states, in an abridged article on his study, "The End of Impressionism", that,

> Often scholars have conceived of the end of impressionism as its passage from an art of mere visual observation to one of emotional expression; thus impressionism is said to end when it accepts, implicitly, the tenets of an emerging symbolism. In this familiar historical account, it is as if the two senses of end - chronological and teleological - were exchanged or confused. We easily lose sight of the fact that artists, critics, and theorists of the nineteenth century associated expressive, subjective content with impressionist art from its very inception. (70)

He convincingly explores the critical writings of Impressionism and Post-Impressionism, what he calls Symbolism, in order to show that, contrary to traditional belief, their projects were linked by common concerns and fundamental similarities.

Shiff's investigation is motivated by a questioning of received opinion which, "...tells us that symbolism arose in opposition to Impressionism in order to reintroduce both subjectivity and rigour into painting." (71) He argues further, through references to Positivist thought as it was presented at the time, that, "The impression... can be both a phenomenon of nature and of the artist's own being." (72)

He suggests that the aesthetic enterprise of impressionism, shared the problematic issue of being true to nature while at the same time being true to oneself, with that of the symbolists. The difference, according to Shiff, is less one of aims than of means. For Shiff Cézanne's art must be seen to be linked intimately to the Impressionist project as articulated in Shiff's terms.

Certainly, Cézanne's works, in their affirmation of both the external reality represented and the internal emotion generated through contact with this external reality, suggest that, in Shiff's terms, his aesthetic was in line with that of the Impressionists in their truth to both nature and the self.

In the standard view of the relationship between the two movements, scholars have polarized them in ways that are challenged by Shiff.

It is noteworthy to consider briefly the emergence of the term 'Post-Impressionism', which was coined by the Fry, in the early part of this century. He used the term as a convenient way of

referring to those artists who came chronologically after the Impressionists. Interestingly, Fry had also proposed an alternative term for these artists, namely, 'Expressionist'. (73) The connotations of the term 'Expressionist', have become widely accepted in twentieth century criticism and its currency has reinforced the polarization of the goals of Impressionism and those of the so-called Post-Impressionists. The term, as it is used, implies the deliberate introduction of subjectivity in visual imagery. A dichotomy is thus set up between the 'objective' goals of Impressionism and the 'subjective' goals of Post-Impressionism.

Since many of the artists that are studied from this period shared the goals of both these 'movements', this unnaturally polarized dichotomy between the objective and subjective is highly problematic. Cézanne's association with Impressionism, his participation in the first and third Impressionist Exhibitions (1874 and 1877 respectively), his association with Camille Pissarro (and others) as well as his comments and ideas on Impressionism expressed in his letters, is well documented. (74) While Cézanne's association with Impressionism undoubtedly generated new possibilities for his work, notably in the structuring of colour, his exposure and involvement with Impressionist ideas should not be seen as divorced from the general cultural context of the time. As Shiff has suggested, the continuities between the various aesthetic explorations of the time have been underplayed.

In order to clarify the 'false' polarity between objectivity and subjectivity in the nineteenth century it is noteworthy to refer to

the interpretation of the period forwarded by Carol Donnell-Kotrozo, in Critical Essays on Postimpressionism (1983). Like Shiff, Donnell-Kotrozo argues that the relationship between Impressionism and Post-Impressionism has been incorrectly defined. She states that, "...definitions of terms such as representation and expression have become confused and muddled in a manner reflective of the dualistic position of the mid nineteenth-century philosophy of positivism in which objectivity, an attachment to external reality (associated with representation) and subjectivity (associated with expression) are irreconcilable." (75)

Donnell-Kotrozo suggests that, "Naturalism accepted the view that one's knowledge of the world was limited to those aspects of reality which the observer experienced empirically. In the most literal way the naturalist upheld the view that 'seeing is believing'" (76), and argues that, "Impressionism carried the seeds of its disintegration within its own theories as many painters within the movement came to see that the depiction on canvas was more than the simple recording of pure 'innocent' visual sensations." (77)

Cézanne's 'distortions' of so-called reality are seen in Donnell-Kotrozo's terms, to have been incorrectly interpreted by scholars as deviations from the representation of reality, "Because the naturalist's and impressionist's represented the standard of photographic accuracy in painting at this time, it came to be believed that the Postimpressionists could offer only a 'distorted' representation of reality by comparison." (78)

Both Donnell-Kotrozo and Shiff in their studies of the period, and their re-evaluation of traditional paradigms for interpretation of the period, generate new possibilities and contexts for the interpretation of Cézanne's artistic enterprise.

In this chapter it has been suggested that the literature reflects the shifting concerns of Cézanne scholarship and in this way informs the understanding of his images. In addition, it has been argued that since the scholar cannot bypass the literature in interpreting the meaning of Cézanne's art, the literature should be viewed as an integral and enriching part of any 'original' meaning suggested by Cézanne's art. Having analysed the literature, it is necessary to explore Cézanne's visual language in the still-lifes. Chapter three attempts to reassess the possibilities of visual analysis for Cézanne's still-lifes, without denying them their written heritage as manifest in the literature.

III: An Analysis of Cézanne's Still-Lifes

The historical context for the emergence of a formalist approach to Cézanne's work has been examined, as well as the subsequent permutations of this orientation. While the questioning of the validity of a formalist approach to Cézanne by recent art historical scholars has generated new areas of research and contributed to defining the problems inherent in this approach, the result has also led to a significant neglect of the importance of visual analysis in the interpretation of his work. Richard Shiff, for example, while shedding much light on the study of Cézanne in his attention to the aesthetic theories of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, pertinent in the evaluation of Cézanne's work, fails to provide a meaningful model for a reading of Cézanne's images. What is therefore challenging to contemporary Cézanne scholars is an exploration of the potential of a revised formalism in which the activity of visual analysis contributes significantly to the interpretation of Cézanne's still-lifes.

While the approach adopted in this chapter is informed by the idea that it is necessary to access Cézanne's visual language as manifest in the physical being of the images themselves, it is equally acknowledged that an examination of factors beyond the 'frame' are not only relevant to the works' meaning, but cannot be avoided. Furthermore, any reading of Cézanne's still-lifes must consider the meaningful distinction between the explanation of the work's visual language and its interpretation, although clearly there

is a degree of overlap between the two. The focus of this analysis is on the latter, namely, interpretation. While visual analysis is never a neutral activity, and always depends upon an ideologically engaged and seeing eye, it is nonetheless, a meaningful tool with which to read and decode the visual language of a work of art, and remains central to the art historian's task.

As has been previously indicated, the formalist enterprise facilitated a close reading of the image, although in its exclusive focus on the image as the index to the work's meaning, it did so at the expense of a fully contextual approach to the image, both historically and in relation to the complex creative process. (1) If the formalist approach to the image denies a subtly layered approach to the work of art's complexity, then indeed the model of formalism is rendered reductive. However, here the formal approach to Cézanne's images presents itself as an enriching approach that embraces the notion of a multiplicity of meanings inevitably generated and coexisting in (the interpretation of) the work of art. In the exploration of selected still-lifes it is argued that the activity of visual analysis facilitates an interpretation of Cézanne's still-lifes that accords these works their appropriate richness.

An overview of the Cézanne literature has shown that scholars have at different times privileged either the formal or iconographic aspects of Cézanne's work. While these traditional models for interpretation tend to differentiate between form (style) and subject matter (iconography), in this chapter, the analysis of Cézanne's still-lifes will explore the complex interdependency of both stylistic

and iconographic elements in the work of art. It will be argued that these two aspects are interdependent and that both contribute, in equal measure, to the meaning of a work of art. (2)

The frequently overlooked importance of the role of technique in Cézanne's representation and codification of visual language, by formalist critics, will be redressed; both what is represented and how things are represented will be seen as integral to the painting's meaning. Thus analyses embrace both the formal language of the work of art and the traditional iconography of the work, both of which are determinants of meaning. The term style is seen to connote a more inclusive idea of the artistic process. The challenge of Cézanne's art lies, perhaps more than any other artist, in the particular way in which style is effective as a generator of meaning in his paintings.

Any understanding of Cézanne's artistic practice must take cognizance of the historical context within which his art emerged. Cézanne, while he explored the potential of the most traditional of genres namely, still life, clearly allied himself with the avant-garde movements of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. (3) Cézanne's conception of style may be seen to reflect the Modernist notion, that, the application of paint to a two dimensional surface signifies itself as well as any illusionistic reference. (4) While the illusion of an object, such as an apple, in Cézanne's still-lifes is created by the application of paint to a surface, it's meaning is also importantly linked to the manner of this application. Cézanne's endless explorations of visual language and the innovative solutions

he sought to the age old problems of representation, reinforce his alliance with the avant-garde of his day. Since Cézanne's visual language is an important part of the meaning of his works, visual analysis also affords the scholar an important historically contextualised understanding of Cézanne's enterprise.

The dichotomy between form and content is evident in the literature in relation to the analyses of different genres in Cézanne's oeuvre. While scholars in their treatment of the various genres privilege form more often in relation to the genre of still-life, they privilege content more often in relation to the bathers, for example. Therefore, although the focus of this dissertation is on the interpretation of the still-lifes, this analysis is necessarily contextualised in relation to his oeuvre as a whole. In order to redress the status quo of the traditional methodological antinomy of form and content in the 'old' art history, it is important to refer to works other than the still-lifes not only to indicate how scholars have tended to treat the various genres in Cézanne's oeuvre in very different ways, but also, to assess how scholars have conceived of the relation between Cézanne's different chronological periods. While the early work has been most recently reassessed, the relationship between the earlier and later periods, remains problematic. Cézanne's explorations of style in the early works need to be examined in relation to his later work in order to critically examine the meaning of style in Cézanne's oeuvre as a whole.

The formalist approach to Cézanne's work has often tended to

deny the still-lifes a richly dramatic or emotional element in focusing on the rigidly formal components of the works. These arguments are often linked to the scholar's interest in Cézanne as an essentially classical painter, influenced by qualities of control and rhetoric. In this line of research, scholars have suggested that Cézanne painted all his genres, in an 'unemotional' way and have commented on the seemingly detached quality not only of his still-lifes but of his bathers, portraits and landscapes (5), an interpretation which is reductive and must be questioned. In this type of research scholars (for example, Erle Loran), have tended to project an aesthetic intention onto their analyses of Cézanne's work. Cézanne's attitude to the classical and romantic ideals of the purpose of art will be discussed further on in relation to Cézanne's concept of the role of 'sensation' in his art.

It is noteworthy that the literature distinguishes between two types of meaning; namely, works that generate an iconographic narrative and works that generate a formal narrative. In this distinction the artificial separation between 'form' and 'content' is reinforced. These two types of meaning are seen to operate in relation to specific genres. For example, the iconographic narrative structuring of meaning is seen to operate in genres other than landscape and still-life, whilst the genres of landscape and still-life are usually interpreted in purely formal terms, thus denying these images any iconographic significance. As a result, the dichotomy between form and content is perpetuated and hence reinforced. In this dissertation, the notion of a stylistic narrative will be forwarded in the analysis of selected still-lifes, in order to redress the

abovementioned imbalance. A consideration of the ways in which Cézanne's still-lifes of seemingly neutral subjects communicate a stylistic narrative that is both rich in its pictorial language and profound in its iconographic meaning will be forwarded. It is significant that Cézanne chose to include many still-life elements and previously executed still-life paintings, in his other genres, and it is therefore important to explore the inclusion of still-life elements in Cézanne's figure paintings. (6) This examination facilitates an understanding of the ways in which these still-life 'quotations' create an important level of meaning in the works, as well as providing parameters within which to interpret the still-life genre as a totality.

In Cézanne's painting entitled Two Card-Players (1890-2: Fig.3) a device is used that recurs in other figure paintings as well as within the still-life genre. (7) On a superficial level the work depicts a simple scene of two men engaged in a game of cards. On closer analysis the work seems to evoke a game of more profound consequence, namely, the game of life. Cézanne's simultaneous depiction of extreme simplicity in the two men at play, and profound seriousness is suggested by a sophisticated manipulation of the formal elements of the work. These elements are not distinct from the subjects and objects used to create the image, and therein lies their sophistication. The still-life articles generate a subtle tension, not immediately apparent. The wine bottle placed on the background of the table draws the spectators' attention to the proximity of the two protagonist's hands. This activates the spatial relationship of the two player's hands and their deals (concealed

from each other) and creates a charged space which acts as a dramatization of space within the work. As if to reinforce this, Cézanne punctuates this tension in the 'still-life' under the table, namely, the player's knees. What is under the table, and usually hidden and often devious, becomes central to the paintings emotionally charged reality. The fact that the knees almost touch and the fact that they are framed by the legs of the chairs forces the spectators attention on an otherwise incidental element of the work. Thus the 'drama' is enhanced by the manifestation of formal elements, whether in the figures themselves, or in the seemingly innocuous still-life elements.

Another example of Cézanne's use of still-life objects in figure paintings to dramatize the protagonist of the painting may be seen in Woman with a Coffee-Pot (1890-4?: Fig.2). In this work still-life elements may be seen to function as external metaphors for internal emotional states. The 'seated' woman is framed on her left by a table, a cup and saucer, a teaspoon and a coffee-pot. This essentially genre scene is silenced in the effects used to shift this scene onto the stage of dramatic tragedy. The spoon (a still-life object) may be seen to be a metaphor for the sitter's psychological state of mind and character.

The sitter's psychological state of mind in Woman with a Coffee-Pot (1890-4: Fig.2), is reinforced by the inanimate objects that are placed on the table next to her. As if to be sure that the spectator would not overlook the significance of these objects and their important function as clues to the sitter's state of mind,

Cézanne tilted the small table toward the spectator. The vertical axis of the seated woman is repeated in both the tilted spoon and the coffee-pot. Through this device of repetition, what could otherwise be read as merely a denotative descriptive detail is transformed into a connotative and symbolic element. (8)

In addition to stressing the two dimensionality of the painted surface and thereby flattening the sitter's dress, the vertical axis of the sitter's dress forces the spectator to read the woman's position as uncomfortable, even painful. The quality of the line of this vertical axis seems to suggest a penetration and hardness which further comments on the sitter's state of mind. The constructed tension between the two and the three dimensional elements of the work, and the spatial ambiguity in the work, thus contribute to the overall impression of the sitter's state of mind.

Scale relationships usually used to indicate the proximity of things to one another are denied the spectator. Cézanne's manipulation of the scale of the table in relation to the sitter creates an uncomfortable ambience for both sitter and spectator. In addition, the spatial relationship between the upright spoon and the tea cup is evident. The spectator asks, by what force is the spoon held rigidly vertical? In the ambiguous space of this painting it almost appears as if the spoon is leaning against the rectangular pattern of the door.

The use of an object, seemingly incidental to the work's meaning, to suggest a visual metaphor for the protagonist is evident in a

drawing entitled Page of studies (Piece of Cloth and Woman's Head) (1876-9: Fig.4). Cézanne's search for an equivalence in style for the narrative implied in an object is suggested in this drawing. The juxtaposition of the woman's head and the piece of cloth seem to explore the poetic and metaphorical potential of visual signs.

In Vallier Full-length (1900-6: Fig.5) a different tone is communicated in the humorous and playful way in which the sitter's shoes visually evoke the surrounding leaves. The green shoe-leaves come to suggest something of the personality of the sitter.

As suggested above, in many of Cézanne's figure paintings, still-life elements extend the narrative content of the works. In different ways these still-life 'quotations' comment on aspects of the paintings. In Le Dejeuner sur l'herbe (c.1870-71: Fig.6) the seemingly randomly placed objects of hat, dog, water bottle etc. contribute to the compositional unity of the scene. In addition, the still-life elements in the work act as a compositional focus for any metaphorical meaning suggested in the work. (9)

In Pastoral (Idyll) (c.1870: Fig.7) unconventional means to unify the different planes of the painting are encountered. The background plane is made up of a waterscape and a skyscape. An almost mirror-like reflection between sky and water, that is only subtly differentiated by the horizon line, creates a continuity between these two elements. This interplay is further reinforced by the tree to the left of the boat silhouetted against the sky, whose shadow,

reflected in the water, creates an illusion of almost touching the bank of the landscape. As if to punctuate this proximity, a bottle and a glass are strategically placed; the bottle in its shape and colouring mirroring that of the tree and its reflection. Commenting on Pastoral (Idyll) (c.1870: Fig.7), Gowing suggests that,

> The peak of Cézanne's Romantic imagining shows the dreamer, recognizable again as the painter himself, to have journeyed (in a boat still under sail in the windless night) to an abode of love, which if it is not the Venusburg, is populated likewise by the naked personifications of passion. He lies down among them to indulge his reverie; round the lake the phallic symbols flourish. (10)

Compositionally the figure of the 'dreamer' is articulated in a similar fashion to the tree/shadow. Like the tree, the figure/dreamer is strongly silhouetted against the sky/water. The figure reclines on the lushly carpeted bank and serves as a transition from the middleground to the foreground of the painting. (11)

The figure/dreamer operates here as the 'artist' as spectator and the artist's directed and intense gaze serves to link the middleground to the couple in the foreground. An equivalence between his spectatorship and that of the viewer is suggested. It is noteworthy that in reading this image the spectator begins to construct the narrative from the bottle and the shadow/tree to the woman's gaze (opposite Cézanne) to the figure of the dreamer and finally to the artist's gaze and the foreground of the painting. (12)

Significantly, the still-life elements included in these figure paintings tend to operate less on a symbolic level in the traditional sense, than as formal devices that facilitate the spectator's access to the image and its meaning. While they comment on the emotional reality of the image and thus convey a connotative level of meaning, they do not operate within an established Western mode of symbol signification.

In Portrait of Louis Auguste Cézanne, Father of the Artist, reading l'Evenement (1866: Fig.9), Cézanne employed a still-life element in a slightly different manner, that is, by quoting his own work by the inclusion of Still life: Sugar Pot, Pears and Blue Cup (c.1866: Fig.10), which hangs just behind, and slightly above, the head of his father. In another work, Cézanne included the still-life Vessels, Fruit and Cover (The Peppermint Bottle) (1890-4: Fig.11) in Plaster Cupid and the "Anatomy" (1895: Fig.12). In both these works Cézanne's inclusion of his other work, extends the narrative content of the work.

Gowing comments thus on Still life: Sugar Pot, Pears and Blue Cup (c.1866: Fig.10):

> This is the still-life which appears like a manifesto of the new style already framed and hanging on the wall in the background of Cézanne's portrait of his father reading L'Evenement. It is demonstrated that the force of handling involved a freedom, indeed violence, of colour modulation more extreme than Cézanne or anyone else had conceived

hitherto. (13)

Gowing suggests in the above quotation that the inclusion of the still-life extends the narrative content of the work by referring to the stylistic experiments with which Cézanne was involved at the time. These stylistic experiments will be discussed in relation to work of this early period further on.

The Walk, (1871: Fig.13), (whose source is "...an illustrated fashion magazine published in May 1871..." (14)), depicts two women at a moment of observation; something has attracted their attention and they are shown engaging with this distraction. However, whatever has halted their stroll, is excluded from the painting and is therefore not a point of focus. It remains a mysterious presence (by its very absence from the painting) in the work and an unknown factor for the spectator. The women's gestures and body language indicate their responses. In addition, the umbrellas they hold equally define their response and suggested awareness of something 'beyond the picture frame'. This is an instance in which a still-life element (the umbrella) is used to convey an extended emotional connotative meaning beyond the denotative function of a parasol. (15)

In one of Cézanne's earliest works The Four Seasons, (1860-62: Fig.14) painted for the salon above the country mansion of the Jas de Bouffan, still-life elements occur in a more traditional context, and symbolize metonymically the traits of the subject of the four seasons. Interestingly, this more traditional use of still-life as

symbol occurs in a more traditional structuring of narrative sequencing, namely, the polyptych.

