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INTRODUCTION

This study focuses on a selection of early figure paintings by Paul Cézanne, works painted between 1865 and 1877. Its purpose is to ascertain the relationships between these diverse paintings, and demonstrate that there is an underlying rationale that unites them. This rationale is the metaphorical expression of Cézanne's search for a personal and unique place in the art world of the 1860's and 1870's. As will be demonstrated, the metaphorical character of these works implicitly reveals the varied forces which shaped his style and helped determine his subject choices as he moved toward maturity as a painter. It was a period crucial to the development of his synthetic approach to painting. His major problem was that of reconciling his intense interest in Romantic art with his Realist commitments and their demands at the time. Cézanne recognized this problem as central to the further development of his art. His drive to synthesize these styles and concomitant ideas emerged as a key feature of his art by the mid-1870's. The meanings of
the works, then, that make up this study point to his conscious and deliberate effort to express the problem of reconciliation and synthesis through metaphorical allusions and direct references to his life and career, and to the cultural context of his time.

The scholarship on Cézanne's work has, in general and until fairly recently, failed to consider deeply the issues of meaning in Cézanne's early paintings. This is quite understandable in the early studies on Cézanne, such as those by Emile Bernard, Joachim Gasquet, Ambroise Vollard, and Georges Rivière, for these studies were based on personal recollections of Cézanne in his later years, when the artist's pursuit of meaning had been fully subsumed into the totality of his work, rather than being an overt aspect as in the early part of his career. These early commentators knew few of Cézanne's early paintings, and even then, the dating and chronology of the works was inaccurate. While Rivière did attempt to produce a catalogue of Cézanne's oeuvre, his lack of systematic analysis as well as the assumptions which he brought to the study from his acquaintance with the painter, led to a cursory and inaccurate treatment of the early years. The emphasis given to the period after 1877 by all of the initial authors on Cézanne, and especially to the works after 1890, was partially responsible for
the rather unbalanced view that we have even today of Cézanne's career.  

The formal bias toward Cézanne's late work was reinforced by such influential writers as Maurice Denis and Roger Fry. Denis regarded Cézanne as "le peintre pur." His famous quote from Sérusier on Cézanne's apples betrays his own belief that Cézanne ignored subject in his quest to realize what the artist called the "motif." From this point of view, subject matter is transformed during the process of painting into something more than a painted object, it becomes a meaningful formal arrangement in which the complexity of visual relationships is substituted for narrative or symbolic meaning. Denis regarded Cézanne as "un naïf artisan, un primitif qui remonte aux sources de son art, en respecte les données primordiales, les nécessités, s'en tient aux éléments fonciers, à ce qui constitue exclusivement l'art de peindre." He thus saw Cézanne as an artist who did not apply intellect, but instinct, in the search for the values inherent in painting itself.

Roger Fry, in Cézanne: A Study of his Development (1927), betrayed a similar attitude. He observed that Cézanne:

...worked, above all, to find expression for the agitations of his inner life, and, without making literary pictures in the bad sense of
the word, he sought to express himself as much by the choice and implications of his figures as by the plastic exposition of their forms.

But, he seems to have ignored the possibility that this choice of motifs had its own complex significance beyond mere Romantic expressionism. He also agreed with Denis that Cézanne was a "primitive" in terms of his vision and thinking: "Though Cézanne belonged to the bourgeoisie, there was much of the simplicity and directness of the peasant and the artisan in his outlook."  

One cannot help but feel that the biography of Cézanne, where he was raised to the level of the heroic and ideal, had intruded upon the judgments of those who sought to more fully understand his painting. The knowledge of his character, his later misanthropy and eccentricity, his struggles and despair, are imposed upon the works and prevent an objective reading of them. Fry's interest in the formal nature of art never led him to consider the subject matter of the early works beyond identifying them as Baroque or Romantic in attitude and conception. But his linking of style and biography suggests that sources external to the art work still guided his considerations of Cézanne.

In the 1930's scholars began to separate the facts from the myths in the study of Cézanne's life and art.
The stream of publications and exhibitions which led up to the centennial of the artist's birth in 1939 was highlighted by Gerstle Mack's biography of Cézanne, Lionello Venturi's catalogue raisonné of the paintings, John Rewald's biographical study of Cézanne and the publication of Cézanne's collected correspondence. The result of this new research was, if not a reconsideration of Cézanne's career as a whole, at least an attempt to deal more precisely and accurately with the chronology and development of his art. By examining some of the myths that came to constitute Cézanne's persona, myths that in some cases remained from the artist's own lifetime, the facts emerged in greater clarity and some of the more basic misconceptions were laid to rest.

Throughout this period in the scholarship on Cézanne, however, the primacy of formalism still formed the basis for the discussion of his paintings. Venturi never mentioned "meaning" in any terms other than formal ones. Although he applied the heading "Romantic" to the early paintings, Venturi was thinking of their outward appearance and the sensibility they gave evidence of rather than their more complex iconographical possibilities. Rewald and Mack were likewise more interested in the biography of the artist than in the issues that his biography raised in the interpretation of
his art. Style was, after all, linked to the chronological sequence of biographical events and to the influences of those with whom the artist had contact. To record the facts about Cézanne's life was to clarify and record the progress of his artistic style. 12

The critical examination of Cézanne that began in the 1930's carried over into the post-war years. In addition to the formal and chronological studies of the artist, there also emerged the first interpretive essays devoted to the problems of content and meaning apart from the formal issues. As the questions of chronology and dating were answered more satisfactorily, and as the material on Cézanne's life was more thoroughly collected and scrutinized, attention turned toward those aspects of meaning which had been neglected in previous research. Meyer Schapiro, Kurt Badt, and, in the early 1960's, Theodore Reff were pioneers in this new interest in Cézanne's content, as they demonstrated that this content was meaningful to a broad range of problems, especially in those works which had not fit well into the established biographical and chronological structure for the artist's development. The key for all three of these scholars was psychology, or more specifically, the influence of the artist's subconscious mind upon the subjects and images he painted.
Kurt Badt's Die Kunst Cézanne of 1956 was the first major attempt to deal with the iconographical side of Paul Cézanne's art on a fairly comprehensive scale. Badt's basis of analysis was both psychological and religious. His goals were expressed thus:

The result of my studies was to convince me that what was most important was that the evolution of Cézanne's art was revealed as a via dolorosa, a road of suffering. This road started out from a revolt, and then a genuine 'conversion' took place. The road was a single-track one and continuous, despite the fact that in its course its direction was completely changed; it was the path taken by a personality which remained true to itself, a creative talent, single-minded from start to finish. The fundamental problem and destiny of this personality was loneliness.

Badt noted that suffering and loneliness were prime features of Cézanne's art, hence linking biography to art in a more intimate, and existential, manner. He also noted Cézanne's art was "single-minded," that is, internally consistent. This single-mindedness was determined by the artist's personality and purpose, rather than by exterior forms. While someone like Forrest Williams saw Cézanne's art as "a cumulative artistic problem, a problem of finding the right shape of the mountain," Badt saw another, internal and expressive, aspect carried through his art. Finally, he observed that the initial impulse toward a meaningful art
was a consequence of revolt. Thus, he sought to clarify some of the paradoxes which confront us when dealing with Cézanne.

Badt relied heavily on the notion of the subconsciously remembered image in order to explain the persistence of certain motifs. While he professed to restore Cézanne as a thinking artist, Badt betrayed that goal by attributing several important images to a subconsciously-driven selective memory. These "memory patterns" occur on both large and small scales. Badt makes the sweeping statement that:

...all these compositions vouchsafe us glimpses into his secret wishes and dreams, in which the sensual and artistic were strangely mixed while the real subject of the work was taken from the deepest levels of the unconscious inner life of the man who created them.

This hardly gives credit to Cézanne as a thinking artist, just as it implies that subjects of sensuality need arise only from the "deepest levels." Could such subjects only have been arrived at through unconscious deliberation? Is the mixture of sensual and artistic attitudes really "strange"? Do the "secret wishes and dreams" that Badt perceives constitute the primary motivation for such works? On all counts, in my view, the answer is no, and Badt's argument is weakened by his failure to address the fact that Cézanne could have been very much in conscious
control of his subject matter and his meaning, even if subconsciously informed.

Cézanne's relationships with various other artists and friends are portrayed in a somewhat misleading manner by Badt. Badt's assessment of Cézanne's important relationship with Manet is questionable, if only because Badt resorts to such subjective and erroneous phrases as "how the clumsy Cézanne must have detested him" and "his hatred of the older painter is well-known." While Badt paints a gloomy picture of Cézanne's attitude toward Manet, I can find little to support such a negative view. Bernard recorded later comments by Cézanne that were hardly hostile to Manet. Cézanne was not of the same character as Manet, to be sure, but that does not mean that he detested him. The similarities between the two artists are actually quite striking, a fact which any reader of Zola's novel L'Oeuvre must admit, for Zola seems to have drawn upon both Manet and Cézanne as sources for the character of Claude Lantier. Professional respect and genuine admiration seem to be disguised under Cézanne's aloofness with the whole Café Guerbois and Café de la Nouvelle-Athènes crowd, which also included Claude Monet, Auguste Renoir, Frédéric Bazille and other equally talented artists. In his discussion of Cézanne's Une Moderne Olympia, Badt is
incorrect in stating that *Olympia* was the first painting
to call attention to Manet, just as he is incorrect to
say that Manet's *Déjeuner sur l'herbe* was the "first
painting in which men were depicted wearing ordinary
clothes in the company of naked girls."18 Also
misleading is Badt's implication that Cézanne's showing
of the second version of *Une Moderne Olympia* at the 1874
Impressionist exhibition had something to do with Manet
refusing to take part in the show, when actually Manet
never seems to have seriously considered exhibiting in
any of the Impressionist independent exhibitions in the
first place. All this serves to weaken an otherwise
insightful study, and throws into relief the issues of
influence, style and meaning.

Theodore Reff has been the most active, and in many
ways the most successful, scholar to study the
iconographic content of Cézanne's paintings. In numerous
articles, Reff has explored various facets of Cézanne's
meaning through an examination of literature,
biographical details, and the traditions of art. In
"Cézanne, Flaubert, St. Anthony, and the Queen of Sheba,"
(1962), for example, he examines the St. Anthony
paintings not only in the context of Flaubert's book, but
also in terms of Cézanne's attitudes toward women.19 In
"Cézanne and Hercules," (1966), Reff compares an early
poem written by Cézanne to the biographical facts about his early career to show that Cézanne was using allegory to describe his circumstances and self-identification with the mythological hero. Reff then demonstrates Cézanne's continued fascination with the Hercules image in a series of drawings that he made in the late years of his life. A similar approach is used in "Cézanne's 'Dream of Hannibal,'" (1963), which also deals with the early writings of the artist.

There are some obstacles in Reff's studies, however. First, the emphasis placed on what can again be termed the "subconscious factor" makes it easy to perceive a certain kind of meaning when none exists, or to interpret images singularly as attributes of a psychological profile. Reff's primary point of departure in interpreting Cézanne is the subconscious motivation of fear and anxiety, and especially Cézanne's presumed fear of women. Thus, the same objection can raised about Reff's analysis as for that of Badt: Cézanne's art becomes a product of the artist's psyche rather than something generated from his entire character or temperament, both consciously and subconsciously.

Second, the network of connections between various paintings of different apparent subject matter is overlooked or ignored in Reff's analyses. Where these
give emphasis to a specific image or set of images, the more complex issues of iconographic or thematic development are not revealed. Admittedly, there is little room in a journal article for developing more than an individual, focused insight, but the wider contexts and relationships are often not even implied. As will be demonstrated throughout this study, Cézanne was a painter of serial works, his approach to and resolution of problems was serial as well; and a subject or issue may be dealt with through a number of seemingly different paintings. Reff's interpretations often are applicable to a single image, but become less useful in this more general context.

Third, Reff's method of iconographical analysis retains an element of subjectivity that is difficult to accept but also difficult to deny. This is especially a factor in an article like "Cézanne's Bather with Outstretched Arms" (1962), where the "hidden" images of the painting form an important part of the meaning which Reff tries to extract from the work, but are, at base, unprovable. The extreme of this approach is found in articles by Sydney Geist, such as "The Secret Life of Paul Cézanne." Meyer Schapiro's article "The Apples of Cézanne: An Essay on the Meaning of Still Life," (1968), is in many
ways the culmination of this line of research, and a model for the analysis of an artist's work from the combined viewpoints of psychology and biographical context. Schapiro not only demonstrates that the obviously symbolic or allegorical paintings of Cézanne were meaningful in the context of the artist's life and career, but that the impulse toward this kind of meaning was present even in works which had no obvious content beyond their immediate subject matter. Unlike Reff, Schapiro attempted to interweave a range of works which he felt were relevant to the iconographical pattern being developed by the artist. The result is an essay which reveals the complexity and diversity of Cézanne's thinking about the content of his work. By limiting himself to a single theme rather than a single image or specific subject, Schapiro gave his essay a wholeness and completeness. Schapiro also perceived Cézanne as having a more conscious role in the development of the content of his works, although the subconscious factor was still in Schapiro's view of primary importance. This subconscious factor was necessary for the binding of images in Schapiro's argument; it is the framework which holds together a very diverse series of paintings. On the other hand, the artist's conscious structuring of his
apple paintings is a factor which Schapiro supports by quoting statements by the artist himself.

The role of the artist's subconscious mind is an elusive element for the scholar who attempts to determine the meaning and intent of Cézanne's art. In this study, that role is minimized, but not denied. Content and meaning are as much a function of the artist's experience and reasoning as of his temperament. As scholars, such as Reff and Schapiro, have shown, Cézanne was well-read, intelligent, and perceptive. He was keenly aware of tradition and of contemporary events. To take the iconographical aspect of his art away from him as a conscious artist and give it over primarily to his subconscious self denies the artist credit for this intelligence and cultural awareness. The intent of this study is to restore a more balanced view of Cézanne's working methods through the examination of his subjects and their meaning, and to provide evidence that his art was generated and given form by his intellectual capabilities and conscious decisions, even if the forces of his inner psychology served as a point of origin for certain of his conceptions.
NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

1 For a survey of Cézanne scholarship, see Judith Wechsler, The Interpretation of Cézanne (Ann Arbor, 1981).


3 It is curious that we should even today view Cézanne "backwards." No doubt this is due to the "Cubist connection" of the late works of Cézanne. Textbook discussions of late Cézanne abound, while the early period of his career is given brief notice. The 1977-1978 exhibition "Cézanne, The Late Work," given at the Museum of Modern Art in New York and at the Grand Palais in Paris, demonstrates the continued interest in the later paintings of Cézanne in our own time. See William Rubin, Cézanne, The Late Work (New York, 1977), and Cézanne, Les dernières années (1895-1906) (Paris, 1978).

4 "Il est, dit Sérusier, le peintre pur. Son style est un style de peintre, sa poésie est de la poésie de peintre. L'utilité, le concept même de l'objet représenté disparaissent devant le charme de la forme colorée. D'une pomme d'un peintre vulgaire on dit: j'en mangerais. D'une pomme de Cézanne on dit: c'est beau! On n'oserait pas le peler, on voudrait la copier. Voilà ce qui constitue le spiritualisme de Cézanne. Je ne dis pas, et avec intention, idéalisme, parce que la pomme idéale serait celle qui flatte les muqueuses, et la pomme de Cézanne parle à l'esprit par le chemin des yeux." Denis, Théories, pp. 252 and following.

5 Ibid., p. 253.


7 Ibid., p. 14.

8 Gerstle Mack, Paul Cézanne (New York, 1936). For reviews of this work, see Art Digest, 10 (November 15,
1935), 23; Erle Loran, American Magazine of Art, 28 (December 1935), 767, 769-70; Apollo, 22 (December 1935), 357; John Pope-Hennessy, Burlington Magazine, 68 (March 1936), 151-52; L'Amour de l'art, 17 (May 1936), 197. For reviews of the French edition (Paris, 1938), see P. du Colombier, Beaux-arts, August 5, 1938, p. 5; Georges Wildenstein, Gazette des Beaux-arts, 20 (September 1938), 133.
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Kurt Badt, Die Kunst Cézannes (Munich, 1956). English translation by Sheila Ann Ogilvie, The Art of Cézanne (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1965), p. 30. All references are to the 1965 English version. A review of the German edition appeared in Werk, 44, suppl. 202 (October 1957). Reviews of the English edition are Ronald Pickvance, Connoisseur, 161 (January 1966), 53-4; Alfred Neumeyer, Art Bulletin, 49 (September 1967), 271-74. Pickvance noted the problems of dating and the less than comprehensive coverage of the works in Badt. Neumeyer, more positive and, indeed, somewhat overly enthusiastic, noted the affiliation of Badt with earlier German art historians of Cézanne, most notably Rintelen, Novotny, and de Tolnay. He also mentioned the similarity of Badt's ideas to those later expounded by Theodore Reff (see below).

Ibid., p. 103.

Ibid., p. 102, n. 14.


Ibid., p. 103.


CHAPTER I
SYNTHESIS AND METAPHOR

It was Maurice Denis who, in the 1890's and early 1900's, first elaborated the notion that Cézanne's paintings were "synthetic" in nature, that is, that his paintings revealed and then reconciled various demands and tensions. Denis was, of course, chiefly interested in Cézanne’s mature works, and he expressed his ideas about synthesis as a way of explaining Cézanne's formal inventions. For instance, Denis saw the opposition of fidelity to nature and subjective response to feelings aroused by nature as the source of many of Cézanne’s abstractions. A balance, harmony, and reconciliation was achieved by the artist between these demands, which resulted in what Denis termed the "déformations" peculiar to his paintings.

Scholars have seen this act of synthesis as crucial to the understanding of Cézanne’s art, as well. Kurt Badt (1956) stated this explicitly:

Cézanne assimilated, as did no other painter of his time, the methods and the conclusions of realism, naturalism and impressionism, without subscribing to any one of these movements; he
made use of certain features of all three to form a synthesis.

In addition, Meyer Schapiro (1952) has observed that this synthesis, or the act of creating this synthesis, involved the balancing of fundamentally opposite ideas:

In this complex process ... the self is always present, poised between sensing and knowing, or between its perceptions and a practical ordering activity, mastering its inner world by mastering something beyond itself.

The synthesis of tensions that Denis perceived in Cézanne's mature art was salient also in his early career. From the beginning, Cézanne was aware of the opposing forces at work in his own tastes, in the mainstream of French painting, and in the more radical and progressive trends of the nineteenth century. He began painting seriously in the early 1860's, and was thus in a position to encounter the late manifestations of Romantic Classicism, the height of Realism, and the full development of Impressionism as his career progressed. He saw the past as a source of inspiration and as a standard against which contemporary art must be judged. It is not surprising, then, that he developed a concept of painting in which the reconciliation of the past and the present was a central feature.
In examining a number of figure paintings from Cézanne's early career, this study is intended to outline his development toward a synthetic art through the later 1860's and first half of the 1870's. While Cézanne's early career was a time of experimentation and learning, the common denominator of many of his paintings in this period was the expression of metaphorical references to art, career, and temperament. By creating links between individual paintings, treating them as sets whose relationships were to be seen as meaningful, he began to address the problem of his artistic synthesis. Cézanne rarely made an autobiographical painting as such, but he himself was central to this concept of synthesis, through his desire to express his temperament and individuality as an artist. The Romantic attitude he thus displayed was combined with a strong Realist commitment to nature and perception. Hence, the opposing forces of subjective and objective truth, as will be demonstrated, provided both the stylistic and the iconographic basis for much of Cézanne's early work.

The implications of Cézanne's development of a synthetic approach to art go beyond simply the desire to emulate, and perhaps surpass, both the Old Masters and his contemporaries. The nature of this synthetic approach tells us about Cézanne as an individual, about
his attitudes toward his own art and what he hoped to accomplish with it, and about the specific influences he absorbed in order to realize his slowly emerging goals. The view which emerges from such a study reveals a complex early Cézanne. The struggle within his art, and the nature of that struggle, perhaps reveals more of the artist than do the facts of his biography.

This study is not intended to be a comprehensive survey of Cézanne's early career. There are many early paintings which will not be discussed, or which will be mentioned only in passing. It would be impossible to adequately integrate the more than three hundred oil paintings that date from before 1877 into a meaningful whole in the present context. The goals of this study are limited to the illumination of what I consider to be the most significant and interesting relationships found among his early paintings. With one exception, all the works that will be considered here are part of a series of multiple works, either as a repetition of the same image, or as a group of related images. Further, all the works presented in this study mark conceptual, stylistic, or expressive milestones in Cézanne's development. Finally, the relationships that can be established between the works, or sets of works, in this study provide the clearest examples of Cézanne's use of
metaphor and allusion as a means of self-reference in his art.

What precisely are the ideas and styles which Cézanne responded to in the 1860's and 1870's, and which motivated him to seek some kind of resolution to their contradictions? When the young Cézanne arrived in Paris, Classicism, Romanticism and Realism all occupied important places in contemporary French art. The Romantic era had long since passed its prime, but the pervasive influence of Romantic-Classicist thought still held sway in both academic and independent circles. The living Romantics, artists like Delacroix, writers like Gautier, figured in the artistic debates and in the thinking of more recent generations in Paris in the 1860's as the leaders of their respective fields. But Realism had surpassed Romanticism as central to the most heated controversies over artistic doctrine among the younger artists and writers. Realism, too, had grayed somewhat, at least in its initial form. A second generation of Realists, led by Edouard Manet in painting and Cézanne's boyhood friend Emile Zola in literature, gained notoriety in the 1860's. Somewhere outside these two generations of Realism remained the juste-milieu and the tradition of academic Romantic-Classicism, both significant for reasons of political and institutional
position rather than artistic vitality. They represented a compromise between the demands of a conservative public and artistic bureaucracy, and an interest in assimilating progressive aspects of contemporary art. As such, they represented a link between the academic and the progressive artists, and often met with great public success.

For a young artist, the issues raised by the conflicting and competing styles, schools, or doctrines were a matter of significant concern. From these issues, one could emerge as a leader whose creative individuality was acknowledged, or be submerged as simply a follower of a school. One's place in the public artistic hierarchy, one's chances for exhibition opportunities, commissions, and recognition, rested on the decisions one made as to which established path, which style, to follow. The prospects for individualism were not good, and the consequences were crucial. While it is sometimes tempting to characterize French art in terms of a simple opposition as being either academic and conservative, or radical and progressive, in the French tradition of the Poussinistes and the Rubenistes, the truth is that the issues were never so clearly delineated. The poles of the argument were formed by the conservative Romantic-Classicists, and the Realists, who focused their disdain
specifically on those academics who controlled the exhibition opportunities. Between these poles, however, the large and ill-defined field of artistic doctrines allowed an artist to incorporate elements from both conservative and progressive styles without ever falling into a specific and identifiable school.

One of Cézanne's first tasks, after arriving in Paris to become an artist, was to choose sides in the complex game of artistic politics, as well as to set himself apart. The basic issue became one of material reward and reputation as opposed to personal fulfillment and lasting achievement. This simplification of the Romantic dilemma masks a subtler significance. The presumption was that an artist had not only an ability but a right to pursue his personal impulses, and that a learned public would ultimately recognize him in this pursuit. An artist like Cézanne faced the prospect of anonymity and failure should he choose to follow what appeared to be the most current and progressive trends in the arts, while the path to material success was fraught with banality and the subordination of individuality to doctrine and style.

A Romantic heritage had instilled in the Parisian artist a sense of separateness from society. Realism, which ostensibly required a commitment to participation
in that society, never seemed to overcome that sense of the artist as an individual outside the demands of society. The self-consciousness artists of the 1860's seemed to display about the place they occupied in the hierarchy of the Parisian art world, as well as the importance of the Salons, the controversies over admission policies, and the significance still attached to medals and awards, was part of the tension between this sense of separation and participation. By turning to an increasingly subjective art that expressed the objective, external forms of the contemporary world, as the Impressionist painters did, artists developed individualized styles and approaches that represented personal resolutions to these tensions.

The self-consciousness of Cézanne's paintings from the mid-1860's through the mid-1870's came from this same tension between artist and public, personal expression and objective naturalism. The means by which he expressed these tensions varied. In style, he worked through a period of intense and exaggerated Realism toward a more controlled, methodical colorism that combined Romantic and Realist aspects. In subject, he chose both conventional Realist subjects, such as portraits, self-portraits and genre scenes, and imaginative Romantic subjects. Even at this early
period, Cézanne found it desirable to utilize both Realist and Romantic art as his sources. The idea of synthesis thus emerged as a consequence of not only the presence of varied styles, but the personal preferences of the artist in his search for a personal style that would distinguish him in the Parisian art world.

This study covers the years between 1865 and 1877. These dates correspond with Cézanne's first artistically significant paintings on the one end, and with the significant shift in style that marked his definitive move away from Impressionism at the other. Three distinct phases or stages of development can be discerned in his early career. Each of these phases is characterized by a specific style and subject matter, and more specifically by the attitude which the artist held about the issues of contemporary art as expressed through that style and subject. The works to be discussed, as has already been mentioned, are those which appear most significant to this development in both style and attitude, while simultaneously embodying metaphorical or allusive elements that refer to the artist himself.

The two portraits of 1865-1866 with which we begin this study, one of the artist's father Louis-Auguste Cézanne, the other of the artist's friend and fellow painter Achille Emperaire, were Cézanne's first
significant portraits, in mastering format, style and content. Their similarities in format and style tie them closely together, the more so since they are quite distinct from the other portraits that Cézanne did at this time. From the date of these two portraits until about 1869, Cézanne's style relied on value contrast and a dramatic surface treatment consisting of thick layers of pigment applied with a palette knife. In his choice of subject matter, as well, contrast was of primary importance. These subjects were fundamentally a means for relating the dilemmas inherent in his choice of art as a career and his orientation toward the more radical trends in contemporary art. Significant in this respect are the portraits of Cézanne's Uncle Dominique and *Jeune fille au Piano (Ouverture du Tannhäuser).

From 1869 until about 1874, a major stylistic change occurred as Cézanne rejected the dominant influence of Edouard Manet. He moved away from the rather monochromatic value system of the 1860's toward an increasingly coloristic approach to painting by the mid-1870's. With this shift in style came a sense of irony through the choice of subjects and even the form of his paintings. *L'Après-midi à Naples, Une Moderne Olympia and the series of picnic scenes related to his *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe combined Realist and Romantic
features, but the ironic tone created by their context, titles, and references indicates that Cézanne had begun to distance himself from the major figures of mid-nineteenth century French painting. The synthesis of styles was a means to his goal of realizing his own temperament in his painting.

This realization reached a turning point in the period between 1874 and 1877. The process of absorbing influences and distancing himself from the styles of other artists led to the creation of a style of painting that was unique in its interpretation of nature. This accomplishment marked, for Cézanne, the end of his early search for a personal style. The content of his works at this time reflected the self-conscious recognition of the importance of this accomplishment. Some of the figure subjects of this period make allusions to Classical mythology and the idea of temptation, as in La Tentation de Saint-Antoine and L'Eternel féminin. The metaphorical nature of these subjects, in the context of this period in his career, expressed both Cézanne's attainment and his personal objectivity toward it.

Eighteen seventy-seven marked a major watershed in the artist's career. The works which lead up to this point foretell the stylistic personality of the mature Cézanne. This year also marks the point at which the
figural paintings in general lost their literary or narrative content, as Cézanne shifted his interests toward formal problems of painting and away from the iconographical concerns of the preceding years. The issues of the early period became part of the larger synthesis embodied in the mature works. While he had arrived at a culmination to the first phase of his career, Cézanne still harbored lingering doubts about the nature of his own art and his role as an artist. Rather than a triumph, his painting reflected the realization that accomplishment in the future would be as difficult as it had been in the past.

It is hoped that this study of Cézanne's early figural works will bring to the reader a view which more fully delineates the ideas and temperament of the artist as expressed in his work, especially one which embraces paintings that have been at times neglected. It is these paintings which will serve as the touchstones of the present study. While Cézanne was a fascinating character, in many ways we have allowed our perception of the man to dominate our interpretation of his works. Returning to these paintings for a fresh look, new questions inevitably arise. Such has been the source of this investigation. While not separating the artist from his oeuvre, the consideration of other material and
contextual factors, whether biographical, psychological, or formal, leads to a fuller understanding of his work. Here, the additional aspects of metaphorical relevance and the continuity of thematic direction will, I hope, supplement this understanding. It is the work which speaks most eloquently for the artist, and through which we understand the nature of the artist himself most completely.
Notes to Chapter I


4 Lionello Venturi, Paul Cézanne, son art, son oeuvre (Paris, 1936), catalogue numbers 91 and 88, respectively. All subsequent references to entries in this catalogue will be abbreviated "V."
CHAPTER II

PROVINCIAL BOURGEOIS AND PARISIAN BOHEMIAN

1. Background

The issues dominant in Paul Cézanne's early life are not hard to discover. Born and raised in the provinces, Cézanne held aspirations first toward literature, then toward painting. Like his friend Emile Zola, he was motivated by a desire to move away from his provincial home and to make his name in the center of French culture, Paris. But unlike Zola, he was temperamentally closer to Provence in his character and thought. His course was swayed by a generous dose of Romantic literature, which not only portrayed the artist with high regard, but also held Paris to be the only place where the artist stood any chance of being recognized.¹

Cézanne had a strong-willed father who himself had made his fortune by just such an escape to Paris, returning with a skill (hat-making) to Aix, where he prospered. The father's professional example was typical of the provincial bourgeoisie, and the course of the
relationship between Paul Cézanne and Louis-Auguste Cézanne often reads like one of the innumerable stories of generational conflicts over ambitions and the demands of a profession. When Cézanne did finally go to Paris in 1861, it was with the intention of becoming an artist, and perhaps with the implied intention of following the conventional path towards that goal, via the Ecole des Beaux-Arts.  

The earliest paintings by Cézanne are both expressions of the desire of a young provincial to become an artist, and the manifestations of his untutored attempts at coming to grips with the technical problems of that craft. It is indeed peculiar how uneven Cézanne's output in these early years really was. On the one hand, he produced several competent copies of works from the museum in Aix, such as Le baiser de la muse, c. 1858-60 (Plate I), based on a work by Félix Nicolas Frillie.  

On the other hand, there are a greater number of canvasses which are at best naive, such as the ex-voto-like La Visitation, c. 1858-60 (Plate II).  

He was not untalented, but neither did he appear to be a naturally gifted artist. The nature of this early technical struggle, however, influenced Cézanne's later path of development in significant ways.
The Paris experience provided him with access not only to superior works of art for study, especially in the Louvre, but also to the opinions and ideas of other ambitious young artists of varying styles and talents. Even in comparison to the works of these other artists, Cézanne's work was awkward and naive, although highly charged and striking. But, it is here that the Cézanne of the 1860's and 1870's, a complex and interesting Cézanne, found his true origins. Paris was at one end of an axis that began in Provence. Cézanne travelled back and forth along this axis for most of his career, with a few significant, but brief, deviations. The Paris-Provence axis was indicative of the dilemma that Cézanne faced in his career as a painter. While his roots and temperament were Provençal, necessity dictated that he had to receive his training and his recognition in Paris. The reconciliation of this dilemma was thus important to his formation as an artist.

