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Abstract

This thesis takes as its central theme the possible presence of techniques of copying, pastiche, and parody in the early poetry and painted works of Paul Cézanne.

A chronologically-based assessment is made of Cézanne's various literary and visual efforts that might be seen to have been produced by such procedures in the period up to the end of the 1860s and the height of his so-called 'manière couillarde'. Not only are the possible formal ramifications of such approaches discussed, particularly in regards to their inherent basis in the intrinsically imagic, but also the forms of multiplying content they might be seen to convey, a multiplicity then exemplified through a discussion of the various and often contradictory interpretations subsequently given those works. A suggestion is made that Cézanne's particular use of multiple and conflating citatory acts within, and across, works might be seen as deploying a particularly fecund form of opened-ended meaning making. Analysis of certain motifs in terms of their evocation of ambivalence, over-coding, and ironic distancing is undertaken in order to explicate how such possibilities may have been made manifest.

In relation to this, key purported biographical tropes such as conflict with his father, repressed sexuality, and innate emotive inner turmoil are discussed in terms of the degree to which they might be functions of the possibly inherent parodic mise-en-scène of Cézanne's poetic and visual output of these years. In addition to a possible redressing of certain of these biographical presumptions on the possibly-mistaken dating of several letters, the nexus between historiography and assumptions regarding the perceived intentional posture underpinning an artwork's execution is explored.

Some attempt is also made to position Cézanne's citatory articulations, as well as his increasingly transgressive and gauchiste paint application of the mid- to late-1860s, in terms of contemporary avant-garde contexts. Comparisons are made, particularly in regard to the engagement with print reproductions, with, for instance, the work of Édouard Manet.
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Finally, an attempt is made to link the general notion of parody and irony, the repetition of the structuring forms of representation rather than the articulation of presumed preconceived content, to the possible embedding within works of a reflexive meditation upon their own stasis as performances, a general thematic that might then be linked to Cézanne's own possibly deliberately contrived performance during the 1860s as authentic maverick.

Works discussed include certain of his posted poetry and pictures of the years 1858–1860, almost all his canvases presumed executed before his second visit to Paris in 1862, his mural scheme in the grand salon of the Jas de Bouffan, presumed executed over the period 1860–1870, and, finally, certain of his multi-figured canvases of the late 1860s.
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Titles of paintings and drawings by Cézanne mentioned for the first time in the main body of the text, and in most footnotes, will be given in the following format: [catalogue number] Title (date of execution). Catalogue numbers are taken from the respective catalogue raisonnés of Paul Cézanne's work by Adrien Chappuis and John Rewald; hence [Ch _) for drawings, [RWC _) for watercolours, and [R _) for paintings. If the work is illustrated by a figure, the relevant figure number is given following this entry thus (fig._). Entries for works in captions to figures are given in the following format: Artist, [catalogue number of a work if by Cézanne] Title (date of execution), medium (dimensions in cm), Provenance. Variations of this format are enacted for engravings and/or photographs reproduced. If a work is not illustrated, its medium, dimensions, and current provenance are given in the footnotes according to the following format: [catalogue number of a work if by Cézanne] Title (date of execution) (medium (dimensions in cm), Provenance). Subsequent references to a work in the body text are given the abbreviated entry Title (figure number), unless this causes confusion, in which case the full entry will be repeated. In close and repeated references, the figure number will also sometimes be dropped. Unless otherwise noted, titles and dates are as they are given in the various respective raisonnés just noted, which entails the titling of drawings (and drawing elements) in English, watercolours and paintings in French. English titles are given in title case; French titles, as is also the case for works by other artists given in French, are given in sentence case, with any noun, as well as associated adjectives or adverbs preceding the noun, that follows an initial definite article (le, la, les, l') capitalized. Media and dimensions are given in accordance with information supplied by the institutions within which works are held, if this is available, and might, thereby, differ from that given in the raisonnés. Titles of artworks other than those by Cézanne are usually given in the language of the institution which they are currently in the collection of. French and Latin terms and are italicised throughout except where they appear as part of a title of an article or book chapter or are the proper names of institutions. In the latter case, they are given maximal capitalisation. Occasionally, if large lists of work are given in footnotes, only the Rewald, Chappuis, or Rewald Water Colour catalogue number will be given.
Spelling throughout is according to current edition of the Oxford English dictionary and quotations, but not book, article or artwork titles, have been modified as such.

Where the comment ‘translation modified slightly’ is appended to a quotation’s citation, this modification is by the author and from the original French or Latin.

When directional indicators are used in describing works or parts of works, they are given, in all cases, in respect to the viewer; hence, for example if a figure in a picture is facing the viewer, the leg which, from that figure’s point of view, is their left leg will be described as the figure’s right leg.
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Introduction

'...like a snail makes its slime.'

The central theme of this thesis is the possible presence of techniques of copying, pastiche, and parody in the early poetic and visual work of Paul Cézanne. This will be discussed in terms not only of the possible formal consequences engagement with such procedures might entail, but also the implications they might hold in regards to the forms of content then perceived conveyed by the works so created. As such, considerable attention will be given to the various interpretations previously provided Cézanne's early poems and paintings, not in order to reject them, but to show how such a proliferation might itself be a specific product of processes instigated by the works themselves. What is resisted, in a sense, is the notion of a stable, conclusive, and preconceived meaning implicit to any of Cézanne's early art. In terms specific to his drawn and painterly output, what is also suggested is an intrinsic interest in imagic repetition, both as a mode of pictorial construction, as well as a defining feature, formally, of much of his later work. Such processes will also be suggested, through this inherent reflexivity, to draw particular attention to the structures through which such representations occur. Depiction becomes, in a sense, a subject of its own interest. Finally, what will be stressed throughout, by virtue mostly of the apparently always possible presence of parody, and, thereby, satire, is a contiguous, and rarely elidable, undercurrent of wry and often self-deprecating humour.

In regards to methodological layout, the analysis will be structured chronologically, examining much of the creative output of Cézanne through his first decade as an aspiring artist in a stepwise manner. Chapter one will begin, then, with Cézanne's adolescence in Aix-en-Provence at the end of the 1850s. Particular emphasis will be

---

placed on his early friendship with Émile Zola and the latter’s subsequent fictionalisation of their shared biography in his novels. A certain prefigurement will thereby be offered of precisely the gesture of possible identity construction alluded to in chapter one. In terms of the art discussed, focus will be on certain drawings—Cézanne’s juvenilia in its truest sense—that seem to involve the practice of tracing, or, at least, the appearance of this. The possibility of mechanical pastiche in conjunction with such processes will also be raised, offering, as it does, a useful illustration of many of the formal qualities, particularly in terms of deformation and distortion, that might likewise be deemed present in, and thereby precursive to, many of the works subsequently discussed. A specific continuity through Cézanne’s early œuvre is thus proposed, in terms either of the actual procedural techniques of pictorial construction employed by Cézanne or as an analogical description of a specific, and perhaps idiosyncratic, form of pictorial thinking responsible for the appearance of such a possibility.

Chapter two will examine the prolific body of letters passed between Cézanne and Zola that was provoked by the latter’s departure for Paris at the beginning of 1858. A shared interest in riddles, puns, and poetic literature this correspondence evinces will be discussed, as well as the degree to which many of the poems and images Cézanne posted to Zola have been presumed to encode serious biographical content. A suggestion will be made, however, that the possibility of parodic intent might unsettle such interpretations, particularly those that characterize Cézanne’s relationship with his father as unusually strained. That such content is nevertheless extricable will also be linked, however, to Cézanne’s apparent habit of including multiple, and often contradictory, references to other artworks in his own creative endeavours. The spectre of pastiche raised in chapter one will thus be re-invoked, although now in terms of the kinds of content such citatory acts might embed, unwittingly or not. Similarly, and related to this, a specific, and potentially life-long, engagement by Cézanne with forms of expression conveying ambivalence will be introduced, in regards not only to the use of ambivalence as a motif in its own right, but also to the polysemy its presentation might entail, a proliferation provoking, deliberately or not, multiple interpretations.

Chapter three will cover Cézanne’s so-called ‘years of crisis’ leading up to his first trip to Paris in 1861 and his presumably concomitant decision to become a painter.
His early artistic training at the local drawing school will therefore be discussed, as well as his foundational grounding in the copying of other artists' works. The prevalence of copying in Cézanne's early œuvre, as well as his apparently eclectic taste, will then be evidenced through an analysis of those canvases presumed executed by him before his move to the capital. In certain cases, possible sources of inspiration for Cézanne's copies outside those previously suggested will be put forward. Particular attention will also be paid to what are presumed to be Cézanne's first large-scale artworks, four mural panels and a large decorated screen, as well as the Jas de Bouffan, a house they were apparently designed for, purchased by his father on the outskirts of Aix-en-Provence. As with his smaller canvases, these will be discussed in terms of their possible basis in practices of copying and/or pastiche, and, in the case of the mural panels, a satirical intent sometimes deemed to underpin their execution. This will also enable a brief description of the salon of that building, in which, over exactly the period covered by this thesis, Cézanne would complete an odd and visually discordant mural scheme that might encapsulate, to a degree, his transition from aspiring Provincial painter to avant-gardist exemplar. An attempt will also be made to ascertain, through Zola's letters, exactly when the plan for Cézanne to move to Paris in order to further a career in painting was first hatched, and by whom. In the course of this, the possible misdating of several of Zola's letters will be noted, a possibility that might, in turn, unsettle the usual presumption that Cézanne's father was intensely antipathetic to his son's desire to become a painter. Resistance will also be offered to the view sometimes proposed that Cézanne arrived in Paris in 1861 a ready-made anti-academic.

In line with this, Chapter four will begin by detailing precisely that trip and, in particular, Cézanne's opinion of the contemporary art scene as might be gleaned from a letter, and, in particular, included poem, he wrote from the capital. Also discussed will be his académies of 1862, executed in Aix-en-Provence upon his return from Paris, as well as, it will be suggested, several of his larger Jas de Bouffan murals, including one obvious copy. Again, discussion will be configured specifically in terms of the possibility of pastiche and the apparent repetition of conventional genre forms.

Chapter five will cover what appears to be a fundamental period of transition in Cézanne's development as an artist, the years between his 1862 arrival in Paris for his
second sojourn there and his adoption of an emphatically transgressive style of paint application around 1865. Attempts will be made not only to characterize the kinds of impetuses and artistic contexts perhaps impelling Cézanne towards such avant-gardism, but also to analyse the move’s possible effects on his continuing practice of copying after other artists. Specific comparisons will be made, in this regard, to the activities of his contemporary Édouard Manet, who seems also to have had an abiding interest in the potentialities of using the imagery of others, especially in engraved form. In line with this, it will be suggested that Cézanne’s involvement with such practices seems to have, intentionally or not, emphasized the intrinsically imagic nature of his models to an extent not displayed in Manet’s appropriations. A link will thereby be drawn with certain of Cézanne’s poetic devices noted in chapter two that can be seen as enacting a reflexive meditation on the nature of representational practice. Again, as with those poems, and specifically in terms of a discussion of what appear to be paraphrases, parodies, or burlesques of traditional pictorial conventions, the seemingly always present possibility of humour in Cézanne’s work is reiterated. Finally, his earliest known self-portrait, executed after a photograph, will also be discussed, in terms both of the just-noted possible presence of self-mocking risibility, as well as its apparent pastiching of badly applied techniques.

Chapter six will consider the last few murals presumed executed by Cézanne at the Jas de Bouffan. These will be discussed in terms both of how they might manifest Cézanne’s appropriations of style from artists such as Gustave Courbet, as well as, again, his possible use of pastiched and ambivalently conflated components. In terms of the latter, Cézanne’s use of apparently deliberately disjunctive stylistic and thematic combinations in these murals will be noted, especially in regard to the degree to which such deployment might invoke, once more, a layer of ironic ambiguity. Finally, several of Cézanne’s late 1860s canvases possibly related to these murals will be discussed, specifically in relation to thematic pastiche, seriality (thereby, in a sense, self-copying), and affective conjunction of ambivalent and over-coded motifs. Hence, a form of full-circle will hopefully be closed, by which Cézanne’s earlier poetic attempts might be seen as prefiguring, in terms of the use of these motifs, as well as the gestures of open-ended meaning-making and reflexivity they seem embedded within, the concerns of his canvases and murals of the late 1860s.
In regards to terminology, certain words, as might be noted in the outline just provided, are used in this thesis repeatedly and with specific implied meaning. To limit misinterpretation, an explanatory summary of these terms follows.

In terms of 'affect', this is used to describe specific qualities in a visual image that might be seen to convey content related either to the image's production or the responses it evokes in a viewer. An 'affect of awkwardness', for instance, would thereby refer to that cluster of visual properties of an image that might lead a viewer to think it was either awkwardly produced or provoked some sensation similar to awkwardness. 'Affective', in turn, connotes visual qualities that not only convey these kinds of content, but also do so strongly. In a sense, then, 'affect' is used similarly to certain inflections of the word 'expression'. 'Affect' is here preferred, however, in order to emphasize that the content conveyed is not necessarily one intended by, or even visible to, the artist creating that image. It also carries with it some suggestion of the always-already-constructed nature of imagic representation.

In terms of 'pastiche', this is used to refer to a specific mode of artistic production whereby works, whether pictorial or literary, are created through the combination of elements sourced from other works. It has here, then, an often specifically mechanical sense, and is an analogical means of referring to a process whereby an artist might, for instance, in the same work copy a figure from one painting next to a figure copied from another. 'Parody' is likewise used with a specifically praxis-based implication, but referring not to the copying of parts, but the imitation of whole structures of representation, for instance literary genres or pictorial conventions. Neither 'pastiche' nor 'parody' is used here with any necessary implication that the artist employing such procedures intends, thereby, to invoke satire.
Chapter One

Aix-en-Provence

1839–1858

‘Everything seems so far away and yet so close’ ¹

The purpose of this chapter is two-fold: firstly, to provide a general biographical outline for Cézanne up to, and including, his final year of secondary schooling at the collège Bourbon in Aix-en-Provence in 1858; and, secondly, to discuss those drawings presumed executed by Cézanne within that period, specifically in terms of the possible application of processes of pictorial construction here placed under the general rubric of pastiche. ²


In terms of the first aim, beyond offering a contextual background from which Cézanne’s emerging practice might be seen to have emerged, what also will be stressed is the degree to which that biography depends, in important senses, on certain constructs of fiction. This is particularly so in the case of the fictionalized reminiscences of Émile Zola, with whom Cézanne shared a friendship defined, in a sense, through an opposition to the provincial bourgeois values surrounding them. As such, both the distinctive opacity of Cézanne’s biography, as well as his later apparently consciously-performed role of outsider whilst in Paris might be prefigured. Cézanne would seem to enter, thereby, the domain of historiography, first and foremost, as a character.

In terms of the second aim, the analysis of Cézanne’s early drawings, focus is given mainly to the notion of copying. Hence, note will be made not only of the apparent prevalence of copying in Cézanne’s early work in general, one seemingly persisting into his later practice, but also of the forms copied, in terms of the diversity of sources and, in particular, the degree to which most seem to have been engraved reproductions. Emphasis then moves to a suggested mode of assembling pictures from copied or traced fragments that might be then used as a metaphor for a particular kind of pictorial thinking perhaps distinctive of Cézanne, or at least, illustrative of the kind of formal deformations manifested in his multi-figured canvases of the late 1860s and early 1870s. Hence, a possible continuity in Cézanne’s practice in terms of these analogical procedures, cast here under the general rubric of pastiche, is proposed. In line both with this notion of continuity, as well as the similarly proposed intrinsically imagic basis of Cézanne’s practice, is his suggested adherence, from the start of his career and up until its close, to the repetition of forms as genre, one of the few presumptions of painterly endeavour seemingly remaining unsubverted by him.

Finally, and in order to presage precisely the originality and later transformational role of Cézanne’s œuvre, the possibility is raised that a link might be made between Cézanne’s early drawing practice (indeed, drawing in general) and certain subversive aspects of his later multi-figured canvases. That is, a possible transference into painting of qualities previously inherent only to drawing is foreshadowed, a


8
foreshadowing resonant with the observations of Yves-Alain Bois, who, in discussing differences between drawing and painting, remarks, with a certain profundity, that Cézanne was 'without doubt the first painter to have abolished this constitutive difference.'

---

1A: The past performed

Paul Cézanne was born in Aix-en-Provence on 19 January 1839, the oldest child of Anne-Élisabeth-Honorine Aubert, an Axois of humble origins, and Louis-Auguste Cézanne, a Paris-trained chapellier originally from Saint-Zacharie.\(^4\) Opening a hat shop in Aix-en-Provence in 1825, his father had decided to concentrate on selling, rather than making, hats, the acuity of his business sense such that, by the 1840s, he had amassed enough capital to offer out loans at interest on the side. In this enterprise he was so successful that in 1848 he could abandon the hat trade for good and acquire the only bank in town, which had recently failed.\(^5\) Although a risky venture considering the uncertain future of the newly-declared Second Republic, the move nonetheless proved timely and astute, particularly after the 1851 coup d'état and the speculative first few years of Napoleon III’s Second Empire when credit became a valuable commodity, especially in the provinces.\(^6\) In short, by the time his only son was a teenager in the 1850s, Louis-Auguste Cézanne was one of the wealthiest citizens in Aix.

Despite this affluence, Louis-Auguste and his family remained outside polite Aixois.
circles, perhaps by virtue of precisely those characteristics that made him such a formidable businessman. Of working class origins and unashamedly an *arriviste*, his rise had come on the back of a keen and tactical business sense that paid little heed to the opinions of others. As his daughter Marie, Cézanne’s sister, would later famously recall, ‘[he] was not a tyrant, but was unable to understand anyone except persons who worked in order to get rich.’ Staunchly Republican, he made few concessions to bourgeois conventionality and not only married a working girl 16 years his junior, but also so did so belatedly—in 1844—and only after she had already borne him the first two of their three children.

The address given on the birth certificate of the eldest of these, the future painter Paul, as the place of birth, 28 rue de l’Opera, is usually presumed hers. Louis-Auguste, although acknowledging paternity, gave his own address as that of the apartment above his hat shop on what is now the cours Mirabeau. It would seem, then, at least officially, that Cézanne would live apart from his father until he was five, when the family, which now included Marie, born in 1841, moved into a house together on the...

---

8 Rewald, ‘Cézanne and his father,’ op. cit., pp. 69–70; Callow, *Lost Earth*, op. cit., pp. 12–16. Although perhaps the stuff of legend, an anecdote regarding Louis-Auguste moving himself into a creditor’s house in Marseilles in order to enforce a stricter regime of household budgeting gives some indication of the kind of forceful business practices reputed to underpin the banker’s success: Lindsay, *Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 5; Callow, *Lost Earth*, op. cit., p. 14.
9 Marie Cézanne, letter to Paul Cézanne fils, 1911, cited and translated in Lindsay, *Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 10.
10 The marriage was legally executed in the Hôtel de Ville, Aix-en-Provence, on 29 January 1844: ‘Acte de mariage entre Louis-Auguste Cézanne et Anne-Élisabeth Aubert, 29 janvier 1844,’ AD 13, centre de Marseille, registre 202 E 375 (5 Mi 1112), Mariages, 1844, acte no. 11, reprinted in reprinted in Archives départementales des Bouches-du-Rhône, *Monseur Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., pp. 20–29. A religious ceremony was performed on the following day: Register of the church of Sainte-Marie-Madeleine, Archdiocesan Archives, Aix-en-Provence, cited in Cahn, ‘Chronology,’ op. cit., p. 528. At the time of the marriage, Louis-Auguste was forty-five, Anne-Élisabeth twenty-nine: ‘Acte de mariage entre Louis-Auguste Cézanne et Anne-Élisabeth Aubert,’ op. cit., p. 20; Lindsay, *Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 3. Recorded on the marriage certificate as ‘sans profession’, Cézanne’s mother is sometimes suggested to have been a formerly employed by Louis-Auguste, sometimes as the sister of one of his former employees or business associates: ‘Acte de mariage entre Louis-Auguste Cézanne et Anne-Élisabeth Aubert,’ op. cit., p. 20; Lindsay, *Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 5; Callow, *Lost Earth*, op. cit., p. 14. In any case, she came from the same working class background her new husband had escaped from.
rue Matheron, purchased by Louis-Auguste two weeks after his marriage. 12 Here, the family would remain until 1870, with another daughter, Rose, born there in 1854. 13

Whatever their living arrangements, and despite their increasing wealth, Cézanne's family seem to have retained marks of their unsophisticated background. Neither his mother nor his maternal grandmother could sign their names on his parent's certificate of marriage, and his father's handwriting was, at best, 'hesitant', the few surviving letters in his hand riddled with spelling errors. 14 Although Cézanne's mother is often cited as actively encouraging her son's artistic pursuits, her general ignorance of art history is borne out by an anecdote of his sister Marie, passed on to her nephew, the artist's son Paul, in 1911: 'I remember hearing Mamma mention the names of Paul

12 Louis-Auguste's address at the time of the wedding is recorded as n° 17 rue de la Glacière, Anne-Élisabeth's as that of her mother, n° 27 rue de Suffren: 'Acte de mariage entre Louis-Auguste Cézanne et Anne-Élisabeth Aubert,' op. cit., p. 20. Bruno Ely offers as further evidence of Cézanne's early separation from his father a purported comment of Cézanne made as an old man to Henri Gasquet, in which the rue de Suffren was described as 'our cradle': Gasquet, Joachim Gasquet's Cézanne, op. cit., p. 209; Ely, 'Cézanne's youth,' op. cit., p. 31. However, whether this comment, even if accurately recorded, referenced Cézanne's childhood home, or, instead, the Pensionnat Saint-Joseph, the school where the two men first met and which, in Ely's own words, was 'not far from rue de Suffren,' however, seems uncertain: ibid., p. 23. For some historians, pace Ely, any separation implied by the addresses given on the official documents cited above were merely the results of token gestures on the part of Cézanne's parents, particularly his mother, to minimize gossip; hence, Jack Lindsay, with Philip Callow following, assert Paul and his mother actually moved in with Louis-Auguste 'shortly after' the boy's birth, and, indeed, this suggested living arrangement might seem given credence by the birth-place given on Marie Cézanne's birth certificate, which was Louis-Auguste's: 'Acte de naissance de Marie Cézanne,' 202 E 372, cited in Archives départementales des Bouches-du-Rhône, Monsieur Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 294; Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., p. 6; Callow, Lost Earth, op. cit., p. 15. Marie Cézanne was born on 14 July 1841: 'Acte de naissance de Marie Cézanne,' op. cit., p. 294. On Louis-Auguste's purchase of the house on the rue Matheron, see the documents cited in: Archives départementales des Bouches-du-Rhône, Monsieur Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 20 n. 1.


14 Cézanne's grandmother, once a labourer in the Marseille saltpetre works, was incapable of signing her name as witness to the ceremony: Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., p. 6; Ely, 'Cézanne's youth,' op. cit., p. 31. A copy of Les Incas by J. J. Marmontel, found amongst Cézanne's things at the time of his death, bears the inscription 'H[onorine] Aubert, 1850', indicating, if this was her signature, that Cézanne's mother could sign her name by then and, presumably, read; although, why she would choose to use her maiden name six years after her marriage is intriguing: Marcel Provence, 'Cézanne collégien: Les prix de Cézanne,' Mercure de France, t. 181, no. 651 (1 August 1925), p. 822; Theodore Reff, 'Reproductions and books in Cézanne's studio,' Gazette des Beaux-Arts, ser. 6, vol. 56, no. 1102 (November 1960), p. 304; Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 198.
Rembrandt [sic] and Paul Rubens, calling our attention to the similarity between the Christian names of these great artists and that of your father.\textsuperscript{15}

Despite all this, as well as his apparent dislike of bourgeois pretension and oft-cited miserliness, Louis-Auguste Cézanne nevertheless ensured his only son would be provided an education typical of that afforded any heir of a wealthy Provençal. Hence, although being sent for his first two years of schooling to the somewhat working-class Pensionnat Saint-Joseph, Cézanne was, for his secondary education, enrolled at Aix’s official preparatory school, the collège d’Aix, renamed the collège Bourbon in Cézanne’s penultimate year.\textsuperscript{16} Once a royal collège, the Bourbon was not only the most prestigious educational institution in Aix-en-Provence, it was also the most expensive.\textsuperscript{17} Enrolled there for six years, beginning in 1852, Cézanne spent his formative years within the walls of this venerable old institution, the first four as a boarder—even though the family home on rue Matheron was ‘mere minutes away’—

\textsuperscript{15} Marie Cézanne, letter to Paul Cézanne fils, 1911, op. cit., p. 10. Interestingly, when Ambroise Vollard and John Rewald use what seems to be the same anecdote, albeit un-cited, it is amended to read, ‘He is named Paul, like Rubens and Veronese, and is no doubt predestined to paint’: Vollard, \textit{Paul Cézanne}, op. cit., p. 16; Rewald, \textit{Cézanne et Zola}, op. cit., p. 24; Rewald, \textit{Paul Cézanne: A Biography}, op. cit., p. 21. Whether this indicates a separate source for the comment (and thereby perhaps laying the blame for the mix-up of the ‘Pauls’ at the feet of Marie Cézanne’s poor memory, rather than her mother’s poor knowledge of art history), or simply a case of Vollard’s creative use of sources in order to dramatize an imagined conversation between Louis-Auguste and his wife and then quoted by Rewald, is difficult to ascertain.


\textsuperscript{17} The fees were 425 francs a year for a boarder, on top of the cost of the uniform: Ely, ‘Cézanne’s youth,’ op. cit., p. 33. The uniform consisted of a ‘blue tunic with red piping and gold palms on the collar, white or grey duck pants, and a blue kepi, or military cap’: Provence, ‘Cézanne collégienn,’ op. cit., pp. 824–825.
and the last two as a day boy.\textsuperscript{18} It was there, most likely at the end of 1852, that he met and befriended Émile Zola who, like Cézanne, was somewhat of an outsider, although for different reasons.\textsuperscript{19}

In addition to the trauma of his father’s early death and the social descent caused by the financial strain placed on his mother, Zola bore a veritable cavalcade of other youthful misfortunes.\textsuperscript{20} He was physically immature, effeminate, and often ill, nearly dying at the age of two from an attack of meningitis that left him with a partial squint that gave his face a lop-sided look.\textsuperscript{21} Born in the capital, Zola spoke not only with a Parisian accent, which earned him taunts of ‘Franciot’, but also with a lisp.\textsuperscript{22}

Pampered and isolated by his mother, who was overly-sensitive to her son’s physical delicacy and contemptuous of the inhabitants of the increasingly impoverished neighbourhoods she was forced to move into after her husband’s death, the young Zola was socially inept and so ‘highly strung’ that even the sound of thunder made

\textsuperscript{18} 'Registre d’inscription au collège d’Aix, années scolaires 1856–1858,' op. cit., pp. 52–55; Rewald, Cézanne et Zola, op. cit., p. 7; Rewald, Paul Cézanne: A Biography, op. cit., p. 2; Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 13; Callow, Lost Earth, op. cit., pp. 24, 26.

\textsuperscript{19} Rewald, Cézanne et Zola, op. cit., p. 7; Colette Becker, ‘Introduction biographique,’ in Émile Zola, Correspondance, t. 1 (1858–1867), edited by B. H. Bakker and Colette Becker, Montréal: Les Presses de l’Université de Montréal, 1978, pp. 32–33. At the time of their presumed meeting, Cézanne would have been thirteen, Zola twelve.

\textsuperscript{20} Zola's father François—to use the French form of the original Italian ‘Francesco’—was an engineer of Venetian descent who had come to Aix-en-Provence with his wife Émilie and only child in 1843, planning to design and supervise the construction of a dam and series of canals to augment the town’s meagre water supply. Although the initial proposal for this project was accepted by the municipality of Aix on 10 December 1838, the contract signed then had to be renewed and modified on 9 April 1843 in line with amendments demanded by the various local landowners and passed on by the Conseil d'Etat, which finally approved the project on 31 May 1844. Even then, preliminary blasting did not begin until the end of 1846, and the first clod not officially turned until 4 February 1847. Tragically, mere weeks after this Zola's father fell ill with pleurisy, and died several days later in a Marseillaise hotel on 27 March 1847, five days before his son's seventh birthday. His widow Émilie and only son Émile were left with little more than debts and shares in the Société du Canal Zola, the company set up in 1845 to fund the project, which would, however, become all but worthless when the company went bankrupt in 1852, partly as a result of Émilie Zola's business incompetency and partly as a result of the shady dealings of some of the principal shareholders. In any case, Zola and his mother, found themselves in a precarious—and worsening—financial situation. On all this, see, for instance: F. J. W. Hemmings, The Life and Times of Émile Zola, London: Paul Elek, 1977, p. 20 (where the date of the float of the Société du Canal Zola is given as 1846); Becker, 'Introduction biographique,' op. cit., pp. 29–32; Clive Thomson, 'Tableau chronologique,' in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., pp. 84–85; Graham King, Garden of Eden: Émile Zola for English Readers, London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1978, pp. 2–3; Philip Walker, Zola, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985, pp. 3–5.

\textsuperscript{21} Walker, Zola, op. cit., pp. 5–6, 10; Callow, Lost Earth, op. cit., p. 27.

\textsuperscript{22} Rewald, Cézanne et Zola, op. cit., p. 7. Ironically, Zola was at this time not even a French citizen, being naturalized only much later, on 31 October 1962. F. W. J. Hemmings, Émile Zola, London: Oxford University Press, 1966, p. 3 n. 1.
him 'inconsolable'.

Enrolled in primary school later than was usual, at the Pension Notre-Dame, his initial experience of school-life was harrowing, unused as he was to discipline and lacking knowledge even of the alphabet. As such, he learnt early on to work hard, especially when his attendance at the collège Bourbon, where he was enrolled, like Cézanne, in 1852, was facilitated only by his mother's extraction of a scholarship from the civic authorities. Unable to adopt the more relaxed approach to schooling affected by his fellow students, who, as the sons of lawyers and wealthy land-owners, were assured secure futures in familial professions, Zola applied himself with a single-minded and almost desperate purpose. Hence, although successful in these efforts, winning numerous academic prizes and honourable mentions, he

---

23 King, *Garden of Eden*, op. cit., pp. 4–5; Walker, op. cit., 9–10. In regards to Émilie and her son’s movements as a result of their worsening finances, they moved first from their large house on the quiet impasse Sylvacane to the pont de Béraud on the town’s fringes in 1851, then to the rue Bellegarde in 1852, the rue Longue-Saint-Jean in 1854, the rue Roux-Alphérard and then to the cours des Minimes in 1855, and, finally, to the rue Mazarine in 1857: Thomson, ‘Tableau chronologique,’ op. cit., pp. 84–90; Joanna Richardson, *Zola*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1978, p. 5. That is, from the salubrious sections of Aix into neighbourhoods increasingly destitute and full of (god forbid) ‘labourers, gypsies, and assorted foreigners’: King, *Garden of Eden*, op. cit., p. 4. The quotes regarding Zola’s temerity come during thunderstorms come from: Walker, *Zola*, op. cit., p. 7. In addition to all this, Zola was also, according to a police report stumbled upon by Alfred Chabaud in the Archives Municipales de Marseille in 1929, allegedly assaulted sexually by a twelve-year-old Arab servant when he was five: Alfred Chabaud, ‘Un épisode inconnu de l’enfance d’Emile Zola,’ *Mercure de France*, t. 210, no. 276 (1 March 1929), p. 508. Whether the event was as ‘portentous’ as F. W. J. Hemmings and Joanna Richardson make out, citing it as possible explanation for Zola’s purported ‘lifelong horror of homosexuality and his timid, often guilty attitude to sex’ is difficult to say: Hemmings, *Emile Zola*, op. cit., p. 9; Richardson, *Zola*, op. cit., p. 5.

24 ‘My mother was very kind and weak where I was concerned and so I grew up without discipline. At the age of seven or eight I still couldn’t read or write’ Émilie Zola, quoted in Denise Le Blond, ‘Une enquête sur l’éducation (textes retrouvés),’ *Les Cahiers naturalistes*, no. 21 (1962), p. 215, cited and translated in Richardson, op. cit., pp. 5–6. The Pension Notre-Dame was a middle-class boarding school catering to people of modest means; the date of Zola’s enrolment there is given by Colette Becker as 1848, which would make him eight, F. W. J. Hemmings writes that Zola did not begin ‘regular schooling’ until he was twelve: Becker, ‘Introduction biographique,’ op. cit., p. 32; Hemmings, *The Life and Times of Emile Zola*, op. cit., p. 24. In any case, at the Pension Notre-Dame, Zola met Philippe Solari and Marius Roux, both of whom he would remain acquainted with late into his life. On Solari, see section 3A. On Marius Roux, and, in particular, his involvement in the first published mention of Cézanne’s name, see section 5C and the beginning of chapter six.

25 Zola’s scholarship was awarded to Émilie Zola in 1854 as ‘posthumous recompense for services rendered to the town of Aix by her husband’: Archives municipales d’Aix-en-Provence, dossier D’, art. 17, f° 106 (séance du conseil municipal du 22 juillet 1854), cited in Becker, ‘Introduction biographique,’ op. cit., p. 32. Presumably, this means Émilie had managed to afford the first two years’ tuition fees for her son’s education at the Bourbon on her own.

remained, all in all, and particularly in the context of the provincially conservative and snobbish collège Bourbon, 'the perfect butt'.

Indeed, it was Zola's unpopularity that, legendarily, acted as the catalyst for his friendship with Cézanne, the latter purportedly recalling, in an oft-cited reminiscence:

'[I]n fact our friendship stemmed from that, from a thrashing which everyone in the playground, big and small, gave me because I took no notice, I disregarded the ban [imposed on Zola], I couldn't help talking to him anyway...a decent rellow. '

Although enrolled in different years, the two quickly became friends, their mutual unpopularity not only the impetus for that friendship, but also, perhaps, its defining feature. Like his new friend, Cézanne was also a good student, excelling, in particular, at Latin and Greek and, with the enlistment of another over-achieving outsider, Cézanne's classmate Jean-Baptiste 'Baptistin' Baille, a trio was soon formed, dubbed 'Les Trois Inseparables', that, for all its aloof insularity, seems to have been as much a trio of swats as anything else.

27 The quote is from: Walker, Zola, op. cit., p. 10. As Zola would later have the title character in his semi-autobiographical La Confession de Claude declare; 'Mes années de collège ont été des années de larmes'; Émile Zola, La Confession de Claude, Paris: Lacroix, 1865, cited in Hemmings, Émile Zola, op. cit., p. 10. In terms of academic success, Zola was awarded prizes and/or honourable mentions in most years, including for Excellence (1853-1857), Religious Instruction (1853-1854, 1857), Latin (1853, 1855-1857), Greek (1855-1856), Grammar (1853, 1856), French (1855), English (1856), Italian (1857), History and Geography (1853-1857), Arithmetic, Geometry, and Algebra (1856-1857), Physics (1857), Classical Recitation (1853-1855, 1857), French Narration (1857), Drawing (1855, 1857), and Woodwind (1855-1856); his name was inscribed on the honour board in 1854 and 1857: 'Pahnares du college d'Aix, 1853-1858,' op. cit., pp. 36-39, 41, 43-45; Thomson, 'Tableau chronologique,' op. cit., pp. 88-90.

28 Paul Cézanne, quoted in Gasquet, Joachim Gasquet's Cézanne, op. cit., p. 39.

29 Rewald, Paul Cézanne: A Biography, op. cit., pp. 2-3; Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 15-16. Also, take the oft-cited quote from Zola's L'Œuvre, describing the childhood meeting of the two main characters, usually presumed to be based upon Zola and Cézanne; '[o]pposites by nature, they became united forever, attracted to each other by secret affinities, the as yet vague torment of a common ambition, the awakening of a superior intelligence in the midst of the brutal mobs who beat them': Émile Zola, The Masterpiece [L'Œuvre], translated by Katherine Woods, New York: Howell, Soskin, 1946 [1886], p. 47.

30 Rewald, Cézanne et Zola, op. cit., p. 8; Becker, 'Introduction biographique,' op. cit., pp. 32-33. As Cézanne himself is later purported to have recalled: 'Can you believe that at college Zola and I were looked on as prodigies? I could knock off a hundred Latin verses at a go...for two sous...By Jove I was smart when I was young!...but Zola didn't give a damn...he had his dreams...a wilful savage...a weedy intellectual!...You know, the kind that street kids hate': Paul Cézanne, quoted in Gasquet, Joachim Gasquet's Cézanne, op. cit., p. 39. Bruno Ely
In any case, it is Zola's fictionalized account of the trio's pastoral romps through the fields surrounding Aix-en-Provence—reeled off as a set of evocative memories the two main characters of *L'Œuvre*, often presumed stand-ins for Cézanne and Zola himself, regale each other with during a portrait-painting session—that sets the background to most biographical accounts of Cézanne's last few years of secondary schooling. Here, the three characters are portrayed as united in their youth not simply by virtue of their being unpopular, but also by their deliberate posture as outsiders. They are not merely passively excluded from the affairs of their fellow students, but actively resistant to it, Rousseauan romantics traipsing around the countryside declaiming poetry to one another and bathing, nude, in the river. In the

interprets this anecdote a little differently than most commentators, seeing it, paradoxically, as evidence of Zola's *reticence* to learn in contrast to Cézanne's diligence, interpreting 'Zola didn't give a damn' as 'Zola didn't do a damn thing': Ely, 'Cézanne's youth,' op. cit., p. 32. In terms of Cézanne's academic achievements, he received prizes and/or honourable mentions in most years, including for Excellence (1854–1857) Religious Instruction (1854), Latin (1853–1854, 1856–1858), Greek (1854–1857), Grammar (1855), History and Geography (1853, 1857), Calculus (1853), Arithmetic and Geometry (1854–1855), Physics (1856), Chemistry (1857), French Narration (1856), Painting (1854); 'Palmarès du collège d'Aix, 1853–1858,' op. cit., pp. 36–42, 44–45, 47. Baptistin Baille was the son of a mere innkeeper and therefore, presumably, equally frowned upon by the Boubon students: Becker, 'Introduction biographique,' op. cit., pp. 32–33. In terms of Baille's awards, these equalled, if not even exceeded, Zola's, winning honourable mentions and/or prizes for Excellence (1853–1858), Religious Instruction (1853–1854, 1857–1858), Latin (1853–1858), French (1854, 1856–1857), Grammar (1855), Geography and History (1853–1855, 1857), Calculus (1853), Classical Recitation (1853–1857), Arithmetic, Geometry, and Algebra (1854–1857), Physics (1856–1857), Drawing (1857); his name was inscribed on the honour board in 1854 and 1855: 'Palmarès du collège d'Aix, 1853–1858,' op. cit., pp. 36–42, 44–45, 47.

The best analysis on the autobiographical aspects of Zola's *L'Œuvre*, and in particular the possible modelling of the characters Pierre Sandoz, Claude Lantier, and Louis Dubuche on, respectively, Zola, Cézanne, and Baille, is: Robert J. Niess, *Zola, Cézanne, and Manet: A Study of L'Œuvre*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1968, pp. 31–33, 62–112. In short, Niess asserts that Zola's fictionalization of his friends involved either taking a kernel of their character and extrapolating, as the novel progresses, an entirely different one, as he argues is the case with Baille/Dubuche; or, in the case of Lantier/Cézanne, combining elements of his friend's character with elements of other of Zola's acquaintances, for instance Manet and Monet.

Take, for instance, the passage from *L'Œuvre* most often cited in biographies of both Zola and Cézanne: 'They would never set foot in a café; they professed a horror of the town streets; they even posed as pining away in the town like caged eagles—and this at a time when their classmates were already dragging the sleeves of their schoolboy jackets across the marble-topped tables and playing cards to see who would stand treat. They were revoluted by this provincial life which ordinarily drew children at an early age into its treadmill: the habit of the little social club, the local newspaper conned over down to the last advertisement, the game of dominoes forever recommenced, the same stroll at the same hour on the same street—the final stupefying effect of the millstone on which one's brain was ground flat. And in protest they would climb the neighbouring hills in search for unfamiliar solitudes, and would declaim poetry in the pouring rain, disdaining shelter to show their contempt for the soft life of towns. In protest, too, they used to plan a camp where they would live like savages on the banks of the
succinct manner of Zola’s preparatory notes, he perhaps puts it best when he writes: ‘No cafés, no women, life in the open air: [it was this] that saved them from the provincial bêtise.’ This bêtise, the ‘trivialities’ of bourgeois social ritual, the charades, the petty intrigues, thus represented the inside against which the three young rebels attempt to define themselves outside of, an outside the characters, mirroring Cézanne and Zola’s own actions, seek escape to, ironically, in the urban and claustrophobic cacophony of Paris.

The other great interior from which Cézanne is often pictured as craving escape, Cézanne’s home life and, in particular, the image of a domineering and miserly father, was also given its most evocative form through the pen of Zola, but in another of his Les Rougon-Macquart novels, La Conquete de Plassans. Set in his fictionalisation of Aix-en-Provence and providing him thereby with a cathartic conduit by which to ridicule everything he hated about the French provincial bourgeois and, in particular, the Aixois, of whom Zola’s memories were anything but pleasant, one of the novel’s chief characters, François Mouret, is often deemed based on the example of Louis-Auguste Cézanne. Zola in his preparatory notes for that novel seemingly makes the connection clear, instructing himself, in concocting that character, to:

"Take the type of C.'s father, mocking, republican, bourgeois, cold, meticulous, stingy; depict his home life; he refuses his wife any luxury, etc. He is, moreover, garrulous and, sustained by his wealth, doesn't care a rap for anyone or anything." 

---

Viome, bathing joyously in the river at all hours, and reading over and over again the few books—they got it down to five or six—that would suffice for their needs': Émile Zola, The Masterpiece [L’Œuvre], op. cit., p. 57. On Zola and Cézanne’s literary interests, see the introduction to chapter two.

33 Émile Zola, Le Dossier préparatoire du roman [L’Œuvre] (Bibliotheque nationale, Ms. N. a. f., n° 10316], cited and translated in Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., p. 17.
34 Émile Zola, La Conquete de Plassans, Paris: Charpentier, 1874. The novel was initially published in serial form in La Siècle, between 24 February and 25 April 1874.
35 Rewald, ‘Cézanne and his father,’ op. cit., p. 69. Some have also seen the character Pierre Rougon, introduced in La Fortune des Rougon, the first novel of Zola’s Les Rougon-Macquart series, as ‘partly based’ on the example of Louis-Auguste Cézanne, particularly in terms of his ‘crass provincial’ opportunism: Walker, Zola, op. cit., p. 100.
The Mouret household as it is then depicted in Zola's novel has hence often been taken as a portrait of Cézanne’s family when Zola had most familiarity with them, in the 1850s. It is a cold, hard place, the wife Marthe brow-beaten, fearful of her husband’s mocking humour, and held a virtual captive by his miserliness.37

Although it might be rash to deny all connection between historical truth and whatever is presented in Zola's novels, it is nevertheless important to keep in mind the degree to which Cézanne's youth might have been re-configured within the exigencies of Zola's novel-writing. For, for all his talk of naturalism and scientific observation, Zola was an author nevertheless captive to the requirements of narrative flow and thematic dynamic, and the first-person reminiscences pillaged by Zola for L’Œuvre, for instance, were not only part-written with their possible use in a novel foremost in mind, but were also often adapted, when transformed into the third person and transplanted into that novel, according to narrative need.

Hence, as an example of the kind of refractive process here being suggested, as well as a means by which to bring discussion around to Cézanne's drawings presumed executed around the time he and Zola were undertaking their pastoral romps, it is interesting to the appearance, in the novel, of a sketchbook in Lantier/Cézanne’s gamebag.

Already Claude [Lantier/Cézanne] carried, between powder-horn and cartridge box, a sketchbook in which he drew bits of landscape, while Sandoz/[Zola] had a book of poetry in his pocket [...]. So in this distant province, in the midst of a small town’s drowsy stupidity, the boys had lived isolated and enthusiastic lives, beset from the time they were fourteen by a feverish passion for literature and art.38

In the original first-person reminiscences that formed the preparatory notes for this section, however, the sketchbook is missing.

37 For example: Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 7-8, 10-12; King, Garden of Eden, op. cit., pp. 88-89; Callow, Lost Earth, op. cit., pp. 20-22.
38 Zola, L’Œuvre, op. cit., p. 56.
Above all, our loves at the time were the poets. We always had books in
our pockets or game bags. 39

Moreover, there is no mention of an appreciation of art, only for literature, for
‘medieval decor, philtres, and sword thrusts’, for the overblown and romantic bombast
of poets such as Alfred de Musset. 40

Nevertheless, it is surprising how often such details, like Cézanne’s sketchbook
slipped into his gamebag by Zola to neaten up the narrative arc of his fiction (Lantier
becomes an artist, so must be depicted, from the start, as an artist), are likewise
slipped, almost unthinkingly, into Cézanne’s biography. 41 A kind of melding has
occurred, partly as a result of a lack of any other biographical material, between Zola’s
fictional construction and the opaque historicity of the real Cézanne, whoever that
might be.

39 Émile Zola, *Le Dossier préparatoire du roman [L’Œuvre]*, op. cit., cited and translated in
reigned above us—an absolute monarch. He delighted us with his forceful rhetoric. We
knew entire poems by heart. When we returned home in the evening at twilight, our gait kept
pace with the cadence of his verses, as sonorous as the blast of a trumpet. His dramas haunted
us like magnificent visions. When we came out of school classes with our brains frozen stiff
by the classical tirades we had to learn by heart, we went into an orgy, fraught with thrills and
ecstasy, and warmed our brains by memorizing scenes from *Hernani* or *Ruy Blas*. How often,
after a long swim, the two or three of us performed entire acts on the riverbank. Then, one
morning one of us brought a volume of Alfred de Musset. Reading Musset was for us the
awakening of our true hearts. We trembled. Our cult of Victor Hugo received a terrible blow.
Little by little we felt ourselves grow chilled. Hugo’s verses vacated our minds. Musset alone
then reigned in our game bags. He became our religion. Over and above his schoolboy
buffoonery his tears won us over, and when we ourselves wept when reading him, he became
completely our poet’: ibid., pp. 163–164. Compare this to the equivalent section from
*L’Œuvre*, following on from the above cited passage: ‘First, the vast sweep of Victor Hugo’s
décór, the gigantic grasp of imagination that was personified here in the midst of the eternal
battle of antitheses, transported into a world of pure epic: a world of gesticulations, of the sun
setting behind picturesque ruins, of life lived—and watched—under the superb and artificial
lighting of the fifth act. Then Musset had come along, to turn their ideas upside down again
with his passion and his tears; and as they listened in his verse to the beating of their own
hearts, a more human world opened up before them, to conquer them by pity, and to sound that
human cry of poverty and wretchedness to which they must henceforth listen everywhere, as
long as they lived’: Zola, *L’Œuvre*, op. cit., pp. 56–57 An alternative translation of the same

40 Zola, *Le Dossier préparatoire du roman [L’Œuvre]*, op. cit., cited and translated in
Andersen, *Cézanne and the Eternal Feminine*, op. cit., p. 165. On Zola and Cézanne’s interest
in de Musset, see the introduction to chapter two, as well as Theodore Reff’s analysis of one of
Cézanne’s poems in section 2C.

41 For instance; ‘Cézanne’s sketchbook stuffed in his gamebag’: King, *Garden of Eden*, op.
cit., p. 7.
If Cézanne did bring a sketch book on the jaunts through the fields outside Aix-en-Provence mentioned above, and did use it, none of the resultant sketches have so far survived, or, if they do, none have been identified as such. Indeed, the pages from possibly his earliest sketchbook that do contain sketches seemingly executed out-of-doors are not even attributed to Cézanne, but, rather, to his sister, and occur on the verso of Cézanne’s own images of, amongst other things, nude men fighting each other (figs 1.3–1.4). 42

The only works deemed possibly executed by Cézanne before this date, but not catalogued by Chappuis, are three caricatures (figs 1.1–1.2) discovered inside the back cover of a book once owned by Cézanne’s mother, and presumably scrawled there by Cézanne when he was a child. 43 Although of little obvious artistic interest, these crude drawings have nevertheless attracted interpretation, and might stand as a useful introduction to certain of the themes raised in this and, in particular, the following chapter, firstly in regards to the desire to read Cézanne’s expression, whether visual or poetic, in terms of particular biographical encoding, and secondly, in terms of encoding more generally. Hence, consistent with what was intimated above in regard to the presumed nature of Cézanne’s early home-life, gleaned in part from Zola’s fictionalized reminiscences and underscored by some of the interpretation given the correspondence between Zola and Cézanne discussed next chapter, Jack Lindsay, for instance, writes:

It is significant that in what seems the earliest drawing we have of his [...] he drew the bust of a scowling heavily-shaded man and two delicate...

42 Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 57–58. Chappuis attributes the landscapes to Cézanne’s sister Marie; the records of the collection of the Department of Prints and Drawings, Israel Museum, Jerusalem, where the drawings are now held, attribute no artist: loc. cit.; Records of the collection of the Department of Prints and Drawings, Israel Museum, Jerusalem, P (2003–2011)-5-61; Personal correspondence with Ronit Sorek, Associate Curator, February 2008.
female figures, one of them merely a smiling face. He seems certainly to be expressing the conflict which hung over his whole life. 44

This affect of conflict perceived by Lindsay as the opposing depictions of an angry father and loving mother seems, however, as much an assumption of biography impressed upon the drawing as vice versa. Hence, Lindsay’s ‘heavily-shaded man’ (fig. 1.2) is, for Chappuis instead and for instance, ‘the first self-portrait by the painter known to us’, and the remaining figures (fig. 1.1), which Lindsay casts as females seem more likely male, delicate and smiling or not. 45 Similar biographical encoding has also been presumed for the misspelled signature beneath the darker figure, the dropped ‘n’ offering, it is sometimes argued, evidence of Cézanne’s awareness at a young age of a reputedly common pun on his father’s name: *seize ânes* [‘sixteen donkeys’]. 46 Hence, Sidney Geist can begin an entire chapter devoted to Cézanne’s deliberate and self-reflexive use of the donkey motif across his œuvre with the words, ‘As a child Cézanne misspelled his name in a way that may indicate a mental association with the donkey.’ 47

However, these issues of possible encoded content in Cézanne’s earliest drawings are not the chief concern of the remainder of this chapter. What is, instead, are issues more formal, and in particular the kinds of procedural activities that might be seen as underlying those earliest efforts. As such, an attempt is made to illustrate certain ways of imagining Cézanne’s pictorial practice—or, perhaps, to put it less concretely, pictorial thinking—that might then be seen as likewise present in his later multi­figured canvases mentioned last chapter. Hence, a certain strand of possible continuity in terms not only of the means by which pictures might be conceived constructed, but also of the formal consequences of such means, is suggested. This

44 Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., p. 12.
45 loc. cit.; Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 198. In terms of the figures deemed feminine by Lindsay, note the presence of what could be caricatures of upturned collars, a device featured in many of Cézanne’s later caricatures of males on pages included in, for instance, a letter sent to Zola in 1859 (fig. 2.5). Marcel Provence, who brought the drawings to light, mentions the suggestion of them being portraits of Cézanne’s parents, but concludes ‘Je ne me prononce pas’: Provence, ‘Cézanne collégien: Les prix de Cézanne,’ op. cit., p. 822.
46 The story goes that Louis-Auguste’s hattery, run by himself and his partners Martin and Coupin was could be turned into the pun ‘Martin, his friend, and sixteen donkeys [Martin, copain, et seize ânes]’: Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 198.
47 Geist, Interpreting Cézanne, op. cit., p. 49. Geist’s analysis of the donkey motif in Cézanne’s œuvre is: ibid., pp. 49–68.
strand, this cluster of affects subsumed under the general term pastiche, by virtue of its emergence in Cézanne’s earliest endeavours, both visual and poetic, as well as its persistence throughout the 1860s, might then be suggested as an intrinsic component of Cézanne’s originality.

In any case, returning to the works to be discussed in this chapter, and excluding the caricatures mentioned above, Adrien Chappuis catalogues some twenty-seven sheets described by him as including elements executed no later than 1858. This group of drawings, in addition to Cézanne’s earliest surviving watercolour, sent to Zola in mid-1858 and discussed in chapter two, thereby comprises, in toto, Cézanne’s juvenilia in its truest sense. For, although he is sometimes cited as having possibly enrolled in drawing classes at the École Gratuite de Dessin d’Aix as early as 1857, only one work, discussed in chapter four, both possibly executed by Cézanne before the end of 1858 and at that institution survives. As such, the efforts considered here would appear to represent Cézanne’s artistic output yet influenced by artistic training in any context more formal than that offered at the collège Bourbon. Hence, they could easily be

---

48 'Sheets' is taken here to mean a single side of a piece of paper, a page and its verso hence counted as two sheets. Sheets that have been suggested as possibly part of the same page but separated at a later date are, likewise, treated as separate sheets. Note that Chappuis’s numbering system includes ‘A’ and ‘B’, as well as ‘bis’ and ‘ter’ suffixing. ‘Elements’ refers to independent drawings that might be included on a single sheet and might have been executed many years apart. Chappuis designates elements in his description with the suffixes (a), (b), etc. In terms of the datings given by Chappuis for the mentioned twenty-seven sheets, fifteen are suggested as including elements executed in date ranges ending in or before 1858 and twelve as including elements executed ‘c.1858’. More complete entries for these are given further below. Note that another twenty-four sheets are cited by Chappuis as including elements executed in date ranges beginning in 1856, 1857, or 1858, but extending into or beyond 1859.

49 The watercolour [RWC] Cicéron foudroyant Catalina (29 [June/July?] 1858) (fig. 2.2) is discussed below in section 2B. Aside from this watercolour, Cézanne’s earliest painted work, according to John Rewald’s dating in his definitive catalogue raisonné of Cézanne’s oil paintings, is the massive decorated screen [R 1–3] Paravent avec scènes champêtres et ornements (figs 3B.1, 3B.6), presumed painted in 1859. On this work, see section 3B.

50 On Cézanne’s enrolment at the École Gratuite de Dessin d’Aix, as well as the mentioned drawing [Ch 73] Antique Bust (1858–1860) (fig. 3A.1), see section 3A.

51 Although rarely mentioned, Cézanne apparently must have studied painting at the collège Bourbon at some point, having been awarded, as noted above, an honourable mention in the subject in 1854, when he was fifteen: ‘Palmarès du collège d’Aix, 1853–1858,’ op. cit., p. 39.
the efforts of someone, still in the final two years of his secondary schooling, yet to even aspire to the career of artist.\textsuperscript{52}

In terms of physical context, nine of the twenty-seven sheets cited above, and seemingly the earliest, are presumed to be the only surviving pages of a sketchbook long-since broken up and now in the collection of the Israel Museum in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{53} Fourteen more come from another early sketchbook, the so-called \textit{Carnet de jeunesse}, a book Cézanne might have used, according to the dates suggested by Chappuis, over a period of more than a decade.\textsuperscript{54} The remaining four sheets are loose leaves of

\textsuperscript{52} For instance, Cézanne would still describe himself as a ‘legal clerk’ at the end of 1860, even though he had dropped out of Law school in February and seemed to be doing little else with his time apart from attending his classes at the École Gratuite de Dessin: Census, Fl ART.19, 1860, Communal Archives, Aix-en-Provence, cited in Cahn, ‘Chronology,’ op. cit., p. 531.

\textsuperscript{53} The sheets, or the sketchbook containing them, were sold by Cézanne’s grandson to Henry Pearlman, who in turn donated them to the Israel Museum, then called the Bezalel National Museum, in 1962: Chappuis, \textit{The Drawings of Paul Cézanne}, op. cit., p. 21. The sheets are: [Ch 4] \textit{Nude Warriors Fighting} (1856–1857) (fig. 1.3), [Ch 5] \textit{Nude Warriors Fighting} (1856–1857) (fig. 1.4), [Ch 6] \textit{Four Figures, Including Two Miser, Seated} (c.1858) (pencil on sketchbook page (23.4 x 16.9), Israel Museum, Jerusalem), [Ch 7] \textit{One Man Grasping the Wrist of Another} (1856–1858) (pencil on sketchbook page (17.5 x 24.4), Israel Museum, Jerusalem), [Ch 8] \textit{Men Handling Guns; A Face} (1856–1857) (pencil on sketchbook page (16.9 x 22.5), Israel Museum, Jerusalem), [Ch 9] \textit{Two Men Bearing a Load; a Musician} (1856–1858) (pencil on sketchbook page (22.9 x 16.8), Israel Museum, Jerusalem), [Ch 11] \textit{Two Faces and a Leaf} (1856–1857) (pencil on sketchbook page (24 x 16.8), Israel Museum, Jerusalem), [Ch 12] \textit{Bush and Faces} (1856–1857) (fig. 2.10(a)), [Ch 14] \textit{Three Seated Figures} (1856–1857) (pencil on sketchbook page (16.9 x 23.3), Israel Museum, Jerusalem). Although the dimensions given by Chappuis for these sheets, and therefore the variations between them (0 cm for short edges and 0.4 cm for long edges), differs to those given by the Israel Museum, which have consequently larger variations (0.1 cm for short edges and 1.5 cm for long edges) and which are those cited here, Chappuis’s presumption that the sheets came from the same sketchbook still seems sound, given both the similarity of the included imagery as well as the sketches on the versos presumed to be by Cézanne’s sister Marie: Chappuis, \textit{The Drawings of Paul Cézanne}, op. cit., pp. 20, 57–58; Records of the collection of the Department of Prints and Drawings, Israel Museum, Jerusalem, P (2003–2011)-5-61.

\textsuperscript{54} Chappuis, \textit{The Drawings of Paul Cézanne}, op. cit., pp. 21, 57, 58, 59, 62, 65–66, 80. The \textit{Carnet de jeunesse} was acquired from the book collector Pierre Berès by the Musées Nationaux in 1953; originally placed in the collection of the Atelier de Cézanne in Aix-en-Provence, it has since been transferred to the Cabinet des Dessins in the Louvre: Chappuis, \textit{The Drawings of Paul Cézanne}, op. cit., p. 21. The fourteen pages from it containing elements dated by Chappuis not exceeding the years 1856–1858 are: [Ch 1] \textit{Studies, Including a Figure of Moses} (c.1858) (fig. 1.5), [Ch 10] \textit{Man Bound} (c.1858) (fig. 1.8), [Ch 15] \textit{Men Round a Table} (c.1858) (pencil on sketchbook page (c.16.5 x 15), Musée du Louvre, Paris), [Ch 18] \textit{Various Studies of a Soldier} (c.1858) (pencil on sketchbook page (15 x 23), Musée du Louvre, Paris), [Ch 19] \textit{Studies, Including a Soldier Making a Bow} (c.1858) (pencil on sketchbook page (15 x 23), Musée du Louvre, Paris), [Ch 42] \textit{Two Figures} (c.1858) (fig. 1.6), [Ch 43] \textit{Studies, Including a Couple Outdoors} (c.1858) (fig. 1.7), [Ch 59(a)] (details) \textit{Cabaret Scene} (1856–1858) (figs 1.10, 1.29), [Ch 62(a–b)] (details from) \textit{Studies, Including a Knife-Grinder} (1857–1858) (pencil on sketchbook page (23 x 15), Musée du Louvre, Paris), [Ch 63(a)] (details from) \textit{Various Studies} (c.1858) (pencil on sketchbook page (15 x 23.2), Musée du Louvre, Paris), [Ch 64(a, c–e)] (details from) \textit{Studies, Including Orientals Smoking} (c.1858) (pencil on sketchbook
ordinary paper, one, [Ch 17] *Drawings Composing a Rebus* (3 May 1858) (fig. 2.1), included in a letter sent to Zola and discussed in chapter two.\(^5\)

In terms of subject matter, every sheet just cited includes depictions of human figures, none include anything approaching a still-life study, and almost all include but the barest hint of setting—landscape or otherwise.\(^5\) In fact, as mentioned above, the only landscapes are those on the verso of the Israel Museum sheets, presumed, by Chappuis at least, to have been executed by Cézanne's sister Marie. As such, few, if any, of Cézanne's earliest drawings could be deemed sketched from life, illustrating instead apparently imagined themes as diverse as faux-antique battle-scenes (figs 1.3–1.4, 1.9, 1.18), biblical personages (fig. 1.5), and Dutch-inspired tavern scenes (fig. 1.10).

Along the way, the styles deployed range from an embarrassingly earnest mock-classicism (figs 1.3–1.4, 1.9, 1.17) to the outright caricatural (fig. 1.6–1.7).

This apparent basis in models imagined rather than real seems part-reason for Chappuis's suggestion that ten—more than a third—of the above-cited twenty-seven sheets are actually copies, or paraphrases, of other artists' works as yet unidentified in all cases but one.\(^5\) Hence, aside from [Ch 12] *Bush and Faces* (1856–1857) (fig. page (15 x 23.2), Musée du Louvre, Paris), [Ch 67(a–c)] (details from) *Page of Studies, Including a Seated Woman* (1857–1858) (pencil on sketchbook page (15 x 23), Musée du Louvre, Paris), [Ch 69(a, c)] (details from) *Studies* (1857–1858) (pencil on sketchbook page (23 x 15), Musée du Louvre, Paris), [Ch 145(a)] (detail from) *Studies for the Illustration of 'Une charogne' (c.1858)* (fig. 1.32(b)). The element in the *carnet* given the earliest dating by Chappuis is: [Ch 59(a)] (detail) *Cabaret Scene* (1856–1858) (figs 1.10, 1.29), discussed below. The latest elements dated by Chappuis are: [Ch 146(c)] (detail from) *Studies for the Illustration of 'Une charogne' (1866–1869)* (fig. 1.32(a)), [Ch 147(b–c, e)] (details) *Studies, Nudes* (1866–1869) (pencil on sketchbook page (15 x 23), Musée du Louvre, Paris).

55 Aside from the rebus, the loose sheets are: [Ch 3] *Fighting Warrior* (1856–1858) (fig. 1.17), [Ch 28] *Ancient Warrior on a Chariot* (1856–1858) (fig. 1.9), [Ch 41] *Three Pen Sketches* (c.1858) (ink on ruled paper mounted on cardboard (14.3 x 18.2), Kunstmuseum, Basel). On [Ch 17] *Drawings Composing a Rebus* (3 May 1858) (fig. 2.1), see section 2A.

56 The earliest element that might be still-life study is [Ch 146(c)] (detail from) *Studies for the Illustration of 'Une charogne' (1856–1859)* (fig. 1.34(a)). Chappuis describes that element as a 'hexagonal, openwork piece of furniture or a smoking brazier'; Chappuis, [*The Drawings of Paul Cézanne*], op. cit., p. 80.

57 The exception is [Ch 12] *Bush and Faces* (1856–1857) (fig. 2.10(a)), two elements of which are presumed studies for Cézanne's painted copy [R 9] *Le Baiser de la Muse, d'apres Frillié* (c.1869) (fig. 3D.1), after Félix Nicolas Frillié's *Le Baiser de la Muse* (1857) (fig. 3D.2) in the collection of the Musée d'Aix; on this, see section 3D. [Ch 12] *Bush and Faces* (1856–1857) (fig. 2.10(a)) is also mentioned again below in section 2E in relation to [Ch 37] *Symbolic Drawing, Inscribed 'La Mort règne en ces lieux'* (1859) (fig. 2.3). The drawings dated as possibly executed no later than 1858 by Chappuis, those listed as copies 'after [unidentified] paintings, drawings and engravings of various schools' are: [Ch 1] *Studies, Including a Figure*
2.10(a)), presumed after a painting in the Musée d'Aix (fig. 3D.2), Chappuis's suggestion of copying seems predicated on the basis of subject-matter and style, rather than the existence of specific originals after which the drawings might be seen to correspond closely. The nearest Chappuis comes to such identification are general imagic categories like 'in the style of' Jacques-Louis David or his followers, or 'reminiscent' of the Le Nain brothers. 58 This is even the case in regards to three of the works that Chappuis describes as including possibly 'traced' elements: [Ch 10(a)] (detail) Man Bound (c.1858) (fig. 1.8), [Ch 28] Ancient Warrior on a Chariot (1856-1858) (fig. 1.9), and [Ch 59(a)] (detail) Cabaret Scene (fig. 1.10). 59 Hence, if copied, or even traced, such drawings would seem to have been executed after works obscure enough to have evaded identification or after works better-known, but through processes resulting in images occluding recognition of those sources.

In terms precisely of such procedures, and specifically in regard to tracing, Chappuis offers no elaboration regarding the possible processes through which the suggested

---

26
tracing was articulated. What might be presumed in the simplest case is the use of thin enough paper to see through, and thereby copy, the broader outlines of an image lying beneath; or, perhaps, the drawing over of the main contours of an image with a substance like charcoal that is then transferred, through rubbing, onto, and in reverse, another sheet of paper. In any case, what ‘tracing’ is here being discussed in terms of is not the physical processes through which such imagic transference might be presumed to have been achieved, but rather the kinds of information, as imagic affect, presumably so-transferred through such procedures. ‘Tracing’ might thereby be taken to mean merely the appearance of close copying of another image’s outline and major contours, often at a scale similar, if not identical, to the original. Left open then, and intentionally so, is a range of procedural possibilities; the works might, for instance, be close copies, or tracings of close copies, or close copies of tracings, of his own or even other artists’ close copies or tracings, etc. and ad infinitum. Of interest, then, is less the identification of specific sources underlying these presumed imagic transferences, and more the processes of transference itself, in terms not only of the affects by which that possibility is signalled, but also the processes of pictorial construction such transferences, or analogies of such transferences, might be articulated through. In short, what is sought is not the factuality or otherwise of the use of tracing or close-copying in Cézanne’s earliest drawings, but, rather, the analogies such processes might provide in highlighting formal affects likewise

60 Given the modesty of the images, as well as of their subject matter, it is unlikely Cézanne utilized anything as sophisticated as the ‘Diagraphe’, ‘a mechanical copying tool’ Ingres presumed the Musée d’Aix was in possession of in 1850, and mentioned by him in an 1850 letter to Joseph-Marc Gilbert, current director of that institution and, later, Cézanne’s drawing instructor; in that letter Ingres requested a tracing be made of his portrait of François-Marius Granet in the Musée’s collection, stating that he preferred the tracing be made with a just such a machine: Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres, unpublished letter to Joseph-Marc Gilbert, 1850, cited by Gary Tinterow in: Gary Tinterow, Charlotte Hale, and Eric Bertin, “Portraits by Ingres: Image of an epoch”: Reflections, technical observations, addenda, and corrigenda,' Metropolitan Museum Journal, vol. 35 (2000), p. 197 n. 5. In that article, the name of the director of the Musée d’Aix, and to whom Ingres’s letter is addressed, is given as Honoré Gilbert, which would seem an error; Honoré Gilbert, Joseph-Marc’s son, was not director of the Musée d’Aix until 1870 and in the years 1849–1853 was in Paris on a scholarship: Bruno Ely, ‘Cézanne, l’École de Dessin et le Musée d’Aix,’ in Denis Coutagne et al., Cézanne au Musée d’Aix, exhibition catalogue (Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence, 1984), Aix-en-Provence: Musée Granet, 1984, p. 165; Coutagne, ‘Introduction générale,’ in Denis Coutagne et al., Musée Granet: Guide des Collections, Aix-en-Provence: Musée Granet, 1997, p. 7. On the Musée d’Aix, and its relation to the École de Dessin, the first, and indeed perhaps only, institution at which Cézanne received any formal artistic training, see section 3A

61 The thickness of the pages of the Carnet de jeunessse would seem to prohibit this process in the case of [Ch 10(a)] (detail) Man Bound (c.1858) (fig. 1.8) and [Ch 59(a)] (detail) Cabaret Scene (figs 1.10, 1.29).
possibly present in certain of Cézanne's multi-figured canvases of the late 1860s and early 1870s.

Firstly, in terms of the kinds of appearances that make certain of Cézanne's early drawings look like copies rather than sketches, the most obvious is subject matter; pictures of chariots, naked warriors, historical costumes, religious personages, etc., are difficult to imagine being produced without the use of other images. Combined with this is a presumed discrepancy between the technical proficiency, or not, of an image's executor and the imagery so-executed. For instance, the figures in most of Cézanne's drawings suggested by Chappuis as copied or traced embody relations of spatial and/or anatomical arrangement deployed more sophisticatedly than seems the case with other of his drawings executed around the same time. Stylistic features that might signal such transference of the appearance of proficient depiction from original to copy include simplification of detail, the use of concise emphatic contours, and the summation of spatial illusionism without recourse to modelling. In short, there is a

62 Hence, compare most of the drawings from what is presumed Cézanne's earliest sketchbook and now in the collection of the Israel Museum, for instance [Ch 7] One Man Grasping the Wrist of Another (1856-1858) (pencil on sketchbook page (17.5 x 24.4), Israel Museum, Jerusalem) with some of the earlier sketches in the Carnet jeunesse presumed contemporary with the Israel Museum drawings, but not considered copies. In the former, a certain degree of subtly is used in the arrangement and placing of limbs, as well as general posturing that, although by no means perfect, shows some attempt to present the appearance of three-dimensionality. In the latter case, some drawings seem not to attempt to be anything other than crude caricatures, for instance the figure on the bottom left of [Ch 1] Studies, Including Figure of Moses (c.1858) (fig. 1.5) and all the figures in [Ch 42] Two Figures (c.1858) (fig. 1.6) and [Ch 43] Studies, Including a Couple Outdoors (c.1858) (fig. 1.7), in particular the dog depicted on the right, in the latter.

63 A perfect example of the relation between the affects of tracing and the presumption, or not, of technical proficiency is played out in the various interpretations given by Adrien Chappuis and Mary Tompkins Lewis in regard to [Ch 59(a)] (detail) Cabaret Scene (1856-1858) (figs 1.10, 1.29). For Chappuis, the confidence of the deployment of the figures in that scene, their disposition in space, the props surrounding them, the costumes they wear, etc., are implied, through the suggestion of tracing, not necessarily to be a reflection of Cézanne's awareness of the conventions of Dutch genre, but qualities of the works from which the drawings were traced in the first place. For Mary Tompkins Lewis, however, who, as noted below, dates the drawing to several years later than Chappuis and does not raise the possibility of tracing, precisely these qualities are taken as evidence of Cézanne's development. That is, precisely those affects Lewis interprets as Cézanne's growing proficiency as a drawer ('a more sophisticated composition and a better understanding of [...] northern genre images'), Chappuis might be seen as attributing, through the presumption of tracing, to Cézanne's proficiency as a tracer: Lewis, Cézanne's Early Imagery, op. cit., p. 132.
stress on linearity and, in particular, outline, affects all often distinctive, in general, of reproductive media, but, in particular, of engraving.