In Cézanne's Afternoon in Naples (with a negro servant) (c. 1866-77: Fig.15) a pictorial dialogue that comments on the narrative of the protagonists is set up between two still-life vignettes. The first still-life is ushered in on a tray by the Negro servant who 'enters' from the left, from behind a curtain. The nature of the second still-life is more ambiguous. It may be read either as a 'real' shelf, directly opposite and above the lovers, on which objects including an urn and glasses are placed, or alternatively, it may be read illusionistically as a picture in a green frame hanging on the wall. The diagonal from foreground to background repeats the ushering servant's right arm across the surface in both the reclining lovers' right arms, thus acting as a unifying agent. The significant entrance of the servant is, so to speak, punctuated by the real 'still-life' on a tray. Although speculative, one may interpret this coming together of still life elements as establishing (ironically within the illusionistic image itself), a dichotomy between 'Reality' and 'Fiction'. This tension is played out in the opposition articulated in the painting between verticality, enunciated in the verticality of the servant and horizontality, evident in the horizontal poses of the reclining lovers. The mirror serves to confuse the spectator, as the reflection in relationship to the angle at which it is placed, mirrors only the drapery and not the servant, as it should.

In comparing Cézanne's preparatory study of The Orgy or The

Banquet (c.1867: Fig.16), for The Feast (The Orgy) (c.1870: Fig.17), it is interesting to note how the urn is framed in the foreground centre of the image. In so doing, possible insight into the artistic process is gained and one senses, albeit speculatively, the artist's focus in pausing to contemplate on this still-life element, and its potential significance. In the final painting, The Feast (The Orgy) (c.1870: Fig.17), the urn with its darkly cavernous inside, turned provocatively toward the spectator, sets the tone of erotic excess in the work. Here a still-life element is suggestive in its voluptuousness and rounded form as well as the abovementioned qualities of the central concern of the painting. (16)

While it has been important to examine the place of still-life elements in relation to Cézanne's oeuvre as a whole, it is essential to analyze, the genre of still-life as a totality. An examination of the still-life genre as a totality affords the posing of questions such as: the possible reasons why Cézanne painted so many still-lifes; explanations as to why in his oeuvre (in general) he tended to repeat so many of his themes; questions as to the psychological reasons for Cézanne's obsession with certain subjects. In addressing these questions issues such as the nature of artistic personality need to be addressed.

Despite the fact that Cézanne's work has generated a large body of literature, little of this literature has explored the genre of still-life, either in relation to Cézanne's oeuvre, or more generally, in the history of art as a whole. Most Cézanne scholars deal with the still-lifes either thematically or historically; rarely as a genre

which has a specific historical tradition to which it adheres or from which it departs. Scholars have not addressed the specific ways in which the genre of still-life structures meaning. In the research of scholars such as Meyer Schapiro and Maurice Merleau-Ponty, who both examine the paintings of Cézanne executed in this genre, the focus is more on the iconographical aspects of the work than on the specific structures that facilitate meaning in the genre of still-life, although both Schapiro and Merleau-Ponty examine Cézanne's style to some extent. While in the general art historical literature studies on the role of genre have been conducted, little has been written on the genre of still-life, in comparison to other genres such as history painting, landscape painting or portraiture. The art historian has traditionally tended to ignore the concrete structures, such as genre, that govern and determine the parameters for generating meaning in the visual arts.

Charles Sterling's study, Still Life Painting: From Antiquity to the Twentieth Century, provides a useful historical overview on the subject of still-life painting. However, Sterling does not examine in detail the structuring principles of the genre, and focuses more on the iconographical elements that appear in the genre at different points in history.

Norman Bryson's recently published study, Looking at the Overlooked: Four Essays on Still Life Painting, examines the genre of still-life and brings to this area of neglected research a number of valuable and new possibilities for interpretation and understanding. Commenting on the lack of research in this area,

Bryson remarks that,

> Although the genre of still life is as obvious a piece of our basic cultural furniture as history painting or landscape - or Westerns or thrillers - its inevitability and indispensability have not helped it generate much corresponding light (or heat) in critical discussion. It has always been the least theorised of the genres, and when the academies that launched the first theoretical accounts of painting came to mention it at all, they did so disparagingly: still life was always at the bottom of the hierarchy, unworthy of the kind of superior attention reserved for history painting or the grand manière. (17)

Bryson states that,

> Though the twentieth century has seen a tremendous proliferation of exhibitions of still life, and of catalogues and monographs dealing with matters of chronology, provenance and connoisseurship, interpretation of still life has generally languished on all sides. (18)

He argues further that,

> ...discussion of still life remains oppressed and inhibited; it was virtually strangled at birth in the academies that relegated still life to the lowest level of art, and it is still marginalised in today's professional art history. (19)

He suggests that in an analysis of the coherence of the genre of still-life the scholar should consider this coherency as produced

> ...(a) by the institution of criticism, from the seventeenth century to the present day, and (b) by the painters themselves, working within pre-established material series, but (c) as produced by the actual objects with which still life deals, and the level of material culture to which those objects belong. (20)

An analysis of the early criticism of Cézanne's work, as well as his place in relation to the historical tradition of still-life, is valuable, in Bryson's terms, in the consideration of the coherency of Cézanne's still-lifes.

The place of Cézanne's still-lifes in his oeuvre is significant and Meyer Schapiro has correctly asserted that,

> ...what is most distinctive and accomplished in Courbet, Manet, Renoir and Monet will not be learned through their still-lifes; but if we lacked Cézanne's, something essential would be missing, a range of qualities, of colours and forms bound to a unique conception of things near at hand. (21)

Although the particular coherency of the genre of still-life is an important consideration in the analysis of meaning in Cézanne's still-lifes, it is at times important and relevant to refer to works other than still-lifes. This offers the scholar useful means of

comparison that significantly contribute to the clarification of Cézanne's artistic project in relation to the genre of still-life. By contrasting the so-called iconographic narrative works with the so-called formal narrative works a great deal can be learned about the role of style in Cézanne's still-lifes.

In Roger Fry's study entitled Cézanne: A Study of his Development, the author makes a significant point about the issue of narrative in Cézanne's work. He remarks, in discussion of Cézanne's still-lifes that they are, "...dramas without dramatic incident". (22) It is essential to analyze what Fry intended by the term 'incident'. An incident suggests a moment in a narrative.

A dramatic narrative moment in a work of art often depends upon recognition by the spectator of a text (other than the work itself) to which the work refers. Fry argues that Cézanne's work articulates drama, and that this drama is created without recourse to the work's subject, theme or even symbolic use and choice of objects. He states elsewhere that, "...for Cézanne...a skull was merely a complicated variation upon a sphere", (23) suggesting further that the potentially rich symbolic meaning of the skull, was of little interest to Cézanne. It will be argued below that Cézanne's still-lifes do communicate drama and furthermore that this drama depends upon the way in which Cézanne manipulates style. In this analysis style will be seen as the 'dramatic incident' of which Fry speaks.

The notion of a drama of style is forwarded to challenge the idea

that is distinct from content, and to suggest that this notion is capable of bridging this gap, in application to the analysis of specific works of Cézanne. Cézanne's visual language will be explored as a notational system that employs a pictorially dramatic visual language. It will be argued that Cézanne's drama of style is intimately linked to the meaning of his works.

In Cézanne's early work the drama of style is evident although differently articulated to works from his later periods. In the early work this drama is more literally depicted in an overtly narrative sense. The stylistic articulation of drama is more traditionally created and Cézanne's use of diagonals suggest a tension and dynamic movement in these works. In addition, the colour tonalities are evocative of specific moods related to the narrative content in these works. These traditional devices may be seen in works such as The Rape (c.1867: Fig.18), The Murder (c.1867-8: Fig.19) and Le Dejeuner sur l'herbe (c.1870-71: Fig.6). In early works such as The Negro Scipion (c.1867: Fig.20), The Feast (The Orgy) (c.1870: Fig.17), Portrait of Louis Auguste Cézanne, Father of the Artist, reading l'Evenement (1866: Fig.9) and Portrait of the Painter, Achille Emperaire (c.1868-70: Fig.21) a drama of style is evident in Cézanne's exploration of the expressive potential of the formal elements of the work. (24)

Cézanne rejected chiaroscuro as an academic artifice that seemed unlike the colouristic effects in nature, and depicted (in later works), according to Merleau-Ponty, objects,

> ... as they appear to instantaneous perception, without fixed contours, bound together by light and air. ... The colour of objects could not be represented simply by putting on the canvas their local tone, that is, the colour they take on isolated from their surroundings; one also had to pay attention to phenomena of contrast which modify local colours in nature. (25)

The sonorous colour range used in Old Woman with a Rosary (1900-4: Fig.22) is similar to that of Plate of Fruit, Sugar-Bowl and Straw-Cased Jar on a Cover (1895-1900: Fig.23) and Still-Life with Apple and Peaches (c.1905: Fig.24). Colour functions as a dramatic device in Cézanne's oeuvre. (26) The dramatic use of colour evident in Old Woman with a Rosary (1900-4: Fig.22), is clearly linked to the subject depicted. When the subject depicted does not immediately suggest a dramatic element, as in Plate of Fruit, Sugar-Bowl and Straw-Cased Jar on a Cover (1895-1900: Fig.23), can the scholar begin to ascribe particular psychological feelings (as attributes of inanimate objects) evoked by the sombre colour tonalities? Given Cézanne's exploration of the dramatic potential of the formal elements of art, and his rejection of the ready-made solutions of perspective and chiaroscuro, (27) it is possible to speculate that colour, like space, in Cézanne's work, is potentially metaphorical in its' evocation of emotion and psychological nuances.

In Portrait of Louis Auguste Cézanne, Father of the Artist, reading l'Evenement (1866: Fig 9), the paint applied to the legs of the

seated father figure is in a thick impasto thus investing a painterly tactility to the legs, and particularly the knees. This painterliness obfuscates the actual bend in the knees and thus give the impression that they could not hold the weight of the father, were he to stand up. The numerous verticals and diagonals used in the work create an uncomfortable space within which the figure sits, despite the fact that an armchair is usually a comfortable place to sit and relax. It is noteworthy that the sitter in Portrait of the Painter, Achille Emperaire (c.1868-70: Fig.21), despite the fact that he was known to be a cripple, appears to be more comfortable in his surroundings.

As suggested earlier, the still-life on the wall in Portrait of Louis Auguste Cézanne, Father of the Artist, reading l'Evenement (1866: Fig.9), extends the narrative content of the work. The still-life may be interpreted as a comment on the actual painting process. In this work, space is invested with an emotional content. The space between the still-life painting, the chair and the father's head is difficult to determine. These spaces seem to be 'unnaturally' close together, thus drawing the spectator's focus toward this area of the work. In this way the space becomes charged and an equivalence is set up between the squashed 'real' space and a claustrophobic emotional metaphorical space. The formal visual language in the work is thus invested with a metaphorical and psychological meaning.

At first glance the face of the father seems to be expressionless, thus seemingly confirming what scholars have forwarded about the

relationship between the genre of portraiture and that of still-life, namely that both these genres lack expression. However, on closer visual analysis one reads an image that is potent because of the apparent control of emotional force. This perceived control operates as a veil or surface in the work. This tension is also to be seen in many of his works that deal with the problem of the issue of representation while at the same time articulate the solutions of representation itself. This presentation of the tensions of visual language cannot be divorced from the emotional content of the works. It is argued that in Cézanne's manipulation of representation he creates a tension between representation as solution/resolution and representation as problematic and thus, establishes an irony and contradiction within the work which is central to the work's meaning.

Cézanne uses paint and deploys it in a way that is inextricably tied up with the subject represented. Painting is not seen as a neutral means to present a subject's emotional qualities. Rather, it is used to contain the very qualities being explored in the subject. Cézanne explores the subtle and complex relationship between the object perceived, and represented, and the perceiving subject in the diverse ways that his work is constructed. The tension created within the visual language of the work not only contributes to the works emotional content but is the works emotional content. The clear distinction between the perceiving subject and the object perceived is thus highlighted in Cézanne's work. The protagonist in Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne, Father of the Artist, reading l'Evenement (1866: Fig.9), is at once both the sitter and the

painting process itself. The fact that both these paradigms are simultaneously operative is part of the focus in the work, namely, process and time. This temporal dimension in the work allows the spectator, like the artist, to create the work in vision. Here the spectator's experience of looking is akin to the artist's experience of creating, and may extend to the uncertainty of the process of making.

In a later work entitled The Murder (c.1867-8: Fig.19) the dramatic narrative is enunciated through the interaction of three figures. The strange figure of the woman bending over the victim accelerates and intensifies the dramatic moment. She becomes, through her actions, an accomplice in the murder. (28) Compare the female accomplice in The Murder (c.1867-8: Fig.19) to the two bathing women on left hand side in The Rape (c.1867: Fig.18). In the latter, the left hand middle ground is occupied by two female bathing women. Given the drama of rape inflicted by the male protagonist on the female protagonist and the accompanying violence of the scene it is important to question why Cézanne would have included these two bathers. Mary Lewis Tompkins has

> ...now recognized that the girdle in the hands of one of the victim's companions establishes her as Persephone abducted by Pluto to the nether kingdom. (29)

The suggestion that colour invokes a dramatic sense in his work is an interesting area for further examination. The inclusion of the bathers remains an ambiguous feature in the work. It may be

suggested, that through this ambiguous feature, the bathers, challenge the spectator's traditional expectations of this genre. While traditionally, scenes of bathers evoke an idyllic pastoral ambience filled with calm and peace, Cézanne's bather series is invested with an underlying tension that may be interpreted as a sexual tension and aggression, if not rape. (30)

In the genre of still-life, this linking of moments, central to the construction of a narrative, is also evident. In Still life: Bread and Leg of Lamb (c.1866: Fig.32), the traditional compositional device of the Baroque diagonal agitates the otherwise still surface of the canvas. In addition, the way in which the leg of lamb is positioned, as well as the highly manipulated surface of the meat, serve to inculcate in the spectator a sense of drama. In Fry's terms, this drama is created "...without dramatic incident". (31) However, it is suggested that while the drama does not necessarily depend upon recognizable symbolic structures (as in the other figure paintings mentioned previously), it does depend on a dramatic incident that is situated in the stylistic rendition of the work.

In the great religious narrative paintings of the 15th century, for example, Roger van der Weyden's Crucifixion (c.1440-1450), objects such as skulls, flowers and fruit were often included to aid the moral import of these paintings by virtue of the symbolic currency that the objects had at the time. For example, Adam's relevance to the Crucifixion, through the doctrine of the Redemption, is suggested in the skull at the foot of the cross. The skull is frequently sprinkled with the blood that drips from the

saviours body, and symbolically refers to the washing away of Adam's sins. (32)

This symbolic shorthand was an important device employed in the traditional genre of still-life. This shorthand, created a language of veiled symbolism, for a symbolic (and often dramatic) narrative with specific moral implications for the spectator. The use of encoded symbols associated with specific objects, was current during the 17th and 18th century. At this time, Dutch and Flemish painters' explored the genre of still-life and the objects therein, which contained a hidden allegory. This hidden allegory suggested by the objects reflected either the transience of the things of the world and the inevitability of death (the vanitas theme) or, by extension, were reflections on the Christian Passion and Resurrection. (33) Meaning was thus conveyed by the use of objects, mostly familiar and everyday, in both traditional narrative painting and still-lifes, which were invested with a symbolic content which was accessible to contemporary spectators.

While Cézanne explored the symbolic potential of the traditional genre of still-life, he did not always confine his communication of a symbolic language to traditional objects invested with symbolic meaning, but rather, explored the formal language of painting as a means of achieving a symbolic level of meaning in his paintings. Cézanne's symbolic structuring of meaning embedded in his pictorial language facilitated a dramatization of style which contributed to a specifically narrative purpose within his work. The term 'symbol' is used in the generic sense to imply the way in

which all art is encoded as symbolic language, and further, suggesting art's metaphorical and figurative capacity.

On occasion Cézanne's early still-lifes partake in the traditional use of symbolic motifs, for example, in Still Life: Skull and Candlestick (c.1866: Fig.33) and Still Life: Skull and Waterjug (c.1868-70: Fig.34). In The Black Clock (c.1870: Fig.35) the vanitas theme is suggested in the emptiness of earthly possessions that are represented and although this work does not depict the traditional skull associated with the vanitas theme, the inclusion of a candle and a clock (which are related symbols), may allude to the passing of time. Rather than constructing the meaning of this work by the use of an established symbolic language, Cézanne explores in The Black Clock (c.1870: Fig.35) the potential of the pictorial language to generate meaning. The narratives communicated in Cézanne's still-lifes are thus suggested in the dramatic use of style in his work. By implication, the spectator, in 'reading' these visual signs partakes in the 'moral' of the narrative. A more detailed analysis of Cézanne's use of the skull will be conducted further on, in relation to the way in which Cézanne's style (both in his early works and in his so-called mature works), is central to the meaning of his art. (34)

In the following analyses the notion of a drama of style as it pertains to Cézanne's still-lifes will be explored. It will be suggested that this notion, in its application to the formal analysis of specific still-lifes, contributes significantly to an understanding of Cézanne's artistic process and ultimately to the meaning of his still-lifes.

In Still life: Sugar Pot, Pears and Blue Cup (c.1866: Fig.10) Cézanne applies paint thickly in an impasto manner to the surface of the work. This evokes a tactile response in the spectator in addition to a purely visual response. This approach to the canvas is apparent in many of the artist's early work including Still life: Skull and Candlestick (c.1866: Fig.33) and Still life: Bread and Leg of Lamb (c.1866: Fig.32). (35)

In these works Cézanne's use of the palette-knife to apply paint to the canvas evokes an emotional force in the actual handling of the paint by the artist. It may be suggested that the spectator, in recognizing this trace of emotional force generated by the artist and present in the tactility of the painted surface, is sensitized and thus made aware of Cézanne's artistic presence in the work. The equivalence between the emotional state of the artist in the process of painting and that of the spectator in viewing the work will be explored throughout this section.

In Still life: Skull and Candlestick (c.1866: Fig.33) the traditionally available symbolism of the objects is extended in the exploration of the dramatization of style in the formal elements in the work. While traditionally the spectator of the vanitas theme, suggested in this work, would ascribe a sequence of narrative meanings to the work by decoding the symbolic language suggested by the objects, the modern spectator could look for this symbolic form in the formal language of the work. The stylistic narrative of the work is conveyed through the formal means explored in the representation of objects depicted. The manipulation of the pictorial language

serve to communicate a connotative and symbolic level of meaning in the work. In this way the spectator's reading of the work's meaning depends on her recognition of both the object depicted and the means employed to depict this object. Since the artist's psychological and emotional state of mind are not available to the spectator, it is not possible to reconstruct what Cézanne may have experienced or felt in creating this image from the painting. However, it is interesting to speculate whether the spectator's response to Cézanne's pictorial language is akin to that of the artist's.

One of the striking features of Still-Life: Skull and Candlestick (c.1866: Fig.33) is the strangely ambiguous spatial construction of the work. The background of the work serves at once to silhouette the skull and candlestick and to define the flatness on which the image is painted. The horizontal edge of the table slopes toward the spectator and clearly show the objects displayed. The objects almost seem to fall into the spectator's space. In this way the illusion of the painted depiction with the space of the artist and that of the spectator is linked. To the bottom right of the foreground a precariously placed book further stresses this spatial ambiguity. To the left of this book is a thick horizontal plane of heavily applied white paint in which the articulated brush mark is clearly visible: the brush mark records the artistic process. The flattening background device and the foreground brush mark are thus unified as flat planes within the image.

Gowing notes that in Still life: Bread and Leg of Lamb (c.1866:

Fig.32) It

> ... was Cézanne's purpose, ... to unmask the essential brutality and coarseness of painting as if with a murderous weapon or drawing as if with a writhing lash. (36)

Gowing suggests here, that even in these early works, Cézanne was exploring the way in which the formal elements of a work contribute to any illustrative meaning that the work may suggest. In addition, he suggests that Cézanne's focus was directed toward the examination of the painting process itself, as meaning in the work of art. As mentioned earlier, Fry suggested that, "...for Cézanne...a skull was merely a complicated variation upon a sphere." (37) It is suggested on the contrary, that Cézanne's numerous works depicting skulls (in various media), pointed to an interest in the traditional symbolism associated with the skull, but that he sought pictorial means to develop the traditional symbolism inherent in the skull. (38) In addition, Cézanne explored the drama inherent in other still-life objects that were by definition everyday objects and hence from the outset denied this encoded and existing symbolic level of meaning. In employing the pictorial language to construct a symbolic level of meaning for these everyday and familiar objects Cézanne affirmed the transformational capacity of style.