Cézanne's beginnings as an artist in the early 1860's take place at a critical time in the development of French art as a whole. The parallel between Cézanne's career and the course of French art in general is enlightening, but it is also somewhat deceptive. The most readily apparent events of importance were the Salons in Paris. The 1863 Salon, with its attendant
Salon des refusés, is often seen as the turning point of modern art, with the conflict of progressive versus conservative or establishment artists reaching a head. In fact, the conflict had long been a feature of Parisian art. The Salon des refusés simply brought public attention to the antagonisms of the two artistic camps. For a young painter, the graphic demonstration of such struggles between the forces of the existing institutions and the demand for artistic freedom served two purposes. First, it brought to the struggle a degree of public scrutiny that would have been impossible under other circumstances. It was with the public that such artists placed their faith in success, trusting that their sincerity would be rewarded by public acclaim. Second, the demonstration of the divisions between academic and progressive styles served to clarify and simplify what was a decidedly confusing situation. If anything, the result of the Salon des refusés was an oversimplification of the problems of the progressive artist, and a signal that there would still be a long struggle before the progressives achieved the status they sought.

While the Salon des refusés was undoubtedly the primary topic of discussion in the artistic circle in which Cézanne moved in 1863, a circle which for him centered around the Atelier Suisse, the direct effects
that it had on him are difficult to establish. The record of works for these years is quite incomplete because the majority of paintings from the period were either destroyed by the artist or are now lost. Edouard Manet, the cause célèbre of the Refusés, does not seem to have had the direct impact on Cézanne that we might assume. Manet's role would emerge later in the 1860's, perhaps after Cézanne had a chance to hear him directly and to study his paintings more closely. If we are to trust the existing examples of the early work as representative of the whole, it was Gustave Courbet who appears to have been a more prominent influence on the young artist in the early part of the decade.

Courbet's influence on Cézanne can be seen in both direct and indirect ways. The painting Le Baigneur au rocher (V. 83; Plate III) was originally painted directly on the wall at Cézanne's provençal family home, the Jas de Bouffan, and, although the sex was changed from female to male, it borrowed the nude figure from Courbet's Baigneuses of 1853 (Plate IV). And, while works like Le Poele dans l'atelier (V. 64; Plate V) and the dramatic self portrait (V. 81; Plate VI), both from c. 1865, reflect less direct influence, they denote the pervasiveness of that influence on Cézanne. Indeed, Cézanne's Realist mode in these early years, evidenced in
portraits, still-lifes, and landscapes, shows a remarkable awareness of Courbet's style. Cézanne's adoption of Courbet's palette-knife technique also demonstrates the influence of Courbet. Courbet's stylistic influence on Cézanne would survive into the time of the Franco-Prussian war, albeit modified by the style of Manet.

The years leading up to 1866 were distinguished by the increasing frustration of the independents, including Cézanne, to make an impact on the public. The Salon des refusés changed matters little, and the Salons following that of 1863 were as repressive as before. Now presented on an annual basis, the Salons were still firmly guided by the forces of conservative taste.

Cézanne spent the years between 1862 and 1866 alternating between Paris and Aix, working at the Atelier Suisse during the winter and spring, then painting in the Midi during the summer and fall. In Paris, he met a number of artists who shared his enthusiasms and ideas, many of them also of provincial origin. Among the most important of his acquaintances at the Atelier Suisse was Camille Pissarro, who would strongly influence him in the early part of the 1870's. It was Pissarro, however, who did the borrowing this time from Cézanne, as the former's Still Life of 1867 plainly shows. If there was any
doubt about the impact of Courbet’s Realism on the technique and style of the independent painters, such as those at the Atelier Suisse, works like this provide ample proof.

As had been the case for the past few years, Cézanne was rejected from the 1866 Salon, despite the relatively liberal selection jury. However, he had found a supporter in Charles Daubigny, who tried in vain to have Cézanne’s Portrait of Valabrègue (Plate VII) included in the Salon. This intervention, and its failure, must have particularly affected Cézanne, for he wrote to Count de Nieuwerkerke, the Director of Fine Arts and the man responsible for the organization of the annual Salon, asking that the Salon des refusés be reestablished in order that the public decide the quality or worthiness of the paintings of the rejected artists. The request came to nothing. The fact that Cézanne, a normally shy person and one who did not often take part in the public discussions at the cafés and studios, should take it upon himself to write to the Director of Fine Arts about a new Salon des refusés indicates that he was deeply concerned with the art establishment, so much so that he was driven to assume the role of advocate. Cézanne’s conscious decision to follow the unorthodox path toward artistic success outside the sanctions of the art establishment
will come up again later, as it is the focal point of Cézanne's early career development and is significant for understanding the meaning of some of his paintings at this time.

Cézanne was encouraged by a number of people even at this early stage of his career. The letter to Nieuwerkerke was probably written with the assistance of Zola, and it reflected the concerns of the whole group of young painters who found it almost impossible to exhibit their painting in the Salon.\textsuperscript{12} Besides Daubigny, who had stood up for him to the Salon jury, he also received praise from the leader of the younger generation, and the man who was at the center of the Salon controversy, Edouard Manet. Sometime during the spring of 1866, Antoine Guillemet, whom Cézanne had met at the Atelier Suisse and who was also a friend of Daubigny, showed Manet some of Cézanne's still-lifes. Manet praised them as being "powerfully handled" works.\textsuperscript{13} Coming from Manet, this must have been particularly encouraging praise for Cézanne.

These direct artistic relationships between Cézanne and his contemporaries were not the only factors shaping his thinking. Although he was never comfortable with theory and artistic debate, the critical environment of Paris was also important, especially since his close
friend Emile Zola had taken an active role as an art critic. In July of 1866, Cézanne spent a particularly happy period with his friends in the small village of Bennecourt, along the Seine. Zola and Antony Valabrègue were there, as were Baptistin Bailie and Phillippe Solari, both also from Aix. The vacation at Bennecourt was recorded by Zola in several articles and short stories, most notably in "Les Parisiens en villégiature," published in 1877. The occasion allowed Cézanne the opportunity to freely discuss art with his closest friends, and no doubt to talk about the direction in which each of them was headed. Zola had just published a booklet entitled Mes Haines and a collection of reviews called Mon Salon, dedicated to Cézanne. In them, Zola elaborated his theory for the visual arts, emphasizing temperament over formula and stressing that contemporary art had become dry and devoid of interest. Both pieces were a defense of Manet in particular, for Zola saw Manet as the leader and the potential savior of contemporary art. Both works are forward-looking, promising things to come and encouraging artists to follow the progressive path. There is little doubt that the contents of both works were discussed in detail at Bennecourt that July.
The events of 1866 marked a turning point for Cézanne's career. The frustration with the Salon jury, the actions taken to voice concerns to the establishment and the public, and the fraternal camaraderie that was the natural extension of like-minded individuals, all came together simultaneously at the exact moment when Cézanne seems to have overcome his stylistic problems and to have arrived at a distinctive style. The stage was set for an expression of the artist's temperament and ideas in two forceful and significant works.

ii. Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne

Paul Cézanne's 1866 portrait of his father, Louis-Auguste Cézanne, is a striking and powerful work (Plate VIII).\(^\text{18}\) It is among the largest of Cézanne's extant canvasses. The power of the work, however, goes beyond size. The image of the artist's father is direct and forceful, and the painting style is bold and energetic, with thick, swirling brushstrokes and strong value contrasts. The portrait is one of Cézanne's first masterpieces, a painting in which his temperamental early style at last came to fruition and which marked the beginning of a series of mature paintings that lasted until 1870.
The portrait is a complex painting, not so much in terms of style, but in terms of its meaning. Moreover, it has significant implications about Cézanne and his art at this time. In this painting, we will see that Cézanne produced one of his most interesting self-commentaries; rarely would his future work make so forthright a reference to himself, his family, or his artistic situation.

The composition of the portrait is quite simple. It is based on strong value contrasts, and on a series of vertical forms: the figure of the father, the chair, the newspaper, and the doorway. Color is less important than the limited range of grays found within an essentially black and white palette. Louis-Auguste is seen frontally, seated in a large chair which is upholstered in a flowered fabric. He sits upright in a very rigid and somewhat awkward manner, and seems to be perched on the edge of the chair rather than seated back into it. He wears a dark jacket, light trousers, a tight-fitting cap and what appear to be slippers on his crossed feet. He holds a newspaper, whose masthead reads "L'Événement" in large block letters. Behind the chair is a wall and, to the right, the indication of a doorway or another room. On the wall, situated directly above and behind Louis-Auguste's head, is a still life painting, identifiable as
one of Cézanne's own. On the right, in the darkness through the doorway, can be seen what appears to be the stretcher of another painting turned toward the wall.

The visual arrangement of the head of Louis-Auguste framed between the painting and the newspaper calls attention to the face of the subject, but it also sets up a meaningful relationship between the father and the images that represent Cézanne and his friend Emile Zola. The painting on the wall is obviously self-referential. The newspaper, L'Événement, refers to Zola, who was at the time a contributor to this short-lived journal. For Cézanne, as for us, Louis-Auguste is the central figure and subject of the work, but Zola is featured prominently, with the masthead of the journal for which he worked and in which he was becoming a public figure boldly displayed and emphasized. Cézanne, however, is relegated to the shadows in the background. His painting is behind his father's head and is the most reticent of the three references.

These relationships appear to be quite deliberate, being carefully composed and rendered. What might Cézanne have been thinking when he did this work, and what is the importance of the work for him, given its scale and its content? Obviously the painting attests to the centrality of his father; but why does he include the
references to himself and his friend Zola, and why in this arrangement?

The portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne appears to be an image devoted to the promise of success. Zola's success is boldly proclaimed by the newspaper title. Whether Louis-Auguste agreed with or even understood the nature of Zola's success is not of primary importance. Zola had achieved a public exposure, and hence an opportunity for public acknowledgement. Cézanne's art had not yet received that public acknowledgement, nor had he even achieved the opportunity for public exposure. For both Zola and Cézanne, the avant-garde, the progressive route to success, represented the only viable path. Ironically, the portrait shows precisely the forum that Cézanne might have hoped to achieve, as his still-life hangs above the father in an accessible bourgeois environment. This painting is the first in which he clearly addresses the problems he has encountered, or expects to encounter in the future, with his art. In contrasting professions and the levels of conventional success, Cézanne reflects upon his decision to become an artist.

There are three points with which we need to concern ourselves in order to understand the portrait of Cézanne's father more fully. As we already know, there
is first Cézanne's relationship with his father, and its bearing upon his art. Second, the reference to Zola's writing signifies that Cézanne's friend is important to the meaning of the painting, and we are given a specific means by which Zola's work is known. But, there is third, the context of this painting. The Portrait of Achille Emperaire is the companion to the portrait of Cézanne's father, and the relationship between these two paintings is the key to their meaning.

In August of 1866, Cézanne had returned from Paris to Aix, where he remained until the following January. It was at this time that the portrait of his father was most likely done. It was also during this time that Cézanne's friend, Antoine Guillemet, interceded with his father on the artist's behalf. Guillemet apparently convinced Cézanne's father that his son was on the verge of success, or at least that he was becoming recognized in Paris. The purpose of Guillemet's intercession was to get Cézanne père to increase his son's allowance. Guillemet could present himself as a moderately successful painter, lending credence to his word. As the pupil of Corot and Oudinot, and the informal pupil of Daubigny, Guillemet had taken a rather conventional approach to his study of painting. His Salon debut was in 1865, which immediately put him in a different class
from Cézanne. In addition, Guillemet was acquainted with a number of artists in Paris, introducing Cézanne and Zola to Manet, and he had access to the studios of many others. Apparently, he was convincing, or at least he touched upon the father's interest in the success of his son, for the allowance was increased.  

Guillemet's intercession on behalf of Cézanne tells us something of the character of the father, since he seems to have been interested in results, or signs of real potential, rather than just promises. This is important in considering the father's portrait. Certainly the scale makes the work a demonstration piece, showing that he was indeed capable of producing significant art; this is true though the father does not seem to have been a connoisseur. In addition, it also would have served as a gesture of gratitude, prompted by the allowance increase. The incident highlights a moment in the relationship between father and son, providing a glimpse into the nature of that relationship, the dynamics of which were so important to Cézanne at this time in his life, and which would continue to be significant for the next 20 years. Upon the death of his father in 1886, Cézanne received a considerable endowment which coincided, perhaps ironically, with the apex of the painter's creative maturity.
This relationship has been the subject of a considerable amount of interest, interpretation and research.\(^2\) The facts as they come down to us, from letters, comments by friends, and events in Cézanne's life, provide a fascinating picture of the sometimes stormy battle of wills between father and son. It is known that Cézanne was both admiring and fearful of his father. On the one hand, Louis-Auguste Cézanne provided him with a modest stipend, freeing him from the sometimes terrible deprivations that affected the artist's friends in Paris. On the other hand, this financial string was always in danger of being severed at the father's discretion, causing Cézanne to live in a state of continual anxiety, especially after 1872, when he was living with a mistress and a son.

It was when Cézanne decided to become an artist, after receiving his baccalaureate in 1858, that this contest of wills was set off. At the same time he enrolled in the evening drawing classes in the Academy of Art in Aix, he also began the study of law. Louis-Auguste no doubt saw his son's future as a professional as the means to success and a rise in social standing. His ambitions for his son are not surprising, for the social ladder to be climbed in Aix had its limitations, and certain doors remained closed for the father. His
son, however, might continue to the upper levels of Aix, or even Parisian, society through a respectable career as a lawyer. Indicative of Louis-Auguste Cézanne's concern for social status is the purchase of an estate, the Jas de Bouffan, in the same year as his son's entry into law school. This acquisition demonstrated his own material success. It was here, too, that Cézanne's portrait of his father would hang.  

Cézanne had other plans contradictory to his father's wishes. His friend Emile Zola had been writing to him from Paris, encouraging him to join him there. Cézanne's desire to do this was checked by his father's preference for having him finish his law studies in Aix. This struggle lasted until 1861, when his father finally relented and took his son to Paris, possibly with the hope that he would gain entrance into the Académie des Beaux-arts. This episode is itself rather curious, for Cézanne returned to Aix within six months and entered his father's bank as an employee.  

The fitful vacillation of Cézanne between Paris and Aix, between the center of the art world and the family circle, the urban milieu and the provincial, characterized his life throughout the 1860's. On the one side was Zola, who wished for Cézanne to be with him in Paris, sharing the struggles the two had mapped out in
their youth, but who was himself better suited to the harshness of the city than his friend. On the other side was Cézanne's father, who was the sole economic support of the young painter and without whom he would have been in desperate difficulties. While his father seems to have more or less given up his hopes of a professional career for Cézanne by 1863, when the latter returned to Paris for the entire year, he did continue to control the affairs of his son, at least in economic terms. Given the fears that Cézanne had about his father's goodwill and support, Guillemet's plea for a higher allowance for him in 1866 was apparently an effort to gain more freedom. In broader terms, Cézanne's choice was between the lifestyle of an artist, or bohemian, and that of a bourgeois professional.

The fact that Louis-Auguste Cézanne not only gave in to his son's wishes to become an artist, but also gave him continual financial support, contradicts some of the negative image which we might otherwise have of him. He does not seem to have been particularly uncooperative toward his son after he left law school. Most indicative of his father's support are the numerous decorations, painted by Cézanne for the Jas de Bouffan. Cézanne eventually set up an attic studio in the Jas de Bouffan where he could paint during his visits home. The
negative comments which come down to us through Cézanne's letters to various friends, and through descriptions by Zola, may not be entirely fair, but instead stem from the general rejection of the values of one generation by the next generation. The conflict of father and son was aggravated by the simplistic division of bourgeois and bohemian as two irreconcilable poles, a perception common enough among youth who understood the bourgeoisie in exclusively negative terms.

But Louis-Auguste Cézanne's willingness to support his son's endeavor to become an artist might also reflect the pattern by which the father himself had become a successful tradesman and banker. As we have mentioned, Louis-Auguste had returned to the provinces from Paris after learning a trade. Realistically, Louis-Auguste had little chance for success in Paris, but had ample opportunity in Aix. Cézanne's pattern of alternating between Paris and Aix seems to have been motivated by an equally simple realization: in Aix he could work undisturbed, in Paris he could not. Foreign to the theoretical battles of the cafés and the salons, Cézanne was never at ease in such circumstances. But Paris was still the center in which one could learn, not only a trade, but an artistic style as well.
The Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne came at a time when Paul Cézanne was for the first time realizing the fruits of his independence and coming into his own as an artist. For the first time, he was faced with a real sense of his role as an artist. His participation in the Paris art scene, the support which he felt from established artists like Daubigny and Manet, as well as from his younger colleagues, and the image which he presented to his own father, with some help from Guillemet, all coalesced at that moment into the first really significant phase of Cézanne's career. The portrait could thus be a statement about this moment, for it shows the forces at work on the artist: the presence of the father, the father's admiration for success, and the son's appreciation of the father's support. But there are still other factors which enter into the work.

The second key to understanding the context of the Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne is Emile Zola. If 1866 was an important year for Paul Cézanne, it was a crucial year for Zola. The friendship between Cézanne and Zola dated to their years in school together in Aix. When Zola was forced to move to Paris with his mother in 1858, the two friends kept up a correspondence which revealed a great deal about their aspirations in the intervening early years. Zola, too, sought artistic success. He was
ambitious, and he saw Paris as the center of a world to be conquered through both talent and audacity. For Zola, struggle and hard work represented the path toward success, which he gauged not only in conventional artistic terms, but in terms of notoriety, attention and money. In this respect, Zola represented a curious blend of artist and publicist, a writer who sought to embrace both literary bohemia and moneyed bourgeoisie.

Art in general, and literature in particular, was the path toward fulfillment for one who owed much to the romantic spirit, even if he professed allegiance to the naturalist school. Ego had much to do with it, as Zola continually sought to reveal the artist's temperament, the man behind the work of art. There is a great deal here which rings true of Cézanne as well, at least in the 1860's and early 1870's. The influence of the writer upon the painter should not be underestimated in this period. There is much in common between the way in which Zola wielded the pen and Cézanne the paintbrush.

L'Evénement, the paper which appears prominently in the portrait of Cézanne's father, was a short-lived journal, first appearing on November 5, 1865 and suppressed by the government on November 15, 1866. Several writers of significance besides Zola contributed
to *L’Evénement*, including Albert Wolff, H. Rochefort, Jules Claretie, and Jules Vallès.\(^{26}\)

Zola began his collaboration with *L’Evénement* on February 1, 1866 and produced 125 articles for publication between that date and November 7 of the same year. In addition, his novel *Le Vœu d’une morte* was published serially in the paper between September 1 and 26, 1866. The majority of articles that Zola wrote for *L’Evénement* were book reviews, under the rubric of "Livres d’aujourd’hui et de demain." Zola viewed his position at *L’Evénement* as more than a sideline, for he had quit his job at the Hachette publishing firm on January 31, the day before his first *L’Evénement* article was published.

Perhaps most important among Zola's contributions to *L’Evénement* were his reviews of the 1866 Salon. The scope of the planned series, some twelve articles, went beyond mere criticism of the works of art shown in the Salon. In the articles which appeared before public outcry forced the editors to cut short his series,\(^{27}\) Zola took the opportunity to examine the workings of the Salon jury, to point out the young generation of painters who followed on the Realists, and to call attention to Edouard Manet as the leader of the new painting. The broader implications of the struggle between the artistic
schools fit nicely into Zola's own ideas about art and literature, for Zola thought that the new painting would parallel his own naturalist literature. His eventual disappointment with Manet, Cézanne, and the Impressionists stemmed from this initial misreading of their individual and collective intentions as painters, a disappointment shared by Cézanne himself, though in a different way. But in 1866, Zola's direction was not yet entirely clear. He had just been introduced into the Café Guerbois circle by Guillemet, and had visited Manet's studio sometime before the opening of the Salon that year. In the heat of crisis after the rejection of Manet and the others at the hands of the Salon jury, Zola saw a cause and an injustice, and he sprang at the opportunity to point it out and correct it.

Zola's writings in L'Événement were significant, especially for those in whose favor Zola had written. The impact was sustained by the republication of the collected reviews in July, 1866, under the title Mon Salon, where Zola added a dedication to Cézanne. Manet was the chief beneficiary, not only in the initial articles in L'Événement, but also for the expanded defense in the booklet that Zola published on him in 1867. The other younger painters who were mentioned also benefited, at least in the fact that they saw a
defender in an influential position and appreciated his support. Renoir's *At the Inn of Mother Anthony, Marlotte*, 1866 (Plate IX), indicates that Zola's publications were important topics of discussion among the artists and thinkers, for it includes, like Cézanne's portrait of his father, a newspaper with the banner of *L'Événement* clearly and prominently displayed.

There is one other fact which may have relevance to the understanding of the prominence of the newspaper in Cézanne's portrait of his father. During the course of his numerous book reviews, Zola wrote of the new work by Fortuné Marion entitled *Les Végétaux merveilleux*, published by Zola's former employer Hachette. The review appeared in *L'Événement* on August 5, 1866 and again on August 10. The work was Marion's first major publication, and the beginning of a long career in the natural sciences. He eventually became a professor at the Marseilles University and in 1880 was named director of the Museum of Natural History there. The publication of this book was another instance of the success of ambitious youth, perhaps not as public as Zola's publication, but nevertheless an accomplishment for the young scientist. Marion was a friend of both Zola and Cézanne, and his modest success was undoubtedly seen in the context of their mutual ambitions. For
Cézanne, the inclusion in his painting of the newspaper which not only contained articles by Zola defending the artists and artistic ideals which Cézanne believed in, but which also contained the announcement of another friend's intellectual triumph, could have been a means of commenting upon the idea of material and public success. It also contrasted sharply with his own lack of public recognition.

Success seems to be the key to the portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne: Louis-Auguste's, Zola's and Marion's, and the promise of future success by the artists who, like Manet, chose to follow a path against the grain of the art establishment. Cézanne's future is foreshadowed, but there are doubts and uncertainties. If Zola was confident not only in himself but also in his friend Cézanne, the painter himself was not so sure, or at least more cautious in his optimism. The correspondence of Cézanne, Zola, and their friends in this period is full of the mutual assurance that success will arrive sooner or later, and that their generation will eventually triumph over an older, less progressive one. But Cézanne's doubt, as Merleau-Ponty so aptly termed it, is expressed here in a subtle and rather melancholy way.
The context of the portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne is the final aspect to be considered in interpreting the painting's meaning. To this end, we must turn to a consideration of a companion work, the Portrait of Achille Emperaire.

iii. The Portrait of Achille Emperaire

The relationship between the portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne and that of Achille Emperaire is both physical and metaphorical. Portrait of Achille Emperaire (Plate X) is the same size as the portrait of the artist's father, and the two are by far the largest works of the early period. The composition is very similar, with the subject seated in the same flowered chair. The presence of this chair suggests that both works were painted at the Jas de Bouffan, as it appears later in the interior Jeune fille au piano (Ouverture du Tannhäuser). But, were the two portraits to be hung together, and if so, where? An earlier portrait of Cézanne's father stands as a precedent (Plate XI). The earlier portrait was created for a very specific place at the family home, the Jas de Bouffan. It was painted on the wall of a semi-circular alcove in the salon of the house. Also in
this alcove, and flanking the portrait, were panels representing the Four Seasons (Plate XII).³⁴

Louis-Auguste sits in the middle of these panels, enthroned like a god, or king, among his attributes.³⁵ But the image and its context are somewhat comical, for this is a bourgeois king, wearing his day-cap and as in his later portrait, reading the newspaper intently. There are features that resemble the later portrait, such as the awkward pose and the large scale. But other aspects are quite distinct from the later portrait, such as the profile pose, the lack of surrounding details, and the rather primitive style.

We cannot be certain of the exact intentions of the young artist in placing this early portrait of his father in such a context, but there are two possibilities. First, we can look at the ensemble as a kind of facetious analogy, where the artist likens his domineering father to some mythological or royal personage, surrounded by attributes of the Seasons as a mocking gesture to his stature and position. For some, the fact that Cézanne signed the Four Seasons panels "Ingres" in large letters confirms the irony. The arrangement is, after all, somewhat ridiculous, and the contrast between the simple portrait of the provincial bourgeois engrossed in the
papers with the stylized female figures of the Seasons reinforces that impression.

This early portrait and its context could be taken quite seriously, however. If the young Cézanne was genuinely trying to lionize his father, for whatever reason, wouldn't such a deliberately naive presentation suit the purpose? Also, why shouldn't the young painter resort to conventional prototypes for his imagery, especially since he seems to have had very limited exposure to art until his trip to Paris in 1861? The traditions of high art and of folk art certainly seem to have influenced him equally at this early stage, and the images which he painted on the walls of the Jas de Bouffan also have a curious blend of naiveté and tradition to them. Other works found in the Jas de Bouffan, like Christ in Limbo (Plate XIII) and Baigneur au rocher, despite their obvious formal problems, are paintings the artist took quite seriously.

Whatever the true intention of the context of the early portrait, the fact that the portrait is part of a deliberate ensemble is what is important to the present argument. If the meaning of the early Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne is enhanced, or complemented, by the physical context of the painting in the family home, then
the later portrait perhaps is similarly to be seen and understood in such a context.

With the precedent set by the earlier portrait of his father, it does not seem unlikely that the companion Portrait of Achille Emperaire could have been hung with the 1866 Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne. Cézanne painted numerous images on the walls of the Jas de Bouffan, in a fragmentary and disorganized manner at times. The paired portraits could not have been any more objectionable to the family than these fragments. Indeed, the similarities of the two portraits, including the fact that they are the same scale, would seem to indicate that they were at least intended to be seen together, even if they never actually were.

What is at work here, and what seems to be the sum of the various allusions that we have referred to already in the portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne, is a comparison, or more accurately, a contrast, of the subjects. In the portrait of the father, we have images of bourgeois success and material accomplishment. Zola's attempt at notoriety and his real personal accomplishments are also indicated. We also have the aspirations of the artist-son, represented by the painting on the wall. The Portrait of Achille Emperaire shows the other side of the argument, only hinted at in
the portrait of the father, for Emperaire represents the struggle of the artist. The meaning of the Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne is not complete unless it is seen in the context of the portrait of Emperaire. Together, they reveal the dilemma facing Cézanne, the choice of a lifestyle and a career. On the one side is the family, with its security, its materialism, its admiration for success. On the other side is the world of the artist, the bohemian world, with its contemplative mood, its cerebral attractions, its melancholy resignation to uncertainty. It is not unlike the choice which, as Reff has indicated, Cézanne described in his 1858 poem "The Choice of Hercules," the choice between Vice and Virtue, but really the choice is between art and a profession. 36

Despite the similarities, there are differences between the two portraits which suggest the contrast. In mood, Emperaire is rather melancholy. In the details of the composition, the chair is enlarged with respect to the frame of the canvas, shrinking the relative scale of the chair with respect to the body of Emperaire. The insistent verticality of the Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne has been softened somewhat in that of Emperaire, as the subject's pose is less rigid. Also, while their style is similar, it is not identical. Whereas the portrait of the father is very boldly painted, partly in
thick palette knife strokes, the portrait of Emperaire is energetic but restrained, with a drier surface and a more deliberate paint application. The fact that there is a large banner across the top of the canvas reading "Achille Emperaire: Artiste Peintre" is all the more striking, as the softening and restraining of Emperaire's image points to a less forceful personality, and a less confident attitude.

Achille Emperaire would seem to have been the perfect subject for such a comparison. In hindsight, Emperaire was one of the most tragic figures among Cézanne's friends. At the time of his portrait, however, he was not yet the failed artist, simply another painter struggling to be noticed, struggling to make his way. Cézanne seems to have identified closely with Emperaire, who was also from Aix and who was a regular at the Atelier Suisse. His sketches of the painter are the most sensitive of the early portraits of Cézanne's friends (Plate XIV).

An anecdote related much later by Gasquet also suggests more than a simple friendship between the two. Gasquet recalled meeting Emperaire in the museum at Aix one day while in the company of Cézanne. Under his breath, Cézanne called Emperaire "Frenhofer," a character with whom Cézanne himself often identified. The
comment is revealing, for Frenhofer, from Balzac's "Le Chef-d'oeuvre inconnu," is the paradigm of the artist who struggles with his own genius, only to fail in his quest for the expression of that genius. With Cézanne's concern for and struggle with "realization" in his own works, it is easy to see the fascination the character had for him. In the case of Emperaire, the identification is an interesting evaluation of the artist on the part of Cézanne. One is also struck by the fact that Frenhofer was a partial model for the character of Claude Lantier in Zola's L'Oeuvre, a book which many believed to be about Cézanne.

At the time of Cézanne's portrait, Emperaire was already thirty-seven years old. The twenty-seven year old Cézanne might have been struck by Emperaire's lack of success at that age, and perhaps saw the same fate in store for himself. This ten year difference in age is interesting in light of a comment by Zola about the prospects for Cézanne's success. In a letter dated June 14, 1866, concerning the 1866 Salon from Zola to Numa Coste, another of Zola and Cézanne's Aix friends, he stated that: "Paul was refused as we expected, so were Solari and all the people you know. They settled down to work again for they are certain that they must wait
another ten years before they can have themselves accepted."

It would be surprising if the "ten year goal" was not a topic of discussion between Zola and Cézanne, perhaps during the July vacation at Bennecourt. In the preface to Mon Salon, the work dedicated to Cézanne, Zola speaks of the past ten-year period when he indicates that he and Cézanne had been friends for ten years: "Je puis aujourd'hui me donner la volupté intime d'une de ces bonnes causeries que nous avons depuis dix ans ensemble," and "Il y a dix ans que nous parlons arts et littérature." In Zola's eyes, at least, the period of ten years was significant for his own career, since it had taken him that long to reach a point where he could see success in the dissemination of his ideas, and for the career of his friend Cézanne, who most likely would have to endure another ten years of struggle before he could enjoy success. Emperaire thus represented not only the struggling artist, but the future in store for the unsuccessful artist. The melancholy tone of the painting, hinted at in the portrait of the father, perhaps reveals the uncertainty with which Cézanne saw the future and his own career.

While the Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne represented a bourgeois perspective of professional
success, the view represented in the image of Emperaire was from the Romantic bohemia. While the term was used rather indiscriminately to describe the entire milieu of artistic life in Paris in the nineteenth century, bohemia and bohemianism applied most specifically to the Romantic generation, the "Men of '30." But the idea of bohemia was still important to the artists of the 1860's. Emperaire would again seem to be a perfect example to which Cézanne could refer. His marginal existence, eccentric art, and lack of recognition were all virtual requirements for the true bohemian.

Zola tried to use the lure of bohemia in getting Cézanne to Paris initially. The urban milieu was equated with artistic liberty and liberal ideas; the provinces were the realm of the bourgeoisie. But the duality already expressed by Cézanne's father in 1859, as quoted by Zola, "On meurt avec du génie, et l'on mange avec de l'argent," represented the other side of the coin. Indeed, Cézanne could have admired Emperaire for the latter's sincerity, and even for his talents as an artist, but he could not have looked comfortably upon Emperaire's economic situation, nor does it seem likely that he would have chosen to actually emulate Emperaire. Emperaire's melancholy extends beyond mere lack of success; it was the failure of an entire generation of
bohemians to find a niche in a society that extolled the virtues of pragmatism and materialism. The reflections of this same melancholy can be found in Cézanne's letters from the earliest date, although the context was quite different.