As such, many of Cézanne’s early drawings seem to resemble, for instance, printed reproductions (fig. 1.12) of John Flaxman’s graphic œuvre, whose outlined-based style was itself directly related to that artist’s copying of antique bas-reliefs (fig. 1.11), statues, and vase decorations. Flaxman’s prints had provoked something of an epidemic of pastiche amongst French painters in the first half of the nineteenth century, with luxury editions of Flaxman’s designs used as copy books from which poses and postures could be unabashedly pillaged for use in the synthetic construction of painted neo-classical compositions. Following from this, resonances with Cézanne’s drawings can also thereby be found in the outline reproductions of such compositions (fig. 1.13), as well as the drawn studies for them (figs 1.14–1.15), published, for instance, in those volumes of Charles Landon’s Annales du Musée et de l’École moderne des beaux-arts devoted to contemporary Salons. To complete the circle, similar comparisons might also be drawn with nineteenth-century reproductions of just the kind statuary inspiring Flaxman’s endeavours in the first place, for instance

---

64 Hence note, in terms of postural affinities, note the right leg of the main figures in Cézanne’s [Ch 28] Ancient Warrior on a Chariot (1856–1858) (fig. 1.9) and [Ch 3] Fighting Warrior (1856–1858) (fig. 1.17), which seems similar to the right leg of the figure in Flaxman’s Antique Battle Scene, After Relief (c. 1809) (fig. 1.11). There is also some similarity, albeit through reversal, between the torso of that same Flaxman figure and the torso of [Ch 10(a)] (detail) Man Bound (c. 1858) (fig. 1.8).


66 Langdon’s Annales du Musée et de l’École moderne des beaux-arts was published between 1808 and 1835 and comprised some thirty-three volumes, all extensively illustrated with reproductions in the distinctive outline style here being discussed. Volumes were dedicated either to contemporary Salons, or to prominent collections; hence, the series came to stand as an indispensable, yet idiosyncratic, visual resource for the art of the past, as well as of the present.
the Pisan engraving after the Farnese marble group (fig. 1.16), published in an 1846 issue of Magasin Pittoresque. 67

Re-emphasizing the observation noted above regarding Chappuis’s inability to identify the sources for Cézanne’s drawings presumed traced, none of the works just-cited bear specific resemblance to Cézanne’s drawings apart from the fragmentary. That is, if such works were sourced by Cézanne for postural components, he must have copied and/or traced only parts—a limb here, a head there. It is this possibility of fragmentary copying or tracing and the subsequent rearranging of these for novel compositions—the repetition, rotation, translation, and/or inversion of fragments of depictions, or whole depictions, of bodies—that is of interest here, particularly in regards to the kinds distortions made visible by these processes, both in terms of the figures so-constructed as well as the spaces implied by their arrangement.

For example, in [Ch 28] Ancient Warrior on a Chariot (1856–1858) (fig. 1.9), those contours seemingly traced, based on the presence of the stylistic features just described, would include most of the central figure, and, perhaps, the legs of what are presumed to be another figure falling off the chariot to the right, or, in Chappuis’s words, ‘an enemy, thrown to the ground.’ 68 The other elements, particularly the clothing and/or cape of the main figure and the chariot he is presumed to be standing on, are sketched far more tentatively and appear, thereby, to be improvised embellishments. 69 In regard to the presumed traced contributions, and aside from this

---

67 It is also not entirely unfeasible that Cézanne copied directly from such statuary, or casts of such statuary himself, there being, for instance, an odd symmetry between the pose, with the exception of the height of the raised arm, of the main figure in [Ch 5] Nude Warriors Fighting (1856–1857) (fig. 1.4) and the figure second from top-left in [Ch 4] Nude Warriors Fighting (1856–1857) (fig. 1.3), which might suggest a depiction of exactly the same pose, but rotated through 180 degrees. The succinctness of the outlining, however, along with the small scale of the sketches, would seem to argue against this. On Cézanne’s other early copying after statuary or casts of such objects, see [Ch 73] Antique Bust (1858–1860) (fig. 3A.1) and [Ch 74] Female Torso (c. 1860) (fig. 3A.2); these, as well as the place of such copying in artistic training is discussed in section 3A.

68 Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 60.

69 Given the absence of an original, this affect, and the presumption following from it of dressing up, or dressing down a figure for use in a novel context, is based only on relations of differences within Cézanne’s drawing, rather than between the unknown original and Cézanne’s copy. There is, as such, a distinctive rupture between what is presumed the
continuity of style, there is also a similarity of scale and shape of the left leg of the standing figure that is repeated in both legs of the figure sliding off the bottom of the page. This repetition through rotated fragments gives the appearance of cut-and-paste pastiche that, precisely in line with that analogy, occurs within a specifically two-dimensional plane abutting, even contradicting, whatever three-dimensionality is implicit in the fragments so-repeated. A tension is thus created between the correctness of the spatiality of the parts and the incorrectness of the spatiality of the picture as a whole. This disjunction is, in turn, however, balanced in part by the decorative unity given the image through this appearance of parts rotated and repeated across its surface. The image has become, in a sense, a plane of activity rather than a window.

To extend the metaphor of assembled fragments, what might also be noticed in regard to the main figure of Ancient Warrior on a Chariot (fig. 1.9) is its similarity to the main figure in [Ch 3] Fighting Warrior (1856–1858) (fig. 1.17), in terms again not only of style and pose, but also of scale. In fact, if reproduced at identical reproductive scales and overlain, it is possible to match certain contours of the figures closely (fig. 1.18). It is, however, impossible to match up the entire figures, only parts. Hence, although a suggestion of tracing might thereby be made for Fighting Warrior (fig. 1.17) on the basis of these matching contours and Chappuis’s suggestion of tracing for Ancient Warrior on a Chariot (fig. 1.9), the articulation of that process, if based on a single external original, or each other, would seem to involve a rearrangement of the parts presumed so-traced. Each figure might, thereby, be conceived of as pastiched from elements of the other.

Precisely this possible procedure is well illustrated through the crude recreation of the pose adopted by the figure in Fighting Warrior (fig. 1.17) using only elements of Ancient Warrior on a Chariot (fig. 1.9) reproduced at an identical reproductive scale and then separated from, and moved and/or rotated relative to, each other (fig. 1.19). The process thus enacted could thereby be seen as analogy for a mechanical procedure of tracing whereby the sheet of paper onto which an image is traced is moved and/or rotated relative to the image being traced during that procedure; or, different images are used to provide different elements. In turn, this imagined procedure of rearranged contributions derived from a traced original—however fragmentarily sourced and/or utilized—and from Cézanne himself.
tracing stands as analogy for a particular form of pictorial thinking here attempted to be highlighted, one that treats the depiction of the figure as the culmination of depicted fragments being combined. In short, they are images of combined images.

In regards to the possible formal ramifications of such possibilities, whereas the repetition of elements mentioned above might be seen as creating an emphasis on continuities contiguous with the picture plane, the combinatorial construction of figures just described disrupts the illusionism of single-point perspective in a somewhat different way. The figure, as a combination of views, rather than a combination of parts within the same view, dissembles spatial cues and distorts the figure such that it tends to be defined in terms of that which is inside a continuous outline, rather than any imagined structure beneath the surface holding that figure's parts together in a spatially consistent way. 70 There is a unity of lines rather than of volumes; the figure is conceived intrinsically in terms imagic rather than spatial.

This process of creating figures from multiple parts might also be extended to the creation of scenes from elements derived from multiple sources, a process that might be suggested as illustrated, if only metaphorically, by the more complete of Cézanne’s early drawings suggested by Chappuis as containing traced contours, [Ch 59(a)] (detail) Cabaret Scene (1856–1858) (fig. 1.10). 71 Here, three soldiers are depicted

---

70 In a sense, this might be characterized as a crude form of proto-cubism, one that, however, not only retains the contour, but actively resists its puncturing.

71 Theodore Reff, Mary Tompkins Lewis, and Joyce Medina all date [Ch 59(a)] (detail) Cabaret Scene (1856–1858) (figs 1.10, 1.29) later than Chappuis, preferring the range 1860–1862: Theodore Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Cardplayers” and their sources,’ Arts Magazine, vol. 55, no. 3 (November 1980), p. 117 n. 106; Lewis, Cézanne’s Early Imagery, op. cit., p. 132; Joyce Medina, Cézanne and Modernism: The Poetics of Painting, New York: State University of New York Press, 1995, pp. 162–163. The reasoning for this, or, at least, the justification is, however, somewhat circular. For, both Mary Tompkins Lewis, who notes that ‘[a]lthough originally dated c.1856–1858 by Chappuis, Cézanne’s Cabaret Scene has been correctly redated to c.1860–1862 by Ratcliffe’: Lewis, Cézanne’s Early Imagery, op. cit., p. 132. Now, although Lewis’ reference to Robert Ratcliffe’s ‘redating’ is uncited, Theodore Reff, in an article Lewis does cite, and often, does reference Ratcliffe as part of his own assertion that the drawing is ‘more correctly dated 1860–1862, with the other drawings in the same sketchbook’: Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Cardplayers” and their sources,’ op. cit., p. 117 n. 106. Likewise, although without mentioning Ratcliffe, Joyce Medina seems also to have based her dating on Reff’s: Medina, Cézanne and Modernism, op. cit., p. 230 n. 33. Now, Reff’s reference leads to Ratcliffe’s discussion of another drawing in the Carnet de Jeunesse—[Ch 148] Seated Man with his Back Turned (1864–1867) (pencil on sketchbook page (23 x 15), Musée du Louvre, Paris)—in which he makes, as an aside, the comment that it occurs in a sketchbook ‘from the early 1860’s’: Ratcliffe, Cézanne’s Working Methods, op. cit., pp. 176, 412 n. 41. Even assuming Reff meant by these words only that those drawings dated by Chappuis as earlier than this date needed such redating (there are many drawings from the Carnet de Jeunesse that
around a table, one of them standing and raising his glass in toast before a notice pinned to the wall declaring, perhaps ironically, ‘Défense de se souler [no drunkenness]’, all of them in costumes and poses reminiscent of Dutch seventeenth-century cortegaardje (‘guardroom’) scenes.\textsuperscript{72} And, although no scholar seems to have taken up Chappuis’s suggestion of possible tracing, inspirational sources for Cézanne’s drawing have been suggested from precisely this genre, Theodore Reff, for instance, proposing both the main figure group in Michael Sweerts’s \textit{Soldats jouant dans une caverne aménagée en corps de garde} (1645) (fig. 1.20) and, in terms of works closer to Cézanne’s time, Ernest Meissonier’s various depictions of card-playing scenes, such as \textit{The Lost Game} (1847) (fig. 1.21).\textsuperscript{73} Joyce Medina and Mary Tompkins Lewis likewise mention similarities in terms of Meissonier’s \textit{The Cardplayers} (1863) (fig. 1.22), Medina noting a coincidence of pose as evidence of Cézanne’s direct copying.\textsuperscript{74} To these might also be added Lewis’s suggestion of David Teniers’s \textit{Le Reniement de saint Pierre dans un corps de garde avec des joueurs de cartes} (1646) (fig. 1.23), in the collection of the Louvre.\textsuperscript{75}

\textsuperscript{72} Chappuis, \textit{The Drawings of Paul Cézanne}, op. cit., p. 65.

\textsuperscript{73} Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Cardplayers” and their sources,’ op. cit., p. 115. Mary Tompkins Lewis likewise makes these suggestions, particularly in the case of Meissonier: Lewis, \textit{Cézanne’s Early Imagery}, op. cit., p. 43.

\textsuperscript{74} Medina, \textit{Cézanne and Modernism}, op. cit., pp. 162–163. Medina’s suggestion of the dependency of [Ch 59 a] (detail) \textit{Cabaret Scene} (1856–1858) (figs 1.10, 1.29) upon Meissonier’s \textit{The Cardplayers} (1863) (fig. 1.22) would, however, require a retracing of Cézanne’s drawing, both in terms of that suggested by Chappuis, (1856–1858), and that suggested by Reff and Lewis, (1860–1862). For, Medina’s dating of the Meissonier panel ‘1860–1863’ would seem broader than necessary, given that Meissonier initialled and dated the panel ‘1863’: Medina, \textit{Cézanne and Modernism: The Poetics of Painting}, op. cit., p. 162; Unattributed author, [Catalogue notes for] Ernest Meissonier: “The Cardplayers”; online database of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, accessible through:


\textsuperscript{75} Lewis, \textit{Cézanne’s Early Imagery}, op. cit., p. 132. Teniers’s \textit{Le Reniement de saint Pierre dans un corps de garde avec des joueurs de cartes} (1646) (fig. 1.23) was acquired by the Louvre in 1784: Unattributed author, [Catalogue notes for] David II Teniers ou Teniers le Jeune: “Le Reniement de saint Pierre dans un corps de garde avec des joueurs de cartes”, online database of the Musée du Louvre, Paris, accessible through:

Now, given the ubiquitous nature of the *corregadoirje* scene in both its original seventeenth-century northern genre context, as well as its nineteenth-century French revival *corps du garde* form exemplified, for instance, by Meissonier's efforts, Cézanne could have as easily, if basing his drawing on the work of others, used multiple, rather than single, sources.\(^{76}\) Hence, the standing figure in *Cabaret Scene* (fig. 1.10) might be deemed reminiscent to the soldiers depicted similarly toasting by Hendrick van der Burch and Pieter de Hooch in their respective *Guardroom Scene with a Soldier Toasting* (c.1660) (fig. 1.24) and *A Merry Company with a Trumpeter* (c.1670) (fig. 1.25).\(^{77}\) Or, in an appropriation of form, but not of content, the same figure might as easily have been derived from Jacob Duck's depiction of a connoisseur examining a glass of wine in *De wijnproevers* (c.1640–1642) (fig. 1.26(a)).\(^{78}\) Likewise, the seated soldier on the left in Cézanne's drawing also bears resemblance to a figure in another Duck painting, *Card Playing in a Guardroom Interior* (n.d.) (fig. 1.26(b)), or, indeed, to any of the correspondingly positioned figures in the Sweerts, Meissonier, Teniers, or de Hooch paintings cited above (figs 1.20–1.23, 1.25).\(^{79}\) Similarly, the figure on the right seems to repeat the pose of a soldier in another of de Hooch's panels, *Tric-Trac Players* (1652–58) (fig. 1.27), or, indeed, a figure from an Adolphe Bayot lithograph published in an 1843 issue of *L'Artiste* (fig. 1.28).

\(^{76}\) Mary Tompkins Lewis makes precisely the same point regarding multiple sources for [Ch 36] *Cardplayers* (1858–1860) (pencil on paper (22 x 27), PC): Lewis, *Cézanne's Early Imagery*, op. cit., p. 132. As mentioned above, Chappuis deems Cézanne's drawing a tracing, describing it as a '[t]racing done from an unidentified engraved reproduction': Chappuis, *The Drawings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 61.

\(^{77}\) There is also some similarity between the pose, but not costume, of the smoker depicted on the right in the van der Burch panel (fig. 1.24) and certain of Cézanne's early drawings likewise of smokers, for instance [Ch 33(d)] (detail) *Man Smoking* (1858–1859) (fig. 2.10(b)), [Ch 34(d)] (detail) *Man Smoking* (1858–1859) (pencil on sketchbook page (23 x 15), Musée du Louvre, Paris), and [Ch 127(a)] (detail) *Man Smoking* (1857–1859) (pencil on sketchbook page (15 x 23), Musée du Louvre, Paris), mentioned again, briefly, in section 2E.

\(^{78}\) Another of Cézanne's early drawings also includes a figure, [Ch 18(d)] (detail) *Soldier* (c.1858) (pencil on sketchbook page (15 x 23), Musée du Louvre, Paris), that seems to repeat one of Duck's stock standing soldier figures, which appears in another section of *De wijnproevers* (c.1640–1642) (fig. 1.26(a)) than that reproduced here, as well as *Dividing the Spoils* (c. 1635) (oil (46 x 74), PC).

\(^{79}\) There is also an odd similarity, albeit reversed, between a head depicted on the same page as Cézanne's cabaret scene, but not reproduced here, [Ch 59(b)] (detail) *Head* (1858–1861), which Chappuis describes as 'an unidentified work', and the heads in two other of Sweert's paintings presumed self-portraits, *Artist in His Studio* (c.1647–1648) (oil (97 x 135), Galleria Nazionale d'Arte Antica, Rome), and *In the Studio* (1652) (oil (73.5 x 58.8), Detroit Institute of Arts, Detroit).
If such works are to be suggested as having influenced Cézanne’s drawing, that inspiration must be presumed, with the exception of the Bayot lithograph, to have come through reproductions, Cézanne yet, if Chappuis’s dating is to be respected, to travel outside the bounds of his provincial home. As such, the agency of illustrated journals, such as L’Artiste, from which Cézanne certainly seems to have copied later in life, as well as Charles Blanc’s monumental Histoire des peintres de tous les écoles, would seem required.

In any case, if the act of pastiche enacted above in regard to Ancient Warrior on a Chariot (fig. 1.9) is repeated with the various works just-cited as possibly influencing Cabaret Scene (fig. 1.29), albeit without adhering to identical reproductive scales, reasonable reconstructions of that drawing are possible, not only with elements derived from multiple sources, but also with multiple possible combinations of those elements, of which the images reproduced here are but two examples (figs 1.30–1.31).

As such, what is being argued is not the facticity of a particular combination of elements, but the affective resonance the demonstration of such combinatorial arrangements conveys. Again, then, the analogy of processes of pastiche might be

---

80 Although the Musée d’Aix, as discussed below, certainly possessed a distinctively strong collection of northern genre works, most, acquired as part of the 1860 Bourguignon de Fabregoules bequest, were not accepted by the Musée until 1863 and even then, not put on public display until 1866. On this, see section 3A. In any case, the few corteguardje paintings included in that bequest, as well as the Musée’s holdings before it, bear far resemblance to Cézanne’s drawing than any of the paintings from other collections so far cited. Some scholars have circumvented the necessity of presuming Cézanne relied on second-hand access to the paintings by dating the drawing later than Chappuis does, hence allowing for the possibility that Cézanne executed it during, or after, his first trip to Paris, and thereby allowing him to have seen the paintings in the collection of the Louvre.

81 On Cézanne’s possible copying of other images, particularly in the 1870s and 1880s, in drawn form and from back issues of L’Artiste mostly dating to the 1840s and 1850s, see: Ballas, Guila, ‘Paul Cézanne et la revue L’Artiste,’ Gazette des Beaux-Arts, ser. 6, vol. 98, no. 1355 (December 1981), pp. 223–232. Ballas counts numerous possible instances where Cézanne either copied from, or even drew upon prints included in that journal: loc. cit. In terms of Charles Blanc’s Histoire des peintres, the two volumes on École hollandaise were published in 1861, but instalments on the individual artists comprising this were published much earlier as stand-alone issues, beginning in 1849: Unattributed author, ‘[Advertisement for Histoires des peintres de toutes les écoles giving lists of featured artist by issue number],’ Gazette des Beaux-Arts, t. 17, livr. 102 (1 December 1864), p. 576 ter.

82 Ironic mention might also be made of a kind of leaking of meaning from works that might be presumed pastiched from and the pastiche itself; hence, Joyce Medina, who, as noted above, sees a correspondence between a figure in [Ch 59(a)] (detail) Cabaret Scene (1856–1858) (figs 1.10, 1.29) and one in Meissonier’s The Cardplayers (1863) (fig. 1.22), observes that in his drawing ‘Cézanne captured the shared mood of the participants, their reciprocal involvement in the play, with one man anticipating a good hand and another drinking to it’, despite the fact
applied, elements derived from multiple sources within a particular genre and
rearranged so as to create a novel composition adhering, still, to the conventions of
that form. Within such a conception, then, Cabaret Scene (fig. 1.29) could be deemed
parodic, a repetition of forms and structures definitional of the corps du garde sub-
genre.

In terms of the possible affective consequences this suggested parodic pastiche might
entail, in addition to those already discussed in terms of the construction of figures
from parts, in possibly relying only on a certain vocabulary of posed elements, a
particular postural database, as it were, as well as the inherent qualities of those parts
in terms of their emphatic outlines, a tendency, in this form of pictorial construction,
towards decorative rather than veristic cohesion might be proposed. For instance, in
the case of two of Cézanne’s early battle-scenes, [Ch 4] Nude Warriors Fighting
(1856–1857) (fig. 1.3) and [Ch 5] Nude Warriors Fighting (1856–1857) (fig. 1.4), the
network of lines defining the postural elements arranged on the page attain a kind of
lattice-like cohesion entirely separate to their role in defining the placement of bodies
within an imagined space. Moreover, in apparently seeking a specific form of clarity
in the presentation of these parts, a resistance to unnecessary overlapping and the
tendency for objects to just touch but not impinge upon one another, creates a set of
forceful negative spaces, a decorative stasis seemingly at odds with the movement
implied by the events depicted.

None of this is meant to imply that Cézanne, in constructing pictures along the lines
just described, even if only metaphorically, was unique in this regard, more that the
gauche affects thereby produced remained obstructions to most contemporary
painters’ true aspirations, which were the forms of finish, illusionistic verisimilitude,
and spatial coherence demanded of academic painting.\(^\text{83}\) Cézanne’s approach to

---

that, in his drawing, the figures seem not to be actually playing cards: Medina, Cézanne and

\(^\text{83}\) For instance, comparison might be made to Meissonier, already mentioned above in regards
to his similar gesture of re-manifesting Dutch genre in works like The Lost Game (1847) (fig.
1.21) and The Cardplayers (1863) (fig. 1.22); and indeed, a passage from Constance
Hungerford’s study of him resonates precisely with some of the kinds of observations here
being made: ‘From these [seventeenth-century Dutch] sources he [Meissonier] derived features
that made his paintings appealing, but the limits of his experience would be reflected in
academically gauche faults, especially involving proportions and the spatial integration of
disparate sections, faults for which critics would chide him throughout his career and yet that
he would never purge from his art’: Constance Cain Hungerford, Ernest Meissonier: Master in
His Genre, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, p. 6. That is, Meissonier’s
drawing, on the other hand, and, in particular, aspects of that approach then seemingly later transferred into the field of painting in, for instance, his multi-figured canvases of the late 1860s and early 1870s, might seem instead deliberate derailments of such investments of effort. There is, then, not only a retention, but also an exaggeration of affects associated with these procedures, a sense in which the qualities of imagery qua imagery, upon being repeated, are emphasized, a generational noise seems added that stresses the inherently pictorial aspects of whatever is copied, or, perhaps more precisely, the means by which that 'whatever', as content, has been copied as image.

Hence, in regard to the torsions noted above as implicit in Cézanne's presumed drawn arrangements of parts, for instance, it is easy to understand why so little attempt has been made to include much indication of the landscape within which the figures stand, the ground implied by their deployment seemingly so malleable that it defies depiction. This vacuity, in turn, might be seen as a exemplifying a particular quality inherent to graphic, as opposed to painterly, modes of representation. As Yves Alain-Bois notes, and returning, thereby, to the quote cited at the beginning of this chapter in regard to his noting Cézanne's abolishment of the 'constitutive difference' between painting and drawing:

"The major difference between the space of drawing and that of painting concerns the nature of the support. Since the time of Alberti, the picture plane is assumed as transparent in painting, but the condition sine qua non of this transparency is that the supporting ground be covered without restricted exposure to academic training, his early, often anonymous and artisanal, work during the 1830s and 1840s designing engraved imagery for illustrated journals and books, and his self-taught pastiching of northern genre schools, are all perceived as having a career-long effect on his artistic output: Constance Cain Hungerford, 'Meissonier's "Souvenir de guerre civile",' *Art Bulletin*, vol. 61, no. 2 (June 1979), pp. 280–281, 287–288; Constance Cain Hungerford, 'Ernest Meissonier's first military paintings: I: "The Emperor Napoleon III at the Battle of Solferino",' *Arts Magazine*, vol. 54 (1980), pp. 90–92, 94; Hungerford, *Ernest Meissonier*, op. cit., pp. 6, 10–27. This lack of academic polish, particularly in regard to the organization of pictorial space in large paintings containing multiple figures is perceived, thereby, as never having been quite effaced. Hence, a kind of crude comparison can be drawn with Cézanne, who, according to what has so-far been discussed in terms of his early drawings, likewise seems first to have entered the domain of pictorial representation chiefly through a self-directed copying of images, often in the form of engraved reproductions. For accounts of Meissonier's increased frustrations in the face of critical reception in such terms, as well as the broader issue of his aspiration to a more creditable 'academic' reputation, see, in particular: Marc Gottlieb, *The Plight of Emulation: Ernest Meissonier and French Salon Painting*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

84 Take, for instance, the landscape implied by the feet positioning of the main figure in [Ch 3] *Fighting Warrior* (1856–1858) (fig. 1.17) and the contradictory implication of the figure lying between that figure's legs, as if in a trench with an invisible embankment.
reserve. Conversely, as Walter Benjamin has remarked, 'the graphic line can exist only against this background, so that a drawing that completely covered its background would cease to be a drawing.'85

The early work, then, at least in regards to the above-noted exaggerated affects related to processes of pastiche, might thereby be seen as distinctly foregrounding the possibility of this later development. For, precisely the amorphous space just described in terms of the backgrounds his early drawn pastiches—this steep void-like screen upon which figures are arranged—is a conception seemingly persisting into, perhaps deliberately, his multi-figured canvases and murals of the late 1860s discussed in chapter six. The unity of the included figures in both these drawings as well as the later paintings, becomes, then, not their sharing of a physically consistent, and thereby illusionistically, defined space, but by their shared nature as occupiers of an intrinsically imagic place defined, fundamentally, by acts of depiction.

Before closing this discussion of Cézanne’s earliest drawings, and to extend the some of the vaguer points made above regarding the concept of compositional unity, mention should also perhaps be made of the degree to which many of the works just-discussed, in particular those in the Israel Museum, for instance the two drawings titled *Nude Warriors Fighting* (figs 1.3–4), deviate from Cézanne’s later drawn practice in a specific and distinctive way. For, most of these earliest drawings comprise what appear to be attempts at constructing a single, coherent scene, however much the space of that scene has been distorted by the arrangement and construction of the figures included. The compositional ground of continuity remains, therefore, despite this distension, the provisional, even if only ostensibly-so, concept of a single viewpoint.

Now, in the case of Cézanne’s slightly later sketchbook, the *Carnet de jeunesse*, which, according to Chappuis’s dates, was used over a period possibly as broad a decade, most of the pages are closer to what is more conventionally understood as study sheets. That is, they are rarely compositional studies, but, instead, pages

---

containing elements of compositions rehearsed and repeated, experimented with, turned this way and that. In the case of the few exceptions to this, depictions of whole scenes never take up a whole page and are often combined with disparate and often unrelated elements, for instance in [Ch 145–146] *Studies for the Illustration of “Une Charogne”* (c. 1858, 1866–1869) (fig. 1.32). Moreover, pages seem added to indiscriminately, often over large periods of time and rarely with any apparent consistency of logic, orientation, and/or scale, and with earlier drawings effaced by, overlain, or unexpectedly juxtaposed with, later ones, as is the case, for instance, with the *Studies for the Illustration of “Une Charogne”* just noted. Indeed, the aesthetics of such an object are entirely different to that of the painted canvas or single-view drawing: there is no specific, ordained orientation, it not being clear even which end of the sketchbook is the beginning. In turning the pages, the viewer finds themselves turning the book around, flipping back and forth, noticing unexpected relations—both formal and in terms of subject matter—across, between, and within pages (fig. 1.32). This contiguity, this haphazard and sometimes mysteriously evocative plane of activity, is itself, in a particular and often startling form, a picturing of thinking, a gesturing towards correspondences and resonances discovered through play, rather than through the attempt to picture better some internal imagining. What is inscribed is process in motion, rather than single moments seized.

What should also be noted, however, and here-signalled as a lead-in to some of the issues raised next chapter in regard to the manifestation of genre in terms of form, is the degree to which such studies, particularly those in the *Carnet de jeunesse*, also seem to express a certain concern to remain within specific genres. Hence, in line with what was noted above in regard to the possibly parodic nature of much of Cézanne’s drawn output in these early years, the perceived intent, then, might be characterized as the attempt not to express a content outside the experience of images, a content to do with the executor’s personal life, but, instead, simply the form, as a genre, as that content. In short, the constructed image, perceived as such, might be seen as a representation of imagic absorption not as a device by which to project preconceived content, but to create it, as a form of escape, in the form of genre.

*
Chapter Two

Posted images and poetry

1858–1859

'More is involved here than a mere play on words' 1

In February 1858, Zola's mother Émilie, who had been in Paris since the end of the previous year, sent a letter to her father, with whom Zola was staying with in Aix, ordering them to sell what remained of their possessions and join her in Paris, which they then did. 2 By the beginning of March, they were installed in the capital in an apartment on the rue Monsieur-le-Prince and Zola was attending, with the aid of another scholarship, the Lycée Saint-Louis. 3 The move precipitated a veritable cavalcade of correspondence between Cézanne and Zola, much of which, unfortunately, does not survive. 4 Nevertheless, given the scarcity of other forms of biographical evidence, the letters passing between the two friends, as well Zola's correspondence with the other of the trois inseparables, Baptiste Baille, form a central component of most biographical, and indeed critical, accounts of Cézanne's early years, and, in particular, the period between Zola's departure for Paris in April 1858 and Cézanne's own first trip there almost exactly three years later. 5

3 Thomson, 'Tableau chronologique,' op. cit., p. 94
4 Of Cézanne's letters to Zola, several from the period 1858–1859 and all from the period 1860–1862 have been lost; John Rewald, '[notes],' in Cézanne, *Letters*, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 64. In terms of Zola's replies before Cézanne's move to Paris in April 1861: only one survives from 1858, only one from 1859, fifteen from 1860, and two from 1861: Zola, *Correspondance*, t. 1, op. cit., pp. 119–121, 126–127, 130–135, 139–152, 159–163, 174–179, 191–195, 212–221, 240–252, 258–261, 271–274. Hence, there is an odd inversion in the proportionate representation of their letters over time: the years 1858–1859 almost entirely made up of letters from Cézanne, the years 1860–1861 entirely made up of letters from Zola.
5 On Cézanne's trip, as well as the events leading up to it, see sections 3C and 4A.
In terms of biographical evidence, Cézanne's letters present themselves in several strata. There are the body-texts of the letters themselves, often highly stylized and bombastic, full of grammatical affectations and pseudo-Romantic exhortations; there are the included poems, perhaps by no means any less seriously intended and often, seemingly, burlesques or parodies of the forms they enact; and then, finally, there are the images often included alongside these poetic attempts. In terms of these, five such survive: [Ch 17] *Drawings Composing a Rebus* (fig. 2.1), part of a letter dated 3 May 1858; [RWC 1] *Cicéron foudroyant Catilina* (fig. 2.2) included in a letter presumed from mid-1858; [Ch 37] *Symbolic Drawing Inscribed* 'La Mort règne en ces lieux' (1859) (fig. 2.3) included in a letter dated 17 January 1859; [Ch 38] *Bathing* (fig. 2.4), sent in a letter of 20 June 1859; and [Ch 27] *Sketches and Caricatures* (fig. 2.5), sent a month later, in July 1859. These, as well as some related poems, are the focus of this chapter, not only in regard to the possible status of both as forms of parody, but also the kinds of interpretations, in regards to Cézanne's biographical contexts, they have provoked.

What is of interest here, then, is the degree to which the possibility that an interest in the structures of expression—as genre, for instance—might govern the kinds of interpretations then made possible, particularly in terms of the proliferation of meaning and, subsequently, a content of ambivalence. Hence, although Cézanne's innate interest in encoding and riddle-making will be presumed, this is an encoding suggested as possibly cleaved from the received notion that Cézanne's motivation in seemingly utilizing these practices was the conveyance, albeit through obfuscatory means, of serious biographical content. As such, and as will be further discussed next chapter, certain tropes deemed allegorized in Cézanne's poetry, such as a presumed strained relationship with his father, will be placed in a kind of abeyance, as a form of content perhaps as much created through the processes of literary pastiche and parody as reflecting any particular historical truth.

Some attempt will also be made to characterize this possible gesture of literary pastiche in terms of the conflation within single works, and, even at times, single motifs, of multiple, and often contradictory, citatory sources. Such transformative pastiching might then be seen not as the creation of a seamless and coherent thematic surface, but, instead, one whose jarring disjunctions not only themselves create a
specific, and possibly novel affective presence, but also draw attention to that surface, here an analogy for the structures through which representation is traditionally encoded. This notion of reflexivity then, in turn, might be seen as emphasized by the presence of enframing—for instance: between components of the images, between the images and the poems around them, between the poems and the body-text around the poems, etc.—that constantly brings to bear a degree of irony that seems not only to resist the attribution of a single coherent meaning, but, perhaps most importantly, actively promote a polysemy that has, in turn, provoked precisely the multiple readings now framing, in terms of art-historical discourse, those endeavours.

In an important sense, then, a lead is taken from John Rewald’s comment regarding Cézanne’s motives for writing poetry: “the sheer pleasure of making rhymes and giving play to his ironical wit inspired his pen and his letters in verse.”\(^6\) Where the analysis enacted here might differ, however, is in terms of Rewald’s dismissal of these motivations as ‘unimportant ambitions.’\(^7\) For, a certain relatedness between these early poetic attempts and Cézanne’s later pictorial practice will be proposed, in terms not only of their shared interest in encodings and the playing with and parodying of representational forms, but also the inclusion of over-coded and/or over-determined motifs and a subsequent overall inherent displacement, and perpetual deferment, of stable meaning. Hence, Cézanne’s early poetry might be taken as template for certain forms of pictorial logic then informing certain of Cézanne’s painterly efforts of the latter half of the 1860s.

However, before any attempt is made to analyse these early posted images and the poetry often associated with them, the degree to which Cézanne’s creative output might be seen as having been grounded at this stage of his life primarily in literary, rather than pictorial, concerns should first be noted. Hence, as late as March 1860, by which time Cézanne had dropped out of his legal studies and seemed to be doing little else with his time other than attending drawing classes at the local École de Dessin,

---


\(^7\) loc. cit.
Zola could still complain: ‘We often speak of poetry in our letters, but the words sculpture and painting come up rarely, not to say never.’

Not only did they often ‘speak’ of poetry, much of their early correspondence, particularly Cézanne’s, was poetry. Indeed, of the thirteen surviving letters sent by him to Zola in the period 1858–1861, only one does not include examples of his own verses, and when included, in most cases exceed, in terms of word-number, the body text of the letters proper. Moreover, with the exception of the letters of June and July 1859, which include, respectively, a depiction of bathers beneath a tree (fig. 2.4) and an eclectic and apparently unrelated assortment of caricatures (fig. 2.5), all the drawings are inextricably related to the textual context within which they are presented. They are, that is, embedded within a textual frame. As such, writing seems to have acted for Cézanne as a form of mutual bonding with Zola beyond the mere contingencies of correspondence, manifesting a particular mode of performative self-creation, of creating a character entertaining to Zola.

In terms of Cézanne’s specific literary interests of this time, Gustave Boyer added to one of Cézanne’s earliest letters to Zola the warning ‘when you in turn come to see Cézanne, you will find on the walls of his room a large collection of maxims from Horace, V. Hugo, etc.’ In one pithy and perhaps deliberately alliterative phrase is perhaps encapsulated Cézanne’s combined taste for classical Latin literature and Romanticism, a conflation that would seem to last him the rest of his life. Apart from Hugo, Cézanne also seem to have been affected by another Romantic, Auguste Barbier. Jules Borely quoted Cézanne in the last few years of his life recalling, ‘In his next to last year [Zola] [...] was lucky to have a professor who loved poetry (I remember the time he read us [Barbier’s] Les lambes).’

---

10 Paul Cézanne, quoted in Jules Borely, ‘Cézanne à Aix,’ Art Vivant, no. 2 (1 July 1926), cited and translated in Doran (ed.), Conversations with Cézanne, op. cit., 22. Although not published until 1926, Borely dated his account ‘1902’; whether or not this date is correct, portions of the text must have been known to Georges Rivière in 1923, as he included passages
However the poet, according to Zola's reminiscences, dearest to the *trois inseperables* was Alfred de Musset, a younger Romantic who displaced their earlier admiration for Hugo.

Victor Hugo reigned above us—an absolute monarch. [...] Then, one morning one of us brought a volume of Alfred de Musset. Reading Musset was for us the awakening of our true hearts. [...] Musset alone then reigned in our game bags.¹¹

Indeed, writing in 1881 some introductory words to some unpublished youthful verses included in Paul Alexis' *Émile Zola*, Zola, partly by way of an apology for the mediocrity of the verses, wrote 'We used to imitate Musset, we made fun of the rich rhyme, we were enthusiasts.'¹² Ignoring the possibility that Zola was here simply trying to defuse the seriousness of these early poetic attempts, it is nevertheless perhaps pertinent that his characterization of his and his friends' imitation of Musset was couched explicitly in terms of making fun. Their adolescent engagement with Musset's poetry embodied a certain ironic appreciation of the overly rich and bombastic nature of his rhymes.¹³

Like Zola, Cézanne also renounced an early appreciation for Hugo later in life, Émile Bernard quoting Cézanne as saying, in 1904, that:

---


¹³ As noted by R. Butler, in 1868 Zola devoted an entire article to de Musset, describing him not only as having a profound influence on Zola's generation, but also that writer whom 'dans la passion d'analyse exacte qui m'a pris' and 'de m'avoir enseigné à pleurer'; Émile Zola, 'Les Cimetières. La Tombe de Musset au Père-Lachaise,' *L'Événement Illustré*, 4 May 1868, cited in R. Butler, 'Zola's art criticism (1865–1868),' *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, vol. 10, no. 4 (October 1974), p. 345.
He preferred Baudelaire to Hugo, whose verbosity and pomposity he disliked. "I can go as far as Contemplations," he said, "but the bombast of La Légende des siècles bores me. As for the rest, I don't want to read any of it." 14

Indeed, an admiration for Baudelaire in his later years is certainly well-attested beyond this remark. Léo Larguier mentions receiving a paint-spattered 1899 edition of Fleurs du mal from Cézanne as a gift, and Émile Bernard describes the old painter reciting Une Charogne, one of the more uncannily affective poems in that collection, entirely from memory. 15 Indeed, a series of drawings presumed executed by Cézanne in the mid-1860s, for instance, Studies for the Illustration of ‘Une Charogne’ (fig. 1.32), seem directly inspired by this poem. 16 However, whether Cézanne had been aware of Baudelaire’s poetry before his first trip to Paris in 1861, especially given the difficulty he would have had in acquiring a copy of Fleurs du mal before its second printing in that year, would seem difficult to determine. 17

In any case, whatever their inspirational models, the apparent excess of poetic concerns in Cézanne’s correspondence with Zola has not only coloured considerably the forms of biographical information extracted from those letters, it has also overshadowed to some degree discussion of Cézanne’s graphic output of the same

16 Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 80. See also [Ch 147] Studies, Including Nudes, a Soldier, and a Jockey (1866–1869) (pencil and ink on sketchbook page (15 x 23), Musée du Louvre, Paris).
17 Les Fleurs du mal was first published in 1857 with an edition of 1300 copies, most of which, however, were seized by the public prosecutor, the author being brought to trial on charges of outrages to public morality. A second edition was published in 1861, with six poems removed as a result of the trial, and others added. A third version was published in 1866: F. W. Leakey, “‘Les Fleurs du mal’: A chronological view,” The Modern Language Review vol. 91, no. 3 (July 1996), pp. 580–581. A particular absence of Baudelaire’s name in Zola and Cézanne’s correspondence of the years 1858–1862 would seem to argue against Cézanne being aware of the poet until his arrival in Paris, perhaps on his second trip at the end of 1862. On this, see also, in terms of Cézanne’s purported use in 1861 of the word ‘chic’ with specific Baudelairean connotations, see section 4A.
period. Hence, although by no means ever judged as overly-competent, Cézanne's poetry has often been seen to be more competent than the images he was producing at the same time. 18 And, despite the often irritating extent to which Cézanne, through affectations of mock-aggrandizement, paralipsis, and ironic bombast, down-plays any 'serious' intent to either the worth or content of his early (and indeed only surviving) poetic attempts, those poems have, nevertheless, attracted considerable attention as biographical sources, particularly in psychoanalytic interpretations. Hence, in a twist perhaps reflective of Cézanne's own development, we come to his early imagery—particularly those involving figures or any semblance of narrative intent—in terms firstly not only of writing in general (Zola's novels and reminiscences, the Latin and Romantic poetry for which they shared an affection for, etc.), but of Cézanne's own writing in particular.

In terms of this, and as a kind of final introductory note before opening a discussion of that writing, it might be worth noting Zola's own opinion of his friend's poetic efforts, given in a letter of 1 August 1861. For there, having mentioned re-reading a poem by Cézanne that had been sent to him a year earlier, and discovering within it 'a line here or there' that impressed him, Zola felt compelled to offer an appraisal of his friend's poetic ability. 19 He began by asking: 'What is missing [...] in this brave Cézanne, for the making of a great poet?' For Zola, the answer is immediate and simple: 'refinement.' 20 This absence of artifice, Cézanne's unaffected impulse for poetic expression, is seen by Zola as thereby causing his verses to be overly contaminated with 'Provençalisms [and] barbarisms'. 21 Such crudity, as unmediated expression of Cézanne's innocence, mars what Zola deems is otherwise required, sophisticated polish. Ironically, precisely this notion of authentic expression in Cézanne's poetry is one suggested below as possibly worth resisting, a characterization running

---

18 These are discussed in sections 3B, 3D, and 3E. See also some of the drawings discussed last chapter.
19 '...divers passages, quelques vers isolés m'ont plu infiniment: [...] En relisant tes lettres de l'année dernière, je suis tombé sur le petit poème d'"Hercile", entre le vice et la vertu': Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, 1 August 1860, cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 216. On the possible identity of that poem, see section 2D.
20 'Que manque-t-il, me suis-je dit, à ce brave Cézanne, pour être un grand poète? La pureté': loc. cit. 'Pureté' is thus translated here as 'refinement', rather than the more usual 'purity', an inflection seemingly more in keeping with the context of Zola's use.
21 'L'idée; sa forme est nerveuse, originale, mais ce qui la gâte, ce qui gâte tout, ce sont les provençalismes, les barbarismes, etc.': loc. cit.
completely counter to Zola's appraisal and almost a complete inversion of his comment that: 'You, Cézanne,] firmly believe what you set down, with me its only a game, a brilliant invention.'\textsuperscript{22} The double irony here is that just this character perceived by Zola, this authenticity untrammelled by the artifice of sophisticated form, might itself be a construct of Cézanne's, a brilliant invention consciously performed.

\textsuperscript{22} Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, 1 August 1860, cited and translated in Cézanne, \textit{Letters}, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., pp. 82–83.
2A: Rébuses, bouts-rimés, mirlitons, etc.

The earliest surviving image sent by Cézanne to Zola, *Drawings Composing a Rebus* (fig. 2.1), was included in a letter dated 3 May 1858, hence only a month-and-a-half after Zola’s move to Paris. Depicted in the drawing are a scythe (*un faux*), a hurdle (*une haie*), a Maypole (*une mai*), and two women—one young and with breasts possibly bared, the other older and uglier—(*les femmes*).23 In concert with the words ‘IL’ and ‘LES’ appearing alongside these, the sentence ‘one should love women’ [*IL’ faut aimer ‘LES’ femmes*] is presumed encoded.24 The rebus is then, in turn, illustrated by a poem, in which Zola is urged to ‘plumb the mystery of this shadowy rebus.’25 It is mentioned again in the main text of the letter, described as ‘great’, and Zola is requested not only to return a letter containing his solution, but also to send a rebus of his own devising.26

Aside from noting the toing-and-froing of puzzles and encodings this mention implies, as well as the odd framing-within-framing the poem mentioning the rebus seems to enact, gestures both discussed below, it is perhaps first worth observing that one of Cézanne’s earliest securely datable images is not only not a picture in the usual sense, but also one that intrinsically relies on reference to textuality. Hence, it is a set of pictographic ciphers that both includes text as well as requiring reference to it in order to decode the meaning implicitly embedded, relying on verbal, rather than visual, punning. Moreover, the ‘art’ of concocting such an image is less a matter of the content so encoded, or the skill with which that encoding is articulated interesting, or even well-rendered, pictures, and more a matter of the sophistication of the puns

23 Inexplicably, Chappuis is translated as describing two of the pictographic elements as ‘a hedge’ and ‘a May tree’, surely incorrectly; the ‘hedge’ is more likely a ‘hurdle’ (both *une haie* in French), and the ‘May tree’ (*Arbre de mai*) more simply ‘Maypole’ (*mai*); loc. cit. Wayne Andersen, does however, follow this same translation: Andersen, *Cézanne and Zola*, op. cit., p. 48. As inexplicably, Nina Athanassoglou-Kallmyer describes the image of the old woman in the rebus as a ‘grotesque bearded male head’, as good an indictment of Cézanne’s early drawing prowess as there is: Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, *Cézanne and Provence*, op. cit., p. 56.
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pictured. The rebus embodies, thereby, a kind of compositional unity entirely outside what is usually deemed pictorial. It is a conceptual, rather than visual, coherence. The space it occupies on the page refers to textual rather than pictorial spaces.

In terms of this, Cézanne's early rebus, or at least the interest in visualized paronomasia it evinces, might seem precursive to some of his later painted efforts. Hence, for instance, the portrait of his friend and fellow Aixois Achille Emperaire discussed in chapter six, Portrait du peintre Achille Emperaire (fig. 6A.13(b)), can be described as inscribing both a verbal pun on the sitter’s name with 'Emperor' as well as a visual one, the dwarf-like stature of Emperaire, along with his distinctive van Dyke beard, resonant with contemporary caricatures of the current Emperor of the French, Napoléon III.27 Similarly, the textual inclusion in a painting often presumed to be that painting’s pendant, [R 101] Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l’artiste, lisant 'L’Événement’ (autumn 1866) (fig. 6A.4), has also been read as encoding specific biographical content.28 Indeed, Sidney Geist has devoted an entire book to interpreting much of Cézanne’s œuvre in precisely this manner, as sets of pictographs—or, as he and Helene MacLean terms them, cryptomorphs—deployed on the surface of canvases as hidden images that offer up meanings separate to the scenes presented more conventionally around them.29 Regardless of the convincingness or otherwise of Geist’s arguments, and leaving aside his odd insistence that the application of these hidden encodings was unconscious, Cézanne’s interest in paronomasia per se certainly seems clear, his letters full of bad puns, invented words, and versified riddles.30

27 As noted in section 6A, the possible textual punning of Emperaire’s name is made more obvious by that name’s inscription, in bold lettering, across the top of the canvas.
28 See section 6A.
29 Geist, Interpreting Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 2, 267 n. 2. Geist’s various and often ingenious meditations on Cézanne’s painting are far too complicated and convoluted to go into here. As an example of the kinds of cryptomorphs perceived by Geist, take, for instance, the hands of the sitter in [R 139] Portrait du peintre Achille Emperaire (1867–1868) (fig. 6A.13(b)), which are seen also as depictions of birds, or the image of a face deemed hidden in the branches of trees in the upper-right corner of [R 350] Le Bassin du Jas de Bouffan en hiver (1878) (o/c (47 x 56.2), PC). Joyce Medina also notices an instance of possible cryptomorphology, in her terms an 'indistinct image', in Cézanne’s 1890s Les Joueurs de cartes series, which is mentioned again in section 2E. [R 139] Portrait du peintre Achille Emperaire (1867–1868) (fig. 6A.13(b)) is discussed in section 6A.
30 In terms of puns, take, for instance, the pun on bandage/bander [bandage/to have an erection] used in a letter of July 1859; ‘the elder of the two girls, she who was once the ugliest and who still is, is sporting a bandage because she has been so horny': Paul Cézanne, letter to...
However, it perhaps should be kept in mind that to be interested in puzzles, encryptions, and logographs does not necessarily imply personal circumstances demanding, or even worthy of, such encryption. Indeed, it could as easily be argued that such an interest was a symptom of the opposite, the rebus exemplifying the kind of frivolous distraction craved by the emergent mid-nineteenth-century middle-classes and referenced by the Goncourt brothers’ famous characterisation of France as ‘An impossible country [...] where there are people who can solve the rébus in L’Illustration’.

Émile Zola, [early July 1859], cited and translated in Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 49. That same letter also contained, as the opening lines to a poem, Cézanne’s famous rhyming of crâne [skull] with his own name: ‘Tu me diras peut-être: Ah! mon pauvre Cézanne, / Quel démon féminin a démêlé ton crâne?’: ibid., p. 45. In terms of invented words, take the dialogue, written in response, it seems, to Cézanne and Zola’s mutual friend Marquey’s publication of novel extracts in the Mémorial d’Aix, in which a discussion is imagined between the editor of that paper, Jean-Baptiste Gaut, and various ‘creatures of Gaut’s inspiration’, as well as the appended ‘Explanatory dictionary of the Gautian tongue’: Paul Cézanne, letter to Émile Zola, 30 November 1859, cited and translated in Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., pp. 52–56. Note also the versified ‘riddle’ included by Cézanne in a letter to Zola of 29 December 1859, in which five couplets describe, in order, three things—chat [cat], riz [rice], and thé [tea]—that together combine, as hinted in the final line, to form a ‘theological virtue’: charité: Paul Cézanne, letter to Émile Zola, 29 December 1859, cited and translated in Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 62. As noted at the beginning of last chapter, few biographers fail to include the local joke purported to have been made regularly at his father’s expense, and sometimes suggested as inscribed within the artist’s presumed earliest known signature; ‘Martin, Coupin, and Cézanne [Martin, Coupin, et Cézanne]’ = ‘Martin, his friend, and sixteen donkeys [Martin, copain, et seize ânes]’: Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 198. On this and the signature mentioned, see section 1B.

31 ‘un pays impossible [...] où il y a des gens qui devinent les rébus de ‘l’Illustration’: Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, Charles Demaillly, Paris: Librairie internationale, 1868 [Les Hommes de letters, Paris: Dentu, 1860], p. 191 [?], cited in Suer-Hermel, op. cit., p. 75. The rebus was transforming precisely at this time from its origins as an educative tool for the illiterate into a popular bourgeois diversion, the solving of them, for instance, part of post-dinner entertainments amongst ‘bonne société’: Maxime Préaud, ‘Brève histoire de rébus français, suivie de quelques exemples de rébus pour la plupart inédits,’ Revue de la Bibliothèque nationale de France, no. 18 (2004), pp. 17–21; Valérie Suer-Hermel, “‘Rébusomanie’ et estampe au XIXe siècle,” Revue de la Bibliothèque nationale de France, no. 18 (2004), pp. 70–80. The ‘bonne société’ quote comes from a publisher of collections of such puzzles, whose introduction declares that post-dinner rebus-solving might ‘avoid annoying debates in politics at the table, force certain serious figures to break their silence, initiate conversations with a pretty neighbour, to declare passions, without offending the one who is the object, etc.’; Simon-François Bloquel [‘Blismon’], Physiologie complète du rébus: ouvrage illustré par 800 petites figures, Paris: Chez Delarue, 1842, pp. 12–13, cited in Suer-Hermel, “‘Rébusomanie’ et estampe au XIXe siècle,” op. cit., p. 71. Bloquel published another such collection in 1855: Simon-François Bloquel [‘Blismon’], Le trésor des énigmes, charades et logographes, suivi de la physiologie du rébus, Paris [?]: n. p., 1855. The popularity of the rebus was intrinsically linked to the explosive proliferation of printed imagery during this period, and it appeared on the packaging of bourgeois commodities as diverse as bonbons, of
Cézanne and Zola also adapted another popular bourgeois parlour game for use in posted form in the exchanging of *bouts-rimés*, where verses were invented based on rhyming words provided by another (hence *bouts-rimés*, or 'end rhymes'). As such, Cézanne, exhibiting as well his proclivity for including snatches of Latin composition and quotation, began a letter dated 9 July 1858 with the versified composition, in Latin, thus:

Dearest Zola, greetings.

1 received your letter, in which you said to me you wished I would send you rhymes for making *bouts-rimés*, rejoice: behold, indeed most beautiful rhymes.

Read therefore, read, and marvel!

He then set out eleven pairs of rhyming words (fig. 2.6), which he instructed Zola to construct poems from, insisting on Alexandrines.

---

Candy-boxes, and perfumes: Suer-Hermel, ‘“Rébusomanie” et estampe au XIXᵉ siècle,’ op. cit., pp. 70–71. It had also become a regular and pervasive component of that bedrock of nineteenth-century imagic dissemination, the illustrated journal, an ancestor, as it were, to the modern crossword and Sudoku puzzle. A rebus first appeared in a French journal in *Le Charivari* in 1841, and was, by 1845, a regular feature of that magazine; a decade later, a regular rebus also featured in *L'Illustration, Le Monde illustré, and Musée des familles: Suer-Hermel, “Rébusomanie” et estampe au XIXᵉ siècle,’ op. cit., p. 75 (where, however, the foundation date for *Musée des familles* is given as 1834 instead of 1833). Cézanne possessed volumes 32 and 33 (1864–1866) of *Musée des familles*: Ballas, ‘Paul Cézanne et la revue l'Artiste,’ op. cit., p. 229 n. 5. Wayne Andersen also asserts *L'Événement* ‘offered a weekly rebus’ and, moreover, that Cézanne’s family subscribed to it: Andersen, *Cézanne and Zola*, op. cit., p. 47.


33 ‘Carissime Zola, Salve. / Accepi tuam litteram, in qua mihi dicebas ...’, translating this as; ‘Accept your letter, wherein, as you have often said...’, presuming, I assume, Cézanne intended *accipi* [accept!] when writing *accepi* [I received] and *milies* [a thousand times] when writing *millis* [which doesn’t seem to have a Latin equivalent, and which the earlier edition of *Letters* has as *milli* [to me]]: loc. cit.; Cézanne, *Letters*, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 18. *Rimas* and *bouts-rimés* are obviously Cézanne’s Latinizations of the French *rimes* [rhymes] and *bouts-rimés* [end rhymes].

34 You have permission to employ the above rhymes, first by putting them in the plural, should your serene majesty see fit; secondly, you can rearrange them in any order you like; but, thirdly, I insist on Alexandrines and, finally, fourthly, I want—no, not want—I beg you to turn the whole thing into a poem, including the poem: Paul Cézanne, letter to Émile Zola, 9 July 1858, cited and translated in Cézanne, *Letters*, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., pp. 18–19. Later in the letter, Cézanne writes ‘My dear fellow, when you have sent me your *bouts-
this challenge, but also, in a letter since lost, have provided rhymes of his own for Cézanne’s use. For, Cézanne remarked in his next surviving letter, of 26 July 1858: ‘[b]y the way, a little later I shall send you your bouts-rimés.’ Hence, although of the surviving letters sent by Cézanne to Zola, only the 9 July 1858 letter provides an actual instance of the provision of a list of rhymed words, the practice seems to have been more prolific than this would suggest.

At any rate, what is of interest here is not Cézanne sending Zola lists of such rhymes, but Zola sending the same kind of lists to Cézanne. For if he did, it is possible that some of the poems in Cézanne’s letters may have been formed from precisely these lists without this necessarily being obvious, particularly given the scarcity of Zola’s surviving letters in the first few years of his correspondence with Cézanne. This might then make problematic any desire to extract meaningful content from Cézanne’s poems, as the inclusion of certain words and phrases might not be Cézanne’s choice, but rather a response to Zola’s restrictions, or the need to connect such rhymed words coherently. As Cézanne himself playfully warns Zola in versified form in a poem of late 1859:

Dear friend, when it’s verse you wish to write,
The end of each line must have rhyme;
Thus in this letter, if it seems inappropriate
To supplement by slipping in my verse a few extra words,
Be not offended by such a sterile rhyme

rimés ... I shall get busy searching out other, richer and more outlandish rhymes; I’m preparing them, I’m developing them, I’m distilling them in my alembic brain. They will be new rhymes—ahem!—rhymes such as are rarely seen, by heaven—in short, perfect rhymes’: ibid., p. 21. I have modified Seymour Hacker’s translation slightly here, keeping the original bouts-rimés rather than replacing them with ‘set rhymes’, as he does. Cézanne writes, near the end of the letter, that the letter was finished on 15 July, nearly a week after the date given on its opening page: ibid., p. 22.

36 This is also the opinion of John Rewald, who writes; ‘Bout-rimés are poems with fixed end-rhymes, of which the friends often sent whole lists to each other’: John Rewald, ‘[Notes],’ in Cézanne, Letters, op. cit., p. 25 n. (a).
They're only there for that purpose.\footnote{\textsuperscript{38}Paul Cézanne, untitled poem in a letter to Émile Zola, 29 December 1859, cited and translated in Cézanne, \textit{Letters}, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., pp. 57, 60. Translation modified slightly.}

If any manifestation not only of the interpretive dangers of form dictating content, but also of the persistent reflexive glee on Cézanne's behalf in regard to the notion of poetry as a play of structural elements rather than as a medium through which to convey serious content, this is it, from Cézanne's own pen. Combined with the possibility of parody and mimicking of particular kinds of author, this challenge-setting implied by the exchanging of rebuses, \textit{bouts-rimés}, and punned riddles, might thereby make problematic any interpretation of Cézanne's poems and posted imagery that uncritically accepts the implied author of those creative acts as Cézanne.

With just such caveats in mind, attention can now be turned to one of Cézanne's earliest poems sent to Zola, entitled 'Poème inédit' (fig. 2.8) and included, along with four others, in a letter dated 9 April 1858.\footnote{\textsuperscript{39}Paul Cézanne, letter to Émile Zola, 9 April 1858, cited in Cézanne, \textit{Letters}, op. cit., pp. 17–18. Although dated 9 April 1858, Cézanne mentions near the end of the letter that he was finishing it on 13 April: ibid., p. 18. John Rewald has suggested the lines beginning the first of the included poems ('\textit{Enfin je prends la plume / Et selon ma coutume / Je dirai tout d'abord...}') might be indication that this was not the first letter Cézanne had sent to Zola since the latter's departure: Cézanne, \textit{Letters}, op. cit., p. 341 n. a. 'Poème inédit' is printed only in French in the appendix to the 1976 edition of \textit{Letters}: ibid., pp. 342–344. English translations are provided in: Lindsay, \textit{Cézanne}, op. cit., pp. 23–24; Cézanne, \textit{Letters}, revised and augmented edition, pp. 7–8; Andersen, \textit{Cézanne and Zola}, op. cit., pp. 39–41; Andersen, \textit{Cézanne and the Eternal Feminine}, op. cit., pp. 166–169.}

Although of all Cézanne's youthful poetry this thirteen-stanza effort full of crude innuendo and bawdy double entendre perhaps best deserves the appellation 'doggerel', the poem does bear, and indeed has borne, closer scrutiny. For, although at first appearing only to be a debased nursery rhyme detailing a base adolescent male fantasy, the poem is of interest not by virtue of its semi-pornographic nature \textit{per se}, and what that might in turn then be interpreted as saying about the young Cézanne, but in terms of the form through which that content is articulated. For that form, as a set of conventional structures repeated deliberately, might not only thereby dictate content as a surface effect of that enactment, but also, in important ways, instigate the proliferation of meanings later seen as conveyed by that form. What is being raised, therefore, as with some of the drawings discussed last...
chapter, is the spectre, again, of parody, of imitation of form for the sake of that form, rather than for the sake of conveying a particular preconceived content. Moreover, and linked to this working under the possibly complicating sign of irony, is what might be seen as a reflexive commenting on the very structures by which content, as meaning, is presented.

In simplest terms, ‘Poème inédit’ (fig. 2.8) recounts an amorous encounter between the poem’s narrator and a pretty maiden. He, having resolved her seduction after hearing her singing ‘deep in the woods’, approaches and showers her with phrases of such flattering artfulness that she swoons. Whilst so indisposed, her sex is then ‘explored’ by the successful orator, the exertions of which are vigorous enough to revive her. Bizarrely, although ‘astounded’ upon waking to find herself so assaulted, the girl merely blushes and lifts her eyes languorously, ‘as if to say “I take pleasure in these games”’. A passionate climax follows, but the maiden’s desire, now ignited it seems, has become insatiable; she demands the narrator continue, exhorting him to ‘Drive it in!’ He complies, but ‘Ten or twelve thrusts’ later withdraws, leaving her appetite apparently unfulfilled: ‘Wiggling her bum,’ she complains, ‘“Why do you stop?”’. And there, seemingly in defiance of the maiden’s plea, the poem ends.

Apparently central to the poem’s concerns, apart from any narrative intent, is the word mirliton, which occurs in what at first appears to be the final line of each of the

\[\text{40} \quad \text{C’était au fond d’un bois / Quand j’entendis sa voix brillante / Chanter et répéter trois fois / Une chansonnette charmante....Je résumes de l’entreprendre....Grâce à cette flatterie / Elle tombe en pêcheur: Paul Cézanne, ‘Poème inédit’, in a letter to Emile Zola, 9 April 1858, cited in Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., ll. 1–4, 16, 41–42, pp. 6, 7. According to Wayne Andersen, in French ‘entreprend quelqu’un’, which ordinarily means, “to work on someone” always implies a result; when used in a sexual context, as in this poem, it means “premeditated seduction”: Andersen, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 478 n. 2.
\]

\[\text{41} \quad \text{Tandis qu’elle est engourdie, / J’explore son mirliton....Puis revenant à la vie / Sous mes vigoureux efforts': Cézanne, ‘Poème inédit’, op. cit., ll. 43–44, 46–47, p. 7. The possible euphemistic meanings of mirliton are discussed below.
\]

\[\text{42} \quad \text{Elle se trouve ébahie / De me sentir sur son corps....Elle rougit et soupire / Lève des yeux languoureux / Qui semblaient vouloir me dire / “Je me complais à ces jeux”.': ibid., ll. 48–49, 51–54, p. 7.
\]

\[\text{43} \quad \text{Au bout de la jouissance / Loin de dire: “C’est assez” / “Enfoncez!”': ibid., ll. 56–57, 59, p. 7.
\]

\[\text{44} \quad \text{Je retirai ma sapière, / Après dix ou douze coups— / Mais trémoussant du derrière: / “Pourquoi vous arrêtez-vous?”': ibid., ll. 61–64, p. 7. What might be intended by the word sapière is discussed below.
\]
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thirteen stanzas, all of which are variations on the line ‘Pour un mirliton, etc.’. Indeed, the whole poem, aside from describing a frankly fantasized scene, manifests what would seem a deliberate demonstration of the various allusive permutations the word mirliton might be put through. Moreover, by virtue of what seems to be a reflexive reference to its own staging as a form of genre at the poem’s outset, an act of self-reflection might also be discerned, gesturing towards an interest in the framing of representation more generally.

In terms of the word itself, mirliton first appeared in 1723, coined by milliners to describe a newly-designed style of ladies’ gauze headwear.45 Within months, however, it had also gained additional euphemistic senses of ‘ditzy inanity’ or ‘frippery’, evinced, for instance, by its appearance in the refrain of an air in a Comédiens Italiens’ parody by Fuzelier of Houde de La Motte’s Inés de Castro.46

In Paris is a woman
In the district Saint-Germain;
Whom they court, for whom they enflame themselves,
I wanted to see her finally:
I saw a mirliton,
Mirliton, mirlitaine,
I saw a mirliton,
Don, don.47

46 ibid., pp. 1255, 1256. Mattauch cites a letter discussing the parody, dated 20 July 1723 and published in the Amsterdam Bibliothèque française, that states, in part: ‘The Palace milliners have invented, at the beginning of summer, a new type of gauze head they named mirliton and this word served consequently as the refrain of a chanson du Pont-Neuf, the tune of which became famous along with the couplets it produced. The Provost of Versailles placed a prohibition on the refrain: but this only enlivened the Poets, it appearing the following day [with lyrics] deriding him and soon afterwards the ladies of the court’: Marie marquise Du Deffrand, ‘Première lettre sur Inés de Castro, tragédie nouvelle de M. de La Motte [20 July 1723],’ Bibliothèque Française ou Histoire littéraire de la France, t. 2 (1723), p. 261, cited in Mattauch, ‘Le Mirliton enchanteur,’ op. cit., p. 1256. The connotations ‘ditzy inanity’ and ‘frippery’ used here are translations of Mattauch’s ‘ineptie’ and ‘niaiserie’: Mattauch, ‘Le Mirliton enchanteur,’ op. cit., pp. 1256, 1257.
Throughout that air, only the refrain's first and third line—the latter simply a repetition of the former—varies; for instance: 'And with the mirliton, / Mirliton, miritaine [etc.],' ‘What a mirliton! / Mirliton, miritaine [etc.].' This, then, is the standard refrain form for what then became known as a mirliton.

Hence, when printing the lyrics to a mirliton, it was necessary only to include the first line of each refrain, which, acting as a run-off from the stanza preceding it, was the only line of the refrain that varied. The tune for the air, along with its satirical use of the word mirliton, was itself adapted from a popular chanson du Pont-Neuf then doing the rounds.49

By virtue perhaps of the scandalous reputation of the ladies of court for whom the word's initial euphemistic sense was intended to mock, mirliton quickly accrued connotations more licentious than the mere derision of ostentatious vacuity.50 Hence, Émile Raunie's comprehensive compilation of eighteenth-century French songs includes, for the year 1723, some fifty pages of 'mirlitons', testifying not only to the explosive popularity of the refrain and the various lyrics adopted as its verses, but also to the increasing preponderance, in such lyrics, of the word mirliton as euphemistic.

48 'Et du mirliton [etc.] [...] Que de mirliton! [etc.]' loc. cit.
49 As observed, for instance, by the eighteenth-century diarist Edmond Barbier only a month after Fuzelier's Parodie was premiered; 'Il a couru un air de pont-neuf assez joli, sur lequel on a fait des chansons, tant sur les hommes de la cour que sur les femmes. Le refrain de l'ancien air était: J'ai un mirliton, miritaine: Edmond Jean François Barbier, Chronique de la régence et du règne de Louis XV (1718-1763); ou, Journal de Barbier, Paris: Charpentier, 1857, cited in Émile Raunie, Chansonnier historique du XVIIIe siècle, Paris: A. Quantin, 1880, t. 4, p. 196 n. 1. The librettists of the Comédiens Italiens themselves acknowledged this indebtedness when Fuzelier's Parodie was printed in 1738, noting in reference to the air quoted above, 'Ce sont là les premiers couplets qu'on ait fait[s] après la chanson du Pont-Neuf': Fuzelier, '[air from] Parodie, tragico-comédie,' op. cit., t. 2, p. 238, cited in Mattauch, 'Le Mirliton enchanteur,' op. cit., p. 1257.
50 Mattauch, 'Le Mirliton enchanteur,' op. cit., p. 1258.
stand-in for the sexual act and/or genitalia. And indeed, the verses compiled by Raunié under this title *mirliton* constitute an incredibly eager and exhaustive compendium of double entendre and smutty innuendo. By way of example, here are two stanzas from ‘Le Jugement de Pâris’:

The shepherd made the three goddesses  
Remove their petticoats; 
He saw three pairs of buttocks 
And three pairs of tits 
and three *mirlitons* [etc].

Of such a chore  
Paris was not frightened, 
But raised his head 
And by turns rifled through  
each *mirliton* [etc].

Six years later, in 1729, the tune such verses were sung to, presumably that of the *Fuzelier* air mentioned above, was itself published in *Le Clerc*’s collection of popular

---

51 Raunié, *Chansonnier historique du XVIII* siècle, op. cit., t. 4, pp. 177–213, 236–237, 244–246, 249, 272–273. Perhaps most explicit is ‘*La Revue des mirlitons*,’ a fifty-verse comic account of Cupid’s examining and passing judgement on the *mirlitons* of some sixty ladies of court, a process rarely straying far from the outright pornographic; this extension of *mirlitons* into realms featuring classical personages also included burlesques such as ‘*Le Jugement de Pâris*’ and ‘*Le Exploits de Jupiter*’, the former detailing the explicit lengths Paris goes to in his judging whom of Juno, Minerva, and Venus was the most beautiful, the latter a recounting of Jupiter’s various dalliances with, for instance, Alcmena, Europa, and Leda: ‘*La Revue des mirlitons*,’ ‘*Les Exploits de Jupiter*’ and ‘*Le Jugement de Pâris,*’ in ibid., pp. 188–193, 193–195, 196–207.

52 Also included were verses under the title ‘*Éloge des mirlitons*,’ which listed and celebrated those historical and mythological episodes instigated ‘*Pour un mirliton*,’ from the sack of Troy up to the ‘*Jamais le galant Ovide / N’eut écrit si tendrement*’, including, for instance, Antony’s love for Cleopatra, Heracles’ subservience in the house of Omphales, Orpheus’ trip to Hades, the judgement of Paris, and Apollo’s pursuit of Daphne: ‘*Éloge des mirlitons,*’ in Raunié, *Chansonnier historique du XVIII* siècle, op. cit., pp. 183–186, 186–188; the quote is from p. 185.

53 ‘*Le berger aux trois déesses / Fit Ôter les cotillons; / Il vit trois paires de fesses / et trois paires de tetons / et trois mirlitons [etc.] / D’une pareille corvée / Pâris ne s’épouvanta pas, / Mais il était tête levée / Et tour à tour feuilleta / chaque mirliton [etc].*’ ‘*Le jugement de Pâris,*’ in Raunié, *Chansonnier historique du XVIII* siècle, op. cit., t. 4, pp. 192–193. I have quoted the verses as they appear in Hans Mattauch’s article, which include the ‘[etc.]’ at the end of each stanza: Mattauch, ‘*Le Mirliton enchanteur,*’ op. cit., p. 1261. Mattauch suggests that the poem, although included in Raunié’s compilation as by ‘anonymous’, was actually by Alexis Piron: ibid., pp. 1260–1261.
folk melodies, apparently for the first time, under the title ‘Le Mirliton’. 54 Hence, although the mirliton had assumed a stable form in terms of its tune, the deliberately open polysemous nature of the refrain’s lyrics remained, and as such, as noted by Émile Raunie, the verses attached to it could be ‘applied to diverse subjects’ and ‘linked only by virtue of that refrain.’ 55 The word mirliton contained within that refrain, in turn, retained its role as lyrical joker card, akin to what Gilles Deleuze terms the ‘blank word’, and thereby acted not only as the word through which this process might be enacted, but also the name of that action itself. 56 A mirliton was a song containing the mirliton refrain, in which the word mirliton might stand for any desired meaning, licentious or otherwise.