While the analysis of works that used the skull indicated Cézanne's concern for finding an equivalent stylistic device for this charged and evocative symbol, it will be shown through references to other

still-lifes in which such symbols do not feature, how Cézanne explored this overriding interest, in his manipulation of the stylistic component in the still-lifes.

The Black Clock (c.1870: Fig.35), as stated previously, although it does not include a skull as part of its subject matter, does partake in the traditionally symbolic language associated with the skull works, and suggests the vanitas theme in the emptiness of the earthly possessions through the candle and clock that are represented. In this work the potential narrative drama of any symbolism associated with the objects depicted, is communicated largely by formal means.

Interestingly, Gowing has stated that,

> The fact that there was apparently no single detail in it that admitted a responsibility to petty descriptiveness had everything to do with this enormous distinction (39)

thus suggesting that Cézanne's focus in communicating the ponderous emotional content of the work was on the formal and stylistic elements in the work. Gowing also remarks that the bright pink mouth of the shell "...has a quality of intimacy which agrees with the directness of the style." (40)

The deeply cleavaged folds of the drapery in the foreground, that operate as the shadows cast by the folds, take on a metaphoric resonance in the work that extends the purely descriptive nature of

these folds. If one reads the spatial relationship of the folds from left to right it becomes apparent that as the folds progress toward the right they gradually relinquish their descriptive function in the work. The fold to the far left is the most literal of the three folds; it adheres to the surface of the table over which it is placed thus describing the table edge and it offers the spectator a modeled sense of the quality of cloth by the artist's traditional use of chiaroscuro. The second fold in the centre seems to be situated closer to the picture plane. Cézanne places a short, left-sweeping brushstroke at the top of the shadow of the fold which draws the spectator's eye to the spatial shift. The placement of the cup and saucer hovers between these two shifting surfaces - it is the cast shadow of these objects, ironically an insubstantial element, that links the two surfaces. The right hand fold is placed almost parallel to the picture surface and almost looks like primed canvas. As if to link this least descriptive fold to the most descriptive one, Cézanne, in an almost baroque extravagance, folds the former back on itself. This detail is once again rendered in more naturalistic terms.

If one reads the folds in reverse, from right to left, one sees how the painting process itself is the creation of an illusion. From the least descriptive fold on the right to the most naturalistic fold on the left. In this way, the spectator is included in the process of creation and thus incorporates his experience of the unfolding process of painting in the spectator's experience of reading the image.

In Glass, Cup and Apples (1873-7: Fig.41) Cézanne presents the

spectator with an image of a surface on which six apples, a cup and a glass are placed. The background of the image suggests a wall paper design seen in many of Cézanne's works. (41) What appears at first glance to be a rather literal depiction of everyday objects is transformed by careful visual analysis to an image of energized proportion.

As Meyer Schapiro has suggested,

> This fruit ..., while no longer in nature, is not yet fully a part of human life. Suspended between nature and use, it exists as if for contemplation alone. What appears most ordered in the still-life picture issues from the painter's visible brush-strokes and alludes hardly at all to the purposes that give neatness and charm to the table in ordinary life. He endows these strokes with a subtle cohesion and a harmony of colours that transfigure the whole as a work of art while intensifying in the objects the appearance of the existent and the familiar. (42)

Schapiro, not unlike Gowing, recognizes in Cézanne's work the centrality of stylistic and formal languages that convey the meaning of Cézanne's art, not irrespective of their subjects, but rather, as commentaries on them.The image seems to be asymmetrically divided into two halves. The left hand side is made up of the glass and three apples and the right hand side of the cup and the remaining three apples. A tension between these two halves is created. The apples on the left hand side in contrast to those on

the right hand side seem to move away from the glass unlike those on the right hand side which appear to gravitate toward the cup, almost adhering to its side. The transparency of the glass is so in contrast to the opacity of the cup which gives these two objects two very distinctive characters. As such, it is almost as if the objects themselves generate an energy which affects the way in which the apples are placed. The violet shadow on the left of the image, and in between two apples, is articulated as a textured brushmark thus investing it with a quality of 'objectness' not dissimilar to that of the apples themselves. This violet shadow also denies the spatial recession that is otherwise suggested by the pyramidal arrangement of the three apples. Cézanne regularly invests his images with a three dimensional quality while at the same time asserting the two dimensional quality of his canvas. The violet shadow is an example of this device. In another work, entitled Jar, Coffee-Pot and Fruit (Still-Life in Black and White) (1870-2: Fig.44), the central piece of cloth that falls over the edge of the table flattens the otherwise differentiated planes of the foreground and middleground.

A similar spatial manipulation is evident in Apples and Plate of Biscuits (1879-82: Fig.43). Here the spatial ambiguity leads the spectator to question not only the relation of the spatial planes in the work, but also the nature of the objects depicted. It is not clear whether the objects sit on a shelf or a kist of sorts. This ambiguity is caused by the fact that the spectator is able to read the space below the objects as either part of the wall or as the front plane of the kist and hence on a different plane to the back wall. The shelf

hangs against a decorated wall on which are placed a number of apples and a plate of biscuits. The shelf bracket (or kist handle) is silhouetted by the painted area that surrounds it thus focusing the spectator's attention on it. The spatial ambiguity is evident in the way that Cézanne affirms simultaneously both recession and flatness in the work. The fact that the decorative pattern of the wall-paper is carried through from the background to the foreground and the fact that the shelf tilts toward the spectator both contribute toward the flattening of the recessive picture planes.

This questioning or playing with the nature of what is real in the image and what is not is evident in Vase, Plate, Ink-Well and Fruit (Blue Vase) (1883-7: Fig.45). The stems of the 'real' flowers depicted in the vase lyrically dance upon the background surface of the pale blue wall. In this way they not only suggest to the spectator the question of what is real and what is not, but create a spatial ambiguity in the relationship between the space occupied by the flowers in the vase and the flowers that decorate the background wall. This spatial ambiguity is continued in other details of the painting including the interrelationship between the many right-angles shown in the work and the nature and relationship between the surface on which the objects are placed and the surface on which they stand.

As noted previously, Cézanne included the still-life Vessels, Fruit and Cover (The Peppermint Bottle) (1890-4: Fig.11) in Plaster Cupid and the "Anatomy" (1895: Fig.12). In the bottom left hand corner of Plaster Cupid and the "Anatomy" (1895: Fig.12) the blue

drapery of Vessels, Fruit and Cover (The Peppermint Bottle) (1890-4: Fig.11) flows into the still-life in the foreground, thus creating an ambiguous relationship between the 'realities' of the two still-lifes. The large onion, placed at the base of the Cupid extends, and even seems to be organically growing, into the still-life depicted in Vessels, Fruit and Cover (The Peppermint Bottle) (1890-4: Fig.11), further articulating the polemic of what is 'real' in the work.

Since the role of the spectator is central to the notion of a drama of style in Cézanne's still-lifes, this role warrants further examination. Meyer Schapiro has suggested that, the "...still-life, as much as landscape and sometimes more, calls out a response to an implied human presence." (43) As forwarded above, the drama of Cézanne's still-lifes is perhaps linked to Schapiro's idea of 'an implied human presence', suggested in the stylistic narrative of the work. The fact that Cézanne implies a spectator despite the absence of a human presence in the work, creates a tension that contributes to the dramatic impact of the still-lifes.

In the visual analysis of Cézanne's still-lifes, insight into the central issue of the complex role of the spectator in Cézanne's work is gained. The image in the Western context of representation does not exist without the intervention of the spectator, whether the spectator is the artist or another person. In the context of this dissertation the spectator is understood to be both the artist and the spectator in the traditional art historical sense of this persona. In this chapter reference will at times be made to the specific

construct 'artist as spectator' in order to explore the processes of image making more fully. (44)

In exploring the meaning of Cézanne's still-lifes, it is important to consider Cézanne as the spectator of his own work. Rather than seeing the artist as creating the art work with precise prior knowledge of the end product, the concept of the artist as spectator of his own work facilitates an understanding of how the processes of image making (as both a world motivated by private and intimate concerns and public and shared realities) inform the end product. The artist as spectator allows the scholar to see the creative process as the first interpretation, in a layering of interpretations.

One of the traditional ways of representing artistic process was to depict the artist engaged in front of an easel. This traditional way of representing artistic process is evident in Cézanne's Self-Portrait with a Palette (1885-7: Fig.46), a drawing of a Painter Holding a Palette (1868-71: Fig.47) and in The Painter (1868-71: Fig.48). Cézanne depicted himself only once in a painting with the attendant objects associated with his craft, namely in the abovementioned Self-Portrait with a Palette (1885-7: Fig.46). In this work he included the traditional attributes of a painter, namely, a palette, a back view of a canvas and a brush, thereby, suggesting the painting process by reference to objects used in the creative act. This traditional representation of the painting process was not, however, examined in any great depth by Cézanne; he chose rather to explore other means of representing this process.

Significantly, Cézanne spoke about the spectator's experience of looking, in relation to the artist's experience of creating and making art. In a letter written to Emile Bernard (dated 21 September 1906), he said,

> You must forgive me for continually coming back to the same thing; but I believe in the logical development of everything we see and feel through the study of nature and turn my attention to the technical questions later; for technical questions are for the most part only the means of making the public feel what we feel ourselves, and of making ourselves understood. The great masters whom we admire can have done nothing else. (45)

Merleau-Ponty, commenting on this aspect of Cézanne's process, suggests that,

> It is not enough for a painter like Cézanne,...to create and express an idea; they must also awaken the experiences which will make their idea take root in the consciousness of others. A successful work has the strange power to teach its own lesson. (46)

It is noteworthy that in many of Cézanne's images he depicts himself in the role of the spectator. It will be suggested that this device of representing himself in the image is developed by Cézanne to enable him to affirm the process of art making as intrinsic to the work's meaning.

In the Preparation for the Funeral, or The Autopsy (c.1868: Fig.49), A Modern Olympia (The Pasha) (c.1869-70: Fig.50), A Modern Olympia (1872-3: Fig.51), Le Dejeuner sur l'herbe (c.1870-71: Fig.6) and Pastoral (Idyll) (c.1870: Fig.7) Cézanne may be seen to have painted himself into the image in the role of the spectator. M.L. Krumrine, in her discussion of Preparation for the Funeral, or The Autopsy (c.1868: Fig.49),

> ...points out the curious parallel between the bald and bearded figure in this picture and the painter, named Laurent, but evidently modeled on Cézanne, who murders the lats husband of Therese Raquin in Zola's novel of that name, then haunts the morgue in search of his victim's corpse. (47)

In this work the pose of the figure of 'Cézanne' is similar to a figure in The Murder (c.1867-8: Fig.19). In the former, the figure of 'Cézanne' is crouched over the corpse in intense concentration dictated by the demands of the job at hand; in the latter the bent over figure of the woman is an accomplice in the job at hand namely, murder. And in the two versions of A Modern Olympia (The Pasha) (c.1869-70: Fig.50) and A Modern Olympia (1872-3: Fig.51) the bottom right hand corner is occupied by a figure of a man who has been identified by Gowing as Cézanne. (48)

To the left of this figure in both works is a table laden with objects such as fruit and wine. This still-life in the painting, while iconographically appropriate, also operates as a formal device. It creates continuity between the different planes of the picture. In

both works the spectator is led into the picture from the right of the work, the place occupied by Cézanne as spectator, and then into the left middleground by the eye's attention on the sumptuous still-life, and lastly to the figure of the reclining nude which is the raison d'etre of the work. As if to balance the subtext of the work, namely spectatorship, Cézanne placed the figure of the servant/Negro in the background. This serves to balance and frame the reclining figure compositionally as well as the work's meaning.

While in the abovementioned works, Cézanne's inclusion of himself introduces the idea of the artist as spectator, another device is often used to 'represent' himself as spectator in the image. This device is evident in the painting process itself, and is therefore less easily apparent to the spectator. It will be suggested that this device, in affirming the process of art making, articulates the artistic presence in the actual physicality of the painted surface. This device embodies the idea of the artist's presence as representationally absent in the traditional sense but present in the metaphorical sense of the artist's hand engaged in the act of painting.

The foregrounding of the process of painting is central to the work's meaning, in that it indicates the painter's presence in the work. This overt presence may be interpreted as the artist's spectatorship of the work in that it focuses so forcibly on the process. The so-called 'unfinished' quality and painterliness of Cézanne's markmaking in many of the early works, the tension between two and three dimensionality and the tentativeness of

certain marks, all contribute to the physical and actual embodiment of art as a process and signify Cézanne's presence as constructor and spectator in the work of art. Attention to these numerous devices will be drawn throughout the following visual analyses of Cézanne's image making and visual language.

While an understanding of the importance of process in the interpretation of Cézanne's still-lifes is important, it is essential to contextualise the centrality of this aspect of his work within a broader conception of the aim and purpose of his artistic enterprise. In the following section, the ways in which the notion of a drama of style as well as the role of the spectator, contribute to the fulfilment of these aims will be examined.

While Cézanne affirmed the aspect of process in his work, which fulfilled the 'demands of art', his aim was also to fulfil the 'demands of nature' within the practice of image making. (49) Cézanne's insistence on creating both an 'illusion' of reality while simultaneously affirming the means by which this 'illusion' is created, namely, the painting process itself, is intimately linked to his artistic programme as a whole and his method of painting. This dual goal of fulfilling both the 'demands of art', and those of nature, meant that both the two and three dimensional aspects of the work needed to be affirmed in the process of image making. For Cézanne, images are both the site for a resolution of visual problems and the site for a problematized statement of visual language. (50)

The tension between these two goals has led numerous scholars to remark on a particular quality of tension in Cézanne's work. While many of Cézanne's interpreters have pointed to this aspect of tension in Cézanne's work they have done so in different ways. Picasso stated that, "...What forces our interest is Cézanne's anxiety - that's Cézanne's lesson;...."; (51) Merleau-Ponty asked, "Why so much uncertainty, so much labour, so many failures, and suddenly, the greatest success?" (52) Elsewhere in the same essay Merleau-Ponty proposes that

> If one looks at the work of other painters after seeing Cézanne's paintings, one feels somehow relaxed, just as conversations resumed after a period of mourning mask the absolute change and give back to the survivors their solidity. (53)

The quality of tension and anxiety referred to above is evident in an analysis of the notion of distortion in Cézanne's oeuvre. The notion of distortion is central to an understanding of Cézanne's formal language of painting in which the painted reality and that reality thereby represented, are simultaneously affirmed.

Erle Loran argued in his study of Cézanne that the distortions in Cézanne's work were intended for compositional purposes. This premise may be seen to be in direct conflict with Cézanne's stated intention. In order to interpret the role of distortion in Cézanne's still-lifes it is therefore essential to understand Cézanne's idea of

'truth' in painting, often expressed in his letters through his concern for the 'realization of sensations'. (54) In interpreting this concern for 'truth' the scholar needs to ask what kind of truth Cézanne was suggesting.

Cézanne stated in a letter to his son (dated 8 September 1906),

> Finally I must tell you that as a painter I am becoming more clear-sighted before nature, but that with me the realization of my sensations is always painful. I cannot attain the intensity that is unfolded before my senses. (55)

The term 'sensation' (56) used in this letter seems to refer to both the perception of something external as well as to the internal emotion generated by the external stimulus and hence, both seeing and feeling is implied. Cézanne's aim in painting would therefore appear to be, not a photographic representation of nature per se, but a more complex and difficult task of representing in painting the dynamic interchange between the subject and the object. In the realization of his sensations, Cézanne forwarded that both the 'demands of art' and the 'demands of nature' should be fulfilled in the painting. Given the difficulty of this task, it is not surprising that scholars have remarked on the quality of tension, anxiety and doubt in Cézanne's work.

Merleau-Ponty has suggested that,

> It is clear from his conversations with Emile Bernard that

> Cézanne was always seeking to avoid the ready-made alternatives suggested to him: sensation versus judgment; the painter who sees against the painter who thinks; nature versus composition; primitivism as opposed to tradition. 'We have to develop an optics,' said Cézanne, 'by which I mean a logical vision - that is, one with no element of the absurd.' 'Are you speaking of our nature?' asked Bernard. Cézanne: 'It has to do with both.' 'But aren't nature and art different?' 'I want to make them the same. Art is a personal apperception, which I embody in sensations and which I ask the understanding to organize into a painting.' (57)

Merleau-Ponty has noted the importance of opposites and dualities in relation to Cézanne, and suggests further that,

> Cézanne did not think he had to choose between feeling and thought, between order and chaos. He did not want to separate the stable things which we see and the shifting way in which they appear; he wanted to depict matter as it takes on form, the birth of order through spontaneous organization. (58)

As stated above, Cézanne's purpose in art is twofold: firstly, to paint nature convincingly and secondly, to fulfil the demands of art. In this way Cézanne's canvases cannot be seen as simplistic imitations of 'reality'. While a rigorous process is followed in his attempts to represent his sensations in front of nature, the resolution of this project is ironically to represent the process of

recording itself, and thereby accept the nature of both these realities and their ensuing differences. Paradoxically, in thus resolving his project, Cézanne affirmed the substance and reality of both. In examining Cézanne's goals it becomes clear that process is both the means and the end of his art. (59)

In relinquishing the expected notion of what an image looks like, Cézanne, according to Merleau-Ponty, "...speaks as the first man spoke and paints as if no one had ever painted before him." (60) Cézanne discarded the conventional modes of seeing and of representing generalized perception. In a prolonged viewing of objects so called aberrant perception occurs. It may be argued that it was this Cézanne sought to find the means to represent. The following analysis of specific images explores the way in which this quality is articulated as a recurring and central aspect of the meaning of Cézanne's work and his artistic programme.

In Vessels, Basket and Fruit (The Kitchen Table) (1888-90: Fig.52) an image of both monumentality and instability is created. This is created in part by the lack of a logical centre of gravity in the work. As a result the 'falling' objects affect our response, and a conflict between what we perceive and what we know generates an anxiety in the spectator. Clearly, the basket to the right of the table exists both on the table as 'real' and off the table as 'painted reality'. The fact that the spectator is viewing a man-made painting seems to be temporarily suspended in a witty play on differing realities. By distorting the scale of objects in relation to the table on which objects are placed, the precariousness of these objects and

their ensuing status in 'reality' reinforces the spectator's doubt and subsequent anxiety.

In Plaster Cupid and the "Anatomy" (1895: Fig.12) Cézanne extends this play on reality by the inclusion of art objects, namely a painting of a lost sculpture attributed to Michelangelo and a plaster statuette of Puget, which exist alongside objects from nature. (61) What is depicted as painted in this work as opposed to what is painted by Cézanne increases the insecurity in the spectator regarding the stability, not only of the actual objects (which seem to be falling into our space) but of reality as a whole.

The tension created between these levels of reality is further articulated in the tension between the two and three dimensional realities of the image. The heavily moulded plaster cast is given a realism of volume through the use of chiaroscuro. In contrast, and as if to negate this volumetric sense in the work, the table on which the objects are placed tilts, thus reinforcing the two dimensionality of the work. This simultaneity creates a feeling of insecurity in both the spectator and the 'objects' that occupy this space, another instance of the dramatization of style.

Merleau-Ponty, in his interpretation of Cézanne's artistic project, suggests that,

> By remaining faithful to the phenomenon in his investigations of perspective, Cézanne discovered what recent psychologists have come to formulate: the lived perspective,

> that which we actually perceive, is not a geometric or photographic one. (62)

In Merleau-Ponty's terms, Cézanne's use of distortion, evident in many of his works, facilitated a representation of 'lived perspective'. In traditional terms, the rule of perspective is based on the assumption that the eye views an object at a fixed eye level and that this viewing is static. The notion of 'lived perspective', as manifest in Cézanne's exploration of distortion, challenges this traditional [illegible].

In Vessels, Basket and Fruit (The Kitchen Table) (1888-90: Fig.52) a sense of insufficient space is allocated to objects. This creates a tension between the represented objects and those objects as they exist in the 'real' space of both the artist and the spectator.

The 'truth' of art is essentially a two dimensional reality (a notion explored by the critic Greenberg and seen by him as an essential part of Modernism) and that of nature is essentially a three dimensional reality. Cézanne's concern was to be 'true' to both the represented reality (nature) and to the created reality (art). In Cézanne's works, both the two and three dimensional elements are affirmed, and thus a tension is set up between the two which constitutes the truth to both art and nature, without the privileging of either.