It would be a mistake, however, to assume that the two portraits are simply the opposition of bourgeois and bohemian lifestyles. They reflect the duality of success and failure more than the social position of the middle class and the artists' class. Despite the negative attitudes that were sometimes betrayed by the friends of Cézanne, they did not reject the values of the bourgeoisie completely. They all recognized its "necessity," that is, the place in economic reality that they occupied. Cézanne could behave eccentrically as a way of expressing his independence from that class, as he would later slight Manet for the latter's bourgeois affectations, but even he recognized that the patrons of his art would be the enlightened bourgeois, a fact that he seems to indicate in the portrait of his father.

The meanings which emerge from a close analysis of the Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne and the Portrait of Achille Emperaire suggest that Cézanne was not only showing contrasting personalities in his two paintings, but that he was using his painting as a form of visual
commentary about his decision to become an artist, his desire for success, and the uncertainty that accompanied an artistic career. The contrast between the two portraits is similar to that which characterized the Parisian art world at the time: material success and notoriety versus anonymous failure, or at least the rejection of conventional definitions of success. In the post-1863 art world, success had taken on a new and more complex meaning, especially for the younger generation of painters. Within the Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne we find the conflicting interests of the artist himself, his respect for and dependence on his father, his admiration for his successful friend Zola, and his own view of himself as an artist working in obscurity and not yet in the public eye. Both Zola and Louis-Auguste Cézanne were men of action. Cézanne seems to have admired the work ethic which they represented and by which they had arrived, and no doubt saw that his own eventual success would come only through hard and sustained effort. The painter's success would be in the future, as he suggests through the comparison of himself with the older, and more melancholy, figure of Achille Emperaire.

But Cézanne does not embrace the kind of success offered in the portrait of his father, just as he does
not completely identify himself with the image of Emperaire. His choice was really not between two opposing lifestyles. Rather, he sought to find the common ground between materialism, theory, and practice, in effect, a synthesis of these attitudes that would result in a progressive, personal, and successful art.

The depth of Cézanne's awareness, and the sensitivity with which the artist handled the issues concerning his own personality and career is rather remarkable. These two portraits are still early works. Cézanne's artistic direction, in terms of style and technique, was not yet mature. Boldness of execution and temperament did not hide the subtlety of characterization and differentiation in the two portraits. Yet he had a strong sense of the direction he was taking, and he was surprisingly objective even in 1866 about his chances of success. The further development of the ideas touched upon in these two paintings would take Cézanne up to the end of the decade.

iv. The Portraits of Uncle Dominique

The second set of portraits to be discussed are those of Cézanne's uncle, Dominique Aubert. They are among a large number of portraits Cézanne painted during
the 1860's, primarily of his family and friends. One is aware in surveying them that Cézanne often portrayed his sitters in various roles, that is, he used his sitters as characters in an almost theatrical sense. While he usually adopted a typically Realist attitude toward the portrait, Cézanne at times indulged in the Romantic notions of costume pieces and role-playing. For the Romantic painters, costuming and role-playing within the portrait genre were a way of engaging in paradoxes of personality (the revelation of hidden character within the individual) or foreign culture (the European view of exotic peoples). Even the Realists utilized portraiture not only to fix the likeness of the subject, but to indicate an alternative role, social or otherwise, for the sitter through costume or mannerism. Courbet's youthful self-portraits are such a case. Manet, too, used the costumed sitter to portray the situations and fashions that guided the particular individual in his or her own social and personal life, as in his "Spanish" portraits.52

These contexts were important and pervasive in Cézanne's art at this time. His early self-portraits are excellent examples of stormy introspection, high drama, and the perception of the self as a figure of temperament and genius. When painting his friends, he seems to have
cast them in specific roles, showing them in a particular light which no doubt best suited their own temperament. He resorted to the Romantic conception of equating physiognomy with the mental attitude of the sitter. The results were the melancholy images of Emperaire, the business-like views of Zola at work (Plate XV), and the scenes of the artist's sisters pretending to fashion, emulating poses taken from magazines (Plate XVI). However, it is the set concerning Uncle Dominique that is unique, due to the variety of roles in which the sitter is cast.

Dominique Aubert was a bailiff and the brother of Cézanne's mother. He seems to have indulged his nephew's interest in painting much more than any other relative, since we have at least ten portraits of him from the period around 1866. Five are fairly conventional, with no attributes to suggest anything other than a simple portrait (V. 75, 77, 79, 80 and 102); a sixth shows Dominique in ordinary clothes and a distinctive, but non-specific, hat (V. 76). It is the remaining four that are much more interesting, due to the treatment of the sitter. Of the four portraits, three have very specific costumes that place the sitter in an identifiable context, derived from different vocations (V. 72, 73, and 74; Plates XVII, XVIII, and XIX). The fourth (V. 82) uses
a straightforward portrait approach, but has Dominique wearing an exotic turban.

Stylistically, the portraits divide into two groups. The group of five bust-length portraits (V. 75, 76, 77, 79, and 80) is perhaps of an earlier date (1865?). Also included in this group, on the basis of scale as well as style, is the turbaned portrait (V. 82). All of these paintings are rather small, falling within the range of 39 to 46 cm high. Their compositions are also similar, with the bust format crowding the frame. The second group of three paintings consists of ones more controlled in execution and brushwork, and larger in scale, being from 63 to 79.7 cm high. Their format differs as well, for the figure is seen in a torso view from a more distant vantage point so that arms, chest and even hands are visible. The compositions are not as crowded, although there is still very little open space around the figures. The second group include the most obviously costumed of all the Dominique portraits. The half-length portrait V. 102 seems to be either a transitional work between the two groups, or a later painting altogether. It is more of the scale of the second group; it is also more finished and deliberately handled. In common with the first group, however, is the fact that Dominique is clothed in the same non-specific ordinary dress and,
unlike all of the others, it is the only one in the entire set to have a dark background.

The style of all the portraits is similar to that seen in the portraits of Cézanne's father and of Emperaire. The palette knife is used to apply thick slabs of paint to the canvas. The direction of the knife strokes conforms to contours of the face and body, thus forming a kind of three-dimensional relief on the surface. Colors are limited and the works are structured through value relationships and modelling patterns. However, certain local color areas are intense to the point of distraction, as with the blue cap seen in V. 73. Overall, however, the colors are basically black and white, with various flesh tones for the face.

Interestingly, in the portraits which portray Dominique with specific attributes, one perceives pointed references to Cézanne's own professional choices. The most obvious is the portrait of Uncle Dominique dressed in the garments of a lawyer. Even though his real profession was not that of a lawyer, certainly Dominique's position as a court bailiff is alluded to here. But, Cézanne's experience in law school between 1858 and 1861 would seem to be relevant as well. Cézanne's father had wanted his son to enter the legal profession, thus acting to solidify the family position
and fortune. The long association of Aix with the law and its famous law school made this profession a most respectable one in Aix society. Jean Arrouye notes the importance of this profession in the eyes of the Aixois:

L'histoire du père de Cézanne est donc celle d'une ascension sociale réussie qui fait de lui un notable aixois et l'on comprend les regrets qu'éprouva cet homme arrivé au plus haut de la bourgeoisie de commerce quand son fils refusa de couronner ses efforts en devenant notaire ou avoué à la cour, ce qui dans une ville de magistrature comme Aix était le moyen d'entrer dans la grande bourgeoisie.

The significance of the portrait of Uncle Dominique as a monk is more complex. Even though he was not a monk, the most obvious point is the pun between the sitter's name, Dominique, and the order in whose garb he is shown, the Dominicans. Certainly, Cézanne's fondness for wordplay and puns is to be found in some of his early correspondence; later, and as we shall see, in a more sophisticated manner, "visual puns" will be incorporated into some of his more complex paintings. The second point about the painting is the fact that Cézanne chose the Dominican garb at all. The Dominicans were a newly restored order in France. During the revolution the order had been shut down. It was not until 1858 that Lacordaire revived the order as well as a grand plan for a renaissance of religious art.
Meyer Schapiro's enlightening analysis of this portrait bears directly upon our investigation:

In portraying his uncle ... in the costume of a monk, he (Cézanne) avowed a desire for solitude and for mastery over the flesh. During this period he also painted a large canvas of the Temptation of Saint Anthony ... The painting of Uncle Dominic is not a true portrait, but something between an ideal symbol and a masquerade, through which the artist could relive his own struggles and dream of release. Painted in the solitude of the family estate near Aix, it is the image of a strong, fleshy person who strives to contain his passions through the religious habit ... and through the self-inhibiting gesture, a crossing or reversal of the hands, which is a kind of resignation, a death of the self.

Schapiro's point is that Cézanne found within the religious a parallel to his own life, but evidence of "resignation" and "a death of the self" is perhaps more appropriate to Cézanne after the mid-1870's than before. Later in his life, Cézanne would indeed evidence a fundamental humility and resignation in terms of his relationship with nature, an attitude which he owed primarily to Pissarro. But before he worked closely with Pissarro in Auvers and Pontoise in the early 1870's, there seems to be little to suggest that a like attitude had any place in his art. Schapiro is suggesting, of course, that this search for a reconciliation in the artist's struggles and passions through resignation was taking place subconsciously, just as he interprets other
early Cézanne canvasses in terms of subconscious sources. 59

Cézanne's periodic use of religious subjects suggests that he identified with certain religious ideals, even at a fairly early date. Kurt Badt recognized this when he wrote of the "conversion" that took place in the 1870's, leading to the development of Cézanne's later style. 60 The image of the monk and the hermit saint appear to have had a special appeal, as we shall see later in his use of St. Anthony subjects.

The third of the later portraits of Uncle Dominique is the least identifiable in terms of costume for us. He is dressed in a long white jacket, open at the front, and wears a soft cap with a tassel at the peak. But Dominique is not portrayed as a manual laborer; he wears the dark coat and tie of a higher class of individual beneath the smock.

Two possibilities are most plausible. First, he may represent an artist, for the jacket and hat suggest the attire of the studio, and Cézanne was known to have worn a worker's smock at the easel. 61 A similar, though not identical, hat appears in a self-portrait by Cézanne from the mid-1870's (V. 284; Plate XX). Second, perhaps no specific profession was meant to be indicated; instead, the costume may be generic, representing any number of
middle-class shopkeepers, artisans and merchants. The blue cap appears to be a kind of casual headcovering; something of the same nature is worn by Cézanne's father in his portrait. While the blue color is usually associated with the smocks of laborers, this is clearly not the case here. Apparently, this portrait is meant to be of a middle-class professional, representing Dominique in a role not unlike Cézanne's own father, a man who could move comfortably between trade and profession, artisan and bourgeois class.

Lawyer, monk and artisan represent three aspects of the ideal career. The lawyer represents education, success and social status; the monk represents study, meditation, and dedication, and the artisan represents training, talent and skill. All of these were important for Cézanne in the mid-1860's. Most likely, they were attributes of being an artist, where he found common ground with his father and family on a basis they could understand.

Just as the portraits of his father and of Achille Emperaire appear to be mirrors of the painter's personal goals and conflicts, so too the portraits of Uncle Dominique emerged from a context of professional awareness. His rejection of his father's plan for his career in adult life was an expression of the need for
freedom and creative fulfillment. While the virtues of bourgeois, religious and artisan, are recognized, and perhaps acknowledged, they are nevertheless antitheses to the bohemian artist.

One problem with such a straightforward interpretation of the Uncle Dominique portraits is their dating. Stylistically, they are from 1865 at the very earliest, and more likely 1866. Painted in Aix, they would have had to have been done during Cézanne's summer stays there. It is true that by this time Cézanne had passed the point in his life where the choice of a career held a dominant position in his thinking. His return to Paris in late 1862 had marked the beginning of his career as a professional artist, although he had yet to produce a sale or, with the exception of the 1863 Salon des refusés, to publicly exhibit his works. Thus, these images were produced four years after his fundamental career choice. It does not appear that Cézanne was having second thoughts about his career as an artist. But it was the occasion of his rejection from the 1866 Salon, and one could conjecture that it was a rejection so stinging that he turned to a series of self-justifying images in order to strengthen his own resolve. In this same light one can understand the uncharacteristic letter that he wrote to Count Nieuwerkerke demanding the
reestablishment of the Refusés. Further, it was at this time that Cézanne sought an increase in the stipend received from his father, presumably to gain some degree of freedom in the handling of his own economic affairs. Coming at this critical time, and portraying subjects having specific relevance for the artist, these works seem to suggest that they were fundamental to a reconfirmation and solidification of his understanding of himself, his commitment and confidence.

At the same time that the portraits of Dominique articulate different insights, as a set they also represent a synthesis, an ideal. They point to three "virtues" in the artist: all emerge from a program of education, study, and training; all exhibit a process which manifests itself through success, meditation, and talent; and finally, all three achieve, as a product or as an end result, status, dedication, and skill. All are part of the "work ethic" which becomes so apparent in Cézanne's later life, and of which we have already spoken in the context of his father and Zola. Interestingly, there is no radicalism in the choice of subject or portrayal, as if Cézanne were deliberately disarming the confrontational aspects of his artistic life.

Just as the portraits of his father and of Emperaire reveal an objectivity, so, too, do the portraits of Uncle
Dominique. However, this objectivity is not accomplished without a bold, resolute and vigorous style. In fact, the execution at first appears to contrast sharply with the rather sober, even pensive, outward appearance of each of the works. But the implication of the "couillard" style of the palette knife is that it is a paradigm of a life of vitality, and that it exemplifies the character of the professional achievement he seeks.64

While objectively Realist in appearance, the costume portraits of Uncle Dominique seem to embody a metaphorical relationship to Cézanne's life. Not only the style of the works, but the subject's various guises themselves reflect upon the artist's professional life and the demands of family and public upon it. Whereas the portraits of his father and of Emperaire presented a contrast of two lifestyles, the portraits of the costumed Uncle Dominique look more deeply into the character of one of these lifestyles. If these characters are metaphors of convention, vocation and success, then their appearance at this moment in Cézanne's career is understandable. So far unsuccessful in his chosen vocation, he reflects upon the nature of success, perhaps perceiving that conventional success can only be measured in terms of conventional behavior.
The problem, by implication, that Cézanne sought to address was one of reconciling the demands of these two aspects of his life. On the one hand was a private, bourgeois, and provincial character to his life, exemplified in the portrait of his father and in the Dominique portraits. On the other was a public, bohemian and Parisian life, reflected in his avant-garde interests and exemplified by the portrait of Emperaire. It is in this dilemma that one may perhaps discover the subjective and personal origins of Cézanne's pursuit of an artistic synthesis.

v. L'Ouverture du Tannhäuser

From the time he settled in Paris on a permanent basis, with significant interludes in Provence, in the winter of 1862-1863, until the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war in 1870, Paul Cézanne underwent a gradual radicalization, one having important implications for his art as well as his life. This process was, in a sense, greater than the sum of its parts. In the public realm, Cézanne embraced the ideas of the progressive group of Parisian artists who gathered around Edouard Manet, and for whom the Salon des refusés of 1863 was a rallying point which focused their distaste for official and
academic art of their day. For Cézanne, this group was a forum for learning new ideas about not only painting, but literature and music as well. In the private realm, Cézanne underwent a quieter radicalization, a process of self-realization, in which his individual attitudes and goals as a painter were formulated. The portraits of his father, uncle, and friend are not radical in their subject matter, or even in their contextual implications, though their style is vigorously unconventional. But there are paintings of the 1860's which indicate, at least in their titles, the more public aspect of this process of maturation, paintings which should be understood as public statements of radical awareness.

One painting, in particular, is indicative of this process of radicalization of the 1860's, for it bridges the division between the private and the public aspects of Cézanne's art. It is a rich and complex work, one which illuminates the iconographical perceptions that we have been tracing in the family portraits of this era. It reflects to some extent the synthesis of formal and iconographical features which would express the artist's uniqueness as well as reflect his affiliation with the progressive artistic tendencies of the day. The painting has been entitled in the Venturi catalogue _Jeune fille au piano_; however, as will be shown, there is no doubt that
it is part of the series of paintings which Cézanne himself titled *Ouverture du Tannhäuser* (Plate XXI).  

The genesis of this painting is recorded by Cézanne's friend Fortuné Marion in a series of letters to Heinrich Morstatt, a German musician and instrument salesman who lived briefly in Marseilles (1865-1866). Marion's first description of a painting called *Ouverture du Tannhäuser* is in a letter of August 28, 1866. He writes that it depicts a young girl at a piano, an old man in an armchair, and a child looking on with "the air of an idiot." He notes that the work was virtually completed in a single morning, and has a wild and overpowering appearance. However, no existing work by Cézanne specifically matches this description.

In another letter of June or July, 1867, Marion writes that Cézanne is again thinking of taking up the *Ouverture du Tannhäuser*, apparently on a larger scale. On September 8, he relates that the painting has been started, praising it extensively, but concludes that the work will probably be rejected from the Salon even though "a canvas like this is enough to make an artist's reputation."  

While this painting also cannot be precisely identified with any known painting in Cézanne's oeuvre, it does correspond to what is today known as *Jeune fille*
au piano, suggesting that, if it is not the same, the existing painting is indeed closely related. While Marion states that the girl at the piano in the September 8 painting is fair-haired, the girl in Jeune fille au piano is dark-haired, and most likely a portrait of Cézanne's sister, Marie. Marion mentions that he himself is portrayed in the work, but mentions no other figures. In Jeune fille au piano, there is no male figure at all, but there is another female figure, apparently Cézanne's mother. However, everything else mentioned by Marion corresponds, notably the light tones and finished treatment of the figures. These are unusual in themselves when one considers the relative darkness and bravura painterliness of so much of Cézanne's work during this period. This painting is, in fact, rather restrained in handling for Cézanne, an aspect which Marion recognized and remarked upon.

If Jeune fille au piano is not the same painting that Marion described in 1867, it certainly is one of a series sharing the same fundamental stylistic and compositional features. The important facts remain that the style is unusual in comparison to the bold vigor of Cézanne's other family works, and that the title Cézanne originally gave to the series, Ouverture du Tannhäuser, is contextually significant.
The crux of the painting's meaning is the title. Apparently, Cézanne had the title specifically in mind from the inception. Further, the subject and its presentations were important enough for him to make at least two, and probably three, versions: the spontaneous sketch of 1866; the more finished version, containing a blonde girl and Marion, of 1867; and the extant version, containing Cézanne's sister and mother, probably also from 1867. In his early career, this repetition of subject was rather unusual, but, as we know, it would become his usual practice in later years. The most vexing question, however, is the seeming incongruity between the title and the extant image and style. Apparently, the title was chosen by Cézanne to specifically inform us as to what the girl at the piano is playing. But why was this so important? Relating a scene of domestic music-making to Wagner's opera Tannhäuser seems rather odd, given the fact that the music itself was for a large orchestra, from an expansive opera, and above all an expression of the revolutionary avant-garde. A piano score of the Ouverture was published in Paris in 1861, and thus it is possible that the girl in the painting is indeed playing that particular piece. It does not, however, lessen the
incongruity of the titling with the character of the scene and the provincial setting of the Cézanne home.

Cézanne seems to have had more than description in mind when he began the first version of the painting in 1866. Anyone familiar with music and musical events in the 1860's would have been aware that Wagner's *Tannhäuser* was at the heart of a great controversy about contemporary music in Paris. Wagner's sweeping "music of the future" was regarded by most in much the same way as advanced painting — at best, as a great joke; at worst, a deceit and offense against good taste. Add to this a streak of ultra-nationalism and anti-German sentiment in France in the 1860's, expressed both publicly and privately, and Wagner's music clearly was seen as a pretext for political and artistic debate. In the scramble to side for or against the new music, *Tannhäuser* occupied a place of special honor and controversy. Thus, it is in this context that the implications of Cézanne's title *Ouverture du Tannhäuser* need to be examined.

Richard Wagner's *Tannhäuser* premiered in Dresden in 1845, but it was not until 1861 that the complete opera was performed in France, at the Paris Opéra. The production was a disastrous failure and a major embarrassment to the Imperial government, which had been partly responsible for supporting the production. The
staged disturbances of the conservative Jockey Club during the performances, the exchange of insults and the general chaos which reigned, made any serious attempt to hear the performance, let alone evaluate it, impossible. There were only three performances, on March 13, 18 and 24, before it closed. As an opera, Tannhäuser would not be performed in France again until 1892, and not in Paris until 1895.

Despite the failure, the impact of the work was profound, and many artists and intellectuals rallied to Wagner's defense. Baudelaire's article, "Richard Wagner et Tannhäuser à Paris," appeared on April 1st in La Revue européenne, and although it was mostly written before the premiere of the opera, it was nevertheless a strong defense of Wagner's music and a perceptive critique of the reactionary forces at work in opposition to the composer in Paris.74

Numerous other articles followed as the battle moved from performance hall to press.75 The controversy pitted artistic radicals against artistic conservatives. While the former held Tannhäuser as the epitome of contemporary art, the latter attacked it as an assault upon the senses, a great deceit of the French people at the hands of the German composer. Wagner's supporters included many of the most brilliant writers of the day,
Baudelaire, Gautier and Champfleury among them. Artists were inspired by Tannhäuser's brief appearance in Paris, and numerous scenes based on the work appeared, including those by Eugène Delacroix and Henri Fantin-Latour (Plate XXII).

As the memory of Tannhäuser's Paris performances waned, the controversy subsided but never really died. The event which brought the controversy to the fore again was the performance of the Ouverture du Tannhäuser during Jules Pasdeloup's Sunday "Concerts Populaires de Musique Classique" at the Cirque Napoléon on March 5, 1865. A riot was almost touched off between the pro- and anti-Wagnerites in the audience. Pasdeloup persevered in what amounted to a personal crusade to bring Wagner's music before the Parisian public, performing the Ouverture du Tannhäuser again on April 2 and December 10. Over the next several years he added other Wagner works to his concerts, which became a popular gathering place for artists and writers as well as musicians and critics.

Thus, the Ouverture du Tannhäuser can be construed as a symbol of the struggle of progressive and conservative thinkers over artistic doctrine in the mid-1860's. It represented the forces of unconventional and anti-establishment art in a manner not unlike Manet's Olympia (1863), which also appeared for the first time in
the Salon of 1865. Both works were central to a controversy that exceeded the works themselves and spilled over into the popular press and popular imagination. Because of its controversial Parisian reception, *Tannhäuser* would not be a piece which would sit well with conservatively-inclined music lovers, nor would it have been one for casual listening in a bourgeois parlor. There were too many associations, too many controversies, attached to it. It was the hallmark of radical taste, and, as such, would be unpalatable to those who felt comfortable with the status quo. Indeed, Wagner had been labeled a "realist" by Liszt in 1849, a term associated with "revolutionary" in a political as well as artistic sense, especially after Wagner's participation in the 1849 Dresden revolution. In France, Wagner became, for hostile critics, the "Courbet of music." Thus, artistic doctrine was attached to politics, and revolution and progress in art were seen as synonymous with political and social revolution.

From this, a series of questions arise concerning Cézanne's choice of pictorial format and title. If the *Ouverture du Tannhäuser* was not generally acceptable to bourgeois taste, if the piece involved radical thinking and threatened the status quo, why is it that Cézanne's work depicts a bourgeois interior, presumably that of the
Cézanne family, with his sister playing the piece while his mother listens calmly? Cézanne himself characterized his family as "les plus sales êtres du monde." Obviously, there is a conflict between image, title and contemporary context. What we see is a rather mundane image and a radical title juxtaposed, two seemingly irreconcilable factors depicted by an artist who himself was not quite a bohemian Parisian, yet also no longer completely a provincial.

What was Cézanne's specific knowledge of Wagner's music? He had made his first trip to Paris in April of 1861, arriving almost exactly one month after the final operatic performance of Tannhäuser. The reverberations of its failure were still echoing in the newspapers. It is not very likely that he would have paid much attention. He seems to have been more concerned with acclimating himself to the environment of the city, for the provincial Cézanne does not appear to have moved in a very large intellectual or social circle, having only his boyhood friend, Emile Zola, as an intimate companion. Returning to his parent's home in Aix only five months later, apparently somewhat overwhelmed by the whole experience, it does not seem likely that he had much time in Paris for music or for reading about music.
At the time of the renewed Wagner controversy in 1865, he was more mature. Cézanne was in Paris during the winter of 1864-1865, when the Pasdeloup concert performance of the Ouverture caused renewed confrontations. It seems unlikely that he attended the concert personally. However, he was now part of a circle of young artists who shared enthusiasms for advanced ideas of art and, presumably, contemporary music. In any event, since he was there at the time of the concert, the controversy would have come to his attention through the newspaper accounts and friends.

His Café Guerbois circle included several people interested in Wagner's music. Among them were Frédéric Bazille, Auguste Renoir and Edmond Mâtre. Mâtre, an amateur critic and musician, greatly admired Wagner's music. At least as early as the winter of 1864-1865, he had become friends with Bazille and Renoir, with whom he attended concerts and for whom he performed German music at the piano. Bazille, Renoir and Mâtre had also been part of the circle who met at the house of Commandant Lejosne, Bazille's uncle; here, other Wagner admirers were in attendance, such as Baudelaire and Fantin-Latour. By 1866, this group began to frequent Manet's Café Guerbois evenings. Mâtre is depicted seated at the piano in Bazille's 1870 painting The Artist's Studio, rue
de la Condamine (Plate XXIII), together with Zola, Renoir, Bazille, Manet and Monet. As well, he appears in Fantin-Latour's *A Studio in the Batignolles Quarter* (1870; Plate XXIV) and in Fantin-Latour's homage to musicians, *Autour du piano* (1885; Plate XXV). In the 1870 painting, Zola, Bazille, Renoir, Manet and Monet are present. They were not only friends among themselves, but of Cézanne as well. Cézanne would have had occasion to learn about Wagner's music from them, even before his painting *Ouverture du Tannhäuser* during the summer of 1865.\(^8^4\)

Emile Zola, Cézanne's closest friend and confidant in these years, recorded the activities of the Café Guerbois circle and the artistic scene in Paris during the 1860's in his novel, *L'Oeuvre* (1886). In it, Zola portrays an artist, Gagnière, who has an enthusiasm for music, above all Wagner.\(^8^5\) He not only attends the Pasdeloup concerts, but gets a black eye at one.\(^8^6\) Zola was aware of the important place the *Ouverture du Tannhäuser* occupied for these contenders for modern music. This is testified to by his rather lengthy description of the piece in the novel, as mouthed by Gagnière.\(^8^7\) Zola even owned one of Fantin-Latour's *Tannhäuser* lithographs, the "Tannhäuser on the Venusberg."\(^8^8\) With such a friend so keenly in touch,
Cézanne could hardly have missed the Wagner controversy of the 1860's and its implications, even if he learned of it secondhand.

There is written evidence that Cézanne had first-hand knowledge of Wagner's music. Even though it has been generally assumed that Cézanne first learned of Wagner through Heinrich Morstatt, whom he had met through Marion sometime around 1865 and whom we know performed Wagner (presumably on the piano) for both Marion and Cézanne, it appears that he already knew of the Wagner debate before he met Morstatt. Since the earliest they could have met was during the summer of 1865 (when Cézanne had returned to Aix), it is after the March concert in Paris featuring the Ouverture du Tannhäuser and after the controversy over Wagner had been stirred up again. Certainly, Cézanne would have sought Morstatt's opinion, since Morstatt was not only a German, but also a music scholar, later a teacher at the Stuttgart Music Conservatory.

The specific evidence that Cézanne actually heard Wagner in concert comes from a note that he appended to a letter, one from Marion to Morstatt dated May 24, 1868. Cézanne reports that "j'ai eu le bonheur d'entendre l'ouverture de Tannhäuser, de Lohengrin et du Hollandais volant." Cézanne had been in Paris during the winter
immediately preceding the note, and a survey of concert performances of Wagner's music in late 1867 and early 1868 shows that the only appearances of the overtures to Tannhäuser and The Flying Dutchman, and the Prelude to Lohengrin were at the Pasdeloup concerts. The performances of the Ouverture du Tannhäuser were December 8, 1867, and February 23, 1868; the The Flying Dutchman overture was performed on January 26, 1868; and the Prélude de Lohengrin was performed on November 24, 1867, and April 19, 1868. Thus, Cézanne himself records that he was interested enough in Wagner to seek out the music directly, and at the source of the controversy, Pasdeloup's concerts at the Cirque Napoléon. While these concerts postdate the second version (as described by Marion) of his painting Ouverture du Tannhäuser, the interest in Wagner is nevertheless significant. If the extant version followed this second one, it would have been closer in time to the moment when he was actually listening to Wagner's music, in the winter of 1867-1868.

But, Cézanne did not choose an image from the opera, or from one of the many representations from it then available, most notably Fantin-Latour's painting in the 1864 Salon. He chose instead the image of a woman playing the piano. There were numerous scenes of this sort executed by the artists with whom Cézanne associated
in Paris, many done around the time he was working on his own painting. The most notable is a now-lost work by Bazille of a young woman playing the piano while a man listens, which was rejected by the jury of the 1866 Salon. Also worthy of mention are Edgar Degas' painting Manet Listening to his Wife Playing the Piano (c. 1865; Plate XXVI), and Manet's own Madame Edouard Manet au Piano, (c. 1867-1868; Plate XXVII). None of these, however, are titled with any indication of the specific piece being performed. Instead, they are genre portraits reminiscent of Dutch music-making paintings.

The focus of Cézanne's work is, then, the confluence of scene, title and context. In fact, by choice of image and title, Cézanne appears to assert his artistic independence and individuality for the first time. By 1867, when the second and third versions of the work were being painted, he had apparently recovered from the introspective moodiness and private anxiety that had characterized his 1866 portraits of his father and Achille Emperaire. Perhaps this work marks the first time he felt a strong artistic orientation and a clear direction. His alliance with the most advanced artists in Paris, both visual and musical, was based on the radicalization of his own temperament and outlook. This bohemian outlook is apparent in the title. His
commitment to Realism, already seen in the portraits of the period, is apparent in the image. But, his self-knowledge and attachment to his home in Provence are also apparent in the persons and setting depicted. His sister sets forth the radical music calmly and forthrightly. His mother listens quietly and diligently.

Even though Cézanne never saw the opera performed, he would have been aware of the theme and nature of Wagner's tale. Tannhäuser, too, is an artist faced with choice. At first captivated by Venus, he renounces the immortality she offers him, and is therefore shunned by her. During the second act "cour d'amour" (itself derived from the poetry and song contests of the Provençal troubadours), Tannhäuser sings the praises of physical love, and is banished for his blasphemy. Finally, torn between returning to the embrace of Venus and remaining unforgiven in the realm of mortals, he overcomes temptation and repents sensual love just in time to learn of his forgiveness. Thus, the opera opposes sensual and platonic love, illusion and art, paganism and Christianity. Tannhäuser as artist must renounce the illusions of the sensual world to rise to the ideal. It is this that struck a responsive chord in those who were struggling with their art and its societal context. It is a scenario for those who, like Cézanne,
perceived a host of irreconcilable oppositions in their pursuit of this ideal balance in their art.

Through a contrast between the family circle (the persons and setting of the painting) and the artistic milieu of Paris (the title), Cézanne encapsulates his dilemma. Repeatedly, Cézanne felt obliged not only to acknowledge his interest in and alliance with radical art, but to reiterate his very choice of a career as an artist. His family was provincial, bourgeois and conservative, but they listened and were supportive. While a Parisian family and setting would have possessed all that was negative to his existence, this family setting did not. True, he was financially dependent upon them, and especially his father, but he was also secure in his quest, especially considering the time it would take, and ultimately he would chose to remain, like his father, in Provence.