Now, the purpose of this digression into the history of the mirliton as a popular song-form is a means not only of backgrounding the specifically smutty sense in which Cézanne might have intended his use of the word, but also of highlighting the

---

54 Jean Le Clerc, Premier recueil de contre danses et la table par lettre alphabetique, avec la basse continue et chiffée, Paris: Chez Le Sr. le Clerc, 1729 [Bibliothèque nationale de France, musique, no. 6267], p. 61. Whether this then acted as a catalyst for its appearance as an air, along with the attached refrain translated into English as ‘with a mirliton &c.’, in John Gay’s English comic opera Polly, published in London in March of the same year, is uncertain: ‘Air XXIV from ‘Polly’’, text by John Gay, Jeffrey Walker: London, 1729, p. 29. J. A. Westrup seems to reject the notion, in general, that Gay copied any of the tunes in Beggar’s Opera and Polly directly from their French sources, although he does not, interestingly, address the mirliton air directly: J. A. Westrup, ‘French tunes in “The Beggar’s Opera” and “Polly”’, Musical Times, vol. 69, no. 1022 (1 April 1928), p. 322. Following this appearance, the mirliton air then reappeared with burden texts all variations of the ‘with a mirliton, mirlitaine, don, don’ refrain, in several subsequent eighteenth-century English ballad operas, for instance the following airs, all of which are cited as having as their indicated tune either ‘mirliton’ or ‘mirleton’: ‘Air 16 from “The Fashionable Lady’’, text by James Ralph, 1730, p. 22; ‘Air 22 from “The Decoy’’, text by Henry Potter, London, 1733; ‘Untitled air from “The Stage Mutineers”’, text by Richard Wellington, London, 1733, pp. 33–34; ‘Air 4 from “Britons, Strike Home”’, text by Edward Phillips, London, 1739, p. 19; ‘Air 9 from “Midas”’, text by Kane O’Hara, London, 1764, p. 10. All are cited in: Unattributed author, ‘Early American Secular Music and Its European Sources, 1589–1839: An Index’, accessible through: http://www.colonialdancing.org/Easmes/Index.htm, EASMES nos. R10.16, R113.22, R81.15, R90.4, R212.9. Any of the critical social and/or licentious overtones the refrain had in its French origins seems, however, to have been lost in its English contexts, the words degenerating into a kind of musical gibberish akin to ‘hey-diddle-diddle’.

55 ‘“le Mirliton” fut bientôt appliqué à toutes sortes de sujets, comme on va le voir, et les couplets les plus variés s’enchainerent sans autre lien que le refrain’; Raunie, Chansonnier historique du XVIIIe siècle, op. cit., t. 4, p. 178 n. 2.

56 ‘The circulating word is of a different nature: in principle, it is the empty square, the empty shelf, the blank word (Lewis Carroll occasionally advised timid people to leave certain words blank)’; Gilles Deleuze, The Logic of Sense, translated by Mark Lester with Charles Stivale, edited by Constantin V. Boundas, London: Continuum, 2004, p. 53. See also: ibid., pp. 61, 79.
specificity of the *mirliton* poetic form in itself.\(^{57}\) For, indeed, Cézanne's effort conforms very precisely to the lyrical precedents just cited, in terms both of the possible euphemistic hoops the word *mirliton* might be put through, as well as, importantly, of the lyrical structure and form of the poem as a *mirliton*.

As already remarked, each of Cézanne's thirteen stanzas ends with a variation of the line "Pour un *mirliton*, etc.", the preceding four lines of each stanza therefore simply the four-line verse-form of a typical *mirliton* followed by an incremental run-off line introducing the refrain. By way of illustration, here is the first stanza of Cézanne’s *mirliton*, as translated by Wayne Andersen:

> It was deep in the woods  
> When I heard a clear voice  
> Singing and repeating three times  
> An enchanting little ditty  
> with the air of a *mirliton*, etc.\(^{58}\)

The concluding 'etc.' would seem thereby to be Cézanne’s means of denoting the superfluous burden text of the *mirliton* refrain—'mirliton, mirlitaine, don, don'—which, when combined with the incremental run-off line concluding each stanza and doubled, formed the chorus of the song.\(^{59}\)

Hence, when Zola and Cézanne asked each other for *mirlitons*, as they did, they would seem to have understood that request to be for a specific poetic response: a series of of quatrain stanzas with the rhyming form {ABAB} followed by the *mirliton* refrain, of

---

\(^{57}\) That the *mirliton* persisted into nineteenth-century French popular contexts as a particular species of melodic form and adaptable lyrical content is, itself, also easily attested. Jean-Pierre de Béranger’s ‘Le Jour des morts’ not only contained the refrain ‘*c'est le jour des morts, mirliton, mirlitaine*’, but also, when printed in 1829, had, as its indicated tune, the ‘*mirliton*’: ‘Le Jour des morts,’ in Pierre-Jean de Béranger, *Chansons de Béranger: Édition complète*, Brussels: Louis Tence, 1829, pp. 90–92. Further, and testifying to the standardized relation between lyric-form and attached music, an instruction was included noting that the first two lines of the *mirliton* tune would need to be doubled to account for Béranger’s six-line verses, which thereby deviated from the four-line versions favoured by every example of *mirliton* here so-far cited: ‘Air: Mirliton. (Les deux premiers vers de l'air sont doubles.)’ ibid., p. 90.


\(^{59}\) As might have been noticed above, this is exactly the device Hans Mattauch uses when quoting *mirlitons*, as in the ‘Judgement de Paris’ quoted above.
which the first line might vary, but which would always contain a *mirliton* double entendre, and all of which would be sung to the tune that had begun its life as a popular *chanson de Pont-Neuf*. Indeed, the performative aspect of the *mirlitons* sent between Zola and Cézanne is noted in a postscript to the very letter containing the 'Poème inédit', where Cézanne not only thanked Zola for the *mirlitons* he had sent (in a letter since lost), but also announced 'we have had the honour to sing [them] with Boyer, *basso*, and Baille, light tenor.'

This implicit specificity of the formulaic and thematic conventions attached the *mirliton* so-far outlined has, however, seemingly been lost, or ignored, whenever Cézanne's 'Poème inédit' has been discussed. Further, when used in other points of Cézanne's correspondence apart from that poem, as in the postscript just quoted, *mirliton* is usually translated with a far broader sense than that here proposed: as 'doggerels', 'idle ditties', or 'ditties'. This is despite the definitions given for *mirliton* in the edition of Bescherelle's *Dictonnaire national* printed just two years before Cézanne wrote his 'Poème inédit', which included not only the coyly ambiguous 'a questionable expression to which is fixed different meanings, some of which lack decency', but also 'a popular refrain'.

Furthermore, the formal apparatus intrinsic to the conventions of the *mirliton* has, at least on one occasion, been mistaken for content itself. Hence, Wayne Andersen can suggest 'Cézanne's repeated use of "etc." at the end of each stanza most likely asks Zola, "D'ya get it?"', signifying, thereby, an ironic toing-and-froing of presumed personal content, a 'reminiscence of mutual secret pleasures', quite separate to the

word's more likely prosaic function in indicating an already known, and therefore superfluous, burden text.\footnote{Andersen, \textit{Cézanne and Zola}, op. cit., pp. 41–42; Andersen, \textit{Cézanne and the Eternal Feminine}, op. cit., p. 169.} Although this mistaking of a performative directive for a form of content might not necessarily undo the complex and subtle interpretation Andersen then gives Cézanne’s \textit{mirliton}, in which the young author is deemed to have embedded a surprisingly sophisticated expression of the limits and character of his adolescent sexuality, it might still stand as synecdoche for the possible creation of such content as a result of the dictates of form, rather than one preconceived by its author. That is, in mimicking a genre and thereby enacting parody, whether or not satirically intended, and using form as formula, what might be at play is not a content deliberately encoded in terms of those forms, but the play of such forms, as possible permutations, enacted in order to create un-preconceived content.

Although the formal adherence of Cézanne to the \textit{mirliton} form has never been noted, his euphemistic use of the word ‘\textit{mirliton}’ to denote a woman’s genitalia in certain parts of that poem is rarely ignored, precisely because of the obviousness of that association in context. For instance;

\begin{quote}
Thanks to my flattery,
She fell in a swoon
And while so indisposed
I explored her \textit{mirliton}.
Oh sweet \textit{mirliton}, etc.\footnote{\textquoteleft Grâce à cette flatterie, / Elle tombe en pâmoison, / Tandis qu’elle est engourdie, / J’explore son \textit{mirliton}. / O \textit{doux mirliton}, etc.’: Cézanne, \textit{Poème inédit}, op. cit., II. 41–45, p. 7.}
\end{quote}

The polysemous nature of the word still leads, however, particularly when the poem is translated, to subtly varied meanings in other parts of the poem. Hence, in the refrain line of the first stanza cited earlier, the maiden heard by Cézanne’s narrator is usually translated as playing a musical instrument, for instance a ‘pipe’, ‘wood pipe’, or ‘Provençal wood flute’.\footnote{The translations are, respectively, Jack Lindsay’s, Seymour Hacker’s (in the 1984 edition of Rewald’s \textit{Letters}), and Nina Maria Athanassoglou-Kallmyer’s: Lindsay, \textit{Cézanne}, op. cit., p. 23; Cézanne, \textit{Letters}, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 7; Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, \textit{Cézanne and Provence}, op. cit., p. 56. Athanassoglou-Kallmyer’s discussion of the poem is brief and occurs in the context of providing examples of Cézanne’s early proclivity to}
writing, the term *mirliton* did name, in addition to the just-described song-form, a toy flute-like instrument similar to a kazoo. However, in the context of Cézanne's first stanza, it would seem odd of her to be 'playing' a *mirliton* while singing. Surely, she is simply *singing* one, the same tune to which the song Cézanne is writing is itself sung to. What such apparent mistranslations—or, indeed, *any* attempt to replace the word *mirliton* with a single consistently used English equivalent—thereby occlude, is not only this inherent polysemy of the word, but also this possibly reflexive staging of the *mirliton* at the very beginning of its performance. In turn, this might elide what might be fundamentally of interest to the *mirliton*s enactment in the first place, an interest in its form *per se*.  

---

gauloiserie. As such, she writes: '[Cézanne’s ‘Poème inédit’] is conceived like a ballad. The childlike naïveté of its tone and structure contrasts with its explicit sexual content, a typical exercise in *gauloiserie*.' Athanassoglou-Kallmyer's translation of *mirliton* in Cézanne's first stanza as 'Provençal wood flute', just mentioned, slips neatly into her overall argument that much of Cézanne's oeuvre should be interpreted in terms of his expressing specifically Provençal concerns. A Provençal wood flute, however, is not, strictly speaking, a *mirliton*, but, rather, a *galoubet*, a specifically Provençal one-handed three-fingered recorder played in concert with the double-ended *tambourin* drum: Don Michael Randel (ed.), *The Harvard Concise Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1999, pp. 249, 518, 658 (s.v. *galoubet*, *pipe and tabor*, and *tambourin*).

The instrument was made from a tube of reed blocked at both ends and containing some kind of vibrating membrane, either of rubber or onion skin; for example, take the entries in the following French dictionaries, published in 1856 and 1862 respectively: *'Espèce de flute très-simple, forme d'un roseau bouche par les deux bouts, avec une pelure d'oignon ou avec un morceau de baudruche'*; Bescherelle, op. cit., t. 2, p. 527 (s.v. *mirliton*); *'bout de roseau au bout duquel on met une pelure d'oignon ou in peau de baudruche'*; Prudence Boissière, *Dictionnaire analogique de la langue française: répertoire complet des mots par les idées et les idées par les mots*, Paris: Aug. Boyer, 1862, p. 589 (s.v. *Flute, clarinette, etc.: mirliton*). And indeed, this was only one of several additional meanings for the word; mirroring its emergence as euphemistically fertile, *mirliton* had, by the time of Cézanne's writing, gained various relatively stable senses, all linked, at least in the mind of Hans Mattauch, by a shared reference to inconsequential or trifling objects: Mattauch, 'Le Mirliton enchanteur,' op. cit., p. 1255. Hence, it named not only the already-ready mentioned eighteenth-century gauze headwear, 'popular refrain', and musical instrument, but also a version of the *Louis d'or* coin made under Louis XV, the shako worn by cavaliers during the Revolution, and a kind of patisserie: *'Coiffure de gaze qui fut en usage dans le XVIIe siècle'*, *'On a, pendant quelque temps, donné ce nom aux Louis d'or'*, *'Art culin. Sorte de patisserie d'entremets, faite avec des auffs, du sucre, de la fleur d'orange, du beurre, etc'*: Bescherelle, op. cit., t. 2, p. 527 (s.v. *mirliton*); *'Shako des soldats et des cavaliers pendant la Révolution'*: Unattributed author, in Paul Imbs (ed.), *Trésor de la langue française: dictionnaire de la langue du XIXe et du XXe siècle (1789-1960)*, Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, t. 11, 1985, p. 874 (s.v. *mirliton*).

In an important sense, this seems one of the few truly novel aspects of Cézanne's *mirliton*; none of the many examples included in Raunier's *Chansonnier historique du XVIIIe siècle* cited above, for instance, feature this reflexive act.
Nevertheless, and related to this issue of form, the polysemy embodied by the word mirliton seems, at times, to spill over into the interpretation of other words in Cézanne's poem, albeit still contained within the presumption of encoded biographical content, as if the machinery of homonymy was contagious. Hence, although Cézanne's use of the word 'sapière' in the final stanza of his poem, given below in Andersen's translation, is often presumed a misspelling of rapière [rapier], this possibly clumsy mistake, a slip of the pen as it were, has also been seen as a deliberately ironic, and quite sophisticated, invention. 69

I took my pecker [sapière] out
After ten or twelve thrusts—
Her butt wiggling for more
Why do you stop?
says this mirliton, etc. 70

Hence, Wayne Andersen suggests Cézanne's use of the word sapière, seemingly in reference to the narrator's penis, is 'cleverly' evocative of precisely the general theme of adolescent sexual inadequacy Andersen sees as motivating much of the poem’s imagery and, thereby, content. As such, he suggests the non-existent word could be a portmanteau-term invented by Cézanne that, by combining sapin (fir tree) with sapinière (a seedling nursery), alludes thereby not only to the sapling-hood of the narrator's penis, but also to the wooden plunger of a slide-whistle. 71 In combining this suggested neologism with the above-mentioned presumption of an encoded personal

69 Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., p. 24. The 1976 edition of Letters does not provide an English translation of the poem, but the 1984 revised and augmented edition does. Seymour Hacker translating sapière as 'tool': Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 8. Nina Maria Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, for her part, prefers 'instrument': Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., p. 56. Andersen does not entirely reject the possibility that the word is merely a misspelling, but does, ironically, in choosing to see the word as possibly deliberately misspelt, seem to contradict, in spirit at least, his own comment made in a different context that; 'As is often the case, Cézanne misspells Latin words, but throughout my text, I correct them, as the purpose of my book is not to point out misspellings with that insidious (sic!) [this sic is Andersen's joke, not mine]. Cézanne's letters, like most anyone's personal letters, are to be received, read, and understood, not graded on grammar and spelling': Andersen, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 478 n. 11.


71 Andersen, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 41; Andersen, Cézanne and the Eternal Feminine, op. cit., p. 169. Andersen had previously discreetly inserted a reference to mirliton meaning a toy slide whistle, a meaning I have not found in any French dictionary so far consulted.
content and a, perhaps mistaken, reading of the word *mirliton* as naming a slide whistle, Andersen is thereby able to imagine a whole series of biographical images: Cézanne and Zola lying naked under the trees by the River Arc ‘fingering’ their wooden slide whistles and imitating the orgasms of their imagined paramours. In short, a possible act of gaucherie and a complex of form mistaken as a form of content together convey possible readings perhaps entirely unintended by their author.

Moreover, the intimations of reflexivity introduced in the first stanza, as well as the associations then made between the inane repetitiveness of the *mirliton* and the sexual act it bawdily concerns—the maiden singing three times, the ‘ten or twelve’ strokes of his *sapière*, the starting and stopping and then the ironic, at the very end, ‘Why are you stopping?’ before the abrupt end, for instance—also creates a kind of layer of content separate to the content ostensible conveyed by the poem itself. When the form is seen as a pattern enacted rather than the device through which content might be expressed, repetitions of certain words might be counted, connections might be sought where perhaps there are none. Nevertheless, the very nature of the game of allusion Cézanne seems to be playing might also be related to, and in itself reflective of, that state of affairs as content—the *game* of seduction, the ritual of discourse—that then makes the search for possible meanings endless and potentially unending. In short, the meditation on repetition and permutation Cézanne’s *mirliton* seems to enact allows the flexibility of language and the fecundity of allusion to operate almost of its own accord. In a sense, a machine for making possible future interpretations is enabled. What Cézanne might be deemed as not yet enacting, is a similar reflexive gesture in terms of visual imagery. He is still, in a sense, at this stage, only playing with words.

---

72 'One can imagine them [Cézanne and Zola] on hot summer days beside a reedy river, hidden deep in a ravine, naked under the screening head of the giant pine tree [...] playing a *mirliton*, fingering its holes—if a slide whistle, making the imaginary girls squeal in pleasure as the plunger goes in and out': Andersen, *Cézanne and Zola*, op. cit., p. 42.

73 Is there fecundity in counting the repetitions of the refrain lines? Is there a reason why in the two stanzas describing the maiden from afar and those two in which she is conscious and compliant with the narrator’s sexual assault it is ‘*Gentil*’ [‘nice’—or, perhaps, ‘pagan’] *mirliton*; why ‘*Joli*’ [‘pretty’] *mirliton* in the four stanzas in which she is flattered; and ‘*Doux*’ [‘sweet’—perhaps even ‘easy’ or, adverbially, ‘submissively’] *mirliton* when passed out?
2B: Cicéron foudroyant Catilina

The second of Cézanne’s five posted images mentioned above and the earliest of his surviving watercolours, Cicéron foudroyant Catilina (fig. 2.2), was sent to Zola with a letter of mid-1858. Depicting the exemplar orator Cicero laying low, literally, the conspirator Catiline with the force of his rhetoric, the image is, in turn, and as with the rebus discussed above, then illustrated by a poem included in the letter, a versified eulogy exhorting not only the drama of the scene depicted, but also, in self-mocking and deliberately po-faced pomposity, the veracity and power of the execution of that depiction.

In terms both of the imagery and its jokingly enframing text, then, Cézanne seems, as with the just-discussed mirliton poem, to toy with the motif of the articulate orator/depicter knocking flat an opponent. In the mirliton, it is a potential sexual partner swooning in the face of artfully contrived praises; here, in the watercolour, it is a political rival, knocked on his back by rhetorical eloquence, and, in

---

74 The exact dating of this letter seems contentious. In both English versions of John Rewald’s letters it is given as ‘29 [June/July?] 1858’ and is implied to have been written before 9 July 1858: Cézanne, Letters, op. cit., p. 21; Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 13. In his catalogue raisonné of Cézanne’s watercolours, it is dated ‘29 [May–June] 1858’: Rewald, Paul Cézanne: The Watercolours, op. cit., p. 83. Many historians follow Rewald’s example in this case; for instance Theodore Reff, Jack Lindsay, and Wayne Andersen (Reff describes the letter as written ‘a few months before’ a 17 November letter; Andersen, although describing the letter as undated, cites another letter of 17 January 1859 as having been sent ‘about six months later’ than the one here being discussed): Theodore Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Dream of Hannibal”’, The Art Bulletin, vol. 45, no. 2 (June 1963), pp. 148, 148 n. 8; Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., p. 26; Andersen, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., pp. 32, 34. Isabelle Cahn, however, claims instead that this dating is incorrect, asserting the letter was in fact written on 2 September 1858: Isabelle Cahn, ‘Chronology,’ in Françoise Cachin et al., Cézanne, op. cit., p. 529. This dating would, however, seem to conflict with Zola’s presence in Aix at precisely this time, who, having arrived sometime in mid-August, stayed in Aix until the end of November: Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, 14 June 1858, cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 97; Colette Becker, ‘[Notes],’ in ibid., p. 99; Thomson, ‘Tableau chronologique,’ op. cit., p. 94. Cahn’s claim might simply be, therefore, a confusing of ‘29 [June/July?]’ for ‘2/9’.

75 For instance: ‘Although I’m the begetter of this great picture / I tremble as I look upon such a magnificent spectacle / […] / How can it be otherwise! No nothing / In all the Roman Empire was ever more grandios [...] / Oh, sublime spectacle, to amaze the eyes / And arouse profound astonishment!’. Paul Cézanne, ‘Cicéron…’ in a letter to Émile Zola, 29 [June/July?] 1858, cited and translated in Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., II. 15–16, 21–22, 31–32, pp. 14–16. As a transition between the poem and the letter proper, there is a further framing comment, the parenthetical and similarly bombastic, ‘However, it’s enough to have pointed out to you the incomparable beauties contained in this admirable watercolour’: Cézanne, letter to Zola, 29 [June/July?] 1858, op. cit., p. 16.
the poem, the viewer of that watercolour, bowled over by the force of Cézanne's prowess at picturing such a scene.76

This interest in reflexive framings, however parodically entailed, is, however, rarely what has caught the attention of those discussing the image and its attached poem. What has, instead, is the possibility of gleaning references to Cézanne's relationship with his father, encodings sometimes deemed deliberately signalled by the anachronistic elements in the picture.77 Hence, although ostensibly a Roman scene, little attempt seems to have been made to depict it as such. The architecture might be Roman—some have seen it as "medieval"—but the costumes and props, with the exception of the various imperial insignia held aloft, are certainly not; instead they are either those of contemporary French judges, or of soldiers.78

The scene undergoing this perceived re-contextualization, as already intimated, is from Cicero's orations against the conspirator Catiline, in particular the first of these, the opening sentence of which is included in paraphrased Latin in the upper right hand corner of the watercolour; "Quo usque tandem Catalina, abuteris patientia nostra [How long, Catiline, will you abuse our patience]?" (fig. 2.2).79 Speaking against both his purported 'prodigious' memory and intimate knowledge of the classics, the passage used by Cézanne is, however, misquoted.80 Nevertheless, the connection seems indubitable; Cézanne is illustrating, or at least basing an illustration upon, this

---

76 'And I anticipate with certainty / That you too will be deeply moved at this striking spectacle': Cézanne, 'Ciceron...,' op. cit., II. 19–20, p. 15.
77 Reff, 'Cézanne's "Dream of Hannibal",' op. cit., p. 148; Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., p. 28.
78 Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., p. 28; Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., p. 74. Indeed, the poem expressly points to at least one of these anachronistic elements with the lines 'Do you note the cuirassiers with their floating plumes / That toss in the air as the wind blows?': Cézanne, 'Ciceron...,' op. cit., II. 23–24, p. 15. Wayne Andersen seems to take this impulse to anachronize a little too far, translating cuirassiers as 'battleships': Andersen, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 33. It might be noted, albeit only as a tenuous aside, that exactly these plumed hats worn by Cézanne's cuirassiers were also called mirlitons.
79 Rewald, Paul Cézanne: The Watercolours, op. cit., p. 83.
80 The quote regarding Cézanne's memory is Joachim Gasquet, and he stresses both the strength of Cézanne's memory and his knowledge of the classics throughout his biography: Gasquet, Joachim Gasquet's Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 39, passim. Cicero's line cited by Cézanne is: 'Quo usque tandem abuter, Catalina, patientia nostra?': Marcus Tullii Ciceronis, Oratio in L. Catalinam: Prima. Habita in Senatu, notices, notes, and complete vocabulary by John Henderson, accessible in various formats from the Project Gutenberg parent directory at: http://www.gutenberg.org/2/4/5/6/24967. Cézanne's rendition is technically correct, but omits the 'poetic' tendency of Cicero to use -re instead of -ris endings in the imperfect and future indicative: ibid., § 1 n. 1. There is, hence, the possibility that Cézanne is 'correcting' Cicero.
text, a text he might well have been furiously studying as part of his preparations for his final year exams at the collège Bourbon.  

For Theodore Reff and others, however, what is really being referred to is Cézanne’s relationship with his father, Cicero standing ‘for the righteous father whose anger he fears, and Catiline for himself.’  

Jack Lindsay, likewise, makes the same identification, but configured more specifically in terms of Cézanne’s balking at the pursuit of a career in law. Cicero, the ‘great man-of-law’, thereby represents the combined authoritative figures of Law and the father Louis-Auguste, in combination rebuking the rebellious son for his ‘backsliding, his failure to grapple with his career and vindicate himself respectably in the eyes of the world.’  

Although Cézanne would later write, in an overblown and only semi-serious poem, of the boringly complex texts his legal studies forced him to read, to state, as Lindsay then does in reference to the Cicero imagery, that ‘in his innermost being [Cézanne] was rejecting Law with all his might’, nearly six months before enrolling in these studies, does seem, however, prolepsis unworthy even of the great Cézanne.  

For his part, Reff backs the suggestion of Cézanne’s identification with the prostrate Catiline by citing a later letter dated 17 January 1859, therefore two months after Cézanne had finally passed the exams mentioned above, in which he apparently assimilated ‘the sound of his own name with Catiline’s.’  

The context of this assimilation is, again, a paraphrase of Cicero’s line, in which Cézanne alludes to his persistent pestering of Zola, in an imagined conversation, for a reason explaining his tardiness in not having written to him recently:

---

81 Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Dream of Hannibal”’, op. cit., p. 148; Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., p. 28. Assuming the usually presumed dates of the letter of mid-1858, these exams would be those Cézanne is presumed to have failed in early August 1858. He then re-sat the exams on 12 November 1858, and passed, the context for which is discussed in more detail in section 2C.  

82 Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Dream of Hannibal”’, op. cit., p. 149.  

83 Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., p. 28.  

84 Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., 28. Paul Cézanne, letter to Émile Zola, 7 December 1858, cited and translated in Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 33. The poem on his legal studies is discussed in section 2D.  

85 Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Dream of Hannibal”’, op. cit., p. 149. The letter in question is discussed more fully in relation to the drawing (Ch 37) ‘Mort règne en ces lieux’ (1859) (fig. 2.3), which is discussed in section 2E.
I could go on boring you and you could, in your vexation, cry out with Cicero *Quosque tandem, Cézasine, abuteris patientia nostra?* To which I would reply that if you don’t want to be pestered, you must write to me at once, if there’s no serious impediment.86

This ‘rhyming’ of Cézanne’s name with Catiline through the Latinized ‘Cézasine’ in the later letter may not, however, be as straightforward as Reff makes out; ‘Catiline’ is only the English spelling of the conspirator’s name, in French the Latin form ‘Catilina’ is retained. In any case, Cézanne’s use of ‘Cézasine’ might be explained through other means, anyway. Hence, Cézanne signs precisely the letter including Zola’s imagined rebuke as ‘Paulus Cézasinus’, itself not a direct Latinization, which would be, it could be presumed, ‘Paulus Cézannus’.87 In using ‘Cézasinus’, Cézanne actually enacts a rather complicated cross-language pun; *asinus* Latin for ‘donkey’, replaced the punned *âne*, which is also ‘donkey’ in French.88 Hence, in Latinizing his name, Cézanne keeps the pun it makes in French.89 When Cézanne then replaces ‘Catilina’ with ‘Cézasine’ in the paraphrase from Cicero, he is actually thereby correctly casting the name of the accused in the vocative, exactly the kind of grammatical pedantry that might be on the mind of someone recently completing their exams, especially those involving the memorizing of famous passages.90

In terms of Cézanne’s watercolour (fig. 2.2), however, completed up to six months earlier than the ‘Cézasine’ remark (and, indeed, before Cézanne had passed any final year exam), if Reff and Lindsay are right in positing Cézanne’s identification with Catiline, it would still not necessarily follow that he was thereby identifying Cicero with his father. Much of Cézanne’s most vitriolic poesy of this time, albeit couched within an ironic exaggeration increasingly typical of him, is aimed not at his father, 86 Paul Cézanne, letter to Émile Zola, 17 January 1859, cited and translated in Cézanne, *Letters*, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 43. 87 Sidney Geist makes this same point: Geist, *Interpreting Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 27. 88 Geist, *Interpreting Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 27. 89 Cézanne’s appreciation, or at least possible awareness, of the pun his family name might make with donkey has already been noted. 90 Chapuis, *The Drawings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 198. The vocative for *-â* stem names such as Catalina is the same as the nominative, but for *-as* names becomes *-æ*: Cézasinus thus becomes Cézasine. The letter containing the ‘Cézasine’ quote comes from 17 January 1859, only two months after Cézanne had purportedly finally passed his baccalauréat *âs* lettres on 12 November 1858. On the latter, see section 3A. 69
but, rather, at his studies, his teachers, and his upcoming exams. Hence, precisely the kinds of motifs featured in Cézanne's descriptions of Cicero in his poem attached to the watercolour, 'whose fiery gaze / Darts a look of such venomous hate', recur in his descriptions of his feared examiners, '[...] whose piercing glances / Send trouble into the depths of my soul. / [...] / Do you see them, Lord, in their cruel glee / As they dart glances at those who will be their prey?' In line with this apparently more plausible context of conflict, or, at the very least, a conflict actually mentioned by Cézanne in his 1858 letters, Wayne Andersen reverses Reff and Lindsay's identification of Cicero, seeing Cézanne as instead identifying himself with the orator's forceful ability to vanquish foes. The invocation of the imagery of Cicero blasting Catiline is then, for Andersen, a subconscious device by which Cézanne steels himself for his upcoming exams, the imagery a kind of exorcism of schoolboy tensions.

However, it is also entirely possible to interpret Cézanne's motives far less seriously. Nina Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, for instance, dismisses all psychological interpretations of *Cicéron fouadroyant Catilina* (fig. 2.2) and attached poem and prefers instead to see them as 'ridiculing jointly men of law and classical culture.' In regards to the former of these possibilities, the mocking of the legal profession, neither of the main protagonists, however, are portrayed as lawyers, both Cicero and Catiline

91 For instance, the poem included in a letter dated 26 July 1858, nine days before his first, failed, attempt at his exams; 'I tremble when I look upon all geography, / History, Latin, Greek, geometry / That conspire against me: I see them threatening me, / Those examiners, whose piercing glances / Send trouble into the depths of my soul. / At every instant, my fear redoubles! / And I tell myself: Lord, all these enemies, / For my certain loss impudently joined, / Disperse, confound this fearsome troop. / [...] / Ah, Lord, lay low these malicious persons. / Do you see them already preparing to assemble, / Rubbing their hands and ready top sink us all? / Do you see them, Lord, in their cruel glee, / As they dart glances at those who will be their prey? / See, see, Lord, how on their desks / They carefully arrange the fatal questions! / No, no, do not suffer me, an innocent victim, / To fall beneath the blows of their growing wrath': Paul Cézanne, untitled poem in a letter to Émile Zola, 26 July 1858, cited and translated in *Cézanne, Letters*, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 25. Translation modified slightly.

92 Cézanne, 'Ciceron...,' op. cit., ll. 3-4, pp. 14, 15. Translation modified slightly.

93 'His subconscious, always on guard, will take over the dire situation. He will call upon Cicero to destroy the conspirators...He will strike down those menacing examiners, flatten them': Andersen, *Cézanne and Zola*, op. cit., pp. 35, 37. How this might gel with Andersen's suggestion that the hatching in the Cézanne's watercolour indicates it was copied from a published etching, in response to which he then wrote the poem, is not elaborated upon: Andersen, *Cézanne and Zola*, op. cit., p. 33.

are bearded and wearing what appear to be military uniforms.\(^{95}\) Although, as Athanassoglou-Kallmyer points out, a ‘group of Daumier-like lawyers’ are certainly present, milling about somewhat inconsequentially, they are not depicted with any of the withering and exaggerated verve that artist’s numerous caricatures of the profession normally exhibit (fig. 2.7).\(^{96}\) Indeed, it is difficult to understand why they are there at all, apart from serving, perhaps, the prosaic function of signalling the possible setting in a modern court of law. Some lengths seem, however, to have been gone to indicate this is not the case; not only is a cartouche carefully included in the watercolour with the inscription ‘Senatus curia [Senate meeting-house]’, additional reference to these words is made in the attached poem:

This new realisation will give you greater insight
Into the meaning of the phrase:

‘Senatus, [sic] Curia.’ An ingenious idea
That is here given expression for the first time by Cézanne!\(^{97}\)

Whether this is some attempt at pointing at a possible pun on the Latin meaning of ‘Senatus, curia [Senators, in court]’ seems difficult to tell.\(^{98}\) In any case, although enacting a somewhat over-the-top and bombastically comprehensive listing of many of the picture’s components, the poem certainly does not seem to shed any further light on the watercolour’s possible meaning.

\(^{95}\) Moreover, Athanassoglou-Kallmyer’s aside that lawyers belonged to ‘a profession Cézanne only knew too well through his brief stint in legal studies’ seems a little precurious, given he had, at the time of executing his watercolour, not yet enrolled in those studies: Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., p. 74.

\(^{96}\) Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 74. Indeed, given the distinctive apparel of French lawyers at this time, it is difficult to imagine any crude cartoon of a member of this profession not being ‘Daumier-like’. There does seem to be a possibly satirical depiction of a lawyer amongst the page of caricatures included in Cézanne’s letter of late July 1859, and therefore after eight months into his legal studies, where a figure in what could be a lawyer’s collar is depicted wearing some sort of clown’s or dunce’s hat (fig. 2.5) (far left).

\(^{97}\) Cézanne, ‘Ciceron…’, op. cit., II, 28–30, pp. 15–16. Senatus would seem a misspelling of senatus, which is as it is spelled in the cartouche in the watercolour; whether or not deliberately so, the added syllable does provide the line with the correct number of syllables for an Alexandrine (albeit with an oddly placed caesura between the seventh and eighth syllables), a metre consistent with the rest of the poem.

\(^{98}\) ‘Curia’, in Latin, originally referred to a courtyard in which the Senate met, and was only later, in imperial times, applied more generally to administrative buildings, including the judicial.
However, in terms of Athanassoglou-Kallmyer's suggestion that the poem's purpose was to deflate the pretensions of antique rhetoric, this seems, likewise, problematic. For, although certainly pompous—whether deliberately or not—the poem is not, as Athanassoglou-Kallmyer describes it, in a classical hexameter, but, rather, the more conventionally nineteenth-century French form, the Alexandrine. It would seem odd, then, for Cézanne to use a contemporary form to burlesque an antique theme; the parodic *modus operandi* usually to present a disjunction of the form parodied and the content expressed.

Indeed, Cézanne's 'Ciceron...' poem seems as much a burlesque of the kinds of purple prose often enacted in contemporary descriptions of art than of classical culture, parodying perhaps not the classical theme that the picture it ostensibly illustrates, but the very act of praising such scenes through learned reference. As an example, here are some words by Lord Cathcart, published in *L'Artiste*, that pre-empt exactly the language Cézanne will use in his own inflated verse-descriptions of the drawings he will send to Zola.

I do not think that there is a picture in the world with the same force of expression; it is impossible to look at it for an instant without being seized with a horror that even the poet [Dante] couldn't excite, and I admit to you that it is not without emotion that I describe it.

---

99 Although flexible, classical hexameter still requires between 13 and 17 syllables, the Alexandrine more strictly 12, usually with a caesura between the sixth and seventh syllables; e.g., from Cézanne's poem, 'Vois-tu cet étendard, don't la pourpre romaine': Cézanne, 'Ciceron....', op. cit., I. 13, p. 15. Almost every line of Cézanne's poem is an Alexandrine, and none hexameters. Cézanne's own awareness of this poetic form, and indeed, poetic form in general, is borne out by his stipulation that, when Zola was to use the paired bout-rimés discussed earlier, he was to use Alexandrines; 'I insist on Alexandrines': Paul Cézanne, letter to Émile Zola, 9 July 1858, cited and translated in Cézanne, *Letters*, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 19.


101 'Je ne crois pas qu'il y ait au monde un tableau de la même force d'expression; il n'est pas possible de le regarder un instant sans être saisi d'une horreur que la poète même n'a pu exciter, et je vous proteste que ce n'est pas émotion que je vous le dicis': Lord Catheart, '[Letter to Etienne Falconet],’ cited in G. Laviron, "Ugolin.—Le Righi," *L'Artiste*, ser. 2, t.6, livr. 5 (1840), p. 84. Lord Catheart's words were published in *L'Artiste*, a magazine Cézanne
Hence, a line that Theodore Reff can cite as part of his above-discussed assertion of Cézanne’s identification with the prostrate Catiline—‘my blood churns with each word (I recoil, I tremble) of Cicero as he speaks’—might be read not as Reff reads it, as Cézanne transposing his own experience of his father onto his description of Cicero, but as a parody of the kind of high-flown emotive identification expounded here by Lord Catheart and typical of that published in luxury journals such as L’Artiste.102

In line with this is also Cézanne’s possible parody of the use of learned reference to other classical figures within his poem, which begins with the words;

Admire Cicero whose fiery gaze
Darts a look of such venomous hate
As he overthrows Statius that hatchet of plots
And strikes dumb his infamous accomplices.103

Wayne Andersen, albeit only as an aside, suggests the Statius referred to is Caecilius Statius, ‘known for use of literary and rhetorical devices, hyperbole, and entwined themes.’104 Andersen seems, however, to have his Statii mixed up; the date range he gives for Caecilius Statius, (‘AD 45–c.96’), is actually that of Publius Papinus Statius, Caecilius Statius having died around BC 166.105 Although both might be described as poets, very little survives of the earlier Statius’s works, which were apparently mostly

owned issues of, and part of an article accompanying an engraved print depicting the same Ugolino episode from Dante’s Inferno that Cézanne would himself, only six months after writing his ‘Ciceron...’ poem, seemingly base his own illustration on: Ugolino, engraving by A. Riffaut, after a painting by Joshua Reynolds, published in L’Artiste, ser. 2, t.6, 5e livr. (1840), p. 84 bis. Cézanne’s possible copying of images, particularly in the 1870s and 1880s, in drawn form and from back issues of L’Artiste mostly dating to the 1840s and 1850s, has already been noted, see also: Ballas, ‘Paul Cézanne et la revue L’Artiste,’ op. cit., pp. 223–232. On Cézanne’s possible use of Ugolino imagery, see section 2E.

102 Cézanne, ‘Ciceron...’, op. cit., ll. 17–18; Reff, Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Dream of Hannibal”’, op. cit., p. 149.
103 Cézanne, ‘Ciceron...’, op. cit., ll. 3–6, pp. 14, 15. Translation modified slightly.
104 Andersen, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 478 n. 6.
literal adaptations of Greek comic plays. The later Statius, on the other hand, produced much poetry that still survives, including the epic *Achilleiad* and *Thebaid*, both of which contained convoluted plots and considerable digressions. Hence, it would seem most likely that if Cézanne is to be interpreted as referring to a Latin poet in the sense suggested by Andersen, as a ‘weaver of plots’, then Publius Papinus Statius would most likely be a better suspect than Andersen’s cited Caecilius Statius.

However, if this was the case, it would seem odd for Cézanne’s poem to describe Cicero as ‘overthrowing’ a poet born nearly a century after his own death. Caecilius Statius, the writer of plays, however, was a poet/dramatist whom Cicero himself had quoted in his *de Amicitia*.

To-day, of all old fools that play the comic parts,
You’ve wheedled me the most and made your greatest dupe.

This famous quote, used as part of Cicero’s discussion of the need to be wary of enemies who flatter, might thereby be seen as being used by Cézanne as a means of describing Catiline in terms of Cicero’s quoting of Statius, by apposition, as it were.

In any case, as this digression on a few words taken from an admittedly, and perhaps purposely, mediocre poem hopefully shows, the very mechanism of citation—or at least; the referencing of exterior literary sources, however incompletely enacted—promotes a certain inevitable proliferation of meaning. By citing incompletely—that is, to say, willy-nilly—the possibility is increased of provoking, deliberately or not, the act of seeking a reason for that citing. An affect of praxis is invoked by which a viewer/reader might ask ‘why is this included?’; a question then opening up the opportunity for further invested meaning, or perhaps, to put it more precisely, the appearance of further invested meaning. Hence, Cézanne might be conceived of as merely citing classical authors and/or imagery *ad hoc*—dependent on factors such as

---

syllabic restrictions, his current studies, whatever lists of words or challenges his friend Zola had sent him, and his current literary fancies an/or bêtes noires—in order to give the appearance of learnedness. Even more complicatedly, Cézanne's intent might have been to satirize the appearance of learnedness through parodying the use of learned citation. Hence, Cézanne's imagery and attached poem seem to dissemble, or at least fail to cohere, meaning, and it seems difficult to see them as anything other than what they at first appear to be: an offhand sketch and poem, one perhaps provoking the other, in which order it is uncertain, concocted out of various elements of Cézanne's studies (Cicero's first oration and, perhaps, the poetry of either of the Statii), vague references to lawyers, and, perhaps but most tenuously, the enacting of an appalling, and not very interesting, pun. If anything, Cézanne does a wonderful job of creating an image and attached poem that seems to mock—if only through its unserious nature, its off-hand presentation, its misspellings, and obliquely-confusing and often contradictory references—the very interpretations they would later provoke.
2C: Hannibal debauched

After failing an initial sitting of his collège Bourbon final year exams in August 1858, Cézanne seems finally to have completed his secondary schooling in November of the same year, gaining his baccalauréat ès lettres with the grading ‘assez bien’.

The evidence usually cited for this success is his own correspondence with Zola, discussed below, as well as his subsequent enrolment at the Faculté de Droit d’Aix-en-Provence on 16 November 1858, which would seem predicated upon his having passed his baccalauréat. How this might tally, however, with the registre des diplômes of the Académie d’Aix for the years 1856–1863, now in the Archives of the Bouches-du-Rhône in Marseilles, which state Cézanne was not delivered his diplôme du baccalauréat ès lettres until 7 July 1859, after obtaining it on 30 March 1859, remains unexplained. Irrespective of this mystery, Cézanne’s own surviving announcement of his success, ‘I have passed the baccalot’, came in a letter to Zola dated 17 November 1858.

---

109 Mack, Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 55; Rewald, Cézanne: A Biography, op. cit., p. 19; Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 26. Both Jack Lindsay and Philip Callow cite Baptistin Baille as graduating the same day as Cézanne on 12 November 1858, but this seems unlikely, Baille having already successfully gained both his bachelier ès-sciences and bachelier ès-lettres by, at the latest, 4 August 1858: Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., p. 33; Callow, Lost Earth, op. cit., p. 37. Indeed, Baille was, at the time of Cézanne sitting his exams, already enrolled and attending classes in the University of Marseilles.

110 Extracts from the Registre des inscriptions à la Faculté de Droit d’Aix-en-Provence 1858–1859, AD 13, Centre d’Aix-en-Provence, fonds de la Faculté de Droit, registre 1T 1900, reprinted in Archives départementales des Bouches-du-Rhône, Monsieur Cézanne, op. cit., p. 58; Archives départementales des Bouches-du-Rhône, Monsieur Cézanne, op. cit., p. 296 n. 6. Isobel Cahn and Bruno Ely, however, both cite Cézanne’s date of enrolment at the law school as 16 December 1858: Ely, ‘Cézanne’s youth,’ op. cit., p. 34; Cahn, ‘Chronology,’ op. cit., p. 529; Cahn also states Cézanne registered for five trimesters of study in total, whereas the Marseilles archives suggest six: loc. cit.; Extracts from the Registre des inscriptions à la Faculté de Droit d’Aix-en-Provence 1858–1859, op. cit., pp. 58–59.


112 Paul Cézanne, letter to Émile Zola, 17 November 1858, cited and translated in Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 27. The dating of this letter is taken, however, from the 1976 edition of Letters, as the 1984 edition’s date ‘Wednesday 23 November 1858’ seems a misprint; 23 November 1858 was a Tuesday: Cézanne, Letters, op. cit., p. 31; Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 26. Although Isobel Cahn, in reference to the same letter cites the 1976 edition of Letters, she nevertheless gives the apparently incorrect date given in the 1984 edition: Cahn, ‘Chronology,’ op. cit., p. 529. The
Latin fragment ‘nom [sic?] labor improbus omnia vincit’; perhaps a paraphrase of the famous line from the first book of Virgil’s Georgics; ‘Labor omnia vicit improbus [relentless toil conquered all].’

Also in the letter, included as part of an apology in regard to their letters having crossed, Cézanne mentions another letter written three days earlier, on Sunday 14 November, since lost, along with the letter from Zola presumably crossed by it. According to Cézanne’s surviving letter, this earlier letter contained not only his initial announcement of his successful graduation, but also mention of a ‘longissime’ poem he had intentions of writing, and for which he asked Zola to provide a title. Appended to the otherwise short surviving letter is another, presumably different, poem, a sixty-eight line effort that Cézanne introduced with mock pomposity, parodying perhaps the tone of the tasks set him in his exams, thus: ‘The content of Latin verses set for rhetoric and translated into French by uself, a poet.’

The poem then following, entitled ‘Songe d’Annibal: Annabilis somnium’, is, like the watercolour just discussed, not only an apparent burlesque on a classical theme, but also a work that has attracted further claims of offering testimony to Cézanne’s perceived strained relationship with his father. Hence, in the words of Meyer Shapiro:

In Cézanne’s Dream of Hannibal, written in mock-classical style, the young hero, after a drunken bout in which he has spilled the wine on the table-cloth and fallen asleep under the table, dreams of a terrible father.

matter is further confused by Theodore Reff, who gives the date as 13 November 1858, perhaps a result of his claims that Cézanne wrote one of the poems included in the letter, discussed below, was written on the morning after his successfully passing his exams: Theodore Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Dream of Hannibal”,’ Art Bulletin, vol. 45, no. 2 (June 1963), pp. 148, 148 n. 2, 149.


114 ‘Our letters have crossed [...]. I’m waiting for the end of the month for you to send me another letter furnishing me with the title for a longissime poem I have in mind and that I mention in my letter of 14 November’; Cézanne, letter to Zola, 17 November 1858, op. cit., pp. 31, 32.

115 Cézanne, letter to Zola, 17 November 1858, op. cit., p. 28.

who arrives in a chariot drawn by four white horses. He takes his debauched son by the ear, shakes him angrily, and scolds him for his drunkenness and wasteful life and for staining his clothes with sauce, wine, and rum. These fantasies convey something of the anxiety of the young Cézanne under the strict regime of his father.\footnote{Schapiro, \textit{Paul Cézanne}, op. cit., p. 23.}

Following this lead, Theodore Reff and Jack Lindsay likewise see the verses as encoding Cézanne's feelings towards his father, albeit in terms deeper and, in the case of Reff, more specifically explicit.\footnote{Reff, 'Cézanne's "Dream of Hannibal"', op. cit., pp. 148–151; Lindsay, \textit{Cézanne}, op. cit., p. 35.} As such, for Reff, the poem, which is characterized as both 'one of the longest and most powerful' of Cézanne's youthful verses, as well as 'perhaps his first authentic work of art', not only inscribes the 'adolescent author's remorse about masturbation and consequent fear of discovery', but also, through the choice of literary models and their articulation, might reveal 'an unconscious desire [on Cézanne's behalf] to eliminate his own father as a rival and threat.'\footnote{Reff, 'Cézanne's "Dream of Hannibal"', op. cit., pp. 148, 151.}

In terms of how such conclusions are reached, and leaving aside for a moment the mention of literary models, Reff begins by observing that the poem proceeds from 'a profound sense of guilt', citing as part evidence for this Hannibal's falling asleep on his left-hand side, 'a familiar equivalent of "wrong" in the symbolism of dreams.'\footnote{ibid., p. 149.} However, as both John Rewald and Wayne Andersen point out, this might seem an overly-elaborate means of explaining the position Hannibal is described as collapsing in ('du côté gauche'). For, given that some posture was required, they argue, the important factor might not be symbolism, but, instead, the need to rhyme with \textit{"débauche"}.\footnote{ibid.} Allusive content might simply be the result of the exigencies of form, the requirements of rhyme. In any case, if there is guilt, Reff continues, it would be odd for Cézanne to be expressing in terms of his laziness, as is the accusation levelled

\footnote{"Il bâille, entend les bœufs, s’endort du côté gauche; / Notre héros pionçait après cette débauche": Cézanne, ‘Songe d’Annibal,’ op. cit., II. 29–30, p. 29. ‘[T]he crucial word in this verse is débauche and that Hannibal would have fallen asleep \textit{sur la droite} or \textit{sur le dos} provided they offered a rhyme with—\textit{auche}!’: Rewald, ‘Cézanne and his father,’ op. cit., p. 100 n. 3. Andersen makes the same point, here: Andersen, \textit{Cézanne and Zola}, op. cit., p. 83.}
at Hannibal by his father in the poem. After all, Cézanne had just passed his exams. As such, Reff deems there must be some other reason for this perceived guilt, and he quickly finds it in the ‘sustained symbolism of ejaculation’ he sees underpinning the description of the banquet’s debris Hannibal collapses in. Indeed, for Reff, the purpose of the entire first third of the poem is but the presentation of a ‘metaphor of onanism’, and the guilt thus expressed is for the wastage of ‘inherited substances’.

Because of a great thump of the fist the hero gave
On the tablecloth, the wine had spilled in floods.
Plates, platters and empty bowls
Rolled sadly in the limpid streams
Of still-steaming punch, a regrettable waste!
Is it possible, gentlemen, that Hannibal should waste,
Infandum, infandum, the rum of his homeland?

This inclusion, in Latin, of ‘Infandum infandum’ is taken by Reff as further evidence of the implicit connection between sex and drinking being drawn, noting that Cézanne had already used these very words before, in a letter of 9 July. There, not only did Cézanne include the parenthetic ‘[...] love (infandum, let us not go into that corrupting subject)’, but also a verse Reff sees as making the erotic overtones of drinking explicit, as well as referencing his own virginity.

Infandum immediately brings to mind Virgil’s Aeneid, where the word figures prominently as description both of the ‘unspeakable’ sadness Aeneas claims he must relive in fulfilling Dido’s request of telling her the tale of Troy’s downfall, and the ‘unspeakable’ love she feels for him, implanted in her breast at Venus’ command, a love whose impropriety will cause Dido’s tragic downfall. For Jack Lindsay,

---

122 Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Dream of Hannibal”,’ op. cit., p. 149.
123 loc. cit.
124 loc. cit.
126 This is the same letter cited above in section 2A in regard to its inclusion of a list of rhymes for Zola’s use in making bouts-rimés.
127 Cézanne, letter to Zola, 9 July 1858, op. cit., p. 21. ‘I’ve not yet raised / To my innocent lips, / The cup of pleasure / From which amorous souls / Drink their fill’: ibid., p. 22.
128 Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Dream of Hannibal”,’ op. cit., p. 149; Lindsay, op. cit., p. 35. The banquet occurs at the end of Book 1 of the Aeneid, Aeneas’ tale of Troy’s capture by the
Cézanne’s inclusion of the words in his ‘Songe d’Annibal’ expressly references this ‘unspeakable’ sense articulated by Virgil, an affective presence of guilt interpreted as signalling Cézanne’s inability to please his father. As such, the ‘backsliding’ motif noted by Lindsay in regard to the watercolour (fig. 2.2) and attached poem discussed above is perceived repeated.

In terms of literary precedents for the poem as a whole, rather than the possible literary references it includes, Reff suggests Cézanne’s inclusion of the Latin Annibalis somnium as subtitle for his poem is a possible clue to the work’s basis on Cicero’s sixth and final book of De re publica, the so-called ‘Somnium Scipionis [Dream of Scipio]’, to which Cézanne’s poem does, indeed, bear passing similarity.

Cicero’s work itself is a recounting of a dream by a fictionalized version of the Greeks and the Trojans’ subsequent wanderings in Books 2–3, and the tragic consequences of Dido’s love for Aeneas in Book 4. Around 1875, Cézanne produced a drawing and a watercolour featuring Dido and Aeneas, the former, according to Adrien Chappuis, a copy after an unknown work: Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 118; Rewald, Paul Cézanne: the Watercolours, op. cit., p. 94. Rather bizarrely, in rejecting Reff’s suggestion of the reference, Wayne Andersen states ‘it’s unlikely that Aeneas would have used this expression [infandum]’, despite the fact that this is exactly, and quite famously, how Aeneas begins his tale of Troy’s downfall (‘Conscivere omnes intentique ora tenebant. / inde toro pater Aeneas sic orsus ab alto: “infandum, regina, iubes renovare dolorem’). Andersen, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 485 n. 6: Virgil, Aeneid Book IV, edited with introduction, notes, and vocabulary by H. E. Gould and J. L. Whiteley, London: Bristol Classical Press, 2001, ll. 84–85, p. 22.

Here the denouncing authority is directly defined as the father. Whether Paul had been rebuked by Louis-Auguste for drinking, or had merely been afraid of some such rebuke, he expresses here strongly his sense of guilt. It is possible indeed that during the months of strain he had made a fool of himself through drinking too much; but the guilt fears go much deeper than any such episode. the Hamilcar-Hannibal image ties up with the Cicero-Catilina one, expressing the crisis of choice that Paul is finding inescapable as schooldays come near their end’: Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., p. 35. See section 2B.

Marcus Tullius Cicero, De Re Publica, edited and with commentary by James E. G. Zetzel, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998, liber 6, ll. 9–29.3, pp. 85–92; James E. G. Zetzel, “Commentary: De Re Publica 6,” in Cicero, De Re Publica, Zetzel edition, op. cit., p. 223; Reff, “Cézanne’s ‘Dream of Hannibal’”, op. cit., pp. 148–149. Reff also suggests certain historical references in Cézanne’s poem might have been taken from Livy’s History of the Second Punic War, but notes that a more likely source, given the dispersal of such information...
Roman republican exemplar Scipio in response to a question posed by a similarly fictionalized Laelius concerning the rewards of moral behaviour. What follows is Scipio’s description of a prophetic dream he had several years before featuring his father, a dream in which laid out before him were not only many of the successes he would enjoy in later life, but also a condensed and rather confusing quasi-scientific eschatological treatise on cosmology and the nature of the soul. As such, Cicero’s ‘Dream of Scipio’ thereby parallels, in both theme and placement, Plato’s Myth of Er, likewise a moralising eschatological dream-sequence concluding his own Republic, the work Cicero’s De re publica was, in many ways, a direct response to. Further, Cicero, by virtue of an included ‘learned and awkward parenthesis’, also positions the dream related by Scipio in terms of previous noted precedents, in particular the vision in Book 1 of Ennius’s Annales but also thence, through implication, ‘the tradition of visions stretching from Hesiod to Callimachus to Ennius.’

In terms of the actual ‘dreams’ recounted by Cicero and Cézanne, there are, however, radical differences, despite certain similarities such as a foregrounding magnificent

through several of Livy’s books, was a biographical condense such as Cornelius Nepos’s Vies des grands capitaines de l’antiquité (edited and translated by W. Rinn, Paris: J. Delalain, 1855): ibid., p. 148 n. 5. In terms of examples of such material in Cézanne’s poem, take, for instance the lines ‘[...] you, the conqueror of Ticinum, / Of Traseminus, of Cannes, a battle in which that city / That was always most hostile to the Hamilcars / And the most implacable of their enemies / Would see its citizens bend at the knee to Carthage’: Cézanne, ‘Songe d’Annibal’, op. cit., II. 52–56, p. 31.

132 Scipio had stated ‘To the wise, the consciousness of good deeds is the noblest reward of virtue. This divine virtue desires not statues with leaden supports, or triumphs, with their fading laurels; but a far more enduring recompense of ever verdant glories.’ To which Laelius’s response is ‘what are these?’: Marcus Tullius Cicero, De Re Publica, liber 6, l. 8 [?]. These prefatory sections are not included in Zetzel’s edition of De Re Publica cited above; the translations are taken from C. D. Yonge’s 1877 translation accessible in various formats from the Project Gutenberg parent directory at: http://www.gutenberg.net/1/4/9/3/14988.

feast and the presence of dead fathers. For instance, in Cicero’s version, the father shows his son a promising future, as well as the underlying nature of reality. In Cézanne’s, the father lectures his debauched son on the evils of laziness and drink. These differences, then, as with the earlier Cicero picture and poem, are taken by many as further signs of the poem’s intent to encode. Hence, even in the act of raising the comparison to Cicero’s work, Reff asserts Cézanne used the classical dream-narrative only as a ‘formal model’ and that this was an inconsequential aside, the essential component being the purported content, the difference, as it were, which, he argues, ‘clearly derives from a more intimate source’, the themes of onanism and filial fear outlined above.

That is, although happy to describe Cézanne’s poem as perhaps intended as ‘a burlesque of ancient rhetoric’, the action of burlesquing is seen by Reff as merely a screen behind which Cézanne might deal with deeper and more personally invested meanings. The fundamental issue of parody is thus avoided, as is the possibility, thereby, that the poem might be commenting on the structure of the sources burlesqued, rather than articulating some perceived preconceived personal content. Indeed, for Reff, Cézanne’s Hannibal being rebuked by his father is direct transposition into verse of ‘what was undoubtedly a real dream, perhaps inspired by a family celebration of his graduation on the previous day.’ Hence, like Wayne Andersen in his discussion of Cézanne’s mirliton, Reff, in reading Cézanne’s ‘Songe d’Annibal’, is able to imagine a rather specific context within which the poem was contrived: Cézanne got drunk at a family celebration for his graduation, has a dream that night similar to the ‘dream’ he then details in a poem inspired by precisely these events, conflating, as it were, reality, dreams based on that reality, and the modes by

---

136 Note also that in both the dead fathers are described in terms of looking more like portraits of themselves: ‘At a later hour, after an entertainment of royal magnificence, we prolonged our conversation far into the night [...] Africanus appeared to me, with an aspect that reminded me more of his bust than of his real face’: Cicero, De Re Publica, Zetzel edition, op. cit., liber 6, l. 10.1, 10.3, pp. 85, 86. Compare this with Cézanne’s, ‘The Carthaginian hero, upon leaving a feast / At which too-frequent recourse had been made / To rum and cognac [...] In short, gentlemen, the very portrait of Hamilcar’: Cézanne, ‘Songe d’Annibal’, op. cit., l. 1–3, 39, p. 30.

137 Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Dream of Hannibal”’, op. cit., p. 149. Added to these differences is Cézanne’s departure from Hannibal’s conventional characterization as teetotaller and stoic: Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., p. 35.

138 Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Dream of Hannibal”’, op. cit., p. 149.

139 Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Dream of Hannibal”’, op. cit., p. 151.
which this might then be encoded as ‘art’ in a poem that is, thereby, ‘an authentic
document of [Cézanne’s] adolescence.’

In terms of this presumed ‘confessional’ aspect of Cézanne’s poem, Reff suggests
another literary source—in addition to the classical dream-narrative exemplified, for
instance by Cicero’s ‘Dream of Scipio’—is necessary. As such, he cites a literary
inspiration without which, he claims, Cézanne’s ‘Songe d’Annibal’ is ‘hardly
conceivable’: the romantic effusions of Alfred de Musset, a poet, as noted above, a
particular favourite of Cézanne and Zola at the time. In particular, Reff cites de
Musset’s versified one-act play Les Marrons du feu, which relates the tale of Lord
Raphael Garuci, who, tired of the demands of his mistress, the dancer Carmago,
arraignes for the Abbé Hannibal Desiderio, who lusts after the girl, to take his place in
a midnight tryst. Despite their cunning disguise of switching coats, however, the
ruse is discovered, and in order to seek revenge on her lover, Carmago convinces the
Abbé to kill him, declaring love that, once the deed is done, she then coldly refutes.
The play then ends with the Abbé’s penitent words:

Oh, she is gone? Oh god!
I have killed my, friend, I have merited the fire.
I have stained my coat, and I am sent away.
That is the moral of this comedy.

Reff notes the coincidence of characters with the name Hannibal and the similar motif
of their stained coats, the Abbé’s with blood, Cézanne’s Hannibal with rum and
sauce. Reff also observes, however, perhaps more importantly, further similarities
in the form of an earlier scene where the Abbé passes out under a table, like Cézanne’s
Hannibal. He is then woken brusquely by Raphael, who offers him Carmago, at

---

140 Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Dream of Hannibal”’, op. cit., p. 151.
141 Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Dream of Hannibal”’, op. cit., p. 150.
142 For de Musset’s play, see: Alfred de Musset, ‘Les Marrons du feu,’ in Podstes complètes,
edited by Maurice Allem, Paris: Gallimard, 1957, pp. 19–58. For an English translation, see,
for instance: Alfred de Musset, ‘Chestnuts from the Fire,’ in The Complete Writings of Alfred
143 de Musset, ‘Chestnuts from the Fire,’ op. cit., p. 167
144 Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Dream of Hannibal”’, op. cit., p. 150. The allusion to Hannibal’s stained
shirt comes as part of the tirade given him by his ‘father’ in his ‘dream’ thus ‘Alas, your new
doublet is all stained with sauce / and with the Madeira wine and with rum! It’s awful!’:
which point they switch coats and disguise themselves as each other.\textsuperscript{145} Aside from these ‘parallels in language’, a further link is found between the Abbé and Cézanne, thereby conflating the author of the poem with its main character:

The Abbé in acting must break his vow of chastity, just as Cézanne must disregard his father’s wish or command. […] Cézanne thus identifies himself with [de Musset’s] Hannibal—a scoundrel who murders his friend in order to possess his mistress. But this friend […] is like his own father—a commanding figure whose wealth and amorous success are conspicuous.\textsuperscript{146}

Thus we come full circle, this reasoning leading Reff to offer the above-quoted suggestion regarding Cézanne’s poem encoding, albeit perhaps unconsciously, a desire to kill his father. In turn, this aporetic ambivalence, these themes of temptation and sin, are then seen by Reff as carried through, as a thematic continuum of underpinning authentic emotive content, into certain of Cézanne’s later paintings, in particular [R 167] \textit{La Tentation de saint Antoine} (c.1870) and his various depictions of debaucheries, for instance [R 128] \textit{Le Festin (L’Orgie)} (c.1867 or later).\textsuperscript{147}

However, what Reff’s characterization, along with those of Schapiro and Lindsay, seems to elide is what might be an oddly fundamental aspect of Cézanne’s poem. That is, the ‘dream’ Hannibal has—his being rebuked by the ghost of his father—might, in fact, not be a dream at all, but a trick played by one of his men who has dressed up as his father, a ‘trick’ perhaps obliquely echoing the disguises donned by the characters in de Musset’s play quoted above.\textsuperscript{148}

\textsuperscript{145} Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Dream of Hannibal”,’ op. cit., p. 150. ‘Raphael: The Abbé is asleep. He calmly lies / Beneath the table like the devil in his cups. / [...] / Hey Abbé! On my soul, / He snores like mad. / The Abbé: Pardon me madam; / Was I asleep? / Raphael: Hey! Do you wish to have Carmago, friend / You know she is a beauty. / The Abbé (rising): Body and head! / [...] Raphael: To represent me, you must take my coat’: de Musset, ‘Chestnuts from the Fire,’ op. cit., pp. 146–147.

\textsuperscript{146} Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Dream of Hannibal”,’ op. cit., pp. 150–151.

\textsuperscript{147} Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Dream of Hannibal”,’ op. cit., pp. 150–151. [R 167] \textit{La Tentation de saint Antoine} (c.1870) (o/c (57 x 76), PC), [R 128] \textit{Le Festin (L’Orgie)} (c.1867 or later) (o/c (130 x 81), PC).

\textsuperscript{148} Note that running against this is the presence, elided from the section quoted describing the disguising of the eldest of the troop, of the lines ‘Four large white steeds hitched to his chariot / Drew it along […]’: Cézanne, ‘Songe d’Annibal’, op. cit., I. 40, p. 30. Reff does not the parallelism of the motif of disguising in de Musset’s play and Cézanne’s poem, perhaps
But Hannibal slept on.—The eldest of the troop,
Dressed as Hamilcar, looked the part to perfection.—
His hair stood on end, his nose jutted out,
He had an extraordinary thick moustache,
Added to a huge scar on his cheek
That gave his face a shapeless look,
In short, gentlemen, the very portrait of Hamilcar.

[...]
[...] he seizes Hannibal by the ear
And gives him a good shake: Hannibal awakens
Already enraged... But calms down
When he sees Hamilcar [...].

That Hannibal is actually awake when being chastised by his ‘father’—in reality the eldest of his troop disguised as such—is further emphasised in the poem’s penultimate couplet, when, following the chastisement: ‘At these words Hannibal, resting his head
/ On his couch, fell back again into a deep sleep.’ The ‘dream’ might thus be but a performance taken only to be a vision from the point of view of Hannibal, and, importantly, by virtue only of his drunkenness.

because it points directly at the possibly deliberately parodic intention of the ‘dream’ Hannibal has.

150 ibid., ll. 65–66, p. 31. Translation modified slightly.
151 Wayne Andersen and Nina Maria Athanassoglou-Kallmyer take exactly this view, but form different conclusions regarding its meaning, Athanassoglou-Kallmyer deeming it, as is suggested here, ‘sheer parody [...] [in which] the poem is less concerned with Hannibal or Hamilcar than with the wasted wine of Hannibal’s debauch’: Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., p. 57. On Wayne Andersen’s part, he sees the poem still encoding personal content, but not in terms of Cézanne’s relationship with his father but, instead, with Zola. Hence, he suggests a previous letter of Zola’s, since lost, contained some rebuke for Cézanne’s laxity in writing, and, as such, ‘The poem is less Hannibal dreaming than of Cézanne talking to Zola: “Could it be that Hannibal lost his head so completely that he could forget you totally? / Could be, Zola, have committed such a horror?”’ The “horror” was Cézanne’s neglect of their correspondence, and that is what he expresses guilt for, saying “Excuse me, excuse me. Yes I’m guilty”; Andersen, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 83. Hence, the letter written by Cézanne on the 17 and containing the Hannibal poem is, thereby, in toto an apology for his neglect in writing, the poem a mere continuance of the apology which began the letter, although not, as Andersen seems to imply, which began the poem; ‘Theodore Reff, following Schapiro’s lead, goes on to say that the central of the poem is the adolescent Cézanne’s remorse about masturbation and fear of discovery—that almost the entire first stanza [‘Excuse me, excuse me. Yes I’m guilty] can be read as a metaphor for onanism’: Andersen, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 79. However, the ‘Excuse me, excuse me. Yes I’m
As such, the poem seems to satirize the entire notion of the classical dream-narrative structure it parodies. In turn, whether consciously or not, a kind of vertiginous mise en abyme is induced, the poem’s multiple possible allusions leading on to multiple possible referents. For instance, if deemed a citing of Cicero’s ‘Dream of Scipio’, Cézanne’s poem could be seen as a burlesque of a dream vision recounted by a character based on a historical figure in which that remembered vision is an answer to a question posed in a dialogue written by the author portraying himself in which the character relating that dream positions its introduction in terms of previous classical dream-narratives such as that articulated in Ennius’ Annales. In short, and whether accidentally or not, Cézanne manages to evoke, perfectly, the fevered infinite regress often inherently implicit in the citatory act. Thereby, as with the mirliton discussed at the beginning of this chapter, and with most, it seems, of his posted images and many of his poems, Cézanne seems to maintain a constant and almost insistent reflection on the structures through which a fiction is being presented. The curtain and the hand upon it, drawing it back, are as much of interest as any scene revealed beyond.

---

guilty,’ Andersen inserts between square brackets within this sentence, presumably as an example of that first stanza, is not in fact from the poem at all, but from the beginning of the letter. Reff’s commentary concerning the possibility of references dealing with onanistic guilt is explicitly confined to the poem, and does not include this prefatory apology as part of its argument: Cézanne, letter to Zola, 17 November 1858, op. cit., p. 26; Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Dream of Hannibal”’, op. cit., p. 149. In any case, the quotes Andersen uses from the poem to support his argument, cited near the beginning of this footnote, are themselves rearranged and slightly altered even from the translation of the poem provided by Andersen earlier in his analysis, which was: ‘Could he, Zola, have committed such a horror, / Without Jupin avenging this awful foulness? / Could it be that Hannibal lost his head so completely / That he could forget you totally, / O rum! [...]’; Paul Cézanne, ‘Songe d’Annibal: Annibalis somnium,’ in a letter to Émile Zola, 17 November 1858, cited and translated in Andersen, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 81. That is, Andersen’s editing seems to skew Cézanne’s poem towards the content he interprets it as conveying, not only reordering the line containing Zola’s name, but also excising the plea to Jupiter and, more importantly, the final ‘O rum?’, which makes perfectly clear Cézanne’s narrator is rebuking the hero not for ‘forgetting’ Zola, but, rather and far more sensibly, for spilling rum in his drunkenness. Andersen also uses an exclamation mark after the ‘O rum’ rather than the question mark occurring in both Letters transcriptions and the version printed in Reff’s article: Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Dream of Hannibal”’, op. cit., p. 152; Andersen, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 81; Rewald, Letters, op. cit., p. 35; Rewald, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., pp. 29, 30. By way of comparison, here is the translation given of the equivalent sections in the 1986 revised and augmented version of Letters: ‘Say Zola, could he commit such an outrage / Without Jupiter taking revenge for such an affront? / Could Hannibal have so lost his head / That he could forget you completely, / O rum? [...]’; Paul Cézanne, ‘Songe d’Annibal: Annibalis somnium,’ in a letter to Émile Zola, 17 November 1858, cited and translated in Rewald, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 30.
Interestingly, the letter containing the ‘Songe d’Annibal’ poem makes no mention to Zola of Cézanne having enrolled at the Faculté de Droit d’Aix the day before, on the 16 November 1858. Indeed, it is not until 7 December that this negligence seems to have been rectified, and then only in the oblique form of versified allusion.

Alas I have chosen the tortuous path of Law.
— I have chosen, that’s not the word, I was forced to choose!
Law, horrible Law of twisted circumlocutions.
Will render my life miserable for three years.

For many, this quatrain epitomizes the culmination of the tension perceived to have existed between Cézanne and his father in regard to his possible future career, the line ‘I have chosen, that’s not the word, I was forced to choose!’ presumed a direct reference to the intercession of Cézanne’s father in such a decision. Again, as with

152 On this enrolment, see the beginning of section 2C.
153 Paul Cézanne, untitled poem in a letter to Émile Zola, 7 December 1858, cited and translated in Cézanne, Letters, op. cit., p. 33. This is one of the few of Cézanne’s early verses translated into English in the 1976 edition of Letters, along with those lines mentioning Hercules, discussed below. In the context of this letter as it is presented in that edition, this has the result, whether intended or not, of drawing closer together two snatches of verse originally further apart, thereby increasing a chance of perceiving a relatedness. Alternative and complete translations of both poems are provided in: Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 36–37; Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., pp. 32–35.