In Basket with Apples, Bottle, Biscuits and Fruit (1890-4: Fig.54) the basket on the left hand side of the image is tilted forward, a

device often used by Cézanne. Objects in the work that would 'normally' not be visible are thus seen. In this work the fact that the actual block used to tilt the basket forward toward the spectator can be so clearly seen is noteworthy. While the image presents the spectator with a view of reality that is 'real', the spectator is ironically made aware of the artificial means used to represent this 'natural' perception, by the obvious block placed under the basket.

This tilting device is also evident in Plate of Cherries and Peaches, Vase and Cloth (1883-7: Fig.55) in which the plate of cherries is tilted toward the spectator probably by the artificial means of wedges. In setting up and essentially composing his still-lifes Cézanne often used this means to manipulate the painted viewpoints and hence, reality. Cézanne employs similar devices in Man with Folded Arms (The Clockmaker) (1895-1900: Fig.56) in the creation of multiple viewpoints and the tilting of axis which affects the spectator emotionally in viewing the image. In Plate with Apples and Cup (Big Apples) (1890-4: Fig.57) and Fruit-Bowl, Cloth, Glass and Apples (1879-82: Fig.58), squaring of ellipses and broken contours in the rendition of objects (arcs and ellipses), are evident as other devices of 'distortion' used by Cézanne.

The implication of a greater solidity of form to objects not usually associated with solidity is evident in The Black Clock (c.1870: Fig.35), Vessels, Fruit and Cloth in front of a Chest (1883-7: Fig.59) and Curtain, Fruit-Bowl, Carafe and Plate with Fruit (1895-1900: Fig.60), where the drapery is treated as sculpted

mass. It is interesting to compare two still-lifes in which the same central object is used to different ends: Plaster Cupid and the "Anatomy" (1895: Fig.12) and Plaster Cupid (1895: Fig.61). In Plaster Cupid (1895: Fig.61) a squatter figure of the Cupid is manipulated in this horizontal composition while in Plaster Cupid and the "Anatomy" (1895: Fig.12) the Cupid is suitably elongated given the vertical composition. As previously mentioned in the discussion of this work, a tension is set up between the represented reality and reality as it exists in our space.

Other 'distortions' encountered include the frequent use of asymmetry of form, the dislocation of horizontal and recessional diagonal lines, the tilting of verticals more often to the left than to the right, the warping of the vertical/central axis of form (not symmetrical), illogical changes in the scale of objects, and the inversion of perspective. In the interpretation of these devices, the scholar articulates the affects of the spatial manipulations in the painting on the spectator.

Some scholars are concerned with the explanation of Cézanne's 'distortions' within terms of perceptual experience. This explanation is in keeping with Cézanne's intention, as reflected in his letters to 'realize his sensations'. However, the primary focus in this analysis is on the interpretation (as opposed to the explanation) of Cézanne's 'distortions'. Although these 'distortions' are perceptually based, it may be suggested that they operate in other ways, which are unmistakeably apparent in, for example, the analysis of the compositional differences in Plaster Cupid and the

"Anatomy" (1895: Fig.12) and Plaster Cupid (1895: Fig.61). In these two works it is clear that the proportions of the scale of the objects are adjusted to the corresponding proportions of the canvas. It is thus suggested that at least in this instance, 'distortion' as a device is also used for both compositional and aesthetic reasons.

In interpreting Cézanne's distortions (as opposed to explaining them) it is important to acknowledge that the spectator in reading the distortions is thereby affected by them. It may be speculatively suggested that the experience of the spectator in analysing these 'distortions' is parallel, to some extent to that of Cézanne. The anxiety generated by the effects of these 'distortions' in the spectator may be similar to that recounted by Cézanne in his letters.

Merleau-Ponty has noted that for Cézanne painting was an extremely complex and difficult task and remarked that he needed one hundred working sessions for a still-life, five hundred sittings for a portrait. (63) In a letter to Emile Bernard (dated 21 September 1906, one month before his death) Cézanne wrote,

> I am in such a state of mental disturbance, I fear at moments that my frail reason may give way. ... now it seems to me that I see better and that I think more correctly about the direction of my studies. Will I ever attain the end for which I have striven so much and so long? I am always studying

> after nature, and it seems to me I am making slow progress. (64)

In another letter to Emile Bernard (dated 12 May 1904) Cézanne stated: "I progress very slowly, for nature reveals herself to me in very complex ways; and the progress needed is endless." (65)

For R.W. Murphy, Cézanne's approach to the canvas can be described

> ... as a perpetual upsetting and restoring of balances. Cézanne began by sketching in pencil the dark outer contours - areas of shadow - of the principal forms. With the first light pencil stroke he was in effect upsetting the balance of the empty canvas, and he had to restore it with another stroke - a diagonal in one direction counterbalancing a diagonal in another perhaps, or a vertical counterbalancing a horizontal. An examination of a work abandoned at this early stage reveals that the rhythmical relationship of the principal masses has been established before objects have assumed a recognizable form. At the time that he made these first sketchy indications of contour, Cézanne began by putting next to them unconnected dabs of colour - a red where an apple would be, a green, complementing the red, next to a contour that would become a vase. (66)

Cézanne's process and methods used in structuring images is evident in the so-called 'incomplete' works, and interestingly, in the medium of watercolour. (67) In River at the Bridge of the Three Springs (1906-7: Fig.62) the transparent quality of the medium of watercolour reveals the process of building up the image. Both the

pencil lines and the colour application contribute to the gradual advancement of the work. (68) The repeated use of colours in Cézanne's work, as for example, in River at the Bridge of the Three Springs (1906-7: Fig.62), appears to be for both aesthetic purposes as well as for any reasons of perceptual accuracy.

In many of Cézanne's still-lifes there exists a strange complicity between objects. This may be seen in Receptacles, Fruit and Biscuits on Sideboard (1873-7: Fig.63), for example. This quality of complicity, even secrecy, has been interpreted by some scholars as a mysterious and at times even divine aspect of Cézanne's work. While Kurt Badt in his analysis of this aspect of Cézanne's work interprets this quality in relation to specifically biographical details of Cézanne's life (for example his conversion, which is articulated in his letters), Schapiro, on the other hand, discusses this in relation to the idea of epiphany and contemplation. Both these aspects can be related to the role of the spectator and the notion of a drama of style. Schapiro notes a quality of poetic silence and an enigmatic and meditative quality in Cézanne's works. It is important to stress that this almost spiritual dimension to Cézanne's work does not take the spectator into a metaphysical realm, but serves to reinforce the profundity of vision, which is possibly a religious experience for the artist.

Merleau-Ponty has also noted this quality in Cézanne's work and suggests that,

> Cézanne's difficulties are those of the first word. He

> considered himself powerless because he was not omnipotent, because he was not God and he wanted nevertheless to portray the world, to change it completely into a spectacle, to make visible how the world touches us. (69)

Schapiro has noted in discussing Giacometti's paintings of apples that, Giacometti

> ...regarded the choice of the still-life object as an essential value and not as a 'pretext' of form. In certain of his later paintings the apple has an air of a personal manifesto or demonstration - perhaps inspired by his understanding of Cézanne's concern - as if he wished to assert dramatically, against the current indifference to the meaning of the still-life object, his own profound interest in the apple's solitary presence as a type of being. (70)

The critical methodology of Russian Formalism, that emerged as early as 1914 and was to play a significant role in the development of Parisian structuralism during the 1960s, forwarded a term that is useful to apply to the nature of Cézanne's visual project. (71)

Shklovsky, one of the theorist of Russian Formalism, suggested the term 'defamiliarization' which he argued, could bring the difference between poetic and practical language into focus. 'Defamiliarization' or 'making strange' enabled art to defamiliarize things that had become habitual or automatic. This device of

'defamiliarization' is the renewal of perception that leads to a recognition by the spectator/reader that is epiphanic. Skhlovsky suggested that defamiliarization's aim was 'to make the stone stony'. Applied to Cézanne, Cézanne's painted apples are more real than real apples in that he captures the 'appleness' of apples. This notion of paradox in Cézanne's art was essential to (re)present and sustain the tension between art and nature so central to his artistic project. The purpose of Cézanne's art, namely to be true to both art and nature was facilitated by this concept of paradox. (72)

The Russian Formalists spoke about art's capacity to generate in the reader/spectator renewed perception facilitated by the use of a sophisticated language system. Cézanne's project insisted on continuously challenging himself (as spectator of nature and art) and the spectator. By 'defamiliarizing' the 'everydayness' of simple objects such as apples, Cézanne explored the means by which ideas are communicated and developed a sophisticated visual language to communicate more than the denotative possibilities of 'appleness'. In so doing, the poetic language of art was extended in Cézanne's innovative explorations of the language and drama of style.

Conclusion

In defining the problems currently facing the discipline of Art History, the 'New Art Historians' have focussed inter alia on the analysis of issues pertinent in the investigation of meaning and interpretation in the visual arts. These critical writings have facilitated a self awareness in the discipline that has both challenged accepted dogma and offered a way forward. However, the activity of visual analysis, beyond the focus of the New Art History, remains of paramount importance to art historians, and critical in the interpretation of Cézanne's still-lifes.

The early Formalist writings of Bell and Fry reflect an acceptance of the challenges posed by the new visual language manifest in the art of Cézanne and his contemporaries. Their attempts to articulate and interpret this visual language contributed to its acceptance. However, both critics polarized the relationship between the formal aspects of the work of art and its 'content'. It is argued that such a dichotomy creates a dualistic approach to the work of art that limits the interpretation of Cézanne's formal language, which is a central determinant of the meaning of the still-lifes. In reassessing the parameters of formalism it is suggested that the notion of a drama of style be considered in the re-evaluation of formalism in the context of an analysis of Cézanne's still-lifes.

The notion of a drama of style, examined in the previous chapter, suggests ways in which to interpret Cézanne's still-lifes and also

offers a contextualized understanding of Cézanne's foregrounding of the creative process and his attitude to the perception and representation of nature in art. It is argued further that the meaning of Cézanne's still-lifes is intricately linked to the interpretation of Cézanne's sophisticated pictorial language.

Central to the interpretation of the meaning of his style is the analysis of the important role of the spectator in his work. It is argued that Cézanne foregrounds the relationship between the spectator and the art object through the stylistic drama enunciated in his still-lifes. The established idea that the still-lifes lack drama because of their alleged neutral subject matter is thereby challenged and found to be fallacious.

The centrality of the genre of still-life in the interpretation of Cézanne's oeuvre is thus affirmed. As Meyer Schapiro has suggested,

> ...what is most distinctive and accomplished in Courbet, Manet, Renoir and Monet will not be learned through their still-lifes; but if we lacked Cézanne's, something essential would be missing, a range of qualities of colours and forms bound to a unique conception of things near at hand. (1)

offers a contextualized understanding of Cézanne's foregrounding of the creative process and his attitude to the perception and representation of nature in art. It is argued further that the meaning of Cézanne's still-lifes is intricately linked to the interpretation of Cézanne's sophisticated pictorial language.

Central to the interpretation of the meaning of his style is the analysis of the important role of the spectator in his work. It is argued that Cézanne foregrounds the relationship between the spectator and the art object through the stylistic drama enunciated in his still-lifes. The established idea that the still-lifes lack drama because of their alleged neutral subject matter is thereby challenged and found to be fallacious.

The centrality of the genre of still-life in the interpretation of Cézanne's oeuvre is thus affirmed. As Meyer Schapiro has suggested,

> ...what is most distinctive and accomplished in Courbet, Manet, Renoir and Monet will not be learned through their still-lifes; but if we lacked Cézanne's, something essential would be missing, a range of qualities of colours and forms bound to a unique conception of things near at hand. (1)

Endnotes: Introduction

(1) I would like to acknowledge at the outset of this research the difficulties raised in working from reproductions in the interpretation of Cézanne's still-lifes. One of the determining motivations for originally choosing to work on Cézanne, was based on the fact that I was fortunate enough to have visited France and viewed Cézanne's work. Although at many times during this research I would have welcomed the opportunity to revisit his works and spectate their enormous physical presence again, the memory of these images was rekindled in the viewing of often numerous reproductions of the same image as well as excellent details of his works which are available.

(2) Cited in C. Donnell-Kotrozo, Critical Essays on Postimpressionism, London and Toronto: Associated University Press, Inc., 1983, p.16. (Primary Source: E.H. Gombrich, Art History and the Social Sciences, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975, p.9.).

Endnotes: Chapter I

(1) "When Block and its seed-bed Middlesex Polytechnic held a conference in 1982 on 'The New Art History?' - to our knowledge the first public use of the term - they gave the phrase a telling question mark to imply a certain scepticism about its usage." A.L. Rees and F. Borzello. eds., The New Art History, London: Camden Press, 1986, p.3.

(2) Ibid., p.5.

(3) "Rather than a tidy description of one trend, the new art history is a capacious and convenient title that sums up the impact of feminist, Marxist, structuralist, psychoanalytic, and social-political ideas on a discipline notorious for its conservative taste in art and its orthodoxy in research" (Ibid., p.2).

(4) D.B. Kuspit, "Conflicting Logics: Twentieth-Century Studies at the Crossroads". The Art Bulletin, March 1987. vol. LXIX, no. 1, p.117.

(5) Ibid.

(6) Rees and Borzello, ibid., p.7.

(7) Examples of research that has critically examined the

writings of Wöllflin and Panofsky, includes: M.A. Holly, Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History, Ithaca: Cornell University, 1984; A. Mezei, "Toward Improving the Objective Status of Aesthetics: On Style and Content of Figurative Pictorial Art", Leonardo, Spring 1981. vol. 14, no. 2, pp.118-121; and G.C. Argan, "Ideology and Iconology", Critical Inquiry, Winter 1975. vol. 2, pp.297-305.

(8) See S. Bann. "How Revolutionary is the New Art History?", Rees and Borzello, Ibid., pp.19-31. Interestingly, Bann cites Svetlana Alpers, who will be referred to further on in this chapter, as an art historian operating within the new art historical paradigm (pp.25 ff).

(9) Ibid., p.8.

(10) Ibid., p.4.

(11) Ibid., p.8.

(12) E. Panofsky, Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance, New York: Oxford University Press, 1939.

(13) C. Belsey, Critical Practice, London and New York: Methuen, 1980, p.2.

(14) D. Carrier, "Manet and his Interpreters", Art History, September 1985. vol. 8 No. 3, pp.320-335.

(15) Ibid., p.327.

(16) Ibid., p.320.

(17) Ibid.

(18) Ibid.

(19) S. Alpers, "Is Art History?", Daedalus, Summer 1977, vol. 106, pp.1-13; p.6.

(20) Carrier, ibid., p.333.

(21) The central role of the spectator in the interpretation of Cézanne's still-lifes will be discussed in greater detail in chapter three.

(22)The way we 'see' Cézanne's art is determined not only by the written component of the literature but also by the social, economic and historical factors evident in Cézanne's 'representation' in the museum context. An anaiysis of Cézanne's 'representation' in museums would prove interesting in showing how the museum context served to reinforce, rather than challenge the position of Cézanne articulated in the literature. Although an important focus of this study is on the

'representation' of Cézanne in the literature (the written word) of equal importance is his representation in the context of the museum. In the same way that the literature organizes information which affects the way we see Cézanne, so too the museum. In the latter context an examination of the Musee d'Orsay and Cézanne's 'representation' therein, would be valuable. The traditionally perceived neutrality of the museum context in relation to the way it collects, documents and exhibits works of art would be seen to be fallacious. For debates on this aspect of research see "The Musee d'Orsay: A Symposium", Art in America, January 1988, pp.85-106; R. Rosenblum, "Nineteenth-Century Art: A Post-Modern View", Sotheby's Preview, February/March 1990, pp.7-10; D. Crimp, "On the Museum's Ruins", in H. Foster. ed. by Postmodern Culture, London and Sydney: Pluto Press, 1985, pp.43-56; M. Gibson, "The Musee d'Orsay: A New and Different 19th Century", Artnews, April 1987, vol. 86, no. 4, pp.142-146.

(23) John Berger comments on spectating works of art in the following terms:

> "When an image is presented as a work of art, the way people look at it is affected by a whole series of learnt assumptions about art. Assumptions concerning: Beauty, Truth, Genius, Civilization, Form, Status, Taste, etc."

He continues, noting that, these assumptions

> "...obscure the past. They mystify rather than clarify....

> Cultural mystification of the past entails a double loss. Works of art are made unnecessarily remote. And the past offers us fewer conclusions to complete in action."
>
> J. Berger, Ways of Seeing, London: British Broadcasting Corporation and Penguin Books, 1972, p.11.

(24) M. Baxandall, Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985, p.1.

(25) Ibid.

(26) J. Wechsler, The Interpretation of Cézanne, Ann Arbor, Michigan: U.M.I. Research Press, 1981, p.2.

(27) T. Gretton discusses the issue of language, meaning and ideology in relation to art historical practice in his article "New Lamps For Old", Rees and Borzello, ibid., pp.63-74.

(28) Ibid., pp.64-65.

(29) The latter was a revision of her thesis submitted to the University of California in 1972.

(30) Cited in J. Wechsler, ed., Cézanne in Perspectiva, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1975,

front page.

(31) S. Alpers, "Is Art History?", Daedalus, Summer 1977, p.6.

(32) D. Ades, "Reviewing Art History", in Rees and Borzello, ibid., pp.11-18.

(33) J. Wechsler, ed., Cézanne in Perspective, ibid., p.3.

(34) Ibid., p.2.

(35) Ibid.

(36) Ibid.

(37) Ibid., p.xiii.

(38) Ibid., p.1.

(39) Ibid., p.2.

(40) J. Wechsler, The Interpretation of Cézanne, ibid., p.ix.

(41) Ibid., p.1.; footnote 1, p.91.

(42) R. Shiff, Cézanne and the End of Impressionism: A Study of the Theory, Technique and Critical Evaluation of Modern Art,

Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1984, p.xiii.

(43) Like Shiff, Tom Gretton also addresses this complicated issue of concern to the New Art History, and acknowledges that, "The carriage of meaning is a complex issue", T. Gretton, ibid., p.70.

(44) Several scholars have approached aspects of Cézanne's work from a psychobiographical perspective, including S. Geist, T. Reff and M. Schapiro. Common to this methodological approach to interpretation, is the desire to explain the artist's work within terms of his life and psychological make up. While M. Merleau-Ponty so rightly points out that, "Although it is certain that a man's life does not explain his work, it is equally certain that the two are connected", the scholar must caution against an oversimplified parallelism between an artist's work and his life. (M. Merleau-Ponty, "Cézanne's Doubt", in M. Merleau-Ponty, Sense and Non-Sense, USA: Northwestern University Press, 1964, p.20.) In addition, the problem of the psychological model (as for example a Freudian or Jungian model) in the interpretation of an artist's work, is the tendency that, in interpreting the artist's work the scholar ultimately reflects the psychological model rather

than the work of art which is the object of study.

(45) Cited in D. Lodge, ed., Twentieth Century Literary Criticism: A Reader, London: Longman, 1972, chapter 26.

(46) Ibid.

(47) R. Barthes, "The Death of the Author", in R. Barthes, Image-Music-Text, London: Fontana Press, 1977, pp.142-148.

(48) R. Barthes, "The Death of the Author", in R. Barthes, Image-Music-Text, London: Fontana Press, 1977, p.143. In chapter three, in the analysis of the role of the spectator in Cézanne's work, the idea of the dual role of the artist (author) as both creator and spectator will be forwarded, thus challenging the notion pointed to by Barthes, that the artist (author) is the 'voice of a single person'.

(49) Ibid., p.148.

(50) In response to Barthes' article on the tyranny of authorship, and its subsequent influence in the literature on the subject, M. Foucault's article entitled, "What is an Author", in which he examines the construct of the author, is noteworthy. M. Foucault, "What is an Author", in M. Foucault. Language, Counter-memory, Practice: Selected Essays

and Interviews, ed. by D.F. Bouchard, Oxford: Blackwell, 1977, pp.141-160.

(51) H.B. Chipp, Theories of Modern Art: A Source Book by Artists and Critics, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1968, p.1.

(52) Chipp proposes that the document be viewed within the following contexts:

"(1) The general cultural context of the age and in particular those ideas and theories of greatest interest to the artist, whether they come from science, history, literature, political or social theory, or from other periods of art.