Marion's statement that the painting was "enough to make an artist's reputation" was certainly prescient in light of what has been said here. It was exactly what Cézanne intended. The painting was, in a sense, a manifesto of purpose for Cézanne, a forward-looking work that contained both a personal and a public meaning.

The portraits of Louis-Auguste Cézanne, Achille Emperaire, and Dominique Aubert, and the Ouverture du
Tannhäuser represent steps toward a reconciliation and a coming to terms with the difficult choices that faced Cézanne in the early years of his career. Finding his progress to success a slow-moving one, he felt the need to express the dilemma of artistic success in terms understandable to himself, and perhaps to those who supported him. In broad terms, these paintings are about commitment and the promise of accomplishment. More narrowly, they indicate the problem of specific dualities, Paris and Provence, progressive and conservative, bohemian and bourgeois.
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See especially the letter of 29 December, 1859, where Zola tells Baille that they and Cézanne "prendrons une petite chambre à deux et nous mènerions une vie de bohèmes." Correspondance, I, 118. Also the letter of 3 March, 1861, pp. 271-73. These letters are reprinted in part in Cézanne, Correspondance, the former on p. 62 and the latter on pp. 66-9, where it is dated 1860.

Zola, Correspondance, I, 249; Cézanne, Correspondance, p. 90. The equation of artistic liberty with sexual liberty was an important part of Henri Murger's bohemia, and it fueled a continuing stereotype of the artist and his model. Murger's Scènes de la vie de bohème was the literary model of this view of bohemian life; see Easton, p. 123.
Easton notes that by 1867, the date of the publication of the Goncourts' *Manette Salomon*, that "Bohemianism had come to signify a state of invariable idleness and mediocrity." p. 163. Used as an anti-bohemian stereotype, the Goncourts perpetuated this conception in their novel, rejecting Murger and his idea of Bohemia. But as Renoir's painting *At the Inn of Mother Anthony, Marlotte*, 1866, indicates, Murger's ghost still occupied the minds of the young generation of artists in Paris, for in that painting a drawing of Murger appears on the wall in the background. Rewald, *The History of Impressionism*, p. 134.
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In the context of costume and the social appearance of people, and especially in the context of Manet's portraits, Baudelaire comes immediately to mind. His interest in modern life included a keen awareness of the clothing of the modern person, as his famous quote about "combien nous sommes grands et poétiques dans nos cravates et nos bottes vernies" indicates. One wonders, however, how great the element of irony is in such statements. Charles Baudelaire, "Salon de 1845," in Claude Pichois, ed., *Oeuvres complètes de Baudelaire* (Paris, 1961), p. 866.

The Venturi catalogue numbers are 72-77, 79, 80, and 82. The dates can be established by Valabrègue's reference to Cézanne's uncle as model in his letter to Zola from late 1866, cited in Rewald, 1968, pp. 80-1.

One cannot help but be struck by the variety of headgear that appears in Cézanne's portraiture, not only in the early period, but throughout his career. Even in his self-portraits, we find several different kinds of
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The painting by Fantin based on Tannhäuser was shown in the 1864 Salon as well: Scene from Tannhäuser (Tannhäuser on the Venusberg), see Douglas Druick and Michel Hoog, Fantin-Latour, exh. cat. (Ottawa, 1983), pp. 159-62.
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The letter is to Pissarro, October 23, 1866; Cézanne, Correspondance, p. 124.

In 1859 Zola remarked that Cézanne didn't read the newspapers, and encouraged him to pick Le Siècle occasionally to keep abreast of events. Whether Cézanne took the advice or not is not known, although by the 1870's he seems to have been an avid follower of the journals. Zola, Correspondance, I, 119; Cézanne, Correspondance, p. 63.


See Daulte, "A True Friendship...," p. 26, on the significant place that music had in the lives of painters in Paris, to the extent that numerous composers performed their works on the pianos which were found in the studios of several artists. Gabriel Fauré performed in Bazille's studio, Chabrier in Manet's studio.
The relationship of Cézanne and Bazille is an interesting one, if considered in the context of their works. The similarities in their backgrounds, the parallelism of some of their themes, and the common sources which they utilized, brings them together much closer than scholarship generally concedes. There does not seem to be much evidence for a close personal relationship, although they knew each other as early as 1863. It is possible that Cézanne had Bazille's rejected 1866 painting of a girl at a piano in mind when he did his own work in the same year.

85 Zola may have had Frédéric Bazille in mind when he created the character of Gagnière; see Niess, p. 187.


87 Zola, O.C., V, 599.


90 Cézanne, Correspondance, p. 130.

91 Kahane and Wild, p. 158.

92 Besides Edgar Degas' Manet Listening to his Wife Playing the Piano, c.1865, there are other images of related topics: Jeunes filles au piano, c.1865, Mme Camus au piano, 1869 (refused from the 1869 Salon), and Mile Marie Dihau, c.1869-72. See Paul André Lemoisne, Degas et son oeuvre, II (Paris, 1946); the paintings are catalogue numbers 127, 130, 207, and 263, respectively.

For Manet's work, see Denis Rouart and Daniel Wildenstein, Edouard Manet, catalogue raisonné (Lausanne and Paris, 1975), I, 124, no. 131.
Fantin-Latour's etching "A Piece by Schumann" of 1864 might be seen as an exception to this genre. Fantin classified Schumann with Wagner as a progressive composer, and his etching represents his "conversion" of the Edwards to the appreciation of Schumann's music. Druick and Hoog, p. 143.
CHAPTER III

THE ROMANTIC AND THE REALIST

1. Background

The character of Paul Cézanne's art in the mid-1860's, which culminated with the Ouverture du Tannhäuser in 1867, reflected, in part, his attitudes toward a number of perceived conflicts. Chief among these was that between his avant-garde tastes and intentions, and his continued attachment to the familial and personal world of his home in Provence. But another conflict was one of direction. Cézanne was faced with the dilemma of choosing the stylistic path to take in pursuit of his artistic goals. Realism was the dominant influence upon him, but it was by no means clear that Realism provided the singular route by which he could express himself fully. Hence, recurrent Romantic aspects of both style and subject matter entered his art as well.

The reconciliation of this latter conflict occupied Cézanne's mind in the years just before and after the Franco-Prussian War. Becoming more familiar with the
state of French art in his own day, he was better able to see his own position in relation to his contemporaries. The element of irony found in some of his paintings of this period perhaps reflects his perception of that position. In following the path of Ouverture du Tannhäuser, which demonstrated the disparity between the public and private arenas of his career, Cézanne began to devote more energy at the end of the 1860's to expressing the outward intentions of his style and subject matter, rather than reflecting upon his personal doubts. His approach to painting changed gradually to become more sophisticated and intellectual.

Cézanne had already manifested the desires and values of the late bohemians, those Romantic and Realist artists and writers who saw themselves as separated from established society, conventions and tastes. Independence was extolled in both social and artistic matters, and the lifestyle adopted by Cézanne reflected his deep-felt need for such independence. Realism, manifested in a bold and monochromatic manner, was the primary means of his artistic independence and radicalism. The desired end of his radicalism was based on the conviction that change could be effected through an overturning of existing institutional values, i.e., those which guided the juries of the Salons. The failure
of his radical and temperamental paintings of 1865-1867 to achieve the sought-after success in the Salons somewhat tempered his enthusiasm for his own deliberately provocative style of painting.

After 1867, his radicalism gave way to liberalism. Instead of seeking sudden and dramatic success, Cézanne seems to have been content to work more quietly and gradually toward his progressive goals. While the Salon remained the primary forum of artistic exhibition, alternatives such as independent exhibitions, like those of Courbet and Manet in 1867, opened new possibilities for independent artists to show their work. The works that Cézanne submitted to the Salon seem, in effect, attempts to bluster the jury into submission. There appears to have been little question, really, of such works being accepted. The bohemian attitude that gave birth to such attempts made it virtually mandatory that shock and scandal be generated by one's paintings. True to the spirit of the Romantic cult of genius, he seems to have believed that taking the Salon, and the Parisian art scene, by storm was to be accomplished through one's ability to render one's temperament in a forceful manner. The independent exhibitions of Courbet and Manet, however, had proved a point about the failure of the jury system, as Zola's 1866 critical articles also
They also raised the question of just what constituted success for an artist in Paris.

If Cézanne's paintings of the later 1860's can be characterized in general, we should say that they took a more "literary" approach to content. Such titles as Un Après-midi à Naples, Une Moderne Olympia and Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe evoke not only artistic precedents, but literary or poetic ones as well. By using the term "literary," I do not imply that the works are programmatic. Instead, Cézanne adopted an approach to subject matter based on such literary devices as irony and parody. It will be recalled that he had already utilized metaphorical references in the portraits of Uncle Dominique. Through these devices, Cézanne more sharply delineated his thoughts on the artistic issues which confronted him, such as the problems of defining a personal style, and the relationship of the artist to the public and his fellow painters. Also, I do not imply that the paintings necessarily have a literary source. As earlier, Cézanne's art is divided between works whose primary function was formal, and those in which formal and iconographic functions are combined.

His style in the late 1860's, to be sure, was still controversial, but it was not as boldly exaggerated as it was earlier. Indeed, Cézanne's style began to show a
significant influence from Manet and especially Delacroix; from the former, a structured system of seeing and recording nature, and from the latter, a means to this system through color. He also began to stress iconographical relations between works of this period, both within and between groupings of paintings. In these groupings, Cézanne chose a subject and established a manner of presentation, and then repeated it with significant variations. Further, in at least two groupings, an opposition is apparent in the treatment of different sides of the same issue, a situation not unlike the portraits of his father and of Emperaire.

The genesis of these literary interests is found earlier. Despite his Realist tendencies and vocabulary, Cézanne produced from the beginning of his career several works which were basically Romantic in inspiration and effect. These were intended to shock, to disturb, to express a deep unrest on the part of the artist. Subjects such as murder, rape and erotic folly were treated in a dark, tortuous style. Due to this, they had little affinity with the mainstream of contemporary art or even with his own Realist portraits and genre pieces.

One confronts a decidedly Romantic element in paintings like L'Enlèvement (Plate XXVIII) or La Toilette funèbre (Plate XXIX), where violence and the macabre
reflect a stormy temperament and a powerful mood. Further, it was a Romanticism steeped in literary and poetic tradition. While Cézanne was basically alone among painters in this Realist translation of Romantic torment, he was not alone in literature. Also depicting this dark and violent world, which straddled Realism and Romanticism, was his friend Emile Zola, who, at the same time, was writing novels and stories that featured similar grim events, painted in a similar dark imagery, while incorporating realistic descriptiveness.

In the late 1860's and early 1870's, the significant subjects of Cézanne were more in the public realm. With his difficulties in exhibiting his works, that public was basically composed of his peers and sympathetic friends. On one level, the subjects were directed to the public in the sense that they existed within a tradition. This is especially true for the picnics and luncheon scenes, which have strong ties to the fête galante tradition of the eighteenth century. Cézanne's subjects also made reference, or contained allusions, to contemporary paintings already in the public eye. The two paintings entitled Une Moderne Olympia (1869-70 and 1873-75, respectively), not only make clear reference to a significant painting by Manet, but engage a controversy in the public realm. In the case of Manet's Olympia, the
controversy held the greatest of implications for progressive artists.

With Cézanne's appeal to public knowledge and his move away from rather private and introspective imagery, one may wonder about the exact social implications of Cézanne's stance and the perceptions of him by others. His public behavior was perhaps eccentric, or at the least embodied the attempts of an insecure young man to draw attention to himself in the face of a largely unimpressed crowd. His art, it seems, simply followed suit. But some of Cézanne's eccentricities apparently carried political overtones, even though perhaps slight. As early as 1866, Marion speaks of his "revolutionary beard" and long hair.  

He goes further to say in 1867 that Cézanne's name "is already too well known, too many revolutionary ideas in art are connected with it." In 1877, Duranty noted that Cézanne's dressed in "one of his costumes of olden times," and that such appearances were "dangerous demonstrations." Dangerous to whom? Perhaps to those who would view such manners and dress as that of the dread radicalism that haunted the moderates and conservatives, especially after 1871.

In Paris, he wore a bright red sash and the blue smock of a worker, a costume that linked him politically to republican-socialism. At home, there is little to
indicate such activity. But, Cézanne's affinity with the Aix working classes, with whom he regularly fraternized in his later years, might just as well demonstrate his preference for a more egalitarian lifestyle, one less demanding and intrusive, than that offered by either the urban bohemian or the provincial bourgeoisie.\(^{11}\)

Admittedly, the connection between Cézanne's artistic and political radicalism is a tenuous one. Cézanne does not appear to have made any overt political statements or taken any actions. But his dress, his provincial mannerism, and his association with radical artistic thought could have created, in the mind of a public sensitive to political symbolism, an image of the artist contrary to the accepted or acceptable norms of both the art establishment and the middle class as a whole.\(^{12}\) His public appearance and behavior does not seem to have strengthened bonds with his Parisian friends and acquaintances, either.

The years between the *Ouverture du Tannhäuser* (1867-1868) and Cézanne's move to Auvers-sur-Oise (1873) were a time of reevaluation for the artist. The works of this period are more transitional than definitive. Seen in isolation, they present a somewhat perplexing picture, but, when they are considered in the context of a developing continuity, this confusion is cleared away.
11. Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe and Realism

The continuation of Cézanne's Realist interests in the late 1860's, and their modification in the early 1870's, is embodied in a series of paintings of picnics, outings, promenades, and fishing scenes. The paintings, subdivided by subject, are the luncheons (V. 107, 234, 238), dating from c. 1869 to 1873-75; the promenades (V. 96, 116, 119, 120), which range in date from 1866 to 1870-71; the fishing scenes (V. 115, 230, 232), which date from 1867-70 to 1872-75; and the outdoor gatherings (V. 231, 234, 238), from 1872-73 to 1873-75. Also related are the genre scenes V. 235 and V. 236 (both 1872-75), and the peculiar pair of images Pastorale (V. 104), dated 1870, and Scène fantastique (V. 243), c. 1873-75.

Unlike Ouverture du Tannhäuser, or as we shall see later, L'Après-midi à Naples, where the subject is handled with stylistic variations over a series of three works, the picnics and outdoor scenes occur in early and late pairs. The clearest examples of this can be found in the set Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe (c. 1869; V. 107; Plate XXX) and Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe (1873-75; V. 238; Plate XXXI); and in Pastorale (1870; V. 104; Plate XXXII)
and Scène fantastique (1873-75; V. 243; Plate XXXIII). The stylistic evolution of both sets is from a fairly monochromatic treatment to a coloristic one, following the general development that occurs in Cézanne's work before and after 1870. While both the early Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe and Pastorale are value-structured, they differ in subject; Le Déjeuner is bourgeois in character, while Pastorale seems more rural in tone and setting. The later Déjeuner and Scène fantastique are both coloristic in treatment, but their subject matter again contrasts, as Déjeuner is rustic, while Scène fantastique seems more park-like and bourgeois. As with the portraits of his father and Emperaire, there is a contrast and comparison of attitude expressed through the choice and presentation of the subject matter. Further, as with Ouverture du Tannhäuser, there is a seeming urban versus provincial aspect, even though the two settings are in the country - one is more rustic and rural, the other more park-like. The park settings reveal figures who are more fashionably dressed, and more sober in character and activity; the rural settings are more rustic and more sensual, as well as perhaps more natural in manner.

Cézanne's two Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe paintings immediately recall Manet's 1863 painting of the same
title, and establish his interest in this work. Manet's Déjeuner (Plate XXXIV) was of such stature for the rising generation of Realists who witnessed the 1863 Salon des refusés that it acquired the aura of a Realist icon. But obviously this was not the exclusive source of inspiration for the works. If Cézanne was responding directly to Manet's work, the gap of some six years between its exhibition and the creation of the first of Cézanne's works with the same title seems too long. Cézanne came much closer to Manet's conception of Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe in Pastorale, or when he was treating the theme of bathers later in the 1870's and 1880's. Nearer in time to Cézanne's paintings on the subject, luncheon or picnic scenes were popular among the future Impressionists, such as Monet and Bazille (Plate XXXV). Indeed, there is a closer formal relation to Monet's Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe of 1866 (Plate XXXVI) in Cézanne's original conception of the theme, than to that of Manet.18

Cézanne's picnics are not conceived in terms of sixteenth century allegory either, although he knew Giorgione's painting in the Louvre (Plates XXXVII and XXXVIII).19 They are instead more at home in the eighteenth century, having more to do with the fête champêtre scenes of Watteau (Plate XXXIX). Perhaps the
closest contemporary painter who produced this kind of imagery was Auguste-Barthelemy Glaize, in *Le Gouter champêtre* of 1850-51 (Plate XL).

These relationships between Cézanne's works and various other artists' styles suggests something of the underlying differences between the contemporary Déjeuner and *Pastorale*. Manet's *Déjeuner* was derived from a classical prototype, Raphael's *Judgment of Paris*. The rather sober character of Manet's painting thus reflects the nature of this source, translated into a Realist idiom. Claude Monet's *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe* also has a reserved character, no doubt strongly influenced by Manet, though more contemporary in viewpoint. In Monet's work, the class character of the subject, a bourgeois picnic, as opposed to a rustic or bohemian one, is underscored by the reserved air of the participants. This same sobriety is evident in Cézanne's early Déjeuner. While contemporary in viewpoint, like Monet's work, Cézanne painting ultimately reflects the influence of Manet and the classical mode contained within his Realist style.

*Pastorale* represents a different character. More sensual and rustic, it still contains a quotation of Manet's *Déjeuner*. The clothed men and nude women may suggest Manet, but the manner of depiction and the
overall tone of the work does not. Here, Cézanne perceived the Romantic heritage that Manet had subsumed, a heritage he had taken an increasing interest in, and which would be clearly evidenced in *L'Après-midi à Naples*. The more Romantic tradition of Giorgione, Rubens and Watteau seems to be a more appropriate source for the atmosphere and character of *Pastorale* than the Classical tradition of Raphael. Indeed, the revival of interest in the 18th century on the part of 19th century artists, as reflected in Glaize's *Le Gouter champêtre*, brought this tradition into a contemporary context. 21 The development of colorism from Giorgione through Rubens and Watteau to Delacroix would be a major influence on Cézanne in the 1870's.

The early *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe* and *Pastorale* thus represent the two stylistic aspects with which Cézanne was primarily concerned in the late 1860's. On the one hand, *Le Déjeuner* refers to Manet's Realist style in a contemporary mode. On the other, *Pastorale* reflects the Romantic tradition, also updated to a contemporary context, and pointing toward the coloristic style of the 1870's. The restatement of both *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe* and *Pastorale* in the 1870's was through the new coloristic style Cézanne began to develop early in the decade. The tradition of Rubens, and, ultimately,
Delacroix, holds forth more strongly in these latter works, despite the continued separation of a Realist and a Romantic character in the subjects.

If Cézanne consciously developed the works of the 1870's from the 1869 paintings, the implication is that the shift in style necessitated a fresh exposition of the subject. While there are common stylistic features within each group of paintings, it is clear that Cézanne made a careful distinction between subjects. Retaining the contrast of (urban) Realism and (rustic) Romanticism, the works of the 1870's do not offer a further explanation of what precisely Cézanne intended with this subject beyond the distinction between the two traditions. In both sets, the actions depicted and the range of characters portrayed invite a narrative reading, backed by numerous literary descriptions of similar picnics and outings. But any narrative scheme, if indeed there is one, is obscure. To merely say that picnics and outings, promenades and boating trips, were a feature of Parisian and provincial life, and that artists commonly painted such events as typical of their time, however, does not shed light on their meaning either.

Both of the early works, Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe and Pastorale, contain self-portraits. In each painting, his self-representation carries a distinct character. In
Pastorale, that character is of ennui and detachment. The Romantic nature of the work is underscored by the pose of his self-portrait, as it is borrowed from Delacroix's *Death of Sardanapalus*. In *Le Déjeuner*, Cézanne's self-portrait takes on a bourgeois character through costume, with the fashionable tophat beside him. Within the Realist style of this latter painting, the intent would seem to be an ironic one. When Zola, Cézanne, and their friends vacationed in Bennecourt, they did not do so in imitation of the middle-class, a point that Zola made clear in his "Une farce, ou bohèmes en villégiature." Through the presence of the artist himself, *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe* becomes more than just a genre scene. Just as the *Ouverture du Tannhäuser* depicted a middle-class genre scene whose meaning was undercut by the implications associated with the title, so *Le Déjeuner* seems to express a tension between the reality of everyday life and a metaphorical, and possibly fictive, interpretation of that life.

The explicit relationship of *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe* and *Pastorale* not only through style, but in the inclusion of the self-portrait, expresses the dilemma of Cézanne's art in the late 1860's. The role that Cézanne occupies in each work, one bourgeois, the other bohemian, seems to be not just a reflection of the two aspects of
his lifestyle, one provincial, the other Parisian, but a metaphor for two modes of painting. The bourgeois image of the artist is contained within the painting most clearly Realist in orientation. The bohemian Cézanne is found in the more Romantic of the two works. In the earlier discussion of the portraits of Uncle Dominique, we demonstrated how the different roles of the sitter represent aspects of an ideal vocation, as well as the different facets of a troubling decision about choice of career and direction. Here, in Le Déjeuner and Pastorale, the roles are occupied by the artist himself, and the implications are also about a decision of direction. The appeal of both Realism and Romanticism vie for his attention; his choice will determine the direction his personal style will take.

The personal nature of these two works, and thus their significance, resides in the self-portraits. In other related works, like Les Promeneurs (V. 96; Plate XLI), La Promenade (V. 116 and 119; Plates XLII and XLIII) and La Conversation (V. 120; Plate XLIV), this significance is not readily apparent. They lack the personal involvement that the self-portraits provide. Les Promeneurs is a sketchy image of Marion and Valabrège in a landscape. In La Promenade (V. 116), the figures seem to be totally anonymous. In La
Conversation (1870-1871), the two women are apparently the artist's sisters, with two men in the background. The rather fashionable image projected in La Conversation by the sitters is perhaps an ironic touch, although he could have reflected the aspirations of his sisters to fulfill these roles in real life. He paints his sisters again in V. 119, whose composition was copied from a fashion magazine plate.

The personal nature of Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe and Pastorale also signifies Cézanne's identification of the expressive possibilities of the two modes of these works. Just as the title Ouverture du Tannhäuser evoked the public memory of a controversial artistic issue, so Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe also conjures up a debate over style and artistic doctrine that would have still been on the minds of viewers in 1869. Cézanne gave the controversial title Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe to the more innocuous of the two 1869 paintings, the one most clearly in the Realist style, with a subject matter that appealed to an urban and bourgeois mentality. When Cézanne used the title again in the mid-1870's, the controversy was by no means dead, and, with the direction that the Impressionists had taken with their exhibition in 1874, it was just as relevant to the problems of independent artists as before.
Compositionally, Cézanne's *Pastorale* is closer to Manet's *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe*. While the Romantic moodiness of the Cézanne contrasts with Manet's factual rendering, the nude women and clothed men in both works are strikingly unconventional. Giving such an image the title *Pastorale* could again be construed as ironic. Flaunting the conventions of pastoral imagery in art, Cézanne chose to reinterpret the subject of Manet's work with his own personal embellishments. The self-portrait further personalizes the image, as if Cézanne were laying claim to a controversy and a method of working that Manet had pioneered. But the conflation, or synthesis, of Realist and Romantic concerns in a single work is indicative of Cézanne's thinking at the end of the decade.

Cézanne had, by that time, come to the realization that his direction as an artist lay elsewhere from Manet. The shift in style that took place after the war was not only an acknowledgement of his own stylistic accomplishment, but the rejection of Manet's direction. Perhaps, then, Cézanne's use of the subject and title of Manet's *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe* were expressions of independence from Manet's influence. The restatement of the title in the mid-1870's, at a time when Cézanne was reexamining old themes and subjects in his new coloristic
style, was a final gesture of individuality that indicated just how far from Manet he had moved.

The Manet references in the picnics and outdoors scenes are not parody. Cézanne treated them seriously, and there is no outright criticism of Manet in the treatment of any of the scenes that either carry the title of Manet's work, or borrow motifs from it. But there is a sense of irony. It is ironic that Cézanne should turn to two modes of painting, Romantic as well as Realist, to interpret Manet and Manet's controversial painting. In discovering, or revealing, a Romantic aspect to *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe*, and then recasting that work into his own broadly expressive Romanticism, Cézanne made a statement about his own interests in artistic synthesis. He found within Manet's work a small truth about art, that being that modernity in art is always dependent upon an understanding and perception of art history. Romanticism, long overshadowed by Realism, still remained a viable and significant force in the creation of contemporary art.

iii. Romanticism and *L'Après-midi à Naples*

In many respects, Cézanne's Romantic *L'Après-midi à Naples* is the opposite of his Realist *Le Déjeuner sur
l'herbe. Mediating the two extremes of approach are paintings like *Pastorale*, which combines Realist and Romantic aspects. The *Naples* series, overtly exotic in setting and erotic in character, contrasts sharply with the more familiar setting and sober activities exemplified by *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe*. The series is based on Romantic prototypes and reflects an essentially Romantic viewpoint.

In turning to Romanticism at the end of the 1860's, Cézanne seems, at first sight, to have contradicted his ambition to establish himself as an avant-garde artist. Why should Cézanne have taken an interest in, or have been influenced by Romanticism at all? By the 1860's, Romanticism carried connotations of official approval. With the death of Delacroix in 1863, a reassessment of his art and his place in history took place, elevating the esteem for his accomplishment. His works, such as those for St. Sulpice in Paris, still astonished the contemporary viewer. It was Delacroix's stylistic approach to composition through color, however, that became the major influence on second and third-generation Realists, as they sought a coloristic solution to the problem of representing nature, while simultaneously embodying their reactions to it. Further, Delacroix provided a personal example of individual genius and
long-term accomplishment in the face of adversity and critical rejection. Thus, his Romanticism had personal appeal for an artist who had experienced the difficulties of gaining critical success through a temperament-dominated style. Cézanne's bohemian guise, or role, however, was not similar to Delacroix's persona.

Ambroise Vollard described the genesis of a painting similar to L'Après-midi à Naples, which he placed around 1866. Indeed, Cézanne sent a painting titled Le Grog au vin to the 1867 Salon, but, it was rejected. This latter title is sometimes used to describe some of the works that are here discussed under the rubric, L'Après-midi à Naples. The work originated as a figure study, but, according to Vollard, it was embellished in process with a woman serving a wine punch to the nude male sitter. Guillemet was supposed to have suggested the title L'Après-midi à Naples. This rather impulsive change of composition, if true, suggests that Cézanne gave little thought to content, and was simply making a Romantic gesture. But, like Ouverture du Tannhäuser, another work whose origins seem to have been rather spontaneous, other versions of L'Après-midi à Naples followed the initial one.

There are three existing oil versions of the subject. The earliest (V. 112; Plates XLV and XLVI) is
subtitled "Le Punch au rhum" in the Venturi catalog and is dated by him about 1870-1872. It is a small work, only fourteen by twenty-four centimeters. The work belonged to Vollard, and, given his account of the related composition described above, the subtitle may originate with him. The two later versions (V. 223; Plates XLVII and XLVIII; V. 224; Plate XLIX) date from about 1872-1875, and are larger in format (30 x 40 cm and 37 x 45 cm, respectively). All three include three figures, with two lying naked on a bed, and the third, a servant, shown holding a tray. The compositions are similar, as well, with the reclining figures in the foreground, a swag of drapery on the left side, and the servant in the left middleground, facing right. The variations among the three are quite interesting. In the first (V. 112) and V. 223 (the second in chronological order?), the servant is fully clothed, whereas in V. 224 (the latest?), the servant is partially naked and is black. In the earliest (V. 112), there is a glass or bottle on a table in the right middleground. In the next (V. 223), there is an overturned table or chair in the left foreground. An additional drapery has been added, hanging on the right side of the scene. In the last (V. 224), the table or overturned object of the earlier works has been replaced by a niche-like opening in the wall, in
which a jug and a glass have been placed, and what appears to be a freestanding mirror has been added.

The earliest version is little more than a sketch, being small in scale and lacking detail. There are similarities between its treatment and other late 1860's paintings. The modeling of the figures resembles that of La Tentation de Saint-Antoine, (c. 1869; V. 103). The thick paint is similar to that in Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe (V. 107) and Pastorale (V. 104), both c. 1869-1870.

The second version (V. 223) is a more controlled and finished presentation of the subject: the composition less crowded, the figures more fully elaborated. Its increased solidity and lighter palette has affinities to the style Cézanne began to develop after he moved to Pontoise and Auvers in 1872. The touch is lighter and more broken, similar to, though less systematic than, the brushwork found in Au bord de l'étang, (c. 1873-74; V. 232) and Scène fantastique, (c. 1873-75; V. 243).

The last L'Après-midi à Naples shares characteristics with immediately post-Pontoise/Auvers works, like La Lutte d'amour, (c. 1875-76; V. 379 and 380) and L'Éternel féminin, (c. 1875-77; V. 247). The paint is lightly applied, the figures are more attenuated, and the linear outlines of the shapes are more pronounced. This work also shares several
similarities with the second and last version of *Une Moderne Olympia*, (c. 1873; V. 225), including the appearance of a black servant and the reclining woman's pose, with legs drawn up toward her chest.

In the earliest and the latest versions, it is readily apparent that the two figures on the bed are a man and a woman. Cézanne traditionally differentiated the two by skin tone, making the man a darker, bronzed hue. This treatment is found as early as his painting *Contrastes* (V. 87; Plate L), executed in the mid-1860's and again in *L'Enlèvement* (V. 101) in 1867. In the second work of the series (V. 223), however, the figures' sex is not clear; perhaps they are two women. The poses are ambiguous, and the hair styling provides no clue either. Both have similar light skin tones, and both are rather muscular, as is typical of Cézanne's female nudes. The ambivalence, however, is not unusual, for it is found in such earlier paintings as *La Tentation de Saint-Antoine*, c. 1869 (V. 103) and in *Baigneurs et baigneuses*, c. 1870 (V. 113; Plate LI). This sexual ambiguity, or androgyny, is an important feature of Cézanne's late bather paintings, of the 1890's and 1900's.

The sources of *L'Après-midi à Naples* can be found in both Romantic and Realist traditions. Delacroix's *Death
of Sardanapalus (1826; Plate LII) bears a certain relationship in image and mood. So, too, do Courbet's Sleeping Women and Woman with a Parrot (both 1866; Plates LIII and LIV). The influence of the latter painting, which Cézanne probably saw in the 1866 Salon, goes beyond the rather abandoned pose of the nude woman. In two of the preliminary drawings related to L'Après-midi à Naples (C. 278 and 280; Plates LV and LVI), dated by Chappuis 1870-74 and 1871-75, respectively, we see a bird, with wings spread wide as it flies above the reclining figures, and, in the latter, a perch not unlike the one in Manet's Woman with a Parrot (1866; Plate LVII). The tradition of the odalisque, from Delacroix and Ingres to Renoir, must also be seen as an influence on Cézanne's nudes and their servants. Ingres' Odalisque and Slave (1842; Plate LVIII) has as much relevance as Renoir's 1870 Woman of Algiers (Plate LVIX). One must not neglect to relate Manet's Olympia (1863, Salon of 1865; Plate LX) to Cézanne's image, either. But all these works represent the traditions which L'Après-midi à Naples derives from, rather than specific sources.