154 The motif of Cézanne being forced into his legal studies by his father is almost ubiquitous in Cézanne biographies; of which the following quotes are but a sample: ‘We know of a prolonged struggle with his powerful father whom he feared greatly and who destined him, as his only son, for the family bank, sending him to law school against his wishes’, ‘Complying with his father’s wishes, Cézanne [...] registered at the law school of the University of Aix’, ‘When Paul passed his final school examinations late in 1858, it was decided that he enter the venerable University of Aix [Faculté de Droit] [...] The son complied with his father’s desires. To do otherwise would have been almost unthinkable’, ‘Yielding to paternal pressure, [he] enrolled in the University of Aix to study law’, ‘His father obliges him to study law’, ‘Cézanne chose, for a time, the “virtuous” way demanded by parental authority. The demand itself was a law, and the vocation to which it led was the practice of law, a fact vented ironically by Cézanne was doubly, indeed triply, punitive since what appeared to be his choice was in fact the choice of another’, ‘Cézanne gave in to his father’s urgent demands and registered at the law school in Aix’ : Schapiro, Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 22; Rewald, Paul Cézanne: A Biography, op. cit., p.12; Rewald, ‘Cézanne and his father,’ op. cit., p. 71; Verdi, Cézanne, op. cit., p. 18; Calm, ‘Chronology,’ op. cit., p. 529; Medina, Cézanne and Modernism, op. cit., pp. 189; Ely, ‘Cézanne’s youth, op. cit., p. 34.
the 'Ciceron...' and 'Songe d'Annibal' poems, as well as the watercolour attached to the former, Cézanne is deemed to have encoded specific biographical material into his creative effusions. However, as with those instances, some unpacking of the presumptions underlying this interpretation of Cézanne's 'tortuous path of Law' quatrain, as well as other verses accompanying it in the same letter, make such characterizations, perhaps, problematic.

In terms specific to the means through which such encoding occurs, Theodore Reff, for instance, sees the quatrain as configuring Cézanne's presumed personal predicament—"the conflict between his father's insistence that he study law and his own desire to study painting"—expressly in terms of the classical allegory, attributed to Prodigos, of Hercules's choice between Virtue and Vice.155 Hercules is not mentioned in the verse, but Reff deems the allusion 'unmistakable', in part because the name Hercules is invoked at other points in the letter, Cézanne writing, in an almost prefatory section, of intending to 'learn the exploits of Master Hercules' and including a poem, the last in the letter, describing the hero asleep in a grotto.156 Although neither of these mentions, discussed further below, would seem related to Prodigos's allegory, Reff notes that Cézanne must have been composing a poem on just such a theme at precisely this time, citing Zola's appraisal of Cézanne's poetic abilities, mentioned earlier in this chapter, that began with the words 'In re-reading you letters of last year, I hit upon the little poem "Hercules", between vice and


156 loc. cit. The other mentions of Hercules are discussed immediately below.
victory.\textsuperscript{157} Hence, although the ‘tortuous path of Law’ quatrain is not deemed by Reff to be the ‘little poem’ referred to by Zola, a poem presumed, thereby, to have been lost, the theme would seem to have been on Cézanne’s mind, a presumed persistence then cited as further evidence of its personal importance.\textsuperscript{158}

In terms of the allegory itself, this concerns Hercules being approached, as an adolescent meditating upon whether to enter adulthood along the path of virtue or of vice, by two women personifying just these qualities. Each then extols, in considerable length, the benefits they proffer. In short: one offers sensual pleasures easily acquired, the other immortality, but only through toil. Hercules, although not actually described as doing so, is implied to have chosen the latter, Virtue. Mapping this onto Cézanne’s presumed personal predicament, then, Reff sees Cézanne picturing himself as the young Hercules trying to decide between these same personifications, with Virtue on his right and Vice on his left, a picturing made possible by a suggested punning on ‘le Droit/la droit’ [‘the Law/the right-hand side’] in the first line.\textsuperscript{159} By elimination, then, Vice, on the left, stands, for Reff, for the path

\textsuperscript{157} ‘En relisant tes lettres de l’année dernière, je suis tombé sur le petit poème d’“Hercule” entre le vice et la virtue’: Zola, letter to Cézanne, 1 August 1860, op. cit., p. 76. On Zola’s appraisal, see the beginning of this chapter.

\textsuperscript{158} Reff, ‘Cézanne and Hercules,’ op. cit., p. 35.

\textsuperscript{159} ‘Thus he imagines himself in these lines as the youthful Hercules at the Crossroads, where Virtue stands on his right and Vice on his left, the word Droit referring not only to the law that he must study, but to the “right” path that he must follow’: loc. cit. Note, however, that Cézanne persistently uses Droit in the masculine in his quatrain. Reff also undertakes a search for a possible pictorial source for Cézanne’s imagining, noting that none of the literary versions of the allegory available to Cézanne made mention of Virtue standing on the right, a search perhaps made redundant by his own assertion that just such an arrangement in Cézanne’s poetic allusion was predicated upon the Law/right pun. In any case, he settles upon an engraving after Carracci’s Hercules at the Crossroads, which includes all the requisite features (Virtue on the right, a tortuous path, etc.): Hercules at the Crossroads, engraving by B. del Vecchio, after a painting by Annibale Carracci (c.1596), published in Antonio Niccolini, Real Museo Borbónico, Naples: Stamperia Reale, 1824–1857, vol. 5, pl. 16; Reff, ‘Cézanne and Hercules,’ op. cit., p. 36. He also, however, suggests woodcut published in an 1844 issue of Magasin Pittoresque, a journal Cézanne’s mother, as mentioned above, was supposed once to have subscribed to: Hercule entre le Vice et la Virtue, woodcut by B. Valentin, after a painting by Gérard de Lairesse (1685), published in Magasin Pittoresque, t. 12 (February 1844), p. 49; Reff, ‘Cézanne and Hercules,’ op. cit., p. 36. The woodcut was accompanied by a translation of Xenophon’s version of the allegory; coincidentally, as Reff notes, included in the same volume of Magasin Pittoresque were two articles on the Musée d’Aix: ‘Le Choix d’Hercule,’ translated by Leclerc, Magasin Pittoresque, t. 12, (February 1844), pp. 49–50; Unattributed author, ‘Musées et collections particulières des départements: Musée d’Aix (parts one and two),’ Magasin Pittoresque, t. 12 (November, December 1844), pp. 369–370, 399–401; Reff, ‘Cézanne and Hercules,’ op. cit., p. 36.
of painting, the same sinister association with "wrong" discerned by him in Hannibal’s collapsing ‘du côté gauche’ in the ‘Songe d’Annibal’ discussed above.\textsuperscript{160}

However, this presumed conflation of painting with Vice might be a little strained. For, in the verses following the ‘tortuous path of Law’ quatrain, Cézanne invokes, in opposition to this, it seems, the ‘Muses of Helicon, Pindar, and Parnassus’, the ‘nine sisters’ from whose altar the author declares he has been torn, and whose confidence ‘he who embraces the career of Law’ will lose completely, along with that of Apollo’s.\textsuperscript{161} Usually, however, the muses stand for the various forms of poetry and Apollo for music. If a symbolic distinction is being drawn in the verses between Law and painting, therefore, it would seem one awkwardly performed.\textsuperscript{162}

Nevertheless, an opposition between painting and Cézanne’s legal studies is made in the letter, albeit later, and in the form of an abrupt interpolation inserted after a fourteen-line and mockingly self-pitying poetic tirade about the arduousness of his legal studies, when Cézanne drops suddenly out of rhyme in order to order Zola, in rather brusque terms, to:

\begin{quote}
Find out about the Académie competition, because I still intend to cleave to our decision to enter at whatever cost, providing, of course, that it costs nothing.\textsuperscript{163}
\end{quote}

Presumably, Cézanne was referring to the concours des places of the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris, and thereby, perhaps, to an intention to study painting, a

\textsuperscript{160} Cézanne, ‘Songe d’Annibal,’ op. cit., I. 29, p. 29; Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Dream of Hannibal”,’ op. cit., p. 149. Cézanne reveals through his very choice of metaphor that he considers a legal career the “right” path and an artistic career the “wrong” one, thus unconsciously accepting his father’s bourgeois attitude even while rebelling against it: Reff, ‘Cézanne and Hercules,’ op. cit., p. 37.

\textsuperscript{161} Cézanne, untitled poem in a letter to Zola, 7 December 1858, op. cit., p. 32. The poem is quoted in its entirety further below.

\textsuperscript{162} For instance: ‘The canonical nine [muses] and their names probably originated with Hesiod. [...] They were: Calliope (epic poetry), Clio (history), Euterpe (flute-playing), Terpsichore (lyric poetry and dancing, esp. choral), Erato (lyric poetry), Melpomene (tragedy), Thalia (comedy), Polyhymnia (hymns and pantomime), Urania (astronomy)’; Albert Schachter, ‘Muses,’ in Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth (eds), \textit{The Oxford Companion to Classical Civilization}, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998, pp. \textendash \textendash.

\textsuperscript{163} Cézanne, letter to Zola, 7 December 1858, op. cit., p. 33.
‘decision’ made perhaps in Zola’s presence during the recent summer holidays. Regardless, in the context of the letter, it is a rather odd and fleeting mention, Cézanne immediately descends back into poetry, with two eight-line stanzas ridiculing the poet Boileau following, and then, a final one, alluded to above, describing Hercules asleep in his wooded grotto, quoted in full further below. As Wayne Andersen concludes, in terms of the brevity of this mention:

Cézanne’s request may have been but a fantasy of escape from that which he had just committed himself. [...] He even defers this fragile intention to be an artist to Zola, saying ‘the intention we had formed’. Then, as an afterthought, comes the fence-straddling coda—‘providing it doesn’t cost anything.’

In any case, if Zola did pass the results of such enquiries on to his friend, they have not survived, and no explicit mention of Cézanne’s possible entry into the Académie is made in their correspondence again.

Returning, however, to the motif of Hercules, or, at least, actual mention of his name, it is worth returning to the beginning of Cézanne’s 7 December letter and examining Hercules’s first appearance there. After a brief comment on Zola’s recent illness, Cézanne began thus:

After having hesitated for some time—for I must admit to you that this pitot didn’t suit me at first—I have actually finally decided to accept it with as little woe as possible. So I’ve begun work; but, by Jove, I do not know my mythology; however, I will settle down to learn the exploits of Master Hercules and convert them into great deeds of pitot, as best I can. I am announcing to you that my work—if it deserves to be called work

---

164 It is difficult to tell, given Cézanne’s occasional (and, for the historian, infuriating) tendency to pepper his letters with grammatical affectations, whether the ‘our’ in the quote is an instance of self-satirizing nosism. Zola had spent the summer holidays in Aix, returning to Paris by the beginning of October, where he contracted encephalitis and was feverish for weeks: Lindsay Cézanne, op. cit., p. 33; Callow, Lost Earth, op. cit., p. 37.
165 Andersen, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 72. Andersen’s translations are his own.
166 As noted above, only one of Zola’s letters to Cézanne from 1859 survives, and that from 30 December, more than a year after Cézanne’s request: Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., pp. 119–121. Only six of Cézanne’s 1859 letters survive; none of these mention the Académie either.
instead of a mess—will be long elaborated, digested and improved by me, for I have little time to devote to the adventurous tale of the Herculean Pitot. 167

In Provençal, the word pitot, repeated three times in this passage and thereby presumably of some importance, means 'young man', perhaps, according to Wayne Andersen, with connotations of rascality. 168 For Reff, the word also carried a shared meaning specific to Zola and Cézanne, citing as evidence of this Zola's reminiscence in a letter to Cézanne of 5 May 1860, in which he wrote: "You remember our swimming parties, that happy time when, unconcerned for the future, we devised together one evening the tragedy of the celebrated Pitot." 169 As such, this 'celebrated Pitot' is, for Reff, Hercules himself, a 'local hero' looming large in Cézanne and Zola's shared imagination. 170 Moreover, the ubiquity of this presence is then mapped onto, albeit through a transformation into other myths, Cézanne's later canvases such as [R 92] Le Jugement de Paris (1862-1864) (fig. 5B.27) and, again, as with his 'Songe d'Annibal' poem, [R 167] La Tentation de saint Antoine (c.1870). 171

However, what Zola's reference to this 'tragedy of the celebrated Pitot' composed with Cézanne 'one evening' might also encapsulate, especially if Andersen's inflection of pitot with specifically bawdy overtones is conflated with their already-

---

167 Cézanne, letter to Zola, 7 December 1858, op. cit., pp. 31-32.  
168 Simon-Jude Honnorat, Dictionnaire provençal-français, ou Dictionnaire de langue d'oc ancienne et moderne, suivi d'un Vocabulaire français-provençal, Digne: Repos, 1847-1848, t. 2, p. 893 (s.v. pitot); Reff, 'Cézanne and Hercules,' op. cit., p. 37; Andersen, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 68.  
169 'Tu te rappelles nos parties de nage, cette heureuse époque où, insoucieux de l'avenir, nous combinions un beau soir la tragédie du célèbre Pitot': Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, 5 May 1860, cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 161; Reff, 'Cézanne and Hercules,' op. cit., pp. 37-38. Running slightly askew of this interpretation of Zola's reference to 'Pitot' having specifically Herculean connotations is Colette Becker's, she suggesting, instead, that the 'Pitot' referred to was a staff-member at the collège Bourbon whom the students made fun of: Collette Becker, '[notes]', in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit. p. 162 n. 3.  
170 In his notion of Hercules as a Provençal youth whose great deeds he planned to narrate, Cézanne obviously expressed his own longing for freedom and adventure at a moment when he felt most constrained. But he also implies that the pitot was a familiar figure to Zola, a kind of local hero in their circle. [...] This would hardly have been surprising for young men raised in Provence in the mid-nineteenth century, since the legends of Hercules, familiar along the entire Mediterranean coast, had penetrated deeply into the folklore of that region': Reff, 'Cézanne and Hercules,' op. cit., pp. 37, 38.  
171 Reff, 'Cézanne and Hercules,' op. cit., pp. 35, 38-41. On [R 92] Le Jugement de Paris (1862-1864) (fig. 5B.27) see section 5B. On [R 167] La Tentation de saint Antoine (c.1870) (fig. 6C.20) see section 6C.
noted habit of singing snatches of naughty songs, is simply their shared propensity for burlesque. That is, it is not hard to interpret Cézanne’s mention of ‘converting’ the exploits of Hercules into the ‘deeds of the pitot’ as akin to the debasing re-contextualization he’d just undertaken with his recently composed ‘Songe d’Annibal’. Both gestures might be seen to repeat, then, the innuendo-filled and smutty updating wrought upon exactly such classical tales by many of the eighteenth-century mirlitons cited above. In fact, the only of Cézanne’s surviving poems expressly mentioning Hercules, the final verse of his 7 December letter already alluded to, might be the beginnings of precisely such an endeavour.

Hercules one day slept deeply
In a wood, for the freshness was good, for truly
Had he not taken refuge in a charming grove,
And if he had exposed himself to the rage
Of the sun, which was hurling burning rays,
He might have got a frightful headache;
Thus, he was sleeping deeply. A young dryad
Passing quite close to him...

Mirroring the ironic ‘Why do you stop?’ at the end of his mirliton discussed above, Cézanne interrupted these efforts with the words ‘But I see I was on the point of uttering some stupidity, so I’ll shut up.’ Yet again, there is an odd enframing reference to a work’s creation, a refusal to let clear meaning coalesce.

What is important here is not just this sense of Cézanne’s planned poem being a specific transformation of Hercules’s exploits in terms of this term pitot, but also the

172 In mind particularly are ‘Le Jugement de Pâris’ and ‘Le Exploits de Jupiter’, which, as noted above, detailed the heroes’ various erotic misadventures, the former in terms of the explicit lengths Paris goes to judging Juno, Minerva, and Venus, the latter in terms of Jupiter’s various trysts with Alcemena, Europa, Leda, and others: ‘La Revue des mirlitons,’ ‘Les Exploits de Jupiter’ and ‘Le Jugement de Pâris,’ in Raunié, Chansonnier historique du XVIIIe siècle, op. cit., pp. 188–193, 193–195, 196–207. Take also the ‘Éloge des mirlitons’, which, as also noted above, provided eroticized retellings of historical and mythological episodes including, for instance, Antony’s love for Cleopatra, Hercules’ subservience in the house of Omphales, Orpheus’ trip to Hades, the Judgement of Paris, and Apollo’s pursuit of Daphne: ‘Éloge des mirlitons,’ in ibid., pp. 183–186, 186–188.
174 Cézanne, letter to Zola, 7 December 1858, op. cit., p. 35.
possibility that the undertaking to do so was at Zola's request. For, as already noted, Cézanne's previous letter of 17 November included, in addition to the above-discussed 'Songe d'Annibal', a request that Zola provide a title for a 'longissime poem' Cézanne was intending to write. Given this, as well as their proclivity for providing each other with puzzles, bouts-rimés, and mirlitons, it seems entirely possible that in the period between Cézanne's letters Zola had complied, providing a title—for instance 'The Herculean Pitot'—that then might have inspired the theme for the planned, and perhaps never completed, longissime work. Indeed, certain of Cézanne's remarks in the pitot section seem to make more sense in the light of this context, for instance:

After having hesitated for some time—for I must admit to you that this pitot didn't suit me at first—I have actually finally decided to accept it with as little woe as possible. So I've begun work.

Such an interpretation might then inflect how the poems following the pitot passage, beginning with the 'the tortuous path of Law' quatrain, might then, in turn, be interpreted. For, after that quatrain Cézanne continued, albeit in slightly different verse-form:

Muses of Helicon, Pindar and Parnassus,
Come, I beg you, to assuage my disgrace.
Have pity on me, an unhappy mortal,
Torn from your altar despite himself.
The arid problems of the Mathematician,
With his pale, creased forehead and pallid lips,
White as the shroud of some grimy ghost,
Appear frightful to you, nine sisters, I know!
But he who embraces the career of Law

175 Cézanne, letter to Zola, 17 November 1858, in Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 27.
176 As noted above, none of Zola's 1858 replies to Cézanne survive, with the single exception of a letter dated 14 June 1858: Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 97.
177 Cézanne, letter to Zola, 7 December 1858, op. cit., p. 31. Wayne Andersen interprets these words entirely differently, seeing Cézanne as using the word 'pitot' to refer to himself adopting the role of a hard-working law student: Andersen, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., pp. 68–69.
178 The 'the tortuous path of Law' is in the rhyme-form {ABAB}, while the next ten lines, separated in the Letters from the previous quatrain by a space presumably referring to a similar break in the letter, are in the form {AABB}. There is another break and the final four lines, likewise in the form {AABB}.
Loses the trust of you and Apollo completely.

Do not look cast upon me too contemptuous an eye,
For I was, alas, less guilty than unfortunate.

Heed my plea, pardon my disgrace,
And I shall pay homage to you throughout eternity. 179

Now, although the author here is ostensibly pleading with the muses of poetry not to abandon him for his embracing a career in law, he might also, however, be jokingly and with mocking self-pity apologizing to Zola for his inability to complete the task set him, mostly by virtue of commitments to study. Such possible sentiments seem confirmed by the lines in the letter following the verses ‘Upon hearing—no, reading—such insipid lines, you might say that the Muse of Poetry has removed herself from my presence. Alas that’s what this miserable Law does.’ 180 There then followed the before-mentioned tirade regarding Cézanne’s legal studies.

Oh Law, who bore thee, what twisted brain
Created for my discomfort, the misshapen Digest?
And that incongruous Code, can it not remain
Unknown in France for another century more?
What strange fury, what triviality and what
Folly troubled your trembling brain
O wretched Justinian, instigator of the Pandects,
And impudent editor of the Corpus juris. 181

If there is a choice between Vice and Virtue being evoked in Cézanne’s letter, then, it might as much be configured in terms of the conflict between the pleasures of contriving drunken poetic burlesques on classical texts and the boring monotony of legal studies. Moreover, it is possible it was not Cézanne who struck upon Hercules as a possible theme for his own poetry, particularly in relation to the allegory of

179 Cézanne, untitled poem in a letter to Zola, 7 December 1858, op. cit., p. 32. Translation modified slightly. The first quatrain is in the rhyme form ABAB, while the next fourteen lines, separated in the Letters from the previous quatrain by a space presumably referring to a similar break in the letter, in the form AABB.
180 Cézanne, letter to Zola, 7 December 1858, op. cit., p. 33.
181 Paul Cézanne, untitled poem in a letter to Zola, 7 December 1858, op. cit., p. 33.
choice, but Zola. 182 For, the only surviving mention of 'Hercules between Vice and Virtue' was, as noted above, Zola's, the poem by Cézanne to which it refers missing. 183 Hence, once more Cézanne has managed, through half-evoked motifs but never-quite-resolved allusions, to provoke a plethora of possible interpretive readings. His burlesquing could be seen as simply that, or as a concealed encoding of deeply serious biographical content. Stable and consistent meanings seem, however, constantly elided, displaced by ellipses and interruptions and swivellings between purported expression and wry enframing comments upon that expression. As such, the entire notion of Cézanne's 'insistent use of the myth of Hercules' in his early years as some kind of persistent content, for instance, might merely be interpretive over-coding. 184 This 'insistence' and the presumptions often determined implicit in it in regard to Cézanne's father, who quickly disappears when any of the poems are examined closely, is perhaps more a construct of the body of interpretive effort springing from Cézanne's poetry, than a quality of that work itself. In short, Cézanne can seem to say more by saying nothing or everything (the ellipses, the missing poems, the contradictory citations, the constant presentation of ambivalence) than by saying anything sensible.

---

182 Interestingly, Wayne Andersen does not pursue this particular line of argument, which would seem to suit perfectly his general thesis that much of the purported tensions between Cézanne and his father were provoked, if not concocted, by Zola’s more selfish desire to have Cézanne move to Paris; that is, in proposing Cézanne produce a poem on Hercules and then later reminding him of the choice of Hercules, Zola might be seen as goading Cézanne closer to action.

183 Both Collette Becker and Wayne Andersen suggest the poem beginning 'Hercules one day slept deeply' are the lines referred to by Zola with his 'little poem on Hercules between Vice and Virtue' comment: Zola, letter to Cézanne, 1 August 1860, op. cit., p. 76; Becker, '[Notes],' in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 220 n. 1; Andersen, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., pp. 70–72.

184 The characterization is Joyce Medina’s: Medina, Cézanne and Modernism, op. cit., p. 179. Cézanne’s link to Hercules might also be subtly reinforced by Adrien Chappuis’s description of a [Ch 34(b)] (detail) Head (1858–1859) (pencil on sketchbook page (23 x 15), Musée du Louvre, Paris) as resembling Hercules 'with a lion-muzzle head-dress': Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 61. However, what the man wears in the drawing appears to resemble less a lion head-dress than a distinctively human-faced mask pushed up the head, similar in many ways to a depiction of the Aix fête Dieu in Gaspard Grégoire’s Explication des cérémonies de la fête-Dieu d'Aix. For a reproduction of this illustration, see: Lewis, Cézanne’s Early Imagery, op. cit., fig. 9, p. 32.
On 17 January 1859, just over a week after his registering for his second trimester of study at the Aix Faculté de Droit and two days before his twentieth birthday, Cézanne began a letter which would include on its pages one of the most discussed images he ever sent to Zola, [Ch 37] Symbolic Drawing Inscribed 'La Mort règne en ces lieux' (1859) (fig. 2.3). As with his watercolour Cicéron foudroyant Catilina (fig. 2.2) and his poem 'Songe d'Annibal: Annabilis somnium', much of this discussion has centred, again, on its possible referencing of Cézanne’s relationship with his father, and, in particular, the increasing strain presumed resulting from a conflict regarding Cézanne’s preferred choice of career. Moreover, like those works, the drawing and its attached dialogue might be seen as having conflated several citatory acts in their production, a gesture that might enable precisely the convoluted acts of interpretation they later provoked. Cézanne’s image might not, thereby, simply pastiche various affective images, but also, perhaps, their associated affective content, thereby allowing multiple, and often ambivalent, readings.

In terms of the picture (fig. 2.3), what appears to be a scene of cannibalism is depicted. Set rather unnervingly in an austere and domestic-looking setting, five figures are shown sitting in a room around a table in the centre of which is a jawless human head, lying on a platter. In the doorway, and apparently unobserved by those around the table, are two bearded men wearing long coats and tall hats, one gesturing into the room as if explaining, or at least showing, the scene to the other. Above them, a

---

cartouche bears the slogan 'La Mort règne en ces lieux [Death reigns in these premises].'

Beneath the drawing are two short versified dialogues, each placed neatly below their corresponding conversation, the first between the pair in the doorway, identified as Dante and Virgil, the second between the figures in the room, identified as a father, his three sons, and a grandson. In the doorway, Dante is asking what the people inside 'are nibbling on', to which Virgil responds, 'it's a skull'. There is an appropriate expression of disgust, and then, when Dante asks the reason for this unseemly repast, Virgil advises him to listen. Inside, the father, perhaps the figure on the far right, is inviting his family to 'Eat with relish this inhuman mortal / Who for so long made us suffer from hunger.' There is an enthusiastic 'Let's eat!', and then the eldest son, his two younger brothers, and the grandson, take turns in claiming various parts of the head: one an ear, one the nose, one an eye, and one, the last, the teeth. The father, laughing at his heirs' eagerness, advises restraint.

As with the two previous images from Cézanne's letters discussed above, Cézanne's drawing and attached dialogue is then, in turn, followed by a poem in part reflexively commenting upon the picture, again in the form of what seems to be a mock-serious acclamation of the work's affective power, perhaps again, as with his 'Ciceron...'

---

186 Kurt Badt remarks that the pointed hats might be interpreted in Jungian terms, as symbols of creative power; Wayne Andersen and Nina Maria Athanassoglou-Kallmyer suggest they are specifically, and deliberately, Provençal: Badt, The Art of Cézanne, op. cit., p. 128 n. 12; Andersen, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 85; Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., p. 57. They might also, however, simply be the 'conical hats [...] characteristic of the bandits of the Roman Campagna, a fashionable subject at that time,' described by Adrien Chappuis as included in another drawing of this time, [Ch 45] Five Men Around a Tree (c.1859) (pencil on sketchbook page (23.3 x 15), Musée du Louvre, Paris): Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 63. See also, [R 18] Cavalier et berger dans un paysage montagneux (c.1860) (fig. 3D.27), which seems to include depictions of campagne romaine figures wearing similar hats; the painting is discussed in section 3D.


189 'Mangez à belles dents ce mortel inhumain! Qui nous a si longtemps fait souffrir de faim.': loc. cit.


191 'Hé-hé, si vous mangez d'une façon pareille! Que nous restera-t-il pour demain, mes enfants!': loc. cit.
In any case, the presence of Dante and Virgil, the cartouche above their head, the skull on the table, and the references to cannibalism have all led to the presumption that the image bears direct relation to the so-called Ugolino episode of Cantos 32 and 33 of Dante's *Inferno*, where the story of the death by starvation of Count Ugolino, two of his sons, and two grandsons, at the hands of his Archbishop Ruggieri is told.\(^{193}\)

Occurring as the narrator, Dante, is taken by Virgil across the ninth and final circle of Hell, where those sinners guilty of betrayal are punished by being frozen in the ice of

---

\(^{192}\) 'My friend, my fixed intention was to make your heart quake / To fill it with an immense and atrocious horror / At the monstrous vision of this horrible tragedy / So well designed to move the hardest of hearts. / I thought that your heart, touched at witnessing such evils / Might cry out: What a marvellous picture this is! / I thought, what a great cry of horror, from your breast / Might leap, upon seeing what can only be conceived / By Hell, where the sinner, expired unrepentant, / Suffers terribly through all eternity': Paul Cézanne, letter to Émile Zola, 17 January 1859, cited and translated in *Cézanne, Letters*, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 42. Translation slightly modified. Compare this with the already-quoted passage of Lord Catheart's published in *L'Artiste*, 'I do not think that there is a picture in the world with the same force of expression; it is impossible to look at it for an instant without being seized with a horror that even the poet [Dante] couldn't excite, and I admit to you that it is not without emotion that I describe it': Lord Catheart, *[Letter to Etienne Falconet]*, op. cit., p. 84.

\(^{193}\) Dante Alighieri, *Inferno*, translated, annotated, and introduced by Steve Ellis, London: Vintage Books, 2007 [London: Chatto and Windus, 1994], canto 32, ll. 124–138 and canto 33, ll. 1–90, pp. 196–90. The inscription in the cartouche "La Mort règne en ces lieux" is perhaps a paraphrase of the words described by Dante as carved upon the gates of Hell 'THROUGH ME TO THE CITY OF PAIN, / THROUGH ME TO THE ETERNAL AGONY,' /.../ SHEL ALL HOPE YOU WHO ENTER': Dante, *Inferno*, op. cit., canto 3, ll. 1–2, p. 13. Wayne Andersen asserts incorrectly that the inscription is from canto 32 and is above a gate to the ninth circle: Andersen, *Cézanne and Zola*, op. cit., p. 85. In terms of the so-called Ugolino episode, Dante drew his tale, like many in the *Inferno*, from Italian history, paraphrasing the fate of the thirteenth-century Ghibelline nobleman Ugolino di Guello della Gherardesca, who, after betraying his own party and helping secure Pisa for the Guelphs in 1275, had gained control of the city for himself in 1284. In 1288, he was then himself betrayed by his former ally Archbishop Ruggieri degli Ubaldi, who led a Ghibelline uprising that not only deposed Ugolino, but also led to his imprisonment, along with two of his sons and two of his grandsons, in the infamous Torre dei Gualandi (the 'hunger-tower'), where he died a year later: Frances A. Yates, 'Transformations of Dante's Ugolino,' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, vol. 14, no. 1/2 (1951), p. 92; Ellis, 'notes,' in Dante, *Inferno*, op. cit., pp. 197 n. 13, 200 n. 86. Some accounts describe the two younger relatives as nephews. Those Cézanne scholars making a connection between Dante's Ugolino episode and *[Ch 37]* *Symbolic Drawing Inscribed ‘La Mort règne en ces lieux’* (1859) (fig. 2.3) include: Badt, *The Art of Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 99; Schapiro, "The apples of Cézanne," op. cit., p. 29; Lindsay, *Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 42; Reff, "Cézanne's ‘Cardplayers’ and their sources," op. cit., p. 114; Reff, 'Cézanne: The severed head and the skull,' op. cit., p. 85; Medina, *Cézanne and Modernism*, op. cit., p. 171; Steven Platman, *Cézanne: The Self-Portraits*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001, p. 186; Athanasoglou-Kallmyer, *Cézanne in Provence*, op. cit., p. 57; Andersen, *Cézanne and Zola*, op. cit., p. 85.
Lake Cocytus, the scene, one of the most popular in the book, occurs when they come across two figures thrust in the same ice-hole, the upper gnawing compulsively at the lower. When Dante, horrified, asks what anguish might have motivated this cannibalism, the upper head pauses long enough from his ‘grisly snack’ to tell his tale, identifying himself as Count Ugolino and the head he chews on as that of his enemy Archbishop Ruggieri. As such, he then relates how, on earth above, after having been imprisoned by Ruggieri in a tower with his two sons and two grandsons, he wakes one morning to hear the door to his prison tower being nailed shut. Over the next week, allegorically reversing the seven days of creation, Ugolino then watches his heirs die, one by one, until, blind with hunger and grief, he too succumbs.

The pathos and drama of this tale in Dante’s poem underpinned a veritable forver for Ugolino-inspired prison imagery in nineteenth-century France, itself an off-shoot of an

\[194\] Specifically, the episode occurs in the Antenora, the second region of Lake Cocytus and reserved for those guilty of sins of political betrayal. The first region, Caina, named after the biblical Cain, was reserved for those guilty of betraying their own family, the third Ptolomae, perhaps named after Ptolemy, for those guilty of betrayal to guests, and the fourth, Judecca, named after Judas the Iscariot, to those guilty of betrayal lords and benefactors: Dante, *Inferno*, op. cit., canto 32, ll. 22–60, 88, 126–127, 129, pp. 192–193, 194, 196.

\[195\] ibid., canto 33, ll. 1, 13–14, p. 197. Famously, Dante has Ugolino open his tale with a paraphrase of the words Virgil’s Aeneas began his own tale of the downfall of Troy in the *Aeneid*, already mentioned above in regard to Cézanne’s use of infandum in his ‘Songe d’Annibal’, ‘... You want me to renew / the hideous grief that wounds me / even in memory, before I speak’: ibid., canto 33, ll. 4–6, p. 197; Robert Hollander, “*Inferno* XXXIII, 37–74 ‘Ugolino’s importunity,’ *Speculum*, vol. 59, no. 3 (July 1984), p. 550; Steve Ellis, ‘*notes,*’ op. cit., p. 197 n. 4. In referencing Aeneas’ words, as he had likewise done in the Paolo and Francesca episode from canto 5 (‘But if you’re keen to know them, / these first rootings of our love, / I’ll talk even while I’m in tears’), a scene conceived by many nineteenth-century artists as a virtual pendant to the Ugolino episode, Dante, by so presenting his sinners in a tragic light, evokes exactly those emotive themes surrounding the clash of duty, fate, and freedom so beloved of Romanticism: Dante, *Inferno*, op. cit., canto 5, ll. 124–126, p. 32; Robert Hollander, *Allegory in Dante’s ‘Commedia’,* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969, pp. 108–111; Hollander, ‘Ugolino’s importunity,’ op. cit., p. 550. On Dante and French Romanticism, see: Michael Pitwood, *Dante and the French Romantics*, Geneva: Droz, 1985; James H. Rubin, ‘Delacroix’s “Dante and Virgil” as a Romantic manifesto: Politics and theory in the early 1820s,’ *Art Journal*, vol. 52, no. 2 (summer 1993), pp. 48–58.

\[196\] ibid., canto 33, ll. 49–75, pp. 199–200. The specificity of Ugolino’s punishment in Lake Cocytus is thereby a graphic symbolization not only of his sin, the betrayal of affiliated causes through insatiable greed, but also his retribution—recompense, as it were, for the unnecessarily cruel murder by starvation of his ‘innocent’ ‘lads’ at the hands of their father’s betrayer. The final line of Ugolino’s tale, “then hunger was stronger than grief”, has sometimes been interpreted as Ugolino succumbing to cannibalism; on this, see, for instance: Ronald B. Herzman, ‘Cannibalism and communion in *Inferno* XXXIII,’ *Dante Studies, with the Annual Report of the Dante Society*, vol. 98 (1980), pp. 53–78; Robert Hollander, ‘Ugolino’s supposed cannibalism: A bibliographical note,’ *Quadernid Italianistica*, vol. 1, no. 1 (1985), pp. 64–81.
earlier English fascination sparked by Jonathon Richardson’s 1719 blank verse translation of parts of Dante’s story in his Discourse on the Dignity, Certainty, Pleasure and Advantage of the Science of a Connoisseur. Richardson’s discussion inspired not only a variety of English literary transformations of the Ugolino scene, but also, through his call for a painterly interpretation of the theme, Sir Joshua Reynolds’s Count Ugolino and his Children in the Dungeon, which was exhibited by the Royal Academy in 1773. Disseminations of engravings of Reynolds’ painting, along with those other English works in turn inspired by it, such as the Ugolino pictures of John Flaxman, Henry Fuseli, and William Blake then seem to have been responsible for the subsequent French fashion for painted versions of the theme, a general trend for prison-cell imagery only exacerbated by the publication Byron’s popular ‘The Prisoner of Chillon’, a rhymed monologue itself conceived as a modernisation of Ugolino’s tale.


199 Joshua Reynolds, Count Ugolino and his Children in the Dungeon (c.1773) (o/c (125.7 x 176.5), Knole, Kent). When the painting was first exhibited it was titled Count Hugolino and his Children in the Dungeon: Yates, ‘Transformations of Dante’s Ugolino,’ op. cit., p. 106. On Reynolds’ inspiration for the painting, see: Charles Robert Leslie and Tom Taylor, Life and Times of Sir Joshua Reynolds: With Notices of some of his Contemporaries [sic], London: John Murray, 1865, vol. 1, pp. 9–12, 353. For accounts of eighteenth-century English literary responses to Dante’s poem after Richardson, see: Yates, ‘Transformations of Dante’s Ugolino,’ op. cit., pp. 93–95; Paget Jackson Toynbee, Britain’s Tribute to Dante in literature and Art: A Chronological Record of 540 Years (c.1380–1920), London: Oxford University Press, 1921, pp. 22–38. For a concise account of general European artistic responses to Dante from the eighteenth century on, see: W. P. Friederich, ‘Dante through the centuries,’ Comparative Literature, vol. 1, no. 1 (winter 1949), pp. 46–47, 50–54.

200 Yates, ‘Transformations of Dante’s Ugolino,’ op. cit., pp. 114–115. John Flaxman, Invenzioni di Giovanni Flaxman sulla Divina Commedia di Dantis Alighieri: Inferno, Purgatorio, Paradiso, Rome: Publicato da Beniamino del Vecchio, c.1800, engraved plates; Ugolino and his Sons Starving to Death in the Tower (1809) (engraving by Moses Highton after a lost painting by Henry Fuseli, British Museum, London); William Blake, Count Ugolino and his Sons in Prison (c.1826) (pen, tempera, and gold on panel (32.7 x 43), Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge). Blake’s painting is itself very similar to one of his much earlier images: Does thy God O Priest Take such Vengeance as This? (plate 14 from the emblem book print series For Children: The Gates of Paradise, etching, published 1793, British Museum, London). Byron’s ‘The Prisoner of Chillon’ was first published in 1816, and there were numerous French translations of his works, beginning in 1819: George Heard Hamilton, ‘Eugene Delacroix and Lord Byron,’ Gazette des Beaux-Arts, ser. 6, no. 23 (February 1943), p. 104 n. 18. On the influence of the Ugolino sections of Dante’s Inferno on Lord Byron’s Prisoner of Chillon, see: William A. Ulmer, ‘The Dantesque politics of “The
As has already been noted, Cézanne may have owned an 1840 issue of *L’Artiste* that published an engraving of Reynolds’s *Count Ugolino* painting along with a commentary on it and the quote from Lord Byron: \(^{201}\) He also, around the time of his *La mort règne en ces lieux* drawing, painted a copy after one of the numerous French paintings inspired by Byron’s ‘The Prisoner of Chillon’, Louis-Edouard Dubufe’s *Le Prisonnier de Chillon* (figs 3D.3–4), purchased for the Musée d’Aix by the French government in 1851.\(^{202}\) A decade later, he would also produce a copy after

---

\(^{201}\) *Ugolino*, engraving by M. A. Riffaut after Joshua Reynolds, published in *L’Artiste*, ser. 2, t.6, livr. 5 (1840), p. 84 bis.

\(^{202}\) On Cézanne’s copy, [R 13] *Le Prisonnier de Chillon, d’après Dubufe* (c.1860) (fig. 3D.3), see section 3D.
Eugène Delacroix’s *La Barque de Dante* (1822) (fig. 5A.1). Hence, if engaging with Ugolino imagery in ‘*La Mort règne en ces lieux*’ (fig. 2.3), Cézanne was thereby dealing with a relatively topical, yet conventional topos, one that would also, it seems, combine many of the interests usually later attributed to him: Romanticism, antique literature, and the affective power of death and mortification.

In comparing ‘*La Mort règne en ces lieux*’ (fig. 2.3) with the various manifestations of the nineteenth-century ‘Ugolino fever’ just cited, however, including even his own [R 13] *Prisonnier de Chillon* (c. 1860) (fig. 3D.4), what is immediately apparent is the novelty of Cézanne’s effort. Attempting to account for this radical difference in terms of content presumed serious by virtue precisely of that difference, has instigated much of the discussion given to the drawing and attached versified dialogue. The explication of such possible content, as well as Cézanne’s possibly serious motives for executing his drawing, begins, in many ways, with an analysis by Kurt Badt, which itself opens with an engagement with Roger Fry’s earlier remarks regarding Cézanne’s *Joueurs de cartes* paintings of the 1890s.

For, although not disputing Fry’s dual characterization of Cézanne’s later *Joueurs de cartes* paintings as ‘the only definitely genre pictures of [Cézanne’s] that exist’ and as containing figures exhibiting a peculiarly forceful ‘monumentality’, Badt nevertheless sees an inherent contradiction in this assertion. Monumentality is an affect that should not be conveyed by mere genre pictures.

203 [R 172] *La Barque de Dante, d’après Delacroix* (c.1870) (o/c (25 x 33), PC). On the suggestion of a possible 1864 execution for this painting, see section 5A.


205 Roger Fry, *Cézanne: A Study of His Development*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969, cited in Badt, *The Art of Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 90. ‘[D]o the Cardplayers gain their monumental quality—so inconsistent with their theme—from the fact they are only apparently genre pictures and that despite the insignificance of their subject they nevertheless portray
In accounting for this disjunction, Badt turns to ‘La Mort règne en ces lieux’ (fig. 2.3), which he sees not only as compositionally precursive to certain of the Joueurs de cartes series but also as having a ‘definite inner meaning’ that has been transferred through this compositional similarity to the later paintings. That is, the affective strength of those paintings is deemed a result of the self-citation of a composition itself encoding a presumed emotive content, which, via the drawing, then accounts for the ‘monumentality’ of the Joueurs de cartes series. The confessional aspect of this content, its authentic force, as it were, is deemed testified by the presence of Dante and Virgil in the doorway.

The two men who have entered Hell’s gate and become witnesses of the horrifying drama are Zola, disguised as Dante, and behind him Cézanne himself, disguised as Virgil, the well-informed person who is gesturing towards the scene. He is the guide to the spot at which his own inner vision is laid bare to his friend.

Although Badt’s assertion of formal association between ‘La Mort règne en ces lieux’ (fig. 2.3) and the later Joueurs de cartes paintings has been rejected by some scholars, few dispute the association made between the pair in the doorway and Cézanne and Zola. In a sense, this association emphasizes not only the perceived confessional something significant which is concealed behind the mask of genre?: Badt, The Art of Cézanne, op. cit., p. 92.


207 ‘Because Cézanne’s youthful drawing has a definite inner meaning, it may be supposed that The Cardplayers series of pictures has one too, a hidden meaning of the same type as the drawing which, according to Cézanne’s own words, illustrates a personal experience of great importance which deeply influenced his whole life’: loc. cit., emphasis his.


209 Theodore Reff outlines the most convincing case against Badt’s suggested formal relation in: Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Cardplayers” and their sources,’ op. cit., pp. 115–116. On the association between the Virgil/Dante pair in Cézanne’s drawing and Cézanne/Zola, see: Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., p. 40; Reff, ‘Cézanne: The severed head and the skull,’ op. cit., p. 88; Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., p. 57. Nina Athanassoglou-Kallmyer is, however, more circumspect than the others, writing ‘Dante and Virgil...[are included] perhaps as alternatives for Zola and Cézanne, their modern counterparts’: loc. cit. Wayne Andersen, as discussed below, sees no relation between the Dante/Virgil and Zola/Cézanne pairing at all, seeing instead a pair of Provençal farmers: Andersen, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 91. Steven Platzman, author of the most comprehensive account of Cézanne’s activities as a self-portraitist, likewise sees no specific relation, characterizing [Ch 37] Symbolic Drawing Inscribed ‘La Mort règne en ces lieux’ (1859) (fig. 2.3) in the more general terms of its
intent underlying the imagery, but also the sense of encoding per se; Cézanne-as-
Virgil is showing Zola-as-Dante a personal hell so terrible it can only be articulated as
code. Simultaneously, this allows for any sense of parodic enframing, in terms of both
the pictorial style through which this encoded content is delivered, as well as the
bombastic praise delivered of that picturing, to be cast as but defensive paralipsis.
Cézanne is seen to distance himself from the personal content deemed possibly
conveyed by saying this is not really that serious.210

In terms of what this encoded content might be, and thereby the motivating force
behind Cézanne production for ‘La Mort règne en ces lieux’ (fig. 2.3) in the first
place, Badt’s interpretation, given the convolutions of his analysis, is a difficult task to
put briefly, but might be summarised as follows: the ‘father’, the figure on the right, is
Cézanne himself offering his own father’s head on a tray to his family, identified by
Badt as Cézanne’s future works of art.211 What is being expressed, therefore,
according to Badt, is Cézanne’s nightmarish realization that the only means by which
he might sustain a career in painting, presuming both that Cézanne held such desires
and that Louis-Auguste opposed them, would be through the eradication of his father,
a death-wish so evil it must, therefore, occur in hell. He also, however, sees the image
and poem as a kind of positive avowal, that in conscripting these unspeakable desires
to paper, Cézanne therapeutically exorcises those wishes and, in posting it to Zola,
declares his determination to pursue an artistic career.212

Likewise, Meyer Schapiro and Jack Lindsay link the imagery of ‘La Mort règne en
ces lieux’ (fig. 2.3) to conflicts between Cézanne and his father. Hence, the former
sees it as depicting ‘an unspoken wish for the father’s death which will give the young
Cézanne the freedom and means for an independent career’, the latter, perhaps more

expressing Cézanne’s fear of death: Platzman, Cézanne: The Self-Portraits, op. cit., pp. 186-
187.
210 Take, for instance, Theodore Reff’s characterization of just this drawing: ‘his ironic
exaggerations cannot conceal his serious purpose’: Reff, ‘Cézanne: The severed
head and the skull,’ op. cit., p. 88.
211 ‘Using a common metaphor he saw his works as his descendants, he would perhaps have
called them his ‘true’ children then. He lived for them; they would bear his name; he would
212 ‘[T]hey enabled Cézanne to strengthen his own will; by sending them to his friend he was
making a vow to himself to stand by the aim he acknowledged in them, namely to concern
106.
circumspectly, sees an encoding of Cézanne’s presumed impasse between the opposing choices of careers in law and art, between what his father is perceived as dictating, and what Cézanne himself is perceived as desiring. Like Ciceron foudroyant Catilina (fig. 2.2) before it, then, ‘La Mort règne en ces lieux’ (fig. 2.3) is thus conceived as both provoked by, and an enfolding of, authentic emotive responses to specifically personal contexts. The expression of this encoding through transformational citation is conceived as a means by which Cézanne ‘increase[s] the horror’ of his own situation by presenting it in terms of a canonic version of that same complex of emotions. Similarly, Theodore Reff, although disputing Badt’s link by formal correspondence between ‘La Mort règne en ces lieux’ (fig. 2.3) and the Joueure de cartes paintings, is, nevertheless, as with Badt, Schapiro, and Lindsay, certain of an all-pervading seriousness of thematic content across Cézanne’s oeuvre that is, thereby, presumed present in the posted drawing, and, again, tied to Cézanne’s relationship with his father.

The important element in all the just-cited interpretations of Cézanne’s drawing is the severed head. By virtue of its absence in conventional descriptions or depictions of Ugolino’s imprisonment, Theodore Reff, for instance, not only deems it ‘Cézanne’s invention’, but also worthy of particular analysis in terms of its possible inspiration in sources outside Dante’s story. Hence, as with his discussion of the ‘Songe d’Annibal’ poem discussed above, Reff suggests Cézanne conflated an older archetype with the liberating impulse of a more contemporary form. In the case of the

---

213 Schapiro, ‘The apples of Cézanne,’ op. cit., p. 29; Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., p. 42.
214 Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., p. 42. Lindsay, however, sees the motif of the skull on the table—and thereby the skulls in certain of his later still-lifes—as standing not for the head of his father as it does for Badt and Schapiro, but as an ‘emblem of inner death, of total dehumanisation and surrender to the values of Louis-Auguste […] the emblem of surrender to the world, the loss of spiritual life as well as spiritual’: loc. cit.
215 ‘In failing to distinguish between a specific psychological content, which would indeed invite interpretation in terms of artistic and biographical precedents, and a pervasive psychological tone, which reflects the artist’s deeply serious personality in everything he paints, Badt ignores a distinction it is crucial to maintain if we are to understand correctly the profoundly personal content of Cézanne’s art’: Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Cardplayers”’ and their sources,’ op. cit., p.116.
216 Reff, ‘Cézanne: The severed head and the skull,’ op. cit., p. 86. Hence, Reff sees the cannibalism explicit in Cézanne’s drawing and poem as referencing the cannibalizing of his sons sometimes deemed implicit in Ugolino’s description of his imprisonment in Ruggieri’s tower, not with Ugolino’s perpetual gnawing on Ruggieri’s head in the ice hole in hell, although Cézanne’s use of the motif was ‘inspired in part by’ the vividness of Dante’s description of this: loc. cit.
Hannibal poem, the contemporary form was the ‘confessional’ impulses and motifs underpinning the versified drama of Alfred de Musset. In the case of ‘La Mort règne en ces lieux’ (fig. 2.3) and associated poem, Reff suggests it was the cathartic excesses of late eighteenth-century satirical caricature, in particular James Gillray’s A Family of Sans-Culottes Refreshing after the Fatigues of the Day, published in 1792 (fig. 2.9), which, Reff asserts, ‘must have been one of the principal sources on which Cézanne drew.’

In terms of that proposed visual source, Reff notes that Cézanne’s drawing repeats not only the centrally placed head on a platter, the cannibalism, and the number of sitters around the table, but also, in the head of the father, presumably the figure on the right, the ‘profile and tied-back hair’ of the figure similarly positioned in the Gillray print (figs 2.3, 2.9). However, the similarity between these heads extends also to certain of Cézanne’s other drawings, in particular a face, [Ch 12(b)] (detail from) Bush and Faces (1856–1857) (fig. 2.10(a)), that Adrien Chappuis, in turn, asserts was part of Cézanne’s efforts to produce his painted copy of a Félix Nicolas Frillié canvas in the Musée d’Aix (fig. 2.10(b)), discussed next chapter. A variety of Cézanne’s other drawings, however, of smokers in particular, for instance [Ch 33(d)] (detail) Man Smoking (1858–1859) (fig 3.10(b)), seem, in turn, to repeat the form of the head presumed to be Cézanne’s study after Frillié (fig. 2.10(a)). Hence, it might here be difficult to discern what is the result of homage to a particular caricature (the Gillray print) and the result of Cézanne’s general style, at this stage, as a caricaturist. In terms of the general compositional similarity between the Gillray print and Cézanne’s drawing, Reff’s observation regarding the above-discussed Cabaret Scene (fig. 1.10), and, through it, card-playing compositions in general (figs 1.20–23), being as ‘close a precedent’ for the later Joueurs de cartes series as ‘La Mort règne en ces lieux’ (fig. 2.3), in rejecting Badt’s suggestion of the latter, could itself be invoked in the case of the Gillray print. That is, ‘La Mort règne en ces lieux’ (fig. 2.3) might as much owe its general layout to the same kind of images presumed to have inspired Cabaret Scene

---

217 Reff, ‘Cézanne: The severed head and the skull,’ op. cit., p. 88. In terms of how Cézanne might have seen the cited print, Reff states this ‘is not clear’, but does note that ‘Gillray’s prints were by no means unfamiliar, reprinted several times in the first half of the 19th century, they were as widely admired in France as in his own country’: loc. cit.

218 loc. cit.

219 Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 58.
Likewise, in terms of the number of people around the table, which Reff notes is also the same as the number of people in Cézanne’s family, this might as likely be fidelity to Ugolino’s tale, which includes Ugolino’s commenting at one point: ‘I saw my own face in their four faces.’

In any case, returning to Reff’s analysis and, in particular, the older literary archetype that Gillray’s print is deemed married to in Cézanne’s genesis of the severed head motif, Reff suggests the sixteenth-century poetic exploits of El Cid, available to Cézanne through popular French translations of the work in such compendiums of medieval romances as Damas-Hinard’s 1844 *Romancero général*. In particular, Reff cites an episode in which El Cid returns home and presents his father with the head of his enemy on a plate. The father then offers his son his own place at the head of the table, saying ‘he who brings such a head should be at the head of my household.’ Reff sees a resonance, then, between the theme of ritual sacrifice and subsequent passing of patriarchal authority and Cézanne’s own troubled relationship with his father. Reff extends this motivation, and indeed much of the symbology he perceives as embedded within ‘*La Mort règne en ces lieux*’ (fig. 2.3), and, by association, Cézanne’s later paintings featuring skulls, beyond both Badt and Lindsay’s interpretation in terms of Cézanne’s battle with his father over career choices, to a deeper and hence earlier conflict of which that dispute was but a symptomatic instance. In short, and, quoting Reff himself, ‘trite though this may sound’, Cézanne was, in his early drawing, expressing an ‘Oedipal wish to eliminate his father.’ In doing so, Reff argues, Cézanne undertook a Freudian decomposition

---

220 Reff, ‘Cézanne’s “Cardplayers” and their sources,’ op. cit., p. 115.
221 Dante, *Inferno*, op. cit., canto 33, l. 57, p. 199.
224 Reff, ‘Cézanne: The severed head and the skull,’ op. cit., pp. 87-88.
225 ‘Virgil here is really Cézanne […] and Dante is Zola, to whom he is revealing a vision of great psychological significance for him. Conceived at a time of unresolved conflict with his father, who refused to support him in pursuing an artistic career and forced him instead to study law, it is a vision that can easily be interpreted as expressing in symbolic form the emotions that conflict generated in Cézanne. […] A much earlier Oedipal wish to eliminate his father, ……'
of his father into two separate components, representing, on the one hand his Godlike aspect (the giver, the provider, the authority), and, on the other, the tyrannical refuser (the ‘inhuman mortal’) who the family is about to feast upon. Hence, a precise ambivalence is mapped directly onto the head on the table, which then becomes the over-coded equivalent of this ambivalence cast forward onto all Cézanne’s subsequent portrayals of skulls.

In a similarly sophisticated analysis, Joyce Medina, who continues, in a sense, Kurt Badt’s project of relating ‘La Mort règne en ces lieux’ (fig. 2.3) to Cézanne’s later Joueurs de cartes paintings, in which she describes the former as a ‘metaphorical nucleus’ of the latter, the skull is a symbolized double-bind, again an indistinct attempt to conflate in one motif the love/hate feelings presumed intensely felt by Cézanne towards his father, and as elucidated by Badt and Reff. For Medina, this thematic underpinning of the skull motif in the early drawing fused in part with themes drawn from Dante, then reappears in the Joueurs de cartes series, conveyed not only by the repeated forms suggested by Badt but also as an ‘indistinct image’ of a skull imposed over the top of those compositions. Hence, the same kind of father, revived now and reinforced by their current conflict, seems precisely what that fantasy is ultimately about, trite though this may sound’: ibid., pp. 88, 89.

226 ibid., p. 89.


228 Medina, Cézanne and Modernism, op. cit., pp. 178–179. Medina doesn’t mention Reff’s analysis, but those elements of Badt’s analysis discussed by Medina are similar to those likewise articulated by Reff, with the important difference that Reff’s severing of Badt’s suggested relation between [Ch 3] ‘La Mort règne en ces lieux’ (1859) (fig. 2.3) and the later Les Joueurs de cartes paintings is not discussed. In terms of other possible influences on Cézanne’s drawing, in particular in regard to the inversion it seems to undertake of Dante’s tale, Medina also cites the work of Victor Hugo, and in particular his poem La Vision de Dante, in which the Dante is given a vision of the Last Judgement, which the punished in the Inferno rising up and confronting the causes of their downfall, reversing, in Medina’s words, ‘the redemptive allegory in Dante’s poem so that repentance was replaced by revenge’: Medina, Cézanne and Modernism, op. cit., p. 176. However, although Medina cites the poem as included in Hugo’s 1859 edition of La Légende des Siècles, it was not actually included until the fifth and final edition, which was published in 1883, nearly twenty-five years after Cézanne’s drawing: loc. cit; John A. Scott, ‘Dante in France,’ Richard H. Lansing (ed), The Dante Encyclopedia, New York: Garland, 2000, p. 260.

229 ‘By changing the angle of inclination of the arms, the shapes of the knees, and even the relative position of the lines of the two hats [in the culminating two-figured d’Orsay Les Joueurs de cartes (1890–1895)], Cézanne “foreshadows” the image of the skull in the cardplaying scene. [...] Through the five versions [of the Joueurs de cartes series], the poses of the arms have been altered to finally attain a strictly angled pose that forms the cheekbones of the skull. The line for the gap of the nose is created by the reflecting glint on the wine bottle, which Cézanne has been moving around in the previous two paintings to determine its ideal
cryptomorphology cited by Sidney Geist as underpinning other of Cézanne's canvases, mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, is deemed not only similarly present in Cézanne's Les Joueurs de cartes series, but also the associated meanings are perceived as constructed, before our (or, more precisely, Zola's) eyes, as it were, in the earlier posted 'La Mort règne en ces lieux' (fig. 2.3).

Now, in terms of the severed head motif in Reff's analysis, and in particular its possible inspiration in sources outside Dante's Inferno, although the decollation of John the Baptist is mentioned in passing in Reff's general overview of severed head imagery, it is not raised as a possibly defining influence by virtue of it not being as 'relevant psychologically' as the Gillray print and El Cid poem. However, in terms of visual interpretations of just this theme, and in particular the presentation of the head of John on a platter to, or by, Salomé, examples would not have been hard for Cézanne to find. The Musée d'Aix had in its collection at the time at least two versions, one by an anonymous French painter from the end of the fifteenth century (fig. 2.11) and another by a follower of Caravaggio from the beginning of the seventeenth century (fig. 2.12). Such imagery, however, although involving the placement. The gaping eye sockets are produced by two voids in space created by the V-shaped dispositions of the cardplayers' arms, which have been growing in size and textural intensity in the progression of the paintings. [...] An allusion to teeth is supported by the four rectangularly shaped knees under the table: Medinad, Cézanne and Modernism, op. cit., p. 155. For a list of Cézanne's five Joueurs de cartes paintings, see n. 204 above.

230 ibid., pp. 145–209, particularly pp. 170–179. On cryptomorphology, see section 2A.

231 Reff, 'Cézanne: The severed head and the skull,' op. cit., p. 41. 'But when Herod's birthday was kept, the daughter of Herodias [Salomé] danced before them, and pleased Herod. Whereupon he promised with an oath to give her whatsoever she would ask. And she, being before instructed of her mother, said, Give me here John Baptist's head in a charger. And the king was sorry: nevertheless for the oath's sake, and them which sat with him at meat, he commanded it to be given her. And he sent, and beheaded John in the prison. And his head was brought in a charger, and given to the damsel: and she brought it to her mother. And his disciples came, and took up the body, and buried it, and went and told Jesus': Matthew 14:6–11.

232 The anonymous Salomé présentant à Hérode la tête de Saint Jean-Baptiste (late c.15) (fig. 2.11) was acquired by the Musée in 1821, the Caravaggiesque Salomé recevant des mains du bourreau la tête de Saint Jean-Batiste (n.d.) (fig. 2.12) was acquired in 1837: Mireille Jacotin, '[Catalogue notes for] Nord de la France, Amiens: "Salomé présentant à Hérode le tête de saint Jean-Baptiste"," and '[Catalogue notes for] Suite de Le Caravage: "Salomé recevant des mains du bourreau la tête de saint Jean-Batiste"," in Denis Coutagne et al., Musée Granet: Guide des Collections, op. cit., pp. 81, 114. Another version of the same scene, Bernardo Strozzi's Salomé tenant la tête de saint Jean-Baptiste (early c17) (o/c (95.3 x 73.3), Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence), was acquired as part of the Bourguignon de Fabregoules bequest of 1860, which, as discussed below, wasn't officially acquired by the Musée until 1863, and even then, not put on public display until 1866. On the painting, see: Bruno Ely, '[Catalogue notes for] Bernardo Strozzi: "Salomé tenant la tête de saint Jean-Baptiste"," in Denis Coutagne et al., Musée...
motif of revenge upon an enemy, does not involve cannibalism. But then again, nor
does the scene from the exploits of El Cid cited by Reff.

There might, however, be an even simpler inspirational route that involves both revenge and cannibalism: Publius Papinus Statius's description of Tydeus's eating the decapitated head of his mortal enemy Menalippus, just the work upon which Dante himself based his own description of Ugolino's chewing at Ruggieri's nape. Reff mentions the Tydeus scene, as well as Dante's use of it in his Inferno, but is not convinced Cézanne would have been aware of the older poet's work, which was not included in the French secondary school curriculum at the time. As noted above, however, Cézanne did have enough awareness of the poet's name, whether in reference to Publius Papinius or his earlier namesake Caecilius, to use it in his poem accompanying the above-discussed Ciceron foufroyant Catilina (fig. 2.2). If this were the case, this would excise the combined motif of sacrifice and duty to, and subsequent replacing of, the father figure present in the El Cid poem, thereby excising also a possible relatedness to Cézanne's presumed biographical context so important to Reff's—and before him Badt and Shapiro's—readings of the imagery.

Granet: Guide des Collections, op. cit., p. 115. On the Bourguignon de Fabregoules bequest, see section 3A.  
233 'Tydeus raises himself and turns his gaze upon him, then mad with joy and anger, when he saw them drag the gasping visage, and saw his handiwork therein, he bids them cut off and hand to him his foe's fierce head, and seizing it in his left hand he gazes at it, and glows to see it still warm in life and the wrathful eyes still flickering ere they closed. Content was the wretched man, but avenging Tisiphone demands yet more. And now, her sire appeased, had Tritonia come, and was bringing immortal lustre to the unhappy hero: when lo! she sees him befouled with the shattered brains' corruption and his jaws polluted with living blood—nor can his comrades wrest it from him': Statius, Thebaid, book 8, ll. 751-762, translation by J. H. Mozley accessible at: http://www.theoi.com/Text/StatiusThebaid8.html. In introducing the scene of Ugolino and Ruggieri locked in the same ice-hole, Dante writes 'like a famished man savages bread, so the upper one chewed the other / there, where brain meets the nape. / Tydeus must have dined like this / on Menalippus's forehead, in his hate; / so the menu here, skull and so on': Dante, Inferno, op. cit., canto 32, ll. 127–132, p. 196.


235 See section 2B.
In a similar anti-biographical line, and running, as usual, against these psychological readings just summarized is Nina Athanassoglou-Kallmyer’s characterization, in which Cézanne’s drawing is seen, as with her interpretation of Cicéron foudroyant Catilina (fig. 2.2) and attached poem, as pure satirical derision: Cézanne was using ‘spoofing black humour to attack that […] pillar of humanistic education: Dante.’

Moreover and in turn, through this pillorying, Cézanne is deemed to be pedagogically redressing the literary tastes of his friend Zola, who is cited as an admirer of Dante by virtue of his quoting a line from canto five of the Inferno in one of his later letters.

The inclusion of the inscription ‘La Mort règne en ces lieux’ in the cartouche above the door in Cézanne’s drawing is, according to Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, thereby a judgement passed on the viability of Dante’s tradition: ‘for modern creators, such as Zola and Cézanne, the grand aesthetic ideal represented by Dante may be defunct.’

Virgil ‘showing’ Dante the scene is thereby configured in terms not of Cézanne showing Zola an emotively charged secret, but, instead, of Cézanne showing Zola the extinct purgatory of Dante’s tradition.

Now, although there is no reason to believe Zola didn’t admire Dante, there seems little evidence, aside from this suggested instance of satire, that Cézanne harboured any opposed negative view. Not only did the letter cited by Athanassoglou-Kallmyer as evidence of Zola’s admiration for Dante come a year later than Cézanne’s presumed slyly invoked rebuke, but also Theodore Reff, citing the same letter, suggests Zola’s interest in Dante, and in particular the Ugolino episode, might have been sparked by Cézanne in the first place.

Moreover, the affective power of

236 Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., p. 57.
237 ‘Je lis Dante et voici la phrase que j’ai trouvée dans le chant V de “L’Enfer”: “L’Armou qui ne fait grâce d’aimer à nul eire aimé, etc.’: Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, 16 January 1860, cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 130.
238 Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., p. 57.
239 In addition to the letter cited by Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Zola also invoked Dante’s name in a later letter of 5 May 1860, in which he wrote ‘On dit—je ne crois que c’est Dante—que rien n’est plus pénible qu’un souvenir heureux dans les jours de malheur’: Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 161. As Collette Becker points out, however, ‘Mais Zola peut simplement se rappeler certains vers de Musset’: Becker, ‘[notes]’ in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 162 n. 4. As illustration she cites two couplets, one from de Musset’s ‘Le Saule’, one from ‘Souvenir’: ‘Il n’est pire douleur / Qu’on souvenir heureux dans les jours de malheur’, ‘Dante, pourquoi dis-tu qu’il n’est pire misère / Qu’un souvenir heureux dans les jours de douleur?’: loc. cit. This conflation of Dante and de Musset’s reference to Dante might in itself be telling.
240 Reff, ‘Cézanne: The severed head and the skull,’ op. cit., pp. 86, 96 n. 11.
Dante’s *Inferno*, if not the poetry articulating it, must have had some particular appeal to the young painter. Not only, as mentioned above, would he later execute a copy after Delacroix’s depiction of Dante and Virgil in the ninth circle of hell, he would also describe Gustave Dore’s depiction of exactly that same scene, seen in Paris on his first trip in 1861, as ‘astounding’.241

Like Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Wayne Andersen also sees satirical intent, but configured more in terms of contemporary social rather than literary/biographical contexts. Andersen suggests Cézanne’s drawing was inspired by a political cartoon invoking Dante’s Ugolino episode in order to highlight the current economic hardships facing Provençal farmers.242 Andersen cannot cite a specific example, but presumes one must have existed, given the current economic climate. In any case, the ‘hell’ being depicted by Cézanne is thereby merely a repetition of the ‘hell’ of rural life presented in the absent cartoon.243 The entire scene is thus an inversion of the underlying premise of much of Dante’s poetic endeavour in his *Inferno*. For, in that poem hell is pictured as an infernal mirror of the material world. In Cézanne’s version, the material world is an infernal mirror of hell. Whether this was, however, a device endemic to the absent cartoon Andersen presumes Cézanne was copying from, or his own invention, is not elaborated upon.

Cézanne’s motive for including the imagery in his letter, according to Andersen, is not that satirical content *per se*, anyway, but merely the use the image might be put to in capturing Zola’s attention, before then berating him in versified form for not posting a

241 ‘G. Doré a au Salon un tableau mirobolant’: Cézanne, letter to Huot, 4 June 1861, cited and translated in Cézanne, *Letters*, revised and augmented edition, p. 157. The painting most likely referred to was Gustave Doré, *Dante et Virgile dans le 9° cercle de l’enfer* (1861), o/c (315 x 450), Musée de Brou, Bourg-en-Bresse. On this, and Cézanne’s comments, section 4A.

242 Andersen, *Cézanne and Zola*, op. cit., p. 91.

243 ibid., pp. 91–92. Andersen does offer up the same Gillray print cited by Reff (fig. 2.9) as ‘the sort of cartoon’ that Cézanne might have seen referencing the plight of the farmers; however, the comparison is clumsy, in particular the rather novel assertion that Gillray’s use of the term *sans-culottes* referred simply to ‘people without means...reduced to eating rats and ultimately to cannibalism’: Andersen, *Cézanne and Zola*, op. cit., pp. 91, 92. Such a characterisation not only misreads the political and historical context of Gillray’s caricature, but also the point of its satire, in which the cannibalism depicted references not famine, but the murderous excesses of the revolutionary *sans-culottes*. See, for instance: Albert Soboul, *The Sans-Culottes: The Popular Movement and Revolutionary Government, 1793-1794*, translated by Remy Inglis Hall, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.
letter recently. The poem in question, which followed the perhaps parodic acclamation of the inclosed image's affective power cited above, listed in ridiculous mock-pomposity, a set of hypothetical reasons that might explain Zola's delay in corresponding. In listing these various possibilities the poem also repeated many of the same motifs of body parts and eating present in the drawing and attached dialogue. Zola's brain might be have been seized by cold, his heart slowly devoured by love; there are mentions of toothaches and headaches and 'awful diseases' causing lack of appetite for even the most 'delectable dishes set before our eyes'; hangovers are described as a hit on the 'noggin'; Zola might even simply have indigestion, from eating too many bonbons on New Year's Day. Cézanne's poem is not just relentlessly silly, but seems, ironically, to deride just such poetic silliness: 'It is enough, upon my word, to abandon oneself brazenly / to nonsense: for time unceasingly trims / Our life, and our days decline [...]'. Then, like the picture to which it is appended as mock poetic enframing, Cézanne's poem ends, suddenly, in hell. ' [...] The tomb / that voracious and terribly insatiable abyss / Is gaping there always.'

For those that see important biographical content encoded in the picture, this poetic flimsy is but part of the ironic paralipsis taken as evidence both of the irrepressibility of the content deemed encoded, as well as Cézanne's fear of expressing it openly. The parodic—here, the poetic burlesquing of motifs that in the picture and attached dialogue are presumed to stand as signs of themes more sinister—is deemed a deliberate screening, an obfuscatory distraction. Leaving aside whether or not such intent did underlie Cézanne's poem, or, even, the degree to which it likewise underlay the drawing and dialogue, this layering of representational mise-en-scène in which images are nested within one another, framing one another, seems to repeat, again, the vertiginous regress already noted above in regard to, for instance, his 'Ciceron...'

---

244 Andersen, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 94.
245 'But, my friend, I observe that for twelve days / Our correspondence has ceased its course. / Is it by chance ennui consumes you / Or your brain captured by some vexing cold / Keeping you, in spite of yourself, in bed, and a cough / worrying you? [...]': Paul Cézanne, untitled poem in a letter to Zola, 17 January 1859, op. cit., p. 42. Translation modified.
246 ibid., op. cit., pp. 42-43
247 ibid., p. 43. Translation modified.
248 loc. cit.
Indeed, the motif of Virgil gesturing in the doorway, showing Dante the scene within the room, of drawing back the curtain, as it were, might emblematize precisely this regress. Dante's device of stories within stories, of dreams within those stories, is not only possibly burlesqued through this gesture, but also given an odd reflexive twist by the transformation of the scene within Cézanne's room to one closer to Statius's Menalippus scene, from which the real Dante wrought, and pasted into, his own homaged parody of the real Virgil. In turn, Virgil's showing is shown to Zola, not only in imagic form but also through the dialogue enframing it and, in turn, the mock-serious poem enframing both. In terms of the psychoanalytic interpretations discussed above, the issue is complicated even further by Cézanne's presence, not only as a parody of himself in the bombastic verse praising his picture's affective worth, but also at the edge of the picture, gesturing in, as Virgil, and then again, in the picture, as the eldest son, and then again, as the other sons, as his future works of art. This multiple presentation of possibly multiple Cézannes is not just a result of the proliferation of meaning the various citatory acts underpinning the image's production might entail, but indeed, a symbol of irony itself, of the multiple forms of author possibly perceived—the author, the character 'author', the author of the character 'author', etc.—once the spectre of parody is raised.

Finally, standing at the centre of all this reflexivity, like a black hole, is the severed head, a seemingly deliberately ambivalent and mysterious object that compresses within its indistinct form a range of disparate and possibly contradictory themes, all invoked by the various literary exteriors that the motif might be seen as transformed citations from. Hence, to co-opt elements of Joyce Medina's analysis of the affective underpinnings of Cézanne's Joueur de cartes series, the skull might be seen, through its symbolic overdetermination, not just as a result of thematic collage, but as a symbol of that collaging itself, as an affectively fertile act. Hence, like certain of

249 The phrase 'black hole' is here an oblique, and perhaps ironic, reference to Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's 'Year Zero: Faciality' chapter of A Thousand Plateau and the account given there-in of the black hole/white wall system, an abstract machine linking subjectivity and signification that might provide an interesting, or at least fecund, prism through which to discuss repeated motifs, for instance the skull, in Cézanne's œuvre: Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia, translated by Brian Massumi, London: Continuum, 2004, pp. 186-211.