(2) The specific ideological milieu in which the writer formulated his own ideas and thoughts, such as his circle of friends and acquaintances and his contacts with critics, poets and writers.

(3) The medium through which the ideas were transmitted, insofar as it conditioned the intellectual and emotional attitude the writer assumed in addressing a specific audience: his choice of language, his logicality or absence of it, and perhaps even the kind of ideas chosen.

(4) The writers personal qualifications as a theoretician, as they may be conditioned by both his education and past experience with ideas, and his present attitude toward the written or spoken word as a means of conveying intentions" (Ibid., p.3).

Endnotes: Chapter II

(1) J. Wechsler, The Interpretation of Cézanne, Ann Arbor, Michigan: U.M.I Research Press, 1981, p.1.

(2) J. Wechsler, ed., Cézanne in Perspective, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1975, p.3. Wechsler says that this statement appeared in the context of "...a review of Emile Zola's novel dedicated to Cézanne, La Confession de Claude, published in an Aix-en-Provence newspaper in 1865." Ibid.

(3) G.H. Hamilton, "Cézanne and his Critics", in Cézanne: The Late Work, ed., W. Rubin, London: Thames and Hudson, 1977, pp.139-150.

(4) Ibid., p.144.

(5) Ibid.

(6) Ibid.

(7) Ibid.

(8) V.B Bettendorf, "Cézanne's Early Realism: Still-Life with Bread and Eggs Reexamined", Arts

Magazine, January 1982, vol.56, part 5, p.138.

(9) For a detailed critical analysis of the tradition of Formalism see for example, B.H. Twitchell, Cézanne and Formalism in Bloomsbury, Ann Arbor, Michigan: U.M.I. Research Press, 1987; J.V. Falkenheim, Roger Fry and the Beginnings of Formalist Art Criticism, Ann Arbor, Michigan: U.M.I. Research Press, 1980; S. Fishman, The Interpretation of Art: Essays on the Art Criticism of John Ruskin, Walter Pater, Clive Bell, Roger Fry and Herbert Read, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1963 and L.W. Light, Formalism, Expression Theory, and the Aesthetics of Susanne Langer, Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International, 1982.

(10) L.W. Light, Formalism, Expression Theory and the Aesthetics of Susanne Langer, Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International, 1982, p.23.

(11) The formalist tradition in both art history and literary studies is complex and has taken on several forms in the hands of various literary and art historical scholars. One of the distinguishing features of this tradition is the overlaps that occur in the attempt to define the nature and purpose of art. Traditional distinctions between the disciplines of art history and literature, aesthetics and philosophy are therefore not always clearly defined.

(12) C. Bell, Art, London: Chatto and Windus, 1947, p.8.

(13) Ibid.

(14) Ibid., p.49.

(15) S. Fishman, The Interpretation of Art: Essays on the Art Criticism of John Ruskin, Walter Pater, Clive Bell, Roger Fry and Herbert Read, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1963, p.77.

(16) C. Bell, ibid.

(17) Ibid., p.50.

(18) Ibid., p.25.

(19) R. Fry, Cézanne: A Study of his Development, 2nd ed., London: Hogarth Press Ltd., 1952, p.41.

(20) C. Bell, ibid., pp.60-61.

(21) Ibid., p.45.

(22) Ibid., pp.44-45.

(23) Ibid., p.45.

(24) Ibid., p.25.

(25) J. Wechsler, The Interpretation of Cézanne, Ann Arbor, Michigan: U.M.I Research Press, 1981, p.34.

(26) R. Fry, ibid., p.18.

(27) M. Schapiro, Paul Cézanne, New York: Harry N. Abrams Inc., 1952.

(28) M. Klimova, Paul Cézanne, Leningrad: Aurora Art Publishers, 1976.

(29) R. Fry, Cézanne: A Study of his Development, ibid., p.65.

(30) S. Fishman, ibid., pp.141-142.

(31) R. Fry, Cézanne: A Study of his Development, ibid., p.53.

(32) Ibid., p.42.

(33) B.H. Twitchell, Cézanne and Formalism in Bloomsbury, Ann Arbor, Michigan: U.M.I. Research Press, 1987, p.20. An in depth analysis of the relationship between formalism and the avant-garde is beyond the confines of this research. Reference to the issue of

"evolution" referred to by Twitchell is however made further on in this chapter. In addition, it is noteworthy that Cézanne, like so many artist's during this period, was opposed to the Academy. It is interesting to speculate whether in this opposition he was allying himself directly with the avant-garde. It is noteworthy in this regard that Cézanne, while he seemed to position himself outside of the Academy, continued to submit works to its annual Salon Exhibitions and was continually rejected. This rejection may ironically be interpreted as an affirmation of his 'success' within the context of the avant-garde. It certainly secured his position amongst the avant-garde. It was only in the 1880s that his work was finally exhibited at the Salon. By this stage the avant-gardism of Impressionism had waned and had emerged, albeit slightly modified, within the Academy itself. M. Ward's article on "The Rhetoric of Independence and Innovation", in The New Painting: Impressionism 1874-1886, ibid., pp.421-442, explores this idea in some depth.

(34) C. Greenberg, cited in J. Wechsler, The Interpretation of Cézanne, ibid., p.45.

(35) Ibid.

(36) C. Greenberg, "Modernist Painting", in ed., G. Battcock, The New Art, New York: E.P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1973, p.67.

(37) Ibid., p.68.

(38) Ibid.

(39) Ibid.

(40) Cited in H.B. Chipp, Theories of Modern Art: A Source Book by Artists and Critics, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968, p.22.

(41) P. Cézanne, Letters, ed., J. Rewald, 4th ed. Tr. by M. Kay. New York: Hacker Art Books, Inc., 1976, p.5.

(42) Related to the letters, but beyond the parameters of this dissertation, are the early twentieth century recollections of writers associated with the artist. Interpreters of Cézanne turn to these early writings for similar reasons that they turn to Cézanne's letters.

(43) Central in the Cézanne literature are the numerous attempts by scholars to reconstruct the life of Cézanne in order to understand more fully the artist's work. A number of important biographical studies on Cézanne exist. In this type of research John Rewald has made a substantial contribution to the Cézanne literature as well as the earlier biographical studies of, for example, Ambroise

Vollard.

(44) According to Rewald, Cézanne's letters may be broadly divided into two categori his letters to his boyhood friend, Emile Zola (with whom he went to school in Aix), which began in 1858 when Zola left for Paris, contain mainly personal matters; in writing to his close friend and mentor, Camille Pissarro, Cézanne dwells on family problems. In these letters little is said about his art and the focus is more on friends, family affairs and general problems. It was only in much later years that we find in Cézanne's letters an expression of his ideas on art. These letters are written to three young men who at different times had sought out Cézanne. Joachim Gasquet (1873-1921), a poet, who at twenty three years old in 1896, had seen Cézanne's paintings at Pere Tanguy's Gallery in Paris. Charles Camoin was an art student, twenty two years old in 1901 when he met Cézanne while serving his military service duty at Aix. Emile Bernard (1868-1941) was known to Cézanne as early as 1890 when Bernard, then twenty two years old published a eulogistic article on Cézanne's paintings in the series Les Hommes d'Aujourd'hui. Bernard met Cézanne in Aix in 1904. The two artists spent a month together in conversation and on painting expeditions which resulted in a series of letters in which Cézanne

formulated his ideas on art. It is essential to note that Cézanne's letters to Bernard, in which he expresses his thoughts on art, must not automatically and uncritically be interpreted as thoughts and ideas on his own art. On the contrary, they may be interpreted as Cézanne's comments on Bernard's art and aspects that Cézanne may have considered lacking therein. On the basis of this interaction Bernard published several articles in Mercure de France in 1921.("Une Conversation avec Cézanne") It is important to stress the context within which Cézanne articulated his ideas about art, an issue that is often overlooked by art historians. In addition, Cézanne's aesthetic ideas as expressed in the letters should not be seen as a watertight manifesto, with intentions for example, that say, Breton may have had in his Surrealist Manifesto (1924), but rather as an informal and essentially private communication of his artistic ideas to personal friends. P. Cézanne, Letters, ibid.

(45) Wechsler comments that in Reff's writings on Cézanne

> "...there are six articles which apply a psychoanalytic approach to the study of Cézanne's subject matter, particularly the figure paintings."

J. Wechsler, The Interpretation of Cézanne, ibid., p.79. See: Geist, Reff and Schapiro in the bibliography (below). Geist, Reff and Schapiro deal with the reconstruction of Cézanne's personality which is seen to govern his work, and examine the latent symbolism evident in his work.

(46) With the publication of Venturi's Cézanne son art, son oeuvre, Orienti's The Complete Paintings of Cézanne and catalogues of Cézanne's drawings and watercolours, Cézanne's art was made available and accessible to scholars and had a profound and enriching effect on the field.

(47) It is interesting to speculate on the reasons for the popularity (in both scholarship and the art market) of certain periods of Cézanne's works at specific points in history. An investigation into the relationship between the demand and availability of his work in the art market and the nature and number of academic studies on his work, would no doubt prove to offer valuable insights on this issue. One could question, for example, the possible ways in which the major exhibition of the late work in 1977 at the Museum of Modern Art in New York created or contributed to both an economic demand and research interest in works of this period. Similar questions could be posed in relation to the major exhibition of the early work in 1988, exactly a decade later, held at the Royal Academy of Arts in London. Valuable studies have been conducted in this line by scholars who investigate the rise in the popularity of women artists and feminist research.

(48) This linearity is also evident in the division within Cézanne's genres.

(49) J. Wechsler, The Interpretation of Cézanne, op. cit., p.3.

(50) C. Donnell-Kotrozo, Critical Essays on Postimpressionism, London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, Inc., 1983, p.13.

(51) Ibid.

(52) Cited in C. Donnell-Kotrozo, ibid., p.96, Note 39, p.105.

(53) Ibid., p.89, Note 14, p. 104.

(54) P. Cézanne, Letters, ibid, p.301.

(55) Two examples of this approach, cited by C. Donnell-Kotrozo are: "'He called increasingly on geometry to second his vision and built on the firm foundation he had detected in nature herself: the 'cylinder, the cone, and the sphere.'" (Cited in C. Donnell-Kotrozo, Critical Essays on Postimpressionism, ibid., p.89, note 16, p.104), and "'Paul Cézanne is the fountainhead of many of the movements in modern art ... out of his theory that nature should be reduced to the cube, the cone, and the cylinder came cubism: out of his insistence that what he painted were his sensations in the presence of nature came expressionism and other 'isms'.'" (Cited in C. Donnell-Kotrozo, Critical Essays on Postimpressionism, ibid., p.89. note 15, p.104.)

(56) It is not the intention here to deny the importance of Cézanne's innovations nor to challenge the impact of Cézanne's work on later generations of artists, poets and writers, but rather, to caution against an oversimplified evolutionary account of the development of art history.

(57) This debate is discussed in S. Lichtenstein, "Cézanne and Delacroix", Art Bulletin, March 1964, pp.55-67.

(58) M. Schapiro, Paul Cézanne, New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1952, p.20.

(59) P. Cézanne, Letters, ibid., pp.305-306.

(60) Ibid., p.280.

(61) Ibid., p.303.

(62) J. Wechsler, The Interpretation of Cézanne, ibid., p.56.

(63) Ibid., p.53.

(64) Ibid., p.49.

(65) M. Schapiro cited in J. Wechsler, ed., Cézanne in Perspective, ibid., p.134.

(66) Ibid.

(67) Ibid.

(68) J. Wechsler, ed., Cézanne in Perspective , ibid., p.16.

(69) Ibid.

(70) R. Shiff, "The End of Impressionism", in C.S. Moffett, The New Painting: Impressionism 1874-1886. Oxford: Phaidon, 1986, p.61.

(71) Ibid., p.62.

(72) Ibid., p.70.

(73) C. Donnell-Kotrozo, Critical Essays on Postimpressionism, Ibid., p.25.

(74) It is important and necessary to examine how scholars have interpreted Impressionism in order to fully understand how they have interpreted Cézanne's art in relation to it. In the chronological development of art movements, Impressionism precedes Post-Impressionism, and the aesthetic projects assigned the two movements are seen to differ in fundamental ways. Impressionism is viewed as an art of outer reality, of pure perception, while that of

the Post-Impressionists is seen as an enterprise of inner reality, of emotions and feeling. The objectivity of the Impressionists is contrasted with the subjectivity of the Post-Impressionists.

In Sandro Orienti's catalogue raisonné of Cézanne's paintings, the works are divided into specific periods. Orienti divides Cézanne's paintings into the following periods: Romantic period up to 1871/Impressionist period 1872-1877/Constructive period 1878-1887/Period of synthesis 1888-1906. Like its predecessor, Venturi, in his catalogue raisonné, also assigns a special catagory to the works produced under the influence of Impressionism. Orienti's entry in the notes accompanying the section entitled 'Impressionist period 1872-1877' reads as follows: "This important stage in Cézanne's development is marked by his sojourn at Auvers-sur-Oise from 1872 and working contact with Pissarro over at Pontoise. The constructive element is stressed, and this has a counterpart in the art of Pissarro who unlike others, gave Impressionism a wish to build bigger; this required a structural approach to light itself." S. Orienti, The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972, p.92.

(75) C. Donnell-Kotrozo, Critical Essays on Postimpressionism, ibid., p.14

(76) Ibid., p.19.

(77) Ibid., p.20

(78) Ibid., p.21.

Endnotes: Chapter III

(1) For many scholars the essentialist doctrine of the Formalist practice was seductive precisely because it offered a transcendental framework within which to interpret the meaning of the art work, thus affirming the ideal that art should be both universal and timeless.

(2) While many important contributions to Cézanne's iconography have recently been forwarded in Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1988, the catalogue accompanying the significant exhibition held at the Royal Academy of Arts during 1988 on Cézanne's early work, many scholars continue to perpetuate the dichotomy between form and content in their interpretation of Cézanne. This split between form and content in the analysis of work from the early period does not negate the fact that this important exhibition has explored a more integrated approach to the relationship between the early and late work, and offered valuable documentary information and interpretative commentary on the early period.

(3) See for example M. Ward's discussion in "The Rhetoric of Independence and Innovation", in C.S Moffett, The New Painting: Impressionism 1874-1886, Oxford: Phaidon, 1986, pp.421-442.

(4) This idea was discussed in chapter two in relation to Greenberg's article on "Modernist Painting", in The New Art, ed., by G. Battcock, New York: E.P. Dutton and Co. Inc., 1973.

(5) See for example R. Fry, Cézanne: A Study of His Development, 2nd ed., London: Hogarth Press, 1952, p.56; A. Barnes, and V. de Mazia, The Art of Cézanne, Pennsylvania: Merion, 1939, p.3; M. Brion, Cézanne, London: Thames and Hudson, 1974, p.14 and F. Novotny, Paul Cézanne, London: Phaidon, 1948, p.8, in which scholars have noted the aforementioned qualities.

(6) This practice of quoting his own works was not limited to the still-life genre. For example, in Man with a Pipe, Leaning on a Table (1895-1900: Fig.1) Cézanne quotes a part of his own work, identifiable as the right hand of the Woman with a Coffee-Pot (1890-4: Fig.2). T. Reff discusses this aspect of Cézanne's work in greater detail in, "The Pictures within Cézanne's pictures", Arts Magazine, June 1979, pp.90-104.

(7) This device is also apparent in Two Card-Players (1890-92: Fig.3).

(8) It is ironic that many scholars have insisted that Cézanne painted his portraits as if they were still-life objects, suggesting thereby that they lacked emotional and/or dramatic content. In reading

Cézanne's formal devices (as distinct from his content), as formal devices for their own sake, this important connotative level of the meaning of Cézanne's formal language has been overlooked.

(9) M.L. Krumrine in, "Parisian Writers and the Early Work of Cézanne" reads the still-life elements as iconographic clues to the work's meaning and thereby significantly brings into question the alleged neutrality of the still-lifes. M. L. Krumrine, "Parisian Writers and the Early Work of Cézanne", in Cézanne: The Early Years, pp.25-27.

(10) Cézanne: The Early Years, cat. 52, p.174.

(11) It is interesting to postulate whether Krumrine's interpretation of Le Dejeuner sur l'herbe (c.1870-71: Fig.6), discussed in Cézanne: The Early Years, cat. no. 51, p.172, is applicable here.

(12) A similar device in linking the background, middleground and foreground is used in Paris: the Quai de Bercy - The Wine Market (c.1872: Fig.8), where the repetition of similar shapes is used as a unifying element of different planes.

(13) Cézanne: The Early Years, p.96, cat. 14.

(14) Ibid., p.180.

(15) It is interesting to speculate whether the fact that one umbrella is open and the other is closed relates to the different attitudes of the two women to the absent presence. In addition, one could speculate on the significance, if any, of the direction of the woman on the left's red umbrella toward the other woman's genitals. The use of the colour red could be found to be symbolic in this regard.

(16) For a commentary on the literary source for this work see M. Tompkins Lewis, "Literature, Music and Cézanne's early subjects", in Cézanne: The Early Years, pp.32-36.

(17) N. Bryson, Looking at The Overlooked: Four Essays on Still Life Painting, London: Reaktion Books Ltd.,1990, p.8.

(18) Ibid.

(19) Ibid., p.10.

(20) Ibid., p.12.

(21) M. Schapiro, "The Apples of Cézanne: An Essay on the Meaning of Still-life", in M. Schapiro, Modern Art 19th and 20th Centuries: Selected Papers, New York: George Braziller, 1982, p. 26.

(22) R. Fry, Cézanne: A Study of his Development, p.42.

(23) Ibid., p.53.

(24) It is interesting to compare Cézanne's use of lettering in Portrait of Louis Auguste Cézanne, Father of the Artist, Reading l'Evenement (1866: Fig.9), and Portrait of the Painter, Achille Emperaire (c.1868-70: Fig.21). In the former, the lettering is used descriptively in the title of the newspaper L'Evenement, and in the latter, as the name and designation of the sitter, Achille Emperaire Peintre. In both instances the lettering contributes significantly to the way in which the spectator constructs the meaning of the works.

(25) M. Merleau-Ponty, "Cézanne's Doubt", in M. Merleau-Ponty, Sense and Non-Sense, USA: Northwestern University Press, 1964, p.11.

(26) Given that both these work's are executed late in Cézanne's career, it is worth noting Kenneth Clark's notion of an 'old age style' which he explores in "The Artist Grows Old", in K. Clark, Moments of Vision and Other Essays, New York: Harper and Row, 1981. Although Cézanne's late style has been assessed in studies of his development, the late style has not been considered in relation to Clark's notion of the ageing artist and an 'old age style'. Such an analysis could prove useful in accounting for the colour tonalities of these later works.

(27) In Wine-Jug and Plate with Fruit (1895-1900: Fig.25).

Cézanne's use of colour/shadow paths is clearly evident.

(28) Cézanne's drawing entitled Scene of Violence (also known as The Murder) (1869-72: Fig.26) is noteworthy. On the right hand side of the drawing, the suggestion of a figure bending over, is reminiscent of the 'female accomplice' in The Murder (c.1867-8: Fig.19).

(29) Cited by L. Gowing in Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, p.132. Interestingly, Gowing also mentions that the nymphs in The Rape (c.1867: Fig.18) are similar to the figures in Women Dressing (c.1867: Fig.27) He observes that Women Dressing (c.1867: Fig.27) "...represents the first appearance in Cézanne's art of the vivid and imaginative colouring which matured in The Rape" (c.1867: Fig.18).

(30) See for example, Love Play (1875-6: Fig.28), Love Play (1875-6: Fig.29), Three Women (1875-7: Fig.30) and Five Women (1885-7: Fig.31).

(31) R. Fry, Cézanne: A Study of his Development, p.42.

(32) J. Hall, Dictionary of Subjects and Symbols in Art, London: John Murray (Publishers) Ltd., 1974, p.85.

(33) Ibid.

(34) This subversion of tradition is not limited to the genre of

still-life, and it is interesting to note that even when Cézanne painted traditionally grand themes of mythological subjects he avoided and removed from their focus the culturally determined and accepted ready-made levels of symbolic meaning. As a result, the normally appropriate and expected parameters of traditional meaning were subverted and challenged. The series of bather paintings indicate this subversion.