A specific literary source would be helpful, but apparently there is none. As with the Tannhäuser series, the title stands out as incongruous. Even if Vollard is correct in saying that the title was suggested by
Guillemet, Cézanne apparently concurred with it. Why did the painting's subject evoke Naples specifically, and not Paris, as in a naturalistic novel, or North Africa, as in a Romantic work? Beyond its exotic (from a French viewpoint) character, the significance of Naples is not clear.

Théophile Gautier's short story, "The Bowl of Punch," from his 1833 collection _Jeunes France_, bears a curious relevance to Cézanne's _L'après-midi à Naples_. Both the story and the painting are about sensual experiences, but in a broader sense they are also both about the dilemma of the Romantic artist or writer. Gautier's story is a satirical look at Romantic lifestyle and literature. The story concerns a group of bored young men who decide to stage an orgy, following written descriptions in various literary works, such as Honoré de Balzac's "Peau de chagrin" and Eugène Sue's "Salamander." The results are predictably humorous and, ultimately, the young men and their guests are punished for their scandalous behavior by supernatural forces of the most hilarious kind.

The story was Gautier's means of both describing the extremes of Romantic behavior and satirizing the popular image of what Romanticism was all about. The narrator of the story presents himself as an egotistical and yet
detached viewer, who imposes his own personality and temperament upon the events of the story; he is the Romantic "conscience." But there is a continual reminder on the part of the narrator of the style and structure of the story, calling attention to its artifice, as well as poking fun at its self-conscious styling. Style, or fashion, becomes more important than the narrative. Through this, the actions and speech of the characters convey something of the stereotypical Romantic: the young man who finds the mundane world boring and who seeks ever-greater sensual and intellectual challenges in the exotic and in the extreme.

Gautier's story is a critique both of the extremes of Romanticism and of the critics of Romanticism. The anti-establishment attitude of the characters is not just a cliché of the Romantic stereotype. Literary Romantics were highly critical of the values of conventional middle-class life, and their public actions were intended to call attention to those values. But the Romantics themselves, of whom Gautier was at one time one of the most vehement and outspoken, were not merely contentious or superficial, for their actions were ultimately very serious and creative. Gautier tried to show that Romanticism was more than empty gesture, just as his characters discover that the written descriptions of
orgies do not correspond to their experience. The realistic point-of-departure for action and feeling in Romantic literature must be understood in its proper context, and to its proper degree. The epigram of "The Bowl of Punch," in which Gautier quotes four different authors with the same phrase, is the key to the critical nature of the story. When expression is reduced to formula, then any movement must necessarily be in danger of becoming an institution of the establishment. Gautier was just as keen to cast a negative light upon the Romantic gentleman as he was to mock the comforts of bourgeois complacency. He defends Romanticism against itself, and by revealing his young Romantics as characters who wish to follow the gestures of the movement without understanding its substance, he warns against a decline into banality. The anti-establishment attitude is not just anti-bourgeois, it is anti-Romantic in so far as any movement can become a gesture, losing its vitality and creativity.

That the Gautier of 1833 should have anticipated the Gautier of the 1860's is itself ironic. Romanticism had indeed been absorbed into the mainstream of artistic convention during the Second Empire, and in his continued defense of Romanticism, Gautier had become a conservative critic and member of the Salon jury. He was now as
adamant in his rejection of progressive trends in art as any conservative academic had been in the days of his youth.34

Gautier's story is not source for Cézanne, but the attitudes expressed through it are a convenient measure by which to compare Cézanne's own attitudes about Romanticism. The relationship of the title "The Wine Punch," which is carried by some of Cézanne's paintings related to L'après-midi à Naples, seems to be coincidental. But, Cézanne's character and attitude contained some of the same excessiveness found in Gautier's literary characters. This excessiveness found its way into his paintings both through style, in his exaggerations of technique, and subject, in his penchant for particularly shocking or controversial subjects. Further, Cézanne began to realize by the end of the decade that bohemian attitudes were often merely a form of posturing, and that the Salon jury and the public were not swayed by them. His persistence in the face of opposition demonstrated his belief in another Romantic maxim — that true accomplishment would ultimately be recognized. Finally, like Gautier, Cézanne seems to have become increasingly critical of the very movement of which he himself was a part. Both took stances in order
to advocate that compromise and excess alike were dangerous to the goals of a progressive art.

Even without a specific literary source, there is a "literariness" to the title of Cézanne's paintings, with so specific a reference to Naples and the implicit assumption that this reference will be understood. 35 There are in Cézanne's oeuvre other paintings which have obvious literary sources; La Tentation de Saint-Antoine, for example. The question of Cézanne's "literariness" is important not only for L'Après-midi à Naples, but for the overall orientation of his subject choices in this transitional period of the late 1860's and early 1870's. Cézanne adopted literary devices within his work; we have already seen that irony and a degree of parody were present at the end of the 1860's. Further, the linking of subject matter between pairs of works and in series anticipates the narrative structure of some Post-Impressionist and Symbolist work. While this mode seems contrary to the developing avant-garde trends in Impressionism, it needs to be more carefully studied in Realism and Symbolism.

But of L'Après-midi à Naples in particular, Cézanne's intentions are not entirely clear. Two possible interpretations are suggested by the works and their context. First, the series was meant to be
contrasted, in the mind of the viewer, with Cézanne's Realist works, thus describing the two conceptual and stylistic poles between which his work was formulated. In this sense, L'Après-midi à Naples was intended to express, through style and subject matter, the Romantic side of his temperament. Second, the works were meant to be ironic in implication, insofar as they were Romantic works created by an artist whose affinities were Realist, and whose intentions were progressive in the context of his time.

The idea that Cézanne's personality held two distinct characters, one pragmatic and reserved, the other passionate and expressive, is not new. Cézanne himself seems to have found the need for a synthetic approach to art within the conflicts of his own temperament. He has been portrayed in most scholarship as an impulsive, restless, and moody person, given over to the same excesses and hyperbolic gestures that Gautier portrays in his story, especially in the 1860's. Paintings like L'Après-midi à Naples are used to confirm Cézanne's love of, or need for, intense expression, painting subjects in a style that would make the Jury of the Salon "rougir avec rage." The works serve as a visual manifestation of one aspect of his individual temperament, indicative of his Romantic and bohemian
inclinations. A point often repeated by scholars is that Cézanne and his art reflect Romantic extremes in order to cover up the doubts that continually plagued him, that the violence, sexual references and erotic content of some of these works were cathartic expressions of his own repressed and somewhat bewildered attitudes toward women and sex. 38

To speak specifically to the idea that paintings such as L'Après-midi à Naples were simply manifestations of sexual insecurity, one should recognize that at the same time the first version of this particular work was undertaken, around 1870, Cézanne met and began a durable relationship with his future wife, Hortense Fiquet. 39 If the artist really was as insecure as some scholars suggest, then it seems unlikely that he would have been able to maintain a stable relationship with a single woman for as long as he did; throughout the 1870's, he went to extraordinary lengths to protect the relationship from the perceived disapproval of his father. 40 Later, it is true, Cézanne expressed a paranoia toward women in general, but he always showed a kind and concerned attitude toward his wife and their son, Paul. 41 The sum of their relationship appears to belie the insight concerning his excessive sexual insecurity. 42
This is not to deny the erotic character of L'après-midi à Naples. Cézanne's Romantic mode of working included a significant erotic component, as already seen in Pastorale. As he progressed toward a style and manner of working that brought Realist and Romantic aspects of his art closer together, and which began to include aspects of Classicism as well, the eroticism of these early works persisted in various forms. One must, however, ask whether the erotic component constituted the raison d'être of these early Romantic paintings. Insofar as their eroticism was a manifestation of a Romantic sensibility, the answer would be yes. But it seems that the expression of a Romantic point of view, in a Romantically-inspired style, was the greater interest of the artist. That he chose erotic subject matter is logical in light of his desire to confront the public, and especially the Salon jury, with works that would draw attention to their creator. The shock value of the eroticism was perhaps as significant as what they expressed about the psychology of the artist.

Indeed, the style and subject matter of L'après-midi à Naples stands out as being more boldly Romantic than the portraits of Uncle Dominique or Pastorale, works that we have already identified as being in Cézanne's Romantic mode. L'après-midi is contemporary in time with Le
Déjeuner sur l'herbe, and the contrast between the former's Romanticism and the Realism of the latter is amplified by their chronological proximity. They are not alternatives, as we have already said, but the components of Cézanne's sought-after artistic synthesis.

His calculations to shock the public, upset the Salon jury and create publicity for himself were not, it seems, entirely motivated by a desire to be notorious. The second aspect of *L'apres-midi à Naples* is their potentially ironic purpose. The potential for irony in the *L'apres-midi* paintings is contained in both their exaggerations and context. The crude or exaggerated brushstroke and drawing was a manner of recasting the stereotypical Romantic image in a style that referred to the excesses of the past, affronted the taste of the present and provided a revolutionary means for the future. That such excesses of artistic enthusiasm could also be progressive was understandably overlooked by the Salon juries that rejected the paintings. By presenting an extreme version of a now officially-sanctioned style for public and official consumption, Cézanne seems to have hoped to score a blow for artistic freedom. What had once been rejected was now accepted. The cycle would start again with a new generation.
The context of the series, carried out simultaneously with Realist paintings by the same artist, submitted to a hostile jury for judgment, and reflecting a rather unique temperamental approach to art, suggests that Cézanne consciously developed the ironic implications of the works. Romanticism had been assimilated by established art and taste. The _juste-milieu_ adaptation of once revolutionary styles like Romanticism was born in an atmosphere of confrontation similar to that artists found themselves in in the 1860's. For Cézanne, this adaptation, really a cohabitation of academic and liberal artists, endangered the goals of a progressive art, as well as his desire to establish his unique artistic personality before the public. By presenting a new Romanticism to the public, one more personal and temperamental than the official version, Cézanne contrasted the vitality of the younger generation and its art with the diluted art of the Salons.

The same might be said of Realism, which had lost considerable esteem in the eyes of the younger generation of the 1860's, as Courbet became more conservative in his subjects and his relations with the art establishment. Courbet's place in the early Empire was different from that in the later "liberal" Empire. No longer was he the
revolutionary and ultra-bohemian of the late 1840's, the
days of A Burial at Ornans. His style was now seen in
the works of such conventional artists as Breton.
Realism, too, was becoming a part of the establishment. 44

The works from the L'après-midi à Naples series
remain problems. The title and its implications remain
elusive. The peculiar imagery also suggests much but
reveals little of a definitive nature. Given their place
in the development of Cézanne's art, the significance of
these paintings seems to be their unabashed Romantic
expressionism. Whether this expressiveness is for purely
erotic purposes or not, their contrast with contemporary
works like Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe reveals the depth of
the problem of reconciling conflicting manners and modes
of art into one whole.

iv. Une Moderne Olympia and the Problem of Manet

The problem of "modernity" never came up in
Cézanne's correspondence, nor did it ever arise directly
in the conversations that he had late in life with
various admirers. But there can be little doubt that it
was always on Cézanne's mind in one form or another. The
radicalism of the 1860's was a quest for the modern in
art. The irony of the late 1860's and early 1870's was a
critical examination of what it was to be modern. The art of the 1870's that we will examine in the next chapter was his way of assimilating modernity.

*Une Moderne Olympia* (V. 106, 1870; V. 225, 1873-74; Plates LXI and LXII) would seem to address the problem of modernity head-on, if the title is taken in its full significance. But, as we have seen in this chapter, the surface meaning of a work in this period does not necessarily correspond to the deeper meaning, for irony was a key device in Cézanne's iconographic program. Several points will be significant to the understanding of the work. First, there is the relation between *Une Moderne Olympia* and Manet's *Olympia* and its significance for Cézanne. Second, there is Cézanne's conception of his own Olympia as being "modern." Third, one must ask about the implications of irony in *Une Moderne Olympia*, if it is indeed present. Finally, the place of *Une Moderne Olympia* in the development of Cézanne's career, especially in the context of his interest in establishing himself through a distinctive style and his quest for an artistic synthesis of styles, will be examined.

Edouard Manet's influence is felt in Cézanne's work from the mid-1860's until the end of the decade, in both style and meaning. Manet was the most challenging artist of the 1860's, replacing Courbet as the center of avant-
garde artistic debate in Paris. Any young painter arriving in Paris, especially after 1863, would have had to deal with Manet's art, either embracing it or rejecting it. Manet's struggles in the face of both public and official rejection took on the air of a universal cause, and if the young artist saw his path as being along the progressive route, then Manet was, if not a leader, at least an embodiment of the struggle for acceptance. On the other hand, Manet stood for that which was subversive and disruptive in art, for the challenge of his style and outlook ran counter to the accepted principles governing painting as an academic institution. Not every young artist was a radical in terms of his artistic views, and there were, after all, the conventional paths toward success prescribed by academic norms. Yet, just as Courbet's art was assimilated by a generation of academics and rendered harmless through that assimilation, so, too, was Manet the object of imitation on the part of artists whose intentions were not fundamentally radical.  

Manet's gesture of defiance in 1867, by choosing not to exhibit in the Salon that year and by setting up his own separate exhibition outside the official exhibition at the _Exposition universelle_, was both the culmination of his struggle to gain acceptance and recognition, and
part of the development of a new relationship between the artist, the institutions of art, and the public. The actual exhibition of fifty works seems to have accomplished little in the way of material gains, but it did symbolize the frustration of Manet, not to mention the younger radical artists, with the official operations of the Paris art exhibitions. The fact thatCourbet also undertook an independent exhibition that year, similar to the one he had staged in 1855, further underscored the problem of the independent artist.

In 1868, Manet exhibited the Portrait of Emile Zola (Plate LXIII) and the Woman with a Parrot (Young Lady in 1866) at the Salon. The former work was a form of appreciation for Zola's defense of the artist in 1866 and 1867. The latter painting seems to have been formulated as a response to Courbet's Woman with a Parrot of 1866, which in turn had been a response to Manet's Olympia. While the portrait of Zola might have interested Cézanne for personal reasons, the Woman with a Parrot seems to have made an impact on Cézanne for artistic reasons.

Cézanne had in 1867 been rejected from the Salon, having submitted two works, Le Grog au vin and Ivresse. Zola defended him in a letter to the editor of Le Figaro, which had published a review that made fun of Cézanne's
Later that year a painting by Cézanne had to be withdrawn from a Marseilles gallery window after the crowd violently objected to it. In 1868 Cézanne was once again rejected by the Salon jury. Undoubtedly he had seen both the 1867 and 1868 Salons before he went to Aix for the summer and fall, as was his habit. In December, 1868, Manet showed his *Spanish Singer* and *Boy with a Sword* at the Société Artistiques des Bouches-du-Rhone in Marseilles, a show which Cézanne could have seen, for he did not return to Paris until the first of the year.

The emerging pattern of this period is one of Manet's gradual acceptance into the Salon, even though he still raised controversy with the paintings he submitted. On the other hand, Cézanne experienced continued rejection, even outright hostility toward his work. The distance, then, between Manet and Cézanne, in terms of their public success, grew much greater between 1867 and 1870. Manet had certainly achieved a degree of triumph by the end of the decade with a modern and original style. Cézanne had seemingly achieved nothing, yet there is every indication that he sought the same success through the creation of an individual style. As Manet had superseded Courbet, and had become more modern than
Courbet, so Cézanne began to think of becoming more modern than Manet.

Cézanne continued to look to Manet as a source of not only moral inspiration but direct artistic inspiration, although by the early 1870's he had begun to distance himself stylistically from him. One need only compare Manet's Woman with a Parrot, especially the peculiar perspective of the base of the bird stand, or the still-life in his Portrait of Théodore Duret of 1868 to Cézanne's Nature morte noire et blanche (Nature morte à la bouilloire) (c. 1867-68; V. 70) of the same time to see the relation in style. The great La Pendule noire (V. 69) of 1870 would be unthinkable without the example of Manet.

It was, however, Manet's Olympia which seems to have had the greatest overall impact on Cézanne. The painting was kept in the public eye after the 1865 Salon in which it was first shown, for Manet created an etched reproduction of it to be included in Zola's 1867 pamphlet and included it in his portrait of Zola in 1868. Cézanne's 1869 response, thus, is not as distant from the painting as it may appear at first.

Cézanne's first version of Une Moderne Olympia has both affinities with and differences from Manet's work. The affinities are obvious in most cases: the reclining
nude woman, the black servant with flowers, the brilliant white bedclothes and stark value contrasts. The differences are also readily apparent. Most significant is the inclusion of a male figure in the foreground, who gazes at the nude woman. Also different is the setting, now an elaborately ornamented interior. Different as well is the mood of the painting. Manet's compelling directness, even coldness, has been replaced by a more sensual, exuberant spirit, at once more erotic and playful.

What is it, then, that makes Cézanne's version of the Olympia theme "modern"? On a literal level, the inclusion of the man in Cézanne's painting is a modern feature, for he fixes, through his dress, a specific reference to bourgeois urbaniy. The furnishings of the room are Second Empire, hence modern. In Manet's painting, the viewer has the uncomfortable feeling that Olympia's gaze is directed at her suitor/customer, i.e. the viewer himself. By this immediacy, what Olympia is is made blatant; it is objectified for the viewer. In Cézanne's conception, the presence of the man absolves the viewer of direct involvement, replacing it with a voyeuristic detachment. Romantic fascination is reintroduced, with a contemporary, familiar setting. Yet, the issue of objectivity, a continuing concern for
Cézanne, is still raised. By including the suitor/customer in the composition, the artist creates a more detached viewpoint for the subject, a process not unlike the distancing by place of *L'Après-midi à Naples*.\(^5\)

Clearly, Cézanne intended that the viewer make a visual connection between his painting and the *Olympia* of Manet. By extension, the title of Cézanne's work implies that Manet's painting had been superseded by his own, more "modern" version. The title, then, was meant to call attention to the differences, rather than the similarities, between his version of the Olympia theme and the more famous version of Manet. By a further extension, Cézanne played upon the *suscès de scandale* of Manet's work by enhancing and making explicit those aspects of the earlier Manet work that caused such great controversy. Modernity then meant for Cézanne not only the objectification of the erotic and sensual image, but the amplification of precisely those aspects which offended the public most: the woman's profession is underscored by the presence of a male customer, and her dramatically flaunted nudity. We can obviously find here Cézanne's earlier delight in shocking imagery, as well as his desire to express his temperament in a forceful, and especially dramatic, way.
With this modern objectivity in mind, as well as the desire to make explicit what Manet had left implicit, Cézanne enhanced certain sensual aspects of the image. He included not only the flowers held by the black servant but a huge spray of flowers in a rococo vase to the right of the painting. He added a table with a small still life of some fruit and a bottle, actually a Manet-like touch. The swags of drapery which hang from the ceiling also add a touch of the sensual, even the exotic, as in an Ingres or Delacroix odalisque. Hence nearly all the senses are represented: sight (the nude herself), smell (the flowers), touch (the drapery and the overstuffed divan upon which the man sits), and taste (the fruit and wine). Only sound is missing from this catalog. While the style still recalls Manet's Realism, the details of setting are more a recasting of Delacroix's exotic harem scenes.

The seated man, however, is the crucial figure. His presence prevents this from becoming just another piece of erotic exotica. His sober gray dress and his top hat, which rests upon the sofa, mark him as a bourgeois gentleman of the Second Empire. He is a theatrically silhouetted repoussoir figure, contrasting sharply with the bright white of the bed and the reclining woman. He is connected with her, though, by the proximity of his
body to hers; her arm actually seems to touch his forehead.

In the second version of *Une Moderne Olympia*, painted around 1873, the style has undergone a significant change, reflecting the experiences that Cézanne had while working with Camille Pissarro in Pontoise and Auvers between 1872 and 1874. The painting is much more colorful and more actively painted. The Delacroix influence that was implicit in the exotic details of the first version is made explicit in the coloristic treatment of the second. Significantly, the man in the painting now closely resembles Cézanne himself. He has a full beard and a balding head, very similar to the man in the 1869 *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe*.

The second version of *Une Moderne Olympia* has other differences from the earlier version. First, the black servant does not just idly stand by; instead, she dramatically pulls back the sheet of the bed to reveal the nude woman. The accoutrements of the room have been clarified, although they are essentially the same. The space of the room has also been opened up, so that the closeness of the objects in the early version is relieved somewhat. The distance between the woman and the man has also been increased, although the woman still gestures with her arm so that her hand appears to be held above
the man's head, palm down. A small dog has been added at the foot of the bed, as well as a hanging lamp above the servant.

The change from an anonymous male figure to one which is specifically self-referential presents a problem in interpreting the work, a problem that we have already encountered in _Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe_ and _Pastorale_. Cézanne seems to assume a role in the painting, perhaps equating himself with a bourgeois gentleman, or conversely, an artist. Was he perhaps equating himself with Manet, the artist of the original _Olympia_? If not, was he picturing himself merely as a gentleman enthralled by the sight of this luxuriant nude?

The gesture of the woman in both paintings seems to be significant, given the overall design of the works. Not only her proximity to the man, but the fact that she touches his brow, implies something more than sensual appeal. The gesture of touching the brow can be understood as a symbol of inspiration, where the muse inspires the poet/artist in his search for beauty or truth, a motif found very early in the copy Cézanne made of Frillie's _Le baiser de la muse_.

In the second version of _Une Moderne Olympia_, the woman no longer touches the man's head, but rather, her hand is held over him, palm down. No longer a gesture of
inspiration, it is a gesture suggesting either blessing or benediction. It is not unlike the gesture for coronation or glorification in earlier art. Given that the man who is the object of this gesture is Cézanne himself, the implication is that this woman is not simply a courtesan or prostitute of the Second Empire, nor the embodiment of sensual and carnal delight. The image suggests, instead, a kind of triumph, where the courtesan Olympia is transformed into a muse of Art, who bestows upon the artist the honors, or at least the recognition, due him.

Clearly, in the second Une Moderne Olympia, it is not Manet who receives the attention of the Olympia/Muse, but Cézanne. One inference that can be drawn is that Cézanne has painted a deliberate parody of Manet's work, placing himself not only in the painting, but in the role of the "triumphant" artist. But it seems more likely, and more consistent with his own work, that Une Moderne Olympia is not parody, but an ironic reinterpretation of Manet's Olympia. The irony of the painting rests in the opposition between Manet's character and accomplishments, and those of Cézanne.

The first Une Moderne Olympia generalizes, and thus objectifies, the implications of the arrangement of man and woman. If her gesture is meant to suggest
inspiration, then the seated man is not just a gentleman, but an artist. Manet was certainly the most gentlemanly of the Café Guerbois group, and it seems likely that it is Manet whom Cézanne had in mind for this figure. But, in its generalized context, the man is probably meant to stand for the artist in general. The gesture of Olympia thus signifies and acknowledges Manet's genius, and his rightful place among the great artists, at the same time that it acknowledges all artistic genius. In part, the "modernity" of this version has to do with this acknowledgement of advanced art, as well as the combination of Realist and Romantic elements. It is ironic, then, that Manet should be honored by the courtesan Olympia posing as a muse of art. She assumes the ambiguous role of sensual temptress as inspiring muse, for Olympia's role as an object of sensual desire is not diminished in Cézanne's version, but, rather, enhanced. As the embodiment of art, her roles as temptress and muse are complementary. One might even go so far as to identify the two natures of the artist in this dual role, the sensual woman being representative of the emotions, the inspirational muse indicative of the intellect.

The second version is more specific, as it is Cézanne himself who receives Olympia's graces. He had,
to be sure, gained self-confidence in the intervening years, although he was still far from his goal. While he still desired success, he seems to have come to the realization that his own struggle would entail a longer period of solitude. The second *Une Moderne Olympia* shows Cézanne basking, not in the purely hedonistic delights of the flesh, as so many have interpreted, but in the glow of inspiration produced by an ironic personification of art itself. Olympia is a temptress, but she is also inspiration, the manifestation of genius which Cézanne, and his friends, felt he possessed, but which he had not been able to manifest concretely. Stylistically, the colorism of the second version confirms Cézanne's new direction, the direction he hoped would result in the concrete affirmation of genius and individuality that would separate him from Manet, and his contemporaries. The brilliant light emitted by Olympia's body and bed suggests that she is not a real flesh-and-blood creature, but the apparition of an ideal woman who embodies the contradictory nature of art, expressing both the intellectual and the emotional sides of painting, a Romantic apparition within a Realist context. With the lamp of wisdom above and the faithful dog below, it is indeed ironic that in his statement of modernity and
individuality, Cézanne turned to the emblems and concepts of tradition to give shape to his vision.

The second Moderne Olympia is a private image, in that it focuses upon the artist himself. It is both Realist and Romantic, but it is unlike the public, social gestures of Cézanne's Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe, where the artist is portrayed within the realm of public institutions and customs, or L'après-midi à Naples, where the shock value of the exaggerated and erotic Romanticism was intended to raise eyebrows and generate scandal. Une Moderne Olympia gives tangible form to the aspirations and dilemma of Cézanne. In this sense, the later version of Une Moderne Olympia synthesizes the bohemian (artistically free, sensual) and the bourgeois (urban, successful) lifestyles into one.

Cézanne found himself, after the turn of the decade, to no longer be quite so radical in outlook. Cézanne realized, in the years after the war, that the posturing and gesturing of the 1860's had not accomplished the intended goal of changing the institutions and public perceptions of art, especially painting, swiftly and suddenly. It had only isolated him and his friends from the bourgeois public. The use of irony suggests that Cézanne had moved toward a more critical stance in his art. It also suggests that Cézanne was consciously
distancing himself from the Manet influence, as indeed he was stylistically.

While he flirted briefly with a "literary" form of Romanticism in L'Après-midi à Naples, it was the irony of style and subject matter which expressed his interests. Moreover, by drawing upon subjects which were already part of the stock of advanced painting, such as Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe and Olympia, Cézanne reflected a more critical view of the art of his day. Further, Cézanne inserted himself into the action of these latter paintings as both an ironic presence and a personal gesture. The choices were between emulation and individuality, radicalism and compromise, and, stylistically, tonal monochromatic Realism and coloristic Romantic-Realism. The consequences were to replace temperament with specific personal values, to move from radicalism to liberalism, and to temper bohemianism with at least a tacit gesture toward the bourgeois audience.
NOTES TO CHAPTER III

Although Marion called for an independent show in 1866, and the Impressionists would realize this aim in 1874, there were those who saw the Salon as the only legitimate arena in which the battle of contemporary art could be fought. Zola and Manet both seem to have agreed on this point, despite, or perhaps because of, Manet’s 1867 exhibit. While Cézanne did show in 1874 and 1877 with the Impressionists, he contributed nothing afterwards, yet he continued to send works to the Salon through the 1870’s.

2 Regarding the refusals of the 1866 Salon, Marion wrote “In reality we triumph and this mass refusal, this vast exile is in itself a victory... We are in a fighting period: youth against old age... the present, laden with promise of the future, against the past, that black pirate.” Scolari and Barr, April 1938, p. 220.

Such a confirmation of isolation through rejection is precisely in keeping with the bohemian attitude. But the conscious cultivation of a counter-academic style suggests that the isolation was as much the fault of the artists as the jury or the critics. Thus, the bohemianism we find in Cézanne and his friends at this time is a blend of the "first-generation" bohemians of the Impasse Doyenné (Gautier, Rogier, Nerval), who withdrew consciously from society in order to pursue their artistic interests outside society’s strictures, and the "second-generation" bohemians based on Murger’s conception, who were outcasts from society’s institutions and misunderstood geniuses awaiting recognition and success.

3 Or perhaps more appropriately, the cult of the bohemian. Easton states the case for an earlier generation: "There were young men calling themselves artist, he (Thoré) said, in 1836, before they had earned the right to call themselves men. They were too conceited to bother about learning their craft, yet, while still students, adopted the language and behavior of experienced professionals. That the public refused to accept the value they set on their work didn’t matter to them in the least, for they had the lowest opinion of the public. Some of these stupid fellows were so convinced of their importance that, when their childish
compositions failed to astonish the world and command universal attention, there was nothing left for them but to kill themselves." p. 86.

Thirty years later, much the same attitude about the self-importance of the artist held sway, although the contempt for the public was more specifically focused toward the academic painters. For Cézanne, the idea of astonishing the world meant specifically to astonish Paris, and he tried through both style and subject matter to accomplish this. On Cézanne's idea of "astonishing Paris with an apple," see Schapiro, "The Apples of Cézanne...," p. 30.

3 Zola, O.C., XII, 789-795.

5 Again, Cézanne's closeness to the Romantic spirit must be noted in the 1860's. Théophile Gautier expressed the Romantic credo thus: "Développer librement tous les caprices de la pensée, fussent-ils choquer le gout, les convenances et les règles." L'Histoire du Romantisme (Paris, 1874), p. 64. The same purpose could very well describe Cézanne's art in the 1860's, where his main goal was the development of his "caprices de la pensée."

6 Zola's early novels like Thérèse Raquin and Madeleine Ferat are good examples of this dark and violent side, as are the stories such as "Les Quatre journées de Jean Gourdon" or "Un Croque-mort."

As we have mentioned in the first chapter, Zola warned Cézanne away from the Realists initially, but by the mid-1860's, perhaps in the wake of the Salon des refusés, that attitude had changed considerably.

8 Scolari and Barr, April 1938, p. 222.
9 Duranty to Zola, in Rewald, The History of Impressionism, p. 406. Auriat, "Duranty and Zola," La Nef, (July 1946). Duranty would also caricature Cézanne in his story, "La Simple vie du peintre Louis Martin." His image there is of an egomaniac, an eccentric in the worst way, and a perfect image of the bohemian as the anti-type of the successful artist. Rewald is wrong, however, when he says that this story was not published until after Duranty's death. It appeared in the collection Les Séductions du Chevalier Navoni in 1877,
well before the author died, and was reprinted posthumously in the 1881 collection *Le Pays des arts.* Duranty, like Zola with his later novel *L'Oeuvre,* apparently felt no particular sensitivity toward the publication of these caricatures, which the artist must have read. This leads one to suspect that either Cézanne did not understand that he was the subject of their satire, which seems hard to believe, or that the caricatures were so exaggerated that it could have applied to other artists, and not just Cézanne.


11 The context of the Card Players, the portraits of his gardener Vallier, and of the other peasant-types in the last years of his life may have significance in this respect. While Cézanne never seems to have developed the attitude of a conventional bourgeois, there is every indication that the townspeople of Aix regarded him as a bourgeois, albeit an eccentric one. This makes his relationship with the working and peasant classes all the more interesting. If his sympathies were with the "folk," was it a paternal gesture of the wealthy man towards those less fortunate, or was it a genuine identification with their lifestyle and attitudes? For a questionable interpretation of the Cardplayers, and their link to some of Cézanne's earliest imagery, see Badt, pp. 87-94, 96-107, 109-28.

12 After the fall of the Second Empire, Cézanne was nominated by the new Municipal Council in Aix to the committee overseeing the art school and museum. His father was elected to the council, and placed on the committee of finance. Neither father or son seems to have taken part in the provisional council, which was dissolved by the spring of 1871. Rewald, 1968, p. 87.

During the Dreyfus affair, Cézanne seems to have been sympathetic to the anti-Dreyfusard side, contrary to his old friend Zola and most of the Impressionists, but even here he did not seem to attach too great a significance to the great political debate. In fact, Cézanne was labeled a pro-Dreyfusard in 1903 by Henri Rochefort, in the context of the sale of Zola's estate
and in an article that caused considerable consternation for the painter. Ibid., 185-87.