250 Because this drawing is interpreted in the present study as an indistinct image or metaphorical nucleus of the visionary shifting motif of the Card Players, the image of the skull
his words in his previously discussed poems—'mirliton' in 'Poème inédit', 'Statius' in 'Ciceron...', 'somnium' in 'Songe d'Annibal', and possibly even 'pitot' in the presumably lost, or perhaps never-undertaken, 'Herculean Pitot'—the severed head in 'La Mort règne en ces lieux' (fig. 2.3) might stand ironically not only as an incarnation of the conflation of several possible citatory acts, but also as an emphatic symbol of the affective power, through the reflexive infinite regress it induces, that act might always be seen as potentially enabling. It is, in a sense, the irony of irony.

will have to be fused with other images and other emotions that are collaged in that ultimate motif': Medina, Cézanne and Modernism, op. cit., p. 179.
Chapter Three

'The Years of Crisis'

1859–1861

"The legend is stronger than history"¹

Cézanne attended all four trimesters of his first-year legal studies, passing his end-of-year exams on 28 November 1859.² He announced this success to Zola, who had just returned to Paris from Provence, in a letter dated two days later, the same cited earlier in regard to its inclusion of a versified apology for Cézanne’s delay in sending rhymes ‘ending in “if”’.³ ‘It’s because,’ he explained, but no longer in verse, ‘[...] on Friday my exam was put off until Monday the 28th, but I did pass.’⁴ He then lapsed, again, into verse:

¹ Paul Cézanne, quoted in Gasquet, Joachim Gasquet's Cézanne, op. cit., p. 183.
² The inscription dates for these were, respectively; 16 November 1858, 11 January 1859, 11 April 1859, and 7 July 1859: Extracts from Registre des inscriptions à la Faculté de Droit d’Aix-en-Provence 1858–1859, op. cit., pp. 58–59. Cézanne passed his exam by ‘deux boules rougues une noire [two red balls [against] one black]’: extracts from Registre des procès-verbaux d'examens de la Faculté de Droit d'Aix-en-Provence 1859, AD 13, Centre d'Aix-en-Provence, fonds de la Faculté de Droit, registre 17 1921, reprinted in Archives départementales des Bouches-du-Rhône, op. cit., p. 60. Bruno Ely asserts Cézanne only passed his first-year laws exams ‘on the second attempt’: Ély, ‘Cézanne’s youth,’ op. cit., p. 35. No other reference to this initial failure seems to exist, unless reference is being made to Cézanne’s mention of his exams being delayed a couple of days: Paul Cézanne, letter to Émile Zola, 30 November 1859, cited and translated in Rewald, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 52.
³ Paul Cézanne, letter to Émile Zola, 30 November 1859, cited and translated in Rewald, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 51. Zola, after having failed the oral component of his baccalauréat ès sciences on 4 August 1859, famously for not being able to recall the year of Charlemagne’s death, had come to Aix-en-Provence for the summer holidays. He then re-sat his exams, this time in Marseille, in November, but did not even make it past the written sections he had breezed through in Paris: Thomson, ‘Tableau chronologique,’ op. cit., p. 102; Becker, ‘Introduction biographique,’ op. cit., pp. 38–39.
Easy to believe
With two reds and a black
And I immediately wanted to ease your mind
Which had been in the dark as to my undecided fate.\(^5\)

Given the already much-discussed presumed context of Cézanne’s decision to enrol at the Aix Faculté de Droit, this ‘undecided fate’ might seem resonant of more than the simple passing of a first-year legal exam. As such, the period incorporating Cézanne’s first and second year of legal studies, the latter of which he dropped out of mid-way, is often characterised precisely in terms of the perceived crisis of confidence this ‘undecided fate’ entailed. Specifically, it is usually configured explicitly in terms of a presumed increasingly irreconcilable conflict between Cézanne and his father in regard to his similarly presumed heartfelt desire to abandon law and flee to Paris in pursuit of a career in painting, a plan usually deemed formed, and presented to Cézanne’s father, at the beginning of 1860.

However, as will be shown, this characterization seems reliant on the possible misdating of several letters, the consequences of which would seem not only to over-emphasize this presumed context of conflict, but also, thereby, add further credence to the doubts raised last chapter in regards to the notion that Cézanne’s posted images and poems implicitly encoded precisely this tension with his father. As a corollary, and in tandem with some of the observations made in regard to Cézanne’s *académies* and canvases of the period, some resistance will thereby be prefaced in regard to the view that Cézanne arrived in Paris in 1861 a ready-made anti-academic, an issue taken up at the beginning of next chapter.

In any case, and for the sake of maintaining a loosely chronological approach, this chapter begins not with issue of when Cézanne’s trip to Paris might first have been planned, but instead with a discussion of the possible contexts within which Cézanne’s conception of art, as a category of imagery worthy of replication, might have been formed. For, what might be seen to change in the period covered by this chapter—the years between Cézanne’s graduation from the Collège Bourbon at the end of 1858 and his arrival in Paris near the beginning of 1861—is his shift towards more concerted

\(^5\) loc. cit.
pictorial production. Not only was it during this period that he received his first, and possibly only, exposure to artistic training within an institutionalized setting, it was also when he abandoned, forever, his legal studies. It is when he is presumed to have executed his earliest surviving paintings.

As such, attention is first given to the Aix-en-Provence École de Dessin, which Cézanne enrolled in by, at the latest, the end of 1858, and which was to provide not only artistic training, but also the social arena within which he forged many of his early friendships, and, perhaps, thereby, his identity as an artist. In concert with this, brief consideration will also be given to the Musée d’Aix and its collection of art, a body of works that would have supplied Cézanne with his earliest first-hand experience of what institutionally prized art might look like.

In addition to these more conventional influences, some attempt will also be made to characterize, through an analysis of Cézanne’s apparent early and prolific activities as a copyist and, possibly, pastichist, the more nebulous and ephemeral field of imagery informing Cézanne’s artistic endeavours outside the walls of the École de Dessin. For, a gamut of sources seem referenced by the artist’s early works, much, it could be assumed, accessed through the medium of engraved reproduction, including: Dutch genre and northern landscape imagery, rococo fête champêtre scenes, vernacular religious traditions, popular romantic prints published in illustrated journals, and, even, perhaps, interior design. Aside from noting the kinds of imagery Cézanne might have sought to copy, and thereby providing some insight into the eclecticism of his taste as well as, perhaps, his artistic aspirations, some attempt will also be made to assess the kinds of procedures by which Cézanne engaged with this imagery. Hence, reference will, again, be made to the possibility of procedures of pastiche, an enactment perhaps, however, at least in terms of his smaller copies and paraphrases, yet to be informed by the degree of self-reflexive parody suggested last chapter as possibly present in his posted images and poetry of the same period. As such, a kind of disjunction between Cézanne’s literary and pictorial efforts will be highlighted, one that might, around the time of his later adoption of more radicalized painterly approaches, seem to be bridged.

Finally, after an attempt to untangle the vexed issue of when Cézanne’s initial trip to Paris was first planned, and the degree to which his father might have been resistant to
it, the Jas de Bouffan estate and, in particular, its main manor house, purchased by Cézanne’s father in 1859, will be introduced. This is a means not only of prefacing an analysis of Cézanne’s presumed first large-scale artistic efforts, a set of personifications of the seasons painted on the wall of the grand salon of that building, but also of foregrounding its later importantly central position in Cézanne’s biography. For, not only would it act as the southern pole in his life-long oscillation between Paris and Provence, the purchase of the Jas de Bouffan provided Cézanne with a surface to decorate, in the form of the walls of its ground floor salon as well as, in terms of the room enclosed by those walls, his first functioning studio.

By virtue of its initial status as mere occasional weekend or summer retreat before his family’s eventual move there in the early 1870s, the Jas de Bouffan might also be seen as giving Cézanne an early and liberating privacy, an arena within which he might concoct, or at least gesture towards, the originality he would later become so revered for. Specifically in terms of this, his murals executed in salon of that building will be briefly appraised as an ensemble, offering, as it does, through its eclecticism and disparate range of styles, an encapsulation of, and therefore useful introduction to, the artistic trajectory of Cézanne covered in the final two chapters of this thesis.

Further, through a discussion of the presumed earliest of those murals, and in particular the addition of faked signatures, the issue of parody and/or satirical intent might once again be raised, this time, however, in a specifically pictorial context. As such, some insight into the imagic mindset Cézanne took with him to Paris in 1861, that first year in a fitful decade that would find him positioned at its end, deliberately or otherwise, as an artist working entirely outside both the prescribed tenets of standard academic procedure as well as the many emergent avant-gardisms likewise reacting against that hegemony, might be gained.
3A: Musée d’Aix and the L’École de Dessin

In terms of the kinds of artistic skills Cézanne arrived with in Paris on his first trip there in 1861, and indeed, his possible attitude toward art in general, as noted above, return must first be made to the end of 1858, when Cézanne enrolled in drawing classes at the Aix-en-Provence École de Dessin, perhaps in the same month that he began his first trimester’s study at the Faculté de Droit. He would then re-register in the Novembers of the following three years, although his 1860–1861 enrolment would be interrupted by his trip to Paris.

Although it is difficult to determine the degree to which these enrolments, especially early on, might have represented determined and deliberate steps towards a career in painting, it was nevertheless at the École de Dessin that Cézanne would experience his first, and possibly only, taste of formal artistic training in an institutional setting. It also provided the social milieu from which many of the friendships of his late teens and early twenties would be drawn, the school an arena of social contact somewhat unfettered by the usual constraints of class and background normally prevalent in day-

---


7 Ely, ‘Cézanne, l’École de Dessin et le Musée d’Aix,’ op. cit., pp. 142, 144, 149–151, 161. On Cézanne’s first trip to Paris, see section 4A.

8 Ely, ‘Cézanne’s youth,’ op. cit., p. 35. Classes were free, and, according to the school’s mission statement, provided ‘instruction as required by working men, to shape their skills and taste and ensure their success, while simultaneously contributing toward progress in industry’: Report by the mayor of Aix on the administration of the drawing school, 11 February 1859, Municipal Archives, Aix-en-Provence, R 3.9., cited and translated in loc. cit.
to-day Aixois life. Many of the artists befriended by Cézanne within the walls of these drawing classes remained his friends throughout the 1860s and beyond, ex-students of the school constituting in Paris a kind of informal and rowdy fraternity, a Provençal brotherhood of would-be artists, including the likes of Phillippe Solari, Numa Coste, Jean-Baptiste Chaillan, Aimable Lombard, Auguste Truphème, and Jausseran Félicien, that Cézanne, in 1861, and then again at the end of 1862, would likewise join.

In terms of the institution itself, in the period of Cézanne’s enrolment, the École de Dessin d’Aix occupied the ground floor of the former priory of Saint Jean de Malte, the church to which it was adjoined. Purchased by the city in 1825 expressly for the purpose of housing the school, the old priory also contained the Musée d’Aix, which, although officially inaugurated only in 1838, had a history intimately entwined with the...

9 Ely, ‘Cézanne’s youth,’ op. cit., p. 35.

10 For instance, the reminiscences of Numa Coste; ‘We dreamed of the conquest of Paris, the possession of that intellectual home of the world [...] When Zola had preceded the group to Paris, he sent his first literary efforts to his old friend, Paul Cézanne, at the same time letting all of us share his hopes. We read these letters amidst the hills, in the shade of the evergreen oaks, as one reads the communiqués of a campaign that is beginning’: Numa Coste, extract from a speech delivered at the unveiling of a bust of Émile Zola by Philippe Solari, 1906, cited and translated in Rewald, Cézanne: A Biography, op. cit., p. 255. Among those who would join Zola in Paris and who had studied alongside Cézanne at the École de Dessin were Philippe Solari, Numa Coste, Jean-Baptiste Chaillan, Aimable Lombard, Auguste Truphème, and Jausseran Félicien: Rewald, Paul Cézanne: Letters, op. cit., p. 68 n. (b); Rewald, Cézanne: A Biography, op. cit., p. 22; Ely, ‘Cézanne, “École de Dessin et le Musée d’Aix,”’ op. cit., pp. 151–154, 158–162, 202 n. 51. Of these, Philippe Solari and Numa Coste would in particular retain close friendships with Cézanne up until the artist’s death; on Cézanne’s fondness for Solari, for instance, take the comments of Joachim Gasquet that ‘All his life he [Cézanne] remained bound to Solari [...] To my knowledge he was the only one of Cézanne’s friends who never experienced his fierceness and his sudden seizures of misanthropy’: Gasquet, Joachim Gasquet’s Cézanne, op. cit., p. 70. Both aspiring artists of humble backgrounds, neither Solari nor Coste would, however, achieve much success in their artistic careers, the former as a sculptor, the latter as a painter: Mack, Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 44–45; Colette Becker, ‘Notices biographiques des principaux correspondants et personnages cités dans les lettres de Zola,’ in Émile Zola, Correspondance, op. cit., t. 1, pp. 546, 556; Rewald, Cézanne: A Biography, op. cit., pp. 64, 73–74, 83, 255. Of the rest of Cézanne’s co-students in Paris, only August Truphème seems to have made a fist of his artistic career. He was awarded a bursary by the town of Aix to travel to Paris at the end of 1861, and gained admission to the Académie des Beaux-Arts there. He became a painter specialising in genre scenes, particularly sentimental ‘scholastic’ scenes such as La Dictée, now in the collection of the Musée where he began his studies; he was awarded the Légion d’Honneur in 1895: Ely, ‘Cézanne, l’École de Dessin et le Musée d’Aix,’ op. cit., p. 154.

11 The school included, along with offices for a concierge and the director of the school, a grand classe with large windows opening onto the garden, a smaller ‘beginner’s class’ at the front of the building, and two smaller rooms for geometry and sculpture classes: Ely, ‘Cézanne, l’École de Dessin et le Musée d’Aix,’ op. cit., pp. 140–142.
school by virtue of their mutual origins in the Académie des Beaux-Arts d’Aix, founded in 1765.\(^\text{12}\)

In a centre characterised by, and justly proud of, the patronage its leading citizens provided the visual arts, the relative lateness of the foundation of an official public museum in Aix-en-Provence seems surprising.\(^\text{13}\) It does, however, exemplify the extent to which the fostering of artistic culture in Aix was left mainly to the efforts of

\(^{12}\) Although established purely for the teaching of art, the Académie des Beaux-Arts d’Aix’s founding benefactor, Honoré-Armand, Duc de Villars and governor of Provence, provided not only the funds for paying the wages of the school’s first two teachers, but also the works of art from which students might copy, donations from his own collection that would form, thereby, the kernel of the later Musée d’Aix collection: Coutagne, ‘Introduction générale,’ op. cit., p. 8; Bruno Ely, ‘[Catalogue notes for] Maurice Quentin de La Tour: Portrait d’Honoré Armand, Duc de Villars,’ in Coutagne et al., Musée Granet: Guide des Collections, op. cit., p. 60; Ludmila Virassamynäken, ‘History of the museum and spirit of the collections,’ translated by Donald Pistolesi, in Denis Coutagne, et al., *The Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence*, Aix-en-Provence: Musée Granet, 2007, p. 8. Bruno Ely cites elsewhere that the school’s foundation was in 1776: Ely, ‘Cézanne, l’École de Dessin et le Musée d’Aix,’ op. cit., p. 140; Ely, ‘Cézanne’s youth,’ op. cit., p. 35. Originally under the jurisdiction of the town council, the Académie des Beaux-Arts d’Aix, along with its accompanying collection of art, was placed under the control of the École Centrale Départementale during the Revolution. Its reopening, housed in the recently confiscated Couvent des Andrettes following the dissolution of the École Centrale Départementale in 1802, was mostly due to the efforts of the Mayor François Satlier: Baille: *Les Petits Maîtres d’Aix à la Belle Époque*, op. cit., p. 31; Coutagne, ‘Introduction générale,’ op. cit., p. 8. With Aix-en-Provence passed over in favour of Marseilles in the Chaptal decree of 1 September 1800, which nominated the fifteen French Museums worthy of official recognition by the donation of paintings from the Paris Musée Central des Arts, it was left to the newly re-opened drawing school and, in particular, its new director Mathurin Clerian, to shoulder much of the responsibility for fostering whatever rudimentary beginnings of a municipal art collection existed: Coutagne, ‘Introduction générale,’ op. cit., p. 6; Coutagne, ‘D’Hier à aujourd’hui le Musée d’Aix-en-Provence,’ op. cit., p. 6; Virassamynäken, ‘History of the museum and spirit of the collections,’ op. cit., p. 7. Consisting of busts, plaster casts, drawings, and engravings, many of which had been obtained by Clerian at his personal expense, this collection remained, however, almost entirely a resource of the drawing school: Loubon et al., ‘Mathurin Clerian,’ op. cit., p. 271; Virassamynäken, ‘History of the museum and spirit of the collections,’ op. cit., p. 9. This remained the case even after the purchase by the town of a large part of the Fauris de Sainte-Vincens collection in 1821, an acquisition so large some of it had to be stored or put on display in the Hôtel de Ville. The École de Dessin was transferred from its old premises in the former Couvent des Andrettes in 1828: Ely, ‘Cézanne, l’École de dessin et le Musée d’Aix,’ op. cit., pp. 140, 142; Unattributed author, *Le Musée dans tout son éclat: Information presse*, Aix-en-Provence: Musée Granet, 2008, pp. 10, 25.

\(^{13}\) For example, from an article on the Musée published in an 1844 edition of *Magasin Pittoresque*: ‘Aucune autre ville d’une égale population, si l’on en excepte Dijon [...], n’avait réuni plus d’objets d’art, et n’a donné le jour à plus d’hommes instruits [...]. La création d’un musée dans une ville où a existé une telle émulation, semblait donc devoir être une chose aussi facile que naturelle, et il y a lieu seulement de s’étonner qu’elle ait été si tardive’: Unattributed author, ‘Musées et collections particulières des départements: Musée d’Aix [part one],’ *Magasin Pittoresque*, t. 12 (November 1844), p. 370.
private collectors and benefactors, rather than to civic or state authorities.\textsuperscript{14} This tradition of private donations that had formed the bulk of the Musée's collection prior to its official opening in 1838 would continue after that date, most notably with the bequest of François-Marius Granet following his death in 1849.\textsuperscript{15} Including most of the artist's own surviving works, Granet's donation also included a substantial cache of works by other artists, principally Dutch and Italian paintings of the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{16} Indeed, the size of the bequest was such that it required considerable extension of the Musée, funded by the cash component of Granet's donation, and an entire new wing was built, not officially opened, however, until 8 December 1861.\textsuperscript{17} Two years later, in 1863, the Musée also took possession of the enormous Bourguignon de Fabregoules bequest, a donation of nearly 900 artworks amassed by Jean-Baptiste de Bourguignon de Fabregoules and bequeathed by his son in 1860, a collection 'rife with curiosities and treasures alike' but particularly strong in seventeenth-century Dutch and Flemish genre paintings.\textsuperscript{18} Like the Granet bequest

\textsuperscript{14} Indeed, the Musée's subservience to the drawing school is borne out by the fact that the role of Musée director, first formally recognized in 1833, was simply added to the duties of the director of the École de Dessin, and that every individual filling that dual position up until 1947 was, first and foremost, a painter or sculptor; Ely, 'Cézanne, l'École de Dessin et le Musée d'Aix,' op. cit., pp. 140-141; Coutagne, 'D'Hier à aujourd'hui le Musée d'Aix-en-Provence,' op. cit., p. 6 n. 1.\textsuperscript{15} Granet had himself been a student at the École de Dessin, a student of Jean-Antoine Constantin: Unattributed author, Le Musée dans tout son éclat: Information presse, Aix-en-Provence: Musée Granet, 2008, p. 11. He later became friendly with Jean-Dominique Ingres, who painted a portrait of the Granet now part of the Musée's collection. Granet was also prominent (see n. 21 below) in acquiring Ingres's monumental Jupiter et Thétis (1811) (fig. 3E.23) for the Musée d'Aix, discussed in section 3E.\textsuperscript{16} 200 of Granet's washes and watercolours were donated to the Louvre: Coutagne, 'Introduction générale,' op. cit., p. 9. Apart from these, the Musée d'Aix received 150 of Granet's paintings and close to 2000 of his graphic works: Coutagne, 'D'Hier à aujourd'hui le Musée d'Aix-en-Provence,' op. cit., pp. 5, 8.\textsuperscript{17} Coutagne, 'Introduction générale,' op. cit., p. 9. The museum was re-named Musée Granet in honour of the artist on the centenary of his death in 1949: Unattributed author, Le Musée dans tout son éclat, op. cit., pp. 8, 25.\textsuperscript{18} Ludmila Virassamynaiken, 'History of the museum and spirit of the collections,' translated by Donald Pistolesi, in Coutagne et al., The Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence, op. cit., p. 13. The donation was made by Jean-Baptiste de Bourguignon de Fabregoules's son on 2 October 1860, but was not officially consigned to the Musée until his death in 1863. The donation included 889 artworks, 633 of which were paintings: Coutagne, 'D'Hier à aujourd'hui le Musée d'Aix-en-Provence,' pp. 8, 10, 11 n. 2. On the character of the collection, take for instance the comments of Cézanne's co-student at the École de Dessin Honoré Gibert, son of Cézanne's drawing professor Joseph-Marc Gibert, in the preface to the inventory of the bequest: 'We would range this zealous collecting enthusiast in the category of collectors who like things especially for their own sake': Honoré Gibert, cited and translated in Virassamynaiken, 'History of the museum and spirit of the collections,' op. cit., p. 13. On the strength of northern paintings in the bequest, see: Ludmila Virassamynaiken, 'Fifteenth-
before it, however, the Bourguignon de Fabregoules donation was too large for the Musée's premises, and it was not put on public display until 1866, and, even then, housed until 1876 in the nearby former chapel of the Pénitants Blancs, annexed by the Musée especially for that purpose.\(^{19}\)

The character of the Musée d’Aix’s collection, and hence perhaps the most decisive formative influence on the young Cézanne’s conception of what comprised institutionally-valued art was, hence, almost exclusively the result of the tastes of private benefactors. Indeed, prior to the additions of the Granet and Bourguignon de Fabregoules bequests, the Musée embodied, in terms of paintings, and aside from its pedagogical materials such as antique statuary and casts after these, a relatively limited, albeit eclectic, collection of works.\(^{20}\) In terms of canvases, its centre-piece, if only terms of size, was undoubtedly Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres’s \textit{Jupiter et Thétis} (1811) (fig. 3E.23), a painting that must have had some effect on the Cézanne, paraphrasing its composition in a cursory sketch, discussed below, presumed to have been executed in the first few years of his enrolment at the École de Dessin.\(^{21}\)

\(^{19}\) Coutagne, ‘Introduction générale,’ op. cit., pp. 9–10. Former École de Dessin student and friend of Cézanne, Victor Combes was for a while concierge of the Pénitants Blancs Musée annex, taking over the role from his father: Ely, ‘Cézanne, l’École de Dessin et le Musée d’Aix,’ op. cit., pp. 142, 156. The possible influence of the Bourguignon de Fabregoules bequest on Cézanne’s work is discussed in sections 5B and 6C.

\(^{20}\) The mainly pedagogical basis of the Musée’s collection is borne out by the comments of Joseph François Porte made in his 1833 walking guide to Aix-en-Provence: ‘[L]e Musée est une dependence de l’École de dessin. Il n’est guère ouvert qu’aux élèves, et on le considère comme une salle destinée à renfermer des modèles de peinture à l’usage des jeunes dessinateurs’; Joseph François Porte, Aix ancien et moderne, ou, Descriptions des édifices sacrés et profanes, etc., d’Aix, Aix-en-Provence: G. Mouret, 1833, pp. 185–186, cited in Ely, ‘Cézanne, l’École de Dessin et le Musée d’Aix,’ op. cit., p. 140. The quote is from the updated second edition of the book, which was first published in 1823, and therefore presumably refers to the Priory of Saint-Jean de Malta incarnation of the Aix École de Dessin.\(^{21}\)

\(^{21}\) Ingres’s painting was acquired on the Musée’s behalf by François-Marius Granet himself, who as Director of the Musée de Versailles organized for it to be offered in recompense for Antoine-Jean Gros’s \textit{Les Adieux de Louis XVIII quittant le Palais des Tuileries dans la nuit du 20 mars 1815}, recovered from Aix by the state in 1835: Denis Coutagne, ‘Nineteenth-century French painting,’ in Coutagne et al., \textit{The Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence}, op. cit., 103. Cézanne’s drawing based on Ingres’s painting, (Ch 50) \textit{Caricature of ‘Jupiter and Thetis’} (1858–1860) (fig. 3E.22), is discussed in section 3E.
Likewise, a similarly-monumentally-sized work by another of Jacques-Louis David’s students, the Digne-born neo-classicist Paul Duquey lard, has also been suggested as an influence on Cézanne’s earliest mural panels. Bernard also records Cézanne, standing before Mattia Preti’s seventeenth-century Le Martyre de Saint-Catherine in the last few years of his life and declaring ‘Here’s how I used to dream of painting.’

Other similarly baroque canvases from the Musée’s collection might have sparked Cézanne’s early interest, for instance the Caravagggesque Salomé recevant des mains du bourreau la tête de saint Jean-Baptiste (c.17th) (fig. 2.12), already mentioned in regard to Cézanne’s ‘Mort règne en ces lieux’ (fig. 2.3) and Giovanni Battista Piazzetta’s equally dramatic, but tonally lighter, L’Enlèvement de d’Hélène (c.1725) (fig. 6B.14), seen by some as a direct influence on his own abduction scene [R 121] L’Enlèvement (1867) (fig. 6.B9), discussed in chapter six. Likewise, the Le Nain brother’s Les Joueurs de cartes (c.17th) has sometimes been cited as inspiring, if only in a general sense, his later Joueurs de cartes series of the 1890s. Finally, there are those paintings from the Musée’s collection that Cézanne produced conventional copies after, including Félix Nicolas Frillié’s Le Baiser de la Muse (1857) and Edouard Dubufe’s Le Prisonnier de Chillon (1846), both of which he painted reasonably close versions of and which are discussed below, and a painting then

**On the possible relationship between Duqueylard’s Ossian chantant l’hymne funèbre d’une jeune fille (1800) (fig. 3E.21) and Cézanne’s mural panels [R 4–7] Les Quatre Saisons (1860–1861) (figs 3E.11–14), see section 3E.**

‘Voilà comment je rêvais de peindre autrefois’; Paul Cézanne, quoted in Émile Bernard, ‘Souvenirs sur Paul Cézanne [part two],’ Mercure de France, t. 69, no. 248 (16 October 1907), p. 616. Before being acquired by the Musée d’Aix, Preti’s painting Le Martyre de Sainte-Catherine (c17th) (o/c (363 x 244), Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence) was on display at the adjoining church of Saint Jean de Malte: Ludmila Virassamynalren, ‘Fourteenth- to eighteenth-century Italian painting,’ in Coutagne et al., The Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence, op. cit., p. 37.

The Caravagggesque Salomé recevant des mains du bourreau la tête de saint Jean-Baptiste (c17th) (fig. 2.12) was donated to the Musée d’Aix in 1837 by Rémi Gérard; the Piazzetta painting was acquired as part of the Magnan de la Roquette bequest of 1827: Jacobin, ‘Suite de Le Caravage: “Salomé recevant des mains du bourreau la tête de saint Jean-Batiste”,’ op. cit., p. 114; Bruno Ely, ‘[Catalogue notes for] Gian-Battista Piazzetta: “L’Enlèvement de d’Hélène”,’ in Coutagne et al., Musée Granet: Guide des collections, op. cit., p. 120. On Cézanne’s [Ch 37] Mort règne en ces lieux (1859) (fig. 2.3), see section 2E. On his [R 121] L’Enlèvement (1867) (fig. 6B.9), see section 6B.
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attributed to Laurent Fauchier, *Pêches sur un plat* (1600s?), which he copied the central section of and which is discussed in chapter five.²⁶

Cézanne’s engagement with the Musée d'Aix, thereby, at least in his formative years, seems consistent with that institution’s early character as but pedagogic adjunct to the activities of the École de Dessin, its collection a visual resource in front of which to practice his artistic skills. It is also a practice, this copying of art in museums, as noted already, that would be maintained throughout his career. As Cézanne himself would later write, in a letter posted to Émile Bernard in the last few years of his life: "The Louvre is a good book to consult."²⁷ Although he immediately tempered this remark with the comment ‘but it must still only be an intermediary’, it should perhaps never be forgotten that, although later identified so closely with the image of an artist steadfastly attached to drawing after nature, Cézanne would maintain a life-long and apparently natural attachment to drawing after the image.²⁸ Even when qualifying exactly what this studying after images in museums might be an intermediary for, Cézanne could not escape recourse to words explicitly referencing the imagic: ‘The real and prodigious study to undertake is the diversity of the picture that nature [presents].’²⁹

*In terms of the actual artistic training Cézanne might have received at the École de Dessin, downstairs from the Musée d’Aix, some indication is given by the categories of prizes awarded in the annual concours.*³⁰ At the time of Cézanne’s enrolment, these

---

²⁶ On Cézanne’s copies after Frillié and Dubufe, [R 9] *Le Baiser de la Muse, d’après Frillié (c.1860)* (fig. 3D.1) and [R 13] *Le Prisonnier de Chillon, d’après Dubufe (c.1860)* (fig. 3D.3) see section 3D; on his copy after the still-life formerly attributed to Laurent Fauchier, [R 22] *Pêches dans un plat* (1862–1864) (fig. 5B.1), see section 5B.

²⁷ ‘Le Louvre est un bon livre à consulter’: Paul Cézanne, letter to Émile Bernard, 12 May 1904, reprinted in Émile Bernard, ‘Souvenirs sur Paul Cézanne et lettres inédites [part two],’ *Mercure de France*, t. 69, no. 248 (16 October 1907), p. 618. Take also his comment in a letter presumed from the following year; ‘Le Louvre est le livre où nous apprenons à lire’: Paul Cézanne, letter to Émile Bernard, [1905], reprinted in ibid., p. 623.

²⁸ ‘...mais ce ne doit être encore qu’un intermédiaire’: loc. cit.

²⁹ ‘L’Étude réelle et prodigieuse à entreprendre c’est la diversité du tableau de la nature’: loc. cit.

³⁰ The concours was judged at the end of each academic year by a jury selected by the mayor and the commission de surveillance, the administrative body assisting the mayor in governing
comprised: *Étude de la figure d’après l’antique*, which involved drawing after the numerous antique statues, or plaster casts after these, in the École’s collection; *Étude de l’ornement dessiné d’après le plâtre*, drawing after a plaster cast of antique ornament; *Étude de l’ornement copié*, drawing after a copy after such ornaments, whether in drawn or engraved form; *Dessin copié (étude de la figure)*, drawn copying after a figure, usually in the form of authorized prints or drawings after master paintings; *L’étude d’après le modèle vivant*, drawn study after a life model; and *Étude d’après le modèle vivant (peintre à l’huile et de grandeur naturelle)*, painted study after a life model, either as a bust or as a full figure. The emphasis given the copying after other works suggested by this list is not, however, unexpected, given both the prevalence of this practice in current academic training and the particularly strong collection of pedagogic works the Musée d’Aix possessed, particularly in terms of antique statuary, both in original and plaster cast form, and engravings.

The earliest of the drawings attributed to Cézanne and presumed to have been executed by him at his drawing classes are precisely these kinds of exercises. Hence, [Ch 73] *Drawing from a Plaster Cast of an Antique Sacred Bust* (1858–1860) (fig. 3A.1), seems after a study cast, albeit unidentified, or, perhaps, an authorized engraving after one; and [Ch 74] *Drawing from a Plaster Cast: Female Torso* (c.1860) (fig. 3A.2), likewise, after an antique statue of Venus, or a cast of one typical of those sold by the Louvre to provincial museums. Although by no means exceptional, Cézanne’s studies are, nevertheless, reasonably competent, displaying exactly the kinds of skills and techniques promulgated in art schools all over France at this time, contours precisely defined with sharp outlines, and the illusion of three-dimensionality evoked through careful yet restrained application of shading.

---

31 Ely, ‘Cézanne, l’École de Dessin et le Musée d’Aix,’ op. cit., p. 143.
If there are deficiencies, they are perhaps most visible in Drawing from a Plaster Cast (fig. 3A.1), where the ear and jaw-line below it are given a disconcerting forward thrust by virtue of the confused indications concerning the direction of the fall of light and distortions in the outline of the head, resulting, for instance, in the placement of the ear too far, it seems, from the eye. Compared with some of the drawings after casts produced by others in the same institution, and in the case of the unattributed Visage à l'Antique (fig. 3A.3), after similar models, Cézanne's surviving efforts seem slightly awkward. Hence, in the case of the unattributed bust, although far less complete, the evocation of spatial illusion, the forward thrust of the nose, for instance, is more convincing than in Cézanne's drawing of a similar bust (fig. 3A.1). Likewise, Figure Study (after a Plaster Cast from the Antique) (1847) (fig. 3A.4) by Achille Emperaire, an older artist later to befriend Cézanne in Paris, includes a meticulous attention to the play of light on the surface, with a subsequent strong illusion of spatiality, that is lacking in both Cézanne's drawings.

Nevertheless, the conventionality and proficiency of Cézanne's approach was adequate enough for him to earn second prize in the second division of the painting section of the August 1859 concours. Although the painting awarded this honour, a 'life-size study of a head after the live model painted in oil', has since been lost, its style is presumably unlikely to have varied much from the only oil study after a live model attributed to Cézanne that does survive from this period, [R 8] Nu académique.

35 Hence, note how the shading along the jaw-line and ear contradict the shading along the cheek ridge. Interestingly, however, this confusion nevertheless, through its simplification of line and formal rhymes between them, gives the section a decorative strength in oppositional to its illusionistic contradictions. A similar treatment of the ear in relation to the eyes might also be noted in the self-portrait after a photograph discussed below in section 5C.

36 Procès verbal de la distribution des Prix du août 1859, p. 4 and Programme et formation des divisions du Concours de 1859, p. 3, both from the Archives of the Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence, cited in Ely, 'Cézanne, l'Ecole de Dessin et le Musée d'Aix,' op. cit., pp. 139, 140; photograph of certifying label, taken by Robert Ratcliffe in 1964 in Cézanne's Lauves studio, Aix-en-Provence and reproduced in Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 16 fig. 1. The label has since gone missing: ibid., p. 16. Adrien Chappuis, perhaps without knowledge of the wording on the programme of the 1859 prize ceremony suggests this award might have been for a 'coloured drawing': ibid., p. 16. Bizarrely, in a later version of his article, Ely lifts Cézanne's award from second to first place; this is surely a typographical or translation error, given the evidence of the photographed label just mentioned: Ely, 'Cézanne's youth,' op. cit., pp. 37, 330 n. 35. Joachim Gasquet, Gersile Mack, and John Rewald, in the earliest edition of his Cézanne biography, all have the prize being for drawing; Mack and Rewald giving its year of awarding 1858: Gasquet, Joachim Gasquet's Cézanne, op. cit., p. 55; Mack, Paul Cézanne, op., cit., p. 55; Rewald, Cézanne et Zola, op. cit., p. 9.
(c.1860 (?)) (fig. 3A.5). Again, this is not an undistinguished attempt: it is competently outlined, reasonably modelled, and presents the static grandeur requisite of such neo-classical poses. However, there are still deficiencies in terms of parts-to-whole relationships, an inability, it seems, to combine elements into a unified illusionistic whole; for instance, the left arm seems too long and attaches oddly to the torso, as does the left leg. Although these figural deformations might be seen to pre-empt certain hallmark elements of Cézanne's late 1860s multi-figured canvases, as might also the academic drawings discussed next chapter, they would seem the result of falling short of, rather than deliberately failing, the academic ideal. That is, they seem earnest attempts at conventional artistic success.

In terms of Cézanne's relationship with the school's director Joseph Gibert, a student of François-Marius Granet and, assuredly, a died-in-the-wool academic, there is often a presumption that this was strained. This might, however, be retrospective exaggeration. For, although on at least one occasion Cézanne let slip the disparaging description 'Gibert Pater, mauvais pictor' in a letter to Numa Coste, he could also, at times, be remarkably respectful towards his old teacher. For instance, in reporting a meeting between the two, fifteen years after Cézanne first walked into the École de Dessin and six years after the just-quoted insult, Cézanne could write of him, this time to Camille Pissarro, in reasonably respectful terms.

---

37 Procès verbal de la distribution des Prix du août 1859, op. cit., p. 4. The model for [R 8] Nu académique (c.1860 (?)) (fig. 3A.5) is purportedly a certain Bouteillon, keeper of the dam at Le Tholonet, a dam conceived by, and posthumously named after, Émile Zola's father, François Zola: Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 68.

38 Paul Cézanne, letter to Numa Coste, [end of November 1868], cited and translated in Rewald, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 128. The quote is given untranslated. It should perhaps be noted that the combination of words used by Cézanne in his description might have been chosen as much by virtue of their sound as by virtue of their meaning—a sonic concoction typical of the malicious glee in word-play discussed last chapter. It was also composed at exactly the time, 1868, that its author was indulging in his most vociferous and anti-authoritarian swagger.

39 'When I told him, for instance, that you replaced modelling by the study of tones and was trying to explain this to him by reference to nature, he closed his eyes and turned his back. But he said he understood, and we parted well satisfied with each other. He is a decent fellow who urged me to persevere, because patience is the mother of genius, etc': Paul Cézanne, letter to Camille Pissarro, June 1874, cited and translated in Cézanne, Letters, op. cit., pp. 146–147. Four years later, in a letter to Zola, Cézanne described travelling to Marseilles with his former teacher and discussing with him Zola's recently published novel L'Assommoir; although complaining of Gibert's propensity to take 'the technical point of view', Cézanne could still add the qualifier 'And yet he's undoubtedly the person most concerned with art in a city of 20 000': Paul Cézanne, letter to Émile Zola, 14 April 1878, cited and translated in Rewald, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., pp. 164–165. Indeed, as if echoing the kind of
The other possible early academic influence on Cézanne, the painter Joseph-François Villevieille, is also sometimes cited as having met Cézanne at the École de Dessin, perhaps as a teacher of his at that institution.⁴⁰ Ten years his senior, Villevieille moved to Paris sometime before the beginning of 1860, and set up the studio where Cézanne, on his first visit to Paris in 1861, worked most afternoons.⁴¹ Indeed, Villevieille might have operated just such an open studio in Aix even before his 1860 move to Paris; for, in a letter to Cézanne of 1860 Zola mentioned, in passing, ‘you must remember those two bathers of Goujon’s that I drew so clumsily one day at Villevieille’s.’⁴² Although the degree to which this drawing ‘chez Villevieille’ might refer to formal drawing classes separate to those offered at the Aix École de Dessin is impossible to determine, Zola’s aside nevertheless leaves open the possibility that other forms of artistic training outside that institution were available to Cézanne before his first trip to Paris.⁴³ There is also every reason to believe that Villevieille’s advice would be, academically speaking, as good as any available in the provinces, having studied at the Paris Académie des Beaux-Arts in the early 1850s as a student, no less, of Ingres, Horace Vernet, and Jean-Jacques Pradier.⁴⁴ Moreover, that

comments Cézanne would quote of his father, and thereby perhaps reflecting a similar ambivalent paternal respect. Cézanne ended this account by recording Gibert’s remark ‘I have to be careful since I can’t be clever’: Joseph-Marc Gibert, quoted in ibid., p. 165.

Villevieille is also occasionally described as a co-student of Cézanne’s; for instance Joachim Gasquet’s comment that Cézanne was ‘in competition’ with Villevieille in the 1859 École concours: Gasquet, Joachim Gasquet’s Cézanne, op. cit., p. 55.

⁴¹ ‘Je n’ai pas encore vu Villevieille. Je lui donnerai tous tes bonjours à la fois’ and ‘Je n’ai pas encore vu Villevieille; à la première occasion je ferai la commission du passe-partout’ and ‘les autres artistes que je vois sont Tréphime Jeune, Villevieille...’: Émile Zola, letters to Paul Cézanne, 30 December 1859, 5 January 1860, and 13 June 1860, cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., pp. 120, 126, 175. On Cézanne’s time in Villevieille’s studio in Paris, see section 4A.

⁴² ‘D’ailleurs, tu connais le genre de Jean Goujon: tu dois te rappeler ces deux baigneuses qui sont dues à son ciseau et que je dessinais si maladroitement un jour chez Villevieille’: Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, 25 March 1860, in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 140.

⁴³ The issue is complicated even further by the possibility that Zola was referring to classes attended at the École de dessin and taught by Villevieille, perhaps while Zola was holidaying in Aix in the summers of 1858 and 1859. Zola’s possible attendance at the École is occasionally mentioned in his biographies, although perhaps based only upon this aside, for instance: ‘He took painting lessons at the Aix academy of art’: Walker, Zola, op. cit., p. 11.

⁴⁴ Ely, ‘Cézanne, l’École de Dessin et le Musée d’Aix,’ op. cit., p. 154. Villevieille’s contact with both Ingres and Pradier must, however, have been brief. Ingres resigned from his professorship at the Académie des Beaux-Arts in October of the very year, 1851, that Villevieille entered as a student and Jean-Jacques Pradier died the following year, in 1852. Upon returning to Aix around 1864, Villevieille seems to have then opened what amounts to a private drawing school, a move apparently causing tension between Villevieille and the
Cézanne would chose to have his studies corrected by Villevieille when he did end up in Paris in 1861, as noted below, would seem to indicate that, even once freed from the constraints of a formal educative setting, Cézanne still sought advice, at least initially, from mentors not only academically trained, but also academically minded.

As such, there seems little to suggest, in terms either of biographical or visual evidence—in this case his early académies—that Cézanne felt in any way stifled by the rigidity of his early instruction. His decision to travel to Paris, when settled upon, thereby, might not necessarily have been impelled by dissatisfaction with either the standard or style of artistic training offered him there. Indeed, that he returned to attending classes at Aix École de Dessin, and under the same professor, after his first, seemingly failed trip to Paris, would seem to indicate such a homecoming marked neither an abandonment of painting, as is sometimes intimated, nor of the École de Dessin, but instead, and then only temporarily, the harsh reality of life in Paris.

director of the Aix École de Dessin Joseph Gibert, who refused to correct the work of any student who was also a student of Villevieille: ibid., p. 154. Indeed, Villevieille’s students appear to have had a history of bad behaviour; in an 1868 ‘uprising’ at the Aix École de dessin, the ring-leaders were seemingly also students of Villevieille and, ten years later, a group of them insulted Cézanne in the street: loc. cit.; Paul Cézanne, letter to Émile Zola, 14 April 1878, cited and translated in Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 165. 
Nearly a month after Cézanne had received the calf-skin album that was his prize for his second place in the 1859 École de Dessin de la ville d'Aix concours, his father bought an estate of approximately 15 hectares of vineyard and grazing land two kilometres west of the centre of Aix-en-Provence. Along with some farm buildings and a conservatory, the property, known as the Jas de Bouffan, also included a magisterial, if dilapidated, three-storey manor house. As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, this building, and the grounds it was set in, was to become an integral and consistent feature of Cézanne's later biography, acting as a southern anchor point in his life-long oscillation between Paris and Provence.

It was also, according to some, a building for which Cézanne's presumed first attempt at a large-scaled work of art might have been conceived, the decorated screen (Paravent avec scènes champêtres et ornementes, c.1859) (figs 3B.1, 3B.6). Aside

---

45 Ely, 'Cézanne, l'École de dessin et le Musée d'Aix,' op. cit., p. 139. The exact size of the property bought by Louis-Auguste Cézanne was 14 hectares and 97 ares, and was purchased for 85,000 francs on 15 September 1859: Actes d'achat de la propriété du Jas-de-Bouffan par Louis-Auguste Cézanne, 15 September 1859, cited in Archives départementales des Bouches-du-Rhône, op. cit., pp. 94, 100. The sale was formally registered on 20 September 1859: Cahn, 'Chronology,' op. cit., p. 530. John Rewald cites the price as 90,000 francs: Rewald, 'Cézanne and his father.' op. cit., p. 70; Rewald, Cézanne: A Biography, op. cit., p. 21.

46 The oft-repeated assertion that the estate's name was derived from the Provençal for 'habitation of the Winds' seems a romance of history; although 'jas' is Provençal for 'sheepcote' (obviously thereby predating the construction of the manor house), 'Bouffan' is unlikely to come from the Provençal for 'windy', which would be 'boufan', and was, instead, probably the name of a former owner of the property: Jean Boyer, 'The true story of Jas de Bouffan,' translated by A. J. F. Millar, in Jean Boyer, Jean Boyer, Jayne Warman, Bruno Ely, et al., Jas de Bouffan: Cézanne, Aix-en-Provence: Société de Paul Cézanne, 2004, p. 14. Indeed, despite what has been written by those assuming the property was exposed to particularly ferocious winds by virtue of this presumed etymology, the Jas de Bouffan is, in fact, as Jean Boyer puts it; 'not situated in a part of the Aix countryside particularly exposed to the mistral, tramontane, main, labé or any other winds of the Provençal compass card': ibid., pp. 13–14. Although A. J. F. Millar points out that the 'le' in 'le Jas de Bouffan' is redundant in translation from French to English, the older, albeit perhaps incorrect, habit of rendering the name of the estate as 'the Jas de Bouffan' rather than simply 'jas de Bouffan' has been retained: A. J. F. Millar, 'translator's note', in Boyer et al., Jas de Bouffan: Cézanne, op. cit., p. 11.

47 In terms of the various dates suggested for the screen, Georges Rivière's gives c.1860, Robert Ratcliffe 1858–1860, and Douglas Cooper 'summer 1859': Rivière, Le Maître Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 196, Cooper, 'The Jas de Bouffan,' op. cit., p. 24. Cooper's specification of 'summer' is perhaps in order to account for the possibility of Zola's help, discussed below, summer being the only time in 1859 when Zola was in Aix-en-Provence during that year.
from its possible biographical importance as one of Cézanne’s first painted expressions, the screen is also worth close analysis by virtue of apparently including procedures not only of copying after other works, specifically in the form of engraved reproductions, but also a form of transformative pastiche in which the meanings of the elements co-opted are inflected by being so pastiched. Moreover, that Cézanne then included sections of the screen’s imagery in the background of certain of his later canvases also seems to introduce a note of reflexive irony. For, in repainting what he had already painted as a copy, but in a different pictorial context, Cézanne might be seen as enacting a meditation upon the various representational layers created through the repetition of images within other images. He might also have thereby allegorized, as a form of humorous irony, the visual conflation and meaning-making inherent to pastiche as an act in itself.

Now separated into two parts and, indeed, two collections, the panels comprising Paravent avec scènes champêtres et ornements (figs 3B.1, 3B.6) were originally part of the same object, a large wooden six-panelled folding that was, according to tradition, intended for use in Cézanne’s father’s office. Painted on both sides in apparent imitation of eighteenth-century interior design, the recto panels (fig. 3B.1) combine aspects of traditional Aubusson tapestry with rococo fête champêtre figure groups, while the verso (fig. 3B.6) displays the flatter, more abstract forms deployed

spending his holidays there: loc. cit., Thomson, ‘Tableau chronologique,’ op. cit., p. 102. Although John Rewald initially dated the work ‘vers 1858’, he later, perhaps following Lionello Venturi’s planned revision of his original dating of 1859-1860, preferred ‘c.1859’ : Rewald, Cézanne et Zola, op. cit., p. 16 bis; Venturi, Cézanne, son arte—son œuvre, op. cit., p. 69 (cat. nos 1–3); Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 66.

48 John Rewald and Robert Ratcliffe suggest the screen must have been intended, thereby, for the Jas de Bouffan, assuming it would have been too large for the smaller town house then occupied by the Cézannes on the rue Matheron: Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 66, Ratcliffe, Cézanne’s Working Methods, op. cit., p. 377 n. 3. The tradition that the screen had been intended for Cézanne’s father’s office seems to have begun with Georges Rivière who, in the list of Cézanne’s paintings concluding his biography of the artist, he included the comment beside the screen, presumably sourced from Cézanne’s son Paul, that it had been ‘[E]xécuté à Aix pour le cabinet de travail de M. Cézanne père et à la confection duquel Émile Zola a collaboré’. Rivière, Le Maître Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 196. Then anecdote is then repeated in Venturi and Rewald’s catalogue raisonnés: Venturi, Cézanne, son arte—son œuvre, op. cit., p. 69 (cat. no. 1–3); Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 66.
in eighteenth-century wallpapers (figs 3B.4(a-b)) and on screens (fig. 3B.5). The sheer size of the screen, at over four metres wide and two and a half metres tall, makes it, if indeed executed by Cézanne, one of the largest surviving painted works ever produced by the artist, as well as one of the more unusual. This is in terms not only of such monumentality, but also of style and, in parts, at least, technical finesse, both of which would seem beyond even the admittedly broad eclecticism of Cézanne's early oeuvre.

Regardless of when, or by whom, the screen was painted, it must have held considerable importance to Cézanne. Not only did he keep it up until his death, having apparently inherited from his father, he also used its imagery in the background of several of his later still-lives and portraits presumed, in part by virtue of the presence of that imagery, to have been executed in his upper floor studio of the Jas de Bouffan. Following the sale of his father's estate in 1899, it must have been taken by Cézanne, along with the rest of his studio props, to his new apartment on the rue Boulegon, and thence, eventually, to the two-story building on the hill above Les Lauves purpose-built to house his final studio. For, it was there, in a ground-floor

---

49 John Rewald describes the screen's design as 'a rather free adaptation of eighteenth-century French tapestries depicting pastoral subjects': Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 66. It is Theodore Reff who narrows the comparison to Aubusson tapestries (particularly, it is presumed, certain floral-bordered examples from the late eighteenth century), with the guarded proviso that certain other features of the verso design, such as the repetitive placement of the trees and the 'stiff provincial style of drawing' are atypical of that workshop: Theodore Reff, 'Cézanne's early paravent,' in Boyer et al., Jas de Bouffan: Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 57, 57 n. 1. Reff cites oral communications with Emmanuel Coquerey, Curator of Decorative Arts at the Musée du Louvre, and Nicole de Pazzis-Chevalier of the Galerie Chevalier, Paris, in support of these assertions: loc. cit. In terms of the eighteenth-century origins of the verso grotesques, see: Reff, 'Cézanne's early paravent,' op. cit., p. 57; Theodore Reff, 'The pictures within Cézanne's pictures,' Arts Magazine, vol. 53, no. 10 (June 1979), p. 95. Similar arabesques and grotesques were also deployed in the more luxurious medium of painted panel decorations, for instance those incorporated in the decorative schemes of Claude Audran III. Cézanne's next largest surviving canvas is [R 857] Les Grandes Baigneuses (1906), which, although of nearly similar height, is only just above half as wide: Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 511. Perhaps the only other works by Cézanne of comparable scale are his mural landscapes, discussed below in section 4C.

50 John Rewald and Robert Ratcliffe suggest the screen was installed at the Jas de Bouffan around 1859, assuming it would have been too large for the smaller town house then occupied by the Cézannes on the rue Matheron: Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 66. Ratcliffe, Cézanne's Working Methods, op. cit., p. 377 n. 3. In terms of the Les Lauves studio, the property upon which it was built was purchased by Cézanne in 1901, for 2000 francs, and construction of the studio was completed by September 1902: Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 535. In the years between the sale of the Jas de Bouffan and his moving into his new Les Lauves studio, Cézanne had also worked, while in Aix-en-Provence,
room off the hall, that the screen was noticed by Bernard during a visit to the painter in 1904. When Cézanne’s attention was drawn by Bernard’s interest, he apparently said:

I often used to play in this screen with Zola. Look, we even wrecked these flowers. [...] There’s painting, it’s no more difficult than that. There is all the skill you need, everything.

Whether or not such comments admit admission of his own involvement in the decoration, along with Zola’s, by 1923 just such an attribution become assumed. For, although not mentioned in the main text of Georges Rivière’s Le Maître Paul Cézanne published in that year, the work was included in the chronological list of Cézanne’s oeuvre concluding that book, along with the comment, presumably sourced from Paul Cézanne fils, that Cézanne had manufactured the screen with Zola’s assistance. Photographs of the recto then appeared in Léo Larguier’s Le Dimanche avec Paul Cézanne and Émile Bernard’s Sur Cézanne (figs 3B.2(a–b)), both of which were published in 1925, the former including a caption repeating the attribution to Cézanne and Zola. According to Theodore Reff, these photographs indicate that the panels had, by then, been detached from their original supports, relined, and re-mounted, an operation that also seems to have entailed the separation of the two sides, along with the possible further division of the verso into two halves or, perhaps, six separate panels.

at a cabin he rented at the Bibemus quarry and a room in the Château Noir: Rewald, Cézanne: A Biography, op. cit., p. 245.

52 ‘À droite, tout à droite, une pièce était bâtie, un paravent fort ancien m'y attira. [...] C’était une réunion de châsses peints de grands feuillages et de scènes champêtres; il y avait de ci, de là des florasions’. Émile Bernard, ‘Souvenirs sur Paul Cézanne et lettres inédites [part one],’ Mercure de France, t. 69, no. 247 (1 October 1907), p. 391. The screen was not, then, strictly speaking, in Cézanne’s studio, which was on the upper floor of the building, and which Bernard entered the day after noticing the screen: ibid., pp. 391, 393.

53 ‘J’ai joué bien souvent dans ce paravent avec Zola. Tenez, on avions même gâté les fleurs. [...] Voilà la peinture, ce n’est pas plus difficile que cela. Il y a là tout le métier, tout’: Paul Cézanne, quoted in ibid., p. 391.

54 ‘[E]xécuté à Aix pour le cabinet de travail de M. Cézanne père et à la confection duquel Émile Zola a collaboré’: Rivière, Le Maître Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 196.

panels.\textsuperscript{56} Hence, in Lionello Venturi's catalogue raisonné of 1936, the screen was catalogued as three separate works, with the verso divided in two, a convention continued by John Rewald in his 1996 catalogue raisonné, despite those panels being since recombined (fig. 3B.6).\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{56} Reff, "Cézanne's early paravent," op. cit., p. 57. Reff backs this suggestion of a pre-1925 relining by citing an analysis of the recto panels undertaken in 2003 that confirmed they had been relined some seventy years ago: David Bull, conservation report on the recto of the \textit{Paravent}, New York: n. p., 2003, [not paginated], cited in ibid., p. 57. I have been unable to locate a recent image of the recto side of the screen or information on its current state; the colour image used here is from: Wally Findlay, Edgar Munhall, and André Parinaud, \textit{Les Environs d'Aix-en-Provence'}, Wally Findlay Galleries International, Inc. Proudly Present Cézanne to Picasso: A Prestigious Exhibition and Sale of Highly Important French Impressionists, Post-Impressionists, and Modern Masters Featuring \textit{Les Environs d'Aix-en-Provence}, a Monumental Painting of Historical Importance by Paul Cézanne, exhibition catalogue (Wally Findlay Galleries, New York, 1975), New York: The Galleries, 1975 [not paginated plate]. Nevertheless, in examining that colour image (fig. 3B.1) in relation to, for instance, Venturi's monochrome photograph (fig. 3B.2(b)), the gaps between the panels seems to have lessened, suggesting they had been once more re-separated, re-trimmed and re-lined after the Venturi photograph had been taken. In terms of the verso panels (fig. 3B.6), there is an early photograph cited by Theodore Reff that apparently shows the six panels combined as a single piece, but in a different order than Venturi's photograph: '[18600. Paris, Coll. P. Cézanne fils.] Paravent (face postérieure),' photograph taken by the Giraudon firm, French School, Box 344, Witt Library, London, cited in Reff, 'Cézanne's early paravent,' op. cit., p. 62 n. 31. It would seem then, that when the screen's verso was separated from its recto, the former was divided into six independent panels which, by virtue of the discrete nature of their decorations, could then be re-arranged in any order without disturbing the work's overall coherence.

\textsuperscript{57} Venturi, \textit{Cézanne, son arte—son œuvre}, op. cit., p. 69 (cat. nos 1–3); Rewald, \textit{The Paintings of Paul Cézanne}, op. cit., p. 66. In giving the dimensions of each of the two halves, John Rewald, inadvertently it seems, gives the dimensions of both combined: loc. cit. Regardless of its division and/or recombination, all panels from both sides of the \textit{Paravent} remained in the collection of Paul Cézanne fils and his family until around 1952, when the recto, in its re-lined and re-mounted state, was sold, possibly after passing through the hands of Maurice Renou to Paul Chadourne in Paris, and, then, in 1974, to the Wally Findlay Galleries in the United States; in an advertisement announcing its exhibition following its purchase by the Wally Findlay Galleries, however, it was implied the work had been purchased directly from the Cézanne family: Findlay et al., \textit{Les Environs d'Aix-en-Provence'}, op. cit., [not paginated]; Rewald, \textit{The Paintings of Paul Cézanne}, op. cit., p. 66; Reff, 'Cézanne's early paravent,' op. cit., p. 57 n. 7. In the Wally Findlay Galleries exhibition following this latter purchase, it was re-titled \textit{Les Environs d'Aix-en-Provence}, apparently in accordance with comments by Edgar Munhall and André Parinaud, who, in the accompanying catalogue, suggest the rococo landscape on the recto might feature depictions of, in the distance and on the left, the façade of the Jas de Bouffan and, on the far right, Mont Sainte-Victoire: Edgar Munhall, 'Paul Cézanne, "Les environs d'Aix-en-Provence"," and André Parinaud, ""Les environs d'Aix-en-Provence,"' in Findlay et al., \textit{Les Environs d'Aix-en-Provence'}, op. cit., [not paginated]. Neither John Rewald nor Theodore Reff agree with the suggestion the paravent depicts the Jas de Bouffan or environs, although Rewald does admit the mountain on the right 'faintly resembles' Mont Sainte-Victoire: Rewald, \textit{The Paintings of Paul Cézanne}, op. cit., p. 66; Reff, 'Cézanne's early paravent,' op. cit., p. 61. Comparison between the colour reproduction of the screen published in the 1974 Wally Findlay catalogue (fig. 3B.1) and Venturi's earlier monochrome (fig. 3B.2(b)) suggest the screen's recto had, in the intervening years, suffered extensive restoration, particularly in the sixth panel; and John Rewald observed at the time of compiling his
Despite few of Cézanne's descendents apparently ever having believed the screen to have been painted by their famous ancestor, the claim that its decorations were Cézanne's doing, with or without Zola's assistance, has rarely been challenged.\(^{58}\)

Hence, both sides appear without qualification in Venturi and Rewald's catalogue raisonnés, and most who have discussed the work at any length have accepted an attribution to Cézanne seemingly without question.\(^{59}\) Recently, however, the veracity catalogue raisonné, published posthumously in 1996, that the verso had been 'recently...extensively restored': Rewald, *The Paintings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 66. Rewald's observations were apparently confirmed in an unpublished conservation analysis of the recto undertaken by David Bull in 2003: Bull, op. cit., [not paginated], cited in Reff, 'Cézanne's early paravent,' op. cit., p. 62. Reff also quotes comments by Cézanne's great-grandson, Philippe Cézanne, that the screen had, at one point, restored by his father Jean-Pierre Cézanne: Philippe Cézanne, written communication cited in ibid., p. 62 n. 33. Whether the restoration on the recto was solely Cézanne's grandson's work, or the work of other, later, hands, or indeed, whether it was again restored after its purchase by the Wally Findlay Galleries seems impossible at the moment to determine. Meanwhile, the verso panels (fig. 3B.6) had been sold to a private collector in 1963 and then, in 1988, to the Musée Granet, an acquisition prompted more by the screen's evocation of Cézanne's time at the Jas de Bouffan than any consideration of its significance in the artist's oeuvre. Rewald, *The Paintings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 66; Curatorial files of the Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence, cited in Reff, 'Cézanne's early paravent,' op. cit., p. 57. The screen verso is now installed, along with other of Cézanne's studio props, as part of the display at Ateliers des Lauves, Cézanne's final studio. Comparisons between the verso as it appears today and with the monochrome reproductions of it published in Venturi and Rewald's catalogue raisonnés indicates it too has been restored in parts.

\(^{58}\) The opinion of Cézanne's descendents concerning the screen's attribution comes from the painter's great-grandson, Philippe Cézanne, in a written communication cited by Theodore Reff: Reff, 'Cézanne's early paravent,' op. cit., p. 57 n. 9. The exception is Paul Cézanne fils, who owned and sold both sides of the screen as works by his father: Rewald, *The Paintings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 66.

of this assumption has been challenged, particularly in regard to the verso, the intricate rococo decorations of which seem outside the style of the rest of Cézanne’s early œuvre, as well as technically beyond his capabilities. 60

What might be less easy to dismiss, however, is the possibility of Cézanne’s involvement with the decoration of the screen’s recto, in particular the rather clumsily executed figure groups that, unlike the verso and, indeed, even the background against which those figures are positioned, do bear resemblance to other of Cézanne’s early work. 61 Citing both the apparently crude execution of the figures compared to their background, as well as the observation that those figures incorporate ‘a specific tone of blue [...] that appears nowhere else’ on the screen, Reff has come up with a rather ingenious, and somewhat startling, suggestion. 62 For, in order to account for the discrepancies not only between the figure groups and the verso ornaments, but also

Cézanne fils, it ‘cannot be verified’: Rivière, Le Maître Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 196; Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 66.

60 Wayne Andersen, for whom most of the attributions of early works to Cézanne are, at best, suspect, seems to have been the first to publish suspicions regarding the painter’s involvement in the screen’s decoration: Andersen, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., pp. 100–102. A more comprehensive account of the screen’s likely origins by Theodore Reff was published soon after Andersen’s book; most of Reff’s arguments underpin the discussion here: Reff, ‘Cézanne’s early paravent,’ op. cit., pp. 57–66. In terms of the verso attribution, Reff notes that, at the time of publishing the just-cited work, both Denis Coutagne and Bruno Ely had considerable doubts regarding Cézanne’s involvement, precisely by virtue of the finesse of the execution: oral communications between Theodore Reff and Denis Coutagne and Bruno Ely in 2002 and 2003, cited in: ibid., p. 58 n. 13. In regard to Cézanne’s artistic training, Reff suggests Cézanne’s studies at the Ecole de Dessin at the time the screen is usually presumed to have been executed were limited to drawing: ibid., p. 59. However, Cézanne must have received some instruction in painting, given his second prize in the second division of the painting section for his ‘life-size study of a head after the live model painted in oil’ awarded at precisely this time, 1859, and noted above: Procès verbal de la distribution des Prix du août 1859, op. cit., p. 4; Programme et formation des divisions du Concours de 1859, op. cit., p. 3. However, even this academic training would hardly have been of much use to Cézanne in allowing him to produce a reasonably sophisticated and entirely accurate copy of eighteenth-century interior painted-panel and tapestry design. For, although the curriculum at the Aix Ecole de Dessin did include copying after ornament, these were plaster casts of antique examples from, for instance, sarcophagi, and, indeed, were exercises aimed at improving skills in modelled illusionism, an approach perhaps antithetical to the flattened abstraction that was the raison d’être of decorative schemes such as that deployed on the screen’s verso. On the ornament copying, see: Ely, ‘Cézanne, l’Ecole de Dessin, et le Musée d’Aix,’ op. cit., pp. 152–154. Moreover, if Cézanne’s comments to Bernard cited above are interpreted as implying some kind of responsibility for the screen’s decoration, it seems from the context of those comments that they were looking only at the recto side at the time.

61 In particular, see [R 23] Le Jeu de cache-cache, d’après Lancret (1862–1864) (fig. 4C.13). This work, one of the murals in the Jas de Bouffan salon, is discussed in section 4C.

62 Bull, op. cit., [not paginated]; visual examination undertaken in 2004 by Theodore Reff and cited in Reff, ‘Cézanne’s early paravent,’ op. cit., p. 66.
between the groups and their background, Reff suggests that Cézanne added the figures onto a pre-existing landscape, itself a nineteenth-century artisanal imitation of eighteenth-century decorative schemes (fig. 3B.3). In short, and to adopt a term from more recent art historical discourse, the figures were Cézanne’s ‘daubs’. 64

Reff’s suggestion seems backed by the recto’s presumed sequence of execution ascertained by David Bull in a conservation analysis undertaken in 2003, which concluded that several layers of paint application had been involved, including a cream-coloured abraded ground and various underpainting washes. 65 Although Cézanne would later come to adopt techniques of toned under-painting, experimenting throughout the 1860s with both the use of imprimatura of a contrasting hue to the main paint layer and, more generally, dark-toned grounds, his technique of the late 1850s and early 1860s seems to have been far simpler, particularly in his larger works, either painting directly onto the support or onto a simple, un-abraded white ground. 66 Likewise, the compositional structures deployed matched the simplicity of these alla

63 Just this genre of historicist decor was popular amongst the Provençal aristocracy in the first half of the nineteenth-century, as well the nouveau riche attempting to imitate these rather regressive aristocratic tastes: Nerte Fustier-Dautier, Les bastides de Provence et leurs jardins, Paris: Serge, 1977; Aaron Sheon, Monticelli: His Contemporaries, His Influence, Pittsburgh: Carnegie Institute, 1978, pp. 24–26; Lewis, Cézanne’s Early Imagery, op. cit., pp. 83–88; Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., p. 140.

64 Reff implies that only the figures were daubed, but it might be possible that Cézanne also added some of the foreground vegetation, there is a certain similarity between some of the plants depicted along the bottom of the screen landscape and a plant depicted at the bottom of Cézanne’s landscape mural [R 34–41] Paysage romantique aux pêcheurs (1862–1864) (fig. 3E.8). Furthermore, at one point one of these plants overlaps one of the women’s dress (fig. 3B.12), implying that if Cézanne did not add the plant, he had to carefully paint around it to include the woman’s dress. In regards to the meaning of the term ‘daub’, this is taken, admittedly perhaps without due license, from the Australian contemporary artist Driller Jet Armstrong, who seems to have come up with it, or at least the specific technical connotations here utilised, in the early 1990s. On Driller Jet Armstrong’s own discussion of Daubism, the movement he ‘founded’ based upon such techniques, see: Driller Jet Armstrong, Daubism 1991–2007, n. p., [not paginated], accessible through: http://www.drillerjetarmstrong.com/documents/a_decade_of_daubism.pdf. More recently, the works of the British artists Jake and Dino Chapman modifying, for instance, print series by Goya and Hogarth seem based on identical techniques, but perhaps with different impetuses.

65 ‘First, a thin, cream-coloured ground was applied to the rather coarse linen canvas, which was then slightly abraded to create a texture. Next, the large areas of the design were laid in with thin, blue-grey washes and darker paint of a greenish blue-grey. Then, the dark green foliage was brushed on fluently and the lighter green leaves were added over it. Finally, the groups of figures were inserted in a heavier, more laborious manner’: Bull, op. cit., cited in Reff, ‘Cézanne’s early paravent,’ op. cit., p. 61.

prima techniques. None of Cézanne’s canvases or murals executed in the late 1850s or early 1860s have the depth of spatial recession, or its associated techniques of atmospheric perspective, apparent in the landscape on the screen’s verso.\textsuperscript{67}

The figures suggested by Reff as the only parts of the screen actually executed by Cézanne offer also the further complication of being copies.\textsuperscript{68} That is, they were not only daubed, but copied daubs at that, reproducing, it seems, engravings by Magdalene Horthernels of pendant designs by Nicolas Lancret, or, more precisely, in order to account for the imagery’s reversal on the screen, printed reproductions of these.\textsuperscript{69} If such were the case, and if it was Cézanne who was responsible, this would be an activity, this copying and often enlarging of engraved imagery, that would be repeated by the artist on several occasions over the next few years, as is discussed below, not only in terms of canvases, but also in the grander contexts of the murals of the Jas de Bouffan grand salon.\textsuperscript{70} Indeed, in regard to the latter, Cézanne would not only repeat the copying of an engraving after a Lancret design (fig. 4C.13), but also

\textsuperscript{67} See, for instance, the steep flattened space of [R 34–41] \textit{Paysage romantique aux pêcheurs} (1862–1864) (fig. 3E.8), one of the murals in the grand salon of the Jas de Bouffan. On this landscape mural, as well as the other landscape murals in the same salon, see section 4C. Indeed, it could be argued that Cézanne never adopted approaches or devices of deep spatial recession and/or atmospheric perspective in his later landscape painting, his tendency to employ all-over techniques of paint application increasingly throughout his career in fact opposed directly to such affects.

\textsuperscript{68} Denis Coutagne, for one, seems to accepted Theodore Reff’s reasoning, writing in 2006: ‘In the early days at the Jas, around 1860–1861, he [Cézanne] painted a number of figures onto a landscape screen purchased by his father’: Coutagne, ‘The Jas de Bouffan,’ op. cit., p. 80.

\textsuperscript{69} Edgar Munhall first identified a possible relation between the figure groups on the screen and certain of Lancret designs, specifically between the figures in the right-hand group and the \textit{Près de vous belle Iris...} engraving after Lancret (figs 3B.10–11): Munhall, ‘Paul Cézanne: “Les Environ d’Aix-en-Provence”,’ op. cit., [not paginated]. Theodore Reff subsequently suggested the pendant image to this, \textit{Quoy! N’Avoir pour vous trois...} (figs 3B.7–8), as a possible source for the left-hand group: Reff, ‘The pictures within Cézanne’s pictures,’ op. cit., p. 97. Mary Tompkins Lewis, however, finds neither identification ‘entirely convincing’: Lewis, Cézanne’s Early Imagery, op. cit., p. 244 n 29. For the engravings, see Georges Wildenstein, \textit{Lancret: Biographique et catalogue critiques l’œuvre de l’artiste reproduite en deux cent quatorze héliogravures}, Paris: Beaux-Arts, 1924, p. 92, cat. nos 320 and 321, figs 87 and 138. Wildenstein also makes mention of oil paintings in the Musée Douai with the same title that, although not by Lancret, might have been copied after Lancret’s design: ibid, p. 92, cat. nos 322 and 322 bis. I have been unable to track down images of these works and so can make no judgement on the possibility that the screen’s figures were in fact copied from engraved reproductions of these.

\textsuperscript{70} On the canvas copies of c.1860 and 1862–1864 presumed to be after engravings, see sections sections 3D and 5B.
the act of daubing, adding a figure, rather disjunctively, to an earlier landscape (figs 3E.7, 4C.1). 71

However, if the figures on the screen were copied, they seem not to have been copied faithfully. For, aside from the obvious differences entailed by the imagery's reversal and enlargement, several other changes are immediately evident if the copies are compared with the originals, differences indicative perhaps of the exigencies of the physical context of the imagery's insertion and the technical proficiency, or not, of the copier. Moreover, in terms of content, some of the themes seemingly intrinsic to the originals seem to have been suppressed, or at least modified. Such modifications stand, then, not only as evidence of pastiche, but also as a possible example of the decontextualization of content that technique might inherently entail.