(35) This approach is not exclusive to the genre of still-life and appears in other early works as for example, in Self-Portrait (c.1866: Fig.36) in the forehead and Portrait of Uncle Dominique (in a turban) (1866: Fig.37) in details of the turban and forehead.

(36) Cézanne: The Early Years, p.94.

(37) R. Fry, Cézanne: A Study of his Development, p.53.

(38) The following works all include skull(s): Three Skulls (1900: Fig.38); Pyramid of Skulls (1900: Fig.39); Three Skulls on Oriental Covering (1904: Fig.40); Still Life: Skull and Waterjug (c.1868-70: Fig.34).

(39) Cézanne: The Early Years, p.168.

(40) Ibid.

(41) See for example, Jug, Fruit, Cloth and Glass (1879-82: Fig.42) and Apples and Plate of Biscuits (1879-82: Fig.43).

(42) M. Schapiro, "The Apples of Cézanne: An Essay on the Meaning of Still-life", in M. Schapiro, Modern Art 19th and 20th Centuries: Selected Papers, p.25.

(43) Ibid., p.23.

(44) The ideas forwarded in relation to the central role of the spectator in the interpretation of a work of art are informed by R. Wollheim's essay on "What the Spectator Sees", in N. Bryson, M.A. Holly and K. Moxey, eds., Visual Theory: Painting and Interpretation, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991, p.101-150. According to the editors, "Richard Wollheim's essay, 'What the Spectator Sees', examines less the production than the reception of the work of art - conditions of spectatorship, or what Gombrich has called the 'beholder's share'. Yet a rigid separation of the two roles - the maker on one side, the viewer on the other - is exactly what his argument calls into question. One of the most suggestive lines of thought in the essay grows from the observation that viewers are not the first to see the painting, for the painter has been there before them: inside the artist is a spectator, the first spectator of the work", Ibid., p.5.

(45) Paul Cézanne, Letters, J. Rewald, ed., p.328.

(46) M. Merleau-Ponty, "Cézanne's Doubt", in M. Merleau-Ponty, Sense and Non-Sense, USA: Northwestern University Press, 1964, p.19.

(47) Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, cat. no. 35, p.140, Preparation for the Funeral, or The Autopsy (c.1868: Fig.49).

(48) Having noted that Cézanne's paintings on the theme of the modern Olympia has at its source Manet's painting of this famous theme, Gowing notes that Cézanne's "...variations contain an element which is lacking in the famous themes that they follow. They all contain, usually in the foreground, a figure that is identifiable as their painter, Cézanne himself. Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872, p.150.

(49) Cézanne often remarked on the importance of nature in relation to his artistic process, in his letters to younger artists. In a letter to Joachim Gasquet (dated 26 September 1987) Cézanne writes: "Art is a harmony which runs parallel with nature - what is one to think of those imbeciles who say that the artist is always inferior to nature?" Paul Cézanne, Letters, J. Rewald, ed., p.261. In a letter to Charles Camoin (dated 22 February 1903) Cézanne wrote: "Everything, especially in art, is theory developed and applied in contact with nature." Paul Cézanne, Letters, J. Rewald, ed., p.294. In a letter to Louis Aurenche (dated 25 January 1904) Cézanne writes: "In your letter you speak of my realization of art. I believe that I must attain it more every day, although a

bit laboriously. Because, if the strong feeling for nature-and certainly I have that vividly - is the necessary basis for all artistic conception on which rests the grandeur and beauty of all future work, the knowledge and the means of expressing our emotion is no less essential, and is only to be acquired through very long experience." Paul Cézanne, Letters, J. Rewald, ed., p.299.

(50) As such, the image offers its resolution in any number of interpretations, both in relation to the practice of artists and art historians. The image is, in effect, always its own first interpreter. In defining the terms of his creative efforts thus, it may be inferred that, Cézanne insisted upon subsequent interpretations of his work as being central to the work's meaning. That is, he assumed that his works would continue to provoke 'commentary' and interpretation, not only from other works by his hand, but also from subsequent generations of scholars and artists.

(51) Cited in J. Wechsler, ed., Cézanne in Perspective, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975, p.77.

(52) M. Merleau-Ponty, "Cézanne's Doubt", in M. Merleau-Ponty, Sense and Non-Sense, USA: Northwestern University Press, 1964, p.9.

(53) Ibid., p.16.

(54) See for example: Paul Cézanne, Letters, J. Rewald, ed., p.327.

(55) Ibid.

(56) It is important to note that the scholar is dealing with the subtleties and complexities involved in the translation of one language into another, namely French into English. The French term 'sensation'refers to both sensation and feeling. See: Harraps Shorter French and English Dictionary, London: Harrap, 1982, p.682.

(57) M. Merleau-Ponty, "Cézanne's Doubt", in M. Merleau-Ponty, Sense and Non-Sense, USA: Northwestern University Press, 1964, p.13. It is interesting to refer the reader here to D. Kuspit's analysis of Meyer Schapiro in his article entitled, "Dialectical Reasoning in Meyer Schapiro" (in D.B. Kuspit, The Critic is Artist: The Intentionality of Art, Ann Arbor, Michigan: U.M.I. Research Press, pp.47-74) in which Kuspit discusses Schapiro's use of the concept of duality and dialectic in his interpretation of art generally, but with particular reference to Cézanne.

(58) M. Merleau-Ponty, "Cézanne's Doubt", in M. Merleau-Ponty, Sense and Non-Sense, USA: Northwestern University Press, 1964, p.13.

(59) It is interesting to note that the idea of 'process' is an

essentially 'modern' notion. L. Nochlin has stated the following: "However, the impression experienced with a growing strength, and which remains dominant, is that Cézanne does not approach nature with a program of art, with the despotic intention of submitting this nature to a law that he has conceived, of subjecting it to an ideal formula which is within himself. He is not, however, completely without program, law, and ideal, but they do not come to him from art, they come to him from the intensity of his curiosity, from his desire to possess the things that he sees and admires. He is a man who looks about him, near him, who experiences an intoxication from the spectacle displayed, and who likes to transfer the sensation of this intoxication onto the restricted space of a canvas. He goes to work and he seeks out the means for achieving this transposition as truthfully as possible." L. Nochlin, Impressionism and Post-Impressionism 1874-1904 SOURCES and DOCUMENTS, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1966, p.104.

(60) M. Merleau-Ponty, "Cézanne's Doubt", in M. Merleau-Ponty, Sense and Non-Sense, USA: Northwestern University Press, 1964, p.19.

(61) Orienti notes these details in the catalogue entries to "Anatomy" by Michelangelo (1895: not reproduced) and Plaster Cupid and the "Anatomy" (1895: Fig.12). S. Orienti, The Complete Paintings of Cézanne, p.124. In L'Ecorche, interior with chair (1887-90: Fig.53), a drawing of the lost

sculpture attributed to Michelangelo, is rendered.

(62) M. Merleau-Ponty, "Cézanne's Doubt", in M. Merleau-Ponty, Sense and Non-Sense, USA: Northwestern University Press, 1964, p.14.

(63) Ibid., p.12.

(64) Paul Cézanne, Letters, J. Rewald, ed., pp.329-330.

(65) Ibid., p.302.

(66) R.W. Murphy, The World of Cézanne: 1839-1906, New York: Time-Life International, N.V. 1968, 1971, p.82.

(67) As discussed in chapter two, scholars have often suggested that these late and seemingly 'incomplete' works were an indication of Cézanne's purposeful development towards abstraction. On the contrary, Cézanne explained the nature of these 'incompleted' works thus: "Now, being old, nearly 70 years, the sensations of colour, which give light, are for me the reason for the abstraction which do not allow me to cover my canvas entirely nor to pursue the delimitation of the objects where the points of contact are fine and delicate; from which it results that my image is incomplete." Paul Cézanne, Letters, J. Rewald, ed., p.317.

(68) The debates about Cézanne's relation to the traditions of

Romanticism and Classicism expressed in the literature and challenged fundamentally in the analysis of Cézanne's process evident in the 'incomplete' works. Both line and colour are equally important to Cézanne's process of image making, neither can be seen to dominate. The Classic/Romantic dichotomy (line/colour) co-exists in Cézanne's working method. Interestingly, Cézanne stated in a letter to Emile Bernard (dated 26 May 1904): "The man of letters expresses himself in abstractions whereas the painter, by means of drawing and colour, gives concrete form to his sensations and perceptions." Paul Cézanne, Letters, J. Rewald, ed., p.303.

(69) M. Merleau-Ponty, "Cézanne's Doubt", in M. Merleau-Ponty, Sense and Non-Sense, USA: Northwestern University Press, 1964, p.19.

(70) M. Schapiro, "The Apples of Cézanne: An Essay on the Meaning of Still-life", in M. Schapiro, Modern Art 19th and 20th Centuries: Selected Papers, p.37, note 65.

(71) For a more detailed account of Russian Formalism and the term see A. Jefferson's article on "Russian Formalism" in A. Jefferson and D. Robey, eds., Modern Literary Theory: A Comparative Introduction, London: Batsford Academic and Educational, 1982, pp.16-37.

(72) In another example of this paradoxical idea expressed in art,

mention can be made of Rene Magritte's famous painting (dated 1928-29), entitled Ceci n'est pas une pipe (The Treachery (or Perfidy) of Images). Magritte explores the s idea albeit by different techniques and means.

Endnotes: Conclusion

(1) M. Schapiro, "The Apples of Cezanne: An Essay on the Meaning of Still-Life", in M. Schapiro, Modern Art 19th and 20th Centuries: Selected Papers, New York:George Braziller, 1982, p.26.

Bibliography

Abrams, M.H.

The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.

...s, J.I. and Richardson, J.A.

"D.H. Lawrence on Cézanne: A Study of Critical Intuition". Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 1970. vol. 28, pp.441-453.

..., K.

...he Phantom of the Show". Art History, September 1986. vol. 9, no. 3, pp.376-380. Book Reviews of The New Painting: Impressionism 1874-1886 by C.S. Moffett and A Day in the Country. Impressionism and the French Landscape by R. Brettell.

Adorno, T.W.

"Valery Proust Museum". In Adorno, T.W. Prisms. Tr. by S. and S. Weber. London: Neville Spearman, 1967, pp.173-186.

Adriani, G.

Cézanne's Watercolours. Tr. by R.M. Stockman. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1981.

Alpers, P. and Alpers, S.

"Ut Picture Noesis? Criticism in Literary Studies and Art History". New Literary History, Spring 1972. vol. III, no. 3, pp.437-458.

Alpers, S.

"Is Art History?". Daedalus, Summer 1977, vol. 106, pp.1-13.

Anderson, W.V.

"A Cézanne Self-portrait Drawing Reidentified". The Burlington Magazine, June 1964, vol. CVI, pp.284-285.

_____.

"Cézanne, Tanguy, Choquet". Art Bulletin, June 1967. vol. 49, no.2, pp.137-139.

_____.

"Cézanne's Carnet violet-moire". The Burlington Magazine, June 1985. vol. 127, pp.313-317.

_____.

"Cézanne's L'Eternel Feminin And The Miracle Of Her Restored Vision". The Journal of Art, December 1990, pp.43-44.

_____.

Cézanne's Portrait Drawing. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1970.

———.

"From Cézanne to Picasso to Suprematism: The Russian Criticism". Art Forum, April 1978. vol. 16, pp.32-37.

———.

Book Review of Les Dessins de Paul Cézanne au Cabinet des Estampes du Musee des Beaux-Arts de Bale by A. Chappuis. The Art Bulletin. March 1963. vol. 45, no. 1, pp.79-82.

Argan, G.C.

"Ideology and Iconology". Critical Inquiry, Winter 1975. vol. 2, pp.297-305.

Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, N.

"An Artistic and Political Manifesto for Cézanne". The Art Bulletin, September 1990.vol. LXXII, no. 3, pp.482-492.

Badt, K.

The Art of Cézanne. Tr. by S.A. Ogilvie. New York: Hacker Art Books, 1985.

Bann, S.

The True Vine: On Visual Representation and Western Tradition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Barnes, A.C. and Mazia, V. de

The Art of Cézanne. Merion: Barnes Foundation Press, 1939.

Barnes, A.

On Interpretation: A critical analysis. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988.

Barthes, R.

"The Death of the Author". In Barthes, R. Image-Music-Text. London: Fontana Press, 1977. pp.142-148.

———.

Critical Essays. Tr. by R. Miller. New York: Hill and Wang, 1975.

———.

New Critical Essays. Tr. by R. Howard. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1990.

———.

S/Z: An Essay. Tr. by R. Miller with a Preface by R. Howard. New York: Hill and Wang, A division of Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 1974. 1st published in 1970.

———.

The Pleasure of the Text. Tr. by R. Howard. London: Cape, 1976. 1st published 1973.

Baxandall, M.

Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985.

Bell, C.

Art. London: Chatto and Windus, 1947. 1st published 1914.

Belsey, C.

Critical Practice. London and New York: Methuen, 1980.

Benjamin, W.

Illuminations. Tr. by H. Zohn. London: Jonathan Cape Ltd., 1970.

Berger, J.

"Arts in Society: The Sight of a Man". The New Society, April 16, 1970, pp.646-647.

———.

Ways of Seeing. London: British Broadcasting Corporation and Penguin Books, 1972.

Bergstrom, I.

Dutch Still-Life Painting in the 17th Century. Tr. by C. Hedstruom and G. Taylor. New York: Hacker, 1956. 1st published 1947.

Berman, E.

"A Portrait of Clement Greenberg". S.A. Arts Calender, July 1975, p.3.

Bessonova, M. (Intro.),

Impressionist and Post-Impressionist Paintings in Soviet Museums. Tr. by Y. Pamfilov. Oxford: Phaidon Press Ltd., 1985.

Bettendorf, V.B.M.

"Cézanne's Early Realism: 'Still-Life with Bread and Eggs' Reexamined", Arts Magazine, January 1982. vol. 56, part 5, pp.138-141.

Bloom, H.

A Map of Misreading. London: Oxford University Press, 1975.

———.

AGON: Towards a Theory of Revisionism. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.

———.

De-construction and Criticism. New York: The Seabury Press, 1979.

———.

Figures of Capable Imagination. New York: The Seabury Press, 1976.

———.

The Breaking of the Vessels. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1982.

———.

Poetry and Repression: Revisionism from Blake to Stevens. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1976.

Bouguereau, William.

1825-1905. Paris: Musee du Petit Palais, 9 Fevrier - 6 Ma 1984.

Boime, A.

The Academy and French Painting of the 19th Century. Nev York: Phaidon, 1971.

Bowness, A.

Book Review of Impressionism: Art, Leisure, and Parisia Society by R.L Herbert and The Studios of Paris by J. Milne The Burlington Magazine, April 1990. vol. 132, no. 104 pp.276-277.

Brailsford, C. Moultrie.

Cézanne and Phenomenology: A Common Objective. Ann Arbo Michigan University Microfilms International, 1987. M.A. thesis University of Georgia, 1984.

Brereton, G. A

Short History of French Literature. 2nd ed. Great Britain: Penguin Books, 1976.

Brion, M.

Cézanne. London: Thames and Hudson, 1974.

Brodsky, J.E.,

"Cézanne and the Image of Confrontation". Gazette des Beaux Arts". September 1978. vol. 92, pp.84-86.

Brookner, A.

The Genius of the Future: Studies in French Art Criticism Diderot Stendhal Baudelaire Zola The Brothers Goncourt Huysmans. London and New York: Phaidon, 1971.

Brown, R. Harvey.

"Toward a Sociology of Aesthetic Forms-A Commentary". New Literary History, Winter 1986. vol. 17, no. 21, pp.223-228.

Bryson, N.

Looking at the Overlooked: Four Essays on Still Life Painting. London: Reaktion Books Ltd., 1990.

———.

Traditions and Desire: From David to Delacroix. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

———.

Vision and Painting: The Logic of the Gaze. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1983.

———.

Word and Image: French painting of the Ancien Regime. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Bryson, N., Holly, M. A. and Moxey, K. eds.

Visual Theory: Painting and Interpretation. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.

Buettner, S.

American Art Theory 1945-1970. Ann Arbor Michigan: U.M.I. Research Press, 1981.

Bullock, A. and Stallybrass, O. eds.

The Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought. London: Fontana/Collins, 1977.

Burger, P.

Theory of the Avant-Garde. Tr. by M. Shaw. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Carpenter, J.M.

"Cézanne and Tradition". The Art Bulletin, September 1951, pp.174-186.

Carr, E.H.

What is History?. England: Penguin Books, 1961.

Carrier, D.

Artwriting. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1987.

_____.

"Manet and his Interpreters". Art History, September 1985. vol. 8, no. 3, pp.320-335.

Cézanne, Paul.

Letters. Ed. by J. Rewald. Tr. by M. Kay. 4th revised enlarged edition. 1st English edition 1941. New York: Hacker Art Books, Inc., 1976.

Cézanne: Paintings, Watercolours and Drawings. A Loan Exhibition, USA: The Art Institute of Chicago/The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1952. Intro. by T. Rousseau, Jr.

Cézanne: The Early Years 1859-1872. London: Royal Academy of Arts, Catalogue published in association with London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson 1988. Text by L. Gowing. Ed. by M.A. Stevens. With contributions by G. Adriani, M.L. Krumrine, M. Tomkins Lewis, S. Patin and J. Rewald.

Champa, K.S.

"Cézanne's revolutionary last decade". Artnews, December 1977. vol. 76, part 10, pp.70-72.

Chappuis, A.

The Drawings of Paul Cézanne: A Catalogue Raisonne. London: Thames and Hudson, 1973. 2 vols.

Cherpin, J.

L'oeuvre grave de Cézanne. Marseille: Arts et livres de Provence, 1972.

Chipp, H.B.

Theories of Modern Art: A Source Book by Artists and Critics. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1968.

Clark, K.

Moments of Vision and Other Essays. New York: Harper and Row, 1981.

What is a Masterpiece?. London: Thames and Hudson, 1979.

Conrad, B.

"Cézanne's Influence on Hemingway". Horizon (U.S.A.), April 1979. vol. 22, part 4, pp.32-37.

Cooper, D.

"Two Cézanne Exhibitions - II". The Burlington Magazine, 1954, pp.378-383.

Coppiestone, T.

General Ed. Art in Society: A Guide to the Visual Arts. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1983.

Coward, R. and Ellis, J.

Language and Materialism: Developments in Semiology and the Theory of the Subject. Boston, London and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977.

Cox, A.

Art-as-Politics. Ann Arbor: U.M.I. Research, 1982.

Cranshaw, R. and Lewis, A.

"Wilful Ineptitude". Art History (Book Review of Cézanne: The Early Years, 1859-72 By Sir Lawrence Gowing), March 1989. vol. 12, no. 1, pp.129-135.

Craven, D.

"This is not a review: Magritte according to Foucault". Art History, December 1984. vol. 7, no. 4, pp.477-480.

Crimp, D.

"On the Museums Ruin". In Postmodern Culture. Ed. by H. Foster. London and Sydney: Pluto Press, 1985, pp.43-56.

Crowther, P.

"Greenberg's Kant and the Problem of Modernist Painting". British Journal of Aesthetics, Autumn 1985, vol. 25, no. 4, pp.317-325.

Culler, J.

"Structure of Ideology and Ideology of Structure". New Literary History, 1973. vol. 4, no. 3, pp.471-482.

Derrida, J.

The Truth in Painting. Tr. by G. Bennington and I. McLeod, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1987. 1st published in 1978.

Devine E., Held, M., Vinson, J. and Walsh G. eds.

Thinkers of the Twentieth Century: A Biographical, Bibliographical and Critical Dictionary. London: Firethorn Press, 1986.

Donnell-Kotrozo, C.

Critical Essays on Postimpressionism. London and Toronto: Associated University Press Inc., 1983.

_____.

"Material Illusion". The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, Spring 1984. vol. XLII, no. 3, pp.277-282.

_____.

"Representation and Expression: A False Antinomy". The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, Winter 1980. vol. 39, no. 2, pp.163-173.

_____.

"Representation as Denotation". The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism. Summer 1982. vol. XL, no. 4, pp.361-368.

_____.

"The Intentional Fallacy: An Applied Reappraisal". British Journal of Aesthetics, Autumn 1980. vol. 20, part 4, pp.356-365.

_____.

"The Problem of Representation and Expressionism in Post-Impressionist Art". British Journal of Aesthetics, 1975. vol. 15, no. 3, pp.226-238.