13 Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe (V. 107) is dated 1869-1870 in the Venturi catalogue; Douglas Cooper places it at c. 1869.

La Partie de campagne (V. 234) is dated 1873-75 by Venturi. Related drawings are C. 356 (c. 1873) and 357 (1873-75).

Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe (V. 238) is also dated 1873-75 by Venturi.

14 Les Promeneurs (V. 96) is dated by Venturi 1865-1868; Douglas Cooper and John Rewald place it in 1866, while Lawrence Gowing puts it at 1867-1868. The relevant drawings are C. 152 and 153, both dated by Chappuis as 1866.

La Promenade (V. 116) is dated 1868-1870 by Venturi, and 1866-1867 by Cooper. However, the two related drawings are dated c. 1858 (C. 43) and 1871-1874 (C. 267).

La Promenade (V. 119) is dated c. 1870 in the Venturi catalogue. The relevant drawing is C. 39, dated 1859-1860.

La Conversation (V. 120) is dated 1870-1871 by Venturi.

15 Le Pêcheur à la ligne (V. 115) is dated 1867-1870 by Venturi. The related drawing is C. 188, dated by Chappuis as 1868-1870.

La Partie de pêche is V. 230, dated 1872-1874. The related drawing is C. 259, dated 1872-1875.

V. 232 is titled Au bord de l'étang, with a Venturi date of 1873-1875.

16 V. 231 is titled La Conversation, dated 1872-1873 by Venturi. Relevant drawings are C. 189 (1865-1870), 251 and 252 (1871-1873), and 267 (1871-1874).

La Partie de campagne is V. 234. It is dated 1873-1875 by Venturi. The related drawings are C. 356 (c. 1873) and 357 (1873-1875).
V. 238 is titled *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe*, with a date of 1873-1875.

17 V. 235 is titled Les Ivrognes. V. 236 is called Les Joueurs de boules.

The relevant drawings for *Pastorale* are C. 248, 249, and 250, all c. 1870.

Drawings for *Scène fantastique* are C. 320, 321, and 353 (all c. 1873).

18 Monet's *Women in the Garden*, rejected by the Salon jury of 1867, is also relevant. Bazille's *The Artist's Family on a Terrace near Montpellier*, shown at the Salon of 1868, is in many ways the closest to Cézanne's *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe* (V. 107), especially in the peculiar mood of the ensemble of people in the painting. Since Bazille was retouching this canvas in 1869, when Cézanne's *Le Déjeuner* was started, it is possible that the latter was directly influenced by the image even after the Salon.


21 This revival of Rococo idioms and subjects was also a part of Provençal art, as artists like Adolphe Monticelli and Achille Emperaire utilized 18th century scenes and even aspects of 18th styles in their art.

22 The picnic, promenade, boating party, and outing were a ubiquitous feature of mid-nineteenth century novels. Of most direct interest in the study of Cézanne's picnic scenes are Zola's passages of such occasions. Picnics can be found in his earliest novels, including *La Confession de Claude* and *Thérèse Raquin*. The picnic is transformed in Zola's later novels to carry a significantly greater symbolic weight, as in the actions in "Paradou" in *La Faute de l'abbé Mouret* or in the retreat to the countryside undertaken by the artist Claude Lantier in *L'Oeuvre*.

In Zola's short stories and essays, the picnic and outing are featured as well. A few examples include "Les
Voleurs et l'âne," "Nais Micoulin" and "Les Parisiens en villégiature."

See also Zola's letter to Numa Coste, July 26, 1866; Zola, Correspondance, I, 452-54; Rodolphe Walter, "Zola et ses amis à Bennecourt (1866)," pp. 19-35; Walter, "Cézanne à Bennecourt en 1866," pp. 103-18; Walter, "Zola à Bennecourt en 1867," pp. 12-26; and Walter, "Emile Zola à Bennecourt en 1868: les vacances d'un chroniqueur," pp. 29-40.

The paintings which seem to match most closely with the 1866 Bennecourt vacation are La Partie de campagne (V. 234) and Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe (V. 238), interestingly both from the early-to-mid 1870's.

Cézanne seems to have made few "vacations" in the middle class sense of the term. He was in Switzerland in 1890 and at Lake Annecy in 1896. These trips were undoubtedly the wish of his wife Hortense, who was originally from the department of Doubs, near both Switzerland and Annecy. Cézanne's lack of enthusiasm for travel in the touristic or vacationing sense was made clear when he said that Hortense, who liked to travel a great deal, only cared for "Switzerland and lemonade." Rewald, 1968, p. 113; Mack, pp. 324-25. Alexis also stated that Cézanne was furious at Hortense for the 1890 trip; Cézanne, Correspondance, pp. 234-35.

Cézanne mentioned this painting in a letter to Zola from the autumn of 1866 (October?), and included a sketch of it at the bottom of the page. Cézanne, Correspondance, pp. 122-24. The letter is reproduced in Chappuis, II, n. 152. See also the related sketch C. 153, and the interesting observations by Chappuis on the figure poses, I, 81.

Mack, pp. 49-50. Mack says that the two men are in fact Valabrègue and a friend named Abram, not Marion.

Compare V. 119, La Promenade, to the fashion image source in Rewald, The History of Impressionism, p. 208.

Rewald, 1968, pp. 64-6. The other canvas rejected in 1867 was called Ivresse. See Zola's letter to Francis Magnard, Correspondance, I, 490-91, which corrected Arnold Mortier's observations in Le Figaro on Cézanne's work. The description of the two canvasses in Mortier's article are similar to the compositions of L'après-midi à Naples, but the accuracy of his observations is suspect. Rewald suggests that the watercolor, R. 34, was a study for the lost 1867 painting, and that V. 112 was painted as late as 1876-1877, presumably because of the changes in compositional details. See Rewald, Paul Cézanne, The Watercolors, pp. 90-1.

Vollard, p. 27. Given Vollard's less-than-reliable handling of other facts concerning Cézanne's life, and the unknown origin of this piece of information on the origins of L'après-midi à Naples, one may have suspicions about this account.

Other drawings relating to the paintings are C. 86, 275-277, 279, 282-286, 291, 460, 461. Related watercolors are Rewald catalogue numbers 34 and 35. In several of these drawings (86, 278, 284, 286), a cat also appears, as it does in both watercolors, a connection perhaps to Manet's Olympia.

In Duranty's story (see note 9), the narrator finds Maillobert (Cézanne) in his studio with a parrot that cries "Maillobert est un grand peintre!" Les Séductions du Chevalier Navoni, p. 329; Le Pays des arts, p. 317.

Ingres' work could not have been seen by Cézanne directly, but Charles Blanc's article on Ingres in the Gazette des Beaux-arts of January 1868 mentions it along with an illustration (pp. 17-8). It was also mentioned by Thoré's in his Le Salon de 1846 (Paris, 1846), pp. 55-6, where the comparison is made to Delacroix's Femmes d'Alger. This review was republished in 1868 as part of Thoré's collected criticism, Salons de 1844-1848 (Paris, 1868).

Renoir's Femme d'Alger was shown in the Salon of 1870 with his Baigneuse au Griffon. Arsène Houssaye wrote favorably of Renoir's Femme d'Alger in a letter to L'Artiste in 1870, which he pronounced a canvas "which Delacroix would have signed." By comparing Renoir's work to that of Delacroix, Houssaye again evokes the Romantic past as a comparison for the Realist present. Joseph C.
Sloane, French Painting Between Past and Present (Princeton, 1951, 1973), pp. 202-3; Rewald, The History of Impressionism, pp. 245-46 and note 15; MaryAnne Stevens, ed., The Orientalists: Delacroix to Matisse, exh. cat. (London, 1984), p. 197. It is worth noting that Cézanne's (rejected) entries for the Salon of 1870 included his Portrait of Achille Emperaire and a now-lost reclining nude, the latter also very much in the odalisque tradition. See the caricature of Cézanne reproduced in Rewald, same reference as above.

32 Venice, rather than Naples, was the standard symbolic setting for sensual and exotic musings in Romantic literature and poetry. The transformation to Naples may have been a simple mistake of locations, or it may have reflected a deliberate countering of that Venetian imagery. Naples was better known for its brigands and its superstitions than for its sensual atmosphere.

Alfred de Musset, "Venise," in Poésies complètes, (Paris, 1951), pp. 91-3. Some of these verses were set to music by Gounod and published in La Petite Revue on July 15, 1865, p. 591, n. 4. Another musical piece with the title "Une Nuit à Venise" by L. Fossey appeared in 1867, as did "Les Nuits de Naples" by E. Eitling, a waltz for piano that was published in Magasin des Demoiselles.


Gautier wrote of Naples in Jettatura of 1856. His "Variations on the Carnival of Venice" appeared in Enamels and Cameos of 1852.


34 Gautier reached the pinnacle of his reputation in the middle of the 1860's, through official recognition and through his entry into the circle of intellectuals and artists around Princess Mathilde. He also wrote for the two major pro-Empire journals in Paris, Le Moniteur Universel and Le Constitutionnel.
Cézanne, Correspondance. There are numerous indications of Cézanne's interest in literature. Zola says in a letter to Cézanne of March 25, 1860 that they usually talk of poetry, not art, in their letters (p. 70). In October of 1866 Cézanne writes to Zola and says that "je ne lis presque plus" but that "je commence à m'apercevoir que l'art pour l'art est une rude blague; ça entre nous" (p. 124). But by July of 1868 he is again picking up both journals and literary criticism, as a letter to Numa Coste attests (p. 131).

In the 1870's Cézanne's interest becomes more specifically contemporary, apparently in response to the literary associations of Zola. In a letter of May 1878, he asks Zola "si tu veux me parler de la situation artistique et littéraire, tu me feras bien plaisir. Je serai par là plus éloigné encore de la province, et plus près de Paris" (p. 166). Cézanne mentions a large number of journals in his correspondence, as well as authors like Daudet, Alexis, Stendhal, and Flaubert. By 1880 his collection of books must have been rather extensive, as he mentions to Zola that a new edition from Alexis "s'ajoute à la collection littéraire que tu m'as faite" (p. 190).

Cézanne appears to have been especially interested in Zola's Rougon-Macquart series during the 1870's and early 1880's, as he mentions receiving and reading a number of the novels in the series. Others seem to have been interested in his opinion of Zola's writing, as he mentions several occasions of discussion, see pp. 165, 172, 203.

It also seems worth mentioning at this point that Cézanne's interest in literature did not end with the breakup of his friendship with Zola. The majority of young admirers who gathered around Cézanne late in the painter's life, either from Aix or elsewhere, were writers, i.e. Gustave Geoffroy, Joachim Gasquet, Léo Larguier, Louis Aurenche, Jean Royère, and others; see Arrouye, p. 50; Mack, p. 349.

Mack, pp. 133, 141; Rewald, 1968, pp. 58-9, 69, 126-29. Zola's Claude Lantier, of Le Ventre de Paris and L'Oeuvre, is often seen as the embodiment of this perception of Cézanne. See also note 9, on Duranty's story "La Simple vie du peintre Louis Martin."
37 Cézanne, Correspondance, p. 113. The letter is dated 15 March, 1865, and significantly it is to Pissarro. Mack's description is typical: "The wildness of many of these imaginative compositions, the tortured attitudes of the figures, betray the feverish turmoil of his spirit at this time; the furious strokes and slashes of colour reveal the intensity of his struggle to express his emotions in a recalcitrant medium." p. 141.

38 Götz Adriani, Paul Cézanne, Der Liebeskampf (Munich, 1980), pp. 9-12; see also John Rewald, Paul Cézanne, The Watercolors (Boston, 1984), p. 91.


41 Mack, pp. 171-72; Rewald, 1968, pp. 113-14. Despite the tensions which Rewald describes between Cézanne and Hortense in their later years together, there is evidence of a great affection on the part of the artist for his wife. Besides the numerous paintings of Hortense, there are dozens of drawings and watercolors. I am particularly struck by the watercolor and pencil drawing, Rewald cat. no. 209, V. 1100, from c. 1885, of Hortense with a bunch of flowers to one side. Not only is the head of Hortense rendered in a very sensitive manner, but the artist chose a spray of hydrangeas, in French "hortensias," in a play upon her name. The implication of the portrait and the association of the head with the flowers is one of great tenderness. This is yet another instance of Cézanne's use of linguistic puns in his art. Rewald, Paul Cézanne, The Watercolors, p. 135.

42 There is a curious parallel between Cézanne's relationship with Hortense and his father's relationship with his mother. Louis-Auguste Cézanne also married his wife, Anne-Elisabeth Aubert, only after several years and after the birth of their son and one of their two daughters. Rewald, "Cézanne and his Father," p. 40.

43 In the infamous 1866 Salon, only Courbet, among the progressive artists, was accepted. See Marion's comment of April 2, 1866, in Scolari and Barr, p. 220. Zola dedicated the beginning of his May 15, 1866 Salon review in L'Evénement to Courbet, see O.C., XII, 811-14. See also Zola, Correspondance, I, 449-50. He also wrote
of Courbet in "Proudhon et Courbet," on July 26 and
August 31, 1865 in Le Salut public of Lyon, see O.C., X, 35-46.

By 1868 Zola was calling himself "un journaliste de
l'opposition," and defending Courbet in La Tribune, a
staunch republican paper; O.C., X, 769.

In February 1868, Théodore de Lajarte attacked the
supporters of Manet and Courbet as being supporters of
Wagner (1), thus emphasizing the perceived relationship
between a revolutionary art and revolutionary music;
Zola, Correspondance, II, 115, n. 4.

44 See Marion's comment on Courbet in 1866, cited in
the previous note.

45 Degas put the case very well, in regards to the
burgeoning of Impressionism in the 1870's when he said
"They shoot us but they pick our pockets." Quoted in
Rewald, 1968, p. 123. Zola characterized the successful
artist who owed his originality to the progressive but
rejected genius in L'Oeuvre, especially in the character
of Henri Fagerolles. Fagerolles seems to be based on the
artist Henri Gervex, although, as we mentioned in Chapter
I, Antoine Guillemet was also an apparent source for the
character. Other names that come up reference to this
character are Bastien-Lepage (more an imitator of Courbet
than Manet) and Carolus-Duran. See Niess, pp. 37-41.

46 Zola had written a study of Manet that was
published on January 1, 1867 and later reprinted as an
exhibition catalogue for Manet independent show that
year. Zola, O.C., XII, 821-45. He also dedicated his
novel Madeleine Ferat of 1868 to Manet.

47 George Heard Hamilton, Manet and His Critics (New
York, 1969), p. 115. See also the comments in Manet,

48 Zola, Correspondance, I, 490-492. Rewald, 1968,
pp. 64-7. The paintings in question seem to have been
none other than different versions of the set L'Après-
midi à Naples.

49 Rewald, 1968, p. 68.
Cézanne did not personally see the Manet or Courbet independent exhibitions in 1867, however. Scolari and Barr, April 1938, pp. 223-25.

Nature morte noire et blanche is dated 1871-72 by Venturi, but Lawrence Gowing places it at 1870 and Douglas Cooper assigns a date of 1869-71. The earlier dates seem more logical in light of the style of the work.

This version is V. 106. See the related drawings C. 199 (1866-1867), 271, and 274 (both 1871-1874).

The objectivity of the bourgeoisie is a matter that needs to be recalled in this context, as the bourgeoisie accepted objectivity as the means for the most efficient relationship of themselves and the world. See Cesar Grana, Bohemian Versus Bourgeois (New York, 1964), p. 68.

Both Douglas Cooper and John Rewald date this work as c. 1873. Venturi dates it 1872-1873. Theodore Reff, in "Cézanne's Constructive Stroke," Art Quarterly, 25, n. 3 (Autumn 1962), dates the work 1872, citing Paul Gachet's assertion that the work was painted in Dr. Gachet's house that year (p. 220, note 18). A related watercolor, V. 882, R. 135, is from 1877; see Rewald, Paul Cézanne, The Watercolors, p. 117.

"La place de M. Manet est marquée au Louvre, comme cela de Courbet, comme celle de tout artiste d'un tempérament original et fort." Zola, Mon Salon, O.C., XII, 806. "Je leur ai répondu que le destin avait sans doute déjà marqué au musée du Louvre la place future de l'Olympia et du Déjeuner sur l'herbe." Edouard Manet, O.C., XII, 845

Interestingly, Zola's tone in the series of articles that composed Mon Salon, and especially in that dealing with Manet, is highly mocking and ironic (of the public).

Cézanne, Correspondance, letter of September 26, 1874, to his mother, p. 148: "Je commence à me trouver plus fort que tous ceux qui m'entourent, et vous savez que la bonne opinion que j'ai sur mon compte n'est venue qu'à bon escient. J'ai à travailler toujours, non pas pour arriver au fini, qui fait l'admiration des imbéciles. - Et cette chose que vulgairement on apprécie tant n'est que le fait d'un métier d'ouvrier, et rend
toute œuvre qui en résulte inartisticque et commune. Je ne dois chercher à compléter que pour le plaisir de faire plus vrai et plus savant. Et croyez bien qu'il y a toujours une heure ou l'on s'impose, et on a des admirateurs bien plus fervents, plus convaincus que ceux qui ne sont flattés que par une vaine apparence."

I quote this particularly interesting passage at length because it shows us Cézanne's thinking in a clear light. The reference to those "qui ne sont flattés que par une vaine apparence" could well be Cézanne's opinion of Manet, although there is no evidence that he had this in mind here. But the fact that he expresses the eventual hope that others will admire his work sincerely might indicate that he was still holding on to the possibility of some kind of popular success, but more likely by this time it was the admiration of the few, such as Chocquet, Murer, and Gachet, that he was referring to.

57 Theodore Reff, Manet: Olympia, pp. 32-35.

58 See, for example, Zola's response to Duret's request for Cézanne's studio address, in Zola, Correspondance, II, 219-20, especially n. 2. Zola's hesitation may reveal his increasing doubts about his friend's abilities as an artist, or it may actually reflect a genuine concern for Cézanne's welfare, in a sense protecting him from the critics who had savaged his works in the past.
CHAPTER IV

THE TEMPTRESS AND THE PAINTER

1. Background

When Paul Cézanne returned to Paris from Provence after the Franco-Prussian war, he brought with him a new attitude toward his art. Painting in solitude in l'Estaque during the war, he had turned his attention to landscape, and he worked methodically toward a style that embraced a more natural, and yet more intellectual, approach to form and color. In the broader perspective of his overall development, this concentrated study of landscape was perhaps the most significant factor in shaping his later stylistic development.

As indicated in the previous chapters, Cézanne's style had changed from a monochromatic Realism to a coloristic Romantic-Realism by this time, and the works which span the war period exemplify the sureness of his commitment to color.

Contributing to his development as a colorist is Cézanne's especially close contact with Camille Pissarro
In the early years of the 1870's. In part, this was due to the changes in his personal life. His relationship with Hortense Fiquet resulted in a son, born in January 1872 in Paris. Shortly after, the family moved to the environs of Pontoise, settling in Saint-Ouen-l'Aumone for the year, and then moving to Auvers-sur-Oise. Their stay at Auvers would last until the summer of 1874. The move made economic sense. It was simply cheaper to live there than in the city. Returning to Aix with a mistress and son was apparently unthinkable, for fear of his father's reaction. Living on his small stipend, Cézanne was forced to economize.\(^1\)

In terms of Cézanne's art, the opportunity to work closely with Pissarro is significant. Pissarro had been living in Pontoise intermittently since 1866, and settled there in 1872. Pissarro and Cézanne had struck up a friendship at the Académie Suisse in Paris in the early 1860's, and the two remained friends until Pissarro's death in 1903.\(^2\) Cézanne already owed much to Pissarro in the way of technical advice and moral support. It was from Pissarro that Cézanne learned the specific nature of the Impressionist approach to color. Working with Pissarro directly, learning his brushwork and palette layout, and painting with him outdoors, aided Cézanne's new approach.\(^3\) From this emerged a new color structure
and a new attitude about the relationship of painting to nature. But, as important was the example set by Pissarro himself. The work ethic which was so strong in Cézanne throughout his life was positively reinforced by the committed, methodical and conscientious Pissarro. Cézanne admired Pissarro's "humility" before nature and art, a quality that he came to emulate.  

Besides Pissarro, there were other artists, and art enthusiasts, at Pontoise and Auvers with whom Cézanne had contact with during his stay there. Edouard Béliard worked with Pissarro in 1872 in Pontoise. Armand Guillaumin was a frequent painting companion of Pissarro and Cézanne there. Living in Auvers was Dr. Paul Gachet, a medical doctor and amateur printmaker who seems to have known Cézanne from an earlier period, perhaps in the Midi. Also present in Auvers was the painter Charles Daubigny, who had been a defender of the young Cézanne's work in the 1866 Salon. Living in the nearby village of Valmondois was the aging Honoré Daumier, and Camille Corot was a frequent visitor of both Daubigny and Daumier. Thus, in the Pontoise/Auvers area Cézanne had the opportunity to work in a true artists' environment, one different from that of Paris, one where, as in Provence, he was free from pressures and expectations,
and able to pursue a more leisurely course of study and communion with nature.  

Again, this differentiation between urban and rural environments plays its significant role in Cézanne's life and art. The need to escape from the city, to seek a rural and relatively undisturbed place to work out the problems of his painting, was manifested both in the continual shifting between Paris and Provence of the 1860's, and in the period of isolation in L'Estaque during the war. Cézanne's most productive periods were those spent in the country, and the Pontoise/Auvers stay was one of his most intensely productive times.

A further point about the conducive environment at Pontoise and Auvers is that Cézanne was in the company of sympathetic admirers, rather than theorists. Certainly Pissarro, and to a lesser extent Guillaumin, held a respect for him. Daubigny had already demonstrated his support. Gachet came to hold Cézanne in great esteem, and only his later association with Van Gogh obscured their friendship. In a word, Cézanne experienced in Pontoise and Auvers a feeling of peer support and sympathetic admiration that he had sought, but never really realized, even in Provence.

Cézanne did not really develop new subjects in the 1870's, but rather reiterated, and made variations upon,
earlier subjects. Purely formal subjects, such as still-life and landscape, increasingly occupied his attention, while his literary or narrative subjects were basically restatements of previous work. This split between subject matter focuses attention on the nature of Cézanne's iconography in this period, for now the fewer narrative and literary subjects stand out dramatically against the growing number of formal compositions.

Were the literary paintings of this period, i.e. from 1872 until Cézanne's return visit to Pissarro in Pontoise in 1877, really just the final resolution of his Romantic inclinations of the late 1860's, or were they something different and apart from these works of the previous decade? Does this repetition suggest that Cézanne was simply "trying out" his new coloristic style on familiar material, or does it imply something more complex, having to do with the metaphorical significance of the subject itself?

Another way of thinking through this problem is to inquire as to the reasons for their demise. From one point of view, their disappearance is evidence that Cézanne purged himself of the Romantic past in favor of the Realist present. In other words, the role of imagination became subordinate to that of observation. The dilemma posed by the synthesis of Romanticism and
Realism was thus resolved in favor of the latter, and the particular manifestation this Realism took was in landscapes, figure pieces, portraits and still-lifes. From this viewpoint, Delacroix's influence on Cézanne's colorism plays a less significant role than Pissarro's.

The alternative point of view follows the pattern taken by this exposition in the earlier chapters of this study. The fact that Cézanne did not paint literary subjects after 1877 suggests that the particular metaphorical problems which these subjects addressed were either resolved, or no longer relevant. This view acknowledges the significant role of Romanticism in Cézanne's art, and implies that what occurred in the 1870's was not a purge, but a resolution and synthesis. If the original thesis of this study is correct, that many of Cézanne's early works reflect a self-conscious awareness of the multiple choices facing the artist, ultimately leading to the concept of a synthetic art that reconciled these choices, then this corollary is a most promising path of inquiry.

As Cézanne moved into the 1870's, his art became more general in reference. The overt dialectic of the paintings of the mid-1860's (Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne and Portrait of Emperaire) had been a highly specific reference to his personal experience. By the
early 1870's, his subject matter changed to one still pointed in reference, but of a more public nature. While Une Moderne Olympia, for example, contained a personal reflection upon fame and success, the subject appealed to a public awareness of the continuing Manet controversy. Although he suggests a possible resolution through some form of synthesis, his conflict is not resolved. In the 1870's, Cézanne drew the circle more widely, and in the process achieved the synthesis of temperament and intellect which he had intimated earlier.

What Cézanne seems to have realized after 1872 was that temperament, the personal imprint of the artist upon his work, could not only be manifested in the cathartic emotion of a work, but realized in the synthetic conception of a work as well. After working with Pissarro, he seems to have realized that "sensation," the word with which he described so much in his later art, was at least parallel, if not identical, with temperament. But, for him, "sensation" was inclusive of, and dependent upon, a response to nature in a Realist sense, whereas temperament had been rooted in emotion and imagination, as a Romantic conception. In other words, "sensation" represented a relationship with the outside world which temperament did not, or could not, allow. By expressing his personal experience clearly and
forcefully, he could express the results of this relationship between himself and nature to the viewer in the work, through stylistic and compositional means. "Sensation" was still highly personal, and Cézanne regarded his own with a kind of fanatic jealousy. However, it represented not only a new understanding of the relationship between the artist and nature, but of the relationship between the personal and the public.

The Impressionist painter is, in a sense, turning his personal "sensation" of the landscape into a general experience. More important than mood or anecdote is not only the perception of the "sensation" of the landscape, but also the record of that "sensation" on the canvas. In other words, the subjective acts of looking and painting are focused through the rigorous discipline of the Impressionist style. The specific artistic "moment" is translated through the medium of the painting into an experience that is at once emotional and intellectual, personal and public.

But, the discipline upon which Impressionism was based was still not rigorous enough to render objectively the experiences which the artists wished to convey. Renoir's disenchantment with Impressionism around 1880, Monet's development of a serial manner of working in the same decade, and Manet's "commentary" on perception in
his 1882 *Bar at the Folies-Bergère*, all seem to be responses to the inability of the artists concerned to render their perceptions and feelings precisely within the Impressionist style. The Impressionist technique was too personalized, as the hand of the artist, not just the eye, interprets the visual experience. The temperament of the artist thus manifests itself through the physical act of painting as well as through the individual perception of the landscape. The problem was not the elimination of temperament in art, but the expression of temperament within, and perhaps through, an objective framework of perception. This was, in part, the problem which Seurat addressed in the 1880's with his Neo-Impressionist technique and style. ^11^

Impressionism did not, however, revolve exclusively around the problem of the artistic perception of nature. Both urban and rural Impressionist subjects carried the stamp of bourgeois experience, a world of harmony, beauty, and accessibility. The rural was, in fact, increasingly treated as suburban, perhaps to render it less Romantic. It was the same subject matter which Baudelaire had identified as being "modern" and, with a hint of irony, "heroic." ^12^

Thus, Cézanne's paintings of the 1870's anticipated to a certain degree the direction that his Impressionist
contemporaries would take by the end of the decade. Cézanne's works existed in a context that encouraged the assimilation of subjective and objective experience under a Realist style. His quest, then, for a synthesis of the two modes, Realist and Romantic, led him to a style that was not, by the end of the decade, mainstream. The recapitulation of literary subjects in the 1870's is interesting in relation to this synthesis, for they seem to be reflections upon the dilemmas that had confronted him all along: public success versus anonymous dedication, preservation of individuality, and innovation in style.

Thus, we shall examine several paintings by Cézanne from the period 1872-77 in light of Cézanne's search for a synthetic ideal. It will be demonstrated that Cézanne's style and unique subject matter in La Tentation de Saint-Antoine and L'Eternel féminin was a culmination of the dilemmas of his early career, and that they metaphorically express the position of the artist in the present and his view toward the future.

ii. Temptation, Realism and La Tentation de Saint-Antoine

Gustave Flaubert's La Tentation de Saint-Antoine was published in its entirety for the first time in 1874.
The genesis of the novel, however, spanned more than two decades. Flaubert first wrote it in 1848-1849, then rewrote it in 1856. A fragment of the novel appeared in L'Artiste, then under the directorship of Flaubert's close friend, Théophile Gautier, in 1856-1857. The final rewriting was finished in 1872, but there were modifications up to the time of publication. The critical reception of the book was mostly negative, and not a little confused, for La Tentation de Saint-Antoine was and still is a challenging and in many ways unique book.  

The position of La Tentation de Saint-Antoine in Flaubert's oeuvre is also peculiar, for the master of Realist literature chose to create a tale of intense visionary quality, a work of fantastic and vivid imagination that was based upon an erudite, one might even say esoteric, scholarship. On the surface, it is a tale about the tribulations of the great hermit saint, as he fends off numerous threatening visions that tempt him with a variety of sins and heresies. The tale is a compendium of religious history, chronicling the factions and heresies that abounded in the early Church. On yet another level, it is a psychological study of committed, even obsessive, religious behavior.
Flaubert's Saint Anthony is faced with a variety of temptations, presenting the saint with a set of alternative choices. As the temptations are heaped one upon the other, the dualism of good and evil that seemed clear to the saint at the beginning slowly slips away under the chaos of conflicting doctrines. Flaubert characterizes the saint's perception of his temptations as not just simple matters of right and wrong, nor as representations of a great dualistic universe. They represent for the saint an assault upon the very logic of reason that had made his faith strong in the first place. By changing the rules of the game, Satan removes Saint Anthony's firm grasp on what he perceives to be the truth of his convictions.

But, a part of the meaning of Flaubert's novel seems to be available only to a more complex reading of the work, a reading based on a knowledge of Flaubert himself. In the introduction to her translation of *La Tentation*, Kitty Mrosovsky considers many of these possible meanings, but slips past the one which seems most obvious. When she asks "was Flaubert casting himself as a saint?" she dismisses the question without really answering it. The possibility that Flaubert was casting himself as a saint, and that the work was in part about himself, does not appear to satisfy Mrosovsky's
sense of the work. But what if that is in fact the meaning? Flaubert did indicate that he, rather than Saint Anthony, was the subject of La Tentation. One might say that the extended allegory of the saint's tribulation alludes to the tribulation of Flaubert as a writer, and that the heresies he witnesses are the "heresies" of art, the multitude of possible artistic paths that deviate from the truth. Anthony is confronted with the same choice as the artist, a choice between the material and the spiritual. He is confronted as well with the problem of creativity. The temptation, then, is the temptation of artistic choice, the path that the artist will take, and the multiplicity is that of art itself. Flaubert sought to define the artist, and the role of the artist, in his work as much as he sought to describe religious behavior.

The relevance of Flaubert's La Tentation to Paul Cézanne's work should be apparent. In many ways, Flaubert and Cézanne shared similar temperaments and a similar respect for art and nature. A parallel exists between Flaubert's book and Cézanne's paintings of the same subject, a parallel that has to do with self-reflection and the artist's understanding of the relationship of art and nature. Flaubert, like Cézanne, apparently saw the dilemmas of his own career and art as
a suitable, even necessary, subject. Cézanne's Saint Anthony, if not a true personification of the artist, is at least a figure with whom Cézanne could identify. His treatment of the subject illuminates the dilemmas confronting both himself and, by implication, artists in general.