In terms of the figures and their presumed sources, the adults in the first group (fig. 3B.9) seem to have come from Lancret's Quoy! N'avoir pour vous trois... (fig. 3B.7). In comparing a reversal of this image (fig. 3B.8) with the figures on the screen (fig. 3B.9), perhaps the most obvious difference is the excision of the woman between the two main protagonists. For Theodore Reff, this was a result of Cézanne’s inability both to cope with the 'foreshortened form' of the original as well as his reluctance to paint anything over the tree behind. 72 However, it would also seem likely that the figure was excluded on the grounds of the more difficult problem of stretching the form across the break between the panels on the screen—a break surely far more visually disruptive when the screen was in its original state. Hence, in Cézanne's own later canvases depicting the screen (figs 3B.16, 3B.20), the break between the panels is emphasized to a degree suggesting more than mere decorative expedience. 73 Similarly, this would also explain the increased distance between the two remaining figures in Cézanne's version. This distancing, in combination with certain other formal modifications, also reconfigures the thematic underpinning of the image it appropriates its figures from. For, in moving the figures apart, but retaining their general posture, their gestures become useless, the man is too far from the woman to be

71 On the Lancret copy, see section 4C. On the mural inclusion, see section 6B.
72 Reff, 'Cézanne's early paravent,' op. cit., p. 64.
73 The verso as it appears today (fig. 3B.6) also gives a good indication of the degree to which each of the individual panels retained a degree of separation that would make painting a figure across the break between them somewhat visually jarring.
pressing upon her the glass of wine he is in the original, her simplified form in Cézanne’s copy changing her retreat from the flirtatious lunge of her suitor into an oddly rigid uprightness, her hands awkwardly before her as if about to catch a basketball. Behind her, a blond boy has also been rather inexplicably inserted, his presence and slightly chastening glower further skewering, perhaps ironically, any erotic overtones implicit in the Lancret original.  

In terms of the second figure group on the screen (fig. 3B.12), this is presumed copied after a reversal of Lancret’s Près de vous belle Iris... (figs 3B.10–11). Although there is not the distancing just remarked upon in the other figure group, there is a subtle change in the positioning of the woman’s parasol that has transformed what in the original Lancret was a grasping motion to remove the woman’s umbrella, into, in Cézanne’s version, a futile declamatory gesture, as if the man were simply delivering a speech. Because the woman in the screen version neither looks at nor leans away from him, reference to the erotics of seduction, to his humorous attempt to remove her parasol, the object impeding his advances, is, as in the first figure group, negated.  

Although the males in both of Cézanne’s copied groups are depicted in costumes similar to their originals, the female figures are wearing attire of considerably more chaste design; bodices are tightly laced and their silken undergarments, unlike in the Lancret originals, under control. This stiffness is transferred to the depiction of outline, perhaps an indication of their executor’s technical lack, which, although following, in both groups, the general contour of Lancret’s figures, lacks entirely the complex foreshortening that, in the originals, allows heads to tilt forward, faces to turn.

---

74 He might also be there simply to fill in the space between the woman and the tree behind her.
75 Reff likewise sees this decontextualization; ‘In adapting [the figures] [...] to the spaces available amid the trees and the large foreground plants in the Paravent, with which he was evidently reluctant to interfere, Cézanne weakens the physical intimacy and narrative coherence of the flirtatious couples so characteristic of Lancret’s rococo art’: Reff, ‘Cézanne’s early paravent,’ op. cit., p. 64.
76 Cézanne might here have been motivated, if there is any kernel of truth in the anecdote about the Paravent being for his father, by the images’ presumed context. For, as might be indicated by an exchange quoted, again anecdotally, by Gustave Coquiot, Louis-Auguste Cézanne might have had relatively strong opinions about the propriety or otherwise of imagery, purportedly complaining to his son of the mural nude [R 29] Le Baigneur au rocher (1867–1869) (figs 3E.7, 6B.3) in the grand salon of the Jas de Bouffan; ‘See here Paul, you have two sisters; how could you have paint a large nude figure on the wall?’: Louis-Auguste Cézanne, quoted by Gustave Coquiot, cited and translated in Mack, op. cit., p. 150. On the large nude, see section 6B.
toward one another, eyes to lock. In being pastiched, Cézanne's figures have lost their integration with each other. They are each alone and floating across a plane, pasted tenuously on a background they cannot fully integrate with. They are, like the figures in certain of his later picnic paintings (figs 1.3–4), for instance, lonely individuals repeating ritual gestures no longer making sense.

Precisely this mode of pastiche implemented by Cézanne, with its concomitant entailments of transformed meaning, should not, however, be seen as an unusual activity. Take, for instance, a screen from the late nineteenth century (fig. 3B.13), in which figures from another Lancret design—one that Cézanne would himself copy onto the wall of the Jas de Bouffan grand salon (fig. 4C.13)—are pasted onto a similar screen. The positioning, excision, and novel inclusion of figures, along with the modification of the background, result, as with Cézanne’s effort, in a dramatic simplification and reconfiguration of Lancret’s original design, in terms both of form and of content.77 Hence, Cézanne might simply be seen as repeating an artisanal gesture itself reflecting precisely the technological and social changes such appropriations were predicated upon: the proliferation, and hence decontextualization, of reproduced imagery. Although when confined to the artisanal workshop such affects might simply be historical documentation of imagic levelling, when transposed into the context of fine art, as might be argued the case in certain of Cézanne’s figural scenes of the late 1860s, such affects of decontextualization could, in fact, be a deliberate meditation upon that levelling. Cézanne might have uncovered accidentally, in this inability to copy depictions of figures correctly and then pastiche them badly onto nebulous backgrounds, precisely the kinds of affects later employed to depict contemporary disconnection, that enacting of futile, and hence mysterious, gestures exemplarily captured, or perhaps wryly parodied, for instance, in his odd picnic scenes of the early 1870s such as [R164] Le Déjeuner sur l’herbe (c.1870).78 In short: Cézanne was depicting awkwardness perfectly through depicting awkwardly.

---

77 Hence, in the screen in fig. 4B.14, the two main figures are detached from their original context as participating in a game of cache-cache Miquelus and re-inserted as performing some kind of dance step, a musician appropriated from another image to supply the music.

78 [R 164] Le Déjeuner sur l’herbe (c.1870) (o/c (60 x 81), PC). For other similarly enigmatic scenes, full of mysteriously portentous but apparently meaningless gestures, see: [R 166] Pastorale (1870) (o/c (65 x 81), Musée d’Orsay).
As noted above, Cézanne used the imagery of his father's painted screen in the background of as many as nine still-lives executed later in his life, the earliest, [R 348] *Le plat de pommes* (c.1877) (fig. 3B.14), suggested as executed in the late 1870s, the rest from the late 1880s or 1890s. In many of these, the inclusion of sections of the screen seems intended to add an enlivening decorative presence, particularly in the upper sections of compositions that might otherwise show bare wall. This appears to have been the case, for instance, in *Le plat de pommes* (fig. 3B.14) and [R 734] *Nature morte au crâne* ([1890–1893]) (fig. 3B.15). The introduction of a painted object into

---

79 Works possibly incorporating sections of the *Paravent* in their imagery are, according to Robert Ratcliffe: [R 348] *Le plat de pommes* (c. 1877 (or later)) (fig. 3B.14), which depicts the base of what is now the fourth panel of the verso; [R 561] *Nature morte au plat de cerises* (1885–1887) (o/c (50.4 x 61), Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Los Angeles), which might include sections of the recto; [R 636] *La Table de cuisine* (1888–1890) (o/c (65 x 80), Musée d'Orsay, Paris), which includes a part of the floral border of the right edge of the recto; [R 734] *Nature morte au crâne* (1896–1898) (fig. 3B.15), which incudes the lower part of the fifth panel of the recto; [R 801] *Un coin de table* (c.1895) (fig. 3B.16), which includes the lower portions of the first and second panels of the recto; [R 809] *Portrait de Joachim Gasquet*, (1896) (o/c (62 x 54) Narodni Galerie, Prague), which includes the floral border of the recto; [R 826] *Paysan en blouse bleue* (c.1897) (fig. 3B.20), which includes the central section of the fifth panel, and perhaps the fourth, of the recto; [R 840] *Deux pommes sur une table* (1895–1900) (o/c (24 x 33) PC), which includes a small fragment of the floral border of the recto; [R 842] *La Grosse poire* (1895–1898) (o/c (44.5 x 54.6) Barnes Foundation, Merion), which includes a section of the sixth panel, and the floral border beside it, of the recto: Ratcliffe, *Cézanne's Working Method*, op. cit., pp. 50–51, 400 n. 128, 402 n. 136. Theodore Reff agrees, it seems, with Ratcliffe in all but the case of [R 561] *Nature morte au plat de cerises* (1885–1887), a work, along with [R 801] *Un coin de table* (c.1895) and [R 809] *Portrait de Joachim Gasquet*, (1896), that Ratcliffe suggests is only a 'probable' depiction of the screen: ibid., p. 400 n. 128; Theodore Reff, 'Painting and theory in the finale decade,' in William Rubin (ed.), *Cézanne: The Late Work*, New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1977, pp. 20, 32; Reff, 'The pictures within Cézanne’s pictures,' op. cit., pp. 95, 104 n. 32. John Rewald restricts mention of a positive identification of the *Paravent's* presence, or the possibility of such, to [R 348] *Le plat de pommes* (c. 1877 (or later)) (fig. 3B.14), [R 561] *Nature morte au plat de cerises* (1885–1887), [R 636] *La Table de cuisine* (1888–1890), [R 809] *Portrait de Joachim Gasquet*, (1896), [R 826] *Paysan en blouse bleue* (c.1897) (fig. 3B.20), and [R 840] *Deux pommes sur une table* (1895–1900); Rewald, *The Paintings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., pp. 66, 233, 378, 486, 495. Of all these paintings, only one, the presumed earliest, [R 348] *La Platt de pommes* (c. 1877) (fig. 3B.14), would seem to depict the verso decorations. [R 781] *Femme à la cafetière* (c.1895) (o/c (130 x 97) Musée d'Orsay, Paris), might also depict, albeit in a manner even more cursory and simplified than the identifications so-far mentioned, the floral border of the *Paravent recto;* Theodore Reff, however, dismisses this possibility, describing the flowers as in the painting as from a wallpaper design: Reff, 'Painting and theory in the final decade,' op. cit., p. 15.

80 The date suggested by John Rewald for [R 734] *Nature morte au crâne* ([1890–1893]) (fig. 3B.15) is 1896–1898; however, the date used here is the suggestion of Jayne Warman, who notes the painting's almost identical arrangement of objects to those depicted in [R 735] *Pot de gingembre* (1890–1893) (46.5 x 55.5), The Phillips Collection, Washington) and [R 736] *Fruits et pot de gingembre* (1890–1893) (o/c (46.5 x 55.5), PC), and hence suggestive of a similar execution date. She also points out that Rewald’s ordering of [R 734] *Nature morte au crâne* ([1890–1893]) (fig. 3B.15) among those paintings in his catalogue raisonné, and
a depiction of an interior, by allowing echoes of form and colour with foreground
objects to be spread into areas of a scene that might otherwise be blank, thereby also
seems to make such interiors, as arranged sets of objects, more like a painting.
Moreover, this use, this provision of a harmonizing decorative element that
simultaneously closes off sections of space—literally screening out depth—might also
stand as an example of the collage-like conception of pictorial arrangement often
alluded to here in terms of pastiche. Indeed, this seems exemplified by the often-made
observation that in positioning the screen within his compositions, Cézanne seems to
have gone to great lengths to ensure the components deemed most useful to that
inclusion were in view. Hence, if Cézanne is to be imagined arranging his still-lifes
before depicting them, he might be imagined doing so in a way resonant with the
activity of collage.

Therefore among a group of still-lifes otherwise dated by him as from the early 1890s (that is:
[R 730–744]) would suggest he was intending, before his untimely death and the final drafting
of the catalogue raisonné, to revise the 1896–1898 dating for [R 734] Nature morte au crâne
([1890–1893]) (fig. 3B.15); Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 453–457;
Jayne Warman, ‘Les Nature mortes au Jas de Bouffan,’ in Boyer et al., Jas de Bouffan:
Cézanne, op. cit., p. 17. Sidney Geist advances the argument that Cézanne’s use of the screen
verso in [R 348] Le Plat de pommes (c. 1877) (fig. 3B.14) is an encoded characterization of his
family, part based on the assertion that the cameo in the portion of the screen copied has been
transformed not only from female to male, but also into Cézanne’s father: Geist, Interpreting
Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 96–98. However, the identification of the cameo in [R 348] Le Plat de
pommes (c. 1877) (fig. 3B.14) as Cézanne’s father is made through the rather circular argument
of citing its crude similarity to a drawing of Cézanne’s titled, by Geist, Cézanne père in a
chair: ibid., p. 97. Geist, however, seems alone in making this identification in terms of the
drawing; Adrien Chappuis, for instance, catalogues the drawing as [Ch 266] Man Sitting in a
Chair (1871–1874) (pencil on laid paper (18 x 24), PC), and is, according to him, an
academic study: Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 107. Likewise, Wayne
Andersen, in his comprehensive survey of Cézanne’s portrait drawings, neither includes nor
mentions that drawing in his section devoted to Cézanne’s portraits of his father: Wayne
206).

81 Take, for instance, John Rewald’s comments regarding the positioning of the screen in [R
348] Le plat de pommes (c. 1877 (or later)), ‘Since [the portion depicted] [...] is very near the
bottom of the screen, though appearing here above the table, it was necessary for the large
screen to be installed at a certain height—possibly hung on a wall—and indicates what trouble
the artist would take to arrange the compositional elements he needed’: Rewald, The Paintings
of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 233.

82 Unfortunately space precludes here a discussion of the presumption the word ‘imagined’ in
this sentences alludes to. That is, many discussions of Cézanne’s still-lives, in particular,
assume a process of working whereby what is seen in the final painting resembles to some
degree a particular physical arrangement of objects within a room. However, and playing
precisely into the kinds of conceptions of pictorial thinking here being characterized, this elides
the possibility of objects, including the canvas, being moved around during the process of
painting, as well as the possibility that sections might be ‘pasted into’ (metaphorically) a
painting, without necessarily likewise that section being ‘pasting into’ the still-life arrangement
being painted from.
In some instances, the screen's inclusion also seems to have provided, in addition to its abstract decorative role, a signal excuse for wry ironic comment on the differing levels, literally, of representation. Hence, by being a painted representation of painted decoration, the screen's presence provides a visible set of relations between levels of represented reality within the same painting—here is a painted representation of a scene in which an apple sits in front of a painted representation of a flower, for instance. This use of visual rhyming between layered images within the same painting, as well as the reflexive gesture of including a work produced many years before, extends to other works in Cézanne's œuvre. Hence, [R 138] *Pots, bouteille, tasse et fruits* (1867–1869) (fig. 3B.17) is included in the much later [R 757] *Le Fumeur accoudé* (c. 1891) (fig. 3B.18), the former pinned to the wall behind the sitter portrayed in the latter. In being so included and so positioned, the bottle and apples depicted in the earlier still-life slyly occupy dual roles in the portrait of the smoker, acting both as back-ground decorative details as well as studio props, almost leaping forward to stand on the table the smoker is depicted leaning his elbow on.

Such imagic collusion, presumed manifested initially in the physical arrangement of objects in a real space, then painted, corresponds to the kinds of pastiche-like construction suggested above as underpinning Cézanne's juvenile *Cabaret Scene* (figs 1.10, 1.29). That is, *Le Fumeur accoudé* (fig. 3B.18) might be seen as making visible a certain *mise-en-scène* of this kind of pictorial construction. For, although the posture of the sitter at a table, his pipe, and the bottle in the background seem to gesture towards Dutch genre panels of tavern interiors or smokers, the status of the bottle as mere illusionistic studio prop, and, indeed, the general atmosphere of the *atelier*, captured, for instance, by the carefully depicted down-turned corner of the still-life pinned to the wall, points in the other direction, to the scene's artificiality as a recreation in the present.

In fact, precisely this same ambivalence seems likewise configured in the painting containing Cézanne's largest inclusion of the imagery of *Paravent avec scènes champêtres et ornements* (figs 3B.1, 3B.6), the enigmatic portrayal of what is

---

83 Reff, 'The pictures within Cézanne's pictures,' op. cit., pp. 94–98.
84 See section 1B.
presumed one of the farm-workers from the Jas de Bouffan, [R 826] *Paysan en blouse bleue* (1897) (fig. 3B.20). Filling most of the background of that painting, and giving some indication of the size of the screen, is the middle section of the fifth panel, which includes one of the figure groups suggested above as daubed onto the panel by Cézanne in his younger years (fig. 3B.19). The screen seems to have been positioned so as to place the male suitor directly behind the seated farm-worker, as if the latter were replacing the former in the pairing with the woman with the parasol, replacing the rococo suitor’s gesture of romantic declamation with the nineteenth-century labourer’s stoic silence. In terms of the treatment of the background screen, it is given a faceted semi-translucent hatching the unfinished feel of which is perhaps the only indication that what is depicted is actually a painted image. Nevertheless, despite this sketchy and cursory appraisal, Cézanne still manages to correct his own earlier daub slightly, introducing a slight twist in her torso and forward thrust to the head which seems to emphasise a visual relationship with the farm-worker before her, as if she were trying to peer around him. In making this visual connection, a series of juxtapositions then seem to be invoked, the contrast of rococo dalliance with the realism of nineteenth-century rural labour evoking ‘a mute dialogue’—or, in Nina Athanassoglou-Kallmyer’s words, a ‘conversational tête-a-tête’—between sexes, between social classes, between the dreams of youth and the hardships of age, between one of the artist’s earliest, albeit daubed, painted efforts and his mature, sullenly mysterious confluences of genre and portraiture.

Simultaneously, through this conflation of images across time, Cézanne might also be seen as enacting that same odd and proliferate reflexive regress noted above as present in certain of his early poems. For, in seemingly including a self-deprecatingly  

---

85 It is difficult to tell whether what is depicted in the upper left corner of [R 826] *Paysan en blouse bleue* (1897) (fig. 3B.20) is the fourth panel of the screen or objects in the room behind the screen revealed by folding back and behind those panels to the left of the fifth. If it is the fourth panel, it has been considerable transformed, including the addition of a coloured shape mirroring the skirt of the woman with the parasol and, in fact, although rotated, that parasol.

86 Reff, ‘The pictures within Cézanne’s pictures,’ op. cit., pp. 96-98.


88 In a sense, what is suggested here is an echo of Theodore Reff’s meditations on Cézanne’s use of his own earlier-painted imagery in his canvases, perhaps summarized by the comment ‘This attachment to his own past, involving a familiar object in his family’s house as well as
painted copy of an early work, perhaps his first, copied after of a reversed reproduction of a rococo engraving then pasted onto the surface of an artisanal landscape itself mimicking, but by a different hand, eighteenth-century tapestry designs, Cézanne’s portrait of the farm-worker might provoke precisely the same vertiginous possibility of interpretation. A whole series of shifting and layered images are evoked, images invoked as memories, or as lost desires, or as social commentary, or, more simply, as wryly humorous asides. In the context of Cézanne’s *Joueurs de cartes* series, contemporary to *Paysan en blouse bleue* (fig. 3B.20) and involving the same sitter, this mute and mysteriously sombre world of nineteenth-century peasants and labourers posed as if in genre scenes might allegorize precisely Cézanne’s peculiar dedication to the production of imagery that not only conflated the affective power of present sensation with the affective monumentality of the art of the past, but also, perhaps, that conflated reality, as a reconstruction in the present, with the affective subjectivity of the intrinsically imagic.

*  

his earliest known work of art, belongs to a self-reflexive, truly conservative side of Cézanne’s personality, of which his frequent habit of quoting his own works is one of the most interesting manifestations: Reff, ‘The pictures within Cézanne’s pictures,’ op. cit., p. 95. For another instance of imagic self-quoting, see the inclusion of [R 93] *Sucrerie, poires et tasse bleue* (1865–1866) (fig. 6A.11(a)) in Cézanne’s portrait of his father [R 101] *Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l’artiste, lisant “L’Événement”* (autumn 1866) (fig. 6A.4), discussed in section 6A.
3C: 'Parle, mais parle donc!!'

On 28 November 1859, Cézanne passed his first-year law exams.\(^{89}\) A month later, Zola concluded a letter to him, the first surviving in his hand since 14 June 1858, with the words:

What shall I say to you to finish this missive merrily? Shall I give you the courage to mount an assault on the ramparts? Or shall I speak to you of painting and drawing? Accursed ramparts, accursed painting! One must stand the test of the canon, the other one is crushed by the paternal veto. When you storm the wall, your bashfulness cries out to you: 'You won't get further!' When you take up your brushes, your father says: 'Child, child, consider your future. One dies with genius, but one eats with money!'\(^{90}\)

Combined with comments in a letter to Baille of the previous day, in which, after mentioning a promise the latter had made to visit Paris, Zola had added 'If that devil Cézanne would come, we could take a small room for two and lead a vie de bohèmes,' this passage exemplifies precisely the themes that have come to dominate characterisations of Cézanne's situation in the years 1859–1860, his so-called 'years of crisis'.\(^{91}\) For, it is presumed that during this period not only was Cézanne continually wrestling with the opposing career choices of Law and painting, but also

\(^{89}\) extracts from *Registre des procès-verbaux d'examen de la Faculté de Droit d'Aix-en-Provence 1859*, AD 13, Centre d'Aix-en-Provence, fonds de la Faculté de Droit, registre 1T 1921, reprinted in *Archives départementales des Bouches-du-Rhône*, op. cit., p. 60. See also the beginning of this chapter.

\(^{90}\)'Que te dirai-je pour achever joyeusement cette missive? Te donnerai-je du courage pour monter à l'assaut du rempart? Ou bien te parlerai-je peinture et dessin? Maudit rempart, maudite peinture! L'un est à l'épreuve du canon, l'autre est accablée du veto paternel. Quand tu t'élances vers le mur, ta timidité te crie: 'Tu n'iras pas plus loin!' Quand tu prends tes pinceaux: 'enfant, enfant, te dit ton père, songes à l'avenir. On meurt avec du génie, et l'on mange avec de l'argent!': Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, 30 December 1859, cited Zola, *Correspondance*, t. 1, op. cit., p. 120. The word canon is left untranslated here in order to leave open the slim possibility Zola might have been making a pun on canon/canon [law].

that the latter implicitly involved his moving to Paris, a plan, in turn, actively, even violently, opposed by his father.

In terms of the historical record, evidence of Cézanne’s activities during this period is as follows. Despite passing his first-year exams, only registered for two more trimesters of study at the Aix Faculté de Droit, beginning, respectively, on 19 November 1859 and 11 January 1860. During the latter of these, presumably around the time he was considering dropping out of his studies, his name was then drawn early enough in the cantonal draft of 24 February 1860 to make military conscription a distinct possibility. He was pronounced fit for service at the conseil du révision held on 28 May, but was, with the purchase by his father of a substitute and the consequent awarding of a certificat pour l’exonération on 14 June, declared officially exempt from military service a month later.

As already noted, there are, unfortunately, no letters in Cézanne’s hand surviving from the end of 1859 up until 1862, and, as such, limited means by which to ascertain his reasons for suspending his legal studies, his opinions regarding his avoidance of conscription through the agency of his wealthy father, or the extent to which he might have been contemplating fulfilling his usually presumed dream of travelling to Paris in

---

92 Extracts from Registre des inscriptions à la Faculté de Droit d’Aix-en-Provence 1858–1859, op. cit., p. 59.
93 Cézanne drew number 49: [Extracts from] Liste du tirage au sort des jeunes gens de la classe 1859, AD 13, Centre de Marseille, registre IR 229, reprinted in Archives départementales des Bouches-du-Rhône, Monsieur Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 68, 69. Each French canton was required to provide a proportion, usually a third, of their twenty-year-old males as recruits for national service; every twenty-year-old in a canton was therefore entered in an annual lottery, the order by which their name was drawn recorded in a cantonal Liste du tirage and each required to appear before a selection board assessing their suitability for service. The medically unfit, the eldest sons of widows and/or infirm parents and those whose brothers were in active service or who had died in active service were exempted. A conseil du révision reviewed those who wished to appeal against their candidacy, exempting or otherwise candidates in a cycle of sittings until the cantonal quota was reached. Exemption could be awarded, until 1873, if a candidate paid another to act as substitute: Alan R. H. Baker, ‘Military service and migration in nineteenth-century France: Some evidence from Loir-et-Cher,’ Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, new series, vol. 23, no. 2 (1998), pp. 194, 196. The quota for Cézanne’s canton in the year he was entered in the Liste du tirage was 35; the candidate with the highest number when this quota was filled following exemptions, including Cézanne’s, was the candidate drawing number 63: Liste du tirage, op. cit., p. 68. It is often implied that the ‘law student’ entered on 24 February as Cézanne’s profession on the Liste tirage was somehow inaccurate, presumably by virtue of the common misapprehension that Cézanne had not enrolled in his sixth trimester of legal studies on 11 January, which, in fact, he had: ibid., p. 69.
94 loc. cit.; Ely, ‘Cézanne’s youth,’ op. cit., p. 35.
pursuit of a career in painting. Reliance must therefore be placed on Zola’s replies to Cézanne’s lost letters, as well as those to Baille in which their mutual friend is discussed.95

Complicating the issue, however, particularly in regard to Cézanne’s proposed trip to Paris, is the contentious dating of three of Zola’s letters.96 For, in the various editions of Cézanne’s *Letters* edited by John Rewald, all three, given as selected extracts, are dated as being from 1860. However, both Henri Mitterand and Colette Becker—compilers of Zola’s *Œuvres complètes* and the most recent edition of his *Correspondance*, respectively—steadfastly maintain, on the basis of their consistency with certain details of Zola’s biography, that an 1861 date for all three is far more likely.97 Nevertheless, Rewald’s 1860 dates seem to have remained unquestioned amongst Cézanne scholars.98 Although a discrepancy of a year may seem inconsequential, in the context of Cézanne’s father’s presumed role in the obstruction of his son’s attempts to travel to Paris, it has considerable ramifications. In short, it might lessen the degree to which Cézanne’s father might be deemed antipathetic to his son’s desires, a lessening, in turn, supporting the resistance made last chapter to interpretations of Cézanne’s posted images and poems of the years 1858–1859 as encoding themes of familial, and, in particular, father-son, conflict.

95 Of Zola’s surviving letters to Cézanne before his first trip to Paris in 1861, one is from 1858, one from 1859, fifteen from 1860 (of which three are addressed to Cézanne and Baille), and two from before April 1861: Zola, *Correspondance*, t. 1, op. cit., pp. 119–121, 126–127, 130–135, 139–142, 159–163, 174–179, 191–195, 212–221, 240–252, 258–261, 271–274. Translated extracts of some of these with specific reference to Cézanne are provided in: Cézanne, *Letters*, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., pp. 64–85, 88–92.

96 There are actually four surviving letters from Zola that mention Cézanne’s trip to Paris, but extracts from only three of these are reprinted in *Letters*, all dated a year earlier than the dates given in Zola’s *Correspondance*: to Baille of 20 February 1860, to Cézanne of 3 March 1860, and to Baille of 17 March 1860: Cézanne, *Letters*, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., pp. 67–69.


The earliest extant indication that Cézanne might have possessed a desire to travel to Paris for the purposes of furthering a career in painting is the already-cited demand from late 1858 that Zola ‘[f]ind out about the Académie competition.’ 99 As noted above, we do not know if Zola replied to this request and it is not until June of the following year—1859—that mention is again made of Cézanne possibly coming to Paris. Even then, it is only in the form of an idly-voiced fantasy of Cézanne’s concerning a ‘certain Justine’. 100 By the end of that same year, painting was again mentioned, but not Paris, Zola sending his painting versus law ‘assault on the ramparts’ passage cited at the beginning of this section. 101 Three months later, in March 1860, Cézanne’s choices regarding painting and law were mentioned again, but not, it seems, in terms of their mutual exclusion. For, after providing Cézanne with one of his first extensive discussions on art, in which the work of Jean Goujon and Ary Scheffer were held up for particular praise, Zola offered up the counsel that ‘You must satisfy your father by studying law assiduously as possible.’ 102 He thus seemed to be advising Cézanne to continue his studies at exactly the moment he was quitting, or, in fact, had already done so. Indeed, in May, by which time Cézanne certainly had suspended his studies, Zola was still under the impression his friend was following his advice, quoting back lines from one of Cézanne’s lost letters.

In your two letters, you give me, as a distant hope, our reunion. ‘When I have finished my law studies, perhaps [...] I shall be free to do what seems best to me, perhaps I’ll be able to rejoin you.’ 103

99 ‘I told myself that if she didn’t hate me we would go off to Paris together, and there I would be an artist and we would be together. I told myself: that way we’ll be happy, I dreamed of pictures, of a fifth-floor studio, you with me, how we would have laughed then!’: Cézanne, letter to Zola, 7 December 1858, op. cit., p. 33. To take these intentions as planned to be matched by future concrete action seems risky; Cézanne, for instance, never seems to have even ended speaking to the girl provoking this fantasy.

100 Paul Cézanne, letter to Émile Zola, 20 June 1859, cited and translated in Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 44.

101 Zola, letter to Cézanne, 30 December 1859, op. cit.


103 ‘Dans tes deux lettres tu me donnes comme un espoir lointain de réunion. “Quand j’aurai fini mes études de droit, peut-être, [...] serai-je libre de faire ce que bon me semblera, peut-être pourrait-je aller te rejoindre”: Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, 5 May 1860, cited in Zola,
By June he was writing, 'You don’t speak any more about Law. What do you make of it? Are you still in discord with it? This poor helpless Law, how you must punish it!' A month after that, he could still end a letter by asking Cézanne about his exams.

It seems odd, then, that not only had Cézanne failed to inform Zola of his suspension, but also that he had maintained such a belligerent silence in regard to it. Nor does Cézanne seem to have mentioned his possible conscription—an event, surely, of considerable alarm—unless the following enigmatic comments, appended as a postscript to a letter from Zola in April, referenced it.

I just received your letter. It gives rise to a very sweet hope in me. Your father is becoming more human, be firm, without being disrespectful. Remember that this is your future which is being decided and that all your happiness depends upon it.

Now, in standard accounts of Cézanne’s biographies, which assume, based on the apparently incorrect 1860 dating for the three letters mentioned above and discussed below, that Cézanne had already planned for, and indeed aborted, a trip to Paris at the time Zola was writing these words, Zola’s reference to Cézanne’s father ‘becoming more human’ are presumed to be in regards to the conflict over this imagined trip. However, without those letters, it is uncertain that such a trip had even been planned, let alone mentioned, to Cézanne’s father, and Zola might instead have been referring

---


104 'Tu ne me parles plus du droit. Qu’en fais-tu? Es-tu toujours en brouille avec lui? Ce pauvre droit qui n’en peut mais, comme tu dois l’arranger!': Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, 13 June 1860, cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 176. Wayne Andersen prefers a slightly different translation for this latter remark, reading ‘avec lui’ as ‘with him [your father]’ rather than ‘with him [the Law]’, emphasising possible conflict between Cézanne and his father: ‘You no longer speak to me about Law. What are you doing about it? Are you still at loggerheads with your father? This poor Law, which cannot help being what it is, how you must rail against it!’: Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, [July 1860], cited and translated in Andersen, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 138


106 ‘Je reçois ta lettre à l’instant. Elle fait naître en moi une bien douce espérance. Ton père s’humanise, sois ferme, sans être irrespectueux. Pense que c’est ton avenir qui se déicide et que tout ton bonheur en dépend’: Zola, letter to Cézanne, 26 April 1860, op. cit., p. 152.
to some other situation, perhaps even Cézanne’s father’s decision to buy his son a substitute.

Nevertheless, what might strengthen the context of Zola’s comments possibly being in regard to painting, and thereby, perhaps, to trips to Paris, is the line immediately following Zola’s comments quoted above, which is: ‘What you say about painting becomes useless the moment you acknowledge for yourself the defects of X ***'.

Now, this mysterious X*** had already been mentioned by Zola in his letter of ten days earlier, in which, warning Cézanne against the pitfalls of ‘commercial’ art, he had written:

[Y]ou are going to work with X ***; you copy his pictures, perhaps you admire him. However, I fear on your behalf for the road you are taking, especially since he whom you are trying to imitate has grand qualities, which he uses poorly, but which nevertheless make his pictures seem better than they are. [...] Therefore, I repeat to you, X *** is a good master to learn your trade from, but I doubt you can learn anything else from his pictures.

Hence, it might be that Zola’s reference to X*** in the later letter from the end of April was directly in response to Cézanne’s defending precisely that teacher following Zola’s criticism just quoted, not necessarily to the lines about Cézanne’s father becoming more human. As a hurried postscript, Zola was, therefore perhaps simply responding briefly to the contents of the letter he had just received from Cézanne, not connecting Cézanne’s father ‘becoming more human’ with Cézanne’s opinion on painting.

107 ‘-Ce que tu dis sur la peinture devient inutile, du moment que tu reconnais toi-même les défauts de X**: Zola, letter to Cézanne, 26 April 1860, op. cit., p. 152. It is unknown why Zola might have sought to disguise the identity of the painter being referred to; some have suggested the disguise might not, in fact, even be the work of Zola but, instead, the editors of the first edition of Correspondance: Becker, ‘[notes],’ in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 148 n. 7.

108 ‘[T]u vas travailler chez X***, tu copies ses tableaux, tu l’admires peut-être. Je crains pour toi ce chemin où tu t’engages, d’autant plus que celui que tu tâches peut-être d’imiter a de grandes qualités, qu’il emploie médiocrement, mais qui n’en font pas moins paraître ses tableaux meilleurs qu’ils ne sont. [...] Aussi, je te le répète, X*** est un bon maître pour t’apprendre le métier; mais je doute que tu puisses apprendre autre chose dans ses tableaux’: Emile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, 16 April 1860, cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 146.
In any case, in terms of who the teacher derided by Zola might have been, some have suggested Cézanne’s École de Dessin drawing instructor Joseph-Marc Gibert, others the painter-teacher Joseph-François Villevieille. 109 Whether the ‘good master’ was either of these, or, indeed, some other painter in Aix, it would seem from the context of Zola’s glib dismissal of Cézanne’s defence of that teacher that Cézanne was, at the time, perfectly happy with the training he was receiving in Aix. If so, this would seem to upset somewhat the usual notion that Cézanne was somehow instinctively opposed, from the outset, to the academic forms of painting exercised, for instance, by the likes of Gibert and Villevieille. 110

However, although he might have been happy with the quality of his training in Aix, Cézanne was certainly not happy with his artistic progress; much of his correspondence to Zola in 1860, going by the replies they received, seemingly devoted to self-flagellant complaints of his painterly inability. 111 To these, Zola’s responses were emphatic, repeating, several times, his motif of working unguibus et rostro quoted above, and chastising his friend for not realising that a true artist required a combination of inborn genius—an unlearnable ‘spark’—and diligent application to work. 112 Cézanne, according to Zola, had the former, and so should be in no position

---

109 Colette Becker suggests the reference is to Gibert; John Rewald is more circumspect, writing ‘The Aix painter referred to here cannot be identified. Perhaps it is J.-F. Villevieille, in whose studio Cézanne is supposed to have worked’: Becker, ‘[notes],’ in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 148 n. 6; Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 86 n. 14. Likewise, Jack Lindsay and Wayne Andersen suggest Villevieille: Lindsay, op. cit., p. 63; Andersen, The Youth of Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 106.

110 Some have suggested, albeit perhaps based only on anecdote or presumption, that Cézanne found Villevieille’s style ‘too academic’; even if true, the opinion is cited as being formed later, when Cézanne was working in Villevieille’s studio in Paris: Mack, op. cit., p. 49.

111 ‘Une autre phrase de ta lettre m’a aussi douloureusement impressionné. C’est celle-ci: “La peinture que j’aime, quoique je ne réussisse pas”, etc., etc.’: Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, 16 April 1860, cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 146; ‘Tu me parais découragé dans ta dernière lettre; tu me parles rien moins que de jeter tes pinceaux au plafond’: Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, 25 June 1860, cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 191; ‘Un autre passage de ta lettre m’a chagriné. Tu jettes, me dis-tu, parfois tes pinceaux au plafond, lorsque la forme ne suit pas ton idée’: Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, [July 1860], cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 213.

112 ‘Je te l’ai déjà dit pourtant: dans l’artiste il y a deux hommes, le poète et l’ouvrier. On naît poète, on devient ouvrier. Et toi qui as l’étincelle, qui possèdes ce qui ne s’acquiert pas, tu le plains, lorsque tu n’as pour réussir qu’à exercer tes doigts, qu’à devenir ouvrier’: Zola, letter to Cézanne, 16 April 1860, op. cit., p. 146.
to complain; all he needed do was practice. Indeed, much of Zola's correspondence from the early part of 1860 verges on condescendingly-articulated advice on the dos and don'ts of painting, warning Cézanne away from the traps of 'realist' or 'commercial' art. Instead, like Ary Scheffer, apparently Zola's favourite painter at the time, Cézanne is encouraged to become a 'spiritualiste'.

In promoting this particular artistic path in opposition to Realism, Zola mounted a concerted diatribe against this latter this style, all for, it seems, the edification of Cézanne, lest he be tempted to follow the heresy of this 'art denuded of poetry'.

What do you want therefore to say with this 'realist'? You brag you paint only subjects stripped of poetry! But everything has its poetry, manure as well as flowers. Would it be because you pretend to imitate nature slavishly? But then, since you rail against poetry so, this is to say nature is prosaic. And there you have lied. —It is for you that I say this, my friend, my grand future painter.

Often, this invective is taken as aimed squarely at Cézanne, the assumption being that the 'you' referred to in the first part of the quoted extract was Cézanne himself, who is thereby presumed to have previously proclaimed some affiliation to realism in his lost correspondence, a position Zola was now attempting to sway his friend from maintaining. However, as the change from the polite vous to familiar tu in the

---

113 loc. cit.
114 Zola, letters to Cézanne, 25 March 1860 and 16 April 1860, op. cit., pp. 140–141, 146. Hence, ironically, if there is a motif in Zola's appraisal of Cézanne's situation of the Choice of Hercules, it is in terms of the artistic path Cézanne should choose to embark upon, not whether or not Cézanne should become an artist in the first place. On the Choice of Hercules, see section 2D.
115 'Scheffer, le spiritualiste, me fait penser aux réalistes. [...] Voilâ bien un tableau qui semble dénué de tout poésie'; Zola, letter to Cézanne, 25 March 1860, op. cit., pp. 140, 141.
116 'Que voulons-vous donc dire avec ce mot de réaliste? Vous vous vantez de ne peindre que des sujets dénués de poésie! Mais chaque chose a la sienne, le fumier comme les fleurs. Serait-ce parce que vous prétendez imiter la nature servilement? Mais alors, puisque vous criez tant après la poésie, c'est dire que la nature est prosaïque. Et vous en avez menti. —C'est pour toi que je dis cela, monsieur mon ami, monsieur le grand peintre futur.'; Zola, letter to Cézanne, 25 March 1860, op. cit., p. 141.
117 For instance, the comments of Lawrence Gowing in regard to [R29] Le Baigneur au rocher: 'If this or any another such borrowing from Courbet was painted as early as 1860 it may have accounted for Cézanne's claim to realism in a letter now lost and his boast that he painted only subjects that were devoid of poetry, which Zola answered on 25 March 1860. No other surviving picture [other than [R29]] fills [sic] the bill': Lawrence Gowing, '[Catalogue
extract seems to indicate (Et vous en avez menti. — C’est pour toi que je dis cela), Zola might not be addressing Cézanne, but his imagined realist nemesis; the reader (Cézanne) might merely be overhearing Zola’s argument.

Although the tone of affected urbanity pervading these dissertations on art, along with Zola’s occasional digs at the ignorance of art-world fashions in the provinces, might be seen as a means by which to subtly goad Cézanne into coming to Paris, there was still no direct discussion of that latter possibility until July 1860. Then, but still before Zola had been informed of Cézanne’s dropping of his legal studies, Zola wrote, apparently in response to more complaints from his friend;

[V]ou want to ask your father to be allowed to come to Paris to become an artist. [...] [B]ut, by the cross of God! if I was in your place, I would speak up, risk everything, not float uncertainly between two different futures, the artist’s studio and the Bar. [...] [B]e really lawyer, or be really artist; but don’t remain some nameless being, wearing a lawyer’s gown spattered with paint.119

As is obvious from Zola’s phrasing, Cézanne seems to have imagined such a trip, but had not yet raised the courage—or, perhaps, the conviction—to canvas the plan with his father, who, assumedly, would have had to fund the endeavour. But then, towards the end of this same letter, Zola interrupts himself to report receiving news from Baille

notes for] The Four Seasons,’ in Gowing et al., Cézanne: The Early Years 1859–1872, op. cit., p. 70. This painting, as well as Gowing’s dating of it to either 1861 or c.1860–1862 is discussed below, section 6B. Wayne Andersen seems to hold a similar view that Zola’s attack on realism was addressed to Cézanne, commenting precisely in regard to the quoted extract: ‘Zola turns to the subject of realism as opposed to poetry. He is struggling with Cézanne’s attitude, which may be resisting the poetic. [...] Still a near hopeless juvenile romantic, Zola lays into Cézanne for lack of interest in the pure emotion of poetry’. Andersen, The Youth of Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 114. Roger Cranshaw and Adrian Lewis also take the letter from Zola as evidence of Cézanne’s self-proclaimed affiliation with the Realists: Cranshaw and Lewis, op. cit., p. 129.

118 For instance; ‘Je ne sais tu connais Ary Scheffer, ce peintre de gène mort l’année dernière: à Paris, ce serait un crime de répondre non, mais en province, ce n’est qu’une grosse ignorance’: Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, 25 March 1860, cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 140.
119 ‘[T]u veux demander à ton père de te laisser venir à Paris pour te faire artiste. [...] [M]ais, par la croix-Dieu! si j’étais à ta place, je voudrais avoir le mot, risquer le tout pour le tout, ne pas flotter vaguement entre deux avenirs si différents, l’atelier et le barreau. [...] [S]ois véritablement avocat, ou bien sois véritablement artiste; mais ne reste pas une être sans nom, portant une toge sale de peinture: Zola, letter to Cézanne, [July 1860], op. cit., pp. 212–213.
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that Cézanne was intending on coming to Paris.\textsuperscript{120} However, if this was the case, by August Cézanne still seems not to have broached the subject with his father, Zola writing:

As for the great question we need not mention, I can only repeat myself, give you the advice I have already offered. As long as two lawyers have not pleaded their case, the case is still at the same point; discussion is the spark that sets everything off. Therefore, if you remain silent how can you go forward and reach a conclusion? It is materially impossible. And notice that it is not the one who shouts loudest who is right; speak softly and prudently; but by the horns, the feet, the tail, the navel of the devil, speak, but speak, then!!\textsuperscript{121}

By September, Zola had lost patience with his friend and his entreaties regarding the possible future trip, or, perhaps, more precisely, his placing that possibility before his father, had devolved into a kind of petulant emotional blackmail, writing to Baille; "It is almost useless for [Cezanne] to write to me until the question of his trip is resolved." Almost immediately, it seems, Zola got what he wanted; in his very next letter, Baille must have repeated not only that Cezanne's intention was still to come to Paris, but also that, in fact, a date had been set: March 1861.\textsuperscript{123}

\textsuperscript{120} "Je viens de recevoir une lettre de Baille. Je n'y comprends plus rien; voici une phrase que je lis dans cette épitre: "Il est presque certain que Cézanne ira à Paris: quelle joie!" Est-ce d'après toi qu'il parle, lui; as-tu véritablement donné cette espérance dernièrement, lorsqu'il s'est rendu à Aix? Ou bien a-t-il rêvé, s'est-il pris à croire réel ton désir seul?": Emile Zola, letter to Paul Cezanne, [July 1860], op. cit., p. 214.

\textsuperscript{121} "Quant à la grande question que tu sais, je ne puis que me répéter, je donner les conseils déjà donnés. Tant que deux avocats n'ont pas plaident, la cause en est toujours au même point; la discussion est le flambeau de toute chose. Si donc tu restes silencieux, comment veux-tu avancer et conclure? C'est matériellement impossible. Et remarque que ce n'est pas celui qui crie le plus fort qui a raison; parle tout doucement et sagement; mais par les cornes, les pieds, la queue, le nombril du diable, parle, mais parle donc!!!": Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, 1 August 1860, cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 219. That Zola began this letter with the already-discussed mention of his rereading a poem by Cézanne on the 'Hercule', entre le vice et la vertu, was trying to subtly imply Cézanne, in not speaking to his father about his apparent desire to travel to Paris was somehow taking the easy, and therefore cowardly, option, is open for debate.

\textsuperscript{122} "Dis à mon vieux Cézanne que je suis triste et que je ne saurais répondre à sa dernière épître; cette lettre est pour vous deux. Il est presque inutile qu'il m'écrive, jusqu'à ce que la question du voyage soit résolue": Émile Zola, letter to Baptistin Baille, 21 September 1860, cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 238.

\textsuperscript{123} "Tu m'assures que Cézanne viendra ici au mois de mars - c'est à Baille que je parle, et non à Paul auquel je me suis promis de ne plus parler de cela": Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne and Baptistin Baille, 2 October 1860, cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 242.
Whether or not this indicated Cézanne had convinced his father to fund his trip to Paris in March, or was merely planning to convince him to do so, by February the plan did, indeed, seem to still be in place, Zola writing to Baille; ‘Voici Cézanne, who is going to come to rejoin me,’ and ‘I await Cézanne and hope to recover a little of my former gaiety as soon as he’s here.’ Within days, however, he was expressing directly to Cézanne his uneasy ‘forebodings’ about this trip, ‘about the more or less impending dates of your arrival.’ Sensing the possibility of backsliding on his friend’s behalf, Zola attempted one final rallying summation of the events of the previous few years to bolster what he seemed to have felt was Cézanne’s flagging resolve:

You fought for two years to arrive at the point where you are now; it seems to me that after so much effort, complete victory cannot remain yours without some new battles. So here is Mr. Gibert who feels out your intentions, who recommends you stay in Aix; a master who undoubtedly sees with regret a pupil escaping. On the other hand, your father speaks of informing himself, of consulting the aforesaid Gibert, a meeting from which would inevitably result the setting back of your trip until August. All that gives me the shivers, I tremble at receiving a letter from you where, with many regrets, you tell me the date has changed. I am so much accustomed to considering the last week of March the end of my boredom, how very painful it would be for me, only having stored up enough patience until then, to find myself alone at that time.

---

124 ‘Voici Cézanne qui va venir me retrouver’ and ‘J’attends Cézanne et j’espère recouvrer un peu de ma gaieté d’autrefois dès qu’il sera ici’: Émile Zola, letters to Baptistin Baille, [around 10 February 1861] and 20 February [1861], cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., pp. 267 and 271. On the dating of the first letter cited, see: Mitterand, ‘La jeunesse de Zola et de Cézanne,’ op. cit, pp. 353–355; Becker, ‘[notes],’ in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 267 n. 1. Rewald’s Letters does not mention this letter, but does reprint an extract of the latter, dated incorrectly, according to Mitterand, as from 1860.

125 ‘Je ne sais, j’ai de mauvais pressentiments sur ton voyage, j’entends sur les dates plus ou moins prochaines de ton arrivée’: Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, 3 March [1860/1861], cited in Zola, Correspondance, t 1, op. cit., p. 271.

126 ‘Tu as combattu deux ans pour en arriver au point où tu en es; il me semble qu’après tant d’efforts la victoire ne peut te rester complète sans quelques nouveaux combats. Ainsi voici le sieur Gibert qui tâche tes intentions, qui te conseille de rester à Aix; maître qui voit sans doute avec regret un élève lui échapper. D’autre part, ton père parle de s’informer, de consulter le susdit Gibert, conciliable d’où résulterait inévitablement le renvoi de ton voyage au mois d’août. Tout cela me donne des frissons; je tremble de recevoir une lettre de ta part où, avec maintes doléances, tu m’annonces un changement de date. Je suis tellement habitué à
Now, this is an oft-cited passage, epitomizing as it does, the perceived conflict believed to underlie all of Cézanne's activities in 1860. For, if regarded as from 1860, as every Cézanne biography seems to do, along with the above-cited letter to Baille of 20 February, this letter implies a trip was planned for March 1860, but never eventuated thanks to the machinations of Joseph-Marc Gibert and Cézanne's father, resistances implied, thereby, to have persisted into the following year, when Cézanne did in fact end up in Paris. Another letter to Baille, and likewise presumed, incorrectly according to Henri Mitterand and Collette Becker, to be from 1860, is also often cited in support of precisely this state of affairs.

I recently received a letter from Cézanne in which he tells me his youngest sister is ill and that he hardly expects to arrive in Paris before the beginning of next month [April].

---

127 In regard to the 1860 datings, take the example of Isobel Cahn's excellent, definitive, and hence often referred-to chronology of Cézanne's life reprinted in several publications since its first appearance in the catalogue for the travelling 1995-1996 Cézanne retrospective, which has, as entries for February 1860, 'Cézanne wants to go to Paris to learn to paint. This plan is thwarted by Gibert, his drawing teacher, who opposes his departure,' and for March 1860, 'Cézanne's departure [to Paris] is delayed by the illness of his sister Rose': Cahn, 'Chronology,' op. cit., p. 530. Oddly, the 3 March letter is cited twice, once as from 1860 and in the former of the entries just mentioned, and once as from 1861 in the entry for April 1861, where Zola's extensive budget given in that letter is quoted: ibid., p. 531. Even more oddly, Mitterand's article, cited above, does not appear in either of the otherwise comprehensive bibliographies given in John Rewald's catalogue raisonné or the catalogue for the 1995-1996 Cézanne retrospective: Cachin et al., Cézanne, op. cit., p. 585; Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 584. For an interestingly dramatized interpretation of the letter just cited, presumed by John Rewald to be from 1860, take the following: 'In February 1860, when life at home became unbearable because of Paul's reproachful glances, brooding silences, and barely contained rebellion, his father offered to let him go to Paris on the condition that his teacher at the local school approve the action. It was a conciliatory move that raised great hopes, but also an extremely shrewd one, since the teacher, as Zola immediately suspected, was not eager to lose a pupil and told the banker that Paul could still learn a great deal in Aix. The disappointment was too much for the young man, who now abandoned himself completely to discouragement and apathy. The father had won the first round': Rewald, 'Cézanne and his father,' op. cit., p. 74.

128 'J'ai reçu dernièremen une lettre de Cézanne, dans laquelle il me dit que sa petite soeur est malade et qu'il ne compte guère arriver à Paris que vers les premiers jours du mois prochain': Emile Zola, letter to Baptistin Baille, 17 March [1861], cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 278.
As such, the trip is often implied to have been first put off until the beginning of April 1860 and then, eventually, until March of the following year.\footnote{Aside from the dating of the three letters just discussed to 1860 rather than 1861, John Rewald also suggests Cézanne’s proposed trip to Paris was set, for a time, to August 1860: Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 86 n. 12. As evidence, he refers to a line in a letter from Zola of March 1860 that reads, ‘In August, we’ll drink, we’ll smoke, we’ll sing’. Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, 25 March 1860, cited and translated in ibid., p. 71. Zola’s comment seems, however, far more likely a reference to his own possible stay in Aix over the summer of 1860, as he had done in the previous two years, and of which he would later write, in May 1860, ‘Leclère met en doute, me dis-tu, mon voyage à Aix. Le cher homme se trompe; je compte aller te serrer la main tout comme l’année dernière,’ and then, in June 1860, ‘Je compte toujours aller te voir bientôt’. Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, 5 May 1860 and 25 June 1860, cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit. pp. 161 and 193; Thomson, ‘Tableau chronologique,’ op. cit., pp. 94, 102. Oddly, Rewald himself mentions Zola’s planned August 1860 trip to Aix elsewhere, ‘Zola’s trip was first postponed from August [1860] to mid-September [1860], but in the end did not occur, probably owing to lack of money’: Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit., p. 87 n. 22. Zola’s promises about dates of trips would seem, thereby, ironically more untrustworthy than Cézanne’s purported vacillations.} If, however, all three letters were written in 1861, as is argued by Mitterand and Becker, it would seem that things moved more rapidly than is usually presented, diminishing somewhat the presumption that Cézanne’s father’s intransigence delayed the trip.\footnote{It would also seem to make Zola’s comments ‘[T]u veux demander à ton père de te laisser venir à Paris pour te faire artiste,’ from his letter presumed to have been from July of 1860, and therefore after the purportedly cancelled trip, somewhat nonsensical: Zola, letter to Cézanne, [July 1860], op. cit., p. 212.} For, in attempting to reconstruct the letter to which Zola was responding at the beginning of March, it might seem that Cézanne’s father had only recently been informed of his son’s desire to go to Paris to further his painting career, a plan apparently against the advice of his drawing teacher Gibert, and had decided to go and ask the latter for his opinion. If this had been done, Louis-Auguste was either given the opinion that such a trip was a good idea or had ignored advice to the contrary. For, although Zola’s ‘forebodings’ about a change of date for Cézanne’s trip did in fact turn out to be correct, it seems not to the extent, nor for the reasons usually cited. Moreover, in the same letter that Zola voiced these forebodings, he also included a suggested budget for Cézanne’s stay in Paris, introducing it thus: ‘As for the matter of money, it’s true that 125 francs a month won’t allow for great luxuries. I’m going to work out you budget.’\footnote{‘Quant à la question pécuniaire, il est fait que 125 francs par mois ne te permettront pas un grand luxe. Je veux te faire le calcul de ce que tu outras dépenser’. Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, 3 March [1861], cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 272.} He then seems to work back from this figure, presumably as Cézanne had...
asked his advice whether this was a sufficient amount to survive on. As such, this might seem to indicate that an allowance amount had been decided upon by Cézanne and his father before the latter had gone to see Gibert, a possibility seemingly confirmed by Zola’s comment that ‘perhaps the sorry reality’ of his budget ‘will persuade [your father] [...] to open his purse a bit wider.’

In any case, whatever Gibert’s advice had been, along with Louis-Auguste’s reaction to it, Cézanne’s assurance of arriving in April 1861 was nevertheless fulfilled, although he arrived towards the end of that month instead of, as initially promised, the beginning.

---

132 Zola’s monthly budget is as follows: 20 francs for rent, 60 francs for meals, 10 francs studio rent (here citing the Académie Suisse, where, as noted below, Cézanne ended up), and 10 francs for art supplies, leaving 25 francs for laundry, lighting, and sundries: loc. cit.
133 ‘Je te conseille de faire à ton père le calcul ci-dessus; peut-être la triste réalité des chiffres lui fera-t-elle un peu plus délier sa bourse’: ibid., pp. 272–273.
134 See section 4A. The 1861 datings for the three letters also seem to unsettle John Rewald’s oft-cited comment that, based precisely upon his dating of the 3 March letter to 1860, that 1858 was the year in which Cézanne began his ‘two year struggle’ to become a painter: Rewald, ‘Cézanne and his father,’ op. cit., pp. 70–71. Pushing it a year forward, however, might match better Cézanne’s biography; for 1859, rather than 1858, was not only the year in which Cézanne received his prize for painting, as mentioned below, but also the year in which he had first related his fantasy of living in Paris with his ‘Justine’.
Aside from writing lost letters to Zola and forestalling, apparently, broaching with his father the subject of his possibly training in Paris to be a painter, what Cézanne did to occupy his time during the bulk of 1860 is difficult to tell. He'd suspended his legal studies, but continued attending drawing classes at the École de Dessin and, in a census report of October 1860, gave as his profession as legal clerk. Apart from this, and as seems evident from the convoluted discussion of Zola’s correspondence just enacted, Zola was as exasperatedly in the dark concerning Cézanne’s activities in 1860 as historians are, Cézanne’s lost correspondence, according to Zola’s surviving responses, full only of verses ‘breathing sombre sadness’, threats to hurl his brushes at the ceiling in frustration, and complaints of being not only bored, but also depressing to those around him and to whom he wrote.

In terms of the paintings Cézanne might have executed in 1860, and aside from the large decorated screen *Paravent avec scènes champêtres et ornement* (figs 3B.1, 3B.6) and the academic nude *Nu académique* (fig. 3A.5) discussed above, and the mural panels [R 4–7] *Les Quatre Saisons* (1860–1861) (figs 3E.11–14) discussed below, John Rewald cites ten paintings as dated c.1860, some surviving only in reproduction. Of these, two, [R 9] *Le Baiser de la Muse, d’après Frillié* (c.1860)
(fig. 3D.1) and [R 13] Le Prisonnier de Chillon, d’après Dubufe (c.1860) (fig. 3D.3), are copies after works held in the Musée d’Aix (figs 3D.2, 3D.4) and one, [R 15] Les Deux enfants, d’après Prud’hon, (c.1860) (fig. 3D.5), is a copy after an engraving of a painting by Pierre-Paul Prud’hon (figs 3D.6–7). Rewald also suggests four more might have been painted after engravings as yet unidentified: [R 12] Fillette au perroquet (c.1860) (fig. 3D.8), [R 14] Scène d’intérieur (c.1860) (fig. 3D.10), [R 16] Paysage avec moulin (c.1860) (fig. 3D.17), and [R 17] Paysage avec moulin (c.1860) (fig. 4D.18). 138 Of the remaining five works, one, [R 11] La Visitation (c.1860) (fig. 3D.23), as noted above and suggested below, might be related compositionally to a painting then in the Chappelle du Grand Séminaire in Avignon (fig. 3D.24), and another, [R 10] Jeune fille en méditation (c.1860) (fig. 3D.19), has been suggested by Mary Tompkins Lewis as configured in terms similar to, and therefore perhaps influenced by, the works of contemporary religious genre painters such as Théodore Ribot and Alphonse Légros. 139 Finally, to this list of works inspired by other artists might also be added [R 18] Cavalier et berger dans un paysage Montagneux (c.1860) (fig. 3D.27), which, as shown below, repeats motifs particular to Dutch Italianate landscapes of the seventeenth and eighteenth century presumably known to Cézanne through engraved reproductions or contemporary or near-contemporary revivals of that style.

---

Fillette au perroquet (c.1860) (fig. 3D.8), [R 13] Le Prisonnier de Chillon, d’après Dubufe (c.1860) (fig. 3D.3), [R 14] Scène d’intérieur (c.1860) (fig. 3D.10), [R 15] Les Deux enfants, d’après Prud’hon, (c.1860) (fig. 3D.5), [R 16] Paysage avec moulin (c.1860) (fig. 3D.17), [R 17] Paysage avec moulin (c.1860) (fig. 3D.18), [R 18] Cavalier et berger dans un paysage Montagneux (c.1860) (fig. 3D.27). Two remaining paintings are suggested by Rewald as executed in the date range 1860–1862, thereby straddling Cézanne’s trip to Paris; these are the still-life [R 19] Objets en cuivre et vase de fleurs (1860–1862) (o/c (41 x 47), WU) and the rather odd, and ex-voto style [R 20] Scène religieuse (1860–1862) (o/c (28 x 23), WU); Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 71. In regard to the former, Rewald notes ‘It seems difficult to accept this paintings of apparently unrelated objects as a genuine work of Cézanne, except that its origin with Vollard and its passage through the Bernheim-Jeune gallery and the Pellerin Collection vouches for its authenticity’: Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 71.

138 [R 12] Fillette au perroquet (c.1860) (fig. 3D.8) is described by John Rewald as a work that ‘may be a copy after an engraving’ and [R 14] Scène d’intérieur (c.1860) (fig. 3D.10) as ‘probably copied from an engraving after a Dutch painting’: Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 69. In terms of [R 16] Paysage avec moulin (c.1860) (fig. 3D.17) and [R 17] Paysage avec moulin (c.1860) (fig. 4D.18), Rewald describes the former as ‘probably copied from an engraving’, but suggests the variations between it and [R 17] Paysage avec moulin (c.1860) (fig. 4D.18), which he describes as ‘essentially the same landscape’, are ‘difficult to explain’ if this is the case: ibid., p. 70.

139 Lewis, Cézanne’s Early Imagery, op. cit., pp. 117–119.
That the bulk of Cézanne’s early works are presumed copies after originals or engravings is not surprising, given the already discussed emphasis on precisely these practices at the École de Dessin.\textsuperscript{140} What might be unusual, however, are the kinds of works Cézanne seems to have chosen to copy, all in styles and depicting subject matter mid-nineteenth century French academic teaching is unlikely to have encouraged.\textsuperscript{141} In short, they are often genre scenes, often with a distinctly Dutch or Flemish bent, and usually concerned with anecdotal and/or sentimental themes. Moreover, those copied after actual paintings, as opposed to engravings, have explicitly romantic themes, emphasising, perhaps, Cézanne’s early preoccupation with poetic rather than painterly, concerns.

In terms of the works themselves, those copied after actual paintings, \textit{Le Baiser de la Muse, d’après Frillie} (fig. 3D.1) and \textit{Le Prisonnier de Chillon, d’après Dubufe} (fig. 3D.3), are described by John Rewald as ‘excruciatingly faithful’, the originals after which they were copied characterized as, respectively, ‘dramatic, vacuous, and inept’ and ‘unspeakably trivial’.\textsuperscript{142} However, regardless of the quality of their models, and although certainly not as divergent as the figures presumed pastiched on the painted screen discussed above, Cézanne’s copies after these paintings might not be as accurate as Rewald implies. And again, as was the case with the figures on the painted screen, comparison between Cézanne’s copies and their originals might offer some insight into the technical abilities, or not, of their executor.

In the case of \textit{Le Baiser de la Muse, d’après Frillie} (fig. 3D.1), close comparison with its original is conveniently easy, the painting today displayed at the Musée Granet alongside the work after which it was painted, Félix Nicolas Frillié’s \textit{Le Baiser de la}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{140} It should also perhaps be pointed out, if only for interest’s sake, that every single one of the paintings suggested as possibly executed by Cézanne in or before 1861, with the exception of the still-life \textit{Objets en cuivre et vase de fleurs} (1860–1862) (o/c (41 x 47), WU), which John Rewald expresses some doubt regarding its attribution to Cézanne, contain depictions of the human figure: Rewald, \textit{The Paintings of Paul Cézanne}, op. cit., p. 19.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{141} For instance, Bruno Ely’s comments on \textit{Le Baiser de la Muse, d’après Frillié} (c.1860) (fig. 3D.1), ‘Les raisons qui purent pousser Cézanne à copier Frillié sont nombreuses et définissent suffisamment de motivations parmi lesquelles on ne peut admettre celle d’une copie imposée par son professeur de l’École de dessin. L’enseignement en effet ne comprenant pas ce type d’exercice’; Bruno Ely, \textit{[Catalogue notes for] Le Rêve du poète ou le baiser de la muse"}, in Coutagne et al., \textit{Cézanne au Musée Granet}, op. cit., p. 209.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{142} Rewald, \textit{Cézanne: A Biography}, op. cit., p. 24.}
In terms of such a comparison, the most obvious difference is Cézanne's lighter palette, the background of Frillié's canvas an almost inky blue-black in contrast to the deep reddish-brown of Cézanne's. This overall lightening of tone seems to have necessitated, in Cézanne's version, the inclusion of the chair the poet is sitting on, Frillié's painting of a dark enough pitch to entirely swamp it in shadows. Consequently, and speaking heavily against the young copyist's ability to paint without a model, real or imagic, Cézanne's depiction of the chair is startlingly crude, its childish, blockish forms deployed in an amateurish inverse perspective that jars markedly with the far more confidently positioned figures around it. In fact, there is something intrinsically odd about a picture of a poet awaiting the kiss of genius having its veil of illusionism punctured not by the appearance of a fantastical winged muse, but, instead, by something as horrifyingly prosaic as badly-depicted furniture. The chair sits at the middle of the canvas undoing much of what the painting might otherwise be seen as trying to depict, the disjunction between the respective depictions of the poet awaiting inspiration and the chair he so awkwardly sits in, whether consciously contrived or not, encapsulating, rather ironically, a particular truth: the truth of aspirations outweighing ability.

In terms of more subtle, but perhaps as telling, deviations, the vertical edge of the table leg to the left is tilted slightly to the left, a divergence consistent with Robert Ratcliffe's observation of a career-long tendency for Cézanne to rotate compositions precisely in this direction the longer he worked on a painting. The angle of the table leg to the left is tilted slightly to the left, a divergence consistent with Robert Ratcliffe's observation of a career-long tendency for Cézanne to rotate compositions precisely in this direction the longer he worked on a painting.

---

143 Frillié's painting was acquired by the Musée d'Aix when it was donated to the museum by Napoleon III following its exhibition at the 1857 Salon de Paris: Ely, 'Cézanne, l'École de Dessin et le Musée d'Aix,' op. cit., p. 171; Bruno Ely, 'Catalogue des œuvres de Cézanne conservées au Musée Granet d'Aix-en-Provence,' in Coutagne et al., Cézanne au Musée d'Aix, op. cit., pp. 208-209. A drawing apparently related to this painting, and in fact described by Adrien Chappuis as a study for his painted copy, [Ch 12 (b)] (detail from) Bush and Faces (1856-1857), is mentioned above in relation to [Ch 37] "Mort règne en ces lieux" (1859) (fig. 2.3); see, also: Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 58.

144 Except where noted, all observations regarding differences between the two canvases, some of which are not apparent from reproductions, are from personal observation of the works at the Musée Granet in October 2008.

145 See also the chairs depicted in [R 10] Jeune fille en méditation (c. 1860) (fig. 3D.19) and [R 95] Portrait de Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l'artiste (c. 1865) (fig. 6A.3), which display a similarly awkward conception; on these, see, respectively sections 3D and 6A.

146 Robert Ratcliffe posited the tilt to the left in [R 9] Le Baiser de la Muse, d'après Frillié (fig. 3D.1) only tentatively, having 'no access to the original source': Ratcliffe, Cézanne's Working Methods, op. cit., p. 137. On precisely this tendency to tilt compositions to the left, see: ibid., pp. 113-155, 214-215.
table's corner has also been opened up, tipping the top of the table towards the viewer. This, combined with the use, unlike in the original, of the same greenish-brown tones for the clothing of the poet as for the table, along with the squaring of the composition by cropping the top and bottom of the picture, results in the centre section being pushed forward, a flattening, again, seemingly precursive to the same affect, and, indeed, underlying device causing it, present in many of his mature masterpieces, in particular his still-lives.

The other of Cézanne's copies after a painting in the Musée d'Aix, *Le Prisonnier de Chillon, d'après Dubufe* (fig. 3D.3), is however, by virtue of being known now only in monochromatic reproduction, difficult to compare as closely with its original, Louis-Edouard Dubufe's *Le Prisonnier de Chillon* (1846) (fig. 3D.4). Nevertheless, some observations might still be made, particularly in terms of certain discrepancies of proportion, Cézanne repeating the heads, and in particular that of Bonivard's dying brother, slightly larger than they are in the original. This problem with parts-to-whole anomalies, noticed already in the discussion regarding his *Nu académique* (fig. 3A.5), oddly pre-empts what Cézanne would later purportedly admit in regard to just this issue.

_I am a primitive, I have a lazy eye. I applied twice to the École des Beaux-Arts, but I can't pull a composition together. If a head interests me, I make it too large._

In the case of both these paintings, it should also be pointed out that Cézanne chose not only relatively conventional, albeit romantic and affectively charged, paintings by painters with mainstream appeal, but also pictures with explicitly literary themes.

---

147 Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 69. Dubufe's canvas was acquired by the Musée d'Aix in 1851: Coutagne, 'Nineteenth-century French painting,' op. cit., p. 104.


149 As Bruno Ely has pointed out, the title of the Frillié painting when first catalogued by the Musée d'Aix, *Le Baiser du Génie de la Poésie*, even more specifically references the poetic concerns of Cézanne at this time: Ely, 'Catalogue des œuvres de Cézanne conservées au Musée Granet d'Aix-en-Provence,' op. cit., p. 209. The Dubufe painting might also have originally been exhibited at the Musée d'Aix alongside a short translated extract of Lord Byron's poem, and definitely cited alongside that same extract in the 1862 catalogue for the Musée compiled by Cézanne's fellow student at the École de Dessins and son of Cézanne's teacher Joseph.
In terms of that affective appeal, some general resonances might be noted between these two canvases and certain of Cézanne’s later so-called romantic canvases of the late 1860s. Hence, the limply hanging arm of female figure carried off in [R 121] L’Enlèvement (1867) (fig. 6B.9) seems dimly reminiscent of the hanging arm of the poet in Frillié’s depiction, the general layout of the male figures in [R 142] La Toilette funéraire (1869) a distant echo, albeit in reverse, of Dubufe’s prison scene.150

However, it is rare for Cézanne’s copy after the Frillié painting to be mentioned by scholars without immediate reference being made to the anecdote that it was his mother’s favourite painting.151 The implication following from this is, then, that it was her taste reflected in Cézanne’s decision to copy the painting rather than his own. This is also often extended to other of Cézanne’s early copies or suspected paraphrases, as if it were impossible to imagine the young painter having anything other than the progressive taste in painting he would later develop in Paris during the 1860s.152

In any case, and in terms of paintings presumed by Rewald to have been executed around 1860 but after engravings, rather than originals, the most obvious is Les Deux enfants, d’après Prud’hon (fig. 3D.5), which repeats the imagery of Pierre Paul Prud’hon’s panel Les Petits lapins (1804–1818) (fig. 3D.7), but in reverse, suggesting Cézanne’s version was after a reproduction.153 One possible source is the mid-nineteenth-century print by Alexandre Collette, an example of which is held in the British Museum (fig. 3D.6), published, according to the records of that institution, in

---

150 [R 142] La Toilette funéraire (1869) (o/c (49 x 80), PC). On [R 121] L’Enlèvement (1867) (fig. 6B.9), see section 6B.
151 ‘Le tableau préféré de sa mère qui l’accrochait dans sa chambre et qui l’emportait à chacun de ses déménagements entre leur maison en ville et le Jas de Bouffan’: Rewald, Cézanne et Zola, op. cit., p. 44.
152 Take, for instance, Wayne Andersen’s comment in regard to [R 12] Fillette au perroquet (c.1860) (fig. 3D.8), mentioned below, which he suggests ‘[Cézanne] would have destroyed had his mother not protected it’: Andersen, The Youth of Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 299.
an 'unidentified French newspaper.' Keeping in mind that Collette’s print is by no means definitively the reproduction after which Cézanne’s panel was executed, observations might still be made in regard to the kinds of changes wrought by Cézanne in copying his image.