Dorival, B.

Cézanne. Tr. by H.H.A. Thackthwaite. London: House of Beric Ltd., 1948.

Eagleton, T.

Criticism and Ideology: A Study in Marxist Literary Theory. London: NLB, 1976. Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press.

Elderfield, J.

"Drawing in Cézanne". Art Forum, June 1971, pp.51-57.

Encyclopedia of World Art. Paul Cézanne entry. vol. III, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959-68, pp.339-355.

Encyclopedia of World Art. Still-Life entry. vol. XIII, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959-68, pp.408-434.

Engel, E.P. (compiled by)

Inventory of 19th century French Art in S.A. Museums. Johannesburg: Rand Afrikaans University, 1977.

Evans, J. (Selected and ed. by).

The Lamp of Beauty: Writings on Art by John Ruskin. Oxford: Phaidon Press Ltd., 1959.

Falkenheim, J.V.

Roger Fry and the Beginnings of Formalist Art Criticism. Ann Arbor, Michigan: U.M.I. Research Press, 1980.

Faxon, A.

"Cézanne's Sources for Les Grandes Baigneuses". The Art Bulletin, June 1983, vol. LXV, no. 2, pp.320-323.

Feder, M.

The Semblance of Self: A Critique of S.Langer's Expressionist Aesthetics. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1982.

Fishman, S.

The Interpretation of Art: Essays on the Art Criticism of John Ruskin, Walter Pater, Clive Bell, Roger Fry and Herbert Read. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1963.

Flint, K. ed.

Impressionists in England: The Critical Reception. London, Boston, Melbourne and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984.

Foster, H.

"The Expressive Fallacy". Art in America, January 1983, vol. 71, pp.80-83 and p.137.

_____.

"The Problem of Pluralism". Art in America, January 1982, vol. 70, pp.9-16.

Forster, K.W.

"Critical History of Art, or Transfiguration of Values?". New Literary History, Spring 1972. vol. 3, no. 3, pp.459-470.

Foucault, M.

This is not a pipe with illustrations and letters by Rene Magritte. Tr. and ed. by J. Harkness. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1983.

_____.

"What is an Author?". In Foucault, M. Language, Counter-memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews. ed. D.F Bouchard. Tr. by D.F Bouchard and S. Simon. Oxford: Blackwell, 1977, pp.141-160.

Fry, R.

Cézanne: A Study of his Development. 2nd ed. London: Hogarth Press Ltd., 1952. 1st ed. 1927.

____.

The artist and Psycho-Analysis. London: Hogarth, 1924.

____.

Vision and Design. London: Chatto and Windus, 1st issued in the Phoenix Library 1928, 1st published in 1920.

Fussiner, H.

"Organic Integration in Cézanne's Painting". College Art Journal, 1956. vol. XV, no. 4, pp.302-312.

Garelick, L.C.

The Aesthetic theories of Roger Fry - a Re-evaluation. Ann Arbor, Michigan: U.M.I., 1985.

Gasquet, J.

Joachim Gasquet's Cézanne: A Memoir with Conversations. Tr. by C. Pemberton, Preface by J. Rewald with an Intro. by R. Shiff. London: Thames and Hudson, 1991.

Geist, S.

"Cézanne: Metamorphosis of the Self". Artscribe, December 1980. vol. 26, pp.10-17.

Gibson, M.

"The Musée d'Orsay: A New and Different 19th Century". Artnews, April 1987. vol. 86, no. 4, pp.142-146.

Gloversmith, F. ed.

The Theory of Reading. Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1984.

Gombrich, E.H.

Art and Illusion: A Study in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation. 5th ed. London: Phaidon Press, 1977. 1st published 1960.

_____.

"Moment and Movement in Art". Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 1964. vol. 27, pp.293-306.

Goodman, N.

Languages of Art: An Approach to a theory of symbols. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Gordon, D.E.

"The Expressionist Cézanne". Art Forum, March 1978. vol. 16, part 7, pp.34-39.

Gottlieb, C.

"The Joy of Life: Matisse, Picasso and Cézanne". College Art Journal, 1958. vol. 18, no. 2, pp.113-116.

Gowing, L.

"Notes on the Development of Cézanne". The Burlington Magazine, June 1956. vol. XCVIII, no. 639, pp.185-192.

_____.

Paul Cézanne: The Basel Sketchbooks. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, Distributed by New York Graphic Society Books/Little, Brown and Company, Boston, 1988.

———.

"The True Nature of Cézanne's Bathers". The Journal of Art, April 1991. vol. 4, no. 4, pp.40-41.Gowing, L. and Rewald, J. "'Les maisons provencales': Cézanne and Puget". The Burlington Magazine, September 1990. vol. CXXXII, no. 1050, pp.637-639.

Gray, C.

"Cézanne's use of perspective". College Art Journal, Fall 1959. vol. XIX, no. 1, pp.54-64.

Greenberg, C.

Art and Culture. London: Thames and Hudson, 1961.

———.

"Can Taste be Objective?". Artnews, February 1973. vol. 72, no. 2, pp.22-23 and p.92.

———.

"Cézanne". In Spencer, H. ed. Readings in Art History, Volume II - The Renaissance to the Present. 2nd ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1976. 1st ed. 1969, pp.321-329.

———.

"Modernist Painting". In G. Battcock, ed. The New Art. revised ed. New York: E.P. Dutton and Co. Inc., 1973, pp.66-77.

———.

"Necessity of 'Formalism'". New Literary History, 1971-2. vol. 3, no. 1, pp.171-175.

———.

The Collected Essays and Criticism, Volume I: Perceptions and Judgments, 1939-1944, Volume II: Arrogant Purpose, 1945-1949. Ed. by J. O'Brian. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Guy Le Paul, C.

L'Impressionisme dans l'Ecole de Pont Aven: Monet, Renoir et Leurs Disciples. J. Le Paul jt. author. Lausanne: La Bibliothèque des Arts, 1983.

Hall, J.

Dictionary of Subjects and Symbols in Art. London: John Murray (Publishers) Ltd., 1974.

Hamilton, G.H.

"Cézanne, Bergson and the Image of Time". College Art Journal, Fall 1956. vol. XVI, no. 1, pp.2-12.

———.

Manet and his critics. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954.

Harari, J.V. ed.

Textual Strategies. Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1979.

Harding, J.

Artistes Pompiers: French Academic Art in the 19th Century. U.S.A: Rizzoli, 1979.

Harraps Shorter French and English Dictionary. eds. P. Collin, H. Knox, M. Ledesert and R. Ledesert. London: Harrap, 1982.

Harris, M.J.

Clive Bell's Formalism in Historical Perspective. Ann Arbor, Michigan: U.M.I., 1957.

Harrison, C. and Orton, F. eds.

Modernism, Criticism, Realism. London: Harper and Row, 1984.

Haskell, F., Levi, A. and Shackleton, R. eds.

The Artist and the Writer in France: Essays in Honour of Jean Seznec. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974.

Hauser, A.

The Philosophy of Art History. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959.

———.

The Social History of Art. vol. 2 (Impressionism). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1952.

Hawkes, T.

Metaphor. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1972.

Herbert, R.

Impressionism: Art, Leisure and Parisian Society. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1988.

———.

"Method and Meaning in Monet". Art in America, September 1979. vol. 67 no. 5, pp.90-108.

Hintikka, J.

The Intentions of Intentionality and other New Models or Modalities. Dordrecht-Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 197[illegible]

Hodin, J.P.

The Dilemma of Being Modern: Essays on Art and Literature. New York: The Noonday Press, date not given.

Holly, M.A.

Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History. Ithaca: Cornell University, 1984.

Holt, E.G. ed.

From the Classicists to the Impressionists: A Documentary History of Art and Architecture in the 19th Century. University of London Press Ltd., 1966.

_____. ed.

The Art of All Nations 1850-1873: Emerging Role of Exhibitions and Critics. New York: Anchor, 1981.

House, J.

"Impressionism and History: The Rewald Legacy". Book Review of Studies in Impressionism by J. Rewald (1985) and Cézanne and the End of Impressionism by R. Shiff (1984) Art History, September 1986. vol. 9, no. 3, pp.369-376.

Hunt, J. Dixon.

Encounters: Essays on Literature and the Visual Arts. London: Studio Vista, 1971.

Huysmans, J.K.

Against Nature. Tr. of A Rebours by R. Baldick. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1959. 1st published in 1884.

Isaacson, J.

The Crisis of Impressionism 1878-1882. Chicago: University of Michigan Museum of Art, 1980. Published for an exhibition at the University of Michigan Museum of Art, from 2 Nov. 1979 - 6 Jan. 1980.

Jefferson, A. and Robey, D. eds.

Modern Literary Theory: A Comparative Introduction. London: Batsford Academic and Educational, 1982.

Jewell, E.A.

Paul Cézanne. New York: Hyperion, 1944.

Johnson, E.H.

Modern Art and the Object: A Century of Changing Attitudes. London: Thames and Hudson, 1976.

Kendall, R.

The History and Techniques of the Great Masters: Cézanne. London: Tiger Books International, 1989.

Khatchadourian, H.

"Metaphor". The British Journal of Aesthetics, July 1968. vol. 8, no. 3, pp.227-243.

Kiefer, C.S.

"Cézanne's "Magdalen": A New Source in the Musée Granet, Aix-En-Provence". Gazette Des Beaux-Arts, February 1984. vol. 103, no. 4, pp.91-94.

Kirsch, B.

Book Review of Cézanne's Early Imagery by M. Tompkins Lewis. The Burlington Magazine, July 1990. vol. 132, no. 1048, pp.501-502.

———.

"Paul Cézanne: Jeune Fille Au Piano and Some Portraits of his Wife. An Investigation of his Paintings of the Late 1870s". Gazette des Beaux-Arts, July/August 1987. vol. 109-110, pp.21-26.

Klimova, M. ed.

Paul Cézanne. Aurora Art Publishers, Leningrad, Co-Edition (U.K.) Collet's Publishers Ltd., London and Wellingborough, Tr. from the Russian by N.Johnstone. 1976.

Kostelanetz, R. ed.

Esthetics Contemporary. New York: Prometheus Books, 1978.

Kramer, H.

The Age of the Avant-Garde. London: Secker and Warburg, 1974.

Krauss, R.

"In the Name of Picasso". October, Spring 1981. no. 16, pp.5-22.

———.

The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths. Massachusetts and London: The MIT Press, 1985.

Krumrine, M.L.

"At Last, the Book of the Blockbuster "Bathers" Show Held in Basle in 1989". The Art Newspaper, February 1991. vol. II, no. 5, pp.211-212.

_____.

"Cézanne's Bathers: Form and Content". Arts Magazine (U.S.A.), May 1980. vol. 54, part 9, pp.115-122.

Kuhns, R.

Psychoanalytic Theory of Art: A Philosophy of Art on Development Principles. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.

Kuspit, D.B.

Clement Greenberg: Art Critic. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1979.

_____.

"Conflicting Logics: Twentieth-Century Studies at the Crossroads". The Art Bulletin, March 1987. vol. LXIX, no. 1, pp.117-132

_____.

"Critical Reflections". Art Forum International, February 1991. pp.100-101.

———.

"Dialectical Reasoning in Meyer Schapiro". In Kuspit, D.B. The Critic is Artist: The Intentionality of Art. Ann Arbor, Michigan: U.M.I. Research Press, 1984, pp.47-74.

Laclotte, M. Tr. by A. Roberts.

Painting in the Musée d'Orsay. Editions Scala. Editions de la Reunion des musees nationaux, 1986.

Laderman, G.

"The Importance of Cézanne". Art News, October 1966. vol. 65, no. 6, pp.39-41.

Lavin, M.

"Roger Fry, Cézanne, and Mysticism". Arts Magazine, September 1983. vol. 58, no. 1, pp.98-101.

Lee, R. W.

Ut Pictura Poesis: The Humanistic Theory of Painting. New York: W.W. Norton and Co. Inc., 1967.

Lee, Vernon. pseud.

The Beautiful: An Introduction to Psychological Aesthetics. Cambridge: University Press, 1913.

Lesko, D.

"Cézanne's 'Bather' and a found self-portrait". Artforum, December 1976. vol. 15, pp.52-57.

Levey, M.

"Looking for Quality in Pictures". The British Journal of Aesthetics, January 1968. vol. 8, no. 1, pp.3-16.

Levine, S. Z.

"Moxey's Moxie and the Summers of '84: Intention and Interpretation in the History of Art - A Commentary". New Literary History, Winter 1986. vol. 17, no. 2, pp.323-349.

Lichtenstein, S.

"Cézanne and Delacroix". Art Bulletin, March 1964. vol. 46, no. 1, pp.55-67.

Light, L.W.

Formalism, Expression Theory, and the Aesthetics of Susanne Langer. University Microfilms International: Ann Arbor, London. 1982. PhD thesis, Buffalo: State University of New York, 1980.

Lindsay, J.

Cézanne: his Life and Art. London: Evelyn, Adams and Mackay, 1969.

Lipton, E.

"Some reflections on the Cézanne events at the Museum of Modern Art". Art Journal, Summer 1978. vol. 37, no. 4, pp.327-329.

Lockspeiser, E.

Music and Painting: A Study in Comparative Ideas from Turner to Schoenberg. London: Cassell, 1973.

Lodge, D. ed.

20th Century Criticism: A Reader. London: Longman, 1972.

Loran, E.

Cézanne's Composition: Analysis of his Form with Diagrams and Photographs of his Motifs. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1963. 1st published 1943.

Lovell, T.

Pictures of Reality: Aesthetics, Politics and Pleasure. London: BFI Publishing, 1980.

Lucie-Smith, E.

Movements in Art since 1945. London: Thames and Hudson, 1984. 1st published in 1969.

Lyas, C.

"Anything Goes: The Intentional Fallacy Revisited". British Journal of Aesthetics, Autumn 1983. vol. 23, no. 4, pp.291-305.

Machotka, P.

"Cézanne's Landscapes and the Functions of Vision". Leonardo, 1983. vol. 16, no. 3, pp.177-179.

Mack, G.

Paul Cézanne. New York: A.A. Knopf, 1935.

Margolis, J.

"On Disputes about the Ontological Status of Works of Art". The British Journal of Aesthetics, April 1968. vol. 8, no. 2, pp.147-154.

Mathieu, C.

Tr. by A. Roberts. Guide to the Musée d'Orsay. Paris: Editions de la Reunion des musees nationaux, 1987.

Maxwell-Mahon, W.D. and Titlestad, P.J.

Literary Criticism: A students reader. Johannesburg and Cape Town: Lex Petria Publishers, 1980.

Merleau-Ponty, M.

"Cézanne's Doubt". In Merleau-Ponty, M. Sense and Non-Sense. Tr. with a Preface by H. L. Dreyfus and P. A. Dreyfus. USA: Northwestern University Press, 1964, pp.9-25.

Mezei, A.

"Toward Improving the Objective Status of Aesthetics: On Style and Content of Figurative Pictorial Art". Leonardo, Spring 1981. vol. 14, no. 2, pp.118-121.

Moffett, C.S.

The New Painting: Impressionism 1874-1886. Oxford: Phaidon, 1986.

Moxey, K.

"Panofsky's Concept of "Iconology" and the Problem of Interpretation in the History of Art". New Literary History, Winter 1980. vol. 17, no. 2, pp.265-274.

Muehsam, G. ed.

French Painters and Paintings from the 14th Century to Post-Impressionism. New York: Ungar, 1970.

Murphy, R.W. (and the eds. of Time-Life Books).

The World of Cézanne 1839-1906. New York: Time-Life International, N.V. 1968, 1971.

McClellan, A.L.

"The Politics and Aesthetics of Display: Museums in Paris 1750-1800". Art History, December 1984. vol. 7, no. 4, pp.438-464.

McCoubrey, J.W.

"The Revival of Chardin in French Still-Life Painting, 1850-1870". The Art Bulletin, March 1964. vol. 46, pp.39-53.

Neiss, R.J.

Zola, Cézanne and Manet: A Study of l'Oeuvre. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1968.

Nochlin, L.

Impressionism and Post-Impressionism 1874-1904 SOURCES and DOCUMENTS. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

_____.

"The Imaginary Orient". Art in America, May 1983, vol. 7, pp.119-191.

Norris, C.

Contest of Faculties: Philosophy and Theory after Deconstruction. London and New York: Methuen, 1985.

Novotny, F.

Paul Cézanne. London: Phaidon, 1948.

_____.

"The Reaction Against Impressionism from the Artistic Point of View". Problems of the 19th and 20th Centuries Studies in Western Art. vol. IV, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963. Acts of the 20th International Congress of The History of Art.

Orienti, S.

The Complete Paintings of Cézanne. Penguin Books, 1985. 1st Published by Rizzoli Editore 1970. With an Intro. by Ian Dunlop. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972.

ORSAY. Numero Special de Connaissance des Arts. Decembre 1986.

Osborne, H.

Abstraction and Artifice in Twentieth Century Art. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.

_____. ed.

Oxford Companion to Art. Oxford: Clarendon, 1970.

Owens, C.

"Representation, Appropriation and Power". Art in America. May 1982. vol. 70, pp.9-21.

Panofsky, E.

Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance. New York: Oxford University Press, 1939.

Paulk, S.F.

The Aesthetics of Impressionism: Studies in Art and Literature. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International, 1981.

Perruchot, H.

Cézanne. London: Perpetua, 1961.

Pevsner, N.

Academies of Art, Past and Present. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940.

Philipson, M. ed.

Aesthetics Today. New York: New American Library, 1980.

Podro, M.

The Critical Historians of Art. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1982.

Poggioli, R. Tr. by G. Fitzgerald.

The Theory of the Avant-Garde. Cambridge, London: The Belknap Press of Harverd University Press, 1968. 2nd Printing 1981. Original Italian Edition 1962.

Pollock, G.

"Artists Mythologies and Media Genius Madness and Art History". Screen, 1980. vol. 21, part 3, pp.57-96.

———.

"Critical Reflections". Art Forum, February, 1990. pp.126-127.

Ray, W.

Literary Meaning from Phenomenology to Deconstruction. England: Basil Blackwell, 1984.

Raynal, M.

Cézanne. Lausannne: Skira, 1954.

Rees, A.L. and Borzello F. eds.

The New Art History. London: Camden Press, 1986.

Reff, T.

"Appendix - New Sources for Cézanne's Copies". Art Bulletin, 1960. 42, pp.147-149.

———.

Book Review: Gertrude Berthold, Cézanne und die Alten Meister. Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1958. Art Bulletin, 1960, pp.145-147.

———.

"Cézanne and Hercules". The Art Bulletin, March 1966. vol. XLVIII, no. 1, pp.35-44.

———.

"Cézanne and Poussin". Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 1960. vol. XXIII, pp.150-174.

———.

"Cézanne's Bather with Outstretched Arms". Gazette des Beaux-Arts. 1962. (Ser.6), LIX, pp.173-190.

———.

"Cézanne's Card Players and their Sources". Arts Magazine (U.S.A.), November 1980. vol. 55, part 3, pp.104-117.

———.

"Cézanne's Constructive Stroke". Art Quarterly. Autumn 1962. vol. XXV, pp.214-217.

———.

"Cézanne's Drawing". The Burlington Magazine, August 1963, pp.375-376.

———.

"Cézanne's Drawings, 1875-85". The Burlington Magazine, 1959, pp.171-176.

———.

"Cézanne's Dream of Hannibal". The Art Bulletin, June 1963 vol. 45, no. 2, pp.148-152.

———.

"Cézanne et Poussin". Art de France, 1963. III, pp.302-310.

———.

"Cézanne, Flaubert, St. Anthony and the Queen of Sheba". The Art Bulletin, June 1962, pp.113-126.

———.

"Cézanne's Later Bather Paintings". Arts Magazine (New York), October 1977. vol. 52, part 2, pp.116-119.

———.

"Cézanne on Solids and Spaces". Artforum, October 1977. vol. 16, pp.34-37.

———.

"Cézanne: the Enigma of the Nude". Art News, November 1959. vol. 58, no. 7, pp.26-29 and p.68.

———.

"Cézanne: the Logical Mystery". Art News, April 1963. vol. 62, no. 2, pp.28-31.

———.

"Cézanne: The Severed Head and Skull". Arts Magazine, October 1983. vol. 58, part 2, pp.84-100.