Scholars who have addressed Cézanne's imagery of temptation, especially in the paintings called "La Tentation de Saint-Antoine," have seen only feminine temptation as the motivating impulse, embodying the fear that the artist expressed much later in life about women as "cats" who tried to "get their hooks" into him. As such, the early violent images become, in the view of many scholars, simply early manifestations of his misanthropy in old age. Naturally, Cézanne's subjects where women are the perpetrators of evil upon men are explained in the same vein. But Cézanne did not begin to manifest this attitude toward women until well after he painted these works. There are no statements in his early letters which suggest he had any particular fear of women. This is not to suggest that the images of temptation, like "La Tentation de Saint-Antoine," are not about carnal temptation, or that they do not manifest some deeper fear of women. We have already seen, however, in "Pastorale" and "L'après-midi à Naples," that the
erotic elements of some of Cézanne's paintings emerge from an interest in Romantic prototypes, and from a desire to present controversial and shocking images.

Cézanne's likening of art to erotic sensuality, as implied in Une Moderne Olympia, suggests that his treatment of the subject of La Tentation de Saint-Antoine carried implications other than purely erotic ones. Given Cézanne's previous reflections upon art, the artist, and the dilemma of choice in the face of apparently conflicting views of art, one might perceive the subject of La Tentation as having a metaphorical nature. Cézanne could have found within the subject of St. Anthony a parallel to himself. His own self-questioning during this period in his career could have assumed the proportions of a religious crisis, as Kurt Badt has suggested, and he might have used the St. Anthony subject as a means of expressing the significance of this self-reflection.

The earlier question of Flaubert and his character of St. Anthony can now be rephrased: was Cézanne casting himself in the role of a saint? It is significant that the beginning of Cézanne's isolation from Paris, and from Parisian artists, takes place at about the same time that he began the Tentation series. His isolation during the war period in L'Estaque, followed by his relative
solitude in Pontoise and Auvers, led inevitably to longer periods in the Midi where the artist worked alone and unbothered. While the legend of Cézanne as the "hermit painter" of Aix exaggerates his separation from people, he was a man who grew to prefer solitude for his work.20 One might see in his interest in Saint Anthony a tendency to identify with the hermit saint, at least in his desire to work apart from the mass of humanity, and to devote himself fully to the problems of his art.

The literary context in which Cézanne worked in the early 1870's was a manifestation of a larger intellectual environment that encouraged allegorical thinking, and a society that valued the development of a basically literary awareness from an early age.21 Cézanne's identification with Saint Anthony, like his identification with Balzac's Frenhofer, would not have been unusual to a Romantic-inspired generation. It is, however, the Realist context that he is so often associated with that makes this self-identification seem unusual, for such ideas seem out of place in a materialistic and bourgeois society. But Flaubert, too, is most often considered a Realist. The degree to which Cézanne melded Romantic and Realist ideas in his art is perhaps reflected in his life as well.
The first version of *La Tentation de Saint-Antoine* dates from about 1869 (Plate LXIV), and therefore seems to have nothing to do with Flaubert's novel. It is possible that Cézanne had seen the 1856-1857 *L'Artiste* publication of Flaubert's book, of which one fragment was the Queen of Sheba episode, but it seems unlikely, for there is little correspondence between the image and the written description of the temptation scene. Cézanne's conception of the saint and his temptation in this early version is unique and idiosyncratic. Indeed, the temptation itself is secondary to the images of the three large nudes in the foreground. While the title is specific, it remains uncertain where it came from. Cézanne may have arrived at the subject coincidentally, based on other artistic prototypes in a similar vein.

This early version of *La Tentation* fits comfortably into the context of other male-female encounter images of the period. The first version of *Une Moderne Olympia* and the early *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe* are almost exactly contemporary, as is the first of *L'Après-midi à Naples*. Stylistically, these paintings are all very close to one another, employing a dark palette and rather heavy application of pigment on the canvas. With the exception of the early *L'Après-midi à Naples*, they are very similar in size. From the curious subject of *La Tentation*,


however, it seems clear that the work was conceived more as a figure study, not unlike the bather scenes, rather than a narrative or literary interpretation. The prominence of the three nudes makes the actual confrontation of the saint and the fourth woman seem like an afterthought. There seems to be little relation, in fact, between the image and any of the traditional descriptions of the saint's torments.

Cézanne had the opportunity to find out about the publication of Flaubert's *La Tentation de Saint-Antoine* from a very direct and reliable source, his friend Emile Zola. As early as April 9, 1874, Zola had written to Flaubert to tell him that he had sent a review of *La Tentation* to Sémaphore de Marseille. But Zola had assisted Flaubert with the latter's premiere of *Le Candidat* on March 11 of that year, so he was in contact with Flaubert even before the publication of *La Tentation*. Zola would also attend the dinner for the "auteurs sifflés" with Flaubert, Léon Daudet, Ivan Turgenev, and Edmond de Goncourt, on April 14, that is, just after his review of *La Tentation* was published. Zola thus had an opportunity not only to read it, but to speak with the author personally about the book.

On April 15, the first of the independent exhibitions of the group that would become known as the
Impressionists opened at Nadar's studio on the Boulevard des Capucines. It seems likely that Cézanne at least attended the show during its month, if indeed he was not at the opening. While in Paris, there is no doubt that he saw and spoke with Zola. Thus, it seems likely that this is when he found out about La Tentation.

The two versions of La Tentation de Saint-Antoine done under the inspiration of Flaubert's book seem to have been painted soon after Cézanne read the work, that is, probably in the fall and winter of 1874-1875, after he returned to Paris from a summer stay in Aix. The larger of the two paintings, V. 241 (Plate LXV), went to Eugène Murer, a patissier and hotelier in Paris, and a friend of Pissarro and Paul Gauguin. The exact time of transfer and the circumstances of the acquisition are not known. Murer was known to have provided meals to some of his artist friends, and perhaps this was Cézanne's way of repaying the debt. We do know, for example, that when he was in Auvers, Pissarro persuaded the local grocer to accept Cézanne's canvasses in lieu of cash payment. Whatever the circumstances, the fact that Murer obtained the painting seems to indicate a Paris origin for at least the larger of the two works.

The two later versions of La Tentation de Saint-Antoine are similar in composition, but the differences
suggest that the smaller of the two works was a preparation for the larger. In the smaller canvas (V. 240; Plate LXVI), the composition is more open, with the two central figures of Saint Anthony and the Queen of Sheba separated by a large and rather empty space. In the larger version, the two figures are much closer together, so that the outstretched arm of Satan (or a demon) bridges the space between the saint and the Queen. This latter design is much more effective, suggesting a physical proximity between the resisting saint and the source of his temptation. From the number of studies which Cézanne did of this Satan figure, it is clear that he understood the importance of this visual link (Plate LXVII). The smaller version also contains details that connect it more closely to the narrative found in Flaubert's book, for example, the dark bird specifically described in the Queen of Sheba episode. This too suggests that the more literal small version preceded the more freely interpreted large version, where Cézanne resolved compositional problems at the expense of accuracy to the text.

Theodore Reff has described Cézanne's choice of the Queen of Sheba episode from Flaubert's work. The Queen of Sheba episode is the most sensual of the temptations of the saint, and thus it appealed to Cézanne's taste for
overtly erotic imagery. However, there are some differences between the narrative and the image. The Queen of Sheba, for example, is presented in the painting as an alluring nude figure, while in the book she is clothed, albeit provocatively so. If, as suggested earlier, Cézanne did not choose this episode for purely erotic and sensual reasons, and if the image is not simply a manifestation of his suspicion of women, then what was the particular attraction of this episode, and why did he enhance its erotic character?

For Flaubert, the Queen of Sheba episode represented more than simply a sensual temptation for Saint Anthony. Anthony, in fact, says nothing during the entire scene. As Jeanne Bern has pointed out, the Queen of Sheba is an image, rather than a real woman, as are all the women in Flaubert's La Tentation. She is to be seen, rather than possessed, as Flaubert himself said. It is vision which reveals the nature of the Queen's temptation.

The confrontation of man and woman is repeated in Cézanne's art many times. In Une Moderne Olympia, Cézanne renders a scene somewhat similar to La Tentation, except that the man does not reject the woman. Again, the primacy of sight over the other senses is emphasized by the act of presenting the nude woman under the gaze of a spectator. In the contemporary La Lutte d'amour (V.
379 and 380; Plates LXVIII and LXIX), the confrontation is physical, as it was in the earlier *Le Enlèvement* and *Satyres et Nymphes* (1864-68; V. 94; Plate LXX). One could also speak of a confrontation in *L'Éternel féminin* (V. 247), except that in this case some of the men are actually lunging toward the woman. About this, more will be said shortly. Clearly, there is no single viewpoint on the relationship of women and men in this variety of images.

One motivation for choosing the Queen of Sheba episode, of all temptations in Flaubert's book, could well have been its relation to Cézanne's native Provence. A fact that seems to have escaped Cézanne scholars in dealing with *La Tentation de Saint-Antoine* is that the Queen of Sheba had long figured in the folklore of Provence, including Cézanne's native Aix. The Queen of Sheba was a major figure in the Carnival and Fête-Dieu processions of many Provençal towns. Her presence seems to date back to the origins of such processions, under the reign of King René. The original role of the Queen of Sheba is not entirely clear, however, she was apparently a part of the procession representing not only evil, but pagan beliefs and deceptions. In Garcin's description of the Fête-Dieu procession in Aix, the Queen of Sheba is preceded by King Herod and by a panoply of
classical gods and goddesses. She is also followed by a group of mythological characters. 36

If Flaubert's book, and particularly the episode of the Queen of Sheba, reminded Cézanne of an earlier period in his life, it would not be the first time that the painter was inspired by a nostalgia for his youth in Provence. The bather paintings had their source in Cézanne's fond memories of swimming in the Arc River in Aix. The landscapes, too, suggest something of a nostalgic air at times, especially those that are of specific Provençal sites that Cézanne visited as a youth. But La Tentation is not primarily a nostalgic painting in any sense of the word. Its illustrative qualities place it firmly in the realm of Flaubert's story. It must be assumed, therefore, that Cézanne was drawn by the content of the episode, and by extension, he is likely to have had a particular affinity for either the character of Saint Anthony or the meaning of his temptation as described in the book.

A comparison of La Tentation de Saint-Antoine and Une Moderne Olympia is revealing. Une Moderne Olympia had its origins in a Realist work, i.e. Manet's Olympia, but it included an element of Romanticism in its sensuality. La Tentation, too, combines Romantic and Realist references. The early versions of both paintings
date from the same time, around 1869. The later versions of both images are also from the same basic period. The later *Une Moderne Olympia* could have been painted as early as 1873, though it possibly is as late as 1874-76. The later *La Tentations*, as we have already stated, could be no earlier than summer or fall of 1874, and probably no later than 1876-1877. Both subjects have an external source, that is, they were inspired by some source outside the artist's own imagination, although both interpret that outside source in a very free and original way. The cast of characters in both works is similar in that the focus of each painting is on a nude woman and a man who is confronted by that woman.

*Une Moderne Olympia*, especially the second and later version, is Cézanne's ironic reexamination of Manet's influence. It asserts his desire to modernize the path which Manet had started out upon, while at the same time it reflects the significant decision to combine Realist and Romantic elements under a coloristic style whose implications were different from Manet's. The woman who reclines under the gaze of the admiring self-portrait of Cézanne in the later version thus potentially represents several points. She is a personification of art; she is an inspiring muse; she is a manifestation of glory, or at least fame. Her nudity is both traditional and modern,
for it represents both Truth in the classical sense, and Nature in the modern sense. She is an allegorical manifestation of the artistic success and achievement that Cézanne desired, although the irony of the work rests partly in the fact that success had not yet arrived for the painter.

The contact between the admiring artist and the courtesan is primarily visual, and indeed, the woman seems to be a kind of vision, resplendent in her halo of white linen. While she reaches out, Olympia does not physically touch the man in the second, more coloristic, version. The insistence on visual contact is not far removed from what Manet sought in his own Olympia. It is also close to what Flaubert created verbally in his text. It also relates to the visionary qualities of Cézanne's own later La Tentation. Here, vision is avoided, as the hermit saint covers his eyes before the sight of the nude woman. The primacy of natural sight is denied, and the Queen of Sheba causes the artist/hermit to turn away from direct visual contact.

An interesting relationship thus exists between the style and subject matter of both the early and late Une Moderne Olympia, and the early and late versions of La Tentation de Saint-Antoine. In the early versions of each, the style remained monochromatic and heavily
dependent on tactile qualities of surface. The subjects of each reinforced the concept of tactility. In the early Une Moderne Olympia, the woman is depicted touching the man's brow. In the early La Tentation, the artist stresses the physical, corporeal quality of the bodies of the prominent nude women through a thick impasto and prominent brushstrokes. The later Olympia and La Tentations are painted in a more visually complex coloristic style. The subjects in these works are less physical in their actions or presentations: Olympia no longer physically touches the gentleman, and the hermit saint rejects the sight of Sheba with a prominent gesture.

La Tentation de Saint-Antoine shows us, not admiration, but rejection, the antithesis of Une Moderne Olympia. Clearly Cézanne did not reject the possibility of success, nor did he reject the notion of truth or integrity in art. What, then, does the hermit saint's reaction to the temptress mean? The parallels between La Tentation and Une Moderne Olympia suggest that Cézanne saw a similarity between the Queen of Sheba and the courtesan Olympia. Both women offer themselves to the man. One man rejects her, the other admires her (but in a rather detached way). Each woman offers something different. Olympia offered, by implication, fame, or
notoriety. The Queen of Sheba, in Flaubert's book, first offers material wealth, and only secondly sensual pleasure. What is more, the Queen of Sheba tells Saint Anthony that she has rejected the wise Solomon (a renowned elder) for him, the virtuous saint. By implication, she offers knowledge, knowledge that is perhaps forbidden. In the context of his painting, the connotation seems to be that the artist/hermit is confronted by the possibility of material gain, but only at the expense of his integrity. Shunning such a path, making a choice in the face of this particular kind of success, was spiritually akin to the hermit saint's rejection of sensual pleasure and material wealth.

If *Une Moderne Olympia* is about the choice that faced Cézanne in the wake of Manet's climb to artistic success, then *La Tentation* might be about the dangers of such success, or at least about the problem of integrity in seeking quick paths to success. Manet's triumph in the 1873 Salon with *Le Bon Bock*, for example, was a triumph through what was perceived by Manet's fellow artists to be compromise. This is what Cézanne seems to resist when he says "j'ai à travailler toujours, non pas pour arriver au fini, qui fait l'admiration des imbéciles." The style of *Le Bon Bock* was retrograde, rather than progressive. Manet, it appeared, had
capitulated to popular taste in order to win a position in the art establishment.

The situation Cézanne found himself in in the 1870's was quite different from that of the late 1860's. He now had supporters, and he had made the decision to separate himself from not only the mainstream of Parisian art, but also the course which some of his Impressionist friends, such as Monet, were taking as well. Pissarro, Gachet, Murer, and Victor Chocquet formed the core of his new "patrons." While deflecting the issues of public success as a matter of compromise, Cézanne seems to have begun to perceive his artistic destiny as one akin to the spiritual struggles of a hermit saint. By withdrawing to the Midi to paint, by severing contacts with both radical and conservative artists, Cézanne sought to preserve his integrity and his style. Cézanne's lack of enthusiasm for the Impressionist exhibitions, and his decision not to show in them after 1877, seems to reflect the artist's desire to remain faithful to his own path toward acceptance and success, but it also suggests that the issue is no longer important.

If this seems like a complete change of attitude toward success on the part of Cézanne, one must bear in mind that Une Moderne Olympia was apparently meant to be ironic. The admiring figure of Cézanne was at once
implicated and disinterested. Cézanne did not give us a definitive statement of direction in Une Moderne Olympia. La Tentation de Saint-Antoine does not state an explicit direction either. Instead, it restates the dilemma of the artist in the face of artistic choice. While the works come close to personal allegory, they exist in a context that relates them firmly with Cézanne's personal experience. Temptation, sensual or otherwise, is a clear reference to choice. Cézanne acknowledges Flaubert as a parallel through his choice of subject matter. But perhaps more significantly, Flaubert's novel came close to the synthesis which Cézanne had himself sought for several years, in which past and present, Romantic and Realist, emotional and intellectual, were brought together under the unique temperament of the individual artist. This synthesis may have been at the heart of Cézanne's treatment of the theme of St. Anthony.

iii. The Classic and Romantic Past in L'Eternel féminin

The curious and provocative L'Eternel féminin (c. 1877; V. 247; Plate LXXI) is an extension of the ideas elaborated by Cézanne in La Tentation de Saint-Antoine. While the latter was implicitly about the artist, L'Eternel féminin makes a clear and direct reference to a
painter, although the figure in question does not appear to be a self-portrait. He stands before an easel, painting an enthroned nude woman, who is surrounded by a throng of admiring men. By virtue of her nudity and her centrality in the composition, the woman of this work is relatable to Cézanne's Olympia and Queen of Sheba. L'Eternel féminin is also similar to La Tentation de Saint-Antoine. The implication is that the artist is confronted by a personification, of art perhaps, and its associated fame. The specific personal temptations and personal choices that are so important to Une Moderne Olympia and La Tentation de Saint-Antoine, appear less significant here. Yet, temptation and choice do play a role in the meaning of the work.

There is an almost Symbolist mood in L'Eternel féminin, an atmosphere of decadence that is rather unusual for Cézanne, and for almost any other artist in the 1870's. From Cézanne's drawings (Plate LXXII), it is clear that the painting evolved from a response to Eugène Delacroix's Death of Sardanapalus. The appeal of Delacroix, and of his Sardanapalus in particular, has already been cited. However, Cézanne has changed the sex of the principal figure in the Delacroix from a passive male surrounded by erotic nudes (recall Cézanne's
translation of this image in *Pastorale* to a solitary nude woman surrounded by admiring men.

The central nude woman is enthroned beneath a kind of canopy, while a group of men gather at her feet, some offering gifts, others playing musical instruments. The painter on the right side strikes a particularly dramatic pose as he looks toward the woman, brush raised in anticipation before placing another stroke on the canvas. The other men represent various professions: one, left of center, is quite obviously a religious figure, as he wears a bishop's miter; another, to the right of the woman, is a uniformed military man. Others through their costume, appear to represent the working-class, as the lunging man with the striped shirt and the man who restrains him in the lower right seem to be. This range of professions, and Cézanne's interest in their attributes, reminds one of the series of portraits of Uncle Dominique of the 1865-1866.

While the painter does not seem to be a direct reference to Cézanne, there are figures in the lower foreground that resemble Cézanne. The bald head of the man seen from behind in the lower center composition is especially prominent, and given that Cézanne was at this time similarly bald, one may infer that the figure is some sort of self-reference. The figure in the lower
left corner, even though very sketchy, has a high forehead and intense eyes that also resemble Cézanne's self-portraits of the period. If either one of these figures is a self-reference, then the obliqueness of that reference is quite different from the self-portrait in Une Moderne Olympia.

There are three points about the painting which are indicative of the possible meaning: first, the style and imagery of the painting itself, with the attendant references to other artists; second, the context in which it was created; and third, the painting's title.

L'Eternal féminin dates from 1875-77. Its style reflects the coloristic treatment characteristic of his period of study with Pissarro - a high-key palette and somewhat broken brushstrokes of relatively pure color. It continues to reflect the influence of Delacroix's style, as well. The painting's surface is quite active, as is true of many of the works of the mid-1870's; but, in this particular instance there seems to be an exceptional fluidity in paint application. The "sketchiness" which results from this free treatment endows the painting with a greater energy. In spirit, then, L'Eternal féminin reflects the style Cézanne developed in the mid and late 1860's and, of all the
figural paintings of the 1870's, it appears to be the most Romantic and temperamental in execution.

In choosing the violent eroticism of Delacroix's Death of Sardanapalus as a point of departure, Cézanne began with a paradigm of Romantic temperament. Delacroix's coloristic innovations proved essential, especially at a time when Cézanne was exploring color as the consolidating structural and expressive basis of his painting. Further, even more unmistakable evidence of his interest in Delacroix is found in the copies he made in the early 1870's after other Delacroix works, including the Barque of Dante and Hamlet and Horatio (Plate LXXIII).44

In addition, L'Eternel féminin refers to other artists' well-known and significant works. Gustave Courbet's The Artist's Studio, 1855 (Plate LXXIV), serves as a comparison, with the central nude woman, the artist at his easel, and the crowd of people from different professions gathered around these figures. Closer in time to Cézanne's painting are a series of sketches by Fantin-Latour for a painting entitled Truth, dating in the mid-1860's (Plate LXXV). The painting itself was shown in the 1865 Salon, but the artist was not happy with it and destroyed the work after the exhibition. From the surviving drawings and sketches, we know that he
presented a nude woman surrounded by writers, musicians and artists (the one at an easel apparently represents Manet), and that this is an allegory of Truth is borne out by the word "Verité" included in some of the drawings, a device to dispel Fantin-Latour's fear that the work would be mistaken for a "painters' orgy."  

For both Courbet and Fantin-Latour, the nude woman not only was a symbol of artistic truth, beauty, but made allusion to tradition. The nude serves as a means of embodying beauty as an allegory for and corollary of artistic beauty. But, for Courbet and Fantin-Latour the nude also represented truth to nature. Their Realist appraisal of the nude was both symbolic and literal, a combination of traditional concerns and Realist ones. Yet, they failed to achieve a genuine synthesis of Romantic imagination and Realist perception. Courbet's The Painter's Studio does not ultimately satisfy the demands of both Realism and Romanticism, and its somewhat uneasy combination of reality and allegory was Courbet's only foray into such territory. Fantin-Latour's realization of his failure to create a modern allegory led him to destroy the painting The Toast.  

Cézanne's desire for a synthesis of styles and ideals has already been discussed. It is not surprising, then, that he should have been attracted to a
composition, or to several compositions, that evidenced similar concerns. Cézanne, however, stated the problem in ironic terms, as he had with *Une Moderne Olympia* and *L'Après-midi à Naples*, letting the incongruity and discontinuity of such imagery speak for itself. The ambiguity of *L'Eternel féminin* is the direct result of this ironic synthesis: a Romantic-Realist work of art.

The circumstances surrounding the creation of *L'Eternel féminin* suggests that the painting was made for a specific audience, one that would be receptive to the allusions within the work. The genesis of the painting took place under the influence of the Pontoise/Auvers circle, specifically Pissarro, Guillaumin, and Gachet. While Chappuis dates the *Sardanapalus* sketches very broadly, 1870-75, they could very well have been done at Auvers or Pontoise. One suspects that the painting had a meaning that the Pontoise/Auvers group would have recognized and understood, as other works from the period contained subtle iconographical details that reflected the interrelationships of the group.\(^{47}\) We know, for example, that Gachet had a great interest in Courbet, and had been part of Courbet's circle in Paris.\(^{48}\) While the idea is purely speculative, it is an intriguing possibility that Gachet could have encouraged Cézanne to create a work in response to Courbet, perhaps
specifically to The Artist's Studio, just as he could have had a hand in guiding the second version of Une Moderne Olympia, a painting that he owned. The irony of both works would have been understood and appreciated by those around Cézanne.

Cézanne's response to the dilemma of reconciling Romanticism and Realism, as expressed in L'Eternel féminin, is really not a solution to the problem, any more than Une Moderne Olympia is. L'Eternel féminin does, however, achieve the most integrated expression of Romantic colorism and Realist detail, within a compositional format that is quite formal and even Classical, to that time in Cézanne's career. Once again, he asserts his independence as an artist, rejecting the influences of his contemporaries and the prevailing schools of his day. If the foreground figure with his back to the viewer is indeed a self-reference, the fact that he turns away from the "public," i.e. the viewer, might be construed as a rejection of that public for a more private audience, perhaps his circle of admirers in Auvers. Whatever the ultimate reference of the painting, whether to Delacroix, Courbet, or even Manet, Cézanne continued to express his awareness of the difficulties in creating a synthetic art from Romantic and Realist, not to mention Classical, ideals.
The title of the painting, however, suggests that Cézanne was specifically interested in giving the temperamental and Romantic side of his art a renewed importance within the framework of his new coloristic style. The phrase "L'Eternel féminin" is found in the first edition of the Larousse dictionary. There, the reference is to a line at the end of the second part of Goethe's Faust:

Alles Vergängliche
Ist nur ein Gleichnis;
Das Unzulängliche,
Hier wirds Ereignis;
Das Unbeschreibliche,
Hier ists getan;
Das Ewig-Weibliche
Zieht uns hinan.

"L'Eternel féminin" refers to the principle of love as a human, particularly feminine, quality. In the context of Faust, it refers to the redemptive powers of love in a world filled with sin and deception. There is nothing in Cézanne's work that refers directly to this use of the term or to this particular passage, but there is an earlier passage in the second Faust which does correspond well to his subject.

In Act III of the second Faust, Helen, the key character of the work, is described first in front of Menelaus' palace in Sparta, then in the courtyard of a
medieval castle. In the courtyard is described a canopy-covered throne:

Stufen zum Thron,
Teppich und Sitz,
Umhang und zelt
Artigen Schmuck;
Uber Uberwallt er,
Wolkenkränze bildend,
Unserer Königin Haupt,
Denn schon bestieg sie,
Eingeladen, herrlichen Pfuhl. 53

Lynceus and a host of other men offer her gifts. Faust himself is invited to sit beside her. A host of warriors appear in order to defend the honor of Helen. Cézanne's presentation of the subject in L'Eterne féminin corresponds fairly closely with this passage. 54

Goethe's Faust would have held several points of interest for Cézanne. 55 First, it is a story about temptation, especially the temptation to knowledge, not unlike Flaubert's La Tentation de Saint-Antoine, and even akin to the story of Tannhäuser. Second, Helen of Troy was a symbol of earthly beauty. Cézanne had already used a symbolic woman to express an idea, in Une Moderne Olympia. The characterization of Helen by Goethe was also symbolic, as she represented Faust's ideal. Cézanne could thus have responded not only to the Romantic version of Goethe's Helen, the symbol of an ideal in the mind of man, but to the tradition of Helen as the
Classical model of human beauty. Third, Cézanne had previously painted a work that has been interpreted as the Judgment of Paris (V. 16; Plate LXXVI). He would paint another version of the subject in the 1880's (V. 537; Plate LXXVII). Helen of Troy, of course, was the "prize" of that judgment. Helen is not only an appropriate symbol of beauty, but by extension she is also a symbol of the rewards of beauty, and thus a reference to art. Indeed, Faust must win Helen by retracing the evolution of the Greek spirit, which takes place in the third scene of Act II, the "Classical Walpurgis Night." The quest is for the Ideal of Beauty, contrasted to Mephistopheles' quest for the Ideal of Ugliness.

If indeed L'Eternal féminin was inspired by Goethe's second Faust, then the Romantic side of Cézanne's work is underscored. While there are correspondences which suggest a link between the painting and Faust, most significantly the title, Cézanne, as in the past, has modified the subject to his own expressive ends. Whereas the woman in the center of Cézanne's painting is nude, Helen in Faust is not; the second throne with Faust on it is not presented; and Cézanne's bishop is not accounted for in the poem. Nevertheless, we have seen how Cézanne took liberties with his transcription of Flaubert's work,
changing the details to heighten the sensual aspects of the narrative. But if in each case the nude woman is meant to be both a figure of carnal desire, as per the conventional thinking, and a symbol of artistic truth or knowledge, as suggested here, then he would have a very good reason to disregard a strict interpretation of the texts. Nudity not only touches upon a Classical sense of beauty, and Romantic sensuality, but becomes a Realist "allegory" of truth.

If one were to characterize the overall composition of *L'Eternel féminin*, one could say that it contains both Romantic and Classical aspects. It is Romantic in execution, color, and the activity suggested by the surrounding male figures. It reflects Classical features, however, in the symmetry of the composition, the centrality of the main figure, and the sense of calm expressed by the pose of that main figure, in contrast to the activity around her. The logic and organization of the composition of *L'Eternel féminin* should be compared to the composition of *Une Moderne Olympia* or *La Tentation de Saint-Antoine*. In the former, the centrality of the woman is offset by the diagonal arrangement of the other two figures in the work. In the smaller version of *La Tentation*, the composition is based on a large empty space in the center, and a rather confusing series of
diagonals that cross the picture plane. In the larger La Tentation, the woman is once again central, but the composition is not symmetrical. In fact, rarely in this period does Cézanne utilize such an obviously balanced composition in a figure painting. Does this perhaps relate to the artist's understanding of the subject as having a Classical reference? It is impossible to say with certainty. However, L'Eternel féminin does come the closest of his works of this period to synthesizing Classical elements with a Romantic colorism and brushwork and a Realist concern for detail.

Olympia, the Queen of Sheba, and Helen thus seem to represent three aspects of the same idea for Cézanne. Jeanne Bém has stated part of this relationship quite clearly: "La Reine de Saba est à Antoine ce qu'Hélène est à Faust dans le Second Faust." Beauty is in the domain of art, and the quest for beauty was the essence of art. But Cézanne had early in his career rejected the idea of painting merely beautiful pictures. He sought to express his temperament through his art, while rejecting the notion of sentiment. Force, power, virility, temperament and strong emotion, all were contrary to the conventions established by the art of his day, but they were the path toward the expression of his unique and personal sensibility in his art. While he tempered his radical
spirit, and increasingly sought to synthesize traditional artistic values with a progressive spirit, he never relinquished his goal of expressive individuality, which constituted for him the basis of success.

As Maurice Denis pointed out, and as we stated at the beginning of this study, Cézanne's search for synthesis in his art was a search for the reconciliation of past and present, the conflation of the Classical, the Romantic, and the Realist.⁵⁹ Olympia, the Queen of Sheba, and Helen, all have a Classical component and a modern component. On the one hand, each woman suggests the Classical interest in beauty. On the other hand, each represents a modern ambiguity. Each offers herself to the artist both as a source of inspiration and, by implication, as a reward. If the artist seeks truth, the naked bodies of these women hold the promise of that truth. But the risk is to become enamored of beauty itself, that is, beauty as the sole end of art. Such narrowness of view produces the "vain surface appearance" ("une vain apparence") which Cézanne detested in the art of the successful academics, and even in successful progressives like Manet.⁶⁰ Indeed, L'Eternel féminin reflects the statements that Cézanne made to his mother in a letter of 1874, criticizing the "thing that is appreciated by the vulgar," and the "end" which "gives
rise to the admiration of idiots," that is, the style without integrity. This perhaps explains the admirers around Helen. The dislike that Cézanne expressed for not only the "vulgar," but for priests and the military, offers a specific reason for including these characters in the crowd around Helen. They are those most attracted by that "surface appearance."

Cézanne's treatment of the subject of the Judgment of Paris, as Meyer Schapiro has indicated, was part of an elaborate extended pun on the symbol of the apple and the implications of the word "Paris." If he did identify with the shepherd Paris, it was possibly because Paris is the paradigm (after Hercules) of the act of choice. Paris, too, is tempted by beautiful women, albeit goddesses, and asked to decide the most beautiful. Thus, Paris was a symbol of the artist, who discerns beauty in nature. The act of choice in the myth results in the awarding of the "prize," Helen, to Paris. But Schapiro points out that "Paris" was the city where the artist sought fame. Thus, the "judgment" of the city Paris results in fame (or failure) for the artist. Helen embodies judgment and reward, and as the source of fame she is eagerly sought by all.

Interestingly, the three women of Cézanne's 1870's works reflect various styles in their sources and
references. Olympia is distinctly modern, a creature of Second Empire Paris. The Queen of Sheba, whose origin for Flaubert was a brief passage in the Old Testament, is presented as a Romantic figure, exotic, sensual, and decadent. Helen is presented within the logical format of a balanced and symmetrical composition. She is not actively gesturing, as is the Queen of Sheba, nor is she surrounded by an environment of sensual luxury, as is Olympia. She is restrained in demeanor, seated in simple surroundings that neither accentuate nor detract from her own beauty. She is, then, in presentation as well as through her association with both Goethe and Greek mythology, an expression of a Classical sensibility. If this triad was not developed deliberately by Cézanne, it nevertheless reflects his interest in the synthetic, polymorphic nature of art.