In terms of the most obvious difference, apart from an increase in the image’s overall size, this is, perhaps as a result of just this increased scale, a decrease in the size of the figures relative to frame size. Combined with Cézanne’s use of a standard French no. 10 figure canvas, which has a slightly squarer format than the print (but, interestingly, not the original panel), this seems to have necessitated a spreading out of the motifs. Hence, in the original panel, and the print after it, the barrel in the background is tucked behind the bench upon which the couple sit, its contour meeting the boy’s wrist. In Cézanne’s version, however, it has been pushed to the left, leaving a gap between it and the boy. There is thereby a kind of shrinking of the elements relative to each other, a reversal of the procedure undertaken in the copy after Dubufe discussed above. Cézanne has also extended even further in his version the imagic simplification present in the print, an aspect concomitantly necessary in engraved reproductions but not necessarily painted ones, especially those at a larger scale than their originals. Hence, affects perhaps peculiar to printed reproductions such as engravings and lithographs are transferred into Cézanne’s painted copy; details are excised, surfaces smoothed. Moreover, the background has become more abstract, the line of the base of the steps on the right squared rather dramatically the line where the base of the steps (?) meets the ground, turning what in the original painting and print (although less so in the latter) seemed a relatively understandable impression of a building seen at an angle to an awkwardly-flat depiction more akin to a stage flat. Similarly, as occurred in his appropriation of the Lancret figures on his Paravent, the

155 The original panel is 24 x 21 cm, the print after it 20.5 x 16.9 cm, and Cézanne’s copy after 55 x 46 cm. Hence, Cézanne’s copy is over twice the size of both Prud’hon’s original panel and Collette’s print after it.
156 On the standard French canvas sizes available to Cézanne during his career, and his use of them, see: Walter Feilchenfeldt, ‘On sizes and subjects,’ in Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 16–17.
157 Hence, note, in particular, the shrinking of the boy’s head and feet and the rabbit on the right.
eyes of his children, embedded in faces smooth as manakins, no longer seem to be engaging with anything in particular, staring vacantly into space.

Like the painting after Prud'hon, John Rewald also suggests Fillette au perroquet (fig. 3D.8), might also be after an engraving. Depicting a young girl on cushions feeding a parrot, it is an unconventional work with a similar sappy sentimentalism to the Prud'hon image he copied (fig. 3D.5), and, perhaps as a result of this, often assumed, like his copy after Frillié discussed above (fig. 3D.1), to have been painted for his mother.\(^{158}\) In terms of the kind of engraving the imagery might have been derived from, there is some echo of the ubiquitous 'Greuze girls' of the late eighteenth century, in which pre-adolescent girls are depicted fondling animals or holding symbolically-charged objects, a sub-genre almost entirely invented by Jean-Baptiste Greuze, but immediately provoking many imitators.\(^{159}\) While extraordinarily popular at the time, and even receiving some critical acclaim, these figures, mixing sentimentality, coming-of-age, eroticism, and pre-adolescent naïveté in equal measure, seem, to modern eyes, almost pornographic.\(^{160}\) In any case, most of the more disturbing aspects of Greuze's paintings of young girls, exemplified, perhaps, by his Girl with Doves (1799–1800) (fig. 3D.9), are likewise present in Cézanne's Fillette au perroquet (fig. 3D.8). Hence, for instance, Cézanne's depiction might reference the symbolism of Dutch genre, in which a girl feeding a parrot is usually deemed an allegory on the temptations of sex; Greuze's painting, likewise, includes similar sexual symbolism—the caged birds, the eggs in a nest, a bird being held in the hand—derived, ultimately, from the same source.\(^{161}\) There is also some congruence of style in terms of the smoothed faces and rounded limbs, the coyly tilted heads and the accidental nudity. However, in possibly paraphrasing Greuze, or perhaps one of his imitators, it

\(^{158}\) Venturi, Cézanne, son arte—son œuvre, op. cit., p. 69 (no. 8); Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 69; Andersen, The Youth of Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 299.


\(^{160}\) As James Elkins so succinctly puts it, 'Greuze is sort of ruined for the twentieth century', or, in Emma Barker's characterization, 'The eroticization of adolescent girls that underlies these works is now likely to seem thoroughly disturbing': James Elkins, Pictures and Tears: A History of People Who Have Cried in Front of Paintings, New York: Routledge, 2001, p. 112; Emma Barker, Greuze and the Painting of Sentiment, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005, p. 1.

\(^{161}\) On this Dutch symbolism, see section 5B.
is not necessarily certain Cézanne would likewise be aware of the connotative symbolism he was also seemingly repeating.

Another of Cézanne’s earlier paintings suggested by Rewald, and, before him, Venturi, as after an as yet unidentified engraving, Scène d’intérieur (fig. 3D.10), might be related to the work of Greuze, the dishevelled interior reminiscent of Greuze’s many genre depictions of domestic interiors. 162 A more likely source, however, and probably the same inspiration for Greuze’s efforts, is, again, seventeenth-century Dutch painting, Mary Tompkins Lewis suggesting, for instance, that Cézanne’s painting ‘recalls the de Hooch he knew best, Intérieur d’une maison, in the Musée Granet’. 163 However, de Hooch’s canvas (fig. 3D.11), like all his interiors, portrays a spare and morally upright middleclass interior, whereas Cézanne’s depicted dishevelment seems closer to the peasant interiors more typical of Adriaen van Ostade, David Teniers the Younger, and Jan Steen. 164 And, in terms of specific formal similarities, some of Cézanne’s figures echo those in lesser known exponents of the Dutch and Flemish peasant interior, such as Hendrick Sorgh (fig. 3D.12) and Ostade’s student Cornelis Dusart (fig. 3D.13). In any case, many of the motifs ubiquitous in this genre—pancake-cooking, brooms crossing corners, earthenware jugs, the pots and pans lying about on the floor, the chaotic shelves, the half-opened doors, etc.—are likewise present in Cézanne’s painting. However, as with the possible sources listed for Cézanne’s cortegaardje drawing discussed in chapter one, Cabaret Scene (figs 1.10, 1.29), none of the works just cited would seem individually

162 Venturi, Cézanne, son arte—son œuvre, op. cit., p. 70 (cat. no. 9); Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 69. For Greuze’s interiors, see, for instance, his Broken Eggs (1756) (oil/c (73 x 94), Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York), and Spoiled Child (1760s) (oil/c (66.5 x 56), State Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg).

163 Lewis, Cézanne’s Early Imagery, op. cit., p. 138.

164 Examples of van Ostade’s peasant interiors are numerous, but include, for instance: Interior with a Peasant Family (1647) (fig. 3D.16), which, as noted below, Cézanne would produce a copy of much later in life, and Peasants in an Interior (1661) (oil on copper, 37 x 47), Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). For David Teniers the younger, see some of the background groups in his tavern scenes, which often include a pancake cook, for instance, Twelfth-Night (The King Drinks) (1634–1640) (oil/c (58 x 70), Museo del Prado, Madrid) and Figures Gambling in a Tavern (1670) (oil/c (60 x 52), PC). For Jan Steen, see his ‘dissolute house’ as well as his peasant interiors, for instance The Lean Kitchen (c.1652-1654) (oil/p (69.7 x 91.9), National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa). Quiringh van Brekelenkam also specialized in peasant scenes, although his interiors were usually less raucous than the artists just cited, see, for instance, Couple Having a Meal Before the Fireplace (n.d.) (oil on panel (46 x 62), PC). Willem Kalf, later better known for his still-lives, also produced some peasant interiors during his so-called ‘Paris period’, for instance, Untidy Interior (1640–1650) (oil/p (17 x 13), Museum Bredius, The Hague).
to have inspired all of the elements present in *Scène d'intérieur* (fig. 3D.10). Hence, it could be suggested, as was suggested as possibly the case with that earlier drawing, Cézanne might have pastiched his painting from multiple elements, presumably through engraved reproductions published, for instance, in those instalments of Charles Blanc's *Histoire des peintres de toutes les écoles* devoted to Dutch artists. ¹⁶⁵ However, what might argue against precisely this possibility is the relatively lucid presentation of the painting, and a consistent relation of scales between elements. For, as was noted in regard to *Les Deux enfants, d'après Prud'hon* (fig. 3D.5), Cézanne still found the need, or failed to prevent, certain distortions relative to his original image, particularly in terms of part-to-whole proportions and a tendency to make images seemer flatter or more abstract, a tendency, as noted immediately below, also seemingly present even in a copy executed three decades later. Given this, and noting that such distortions occur glaringly in *Scène d'intérieur* (fig. 3D.10) only, perhaps, in details such as the baby in the lap of the closest woman, it would seem more likely that, as suggested by Venturi and Rewald, the painting is a reasonably complete copy after a single work yet to be identified, perhaps, like the copy after Prud'hon, in engraved form. Hence, if there is anything particularly Cézannesque about the painting, it might seem confined to the confused depiction of the fireplace on the left, which has the same awkwardness as the only novel addition, the chair, in his copy after Frillié (fig. 3D.1). ¹⁶⁶

---

¹⁶⁵ Of the painters just mentioned, Ostade, Teniers the younger, and Steen each had two issues devoted to them (nos 31–32, 18–19, and 82–83 respectively), Dusart one (124): '[Advertisement for *Histoires des peintres de toutes les écoles* giving lists of featured artist by issue number],' *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, t. 17, livr. 102 (1 December 1864), p. 576 ter. Given the commencement date of the series in 1849, and presuming a twice monthly publication schedule, these issues would have been published, respectively, in 1850, 1849, and 1852. ¹⁶⁶ In addition to [R 14] *Scène d'intérieur* (c.1860) (fig. 3D.10), and as already alluded to with [Ch 59(a)] (detail) *Cabaret Scene* (1856–1858) (figs 1.10, 1.29), discussed in chapter one, as well study sheets such as [Ch 35] *Studies, Including a Woman Playing a Mandolin* (1858–1859) (fig. 1.33), Cézanne's early interest in Dutch genre might also have extended to the related subgenre of the tavern scene. Hence, there are two drawings, [Ch 15] *Men Round a Table* (c.1858) (pencil on sketchbook page (c.16.5 x 15), Musée du Louvre, Paris) and [Ch 36] *Cardplayers* (1858–1860) (pencil on paper (22 x 27), PC), that repeat many of the conventions of this mode, particularly as evidenced in engraved or etched form; there are the sloped hats, the rustic benches, the tight grouping of figures, the lumpy outlining of figures stressing their coarse clothing, the emphasis on eating, drinking, and playing games, and, in particular, the peculiar forward tilt of the compositions, as if the scenes were almost being viewed from above. In terms of [Ch 15] *Men Round a Table* (c.1858), some precedent might be suggested in terms of the imagery produced by those artists cited in regard to [R 14] *Scène d'intérieur* (c.1860) (fig. 3D.10), an etching after Ostade published in an 1846 issue of *L'Artiste (Les Gais compères*, etching by F. Hillemacher, after Adriaen van Ostade, published in *L'Artiste*, ser. 4, t. 5, livr. 5 (30 November 1846), p. 84 bis) serving as a good example. Added to this list might
also be the numerous tavern scenes of Cornelis Bega, who often reproduced his own imagery in etched form, for instance A Young Tavern Keeper Caressed by an Elderly Peasant (n.d.) (etching on paper (19.5 x 16.6), Auckland Art Gallery, Auckland), which were then widely disseminated, whether in these original forms or as subsequent engravings after these. In terms of the second of Cézanne’s tavern drawings, [Ch 36] Cardplayers (1858–1860), the possibility of a reproductive source of inspiration is heightened by Adrien Chappuis’s description of it as a ‘[r]acing after an unidentified engraved reproduction,’ presumably by virtue of a combination of its style and, in particular, the oddly emphatic outlines: Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 61. As with most, if not all of Cézanne’s early drawings, the image provoking this possible appropriation, however, remains unidentified. Theodore Reff has suggested that ‘A picture by Teniers or Adriaen Brouwer may well have been Cézanne’s model for the drawing’, presumably in reproduced form, whilst Mary Tompkins Lewis has added the possibility of a painted source of inspiration in Jan Horemans’s Les Joueurs de cartes (c.1720), acquired by the Musée d’Aix as part of the Bourguignon de Fabregoules: Reff, Cézanne’s “Cardplayers” and their sources,’ op. cit., p. 116 n. 53. Presumably Reff has in mind, in terms of Teniers’ paintings works like Le Reniement de saint Pierre dans un corps de garde avec des joueurs de cartes (1646) (fig. 1.23) and Le Chapeau rouge (1658) (o/p (49.6 x 69.9), Terry-Engell Gallery, London), and, in terms of Brouwer’s, works like The Cardplayers (n.d.) (o/p (25.5 x 39), Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp) and Interior of a Tavern (1630) (o/p (32.4 x 43.2), Dulwich Picture Gallery, London). For her part, Lewis observes that, in comparison to Horemans’s Les Joueurs de cartes (c.1720) (o/p (30.8 x 26.2), Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence), Cézanne’s Ch 36 Cardplayers (1858–1860) (pencil on paper (22 x 27), PC) has ‘the same coarse wooden table, slouched poses, and sharply tilted perspective’: Lewis, Lewis, Cézanne’s Early Imagery, op. cit., p. 131. However, Horemans’s painting is depicted from a much lower vantage point, has a more claustrophobic focus, and lacks the distinctive A-ended benches featured in Cézanne’s drawing; the table is also set much higher relative to the sitters in Horemans’s panel and the figures in that painting wearing distinctively long and shapeless great-coats. Moreover, and as with the de Hooch interior mentioned above, if Chappuis’s dating for the drawing is to be accepted, how Cézanne might have seen this painting before it was put on display, as part of the Bourguignon Fabregoules bequest as it was, in 1866 is unexplained; on this, see: above, pp. 99–100. Although there is also some similarity, as indeed is also the case with [Ch 15] Men Round a Table (c.1858), to Flemish village fête scenes, for instance the unattributed Country Fair (c.1600) (o/p (30 x 41.5), Museum Bredius, The Hague), one painting with surprising similarities to [Ch 36] Cardplayers (1858–1860) is not a northern genre scene, but, rather French and from the early nineteenth century, Louis Léopold Boilly’s Scène de cabaret (1800–1825) (o/c (37.5 x 47.5), Musée du Louvre, Paris), where there is an odd contiguity in the depiction of furniture and certain features of pose and costume, although certainly not enough to suggest the Boilly painting was a source direct enough to suggest tracing, pastiched or otherwise. However, Boilly painted several similar cabaret scenes, and many of these were reproduced as engravings, which might then be suggested as having reached Cézanne and, perhaps, inspired his drawing. 161 Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 394.
27] *Vue de Colisée à Rome, d’après F.-M. Granet* (1863–1865) (fig. 5B.4), likewise seems present in the copy after van Ostade, executed nearly thirty years later.\(^{168}\) Hence and in particular, there seems a tendency to steepen lines of perspectival indication; for instance, in the Ostade copy, the angling of the feet of the closest chair and the slope of the beam across the chimney lean closer to the vertical than in both the *Magasin Pittoresque* etching and Ostade’s original panel. This, counterbalanced by the dramatic lightening of the background and the lengthening of the foreground space, has the odd effect of, as with many of Cézanne’s images here-discussed, flattening the composition, especially as many of the structural elements in the background have been highlighted. Hence, what in the etching and panel is a spotlighted foreground with a background plunged in shadowy depths becomes an equally lit and thereby oddly confused scene. Even though the dramatic reduction in the size of the background doorway in Cézanne’s version should provoke some sense of spatial regression, this doesn’t occur, and instead merely appears to an oddly small door.

Two other of Cézanne’s c.1860 canvases, both titled *Paysage avec moulin* (figs 3D.17–18) are also presumed to reference northern painting, but in terms of landscape, both suggested as copies after the same as yet unidentified engraving.\(^{169}\)

Complications arise, however, not only by virtue of Cézanne’s paintings differing from each other, but also, in the case of [R 16] *Paysage avec moulin* (fig. 3D.17), between later reproductions of that painting and the one given in Lionello Venturi’s catalogue raisonné, indicating considerable cleaning or restoration in the meantime.\(^{170}\)

As John Rewald notes, it is thereby difficult to determine which of the two ‘states’ of

---

\(^{168}\) See section 5B.

\(^{169}\) Venturi, *Cézanne, son art—son œuvre*, op. cit., pp. 73, 74 (cat. nos 26, 28); Rewald, *The Paintings of Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 70. Venturi calls the possible source a ‘gravure suisse’; Venturi, *Cézanne, son art—son œuvre*, op. cit., pp. 73, 74 (cat. nos 26). It could as easily, as Mary Tomkins Lewis points out, have been a Dutch pastiche of northern European motifs, in imitation, for instance of the numerous watermill paintings of Jacob van Ruisdael: Lewis, ‘Cézanne’s paintings in the grand salon at Jas de Bouffan,’ op. cit., p. 83 n. 23.

\(^{170}\) Rewald, *The Paintings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 70. The reproduction used here is the one included in the notes section of Rewald’s catalogue raisonné, presumably taken from the catalogue published on the occasion of the painting’s sale in 1963: Unattributed author, *Trois belles estampes anciennes et modernes; lithographies par Toulouse Lautrec; dessins et aquarelles; gravures et lithographies coloriées; livres sur la gravure et les graveurs*, sale catalogue, Paris: Hôtel Drouot, 28 June 1963, p. 58 bis.
In any case, in regards to similarities between the two canvases in their current states, which can unfortunately only be compared through reproductions, what is repeated is the general arrangement of the background, what is altered are details such as the kinds of figures, and their placement, featured in the foreground. Hence, if Cézanne copied from the same engraving to produce both works, he would seem to have retained only the broader compositional structure of the original and then modified details, adding, removing, or moving staffage as needed. Precisely this procedure was not unusual amongst nineteenth-century French landscape students, who, after beginning their training copying the backgrounds of reproductions of old masters, moved onto producing their own compositions through the pastiching of elements from pedagogic albums, lithographic compilations of motifs, staffage, and buildings derived, again, from seventeenth-century Dutch landscapes. Indeed, the liberties with scale such pastiching might enable, and in fact often entail, is well-illustrated in Cézanne’s pair of paintings, where the foreground figures differ markedly in scale across the paintings, particularly in the case of the shepherd in [R 17] Paysage avec moulin (fig. 3D.18), who is a veritable giant compared to the doorway behind him. Hence, there is some irony in the possibility that the earliest landscapes of Cézanne, a painter later so legendarily associated with working directly in front of nature, were pastiches of other images of landscapes other than those around him.

---

171 Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 70. Venturi, presumably in his notes for his revised catalogue, apparently perceived a freer style of execution for [R 17] Paysage avec moulin (c.1860 or earlier) (4D.18), and therefore suggested this painting was, regardless of whether after the same engraving as [R 16] Paysage avec moulin (c.1860 or earlier) (fig. 3D.17), the later of the two paintings: Lionello Venturi, cited in loc. cit.

172 Peter Galassi, Corot in Italy: Open Air Painting and the Classical-Landscape Tradition, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991, pp. 61–62, 80. Galassi offers an example of precisely this process with Corot’s copying a motif from a lithograph by Constant Bourgeois, developed first into a sketch and then into an oil study: ibid., pp. 79–80 and figs 91–93. Indeed, this early training seems to have then influenced Corot’s conception of the kinds of motifs he then chose to paint when he did actually begin basing his painting in more Plein air techniques, choosing views similar to those deployed in Dutch landscape convention: Petra Ten Doesschate Chu, French Realism and the Dutch Masters: The Influence of Dutch Seventeenth-Century Painting on the Development of French Painting between 1830 and 1870, Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker and Gumbert, 1974, pp. 20–21. On the influence of Dutch landscape on French landscape painting of the first half of the nineteenth century more generally, see: ibid., pp. 1831

173 That same shepherd figure, in particular, also looks like a typical peasant included in, for instance, Dutch Italianate landscapes like those reproduced in (figs 3D.28–32).
Of those canvases dated c.1860 that John Rewald does not describe as possible copies or paraphrases, these are the apparently lost Jeune fille en méditation (fig. 3D.19), La Visitation (fig. 3D.23), and Cavalier et berger dans un paysage montagneux (fig. 3D.27).\textsuperscript{174} In the case of Jeune fille en méditation (fig. 3D.19), a woman is depicted in a sparsely furnished room, leaning on a chair, and praying before what Mary Tompkins Lewis has identified as a bénitier, a combined holy water font and crucifix.\textsuperscript{175} By virtue of this object's presence, Lewis has suggested Cézanne's painting was articulated within the same framework of religious genre as that deployed by contemporaries such as Théodule-Augustin Ribot and Alphonse Legros, citing as examples, respectively, their paintings Les Deux Novices (1861) and Ex-Voto (1860) (fig. 3D.20).\textsuperscript{176} As it is unlikely that Cézanne would have seen either of these artists' works before travelling to Paris in 1861, such coincidence would seem, however, a case of parallelism.\textsuperscript{177} However, a comparison between Legros's Ex-Voto (fig. 3D.20) and Cézanne's Jeune fille en méditation (fig. 3D.19), is, nevertheless, illuminating, highlighting, as it does, not so much their similarities but their differences, particularly, and most jarringly, in terms of the technical competency and scope of endeavour of their respective executors, who differed in age by only two years. Hence, as but one example, Cézanne's rather astonishingly awkward depiction of the chair the girl in his picture leans on contrasts markedly with the overall verism of his peer's effort.

In terms of images Cézanne is more likely to have seen around this time, and thereby perhaps influenced by in creating Jeune fille en méditation (fig. 3D.19), the sentimental genre scenes of the painter and engraver Charles Chaplin might be put forward, particularly his coy depictions of girls in barely furnished rooms that were

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[174] Mary Tompkins Lewis describes the missing [R 10] Jeune fille en méditation (c.1860) (fig. 3D.19) as being on board; John Rewald's catalogue raisonné implies it was on canvas: Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cezanne, op. cit., p. 69; Lewis, Cezanne's Early Imagery, op. cit., pp. xiii, 118.
\item[175] Lewis, Cezanne's Early Imagery, op. cit., p. 119.
\item[176] loc. cit. Legros's Ex-Voto (1860) (fig. 3D.20) is mentioned again in section 6C.
\item[177] As noted below, although a successful Salon contributor throughout the mid-late 1860s, Théodule-Augustin Ribot began painting in the late 1850s, and only exhibited for the first time in 1859, in the Paris atelier of François Bonvin. Alphonse Legros also exhibited at Bonvin's studio in 1859, but had also successfully appeared at the Salons of 1857 and 1859. On these artists, see also section 4A.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
popular inclusions in journals such as *L'Artiste* (fig. 3D.22). There is also some similarity between Cézanne's use of the tilted chair motif and the work of another popular genre painter of the period, Octave Tassaert, whose *L'Abandonnée* (1852) (fig. 3D.21) features just this motif in a portrayal of a pregnant mistress fainting at the wedding of her lover. Although probably not directly inspired by Tassaert's painting, the use of the motif is idiosyncratic enough to suggest it had a specific meaning, perhaps identical to that implied in the Tassaert canvas. 178 As such, the work would seem to be an attempt to articulate specific and perhaps topical genre tropes.

More obviously religious in theme is perhaps the even cruder *La Visitation* (fig. 3D.23), which depicts Mary's visit to her cousin Elizabeth, mother of John the Baptist. On the left, in the doorway with the inscription 'Père Zorobabel' above it, is, presumably, Elizabeth's husband Zacharias, and on the right, beneath an apparition of a head surrounded by flames, a man riding a donkey. At the base of the painting is the inscription, in red, of the words 'La mère des 7 douleurs' referring, it would seem, to Mary, and 'Belzébeth', referring, most likely, to the flaming head in the sky. In terms of the identity of the man riding the donkey, Sidney Geist has suggested it represents Cézanne himself, Zacharias in the doorway thereby standing for his father and Mary for his mother, whilst Nina Maria Athanassoglou-Kallmyer sees the rider as Zorababel, described by her as Mary's ancestor. 179 However, it would seem more likely the figure on the donkey was intended to represent Joseph, who, although in most textual interpretations of the scene is presumed to have stayed home in Nazareth during Mary's visit, is commonly included in visual presentations of the scene, often with a donkey. 180

---

178 Tassaert's painting was, before its donation to the Musée Fabre in 1868, in the collection of Alfred Bruyas. Although there is the slimmest of chances that Cézanne might have had the opportunity of seeing the work exhibited at a showing of Bruyas's collection held in Montpellier, only a couple of hours by rail from Aix-en-Provence, in 1860, this would seem unlikely; on this exhibition, and its inclusion of Courbet's *Les Baigneuses* (1853) (fig. 6B.2), see section 6B.

179 Geist, *Interpreting Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 49; Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, *Cézanne and Provence*, op. cit., p. 68. The relation between Zorababel and Mary, by virtue of how the genealogies of Jesus given in the Gospels of Luke and Matthew, which both include Zorababel's name—as Zerubbabel—but differ on most other counts, are interpreted, is a matter of considerable theological debate. Hence, if interpreted as presenting Jesus's descent through his presumably adoptive father, Zorababel is Joseph's ancestor, if interpreted as Mary's genealogy, he is her ancestor.

180 For instance, and in the same layouts used by Cézanne, with Mary and Elizabeth in the centre and framed by, on the left, Zacharias and, on the right Joseph, see the painting formerly
Just such an arrangement, and one close enough to *La Visitation* (fig. 3D.23) to suggest that it, or a copy after it, provided Cézanne’s inspiration for his painting, is featured in a *Visitation* by Guillaume Grève in the Chapelle du Grand Séminaire in Avignon (fig. 3D.24). Hence, Cézanne’s version repeats not only the general layout of the figures and the building, but also the postures of Mary and Elizabeth. If there is a difference, it is in the dramatic reduction in scale of Joseph and his donkey, perhaps in order to fit the likewise novel inclusion of the flaming head. In terms of this head, as well as the heart symbol attached to Mary, the various inscriptions, and the general naïvité of execution, Cézanne’s apparent paraphrase of Grève’s composition would seem, thereby, to blend Grève’s fine art articulation with the more vernacular traditions of ex-voto panels.

Similarly, this use of imagery possibly sourced from religious institutions seems repeated at least on one other occasion by Cézanne, with his early drawing [Ch 2] *The
Judgement of Solomon (c.1859) (fig. 3D.25), which would seem related to Nicolas Pinson’s Le Jugement de Salomon (1671-1674) (fig. 3D.26), a painting on display in the church of Saint John of Malta, the building abutting the École de Dessin and Musée d’Aix. However, the similarity is more general than is the case with his visitation scene, and confined mostly to the general positioning of the figures, rather than their poses. As such, and to pre-empt Adrien Chappuis’s characterization of another drawing by Cézanne, [Ch 50] Caricature of ‘Jupiter and Thetis’ (1858–1860) (fig. 3E.22), discussed below, Cézanne’s attempt might be termed a caricature, possibly executed from memory. Whether, then, The Judgement of Solomon (fig. 3D.25) might manifest the same gesture of satirical derision often presumed inherent in his Caricature of ‘Jupiter and Thetis’ is difficult to tell.

Finally, in regards to Cavalier et berger dans un paysage montagneux (fig. 3D.27), a landscape depicting a rider and figures in an oddly sparse landscape, John Rewald relates, in his catalogue notes for the painting, an anecdote concerning Cézanne ‘dressing some of his friends in rags’ in the summer holidays of 1859 and posing them at Les Infernets, a stretch of land between the François Zola dam and Mont Sainte-Victoire. As such, it is suggested, thereby, that Cavalier et berger dans un paysage montagneux (fig. 3D.27) might have related to these efforts. However, as with the two landscapes discussed above, the work might well be a pastiche of Dutch Italianate landscapes. As such, the figures are almost identical, in both pose and costume, to many of the figures included by, for instance, Nicolaes Berchem and Frederick de Moucheron in their many depictions of the Roman Campagna (figs 3D.29–31), figures themselves often derived from first generation Italianate landscapists such as Paul Bril (fig. 3D.28). Berchem’s figures, especially the slouch-backed dog likewise present in Cézanne’s portrayal, were particularly ubiquitous, the artist often commissioned to add staffage to the landscapes of other painters such as Jacob van Ruisdael and Jan Both (fig. 3D.32). Cézanne’s figures could also as easily have come from nineteenth-century French landscapists like Camille Corot, who, following in the footsteps of the Dutch south, travelled to Italy to created landscapes fundamentally informed by, if not
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183 Rewald, *The Paintings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 70. The anecdote also appears in various of Rewald’s earlier biographies of Cézanne, for instance: Rewald, *Cézanne et Zola*, op. cit., p. 17; Rewald, *Cézanne: A Biography*, op. cit., p. 20. The source of the anecdote is not given.

184 See also the various Italianate landscapes of Karel Dujardin, for instance: *Italian Landscape* (1650s?) (o/p (20.6 x 27), Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge).
direct pastiches of, the efforts of their Dutch predecessors. And, although the landscape onto which Cézanne seems to have pasted his figures might resemble, to some extent, the rocky area around Le Tholonet cited by Rewald as where Cézanne might have posed his friends, it might as equally resemble the spare and often rocky views offered by the Roman Campagna.

Hence, if this was the case, and as was also suggested for his two watermill landscapes (fig 4D.17–18), Cézanne might be seen to have undertaken a conventional, although perhaps slightly outmoded, entrance into landscape practice, one involving either pastiching sections of images taken from a variety of sources, or upon freely adapting such sources through the inclusion of extraneous staffage from other images. As has been noted already in regard to the figures suggested above as pastiched by Cézanne onto his father’s decorated screen (an act oddly echoing precisely Berchem’s just-noted activities as staffage painter), there is a similar decontextualization in the use of his figures in [R 18] Cavalier et berger dans un paysage montagneux (fig. 3D.27). For instance, it is difficult to tell to whom the figure on the left is gesturing. Likewise, and as was also suggested as the case for [R 17] Paysage avec moulin (fig. 3D.18), there is a peculiar discrepancy in scale, the standing figure seemingly too large in relation to the figure on the horse.

Aside from noting such formal consequences, the persistence of Cézanne’s engagement with possible practices of pastiches across his early works, particularly in regard to those paintings presumed after engravings, might also be deemed congruent with a general mid-nineteenth-century interest in imagery, or imagic styles, of previous centuries, a revivalist impulse predicated upon the explosive proliferation of reproductive print media, such as illustrated journals, lithographic albums, and stand-alone print production. 185 In short, the emulation of previous genres and sub-genres of painting was in the air, and it would seem difficult to distinguish a specific interest in these genres or styles and the unthinking repetition of those styles through the copying of contemporary revivals. Cézanne might as likely have been copying recent copies as older originals. His practice, as intrinsically based initially on the copying of images,

---

185 On the importance of engravings, lithographs and reproductions of seventeenth-century Dutch paintings in the development of nineteenth-century French painting, along with their prevalence in and dissemination through illustrated journals, etc., see: Chu, French Realism and the Dutch Masters, op. cit., pp. 2–8.
reflects, then, through its eclecticism and the impossibility of determining to what degree the repetition of forms was informed by any understanding of their original contexts, precisely the historical levelling of imagery entailed by reproductive print technologies. The landscape, as it were, was becoming increasingly full of images.
3E: The first Jas de Bouffan murals

As noted above, the purchase in September 1859 by Louis-Auguste Cézanne of the Jas de Bouffan estate on the outskirts of Aix-en-Provence might be seen as a pivotal moment in his son’s development as an artist. Not only did the building and surrounding grounds, used by the family only as an occasional summer or weekend retreat in the decade following its purchase, seem to have given Cézanne an escape from the petty bêtise of day-to-day life in Aix-en-Provence, it also seems to have provided him with his first functional studio, the grand salon on the ground floor that, until then, had been used to store fruit or hay. He also seems immediately to have begun decorating the walls of that room with a startlingly eclectic and somewhat disparate ensemble of mural paintings.

The presumed earliest of these murals, a set of four panels depicting personifications of the seasons at the northern end of that salon are the main focus of the rest of this chapter, particularly in regard to the degree to which their execution was, or was not, intended satirically. As such, some attempt will be made to determine not only how such satire might be perceived as inscribed within those works, but also, concomitantly, the degree to which Cézanne’s attitude to academic art, at least as exemplified by the work of Ingres, the artist whose panels are usually cited as derisively parodying, was at this time informed by the same antagonism later underpinning much of his artistic output in the late 1860s. However, before such analysis can be undertaken, some understanding of the physical and temporal sequencing of the murals in the Jas de Bouffan, as an ensemble, is perhaps necessary.

Although sometimes characterised as the ostentatious ‘whim of a parvenu’, Cézanne’s father’s acquisition of the Jas de Bouffan in the autumn of 1859 was probably

\[186\] On the purchase, see section 3B
\[187\] Jean-Michel Royer, ‘The arbor of weeping chestnuts: (Notes on Jas de Bouffan, from the 18th century to the present day),’ translated by A. J. F. Miller, in Boyer et al., Jas de Bouffan: Cézanne, op. cit., p. 158; Coutagne, ‘The Jas de Bouffan,’ op. cit., pp. 81, 335 n. 3.
impelled as much by the desire to recover a debt as any aspiration to own a country estate. 188 Hence, it is difficult to determine, then, whether the at the time of its purchase the banker ever intended moving to the property, as his family in fact would in 1870. Indeed, when first purchased, the main building was purportedly so rundown that it was uninhabitable. 189 Despite this disrepair, however, the Jas de Bouffan was nevertheless an imposing structure. Three-storied, rectangular, and austerely decorated, it was typical of the grand bastides erected throughout the countryside by the Provençal nobility in the eighteenth century, and indeed was, legendarily but seemingly incorrectly, thought to have been once owned by the Duc de Villars. 190

188 65,000 francs of the 85,000 franc sale price for the Jas de Bouffan estate represented the accumulated unrepaid personal loans made by him to the vendor, Gabriel Fernand Joursin; on the sale price’s inclusion of these debts, including the recovery of 2,000 francs owed to the bank run by Louis-Auguste Cézanne and his associate Joseph Cabassol, see: *Actes d’achat de la propriété du Jas-de-Bouffan par Louis-Auguste Cézanne. 15 September 1859*, cited in Archives départementales des Bouches-du-Rhône, *Monsieur Cézanne*, op. cit., pp. 100–104; Boyer, ‘The true story of Jas de Bouffan,’ op. cit., p. 11; Bruno Ely, ‘“Pater omnipotentem aeternam Deum”: The purchase and sale of Jas de Bouffan by the Cézanne family,’ in Boyer et al., *Jas de Bouffan: Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 25. Gabriel Fernand Joursin had inherited the property from his mother, Gabrielle Gasparine Justine Truphème: Boyer, ‘The true story of Jas de Bouffan,’ op. cit., p. 12. Joachim Gasquet suggests Cézanne’s father’s purchase of the estate might also have been impelled by other commercial interests, leasing out some of its fields to farmers bringing stock into town on market days: Gasquet, *Joachim Gasquet’s Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 36. Gasquet’s account, however, seems chronologically muddled, the context of his comments implying Louis-Auguste Cézanne had purchased the property before becoming a banker. As already mentioned, Cézanne’s father opened his bank fully ten years before buying the Jas de Bouffan. In any case, perhaps uncharacteristically for the wily banker, the purchase seems to have been a bad investment; at the time of Louis-Auguste Cézanne’s death in 1886, the property was valued at it only 62,500 francs, three-quarters what he had paid for, a devaluation that might have been an attempt to ease the tax burden on his inheritors. Nevertheless, when the property was auctioned in 1899, following the death of Cézanne’s mother in 1897, its eventual sale price, after initially being passed in, was 75,000 francs, and thereby still less than the 1859 purchase price: *Procès-verbal de vente par adjudication du Jas de Bouffan, 21 November 1899 (Secondes enchères)*, AD 13, Centre d’Aix-en-Provence, minutes de M’ Mouravit, registre 307 E 1465, acte no 740, cited in Archives départementales des Bouches-du-Rhône, op. cit., p. 198. On the convoluted 1899 sale of the Jas de Bouffan to Granel, see: ibid., pp. 184–190. On the characterization of Cézanne’s father purchase of the Jas de Bouffan as the ‘whim of a parvenu’, see: Rewald, *Paul Cézanne: A Biography*, op. cit., p. 21; Rewald, ‘Cézanne and his father,’ op. cit., p. 70.

189 ‘[T]he house was in a deplorable state. A large salon on the ground floor and several rooms in the upper stories were in such a dilapidated condition that they were uninhabitable. They were locked up, and at first nothing was restored’: Rewald, *Cézanne: A Biography*, op. cit., p. 21. See also: Cooper, ‘The Jas de Bouffan,’ op. cit., p. 24.

Facing north, it overlooked a broad drive bordered with trees and opened to the south onto a terraced courtyard with fountain. The main entrance to the house was, as it is now, placed off-centre in the northern façade (fig. 3E.1(a)), the wide main hall beyond splitting the ground floor along the building’s shortest axis into two unequal-sized halves, the smaller of which to the west was almost completely taken up by a large salon (figs 3E.2–3), the room that was to become Cézanne’s studio and home to his mural ensemble.

Although some re-arrangement of the building’s internal layout occurred after the Jas de Bouffan was sold by the family in 1899, the general layout of the grand salon at the time of Cézanne’s first appropriating it seems relatively easy to reconstruct. As such, it was a rectangular room with its longest axis running north–south, terminating at the northern end in a windowless semi-circular alcove (figs 3E.3–4). To the south, the room overlooked the terrace behind the house through two large casement windows (fig. 3E.1(b)), the western wall including a similar window at its southern end, as well as centrally-placed French doors opening out onto the western side of the house (fig. 3E.2). Another doorway at the southern end of the eastern wall connected the salon to the main hall, close to where that hall itself opened, through the smaller rear door, onto the southern terrace (fig. 3E.1(b)). It was on the inner eastern and northern walls, as well as the spaces between the windows on the western wall that Cézanne executed
his various murals, their scales and format often dictated by the decorative plasterwork dividing the walls into panels.

Although perhaps never intended for the degree of public scrutiny the exhibition of canvases might hope for, the ensemble of murals executed by Cézanne in the salon of the Jas de Bouffan might, nevertheless, stand as a kind of encapsulation, literally, of the artistic terrain through which the painter traversed in that decade. As such, it might function as a conspectus of his pursuit of a signature style, for that form of expression that might best convey his 'température'. 192

In terms of Cézanne's own later opinion of these mementos of his artistic awakening, this is as obscure as his initial motivation in producing the murals. That he apparently made no attempt to organise for their removal before the sale of the Jas de Bouffan in 1899 suggests they were, at the very least, incidental to his interests; indeed, if Joachim Gasquet's reminiscences are correct the painter was more upset by the destruction of his father's furniture than the possible fate of his juvenile murals. 193 However, that they did escape destruction at the hands of their executor, a fate

192 The term 'température' comes from Cézanne and Zola's related, although not necessarily identical, concepts of ideal art developed throughout the 1860s; the term is discussed at the beginning of chapter five.

193 'I remember his pathetic arrival one evening, his mute expression, the sobs that prevented him from speaking, the sudden tears that relieved him late on that day when, while he was painting and without letting him know, they had foolishly burnt the old pieces of furniture that had been religiously preserved in his father's room. ‘---I would have taken them, you understand...They didn't even try to sell them, they found them a nuisance...Dust traps, worthless things...Now they've made a bonfire of them...A bonfire!'': Gasquet, Joachim Gasquet's Cézanne, op. cit., p. 38. Cézanne's ambivalence towards his own work once completed, or beyond the possibility of completion, is a standard motif in Gasquet's book; 'Never, I believe, had anyone felt such scorn for his life's work. He was completely detached from it. His canvases, the most beautiful of them, lay about the floor, he walked over them. One, folded in four, was used as a wedge in a wardrobe. He left them in fields, he left them rotting in the bastidons where the peasants put them under cover’: ibid., p. 138. Likewise, in terms specific to the fate of the numerous canvases stored at the Jas de Bouffan, Gustave Coquiot cites an anecdote concerning Louis Granel discovering them abandoned by Cézanne and then burning them, keeping only the stretchers: Gustave Coquiot, cited and translated in Mack, op. cit., p. 143. The volume of canvases in Cézanne's studio prior to the sale is recalled by Gasquet as in the 'hundreds', mostly executed in the 1880s and 'piled up helter-skelter in the attic of the Jas de Bouffan'; he also alluded to the above-mentioned burning of canvases, albeit more obliquely than Coquiot, referring to a canvas 'which was burnt, it seems, along with thirty others, even in Cézanne's lifetime without his deigning to bother with them': Gasquet, Joachim Gasquet's Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 72, 106.
legendarily befalling many of his other early works, does argue against Cézanne being offended or overtly embarrassed by their existence. Indeed, his only surviving comment on the murals reflect precisely this ambivalence, when, upon meeting Maurice Denis in early 1906 and hearing the young painter had visited his family’s former home, he purportedly said; ‘So you went to the Jas de Bouffan? Those things aren’t great, but they’re painting. It’s so hard!’

By the October following Denis’ visit and recording of this comment, Cézanne had died. A year later, the murals, still intact and in situ, were then offered by Louis Granel to the state. In response, the curator of the Musée du Luxembourg, Léonce Bénédite, travelled to the Jas de Bouffan in order to appraise the suitability of the donation. Apparently unimpressed, Bénédite then wrote a report to the director of the Musées Nationaux succinctly advising against Granel’s offer being accepted. Although by no means complimentary in regard to the quality of Cézanne’s work, Bénédite’s report nevertheless provides the only extensive description of what that ensemble must have looked like in its complete state and the positioning of each of its components. Hence, before subjecting any of those murals individually to detailed
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194 Anecdotes concerning Cézanne’s overt antipathy towards his earlier works are as common as those referring to his disinterest; for instance, Joachim Gasquet’s description, referred to in the note above, of canvases ‘full of holes, slashed with a knife’, and Émile Bernard’s tale of Julien Tanguy having to hide [R 139] *Portrait du peintre Achille Emperaire* (1867–1868) (fig. 6A.13(b)) from the painter because he wanted to destroy it: Gasquet, *Joachim Gasquet’s Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 72; Émile Bernard, ‘Souvenirs sur Paul Cézanne et lettres inédits [part 2],’ *Mercure de France*, t. 70, no. 248 (16 October 1907), pp. 608–609. John Rewald also cites an undated comment of Maxime Conil’s, husband of Cézanne’s sister Rose, in regard to the canvas [R 79] *Paysage aux environs d’Aix-en-Provence* (c.1865), which he claimed to have found ‘abandoned by Cézanne in a room of the Jas de Bouffan, together with other paintings that my father-in-law destroyed after his son’s departure’: Maxime Conil, quoted in Rewald, *The Paintings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 87.

195 Paul Cézanne, quoted in Maurice Denis, ‘[Excerpt from] *Journal* [1906],’ cited and translated in Doran (ed.), *Conversations with Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 93. Denis’s own description of the murals was: ‘on the wall, some Cézannes: fiery, young, without great depth, Christ (after Navarete [sic]), black, white, and red, the Lancret, hard and stifling, a portrait of [...] *Emperaire*, two very spirited heads. I am reminded of Claude and his ideas in Zola’s *L’œuvre*’: ibid., p. 92. Bernard’s incomplete description, in terms of the murals now presumed to have been in the salon, might indicate some had already been covered in wallpaper by this time, as some certainly later were. Hence, we might not be certain which of the murals from the salon now attributed to Cézanne were actually being referred to by him here.

196 The report by Léonce Bénédite is reprinted in its entirety in: Mack, op. cit., pp. 145–147. Significant extracts, in the same translation occur in: Rewald, *The Paintings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 67. Apart from the murals, Bénédite’s report also mentions Cézanne’s [R 152] *La Conversation* (1870–1871), a ‘small canvas’ ‘in the studio located on the top floor of the villa’ but not whether it too was being offered to the Luxembourg; regardless, the painting was later sold to the Gallery Bernheim-Jeune: Bénédite, op. cit., p. 147; Rewald, *The Paintings of Paul
discussion, it is perhaps best first to attempt some sort of reconstruction based upon this report, the conclusions of which, by way of introduction, are summarised in schematic form in (fig. 3E.4).

Like most discussions of Cézanne’s Jas de Bouffan murals do, Bénédite’s account began in the northern alcove.

This apse is decorated with five tall narrow paintings. In the middle, a portrait of a man dressed in black [...] It is Cézanne’s father. Alongside this picture are four panels representing the four seasons. 197

As confirmed by a photograph reputedly taken around 1900 (fig. 3E.5), these were [R 95] Portrait de Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l’artiste (c.1865) (fig. 6.A3), and the four personifications of the seasons known collectively as [R 4–7] Les Quatre Saisons (1860–1861) (figs. 4E.11–14). 198 Bénédite’s report then moved on to describing the murals of the longer walls, starting with [R 23] Le jeu de cache-cache, d’après Lancret (1862–1864) (fig. 4C.13), copied, it seems, from an engraving after Nicolas Lancret’s Le jeu de cache-cache mitoulas (fig. 4C.12) and located ‘near the fireplace, to the right, on the wall opposite the entrance.’ 199 This would place the panel at the

---

Cézanne, op. cit., p. 128. If the anecdotes mentioned above regarding the destruction of canvases left by Cézanne following the sale of the Jas de Bouffan are true, this painting would seem, thereby, along with [R 32] Diable enchaîné (1862–1864) (o/c (41 x 34), PC), to be one of the few survivors of that destruction. 197 Léonce Bénédite, report of November 1907, Louvre Archives, 3 December 1907, p. 30, cited and translated in Mack, op. cit., p. 146. 198 The c.1900 date of the photograph, given by John Rewald, is contested by Wayne Andersen, who argues the photograph has the appearance of being taken by a professional photographer, citing the lighting and angle of focus, and therefore was more likely to have been taken after Cézanne’s early work had come to have market value: Andersen, The Youth of Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 102. By this I am presuming Andersen is referring to the years between the artist’s death in 1906 and the removal of the murals in 1912. I have been unable to determine whether a copy of this photograph was the same one exhibited at the posthumous retrospective of Cézanne’s work held as part of the 1907 Paris Salon d’Automne retrospective, but it seems likely. The collections database of the National Gallery, London, which now owns the mural portrait of Louis-Auguste, gives the photograph’s date as c.1905: Unattributed author, ‘[Catalogue notes for] Paul Cézanne: “The Painter’s Father, Louis-Auguste Cézanne” [NG6385],’ in the online collections database of the National Gallery, London, accessible through: http://www.nationalgallery.org.uk/collection/default_online.htm. 199 Bénédite, report of November 1907, op. cit., p. 146. Bénédite described Cézanne’s mural as ‘a scène galante in the style of Lancret’; Gerstle Mack incorrectly identified the Lancret work after which it was copied as Le Bal Champêtre; Mack, Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 146. I have been unable to determine whether or not the fireplace existed in the centre of the eastern wall at the time Cézanne was executing his murals; on the mural and fireplace, section 4C.
southern end of the eastern wall, between the centrally-placed fireplace and the doorway into the main hall. The ‘entrance’ mentioned by Bénédite would therefore seem to refer not to this doorway, but to the French doors opening out onto the western façade of the building, confirmed, it seems, by Bénédite’s earlier comment that ‘a marble medallion [of the due de Villars] [...] crowns the entrance door.’ And, indeed, just such a medallion is above the French doors (figs 3E.2, 3E.6), but not the doorway into the main hall.

Bénédite’s report next described the murals on the wall opposite the fireplace, beginning with the panel to the left, presumably as one came in, of the French doors, a panel described as ‘completely covered by an immense landscape.’ ‘Further to the left’ of this, presumably as one turned to view the work after entering through the French doors, was an ‘obtrusively [...] nude torso of a man, seen from behind, executed in a coarse manner.’

The nude would be [R 29] Le Baigneur au rocher (1867–1869) (fig. 6B.3) a figure Cézanne, as noted above, seems to have added several years after the completion of the landscape it overlaid, and which was later divided into [R 28] La ferme and [R 30] Chute d’eau (both 1862–1864) (fig. 3E.7). In terms of the landscape depicting ‘great leaning cedars with excessively tall trunks,’ the nude is implied to lie to the left of, some confusion remains regarding which of the surviving murals, or at least reproductions of these murals, the report was actually referring to. Both John Rewald and Mary Tompkins Lewis seem to presume it was describing not the

200 Bénédite, report of November 1907, op. cit., p. 145.
201 Jean-Michel Royer mentions the medallion in quoting Andre Corsy (grandson of Louis Granel and owner of the Jas de Bouffan from 1943 until its sale to the town of Aix in 1994) as recognizing in the medallion the likeness of Honoré-Armand de Villars: ‘The arbor of weeping chestnuts,’ in Boyer et al., Jas de Bouffan: Cézanne, op. cit., p. 155. On how and why the medallion might have ended up above the French doors, and perhaps its cause for the legend of the Duc’s once owning the building, see: loc. cit.
202 Bénédite, op. cit., p. 146.
203 loc. cit.
204 The whereabouts of [R 28] La ferme and [R 30] Chute d’eau (both 1862–1864) (fig. 3E.7) is unknown: Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 72, 74.
205 Bénédite, report of November 1907, op. cit., p. 146. I am here using the translation given by John Rewald in his catalogue raisonné, which is identical to that given in the English edition of Mack’s Paul Cézanne with the important exception of ‘tall’ replacing Mack’s ‘thick’ cedar trunks: Mack, Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 146; Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 67.
landscape over which the nude was painted, but, rather, the landscape.\[R 34-41\] Paysage romantique aux pêcheurs (1862–1864) (fig. 3E.8) that faced the former across the salon, as shown in a photograph taken in 1955 (fig. 3E.9).\[206\] However, it is not entirely sure that Paysage romantique aux pêcheurs (fig. 3E.8) was the landscape being referred to by Bénédict; the trees depicted in that work might conceivably be, with some stretch of the imagination, cedars, but they certainly do not lean. However, there are leaning trees in the waterfall landscape (fig. 3E.7), for instance the paired firs above the bather’s head, which might be mistaken for cedars, as well as the paired trees further to the right of these, which look similar to the trees in Paysage romantique aux pêcheurs (fig. 3E.8), but with the important difference not only of leaning, but also of having thinner, and thereby taller, trunks.\[207\]

If this was the case, though, Bénédict seems thereby not to have mentioned Paysage romantique aux pêcheurs (fig. 3E.8) in his report at all, as he certainly didn’t in the case of the smaller mural [R 31] Entrée du château (1862–1864) (fig. 4C.7), which John Rewald describes as ‘continuing [the landscape Paysage romantique aux pêcheurs (fig. 3E.8)] on the right, above the wainscot’, thereby positioning it above the fireplace (fig. 3E.4).\[208\] Fifty years later, Douglas Cooper, in his 1955 article describing the rediscovery of Paysage romantique aux pêcheurs (fig. 3E.8), apparently until then covered in wallpaper, also omitted mention of the mural above the fireplace.\[209\] Whether this might indicate that both Paysage romantique aux pêcheurs and Entrée du château had been covered by wallpaper at the time of Bénédict’s visit, or more intriguingly, that he had been informed, or presumed, these were not works by Cézanne, and that only Paysage romantique aux pêcheurs was then uncovered at the time of Cooper’s writing his article, is difficult to determine.\[210\]

\[206\] Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 67; Lewis, ‘Cézanne’s paintings in the Grand Salon at Jas de Bouffan,’ in Boyer et al., op. cit., p. 70. Confusingly, Lewis also describes [R 28–30] as ‘near’ the Lancret copy [R 23], when in fact they seem to have been diagonally opposite each other: loc. cit. The photograph of the two landscape fragments in situ was first published in: Cooper, ‘The Jas de Bouffan,’ op. cit., p. 23.

\[207\] Douglas Cooper, for one, seems to see the paired trees above the bather’s head as cedars: Cooper, ‘The Jas de Bouffan,’ op. cit., p. 26.

\[208\] Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 74. Rewald claims it is the mural behind the nude that Bénédict failed to mention: ibid., p. 74.


\[210\] Note also the comments of Maurice Denis, cited already, which likewise fail to mention any of the large landscapes: Cézanne, quoted in Denis, ‘[Excerpt from] Journal [1906],’ op. cit., p. 92.
Returning to Bénédite’s report, we find it concluding, following the mention of the nude bather *Le Baigneur au rocher* (fig. 6B.3) cited above, with a description of the murals between the French doors and the only window on the western wall, a panel comprising depictions of ‘Christ bending over a group of kneeling beggars’, ‘two life-size heads representing a bearded man and a woman’ to the left of this, and, to the right of both, ‘still another figure, also life-size, in an attitude of prayer.’

Undoubtedly these were, respectively, Cézanne’s copy after Sebastiano del Piombo [R 145] *Christ aux Limbes* (c.1869), the head study [R 155] *Contraste* (c.1870), and the penitent figure [R 146] *La Douleur* (c.1869), a photograph taken in 1912 illustrating Bénédite’s description perfectly (fig. 3E.10).

Following the state’s refusal of his offer, Louis Granel managed to sell some of the murals to the Parisian art dealer Josse Hessel, who then organized removal of the purchased works in 1912. Included in this initial program of removal were *Les Quatre Saisons* (figs 3E.11-14) and *Portrait de Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l’artiste* (fig. 6A.3) from the alcove, the nude *Le Baigneur au rocher* (fig. 6B.3) from the landscape in the north-west corner, and the paired *Les Christ aux Limbes* and *La Douleur* (figs 3E.10) from the panel of the same wall and to the south. The murals remaining in the salon were then subsequently at some point covered in wallpaper, if

---

211 Bénédite, report of November 1907, op. cit., p. 147.
212 For a reconstruction in colour of how these might have looked in their original state, see (fig. 6C.3(a-c). For a discussion of them, see section 6C.
214 John Rewald, in his discussion of the dispersal of the murals, states [R 145] *Les Christ aux Limbes* (c.1869) (fig. 6C.7) remained behind after the 1912 phase of removals: ibid., p. 67. However, the provenance given by him later for that same painting includes it as belonging for a period to Josse Hessel, before being passed on to August Pellerin, who had possession of the painting by the early 1920s: ibid., p. 123; records of the Musée d’Orsay, accessible through the Musée d’Orsay collection database accessible at: http://www.musee-orsay.fr/en/collections/overview.html. Whether this means the painting was detached by Josse Hessel separately from the other murals in the years between 1912 and the early 1920s, is difficult to determine. In a list of works appended by Walter Feilchenfeldt to the 2004 reprint of Rewald’s catalogue raisonné notes related to the Jas de Bouffan murals, [R 145] *Les Christ aux Limbes* (c.1869) (fig. 6C.7) is included amongst those works described as removed in 1912: Walter Feilchenfeldt, ‘Cézanne’s murals in the Jas de Bouffan: According to John Rewald’s *Catalogue Raisonné of the Paintings of Paul Cézanne*,’ in Boyer et al., op. cit., p. 97. Whether or not the removal of [R 145] *Les Christ aux Limbes* (c.1869) (fig. 6C.7) and [R 146] *La Douleur* (c.1869) (fig. 6C.11) occurred at the same time, it involved their separation from each other, as discussed below in section 6C.
not already, and remained unseen, it seems, until the 1950s. Since then, all have been detached, transferred to canvas, and dispersed.

In terms of the ensemble’s order of execution, Cézanne is usually presumed to have undertaken it in three phases: first, the personifications of the seasons in the alcove, executed either before or on either side of his first trip to Paris in 1861; then, the large landscapes and the copy after Lancret on the long walls, executed either side of his second trip to Paris in 1862–1864; and, finally, in the years between 1865 and 1870, and in a mode marked by a far more vigorous paint application, the portraits of his father and Achille Emperaire, the head study, the large nude painted over the landscape with waterfall, the Christ aux Limbes after Sebastiano del Piombo, and the praying La Douleur adjoining it. The program might thus be described, albeit perhaps crudely and only provisionally, as passing sequentially through a neoclassical, a rococo or northern landscape phase, and then, finally, a phase in a more transgressive and person style similar to what Cézanne himself would later describe as his ‘manière couillarde’.

---

215 Cooper, ‘The Jas de Bouffan,’ op. cit., p. 26. The murals and/or their fragmentary constituents remaining were, therefore: [R 23, 28, 30, 31, 34–41, 141, and 155]. In terms of which were then covered and when, at least [R 141] and [R 155] were visible in 1919, when Roger Fry saw both during a visit to the Jas de Bouffan, writing: ‘At last I found two early Cézanne—one, the head of Emperaire; the other a thing called Contrastes [sic], a head of a bearded man and the silhouette of a woman (a kind of caricature of your mother) in front. It’s reproduced in Vollard, an early Daumier-like thing and very sketchy but very fine, also a sanguine of a head in the great style’: Roger Fry, letter to Vanessa Bell, 29/30 November 1919, cited in Roger Fry, Letters of Roger Fry, edited by Denys Sutton, vol. 2, London: Chatto and Windus, 1972, pp. 473–474.

216 The landscapes, including the one above the fireplace, were sold at an auction in Paris in 1960, the surviving parts of the landscape with waterfall divided into the two pieces [R 28, 30], the river landscape with fishers divided into eight [R 34–41]: Unattributed author, Très belles estampes modernes, aquarelles, pastel, dessins, catalogue of auction held 17 June 1960, Paris: Galerie Charpentier, 1960, nos 60–70; Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 73–76. Of the landscape fragments, [R 28, 30, 36, 40, 41] now have whereabouts unknown, and, of the rest, all but two ended up in private collections; the exceptions are [R 38] and [R 39] now in the collection of the France Art Centre, Paris: ibid., pp. 73, 74, 76.

217 These phases have been delineated using John Rewald’s datings; alternative dates suggested by other scholars, in particular in regard to later of the three phases here described is discussed below in section 6A and 6B.

218 Cézanne’s use of the term ‘couillarde’ in relation to certain of his paintings of the 1860s was first reported by Ambroise Vollard in 1914, presumably quoting conversations with the artist in the late 1890s: Vollard, Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 22. ‘Manière couillarde’ was quoted by the same author in the later: Ambroise Vollard, En écoutant Cézanne, Degas, Renoir, Paris: Grasset, 1938, p. 20. The term, as well as the timing of the transition into Cézanne’s more transgressive style of the mid- to late-1860s is discussed in section 5A.
In terms of the first of these phases, and the only to have been deemed by scholars as possibly including elements executed before Cézanne's first trip to Paris in 1861, the four panels collectively known as Les Quatre Saisons (fig. 3E.11-14). By virtue of their subject matter and style, they might also be seen as the only murals possibly related to the academicism he was undoubtedly exposed to at the École de Dessin. They might also, however, reflect precisely the kinds of artistic ideals Zola was espousing in his letters of 1860 discussed above, ideals of *spiritualisme* that Zola, at least, would quickly abandon around 1863 for naturalism. 219 They have also aroused considerable interest by virtue of their signatures, the obviously false attribution of ‘Ingres’ often deemed a signal of deliberately satirical intent.

In regards to the panels themselves, these were painted onto the curved wall of the alcove at the northern end of the grand salon of the Jas de Bouffan, at scales determined by the decorative plasterwork. [R 5] *Été* (fig. 3E.12) and [R 6] *Hiver* (fig. 3E.13) were placed centrally, flanking the middle empty panel later to be filled by *Portrait de Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l'artiste* (fig. 6A.3), and [R 4] *Printemps* (fig. 3E.11) and [R 7] *Automne* (fig. 3E.14) in turn flanked these. 220 Hence, the arrangement presents the rather unusual temporal sequence of, from left to right; spring, summer, winter, and autumn, a layout respected by John Rewald’s catalogue numbering.

The figures of the four personifications themselves are delineated with a precise contour, each in a different pose and in different costume. Hence, *Printemps* is portrayed standing in a somewhat classical pose and wearing what appears to be antique clothing. Both *Été* and *Hiver* are sitting, the former wearing what might be a version of the traditional Provençal Arlésienne costume (fig. 3E.16), the same costume

219 See section 3C.
220 Sometimes the panels have been described as painted directly onto the plaster, at others as painted on canvas glued to the wall. For instance, Douglas Cooper, “These paintings were executed in oil directly on the plaster of the wall”: Cooper, ‘The Jas de Bouffan,’ op. cit., p. 25. Jean-Michel Royer, however, writes ‘the first of them, the one inspired by Lancret [presumably [R 4] *Printemps* (1860–1861) (fig. 3E.11)], had been painted directly, as a fresco, on the plaster wall to which its three sister-panels were later glued’: Royer, ‘The arbor of weeping chestnuts,’ op. cit., p. 160. In Rewald’s catalogue raisonné they are described as ‘wall painting, detached and mounted on canvas’: Rewald, *The Paintings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 66.
Cézanne appears to have depicted in a canvas executed near the end of his life, [R 812] _Jeune italienne accoudée_ (c.1900) (fig. 3E.17). The standing _Automne_ (fig. 3E.15), for her part, seems to be wearing the same outfit worn by a woman in the above-discussed _Paravent avec scènes champêtres et ornements_ [recto] (fig. 3E.18), which seems itself to differ slightly from the figure in the print it is presumed to have been copied from (fig. 3B.8). All the panels also have different horizon levels and seem to depict different times of day, perhaps thematically related to the season they are depicting. The outer two figures are standing while the central two are seated, although this was not always the case, underlying pentimenti revealing _Hiver_ (fig. 3E.13) once originally included a standing figure.

Stylistically, while all the figures are executed holding somewhat static poses and rather flatly, the outer panels incorporate considerably more confident modelling and therefore greater illusion of three-dimensionality. Moreover, these outer panels seem to have a more refined and, indeed, complete finish, whereas the central panels look almost abandoned; the backgrounds only sketchily suggested and the awkward poses held by the figures barely resolved. Finally, each of the panels was signed bottom-

---

221 Against this suggestion of a Provençal costume being depicted in [R 5] _Été_ (fig. 3E.12), however, is a passing remark of Nina Maria Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, a scholar well-versed in Provençal themes throughout Cézanne’s oeuvre and who devotes some pages to discussing the Arlésienne costume, that, in reference to [R 812] _Jeune italienne accoudée_ (c.1900) (fig. 3E.17), ‘Cézanne depicted an Arlésienne only once’: Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, op. cit., p. 140. The woman depicted in [R 5] _Été_ (fig. 3E.12) is also wearing her hair down, in a most un-Arlesienne manner. In any case, in regard to the costume, Athanassoglou-Kallmyer notes, ‘Among Provence’s emblematic, sacralized images, none was more potent than the Arlésienne. With her picturesque dress of billowing skirt, black velvet bodice (an alternative for the white broad-sleeved shirt), muslin fichu, and starched white or black lace headdress, the Arlésienne was a living myth in her own right, the spirit of Provence incarnate’: ibid., pp. 141-142. In regard to [R 812] _Jeune italienne accoudée_ (c.1900) (fig. 3E.17), John Rewald notes that the ‘italienne’ of the painting’s title is related to the tradition that Cézanne used as his model a young girl related to the Italian model who posed for the various _Garcon au gilet rouge_ paintings [R 656–659]; he also notes, pre-empting Athanassoglou-Kallmyer’s observations, ‘It does seem possible that the girl’s outfit is part of the famous Arlesian costume, without the typical large black shawl that usually hides whatever is worn underneath’: Rewald, _The Paintings of Paul Cézanne_, op. cit., p. 489.

222 Whether or not this might indicate an effort on Cézanne’s part to depict another version of Provençal costume, it might offer some evidence of an attribution to Cézanne of the suggested daubed sections of the screen.

223 Hence, [R 4] _Printemps_ (fig. 3E.11) seems to evoke a pre-dawn flush, _Été_ the full-blown glare of noon, _Automne_ a blood-red sunset, and [R 6] _Hiver_ (fig. 3E.13) the stars of midnight.

224 On this pentimenti see also section 6A.
right ‘Ingres’, with *Hiver* having the additional inscription ‘1811’ at bottom-left.\(^{225}\)

Regardless of any possible perceived satirical intent in the addition of Ingres’s signature, and hence the possible satirical intent of the imagery in general, issues both discussed shortly, the panels, at over three metres high and up to a metre wide each, must have nevertheless represented a considerable investment of time and effort on Cézanne’s behalf.\(^{226}\)

In terms of dating Cézanne’s efforts, two letters from Zola are usually cited as offering clues.\(^{227}\) The first, to Cézanne and from 13 June 1860, included a description by Zola of ‘large panels’ he had seen in a café in Vitry ‘like you want to paint at your place’; the second, from later that same year and to Baille, mentioned a desire to see in an upcoming visit to Aix ‘Paul’s panels, [and] Baille’s moustache’.\(^{228}\) The ‘panels’ so referred to are hence presumed to be *Les Quatre Saisons*.\(^{229}\) If this were the case, it would seem Cézanne had started one or more of the panels before the end of September 1860, the date of the second letter.\(^{230}\) A hiatus in the painting of the panels

\(^{225}\) Bénédicte, op. cit., p. 146; Rewald, *The Paintings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 66.

\(^{226}\) The panels exact sizes, in order of Rewald number and after removal from the walls, are: 314 x 97 cm, 314 x 109 cm, 314 x 104 cm, 314 x 104 cm.


\(^{228}\) ‘Dans ce café [...] C’etait de grands panneaux comme tu veux en peindre chez toi’ and ‘J’ai tant de choses à voir: les panneaux de Paul, la moustache de Baille’: Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, 13 June 1860, and letter to Baptistin Baille, 21 September 1860, both cited in Zola, *Correspondance*, t. 1, op. cit., pp. 175 and 239.

\(^{229}\) Arguing against any of the *Les Quatre saisons* being the ‘panels’ referred to in Zola’s letters is that the paintings described by Zola in the Vitry café seem comparable to *Les Quatre saisons* only in terms of size; as Zola himself wrote, the works he saw were on canvas rather than plaster and depicted ‘village fêtes’ rather than allegories of the seasons; ‘C’etait de grands panneaux comme tu veux en peindre chez toi, peints sur toile, représentant des fêtes de village’: Zola, letter to Cézanne, 13 June 1860, op. cit., p. 175. Mary Tompkins Lewis cites this reference to village fêtes as evidence that Zola and Cézanne shared the ‘lingering nineteenth-century fascination with vernacular sacred art and the undercurrent of religiosity that persisted in provincial quarters’: Lewis, *Cézanne’s Early Imagery*, op. cit., p. 27. However, it is not the subject matter than seems to have caught Zola’s eye in the Vitry paintings, but rather their ‘chic’ brushstroke and the impressive illusion of depth; ‘mais un chic, un coup de pinceau si sûr, une entente si parfaite de l’effet à distance, que je demeurai ébahi’: Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, 13 June 1860, op. cit., p. 175. Lawrence Gowing has suggested Zola’s description of the Vitry panels might have prompted Cézanne’s mural copy after Lancret [R 23]: Gowing, ‘“The Four Seasons”,’ op. cit., p. 70.

\(^{230}\) John Rewald’s date in his catalogue raisonné is 1860–1861; Leonello Venturi originally dated the panels 1859–1862, but intended, in his never published revised catalogue, to re-date
might then have been entailed by Cézanne's first trip to Paris in 1861; which might also explain not only the unusual temporal arrangement of the seasons, but also by the stylistic discrepancy between the central and flanking panels, the latter being executed, perhaps, upon his return. 231

Coincidentally, a letter from Zola to Cézanne around the time Cézanne is presumed to have been in the midst of painting these panels contains a discussion precisely on the importance of artists dating their work. 232 Debating at which point a work, whether poetic or pictorial, should be laid aside, an issue with which Zola says he is in agreement with Cézanne, and, apparently, contra Baille, he wrote:

So, I am absolutely of your opinion: work conscientiously, do the best you can, file away, adjusting the parts to present a better whole, then leave your work to its destiny, good or bad, taking care to have put the date of its composition at the bottom. It is always wiser to leave bad what is bad and to try to do better on another subject. 233

them c.1860: Venturi, Cézanne, son arte—son œuvre, op. cit., p. 69 (nos 4–7); Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 66. Lawrence Gowing has also suggested the inscribed date of '1811' on [R 6] Hiver (fig. 3E.13) might provide evidence of an 1861 execution for at least this panel, raising the possibility its inscription specifically referenced, and hence pilloried, the jubilee of Ingres's 1811 painting, Jupiter et Thétis (fig. 3E.23), the painting often presumed to have provoked Cézanne's appropriation of Ingres' signature on the panels as well: Gowing, "'The Four Seasons'," op. cit., p. 70; Gowing, 'The early work of Paul Cézanne,' in Gowing et al., Cézanne: The Early Years, op. cit., p. 6; Ratcliffe, Cézanne’s Working Methods, op. cit., p. 377 n. 3a.

231 Gowing, 'The early work of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 6–7; Gowing, "'The Four Seasons'," op. cit., p. 70; Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 68. Wayne Andersen has posited, instead, that the stylistic discrepancy might not be evidence of a maturing confidence but, rather, of execution by different artists. Hence, although admitting Cézanne probably 'had a hand in the project', he suggests [R 4] Printemps and [R 7] Automne were by a 'more mature painter', perhaps Achille Emperaire: Andersen, The Youth of Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 101. Emperaire's involvement would, however, seem to disrupt the dating of the panels' execution suggested by John Rewald, and indeed accepted by Andersen, of 1860–1861; although apparently known by name before his first visit to Paris in 1861, Cézanne did not, according to most biographers, meet the older artist in person until that trip, at the Académie Suisse: Mack, Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 46; Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 66, 100.

232 Zola, letter to Cézanne, 1 August 1860, op. cit., pp. 216–221.

233 'Ainsi donc, je suis complètement de ton avis: travaillez avec conscience, faites le mieux que vous pourrez, donnez quelques coups de lime, pour mieux ajuster les parties et présenter un tout convenable, puis abandonnez votre œuvre à sa bonne ou à sa mauvaise fortune, ayant soin de mettre au bas la date de sa composition. Il sera toujours plus sage de laisser mauvais ce qui est mauvais et de tâcher de faire meilleur sur un autre sujet.': ibid., p. 218.
Whether or not Cézanne had likewise mentioned, in his own (lost) letter to which Zola was responding, this dating of works bad or otherwise that Zola seems to be writing he agreed with, Cézanne did date, as noted above, one of the Saisons panels, but with the obviously false ‘1811’. He also signed all of them with the equally fake ‘Ingres’. As intimated above, this appropriation of Ingres’s signature is often cited as evidence of Cézanne’s intent, in producing this imagery, to deride the artist whose name he’d forged.