———.

"Copyists in the Louvre, 1850-1870". The Art Bulletin, December 1964. vol. XLVI, pp.552-559.

———.

"Reproductions and Books in Cézanne's Studio". Gazette des Beaux Arts, 1960. vol. LVI, pp.303-309.

———.

"The Pictures within Cézanne's Pictures". Arts Magazine, June 1979, pp.90-104.

Reitlinger, G.

The Economics of Taste, Volumes I and II. Volume I: The Rise and Fall of Picture Prices 1760-1960. New York: Hacker Art Books, 1982.

Rewald, J.

Paul Cézanne: A Biography. New York: Simon and Schuster, Copyright 1939 by Albin Michel, Copyright 1948 by Simon and Schuster.

_____.

Cézanne and America: Dealers, Collectors, Artists and Critics 1891-1921. With the research assistance of Frances Weitzenhoffer, London: Thames and Hudson, 1989.

_____.

Paul Cézanne: The Watercolours: a Catalogue Raisonné. London: Thames and Hudson, 1983.

_____.

Cézanne, the Steins and their Circle. London: Thames and Hudson, 1986.

_____.

"Choquet and Cézanne". Gazette des Beaux Arts, 1969. vol. 74, pp.33-98.

_____.

ed. by I. Gordon and F. Weitzenhoffer. Studies in Impressionism. London: Thames and Hudson, 1985.

_____.

The History of Impressionism. Revised and enlarged ed. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1961.

Richardson, J. Adkins.

"Cézanne and the Dissolution of A Priori Space". In Richardson, J. Adkins. Modern Art and Scientific Thought. Urbana, Chicago and London: University of Illinois Press, 1971, pp.33-56.

———.

"Estrangement as a Motif in Modern Painting". British Journal of Aesthetics, Summer 1982. vol. 22, no. 3, pp.195-209.

———.

"Illustration and Art: Thematic Content and Aesthetic Standards". The British Journal of Aesthetics, Autumn 1971. vol. XI, no. 4, pp.354-368.

Richardson, J. Adkins. and Ades, J.I.

"D. H Lawrence on Cézanne: A Study in the Psychology of Critical Intuition". The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 1970. vol. 28, pp.441-453.

Rilke, Rainer Maria. ed. C. Rilke,

Tr. J. Agee. Letters on Cézanne. London: Jonathan Cape, 1988. Originally published under title "Briefe uber Cézanne". Frankfurt: Insel Verlag, 1952.

Robert, K.

Cézanne. New York: Tudor, 1967.

Roget's Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases. ed. Lloyd. S.M. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1984.

Rosen, C. and Zerner, H.

Romanticism and Realism: The Mythology of Nineteenth Century Art. London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1984.

Rosenblum, R.

"Nineteenth-Century Art: A Post-Modern View". Sotheby's Preview, February/March 1990, pp.7-10.

_____.

Paintings in the Musée d'Orsay. New York: Stewart, Tabori and Chang, 1989.

Roskill, M.

The Letters of Van Gogh. Great Britain: Fontana/Collins, 1980.

_____.

Van Gogh, Gauguin and the Impressionists Circle. London: Thames and Hudson, 1969.

Rubin, W. ed.

Cézanne: The Late Work. London: Thames and Hudson, 1977.

_____.

"Further reflections on Cézanne at MOMA". Art Journal, Winter 1978/9. vol. 38, no. 2, pp.119-120.

———.

"Pablo and Georges and Leo and Bill". Art in America, March-April 1979. nc. 2, pp.128-147.

Russell, B.

History of Western Philosophy. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1946.

Sacks, S. ed.

On Metaphor. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Schapiro, M.

Paul Cézanne. New York: Harry. N. Abrams, Inc., 1952.

———.

Modern Art 19th and 20th Centuries: Selected Papers. New York: George Braziller, 1982.

———.

"The Still Life as Personal Object - A Note on Heidegger and Van Gogh". In Simmel, M.L. ed. The Reach of Mind: Essays in Memory of Kurt Goldstein. New York: Springer Publishing Co., Inc., 1968, pp.206-208.

Schom, A.

Emile Zola: A Bourgeois Rebel. London: Macdonald Queen Anne Press, 1987.

Shanes, E.

The Genius of the Royal Academy. London: The Mallord Press, John Murray (The Royal Academy), 1981.

Sheridan, A.

Michel Foucault: The Will to Truth. London: Tavistock, 1980.

Shiff, R.

Cézanne and the End of Impressionism: A Study of the Theory, Technique and Critical Evaluation of Modern Art. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Silverman, H.J.

"Cézanne's Mirror Stage". Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, Summer 1982. vol. 40, no. 4, pp.369-379.

Song, M.

Art Theories of Charles Blanc 1813-1882. Ann Arbor, Michigan: U.M.I. Research, 1984.

Spalding, F.

"Roger Fry and his Critics in a Post-modernist Age". The Burlington Magazine, July 1986. vol. CXXVIII, no. 1000, pp.489-492.

Spector, J.

"The State of Psychoanalytic Research in Art History". The Art Bulletin, March 1988. vol. LXX, no. 1, pp.49-76.

Steinberg, L.

"Other Criteria". In Steinberg, L. Other Criteria. New York: Oxford University Press, 1972, pp.55-91.

_____.

"Resisting Cézanne: Picasso's 'Three Women'". Art in America, November/December 1978. vol. 66, pp.115-133.

_____.

"The Polemical Part". Art in America, March-April, 1979. no. 2, pp.115-127.

Steiner, W. ed.

Image and Code. Michigan: Michigan Studies in the Humanities, 1981.

Sterling, C.

Still Life Painting: From Antiquity to the Twentieth Century. Icon Editions. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1981. 1st published in 1952. Revised ed. in 1959 and Tr. by J. Emmons.

Stokes, A.

The Critical Writings of Adrian Stokes Volume I 1930-1937. London: Thames and Hudson, 1978. ed. L. Gowing.

_____.

The Critical Writings of Adrian Stokes Volume II 1937-1958. London: Thames and Hudson, 1978. ed. L. Gowing.

Stuckey, C. F.

"Blossoms and Blunders: Monet and the State, II". Art in America, September 1979. vol. 67, no. 5, pp.109-125.

Sturrock, J. ed.

Structuralism and since: From Levi-Strauss to Derrida. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Summers, D.

"David Summers Replies". New Literary History, Winter 1986. vol. 17, no. 2, pp.333-349.

_____.

"Intentions in the History of Art". New Literary History, Winter 1986. vol. 17, no. 2, pp.305-321.

_____.

"The 'Visual Arts' and the Problem of Art Historical Description". Art Journal, Winter 1982. vol. 42, no. 4, pp.301-310.

Sutton, D.

Book Review of Cézanne and America: Dealers, Collectors, Artists and Critics 1892-1921 by J. Rewald. The Burlington Magazine, January 1990. vol. CXXXII, no. 1043, pp.45-46.

_____.

"The Early Cézanne". Gazette Des Beaux-Arts, October 1988. vol. 112, pp.149-154.

"The Late Cézanne: A Symposium". Art in America, March/April 1978. vol. 66, pp.83-95.

"The Musée d'Orsay: A Symposium". Art in America, January 1988. vol. 76, pp.85-106.

Tillim, S.

"Criticism and Culture, or Greenbergs Doubt". Art in America, May 1987. vol. 75, no. 5, pp.122-127 and p.201.

Todorov, T.

Introduction to Poetics. Tr. by R. Howard. Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1981.

Tompkins Lewis, M.

Cézanne's Early Imagery. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1989.

———.

"Cézanne's 'Harrowing of Hell and the Magdalen'". Gazette des Beaux Arts, April 1981. vol. 97, no. 1347, pp.175-178.

Tsiakma, K.

"Cézanne's and Poussin's Nudes". Art Journal. Winter 1977/8. vol. 37, no. 2, pp.120-132.

Tucker, M.

"The Structure of Color". In ed. G. Battcock. The New Art. USA: E.P.Dutton and Co. Inc., Revised, 1973, pp.227-245.

Tucker, P.

"The First Impressionist Exhibition and Monet's Impression, Sunrise: a Tale of Timing, Commerce and Patriotism". Art History. December 1984. vol. 7, no. 4, pp.465-476.

Twitchell, B.H.

Cézanne and Formalism in Bloomsbury. Ann Arbor, Michigan: U.M.I Research Press, Studies in the Fine Arts: Criticism, 1987.

Venturi, L.

Cézanne. Geneva: Editions d'Art Albert Skira S.A., 1978.

———.

Cézanne: Son Art - Son Oeuvre. vol. I (Texte) and vol. II (Planches), Paris: Paul Rosenberg Editeur, 1936.

_____.

History of Art Criticism. England: Dutton, New Revised Edition, 1964. Originally published in 1936.

_____.

Paul Cézanne: Watercolours. 2nd ed. Oxford: Bruno Cassirer, 1944.

Verdi, R.

Book Review of Interpreting Cézanne by S. Geist. The Burlington Magazine, December 1989. vol. CXXXI, no. 1041, pp.857-859.

Vollard, A.

Cézanne. Tr. by H. L. Van Doren. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1984. 1st published in 1937 under the title Paul Cézanne: his Life and Art.

Wadley, N.

Cézanne and his Art. London: Hamlyn, 1975.

Waldfogel, M.

"A Problem in Cézanne's Grandes Baigneuses". The Burlington Magazine, December 1962. vol. 104, pp.200-204.

_____.

"Caillebotte, Vollard and Cézanne's Baigneurs Au Repos". Gazette Des Beaux-Arts, 1965, pp.113-120.

Ward, M.

"The Rhetoric of Independence and Innovation". In Moffett, C.S. The New Painting: Impressionism 1874-1886. Oxford: Phaidon, 1986, pp.421-442.

Watney, S.

"Modernist Studies: the Class of '83". Book Reviews of The Open University. Arts: A Third Level Course. Modern Art and Modernism: Manet to Pollock; Modern Art and Modernism. A Critical Anthology ed. F. Frascina and C. Harrison; The Meanings of Modern Art by J. Russell; Aesthetics after Modernism by P. Fuller. Art History, March 1984. vol. 7, no. 1, pp.102-110.

Wechsler, J. ed.

Cézanne in Perspective. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., and London: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

_____.

The Interpretation of Cézanne. Ann Arbor, Michigan: U.M.I. Research Press, 1981.

Weisberg, G.P.

Chardin and the Still-Life Tradition in France. Exhibition catalogue. Cleveland: The Cleveland Museum of Art, 1979.

_____.

The Realist Tradition: French Painting and Drawing 1830-1900. Cleveland: The Cleveland Museum of Art in co-operation with Indiana University Press, 1980.

Wells, G.N.

Metaphorical Relevance and Thematic Continuity in the Early Paintings of Paul Cézanne, 1865-1877. Ann Arbor, Michigan: U.M.I., 1988.

Werckmeister, O.K.

"Marx on Ideology and Art". New Literary History, 1973. vol. 4, no. 3, pp.501-519.

White, B.E. ed.

Impressionism in Perspective. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1978.

Williams, F.

"Cézanne and French Phenomenology". Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 1954. vol. 12, pp.481-492.

Wimsatt, W.K. and Beardsley, M.C.

In Lodge, D. ed. 20th Century Criticism: A Reader, London: Longman, 1972, chapter 26.

Wolff, J.

Aesthetics and the Sociology of Art. London, Boston and Sydney: George Allen and Unwin, 1983.

Woolf, T.

The Painted Word. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 1975.

Worringer, W.


Abstraction and Empathy: A Contribution to the Psychology of Style. Tr. by M. Bullock. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1963.

Wright, E.


Psychoanalytic Criticism: Theory in Practice. London and New York: Methuen, 1984.

Zola, E.


The Masterpiece. Tr. by T. Walton. Ann Arbor Paperbacks: The University of Michigan Press, 1968. 1st published in 1886.



1. Man with a Pipe Leaning on a Table, 1895-1900, 92 x 73, oil on canvas, Moscow, Museum of Modern Western Art.



2. Woman with a Coffee-Pot, 1890-4 ?, 130 x 97, oil on canvas, Paris, Louvre.




3. Two Card-Players, 1890-2, 45 x 57, oil on canvas, Paris, Louvre.



4. Page of studies (Piece of Cloth and Woman's Head) (detail), 1876-9, 30.5 x 49, pencil drawing.



5. Vallier Full-Length (The Gardener), 1900-6, 63 x 52, oil on canvas, London, Tate Gallery.



6. Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe, c.1870-71, oil on canvas, 60 x 80, Private Collection.




7. Pastoral (Idyll), c.1870, oil on canvas, 65 x 81, Musee d'Orsay, Paris.



8. Paris: the Quai de Bercy-The Wine Market, c.1872, 73 x 92, oil on canvas, Private Collection.



9. Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne, Father of theArtist, Reading l'Evenement, 1866, oil on canvas, 200 x 120, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Collection of Mr and Mrs Paul Mellon.



10. Still life: Sugar Pot, Pears and Blue Cup, c.1866, oil on canvas, 30 x 41, Musée d'Orsay, Paris, on deposit with the Musée Granet, Aix.



11. Vessels, Fruit and Cover (The Peppermint Bottle), 1890-4, 65 x 81, oil on canvas, Washington D.C., National Gallery of Art.




12. Plaster Cupid and the "Anatomy", 1895, 71 x 57, oil on canvas, London, Home House Trustees.




13. The Walk, 1871, oil on canvas, 58 x 43, Private Collection.



14. The Four Seasons, a) Summer, c.1860-62, oil on canvas, 314 x 109, b) Winter, 314 x 104, c) Spring, 314 x 97, d) Autumn, 314 x 104, Musée de la Ville de Paris, Petit Palais.




15. Afternoon in Naples (with a negro servant), c.1866-77, oil on canvas, 37 x 45, Australian National Gallery, Canberra.



16. The Orgy or The Banquet, c.1367, pencil, black and coloured chalk, watercolour and gouache on thin cardboard, 32.4 x 23.1, Private Collection, Stuttgart.




The Feast (The Orgy), c.1870, oil on canvas, 130 x 81, Private Collection.



18. The Rape, c.1[illegible], oil on canvas, 90.5 x 117, The Provost and Fellows of King's College, Cambridge (Keynes Collection), on loan to the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.



17. The Feast (The Orgy), c.1870, oil on canvas, 130 x 81, Private Collection.




18. The Rape, c.1867, oil on canvas, 90.5 x 117, The Provost and Fellows of King's College, Cambridge (Keynes Collection), on loan to the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.



19. The Murder, c.1867-8, oil on canvas, 64 x 81, National Museums and Galleries on Merseyside, Walker Art Gallery.




20. The Negro Scipion, c.1867, oil on canvas, 107 x 83, Museo de Arte, Sao Paulo.



29. Love Play, 1875-6, 38 x 46, oil on canvas, New York, Harriman Collection.



30. Three Women, 1875-7, size not noted, oil on canvas, location not noted.




33. Still life: Skull and Candlestick, c.1866, 47.5 x 62.5, oil on canvas, Private Collection, on loan to the Kunsthaus, Zurich.



34. Still Life: Head and Watering, c.1868-70, 60 x 50, oil on canvas, Private Collection.



35. The Black Clock, c.1870, 55.2 x 74.3, oil on canvas, Private Collection.



36. Self-Portrait, c.1866, 45 x 41, oil on canvas, Private Collection.




39. Pyramid of Skulls, 1900, size not noted, oil on canvas, location not noted.



40. Three Skulls on Oriental Covering, 1904, 54 x 65, oil on canvas, location not noted.



21. Portrait of the Painter, Achille Emperaire, c.1868-70, oil on canvas, 200 x 122, Musée d'Orsay, Paris.



22. Old Woman with a Rosary, 1900-4, 85 x 65, oil on canvas, London, National Gallery.



23. Plate of Fruit, Sugar-Bowl and Straw-Cased Jar on a Cover, 1895-1900, 60 x 73, oil on canvas, New York, Museum of Modern Art.



24. Still-Life with Apple and Peaches (not in Orienti), c.1905, oil on canvas, Washington, Washington National Gallery.




25. Wine-Jug and Plate with Fruit, 1895-1900, 53 x 71, oil on canvas, London, Tate Gallery.



26. Scene of Violence (also known as The Murder), 1869-72, 14.1 x 18.2, Reed pen, ink, and wash, Basel Kunstmuseum.



27. Women dressing, c.1867, 22 x 33, oil on canvas, Insel Hombroich.



28. Love Play, 1875-6, 42 x 55, oil on canvas, location not noted.




27. Women dressing, c.1867, 22 x 33, oil on canvas, Insel Hombroich.




28. Love Play, 1875-6, 42 x 55, oil on canvas, location not noted.



31. Five Women, 1885-7, 65.5 x 65.5, oil on canvas, Basle, Kunstmuseum.



32. Still life: Bread and Leg of Lamb, c.1866, oil on canvas, 27 x 35, Kunsthaus, Zurich.



33. Still life: Skull and Candlestick, c.1866, 47.5 x 62.5, oil on canvas, Private Collection, on loan to the Kunsthaus, Zurich.



34. Still Life: Skull and Waterjug, c.1868-70, 60 x 50, oil on canvas, Private Collection.



37. Portrait of Uncle Dominique (in a turban), 1866, 44 x 37, oil on canvas, Private Collection.




38. Three Skulls, 1900, 34 x 60, oil on canvas, location not noted.




41. Glass, Cup and Apples, 1873-7, 41.5 x 55, oil on canvas, location not noted.



42. Jug, Fruit, Cloth and Glass, 1879-82, 60 x 73, oil on canvas, Paris, Musees Nationaux.



43. Apples and Plate of Biscuits, 1879-82, 46 x 55, oil on canvas, Paris, Musées Nationaux.



44. Jar, Coffee-Pot and Fruit (Still-Life in Black and White), 1870-2, 63 x 80, oil on canvas, Paris, Louvre.



45. Vase, Plate, Ink-Well and Fruit (Blue Vase), 1883-7, 61 x 50, oil on canvas, Paris, Louvre.



46. Self-Portrait with a Palette, 1885-7, 92 x 73, oil on canvas, Zurich, Buhrle Collection.



47. Painter Holding a Palette, 1868-71, 10.3 x 17, pencil and pen, Basel Kunstmuseum.



48. The Painter, 1868-71, 17.1 x 10.3, pencil, Basel Kunstmuseum.




49. Preparation for the Funeral or The Autopsy, c.1868, oil on canvas, 49 x 80, Private Collection.



50. A Modern Olympia (The Pasha), c. 1869-70, oil on canvas, 56 x 55, Private Collection.



51. A Modern Olympia, 1872-3, 46 x 55, oil on canvas, Paris, Louvre.



52. Vessels, Basket and Fruit (The Kitchen Table), 1888-90, 65 x 80, oil on canvas, Paris, Louvre.



53. L'Ecorché, Interior with chair, 1887-90, drawing.



54. Basket with Apples, Bottle, Biscuits and Fruit, 1890-4, 65 x 81, oil on canvas, Chicago, Art Institute.




55. Plate of Cherries and Peaches, Vase and Cloth, 1883-7, 50 x 61, oil on canvas, Los Angeles, County Museum of Art.




56. Man with Folded Arms (The Clockmaker), 1895-1900, 92 x 73, oil on canvas, New York, Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum.



57. Plate with Apples and Cup (Big Apples), 1890-4, 46 x 55, oil on canvas, location not noted.



58. Fruit-Bowl, Cloth, Glass and Apples, 1879-82, 46 x 55, oil on canvas, location not noted.



59. Vessels, Fruit and Cloth in front of a Chest, 1883-7, 71 x 90, oil on canvas, Munich, Neue Staatsgalerie.




60. Curtain, Fruit-Bowl, Carafe and Plate with Fruit, 1895-1900, 73 x 92, oil on canvas, Paris, Louvre.



61. Plaster Cupid, 1895, 63 x 81, oil on canvas, Stockholm, Nationalmuseum.




62. River at the Bridge of the Three Springs (detail), 1906, pencil and watercolour.



63. Receptacles, Fruit and Biscuits on a Sideboard, 1873-7, 75 x 81, oil on canvas, Budapest, Szepmuveszeti Muzeum.







Author: Jersky Michelle.

Name of thesis: Meaning In Cezanne's Still-life Paintings.

PUBLISHER:

University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
©2015

LEGALNOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page)for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.