With this relationship between L'Eternel féminin, La Tentation de Saint-Antoine, and Une Moderne Olympia, one may ask whether they were intended as a set, to be seen together, so that their respective implications would reinforce one another. While it is not known if they were intended to be shown together, the dimensions of the works are very similar, differing only by a few centimeters. The later Une Moderne Olympia was owned by Cézanne's friend Gachet; the larger La Tentation (V.
belonged to Eugène Murer, who joined the Auvers group when he moved there in the late 1870's, but who had contact with the group much earlier. The similarity in size strongly suggests a contextual relationship, as Cézanne painted no other set of works with such close dimensional similarities while having a consistent thematic presentation.

L'Eternel féminin is one of the last literary paintings in Cézanne's oeuvre. Stylistically and iconographically, the work represents a culmination of development that stretches back to the mid-1860's. In it, Cézanne gives full rein to his coloristic innovations, as well as expressing through ironic and allusive means, the dilemma which, though not entirely resolved, is at least realized and acknowledged. The problem of personal achievement within a framework of public acceptance no longer represented the crucial problem of his career. Having accepted the role of innovation and individuality over that of accommodation and conventional success, Cézanne turned to new material for his art.
NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1 The problem of money would continue to plague Cézanne through the decade. Unwilling to admit that he was keeping a mistress and a child, Cézanne was forced to live on the allowance which his father provided, an allowance which was only enough for one. This problem led to a number of difficulties as Cézanne sought to keep his relationship secret. Rewald, 1968, pp. 108-13. See also the very complete description of his circumstances during 1878 as found in his letters to Zola, from whom he had to borrow money to support Hortense and his son, in Cézanne, Correspondance, pp. 160-62, 164-66, 167-73, 175, 177-78.

2 Cézanne would especially refer to Pissarro after the latter’s death in 1903. See Cézanne, Correspondance, pp. 314, 318-19, 328-29. See also the passages on Pissarro from the conversations which Cézanne had in later life with various people, in Conversations avec Cézanne, ed. P. M. Doran (Paris, 1978), pp. 21, 24-5, 32-3, 45, 62, 65, 84, 91, 94, 98, 121, 148, 150.

3 The exact working relationship in this period between Cézanne and Pissarro is not clear. While there are some paintings by the two artists which correspond to one another, and which suggest that they were perhaps painted simultaneously, these are relatively rare.

The clearest indication of Pissarro’s pedagogic role for Cézanne is the copy which the latter made after a canvas by Pissarro, Louveciennes, V. 153. This is, however, a curious work. Why does Pissarro have Cézanne copy one of his paintings, if in fact the goal of Pissarro, and the other early Impressionists, was to render the effects of natural light and color? Was it instead done at the insistence of Cézanne himself? The act of copying was an academic and classical exercise, one which most of the Impressionists quickly moved away from. Cézanne, however, continued to produce copies of the works of various masters until late in life. The copy seems to have been a major path toward understanding art for Cézanne, as the copious drawings after the old masters in his notebooks attest; see Gertrude Berthold, Cézanne und die alten Meister (Stuttgart, 1958). But the fact that Cézanne was trying to learn the Impressionist style from copying, as well as actual plein-air painting,
throws an interesting light upon his working methods and his thinking. This is probably the earliest evidence that Cézanne was seeking a genuine synthesis of Classical and Realist modes in his mature art.

4 Cézanne's views on humility and work were especially revealed in his conversations and letters to Émile Bernard: "On n'est ni trop scrupuleux, ni trop sincère, ni trop soumis à la nature."


5 The question of Dr. Gachet's relationship to Cézanne has never been explored. A letter exists from Cézanne's father to Dr. Gachet, dating from August 10, 1873; see Cézanne Correspondance, p. 141. This letter suggests that the Cézanne family had known Gachet from a much earlier date, and that Gachet had corresponded with the artist's father. Gachet had been in Montpellier during the late 1850's, studying at the medical college there. It is possible that he met the Cézannes at that time. This point is indicated in the biography of Gachet in d'Amat, Dictionnaire de biographie française, 14, fasc. 84 (Paris, 1979), p. 1526: "À la faveur de son séjour à Montpellier, il est recommandé à Bruyas et rencontre la famille Cézanne." However, the two source biographies on Gachet make no mention of this: Dr. Victor Doiteau, "La Curieuse figure du Dr. Gachet," Aesculape, 13 (August 1923), 169-73; Pierre Vallery-Radot, "Une Figure originale de médecin, artiste et ami des artistes, le docteur Paul-Ferdinand Gachet," La Presse Medicale, 60, n. 56 (September 6, 1952), 1187-8.

The question of when Gachet met the Cézannes is interesting because he also had contact with Alfred Bruyas in Montpellier during his stay there. If the young Cézanne had known Gachet then, this provides a link to Courbet's art at a time when Cézanne would have had little opportunity see his paintings. If he in fact travelled to Montpellier, he possibly could have seen Bruyas' collection of Courbet's paintings directly. This could perhaps explain the early image painted at the Jas
de Bouffan, *Le Baigneur au rocher*, which is clearly based on Courbet's *Baigneuses*, but which dates from before Cézanne's first Paris trip. The Courbet was in Bruyas' collection by the late 1850's. Remember as well that Frédéric Bazille lived virtually across the street from Bruyas in Montpellier.

6 Daubigny wrote about meeting Cézanne while the latter was painting on the banks of the Oise. Rewald, 1968, p. 94.


8 This explains the outrage Cézanne felt when he suspected Gauguin of "stealing" his "petit sensation." Rewald, 1968, pp. 119-20; Rewald, *The History of Impressionism*, p. 458. "Sensation" represented for Cézanne not just the perception of nature, but the interpretation of what was perceived. Gauguin's quote is revealing: "Has Monsieur Cézanne found the exact formula for a work acceptable to everyone?" Gauguin went on to describe the "formula" as a means for "Compressing the intense expression of all his sensations into a single and unique procedure." Thus, "sensation" was to be expressed intensely, that is, subjectively and temperamentally. But the "single and unique procedure" which characterized the "formula" was objectively realized, and accessible to all, hence Cézanne's suspicion that it could be "stolen" by another artist.

9 The notion that Realism was a "scientific" mode of artistic production seems to have been widely understood in the mid-nineteenth century. As Linda Nochlin has observed, "the Realists, if not strictly scientific in their methods, were nevertheless scientific in their attitudes towards nature and reality." *Realism*, p. 41.

Of particular relevance for Cézanne was Zola's vociferous defense of science as the "basis" of his literary art. Zola proclaimed that he, as the writer, was a mere observer who recorded the facts with objective and dispassionate interest. His famous dictum, that a work of art was "un coin de la création vu à travers un tempérament," confirmed his interest in nature as the
sole foundation upon which a work of art could be built (O.C., XII, 810). But a contradiction arises in application, as the definition of a work of art implies. When does "temperament" mean "subjectivity?" Can a "scientific" work of art really adequately address temperament and still remain "objective?" This is the question which Cézanne seems to have intuitively or consciously posed to himself.

10 A similar argument is advanced by Richard Shiff: "The truth which the impressionist sought could be found in any act of perception that had (or seemed to have) the idiosyncratic character associated with a personal, spontaneous 'impression.' Nevertheless, the impression, as an image or an object of vision, was not the end of impressionist art, but the means to that end, the means to an experience through which the true could be apprehended in an act of seeing." Cézanne and the End of Impressionism (Chicago, 1984), p. 13.

11 Joel Isaacson has pointed out that by about 1880 "there was the greater suspicion...that the very form of their art, the challenging new way that they had attempted to open and to which they had been so profoundly committed in their youthful enthusiasm, might be the primary, the overriding reason for the failure of their individual and communal dreams." The Crisis of Impressionism 1878-1882, exh. cat. (Ann Arbor, 1980), p. 20.


16 In the preliminary notes for La Tentation, Flaubert jotted down a number of ideas on art, especially the art of Antiquity, Oeuvres complètes de Gustave
Flaubert, IV, 424. On the role of art in La Tentation, see also Jeanne Bem, Désir et savoir dans l'oeuvre de Flaubert (Neuchâtel, 1979), chapter VII.

Also significant, from the viewpoint of the visual arts, is the fact that Flaubert gained inspiration from a painting of the Temptation of St. Anthony by Breughel, and later he hung a print of the same subject by Callot over his writing table.

17 Monet called Cézanne "un Flaubert de la peinture," although he did not support his idea except to say that he "parfois restant dans les tâtonnements d'un génie qui lutte avec pathétique pour se saisir soi-même." Elder, p. 49.

18 Reff, "Cézanne, Flaubert, St. Anthony, and the Queen of Sheba," pp. 113-14, 116-17; Mack, 140-41; Badt, pp. 111-12; Gasquet, p. 29.

19 Badt, Chapter III, especially pp. 143-181.

20 Cézanne was never as isolated as stories made him out to be in later life. He was always in contact with at least the local intellectuals of Aix, and he enjoyed sitting at the cafés of Aix to discuss with his friends matters of art. In the last years of his life, when he had been out of the Parisian public's eye for some time, the younger artists there sought him out in Aix, and returned to tell of his "isolation" and hermit-like existence. Writers like Emile Bernard were, I think, betraying something of their own condescending attitudes toward the "provinces" and provincial life. Indeed, life in Aix at the turn of the century must have seemed quite cut off from the "civilized world" of Paris to a Parisian. Also contributing to the hermit legend were Cézanne's frugal ways. Visitors seem to have confused his spartan lifestyle with social antipathy and misanthrope. True, Cézanne writes of the taunts and pranks played on him by the children of the town, but I don't think that too much can be read into these passages of his letters. There is no doubt that his eccentricities would have aroused in the townspeople of Aix a certain disdain, but I again would not confuse that with social isolation.

21 "Literature, said Dumas, had become the most characteristic and most epidemic folly of youth. There was no child who did not begin a classical tragedy in the
fifth grade and finish it in the seventh, and even professionals and businessmen remained secretly haunted by literary reveries of their school days." Grana, pp. 26-7. Cézanne proposed a tragedy entitled Henry VIII d'Angleterre, to be produced with Zola, in a letter dated July 9, 1858; see Cézanne, Correspondance, p. 33.


Giula Ballas has shown that Cézanne did copy engravings found in L'Artiste, but not the specific issues in which Flaubert's fragments appeared. See Giula Ballas, "Paul Cézanne et la revue L'Artiste," Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 98 (December 1981), 225-31.

Mary Tompkins Lewis believes that Cézanne did know of this early publication of Flaubert's La Tentation de Saint-Antoine, and that it inspired, in addition to the painting we now know as La Tentation, the painting called L'Orgie (V. 92). Again, the formal correspondence is not great, and there is no direct evidence for Cézanne's knowledge of the early text. "Cézanne and Flaubert: A Banquet of Pictorial Imagery," Paper presented at the College Art Association Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, February 17-19, 1983.

23 See, for instance, Cézanne au Musée d'Aix, pp. 188-90. In the Salon of 1868, there was a painting by Eugène-Romain Thirion on Saint Paul, premier ermite, et Saint Antoine (catalog number 2368), and a drawing by Émile-Jean-Baptiste Caron, Saint-Antoine, ermite (catalog number 2728). In 1869, Gautier reviewed Isabey's La Tentation de Saint-Antoine in the Salon of that year; see Badt, p. 112. The subject of Saint Anthony seems to have been a fairly common one at the Salons throughout the period.

24 Reff's discussion of these figures and their poses is enlightening, especially the link he draws between this painting and Pastorale (V. 104) and Le Jugement de Paris (V. 537). "Cézanne, Flaubert, St. Anthony, and the Queen of Sheba," pp. 116-19.

25 Zola, Correspondance, II, 354. The review is reprinted in O.C., XI, 144.
The actual printing was completed in early February, and the book went on sale April 5. Oeuvres complètes de Gustave Flaubert, IV, 19.

Nadar, too, was a member of the "bohemian" generation of Murger, Nerval, et al. He had been part of the group of "Buveurs d'eau" in the early 1840's. He had attended to Murger while the latter spent his last days in the hospital in 1861, and collaborated with Noel and Lelioux on a book on Murger and the Paris Bohemia (Histoire de Murger pour servir à l'histoire de la vraie Bohème par trois Buveurs d'eau (Paris, 1862)). In the context of Nadar's relation to the first Impressionist exhibition, it might be noted that Murger, Nadar, and the other "Buveurs d'eau" had supported an exhibition of "refusés" after the Salon of 1842. Easton, pp. 114, 132.

According to Gasquet, it was the poet Gilbert de Voisins who suggested that Cézanne illustrate Flaubert's book; Gasquet, p. 29. He also suggests that Cézanne was reading Flaubert in the 1860's in Paris; p. 40.

The first direct reference to Flaubert in Cézanne's letters comes only in 1880, where he notes the author's death. Cézanne, Correspondance, p. 192. In 1896, he says that he is rereading Flaubert, although he doesn't say what he is reading; p. 255.

The two paintings are V. 240 and 241. Studies for these paintings are C. 444-453.

On Eugène Murger, see Rewald, History of Impressionism, especially pp. 413-14 and p. 436, note 34.

Rewald, History of Impressionism, p. 301.

Reff, "Cézanne, Flaubert,..." pp. 119-22.

Ibid.

Bem, pp. 85, 91. The point is also made in Lucette Czyba, Mythes et idéologie de la femme dans les romans de Flaubert (Lyon, 1983), pp. 124-25.

The background figures in L'Enlèvement bear a resemblance to the three nudes of the early La Tentation de Saint-Antoine, as does the general dark atmosphere of the painting.
In Flaubert's book, too, the Queen of Sheba is followed by a procession of pagan gods and goddesses, Flaubert, pp. 189-195.

The idea suggested in Cézanne au Musée d'Aix, p. 188, that the David Teniers painting La Tentation de Saint-Antoine found in the Musée Granet in Aix was in some way related to Cézanne's interest in the theme, seems unlikely. Even formally, there is little to indicate a relationship between the Teniers and the versions by Cézanne. More convincing is the relation of Cézanne's later versions of La Tentation to Dominique Papety's painting La Tentation de Saint-Hilarion. There are still significant formal differences, but the pose of the saint and the temptress are similar in both cases; see Giulia Ballas, "Daumier, Corot, Papety et Delacroix, inspirateurs de Cézanne," Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art Français, 1974-1975, p. 197.

The connection between Flaubert's conception of the artist and that new conception offered by Manet has been discussed by Michel Foucault in "La Bibliothèque fantastique," in Flaubert, Miroir de la critique (Paris, 1970), pp. 175-76; cited in Bem, pp. 124-25.

"La Reine de Saba est l'énigme elle-même, et l'énigme est une métaphore du signifiant...Flaubert, dans sa version du mythe, franchit un pas de plus: la Reine de Saba n'apporte à Antoine que son discours." Bem, p. 102.

"Manet's friends, however, missed in this portrait his usual vigor and temperament, regretting the old-master aspect of this work." Rewald, History of Impressionism, p. 302. Rewald further notes that Paul Alexis, Zola's close friend, also felt uncomfortable with Le Bon Bock, and was probably repeating the opinions of the Café Guerbois crowd of artists (p. 304).

Cézanne, Correspondance, p. 148.
Cézanne, Pissarro, Béliard and Guillaumin were part of the L'Union des artistes, formed in 1875, which for a brief time competed with the group of Impressionists led by Monet. Cézanne withdrew from the group in 1877, as did Pissarro and Guillaumin. Cézanne, Correspondance, pp. 152-53; Rewald, The History of Impressionism, pp. 362-63, 390.

The "Salon des refusés" of 1873 seems to have had little appeal as well, although Renoir did receive critical support there. Cézanne, however, did not exhibit in it. Cézanne's eventual chance to exhibit in the Salon only came in 1882, under the efforts of Guillemet. This rather embarrassing episode was featured prominently in Zola's L'Oeuvre.

Chappuis, nos. 257, 258 (1870-75). There is also a study of Delacroix's painting from the same sketchbook, Chappuis n. 141. The most interesting feature of the drawings, besides the affinity they show to the Delacroix composition, is in C. 258, where the entire group of figures is surrounded by a line, and a man appears to be standing behind the image, looking around the right edge. This picture-within-a-picture effect suggests that Cézanne wanted the image to be seen, not from an involved, i.e. subjective, point of view, but from a more distanced point. In other words, the figure who peers around the edge of the "canvas" objectifies the image for the viewer by reminding the viewer that the image is indeed only a painting.

See also the watercolors, Rewald cat. nos. 57, 139, and 385.

Cézanne's copy of the Barque of Dante dates from 1870-73 and is V. 125. Hamlet and Horatio is not catalogued in Venturi, and dates from 1870-74, probably nearer 1874. This latter work was copied from a lithograph of Delacroix's painting of 1839 (Robaut catalogue 694). For an examination of this copy, see Joseph J. Rishell, Cézanne in Philadelphia Collections, exh. cat. (Philadelphia, 1983), pp. 2-3. See also the original publication of the work: Lionello Venturi, "Hamlet and Horatio, a Painting by Paul Cézanne," Art Quarterly, 19, n. 3 (Autumn 1956), p. 273. Two drawings of the subject exist, C. 325 and 326.

For a further discussion of Cézanne's relationship to Delacroix's works, see Sara Lichtenstein, "Cézanne and
Delacroix," Art Bulletin, 46 (March 1964), 55-67; Sara Lichtenstein; see also Berthold, Cézanne und die alten Meister, pp. 37-8.


46 Ibid.

47 Pissarro's Portrait of Cézanne is a case in point, and it has been analyzed by Theodore Reff in "Pissarro's Portrait of Cézanne," Burlington Magazine, 109 (November 1967), 625-31+. Cézanne's etching Portrait of Guillaumin, with its tiny hanged man emblem, also seems to have been a personal reference to the Auvers group, as the hanged man was a reference to Cézanne's painting La Maison du pendu, 1873. The etching itself was done in Dr. Gachet's print studio, and was one of only a handful of graphics by Cézanne.

48 Doiteau, August 1923, p. 170.


50 Goethes Poetische Werke (Stuttgart, 1951), V, 587.


52 Max Dellis has interpreted the painting L'Eternel féminin as a depiction of Balzac's story "La Belle Imperia." "Note relative au tableau 'L'Eternel féminin,' de Cézanne," Arts et Livres de Provence, no. 81 (1972), 7-10. The passages in Balzac's story, however, do not match very closely to the image.

53 Goethes Poetische Werke, V, 483.

54 A later interpretation of this scene by Fantin-Latour is remarkably similar to Cézanne's L'Eternel féminin. A lithograph from 1890 (Héliard cat. no. 95) and an oil painting of 1892 of the same subject are entitled Helen. The painting appeared in the 1892 Salon. The figure of Helen is nude, and she is again surrounded by various figures: a warrior, a hermit-like man, an artist, etc. Druick and Hoog, p. 347.
Goethe's Second Faust was widely available in French in the 1860's and 1870's. Gerard de Nerval's translation of both the first and second parts, originally published in 1852 and in a new edition in 1868 and 1877, was perhaps the most celebrated. The 1868 edition contained a study by Théophile Gautier. Two illustrated editions of the Nerval translation, with plates by Edouard Frère and Tony Johannot respectively, were published in 1860 and 1868, Henri Blaize's translation of Faust was also widely available, the twelfth edition appearing in 1869, the thirteenth edition in 1875. A translation of only the Second Faust, by A. Poupart de Wilde, was published in 1863 and 1866. Several sets of Goethe's collected works, which included Faust, were also published in the relevant time period for Cézanne to have consulted. Oeuvres de Goethe, translated by Jacques Porchat, was published by Hachette between 1861 and 1863. Another edition of this set was published between 1862 and 1870, and a third similar edition appeared between 1871 and 1874. Musically, one should mention Gounod's Faust, which premiered in 1859 and which received numerous performances in the 1860's.

Schapiro believes that the subject of this work is actually "The Amorous Shepherd," a Virgilian scene. See Schapiro, Modern Art, pp. 1-5. Probably incidental, but interesting nonetheless, is the figure (Helen?) behind the shepherd in this painting. Her pose is strikingly like that of the Queen of Sheba in the two later versions of La Tentation.

In addition, there are two versions of Leda and the Swan from about the same time as this work. Leda was the mother of Helen; Zeus, in the form of the swan, her father.

Schapiro, Modern Art, pp. 30-1.

Bem, p. 86. In the first version of La Tentation de Saint-Antoine, Helen does appear with Simon the magician; see Ibid., pp. 93-4.

Denis, Théories, p. 252.

Cézanne, Correspondance, p. 148.

Ibid.
In his earliest letters, Cézanne often referred to classical writers, although less often to specific mythologies. The famous letter of December 7, 1858, in which he presents part of his poem about the "Pitot Herculéen" also has Cézanne saying "je ne sais pas ma mythologie," referring to his detailed knowledge of the myth of Hercules; Correspondance, p. 39. In a letter of December 30, 1859, Zola mentions that Cézanne was translating Virgil's Second Eclogue; Correspondance, p. 64. Except for passing references, the next mention of classical myth doesn't appear until 1885, in a letter to Zola, which contains a passage from Virgil's Tenth Eclogue; Correspondance, p. 217. The association of Cézanne and Virgil, however, must have been a fairly common one, for Gauguin described Cézanne in 1885 as "homme de Midi il passe des journées entières au sommet des montagnes à lire Virgile et à regarder le ciel." Maurice Malingue, ed., Lettres de Gauguin à sa femme et à ses amis (Paris, 1946), p. 45.

See, for example, the self-portrait by Anthony van Dyck, The Artist as the Shepherd Paris.

The later Une Moderne Olympia (V. 225) is 46 cm by 55 cm; the larger La Tentation de Saint-Antoine (V. 241) is 47 cm by 56 cm; L'Eternel féminin is 43 cm by 53 cm.
CONCLUSION

Cézanne's concern with the means, development and integrity of his talent and expression did not differ in substance from that of his contemporaries. It did differ in form, however, and this has been the motivation for this study. As I have tried to demonstrate, Cézanne's unique works of the 1860's and 1870's reflect the means by which the artist came to terms with himself and with the forces affecting him. On the premise that an artist's intent can be discerned in the choices made, then his work before 1877 illuminates a most crucial aspect of his career as a whole. The culmination of this period has been seen by subsequent commentators as fundamental to Cézanne's art, in his achievement of a Classical synthesis.

The pattern that emerged in this period was one of self-conscious reflection and metaphorical allusion. Of course, this is not always consistent, and the difficulties in tracing the meaningful implications in Cézanne's works are, as in most artists' early works, compounded by the inherent contradictions. Admittedly,
metaphor can be vague, and a self-referential metaphor perhaps even more obscure. He invested subjects with an extended meaning encompassing self-referential aims, through the choice of subjects and frames of reference. The basic elements of his synthesis were based on metaphor, through which he made himself an integral element of his work. Indeed, he was not alone in this, as Courbet and Manet represent contemporaries who shared a similar attitude, if different approach, in their art.

This study has also shown that, while individual paintings are significant, they are yet more significant when taken as sets. The relationships established by these sets reveal the context of the meaning of the individual works, and in so doing, cast light on Cézanne's direction. The choice of works to be studied was determined by their overall significance for this direction and clarity within this context, rather than by an attempt to be comprehensive. Cézanne preferred action to theory, and his working out of artistic problems, both stylistic and iconographical, took place at the easel rather than the café table. This accounts for his unease with the art theorists in Paris, and his preference for the solitude of the countryside.

Despite the personal relevance of their subject matter, the works of the mid-1860's were clearly meant
for a public forum. The bold style in which he worked in these years was a public gesture, his way of forcefully attempting to address an audience. While Cézanne is often portrayed as a reticent and socially-backward person, it is inconceivable that the scale and style of paintings such as the portraits of his father and Emperaire were only expressions of ego. The forum of public debate was the Salon, and Cézanne's desire to be "successful," in whatever form that success might take, was necessarily tied to a public presence.

Yet, Cézanne was not successful, and he did not have the opportunity to present his works before the public in the way he had hoped. As the trend of his art shows, his failure in the mid-1860's, at a time when factors seemed most favorable to the entry of the younger generation into the Salon, resulted in his rethinking of the problems of his art at the end of the decade. The culmination of his monochromatic Realism was also the culmination of traditional narrative Realist subject matter in his art. And, while already having begun to work in both plein-air Realism and in a Romantic-Realist mode, he began to emphasize those subjects that utilized literary and imaginative sources.

The reintroduction of a Romantic element, via Delacroix's colorism, and the different emphasis on
subject choice, is the point at which Cézanne established the determining direction of his future career. Breaking from both Courbet, who had been a moderately important influence on him, and Manet, who was a significant influence, Cézanne moved for the first time into a territory that was relatively unexplored by either of them. In so far as the stylistic changes of the 1870's were a result of not only Delacroix's influence, but the direct impact of Pissarro, Cézanne assimilated the mainstream developments of a more avant-garde, coloristic Realism. However, he took a unique approach, continuing to draw upon Romantic prototypes and models, as well as exploring a combination of Romantic and Realist concerns in subject matter and style. Distancing himself from his contemporaries, he moved away from the public aspects of painting to a more hermetic involvement with his art. Simultaneously, he adopted a more objective view of his work, preferring the study of nature to the creation of imaginary scenes. Within this objective framework, metaphor and indirect reference still operated as a guide to what was still the essential issue of his work, his talent as a unique temperament, and the integrity of its means and expression.

His metaphorical intent was reflected not only in subject matter, but in the conscious reconciliation and
synthesis of previous interests and influences, emerging in his new style and choice of subject. The sharp division, in the 1870's, between Cézanne's formal works and the literary, allegorical, and imaginary works, can best be accounted for as a deliberate exploration of alternative modes of creation and expression rather than inexplicable and fundamental contradiction. What emerges from a consideration of these works is evidence of a coherent pattern of development, one based on self-referential subjects and a style that is a synthesis of the major modes of painting of the nineteenth century.

That Cézanne was not a theorist was significant to this study. He left no primary documentation explaining the content of the early paintings, and while his letters provide a variable source of information, as do the statements and writings of friends, critics, and other contemporaries, one is left with the works themselves, and the relevance and relationships of style and subject must be discerned directly.

That this was intended to be so by Cézanne, and carries fundamental implications for the understanding of his later works, is illustrated by his own statements. Cézanne wrote, in 1904, that the artist:

doit dédaigner l'opinion qui ne repose pas sur l'observation intelligente du caractère. Il doit redouter l'esprit littérateur, qui fait si
souvent le peintre s'écarte de sa vraie voie - l'étude concrète de la nature - pour se perdre trop longtemps dans des spéculations intangibles.

No doubt this admonition was focused toward the recipient of the letter, Emile Bernard, whose penchant for "speculations intangibles" had already affected his writings on and discussions with Cézanne. This statement would at first seem to warn the artist against literary or narrative content, and the employment of such literary devices as metaphor or allusion. That is, he cautions against the exact process which he himself utilized in his early career. It would also seem to warn against a literary interpretation or approach to his own works. On more careful examination, the context makes clear that he was rejecting the critical evaluations of those who would interpret his works on theoretical grounds, insofar as he describes his own process of painting. The work itself must be "read," for the meaning cannot be extracted from theory.

Elsewhere in the same letter he says "il faut bien voir son modèle et sentir très juste; et encore s'exprimer avec distinction et force." In order to see and to "sentir très juste," he adds, one must rely on "le gout," or taste. He concludes the thought by saying that
such taste is rare and that "l'art ne s'adresse qu'à un nombre excessivement restreint d'individus." By restricting the understanding of the processes of art to those few who are capable of "le gout," Cézanne admitted that his art was not easily accessible. The critics, Bernard included, who sought to clarify or to explain his art were motivated by theory rather than a clear understanding of the process involved, and achievement attained. His continual emphasis in his last years on the process of painting and seeing, underscores the significance of this view of his own art. He had no time for theories, and the fragments of theory that he offered up to Bernard were cryptic, even misleading.

Cézanne never rejected outright the idea of content or expression. If Cézanne's later art has been interpreted as purely formal in its aspirations, stripped of its content to reveal a "peinture pur," the potential for an earlier iconographically rich art is not excluded. Cézanne always sought to complement the formal with the intellectual or expressive. As early as 1866, Cézanne expressed his belief that "l'art pour l'art" was "une rude blague," apparently rejecting aesthetic concerns that had no relation to intellectual ones. His later quest for "realization" was also a rejection of purely
aesthetic and formal means, as he envisioned a balance, or a synthesis, between form and expression.

This same letter to Emile Bernard contains a reference to the painting Apothéose de Delacroix (V. 245; Plate LXXVIII). While a photograph exists which seems to show Cézanne working on the canvas in 1894, stylistically the work is closer to paintings of the middle to late 1870's, such as La Lutte d'amour and L'Eternel féminin. Apothéose de Delacroix is the most obviously metaphorical of Cézanne's works. Delacroix's triumph is the triumph of the artist in a general, especially in the face of a critical and unreceptive public. The figures gathered to witness the event represent Cézanne, Chocquet, Monet and Pissarro. They are the "nombre excessivement restreint d'individus" who have the perceptiveness to admire the artist on his own terms, and, with very different results in their own painting. It is probably no coincidence that they are also the admirers of Cézanne himself, who appreciated Cézanne's unique talents.

If the painting is actually from the 1870's, then the photograph of the artist "at work" on the canvas in 1894 must reflect Cézanne's continued interest in its meaning. The commitment to metaphor, even in the 1890's and 1900's, demonstrates that the formal path he
undertook in the 1870's was not fundamentally opposed to an iconographically complex art. Moving into old age, Cézanne naturally began to identify with the idea of the artist's apotheosis. The relevance of the subject in the 1870's is apparent if one understands the self-referential context of his works. The aspects of choice, commitment, and the appreciation of the few, as opposed to the many, are carried through works like La Tentation de Saint-Antoine, Une Moderne Olympia, and L'Eternal féminin. If Apothéose de Delacroix is indeed from the 1870's, then it is the logical conclusion to Cézanne's early iconographical development.

Apothéose de Delacroix also carries implications about the wider nature of Cézanne's art. The possibility of a greater complexity in meaning, even in the formal studies such as landscapes and figure pieces, is indicated by the appearance, or recurrence, of this work in the later photograph and in his letter of 1904. While the subject matter of works from the later 1870's through the end of his life lacks the obvious literary, narrative, or metaphorical objectives of the earlier period, it nevertheless carries the possibility of self-referential content through choice of motif, subject repetition and stylistic character. This relatively unexplored area of study in Cézanne's art promises to be
a rich and complex one for understanding both the artist and his work.
NOTES TO CONCLUSION

1 Cézanne, Correspondance, pp. 301-302.
2 Ibid., p. 301.
3 Cézanne, Correspondance, p. 124.
4 A watercolor version is R. 68. Related drawings are C. 174 and 175, both 1866-67.
5 Rivière dated the work 1894, while on another occasion he placed it at c. 1900; Le Maître Paul Cézanne, p. 204. Venturi dated the work 1873-1877 in his catalog. Rewald places the work at 1878-1880, with the proviso that it was finished, or at least retouched, later.
6 Bernard, p. 69.
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