[Cézanne] jointly mocked academic allegory and Ingres’s academic style by parodying its polished surfaces, flat colours, and relentless linearism. To make the joke complete, he signed the panels ‘Ingres’. 234

This would seem to presume, thus, that Cézanne’s motives for executing Les Quatre Saisons (figs 3E.11–14) in the first place, including decisions about what those murals were to depict, what style they were to be executed in, and where they were to be positioned, were the same as the motives for including Ingres’s signature: Cézanne despised the French neo-classicist par excellence and was here, in one of his first large-scale endeavours, declaring that antagonism openly. It presumes that the antipathy assumed to be held by Cézanne later in life, when the gears of marketing were well-engaged, was already present in a provincial painter barely out of their teens with perhaps little idea of the broader context of French painting. 235

---

234 Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., p. 81. Athanassoglou-Kallmyer dates the panels’ execution as 1862: loc. cit. Take also the remarks of Aruna d’Souza; ‘Cézanne, I suspect, only made these paintings to launch a good-natured and broad-humoured rebellion against authority (parental—his father, who did not know what to make of the pictures that now adorned his house—and artistic—Ingres, who was the butt of Cézanne’s visual joke’: Aruna d’Souza, Cézanne’s Bathers: Biography and the Erotics of Paint, University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008, p. 149 n. 17. 235 Hence the following comments on Ingres by Cézanne, all post-dating his first one-man show in 1895, when Cézanne was fifty-six: ‘That fellow Dominique [Ingres] is damned talented! [...] but he bores the shit out of me!’: Paul Cézanne, quoted in Vollard, ‘[Extract from] Paul Cézanne,’ cited and translated in Doran (ed.), Conversations with Cézanne, op. cit., p. 9; ‘Ingres, in spite of his style (style as we pronounce it in Aix), and his admirers, is only a very minor painter’: Paul Cézanne, letter to Emile Bernard, 25 July 1904, cited and translated in Doran (ed.), Conversations with Cézanne, op. cit., p. 45; ‘In spite of the exclamation collected by Monsieur Vollard during his portrait sittings, “Jean Dominique is great!” it is certain that he did not like Ingres’: Maurice Denis, ‘“Cézanne” (excerpt from Théories),’ cited and translated in Doran (ed.), Conversations with Cézanne, op. cit., p. 175. As Michael Doran points out, Denis’ quoting of Cézanne’s comments to Vollard proceeded its appearance in Vollard’s own work, suggesting Vollard had told Denis about the exchange: Doran, ‘[notes],’ in Doran (ed.), Conversations with Cézanne, op. cit., p. 258 n. 11; ‘Ingres is just the same...bloodless! He’s a draughtsman. [...] Oh!, it’s beautiful enough, Ingres, Raphael, that
As is implicit in the quote from Athanassoglou-Kallmyer cited above, however, the satirical antagonism such an interpretation perceives is, without the signature, invisible; without it, the joke is not ‘complete’. As such, not all scholars see the imagery in toto as satirical, only the signature, the execution of which is perceived as a later act of self-mockery, marking a rupture, an epiphany of renunciation that simultaneously and catharcically expunged both academicism and Cézanne’s own earlier lacklustre efforts associated with it. However, if the intentions underlying the execution of the panels are deemed different to the execution of the signatures, there is no reason to believe their execution was coeval. As such, although the addition of the signatures might mark a denunciation, through ironic apposition, of his own Ingres-style attempt at academic-style classicism, there is no way of telling when this change in opinion occurred. For it is with the signature that the discourse opened up within the work concerning its own possible intent becomes visible, an intent retrospectively congruent with Cézanne’s later perceived hatred of ‘that pernicious classicist’.

In terms precisely of the panels’ style, and, in particular, their possible formal sources, the obvious suggestion is, given the signatures, Ingres. However, although, as

whole outfit. I can appreciate them as well as anyone else. I can take pleasure in line if I want to. But there are snags. Holbein, Clouet or Ingres have nothing but line. Well, it’s not enough. It’s very beautiful, but it’s not enough. [...] Jean-Dominique [Ingres] is powerful, very powerful! Yet he’s very dangerous. [...] All the same, he tries in vain, does Jean-Dominique, to wring your heart with his glossy finish! I said this to Vollard, to shock him, he’s very powerful! Nevertheless he’s a damned good man... the most modern of the moderns. Do you know why I take my hat off to him? Because he forced his fantastic draughtsmanship down the throats of the idiots who now claim to understand it: Paul Cézanne, quoted in Gasquet, Joachim Gasquet’s Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 178, 184, 192. Gasquet also included Cézanne’s quote from his letter to Bernard cited above but not attributed as such: Gasquet, Joachim Gasquet’s Cézanne, op. cit., p. 191.

236 Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., p. 81. As Jean-Michel Royer also comments: ‘The key lies in the second degree, the humour, the gag: otherwise, why this signature “Ingres, 1811”? But yes, of course you know why: 1811 was the date on that delicious and enormous “grand machine”, our Jupiter and Thetis in the Musée Granet. Kolossal sublebly!’. Royer, ‘The arbor of weeping chestnuts,’ op. cit., p. 159.

237 ‘It is quite possible that the Seasons were an experiment undertaken in all seriousness; but if so, the young painter’s academic mood did not last long. The irreverent signature Ingres at the bottom of each panel certainly seems to have been added in a spirit of mockery rather than of emulation’: Mack, Paul Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 148–149. Or, more succinctly, take Jack Lindsay’s characterization of the signature’s deployment ‘not out of scorn for that painter [Ingres], but as a piece of self-mockery’: Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., p. 63.

238 Paul Cézanne, quoted in Emile Bernard, ‘Paul Cézanne,’ L’Occident, (July 1904), cited and translated in Doran (ed.), Conversations with Cézanne, op. cit., p. 38.
Athanassoglou-Kallmyer notes, there is some general stylistic similarity in terms of a general emphasis on linearity and polished surfaces between Cézanne’s figures, particularly those in the outer panels, and Ingres’s work more broadly, specific figural correspondences are hard to find. Hence, Bruno Ely, has suggested, thereby, that Cézanne might have drawn inspiration from one of Ingres’s co-students under Jacques-Louis David, Paulin Duqueylard, a Provencal painter represented in the Musée d’Aix with three paintings. Of these, Ely suggests resemblances between Printemps and Duqueylard’s enormous Ossian chantant l’hymne funèbre d’une jeune fille (1800), noting not only a similarity in style, but also in the head positioning of the female figures and, in one case, general posture (figs 3E.19–20). Lawrence Gowing, however, prefers to suggest Cézanne might have drawn inspiration from more directly Renaissance models, for instance an engraving after a Seasons painting once attributed to Botticelli. Mary Tompkins Lewis, in turn, repeats this suggestion, seeing in Printemps a certain Botticellian ‘splayed feet and floating posture’. Indeed, the proportions and pose of that Cézanne figure has a certain mannerist classical ubiquity about it, and might also be compared, for instance, to the fountain decorations of Jean Goujon (fig. 3E.21(a)), exactly the nymphs Zola had rhapsodized about in a letter already cited, that had also included the advice that Cézanne should emulate precisely this artist. There is also a similarity between Cézanne’s Printemps and another of Goujon’s commissions, his own Printemps personification from an allegory of the seasons decorating the façade of the hotel de Carnavalet in Paris (fig. 3E.21(b–c)). Finally, Lawrence Gowing has suggested a


240 Denis Coutagne, ‘Deux œuvres de Paul Duqueylard,’ L’Estampe/L’Objet d’Art, hors-série no. 31 (June 2007), p. 48.


243 Gowing, ‘The early work of Paul Cézanne,’ op. cit., p. 6; Lewis, ‘Cézanne’s paintings in the grand salon at Jas de Bouffan,’ in Boyer et al., Jas de Bouffan: Cézanne, op. cit., p. 73

244 See section 3C.

245 Whether Cézanne saw, or, indeed, would have been able to see, Goujon’s allegory in the flesh, as it were, from through the entrance gate and across the front courtyard is debatable; the
source outside fine art, in the form of rococo-revival *papiers peints* decorations, citing as an example a set of single-figure allegories installed as part of the decoration of the Château de la Barben near Salon-en-Provence. 246

However, it would seem odd that, if *Les Quatre Saisons* were intended, from the start, to parody Ingres, Cézanne would mimic works not actually by that artist. Moreover, if there is mimicry, it seems mostly in terms only of the *Printemps* (3E.19), and, even then, multiple sources seem possible. Moreover, aside from the considerable effort, as well as commitment of time, the panels' physical execution would seem to have entailed, there also seems to have been some effort made to include encodings or symbolic references outside a simple dig at Ingres, or, even, neo-classicism in general. That is, there seems some effort made to match seasons to times of the day and to give the figures costumes perhaps intended within a similar sequential program. In short, and to repeat what has already been said, it would seem that if satire was included, it was included only with the addition of the signature which would thereby seem unlikely to have been added at the point at which the panels were completed, but several years later, when Cézanne had set himself more clearly on the path of avant-gardism. In fact, the act might seem to have been executed with precisely the spirit of retrospective commentary his addition of the bather to the landscape on the adjoining wall (fig. 3E.7) might have been undertaking with.

Cézanne's engagement with Ingres's work wasn't, however, confined at this stage to the signature added to his *Les Quatre Saisons* panels alone. He also executed a drawing, [Ch 50] *Caricature of 'Jupiter and Thetis'* (1858–1860) (fig. 3E.22), after the same painting usually presumed to have provoked his appropriation of Ingres's signature in the first place, Ingres's *Jupiter et Thétis* (1811) (fig. 3E.23). However, as Adrien Chappuis is quick to point out in his catalogue raisonné, the drawing is not strictly speaking a 'copy', but rather a 'caricature' of Ingres's painting. 'Cézanne was probably drawing from memory, showing Jupiter—inaccurately—with his head tilted

---

building, bought by the town of Paris in 1866, was only open to the public as the Musée d'Histoire de Paris from 1880 onwards. 246 Gowing, 'The early work of Paul Cézanne,' op. cit., p. 6.
and his arm around Thetis. For many, as with his personification of the seasons just discussed, this inaccuracy of pose, along with the simplified style, has been seen as deliberate satirical debasement.

Without necessarily attempting to refute this characterization, a few asides might be interposed, if only to highlight the nebulousness of detecting satire. As would already have become apparent from the discussions in chapter one and chapter two above, Cézanne was certainly familiar with, if not an inveterate lover of, antique poetry. He excelled at Greek and Latin translation at the Bourbon and, much later in life, purportedly used to surprise artist-writer interlocutors such as Maurice Denis with extensive off-the-cuff quotes from Virgil and Lucretius. It is not unlikely, then, that he knew his Homer and, as such, the specifics of the scene depicted in the painting by Ingres his caricature paraphrased. As such, he might well have been aware that, before Thetis began her pleas that Zeus should punish Agamemnon’s wronging of her son by aiding the Trojans in their upcoming fight with the Archaean host, the following occurred:

She sank to the ground beside him, put her left arm round his knees, raised her right hand to touch his chin, and so made her petition to the Royal Son of Cronos.

Whereas Ingres’s switching of hands, at least in the case of which hand Thetis twiddles Jupiter’s beard with—his getting it wrong, as it were—is occasionally

\[\text{247 Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op., cit., p. 63.}\]
\[\text{248 'Cézanne saw Ingres as the symbol of reaction, artistic and political [...] and he expressed his hostility in sarcastic parodies. In a drawing of 1858–1860, he ridiculed Thetis's act of beseeching Jupiter by making it look like a trite and gawky embrace': Athanassoglu-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., p. 81.}\]
\[\text{249 See section 1A. 'Là dessus la conversation dévait sur les négligences de l'éducation moderne, puis, après des citations d'Horace, de Virgile, de Lucrece, Cézanne se remettait au fil de son discours...': Bernard, 'Souvenirs sur Paul Cézanne et lettres inédites [part one],' op. cit., p. 393. In a letter from the penultimate day of 1859, already cited, Zola could also write, 'Puisque tu as traduit la seconde élegyque de Virgile, pourquoi ne me l'envoies-tu pas?': Zola, letter to Cézanne, 30 December 1859, op. cit., p. 120. In a field so richly strewn with psychosexual interpretations as Cézanne scholarship, it is surprising that the pederast overtones usually concomitant with any mention of this work by Virgil has yet to be seized upon, particularly by those readings of Cézanne's 'violent' figural output of the 1860s that stress Cézanne's inability to deal with women.}\]
commented upon, Cézanne's switching them back again—his getting it right, as it were—never is. 251 In any case, returning to Homer, with Thetis's entreaties finished, Zeus makes no reply and the sea nymph, still clinging to his knees, pleads for some sign of his aid. Zeus after complaining of his fears of upsetting his wife finally says, however, 'to reassure you, I will bow my head—and the immortals recognize no surer pledge from me than that.' 252 So finishing, the god bowed his head. 253

So, Jupiter's nod, part of Athanassoglou-Kallmyer's above-described 'gawky embrace', as well as his switching Thetis's hands could as much be seen as fidelity to Homer's text as parodic reconfiguration of Ingres's painting. Indeed, Cézanne's version would seem closer to the spirit of Homer's characterisation of the pair's awkward interaction than Ingres's coolly imperial reconfiguration. 254 It also, in the humanizing spirit through which this awkwardness is presented, might offer a kind of visual equivalence to the burlesquing of antique poetry discussed last chapter. Ironically then, if Cézanne was satirizing Ingres, he was doing so by exaggerating what Ingres's painting lacked, at least in terms of Homer's text.

Finally, and as an oblique return to the issue of possible pastiche, one of the main differences, formally, between Cézanne's caricature and Ingres's painting, is depiction of Jupiter's legs. In the Ingres original, they are positioned emphatically frontally, whereas in Cézanne's drawing they are slewed to the right. Now, although Chappis implies this was merely a result of Cézanne working from his memory, there is some similarity between Cézanne's positioning of Jupiter's legs and an engraving after a statue of Poussin published in L'Artiste (fig. 3E.24), repeating even the raised right foot, but not the support underneath it. Hence, although it would seem odd that such

253 'Zeus, as he finished, bowed his sable brows. The ambrosial locks rolled forward from the immortal head of the King, and high Olympus shook': ibid., p. 37 [book 1, ll. 648–650].
254 Take, for instance, Aruna d'Souza's brilliant description of Cézanne's variation as 'Jupiter awkwardly cops a feel from Thetis': D'Souza, Cézanne's Bathers, op. cit., p. 109.
an image would be a source for Cézanne's drawing, the uneasy possibility, visually, persists.

•

If, then, the kinds of painterly endeavours Cézanne was undertaking in the years before his first trip to Paris were summarized, such a list it would seem to have included most of the visual forms then available to him. He had tried his hand at Dutch landscape and interior genre, religious themed paintings tending at times to the naiveté of ex-voto imagery, académies, copies of rococo prints, sentimental copies and/or paraphrases of kitsch late eighteenth- or early nineteenth-century genreism, and direct and reasonably detailed copies after contemporary paintings of a romantically literary bent. Moreover, the gamut of copying techniques utilized seems covered, from the relative close copying of the paintings in the Musée d'Aix, through the free interpretations of the painting after Prud'hon, and up to the relatively free pastiches of his Dutch landscapes and the rococo insertions on his father's decorated screen. In short, there seems little Cézanne hadn't attempted.

However, what might also be noted, and this is perhaps congruent with Zola's remarks concerning much of Cézanne's lost letters of that year containing complaints of his technical deficiencies, is that Cézanne, especially when left to himself and working from his imagination rather than a model, imagic or living, might not seem to have been a particularly good painter in academic terms, his work often marred by disproportions, awkward construction, and disjunctions of spatial arrangements. Indeed, even when painting from an image and, apparently, attempting a close copy, he seems unable to have restrained himself from alterations upsetting not only parts-to-whole relations but also adding a certain uncanny artificiality to the imagery. Figures seem pasted onto abstract, almost comically theatrical stage sets, and interactions between figures short-circuited by the executor's inability to position them within a single and consistent spatial framework. Although such affects are highly unlikely to have been intentional at this stage, it is precisely these tendencies, the intrinsically imagic nature of such works resulting, perhaps, from their status as, essentially, images of images, that might then be seen to re-emerge in certain of Cézanne's later multi-figural landscapes.
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In terms of his attitude towards the images he was producing, evidence suggesting that such production was undertaken in anything other than a spirit of sincere endeavour seems restricted to the possibly retrospective addition of signatures to his mural personifications of the seasons, which might itself have been a gesture enacted years after their completion. Nevertheless, there does seem some congruency, specifically in terms of several of his drawn caricatures, between the burlesquing spirit of his posted poems and some of the images produced by him in this same period. However, it might be difficult to conclude that such burlesqueing had particularly polemic purposes, and therefore equally difficult to conclude that Cézanne had already formed an antithetical opinion of academicism or popular Salon art before travelling to Paris.

Finally, and related, perhaps, to this latter point, might also be noted the possibly exaggerated emphasis usually placed upon a presumed strained relationship between Cézanne and his father over these years. For, if this is characterization is resisted, based partly upon some of the dating issues discussed above, this might not only undermine some of the biographical context presumed encoded by Cézanne’s later more transgressive artn works, but also lessen, perhaps, the notion that Cézanne was instinctively anti-authoritarian in his creative pursuits. As such, given the degree to which such content has been interpreted as present within Cézanne’s early works, particularly his poetry, the question might be asked as to whether such presence might be a result of the kinds of citatory practices enacted by Cézanne. That is, it might be suggested that there was something intrinsic to Cézanne’s creative approach that entailed the production of works inherently open to multiple and often ambivalent readings.
Chapter Four

Salons, académies, and landscape murals

1861–1862

"...my naïveté at the time didn’t make me aspire to more and I had been piously brought up."

Cézanne did finally arrive in Paris at the end of April 1861, with his father and sister. He seems, however, to have stayed in the capital for less than six months, returning to Aix perhaps as early as September, where he remained until the end of the following year, when once more he was back in the capital. It is this year-and-a-half period, between Cézanne’s first arrival in Paris in April 1861 and his return there around November 1862 that is the main concern of this chapter.

Of specific interest is what might be gleaned of Cézanne’s reactions to the capital, particularly in terms of the kinds of attitudes he might have formed, or have brought with him, regarding contemporary art practice. Hence, not only will an attempt be made to characterize the kinds of art Cézanne might have seen on first trip to Paris, but also the degree to which he might or might not have been aware of developing strands of avant-gardism in the capital. Unfortunately, however, in regards to painterly efforts possibly produced by Cézanne during this pivotal period, little seems to survive, and recourse must, once again, be made to his correspondence and, in particular, a poem he wrote a month-and-a-half after arriving in Paris. Like many of
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1 "ma naïveté d'alors ne me faisait pas ambitionner plus et que j'avais été élevée pieusement": Paul Cézanne, quoted in Émile Bernard, "Souvenirs sur Paul Cézanne et lettres inédites [part one]," op. cit., p. 393.
2 Vollard, Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 21.
3 Rewald, Cézanne et Zola. op. cit., pp. 30, 32.
4 Indeed, apart from the canvases dated c.1860, all of which were discussed or mentioned in passing last chapter, John Rewald suggests only two paintings as possibly painted in 1861, the
Cézanne’s poetic efforts discussed in chapter two, this poem, which describes Cézanne’s impressions of his visit to the 1861 Salon, will likewise be shown to possibly embed, albeit perhaps unintentionally, a particular ambivalence that has enabled contradictory interpretations. Once more, this ambivalence might be shown to centre on a single word whose meaning depends on the degree to which its use is deemed ironically parodic.

Continuing to a degree some of the themes teased out in chapter three, some resistance will also be given to the notion that Cézanne arrived in the capital already possessed of anti-academic tendencies. Instead, it will be suggested it was as likely he retained his provincially conservative, albeit eclectic, tastes and still harboured reasonably conventional aspirations for entrance into the Paris École des Beaux-Arts. Following from this, and indeed in line with this suggestion, a brief analysis will be undertaken of Cézanne’s académies presumed to have been executed at the École de Dessin in the year following his return home, chastened, according to most biographies, by his experiences in the capital.

Discussion will then move to those murals in the Jas de Bouffan suggested by John Rewald as executed in the period 1862–1864, and which would seem, like many of the works discussed last chapter, to have involved the pastiching, paraphrasing, or copying of imagery derived from reproductive prints. Moreover, a suggestion will be made that the style of these murals, in addition to this similarity of procedural year of that trip: a still life that Rewald has doubts as to its attribution to Cézanne and is which now known only in reproduction, [R 19] Objets en cuivre et vase de fleurs (1860–1862) (o/c (41 x 47), WU), and an odd painting depicting several figures apparently worshipping the sun, [R 20] Scène religieuse (1860–1862) (o/c (28 x 23), PC), a crudely epiphanic work perhaps related to the ex-voto styled [R 11] La Visitation (c.1860) (fig. 3D.23), discussed in section 3D. Excluded from this count are the mural panels [R 4–7] Les Quatre Saisons (1860–1861) (figs 3E.11–14). Sometimes also deemed as executed by Cézanne in 1861, although not by Rewald, is the apparently unfinished [R 78] Portrait d’Émile Zola (1862–1864) (fig. 6C.24), which is sometimes suggested as related to the portrait painting sessions described by Zola in a letter to Baille of mid-1861: Gowing, ‘The early work of Paul Cézanne,’ op. cit., p. 7. However, it would seem that Cézanne executed several portraits, as at least one seems to have been described by Zola as destroyed, relating Cézanne’s words thus ‘Je viens de le crever. J’ai voulu le retoucher ce matin, et comme il devenait de plus en plus mauvais, je l’ai anéanti’: Émile Zola, letter to Baptistin Baille, [end of June/beginning of July 1861], cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 300. Although Wayne Andersen writes ‘It cannot be said for certain that [[R 78] Portrait d’Émile Zola (1862–1864) (fig. 6C.22)] […] is the portrait of Zola referred to in Zola’s letter’, he does point out that Cézanne only spoke of scraping back his painting, ready for repainting, and the surviving painting certainly has that appearance: Andersen, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., pp. 151, 152
underpinning, is relatively contiguous with his smaller pre-Parisian canvas and panel endeavours. As such, a proposal is made that, if it is presumed Cézanne did not return to Aix between the end of 1862 and 1864, these murals were probably completed just before his departure for Paris in 1862, or, perhaps, even earlier. Again, as was the case with the personifications of the seasons likewise discussed last chapter, brief appraisal will also be given to Cézanne’s possible motivations in executing his mural scheme, particularly in regard to the degree to which it might, or might not, represent a deliberately enacted gesture of satirical parody.
Upon arriving in Paris, Cézanne moved into a hotel on the rue Coquillièr near the Les Halles and then set about seeking more permanent lodgings, assisted by his father and sister, who had accompanied him to the capital. His father also made the necessary arrangements for his son's allowance, organising for it to be transferred regularly through a credit account with the firm Le Hideux, the Bank Cézanne-Cabassol's Parisian agent. Although there is little consensus regarding the exact amount Cézanne received by way of this allowance, it was certainly not meagre, and at least equal to the 125 francs a month Zola's suggested budget proposed in his letter of the previous month had been based upon. It was also far more than Zola was earning at the time, the struggling writer at best intermittently employed and living hand to mouth in squalid and unseemly conditions.

Surprisingly, given Zola's persistent badgering in regard to the visit, Cézanne did not inform his friend of his imminent arrival. Instead, as reported in a letter to Baille of 22 April, he surprised Zola by appearing unannounced at his door. Although Zola mentioned in that same letter a plan of lodging together once Cézanne's father had left

---

7 John Rewald cites the amount as 125 francs per month, the amount suggested by Zola: Rewald, *Paul Cézanne: A Biography*, op. cit., p. 23. Gerstle Mack claims it was initially 150 francs but 'soon' doubled to 300 francs: Mack, *Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 104. Jack Lindsay states it was initially 250 francs but raised soon after Cézanne's arrival, to 300 francs: Lindsay, op. cit., p. 76. On Zola's proposed budget, see section 3C.
8 An indication of the relative size of Cézanne's allowance is given by Zola's wage as a dockworker in 1860, which was 60 francs a month: Becker, 'Introduction biographique,' op. cit., p. 39; Thomson, 'Tableau chronologique,' op. cit., pp. 124. On Zola's poverty in the years 1859-1862, see, for instance: Becker, 'Introduction biographique,' op. cit., pp. 39-48.
9 "J'interromps cette analyse trop rapide et trop indignes, pour m'écrier: 'J'ai vu Paul!!! J'ai vu Paul, comprends-tu cela, toi; comprends-tu toute la mélodie de ces trois mots? Il est venu ce matin, dimanche, m'appeler à plusieurs reprises dans mon escalier. Je dormais d'un sommeil; j'ai ouvert ma porte en tremblant de joie et nous nous sommes furieusement embrassés. [...] Tant que son père sera ici, nous ne pourrons nous voir que rarement, mais dans un mois nous comptons bien loger ensemble" : Émile Zola, letter to Baptiste Baille, 22 April 1861, cited in Zola, *Correspondance*, t. 1, op. cit., pp. 284-285. Given the date of Zola's letter, Cézanne must have, therefore, arrived either on the night of 20 April, a Saturday, or, more likely, the morning of 21 April, a Sunday: 1861 calendar posted at: http://www.hf.rim.or.jp/~knii/cal/cal.cgi?1861.
Paris, this never eventuated, perhaps by virtue of Zola’s poverty. In any case, once Cézanne had moved into a furnished room south of the Latin Quarter, mere blocks from where Zola was staying on the rue Soufflot, and once his father and sister had returned to Aix, the old friends began to see more of each other.¹⁰

Unfortunately, however, despite his allowance and Zola’s companionship, Cézanne’s Parisian sojourn seems to have fallen beneath his expectations. ‘Barely had he arrived here,’ Zola complained to Baille in another letter of 10 June, ‘than he was talking...’

¹⁰ ‘Je suis allé dimanche dernier à l’exposition de peinture avec Paul. [...] Je vois Paul fort souvent’: Émile Zola, letter to Baptistin Baille, 1 [June?] 1861, cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 288. John Rewald gives the date of the letter as 1 May 1861, but this would seem inconsistent with the letter’s contents; at one point Zola writes ‘Demain dimanche,’ implying the letter was written on a Saturday, and 1 May 1861 was a Wednesday. Furthermore, the Salon of 1861, presumably the ‘l’exposition de peinture’ referred to by Zola, opened on 1 May, making it impossible for Cézanne and Zola to have visited it ‘dimanche dernier’ unless the letter was written after 6 May. It is also difficult to imagine Cézanne ‘travaille beaucoup’ as Zola describes it, a mere week after his arrival in Paris. 1 June 1861 is hence a more likely candidate for the letter’s date; it was not only a Saturday, but also a date sufficiently after Cézanne’s arrival for him to have settled into some kind of working routine: loc. cit.; H. W. Janson (ed.), Catalogues of the Paris Salon: 1673 to 1881, New York: Garland Publishing, 1977–1978, vol. 42 [1861], p. 1; 1861 calendar posted at: http://www.hf rim.or.jp/~kaji/cal/cal.cgi?1861. It should perhaps be added, however, that on 10 June 1861, Zola was already writing ‘Je vois Cézanne rarement’: Émile Zola, letter to Baptistin Baille, 10 June 1861, cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 293. Whether nine days is a long enough time for the change from seeing someone ‘often’ to seeing someone ‘rarely’ to be noted, is open to debate: Zola, letters to Baille, 1 [June?] 1861 and 10 June 1861, op. cit., pp. 92 and 94. In terms of Cézanne’s address in Paris after his father and sister’s return to Aix, Ambroise Vollard, with Gerstle Mack, John Rewald, Jack Lindsay, and Wayne Andersen following, gives it as the rue des Feuillantines: Vollard, Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 22; Mack, Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 104; Rewald, Paul Cézanne: A Biography, op. cit., p. 215; Lindsay, op. cit., p. 76; Andersen, The Youth of Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 143. Vollard, however, seems to have given Zola’s address at the time of Cézanne’s arrival in Paris incorrectly, stating he lived on the rue Saint-Victor: Vollard, Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 22. Although Zola did live there up until February 1861, by the time of Cézanne’s arrival, he had moved into a dilapidated hôtel on the rue Soufflot: Thomson, ‘Tableau chronologique,’ op. cit., p. 256. More recently, Isabelle Cahn has stated Cézanne moved first into a room at ‘39, rue d’Enfer’, an address that no longer exists, but might refer to the impasse Saint-Dominique d’Enfer, now the impasse Royer-Collard, which would indeed have been even closer to Zola’s room in the rue Soufflot than the rue des Feuillantines (rue d’Enfer might however, although perhaps less likely, refer to the passage d’Enfer, near the Cimetière du Montparnasse): Cahn, ‘Chronology,’ op. cit., p. 531. Cahn also cites a cadastral survey that, at the time of Cézanne’s arrival in Paris, records the address she cites (39, rue d’Enfer) as housing several artists’ studios, but that Cézanne’s name was not among those listed: loc. cit. In any case, during Cézanne’s second stay in Paris, he did stay for a period on the impasse Saint-Dominique d’Enfer: Cézanne, letter to Coste and Villevieille, 5 January 1863, op. cit., p. 103.
about returning to Aix." Indeed, Cézanne's only surviving letter from that first visit to Paris, written to Joseph Huot, reflected exactly this negativity:

I don't want to make a eulogy from these few lines, but nevertheless, I must admit, my heart is not very cheerful. I nibble away at my little existence, left and right [...] I eat what 15 sous a meal will allow; it is not a lot; what do you expect? Anyway, I'm not starving.

Complaining of a continued boredom he had hoped would be left behind him in Aix, he then gave his first impressions of Paris in the guarded and affected form of sarcastic world-weariness.

I've seen, it's naïve to say, the Louvre and the Luxembourg and Versailles. You know, the tartines these marvellous monuments contain, it's all stunning, startling, overwhelming. Don't think I'm becoming a Parisian.

More positively, however, Cézanne also wrote of visiting the biennial Salon where, he asserted, the best paintings were to be found, "because there all tastes, all genres, come together and collide." By way of illustration, he offered up his own versified evocation of this imagic cacophony.

I saw Yvon's sparkling battle;

11 ['À] peine arrivé ici, il parlait de retourner à Aix': Zola, letter to Baille, 10 June 1861, op. cit., p. 294.
12 "Je ne voudrais pas faire de l'éloge durant ces quelques lignes, mais pourtant, faut l'avouer, je n'ai pas le cœur très gai. Je boulotte de droite et de gauche ma petite existence; Suisse m'occupé de six heures du matin jusqu'à onze. Je mange à l'avant à 15 sous par repas; ce n'est pas gros; que veux-tu? Je ne meurs pas de faim, cependant": Paul Cézanne, letter to Joseph Huot, 4 June 1861, reprinted in Maurice Rainbault, 'Une lettre de Cézanne à Joseph Huot,' Provincia: Bulletin trimestriel de la Société de Statistique, d'Histoire et d'Archéologie de Marseilles et de Provence, vol. 17 (1937), p. 4, cited in Ely, 'Cézanne, l'Ecole de dessin et le Musée d'Aix,' op cit., p. 156.
13 "Je croyais en quittant Aix laisser loin derrière moi l'ennui qui poursuit. Je n'ai fait que changer de place et l'ennui m'a suivi. J'ai laissé mes parents, mes amis, quelques-unes de mes habitudes, mais voilà tout [...] J'ai vu, c'est natt à dire, le Louvre et Luxembourg et Versailles. Tu le sais, les tartines que renferment ces admirable monuments, c'est épatant, esbrouffant, renversant. Ne crois pas que je devienne parisien..." (emphasis Cézanne's): Cézanne, letter to Huot, 4 June 1861, op. cit., p. 156.
14 'Je crois que c'est là ce qu'il y a vraiment de mieux parce que là tous les goûts, tous les genres s'y rencontrent et s'y heurte': Cézanne, letter to Huot, 4 June 1861, op. cit., p. 156.
Pils, whose chic pencil traces the memory
Of an moving scene in his tableau,
And portraits of those who drag our leashes:
Grand, small, average, short, beautiful, or of kinds far worse.
Here there's a stream; there, the burning sun,
Phoebus rising, the sinking moon;
Scintillating daylight, a deep dusk,
The Russia clime or the African sky;
Here, the stupefied face of brutal Turk,
There, in contrast, a childish smile:
On cushions of purple a pretty girl
Displaying the splendour and freshness of her breast.
Fresh little cupids flit in space;
A coquette looks at the reflection of her pretty face in a mirror
Gerome alongside Hamon, Glaize with Cabanel,
Muler [sic], Courbet, Gudin, all vying for the honour
Of victory...

15 J'ai vu d'Yvon la bataille éclatante; / Pils dont le chic crayon d'une scène émouvante
Trace le souvenir dans son tableau vivant, / Et les portraits de ceux qui nous mènent en laisse;
/ Grands, petits, moyens, courts, beaux ou de pire espèce / Ici c'est un russeau; là, le soleil brûlant, / Le lever de Phôbus, le coucher de la lune; / Un jour étincelant, une profonde brume, / Le climat de Russie ou le ciel africain; / Ici, d'un Turc brutal la figure abrutie, / Là, par contre, je vois un sourire enfantin: / Sur des coussins de pourpre une fille jolie / Et de ses seins l'éclat et la fraîcheur. / De frais petits amours voltigent dans l'espace; / Coquette au frais minois se mire dans la glace, / Gerome avec Hamon, Glaize avec Cabanel, / Muller, Courbet, Gubin, se disputent l'honneur / De la Victoire...; / Paul Cézanne, untitled poem in a letter to Joseph Huot, 4 June 1861, op. cit., p. 157. Only the paintings mentioned in the first two lines of the poem seem definitively identifiable; Adolphe Yvon's La Bataille de Solferino, 24 juin 1859, the massive painting commissioned by the state and acting as backdrop to the Salon's award ceremony, and Isidore-Alexandre-Augustin Pils' Bataille de l'Alma (20 septembre 1854), which received the highest medal of honour at that ceremony; Janson (ed.), Catalogues of the Paris Salon: 1673 to 1881, op. cit., vol. 42 [1861], pp. 308, 383-384; Adolphe Tabarant, La Vie artistique au temps de Baudelaire, Paris: Mercure de France, 1963, p. 285; Henri Loyrette, 'History painting,' in Tinterow and Loyrette, Origins of Impressionism, op. cit., p. 33. The line 'Ici, d'un Turc brutal la figure abrutie' might refer to Jaroslav Čermák's Razzia de bachibouzoucks dans un village chrétien de l'Herzégovine (Turquie) [sic] (1861) (fig. 6B.16), a painting mentioned below in chapter six in regard to its possible connection with Cézanne's [R 121] L'Enlèvement (1867) (fig. 6B.9); on this, see section 6B. Of the painters mentioned in the final three lines, Jean-Leon Gerôme exhibited the six paintings Phrynie devant le tribunal, Socrate vient chercher Alcibade chez Aspasie, 'Deux augures n'ont jamais pu se regarder sans rire', rembrandt faisant mordre une planche à l'eau-forte, Hache-paille égyptien, and Portrait de Rachel; Jean Louis Hamon exhibited the five paintings Vierges de Lesbos, Tuelle, La volière, L'escamoteur—quart d'heure de Rabelais, and La sueur aînée; 'Glaize' would seem to refer to either Auguste-Barthélemy Glaize, who exhibited the three paintings La pourvoyeuse misère, Autour de la gamelle, and Un trou de meulière à la Ferté-sous-Jouarre, or his son Pierre-Paul-Léon Glaize, who exhibited the two paintings Samson pris par les Philistins and La Nymphe et le faune; Alexandre Cabanel exhibited the six paintings.
Cézanne’s earliest and most comprehensive surviving written account of the art of his own time comes down to us as deliberately rhymed verses, repeating, thereby, certain of the poetic and imagic gestures included in the letters discussed in chapter two. As with many of those earlier efforts, Cézanne also included an enframing text coyly and self-deprecatingly undermining the possible seriousness of the poem they bracketed, introducing them thus: ‘I could give you here some beautiful descriptions and put you to sleep. Be grateful to me for what I spare you.’ After the verses, he then concluded, as a parenthetic aside after the final ellipse:

(Here, I’ve run out of rhymes, so it’s just as well I fall silent because it would be presumptive of me to attempt to impart to you any idea, even the slightest, of the chic of this exhibition).

Aside from the ironic distancing such paralipsis might entail and precisely as Cézanne’s ‘I’ve run out of rhymes’ seems to make clear, the gleaning of evidence regarding Cézanne’s opinion of the artworks mentioned in his poem, and by extension, of contemporary art in general, would seem compromised by exactly the constraints of rhyme and metre argued above as contaminating attempts to interpret his earlier poems. Any such content might also be obfuscated, again as with those earlier efforts, by the ambivalence the sign of possible parody brings to bear. That is, in describing works of art poetically, Cézanne’s poem might parody the performance of

Marie-Madeleine, Nymphe enlevée par un faune, Poète florentin, Portrait de S. Exc. le Ministre de l’agriculture, du commerce et des travaux publics, Portrait de Mme. W. R..., and Portrait de M. M. P...; ‘Muler’ would seem to refer to Charles-Louis Müller, who exhibited the three paintings Madame Mère, Leda, and Portrait de M. F. H...; Gustave Courbet exhibited the five paintings Le ruisseau de printemps (combat de serfs), Le cerf à l’eau (chasse à courre), Le piquet, Le renard dans la neige, and La roche Oragon, vallon de Mezières (Doubs); and Théodore Gudin exhibited the five paintings Arrivée de la reine d’Angleterre à Cherbourg, La flotte française se rendant à Cherbourg à Brest, Vue de la plage de Scheveningen, Gros temps sur la côte d’Angleterre, and Disperison de l’Armada espagnole par une tempête, dans la mer du Nord; Janson (ed.), Catalogues of the Paris Salon. 1673 to 1881, op. cit., vol. 42 [1861], op. cit., pp. 61, 87, 150, 157, 167, 172, 281. On Cabanel’s submission Nymphe enlevée par un faune (1860) (fig. 6B.15), see section 6B.

16 ‘Je pourrais te faire ici de belles descriptions et t’endormir. Sache-moi gré de ce que je t’en fais grâce’: Cézanne, letter to Huot, 4 June 1861, op. cit., p. 156.

17 ‘Ici je suis à bout de rimes, aussi bien ferai-je de me taire car l’entreprise serait téméraire à moi de vouloir te donner l’idée, même la plus mince, du chic de cette exposition’: ibid., p. 157.

18 See chapter two.
that describing, a satirical gesture similar in spirit to that suggested above as possibly enacted in his poetical lauding of certain of his posted images. In which case, the poem might mock as much the mode by which it described paintings as the paintings which it so described.

Nevertheless, and despite precisely these caveats, Cézanne's poem and letter, as one of the few surviving documents of his first trip to Paris, must inevitably function as integral component of any account of Cézanne's activities during this formative year. This evidence can and has, however, provoked seemingly antithetical conclusions to be drawn regarding Cézanne's attitude to the poem's content, particularly the works of art it mentions. An exemplary illustration is offered, thereby, not only of the ambivalent nature of the evidence itself, but also exactly the interpretive gestures enabled by, and indeed dependent upon, what the possible presence of parody, and thereby satire, inevitably presents.

Hence, without such a possibility presumed, interpretations tend to treat Cézanne's poem and letter as transparently conveying a positive regard for the works they list, a catalogue of affective impressions that, although structured by the conventions of

---

19 On other poetic recreations of the Salon experience, see for instance the three poems by Emmanuel des Essarts describing specific paintings by Gerôme, Curzon, and Hamon exhibited at the 1859 Salon and published in an *L'Artiste* edition of that year: Emmanuel des Essarts, 'Poésies: Trois tableaux du Salon,' *L'Artiste*, nouv. ser., t. 7, livr. 7 (12 June 1859), pp. 109-110. See also Henri Vermot's two-and-a-half page effort that swings from sardonic derision to florid and laudatory praise of the paintings exhibited at the 1844 Salon and published in a *L'Artiste* issue of that year, of which the following extract bears some similarity to Cézanne's, albeit more abbreviated, attempt: 'Diaz de l'Orient nous trahit les fées. / Et jamais les splendeurs de ces fables chères / Qu'à nos âges si bien convait monsieur Galland, / N'ont brillé d'un éclat plus fin ni plus charmant. / Si j'avais, à Corot, la plume aimable et douce / Du pastoral Gessner, je dirais, sur la mousses, / Cette brune indolente aux yeux pleins de dangeurs, / Qui semble écouter battre et soupirer son cœur. / Elle est là, mi-couchée, en sa muce irreestre, / De la senteur des bois embaumant sa paresse, / Tandis qu'un peu plus loin, sous les arbres touffus, / Une autrue sur la luth chante un hymne à Venus. / Je sens, à contempler ce verdoyant bouquet, / Le parfum des gazons, la fraîcheur de l'ombre, / Et je sorge à ces temps où, par les prés d'Endor, / J'allais avec l'amour cueillir des bouquet d'or! / Meyer sur l'Océan, dans la trombe et l'orage, / Salt, en pilote habile, éviter un naufrage. / Adrien Guignet, Bard, Pérignon, Champmartin, / Glaze, Thullier, Coulon, Wattier, Vital, Jardin, / Chacaton!...': Henri Vermot, 'Le Salon,' *L'Artiste*, ser. 3, t.5, 14è livr. (7 April 1844), pp. 217-219. That Cézanne executed a drawing ([Ch 518] *Study of a Woman Bather Drying Herself* (1879-1882)) on the verso of a print published in an *L’Artiste* edition of 1845 indicates that, at least in later life, he had access to *L'Artiste* back-issues from the 1840s: Chappuis, *The Drawings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 154; Ballas, 'Paul Cézanne et la revue *L'Artiste* ', op. cit., pp. 223-224, 229 n. 11. On Cézanne's copying from *L'Artiste*, see: above, chapter one n. 81.
poetry, was congruent with what Cézanne at the time admired. More recently, however, and in line with what seems to be an increasing desire to read Cézanne’s early art not only as strategic but also, through mechanisms of satire, self-consciously so, exactly the opposite interpretation is extracted. Nina Maria Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, for instance, reads the poem as an extension of author’s presumed contempt for the content it describes; when coupled with the comments quoted above and preceding it in Cézanne’s letter, the poem, is deemed a deliberate attack on institutionally prized art en masse.

Leaving aside for a moment the inclusion of Meissonier’s name amongst those artists Cézanne is presumed here to have ‘poked fun at’, an issue discussed below, Athanassoglou-Kallmyer’s ability to derive an inverse interpretation compared with those preceding hers, might well be explained, or at least illustrated, by considering her understanding of Cézanne’s deployment of the word ‘chic’, used once in his poem in regard to Pils’s Bataille de l’Alma (20 septembre 1854), and again, following the poem, in the concluding parenthetical aside, to describe the Salon in general. For, in suggesting the word was quoted from Baudelaire, Athanassoglou-Kallmyer characterizes its use by Cézanne strictly in terms of the polemical aims provoking that

[H]e dismissed the pictures in the Louvre, the Luxembourg, and Versailles as tartines (daubs) [...] [H]e poked fun at the popular Salon masters of the day, Yvon, Pils, Gérôme, Cabanel, Meissonier, and even Courbet, whom he saw as, by then, catering to the establishment.

20 For instance; ‘Despite his admiration for the masters of official art, in spite of his walks, his frequent visits to the Louvre [...] the boredom which “pursued” Cézanne increased and he was becoming disgusted with Paris’: Rewald, Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 24; ‘Quite possibly [Cézanne] [...] admired the technical abilities of the academic painters he mentions: Yvon, Pils, Muller, Gubin, Meissonier, Doré’: Ratcliffe, Cézanne’s Working Methods, op. cit., p. 66; Gaétan Picon and J. L. Logan note in an un-cited assertion presumably based on Cézanne’s poem, that Cézanne appreciated Gérôme and Cabanal in his early years: Gaétan Picon and J. L. Logan, ‘Zola’s painters,’ Yale French Studies, no. 42 (1969), p. 127; Jack Lindsay remarks that Cézanne’s letter to Huot is invaluable for its showing ‘how unclear his ideas still were and how he accepted academic values’: Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., p. 78.

21 Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, ‘An artistic and political manifesto for Cézanne,’ op. cit., p. 79.

22 Loc. cit.

author's own satirical use of the term. "[Cézanne was] dismissing them [the popular Salon masters] as superficial, phoney, and chic, the disparaging Baudelairean word." 24

At the time of Cézanne's writing, chic was not yet an altogether common word, and, seemingly, likewise not yet detached completely from its origins in the argot of the artist's atelier, where it referred to the facile knack for depicting well without a model. 25 Hence, in reviews of precisely the Salon Cézanne's poem described, both Hector de Callias and Albert de la Fizelière, for instance, found it necessary to provide their readers with explanatory remarks concerning the word's meaning in the prefatory sections of their reviews. 26 Why both reviewers sought to do this lay in its encapsulation of certain features deemed by them symptomatic of a crisis in French painting. In turn, this extended, through such characterization, observations made fifteen years earlier by Baudelaire in the 'Du chic et du poncif' chapter of his pivotal Salon de 1846. 27 In that work, Baudelaire, with an affected and ironic reluctance,

---

24 Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, 'An artistic and political manifesto for Cézanne,' op. cit., p. 486; Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., p. 79.
25 The word does not appear in Bescherelle's Dictionnaire national of 1856, but does appear in the Nouveau dictionnaire universel of 1865, where it was described as '[D]'atelier de peinture. Ce mot, passé de l'argot du rapin dans le langage vulgaire, est presque indéfinissable, comme la plupart des expressions bâtarde qui empruntent leur signification à leur pittoresque. Il indique une certaine adresse, une habileté spontanée à reproduire la nature dans ce qu'elle a de plus accusé et de plus mouvementé. On l'a d'abord appliqué spécialement à l'art, puis à toute espèce de chose bien réussie': Maurice La Châtre, Nouveau dictionnaire universel, two volumes, Paris: Docks de la librairie, 1865, t. 1, p. 917 (s.v. chic).
26 Hector A. Callias, 'Salon de 1861: La lettre A,' L'Artiste, nouv. ser., t. 11, livr. 10 (15 May 1861), pp. 218–219; "À côté de la peinture de chevalet, un genre secondaire, il est vrai, mais plein de charmes et accessible à tous, le paysage, s'est élevé au point d'atteindre parfois à la perfection relative. Il a fait renaître le goût d'une âme judicieuse de la nature, source de toute vérité et de toute poésie, et il en est arrivé à rendre désormais impossible le triomphe, naguère encore si facile, de cette plate désastreuse de l'art qu'on appelle le chic en argot d'atelier" (emphasis of the Fizelière's): Albert de la Fizelière, "Coup d'œil sur le Salon," L'Artiste, nouv. ser., t. 11, livr. 11 (1 June 1861), p. 251. Indeed, Callias even recounted a shaggy dog story purporting the word's origin to be in the name of a certain German art student called Schick, whose laziness and skilful hand combined to create pictures that, although pleasing to the eye, lacked the underlying truthful cohesion presumed to be the result of meticulous preparatory studies taken from nature; when other artists saw his work, they would pronounce, with a certain knowing wryness: 'That's Schick!'; Callias, 'Salon de 1861: La lettre A,' op. cit., pp. 218–219. Callias' explanation seems to predate, but be linked to, later suggestions that the etymology of the word derived from the German 'Schick', for 'aptitude, façon, tournure'; Émile Littré, Dictionnaire de la langue française [...], four volumes, Paris: Hachette, 1873–1874, t. 1, p. 600 (s.v. chic).
declared 'chic' to denote a mode of artistic depiction that, by virtue of its facile
dependency on techniques learnt by rote, was, for Romantics such as him, redundantly
barren and formulaic. In annexing and inverting a laudatory and semi-technical term
of the artist's workshop, Baudelaire was thereby simultaneously satirizing the
bourgeois parroting of artistic terms when admiring affects of painting deemed by him
as merely trifling. The co-opted term combined thereby, for him and those
following his usage, a Romantic abhorrence to the inauthentic with an elitist bohemian
disdain for the perceived too often easily slaked tastes of the merchant classes, the
antithesis of art that should, he would have argued, necessarily be anti-academic, and,
perhaps, even anti-social. In short, it was, in a sense, although likewise referring to
modern contemporaneity, the unpreferred opposite of 'strange'.

In terms of Cézanne's own use of the word 'chic' in his poem and letter to Huot, two
senses are thereby possible: the more straightforward ascription of admirable technical
proficiency assumed by interpreters before Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, a meaning,
indeed, apparently identical with Zola's use of the word in his letter of the previous
year praising the paintings he'd seen in a café in Vitry; or, conversely, the derisory
and seemingly far more sophisticated implications a citing of Baudelaire might seem

28 'Chic, a strange frightful word of modern fabrication, whose spelling I don't even know, but
which I am forced to use, because it is consecrated by artists to express a modern monstrosity,
means: the absence of model and of nature. Chic is the misuse of memory; or rather, chic is a
memory of the hand rather than a memory of the mind. [...] The chic may be compared to the
work of those masters of penmanship [...] who are able to trace boldly, with their eyes closed,
in the form of a signature, the head of Christ or an emperor's hat': ibid., p. 163. See also:
Richard Webb, 'Terminology in the Salon reviews of Charles Pierre Baudelaire,' Journal

29 Michele Hannoosh, Baudelaire and Caricature: From the Comic to an Art of Modernity,
University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992, pp. 97, 99, 153. See also
Baudelaire's use of the word poncif (in its simplest sense 'pompous') in the same article
devoted to chic: Baudelaire, 'Du chic et du poncif,' op. cit., pp. 163, 165; Hannoosh, Baudelaire
and Caricature, op. cit., pp. 233-235. Baudelaire's conception, treatment, and opinion of the
bourgeoisie and its role in artistic discourse and/or marketplace is vexed and often overlain
with irony: Michael Fried, 'Painting memories: On the containment of the past in Baudelaire

Baudelaire's demands for the rejection of the facility underpinning his use of the word chic
was, in inextricable ways related to his, and other contemporary critics such as Théophile
Thoré's, persistent call for, in addition to the depiction of contemporary motifs, a return to
painterly originality in opposition to an over-reliance on the antique conventionalities of
academic painting: Albert Boime, The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth
Century, London: Phaidon, 1971, pp. 179-181, 219 n. 64; Chu, French Realism and the Dutch
to convey.\footnote{The Zola quote ("[M]ais un chic, un coup de pinceau si sûr, une entente si parfaite de l'effet à distance, que je demeurai ébahis") is from: Zola, letter to Cézanne, 13 June 1860, op. cit., p. 175. Note also Maurice Denis' comments, while not necessarily quoting Cézanne and indeed in the entirely different context of a discussion of Cézanne's opinion of Ingres, describing the painter thus: '[Cézanne] preferred, one cannot doubt, the chic drawing of the Bolognese to the conciseness of Ingres': Maurice Denis, 'Cézanne-II', translated by Roger E. Fry, Burlington Magazine, vol. 16, no. 83 (February 1910), p. 276.} In the latter case, not only is a presumption thereby formed that Cézanne, upon arriving in Paris in 1861, already had a critical awareness congruent with the stance he undoubtedly later adopted as a jury-shocking avant-gardiste, but also, this presumption seems dependent upon, and indeed figured explicitly in terms of, the perceived presence of satirical parody. In pretending to use a word in a positive sense, Cézanne is seen to be satirizing the tastes that positivity typified.

Whether or not Cézanne was even aware of Baudelaire’s artistic criticism, there does seem some sort of resonance between Baudelaire's modus operandi, exemplified in part by precisely his ironic appropriation and inversion of the fashionable term ‘chic’, and the apparently sardonic inclusion of certain other words in Cézanne’s letter.\footnote{As noted above, although Cézanne later in life certainly developed a deep and long-lasting admiration for Baudelaire’s poetry, as well as, possibly, some of his theories on art, the point at which this admiration might first have arisen, is difficult to determine. On Cézanne’s admiration for Baudelaire’s poetry, see: above. In regards to the resonances between Cézanne’s theories of art and Baudelaire’s, albeit articulated only in terms of various comments made by him in the last few years of his life and confined mostly to the ‘L’Œuvre et la vie d’Éugène Delacroix’ chapter of Baudelaire’s L’Art romantique, see: Ratcliffe, Cézanne’s Working Methods, op. cit., pp. 364–372; Richard Shiff, ‘Seeing Cézanne,’ Critical Inquiry, vol. 4, no. 4 (summer 1978), p. 790.} Hence, when discussing his impressions of visiting the Louvre, the Luxembourg, and Versailles, Cézanne gave italicized emphasis to the kinds of words that might be overheard when standing about in precisely these places; ‘[y]ou know, the tartines these marvellous monuments contain, it’s all stunning, startling, overwhelming.’\footnote{Tu le sais, les tartines que renferment ces admirable monuments, c’est épatant, esbrouffant, renversant [...]’ (emphasis Cézanne’s): Cézanne, letter to Huot, 4 June 1861, op. cit., p. 156.} There might be a sense, then, that Cézanne was mimicking, and perhaps thereby satirizing, as much the reception of art within the capital as the artworks so received. The possible presence of this intent signalled by italics seems thereby to evoke the same kinds of doubled presentation noted in regard to Cézanne’s earlier letters, where the perceived presence of irony might challenge presumptions of a conflation of author and character implied as author.\footnote{An example of precisely such possible complexity is Cézanne’s description of Pils’ painting thus: ‘Pils dont le chic crayon d’une scène émouvante / Trace le souvenir dans son tableau}
conveying his own naïve wonderment in the face of the eclectic and ostentatious bravado on show at the Salon, as self-deprecatingly parodying it; as much enacting the socio-literary context within and by which artistic discourse was articulated in Paris, as sardonically mimicking it. In fact, he might have been doing all, his poem and bracketing comments a kind of tartine on tartines, as it were. Content, here evidence regarding Cézanne’s attitude to contemporary art at the time of his first arrival in Paris, might not thereby be one preconceived by its author, but, rather, a result of his ‘poetic’ response wryly repeating literary form as a form of expression, a gesture simultaneously interposing at all times a kind of ironic distance peculiarly persistent throughout and across Cézanne’s early written oeuvre.

Aside from the pedantry this point regarding the difficulty of determining exactly what Cézanne might have been parodying and, therefore, what he might or might not have been satirising in his poem, interpreting its intent purely in terms of a posture presumed deliberately oppositional to the academic and/or popular seems, however, problematic. For, following the poem and in the cooler medium of prose, not only is Dore’s Salon submission, presumably Dante et Virgile dans le 9e cercle de l’enfer, described as ‘astounding’, but also Meissonier’s contributions, five in all, are declared ‘magnificent’.35 However, and as evidenced by the easy inclusion of Meissonier "vivant [Pils, whose chic pencil traces the memory / Of an moving scene in his tableau]".

Cézanne, untitled poem in a letter to Huot, 4 June 1861, op. cit., p. 157. For, although assiduously tailoring many of his depicted themes to Second Empire propagandist aims, Pils was, in terms of technique and despite his academic training, assiduously a realist, basing most of his works in numerous preparatory sketches taken carefully from life and which betray a relish for their recording of veristic detail; in short, Pils employed a decidedly un-chic approach. However, in the case of his battle of Alma painting submitted to the 1861 Salon, Pils’s ill health had prevented him from travelling to the Crimea to execute preparatory sketches, forcing him to rely, it seems, not on his own studies or memory, but instead, on interviews with participants and, perhaps, photographs and/or etchings published, for instance in publications such as the Illustrated London News. Whether or not Cézanne was aware of any of these facts or Baudelaire’s characterisation of chic as an ‘abuse of memory’, that he might explicitly articulate his ascription of chic to Pils’s painting precisely in terms of memory is, nevertheless, interesting. On Pils and the sources for the above comments on his painting methods, see: Gabriel P. Welsberg and Petra ten-Doesschate Chu, The Realist Tradition: French Painting and Drawing 1830–1900, exhibition catalogue (Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland, 12 November 1980–18 January 1981; Brooklyn Museum, New York, 7 March–10 May 1981; St Louis Art Museum, St Louis, 23 July–20 September 1981; Kelvingrove Art Gallery and Museum, Glasgow, 5 November 1981–4 January 1982), Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland, 1980, pp. 108–113, 134–135, 137–140, 305; Gabriel P. Weisberg, 'Early realist drawings of Isidore Pils,' Master Drawings, vol. 28, no. 2 (winter 1990), pp. 387–408. 35 "Il y a aussi de magnifiques Meissonier [...] G. Doré a au Salon un tableau mirobolant": Cézanne, letter to Huot, 4 June 1861, op. cit., p. 157. The full title of the Doré painting mentioned by Cézanne was Dante et Virgile dans le neuvième cercle des enfers, visitant les...
among the list of Salon masters Nina Athanassoglou-Kallmyer is cited above as describing Cézanne as having ‘poked fun at’ in his poem, there seems a certain resistance to the idea that Cézanne could have held regard for such populist painters, despite this apparently unequivocal praise.

Meissonier, in particular, was exactly the kind of artist any card-carrying progressive should deride. He was one of the most financially successful painters of the period and produced a ready supply of small historicizing panels perfectly-suited to an art market increasingly dominated by collectors seeking portable and thematically unchallenging paintings. He had exhibited successfully in almost even Salon from 1834 onwards and garnered numerous medals along the way, receiving, particularly during the early 1850s, considerably praise from the critics. He would even, in the very year Cézanne first saw his panels at the 1861 Salon, be elected to the Académie, an acceptance that was, however, granted only grudgingly, Meissonier’s work not entirely representative of the values in painting that institute might be seen as conventionally upholding.

traitres condamnés au supplice de la glace, y rencontrent le comte Ugolin et l’archevêque Ruggieri ([1861]), o/c (315 x 450), Musée de Brou, Bourg-en-Bresse: Janson (ed.), Catalogues of the Paris Salon: 1673 to 1881, op. cit., vol. 42 (1861) p. 111. Doré also exhibited Un vallon des Vosges—effet de matin and drawings illustrating three other episodes from Dante’s Inferno; loc. cit. Meissonier’s five canvases included three genre scenes and two portraits: Un maréchal ferrant, Un peintre, Un musicien, Portrait de M. Louis Fouil, Portrait de Mme. H. T.: ibid., p. 263. Un peintre is usually presumed to be the painting now known as Amateurs de peinture (1860) (o/p (35.5 x 28.5), Musée d’Orsay, Paris): Constance Cain Hungerford, Ernest Meissonier: Master in His Genre, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, p. 226. Although listed in the catalogue, Meissonier’s painting S. M. l’Empereur à Solferino was not shown: loc. cit.


For, despite aspirations to history painting, Meissonier's reputation was based almost entirely upon his genre scenes and his abilities as a miniaturist. Moreover, he had a limited academic background and much of his technique, based as it was in the pastiching of seventeenth-century Dutch and Flemish genre painters, was, as already noted, self-taught and derived mostly from his early work as in book illustration. Re-invoking the crude comparison made above in chapter one, albeit only in passing, between Cézanne's early drawn efforts and Meissonier's œuvre in general, and if Athanassoglou-Kallmyer's characterisation of Cézanne's poem and letter to Huot as polemic diatribe against all Salon art is resisted, an appreciation for just such an artist might not, thereby, be so surprising.

As unsurprising might also be Cézanne's lauding of Doré, the only other painter singled out for definitive praise in his letter, the 'astounding' remark cited above and presumed in reference to his Dante et Virgile dans le 9e cercle de l'enfer. Doré's grande machine not only attracted considerable positive critical attention at the 1861 Salon, but also dealt with exactly the same subject matter presumed to have underlain Cézanne's 'La Mort règne en ces lieux' (fig. 2.3), discussed in chapter two. Like Meissonier, Doré was primarily self-taught and even more grounded in the graphic arts, his reputation due mostly to his efforts in illustration, the exhibition of his monumentally-scaled Dante et Virgile dans le 9e cercle de l'enfer at the Salon part promoting the publication in that year of what was to become one of the artist's most enduring artistic legacies, his self-funded and lavishly illustrated edition of Dante's

39 A useful list of Salon reviews of the 1840s and 1850s emphasising appreciation of Meissonier's precisely in these terms, is provided in: Hungerford, 'Meissonier's Souvenir de guerre civile,' op. cit., p. 280 n. 11. For accounts of Meissonier's increased frustrations in the face of this characterization, as well as the broader issue of his aspiration to a more creditable 'academic' reputation, see, in particular: Hungerford, 'Meissonier's first military paintings: I,' op. cit., pp. 91–92; Constance Cain Hungerford, 'Meissonier's first military paintings: II: 1814, The Campaign of France,' Arts Magazine, vol. 54 (January 1980), pp. 102–107; Gotlieb, The Plight of Emulation, op. cit., passim.

40 G. Doré a au Salon un tableau mirobolant': Cézanne, letter to Huot, 4 June 1861, op. cit., p. 157.

41 'What a sense of reality! What a visionary and chimerical spirit! Being and non-being, the body and the spectre, day and night: [...] Doré can render everything. It is to him that we shall owe the first illustration of Dante, since Michelangelo's has been lost': Théophile Gautier, Abécédaire du Salon du 1861, Paris: Dentu, 1861, p. 133, cited and translated in Joanna Richardson, Gustave Doré: A Biography, London: Cassell, 1980, p. 57. For a slightly less glowing review of the painting, however, see: Hector Callias, 'Salon de 1861: V: Les letters B. C. D. E.,' L'Artiste, nouv. ser., t. 11, livr. 11 (1 June 1861), p. 248. On Cézanne's drawing, see section 2E.
Nevertheless he was, again like Meissonier, popular amongst the critics as well as the public, and, although not awarded a medal for his 1861 Salon submissions, did receive an honourable mention. 43

Indeed, whether satirical or not, Cézanne’s poem and letter parallel most contemporary reviews of the 1861 Salon in terms of the artists mentioned. Hence, for instance, Arsène Houssaye’s review included not only Doré and Meissonier in the first paragraph of his introductory article to the L’Artiste reviews of the 1861 Salon, in which he summarized that year’s highlights, but he also named, as in Cézanne’s poem, Cabanel, Pils, Hamon, Gérôme, and Courbet. 44 Hence, Cézanne’s taste here, if authentically expressed, would seem contiguous with the kinds of interests his various copies discussed last chapter might likewise give indication of: that is, a predilection both for genre-styled anecdotalism as well as antique-tinged romantic narratives writ large. It might also indicate that the young painter, not yet worn down by life in the city and/or unsullied by the disappointments of gaining entrance to the École des Beaux-Arts, stilled harbour reasonably conventional artistic aspirations.

The one possible note of dissonance in Cézanne’s list of painters concluding his Salon poem, and hence a possible echo of his comment preceding it, and quoted above, regarding the Salon’s clash of ‘all tastes, all genres’, might be the inclusion of Courbet’s name, synonymous as it was with anti-academic posturing. 45 Courbet’s example, in terms not only of his nose-thumbing swagger, but also of his painterly

45 ‘Je crois que c’est là ce qu’il y a vraiment de mieux parce que là tous les goûts, tous les genres s’y rencontrent et s’y heurtent’: Cézanne, letter to Huot, 4 June 1861, op. cit., p. 156.
approach, and, in particular, his signature use of the paint-knife, has also often been cited as a defining influence on the evolution of Cézanne’s avant-gardism during the 1860s. However, and as perhaps indicated by Houssaye’s positive mention of Courbet cited above, Courbet’s submissions to the 1861 Salon, as landscapes or hunting scenes, were far less controversial than his submissions during the 1850s.

Hence, in line with this, as well as her characterization of Cézanne’s Salon poem as not only satirical dismissal of the artists it mentions, but also as evidence of Cézanne’s own posture of institutional resistance, Nina Athanassoglou-Kallmyer suggests the inclusion of Courbet’s name marked a decline in Cézanne’s estimation of him. Hence, according to her, Courbet was, in Cézanne’s eyes, ‘by then, catering to the establishment, an opinion shared by Zola. The ascription to Cézanne of an opinion regarding Courbet’s perceived decline into mediocrity, in particular in terms of it being shared by Zola, seems, however both preemptive and overly-reductive, if not circular. As Athanassoglou-Kallmyer herself notes, Zola’s earliest published expression of such a view came only in 1866, after he had discovered and begun championing the comparatively younger and perhaps more

---

46 In terms of Courbet’s example as a personality, see, for instance: Theodore Reff, ‘Pissarro’s portrait of Cézanne,’ Burlington Magazine, vol. 109, no. 776 (November 1967), pp. 629–631. Reff’s observations arise through an analysis of Pissarro’s Portrait of Paul Cézanne (1874) (o/c (73 x 59.7), National Gallery, London), in which a caricature of Courbet is depicted behind Cézanne and apparently toasting him with a glass of beer. In regards to Courbet’s facture and general painterly approach, nine of Cézanne’s landscapes on canvas—including the Jas de Bouffan murals discussed below—presumed by John Rewald to have been executed by Cézanne in the years 1862–1864, three ([R 43] Paysage (1862–1864) (o/c (23 x 30), PC), [R 44] La Voûte (1862–1864), and [R 45] Sous-bois (1862–1864)) are suggested by him as showing Courbet’s influence: Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 76. The painting of Cézanne’s most often related to Courbet is the mural inclusion [R 29] Le Baigneur au rocher (1867–1869 or earlier) (fig. 6B.3); on this, see section 6B. Also note the presence in Cézanne’s portemonnaie, discovered in his grand-son Jean-Paul Ozanne’s ‘storage closets’ in 1963 by Wayne Andersen, of postcard reproduction of Courbet’s Femme au perroquet (1866), shown at precisely the Salon provoking Zola’s criticism cited above, and which Andersen cites as evidence of ‘Cézanne’s lifelong interest in Courbet’s art’: Wayne Andersen, ‘Cézanne’s Carnet violet-moiré,’ Burlington Magazine, vol. 107, no. 747 (June 1965), p. 313; Andersen, Cézanne and the Eternal Feminine, op. cit., pp. 133, 135 fig. 80.

47 As noted above, the catalogue of the 1861 Salon records Courbet as exhibiting Le ruisseau de printemps (combat de serfs), Le cerf à l’eau (chasse à courre), Le piquier, Le renard dans la neige, and La roche Oragnon, vallon de Mzères (Dourbs): Janson (ed.), Catalogues of the Paris Salon: 1673 to 1881, op. cit., vol. 42 [1861], op. cit. p. 87. On perceptions of Courbet’s changing status over the period 1851–1870, with a turning point perhaps exemplified his 1861 Salon submissions, see, for instance: Linda Nochlin, ‘The de-politicization of Gustave Courbet: Transformation and rehabilitation under the Third Republic,’ October, vol. 22 (autumn 19882), pp. 67–74.

48 Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., p. 79.
transgressive Edouard Manet. Further, in citing other manifestations of Cézanne’s possibly critical attitude toward Courbet apart from the asserted satirical intent of his Salon poem, recourse can only be made, again, to Zola, through the opinions expressed by Claude Lantier, Cézanne’s oft-presumed, although perhaps mistakenly-so, literary equivalent in Zola’s 1886 novel *L’Œuvre*. Moreover, albeit having to ignore the usual caveats regarding the untrustworthiness of that author’s reminiscences, it is interesting to note that Joachim Gasquet quotes Cézanne, in a discussion of the ‘revolution’ by which artists rediscovered nature, as including, as a pivotal moment, Courbet’s ‘forest floors’, exactly the kind of paintings exhibited by Courbet at the 1861 Salon.

As an extension to this latter point regarding the presence in Cézanne’s poem of the historiographically-resonant name Courbet, it might also pay to consider those artists exhibiting at the 1861 Salon not mentioned in Cézanne’s account, but whom might be expected to have been noticed by him, at least based on the trajectory of his artistic development during the early 1860s and, in particular, its possible stylistic affinities with exactly these artists. This visibility by absence, as it were, if Athanassoglou-Kallmyer’s characterisation of Cézanne’s 1861 Salon poem as oppositional polemic is resisted, might also thereby illume the degree to which Cézanne was—or, more particularly, was not—aware of the emergent, if eclectic, strands of progressive painting on display at the 1861 Salon. If nothing else, and perhaps more importantly, it is a consideration that might also, at the very least, provide an illustrative context for precisely the diversity of artistic practice Cézanne’s 1861 letter seems authentically to


51 Paul Cézanne, quoted in Joachim Gasquet, ‘What he told me [extract from “Cézanne, 1921”]’, in Doran (ed.), *Conversations with Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 117.
have gestured towards, without necessarily revealing a capability or desire on its
author’s behalf to structure that diversity in terms of critical frameworks.

Cézanne mentions, at least by name, neither Jean-Baptiste-Camille Corot nor Charles-
François Daubigny, landscapists whose canvases, although not strictly speaking
revolutionary, have often been cited not only as laying the groundwork for the rise of
Impressionism in the decades following, but also, as influencing Cézanne’s own early
landscape attempts in the years immediately following his visit to the 1861 Salon, *en
route* to his more emphatically idiosyncratic efforts of the mid- to late-1860s.52
Likewise, no reference by name or description seems made to any painter, other than
Courbet, then attached to the Realist circle, including, for instance, François Bonvin,
Théodule-Augustin Ribot, and Alphonse Legros.53 Nor did Cézanne mention any of

52 Corot exhibited six paintings, Daubigny five. There is a slim chance the lines from
Cézanne’s poem ‘Ici c’est un ruisseau; là, le soleil brûlant, / Le lever de Phèbus, le coucher de
la lune’, might have been referring to paintings such as Corot’s *Soleil levant* and/or Daubigny’s
*Lever de lune*: Janson (ed.), *Catalogues of the Paris Salon: 1673 to 1881*, op. cit., vol. 42
[1861], pp. 96, 85. However, there were many other such similarly titled works in the Salon.
On general comparisons between Cézanne’s 1860s landscapes and the work of Corot and
Daubigny, see, for instance: Rewald, *The Paintings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., pp. 72, 76, 78.
The paintings by Cézanne cited by Rewald in these comparisons are: [R 24] *La Tour de César*
(c.1862) (fig. 5 A.4), [R 42] *Paysage* (1862-1864) (oil (35 x 30), Wu), and [R 53] *Paysage*
(c.1865): loc. cit. Although Adrien Chappuis has noted a ‘curious similarity’ between a
drawing by Cézanne on a page from one of his early sketchbooks, [Ch 117 (a)] (detail) *River
Scene with a Bridge* (1864-1867), and Daubigny’s painting *The Ferry* (n.d.), the comparison,
however, seems visually tenuous: Chappuis, *The Drawings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 75.
Around the time Cézanne is presumed to have executed this latter drawing, Daubigny is said to
have defended Cézanne’s submission of [R 94] *Portrait d’Antony Valabrègue* (spring 1866) to
the 1866 Salon: Antony Valabrègue, letter to Fortuné Marion, 12 April 1866, cited and
translated in Rewald, *History of Impressionism*, op. cit., p. 139; Rewald, *Paul Cézanne: A
Biography*, op. cit., p. 49. In any case, despite whatever defence Daubigny might have
provided, Cézanne’s portrait of Valabrègue was rejected.

53 Francis Bonvin could perhaps be considered the elder statesmen of the realists; he exhibited
*Intérieur de cabaret* (1859): Janson (ed.), *Catalogues of the Paris Salon: 1673 to 1881*, op. cit.,
vol. 42 [1861], p. 43; Gabriel P. Weisberg, ‘François Bonvin and an interest in several painters
of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries,’ *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, vol. 76, no. 1223
(December 1970), pp. 361-362. Théodule-Augustin Ribot, who only began painting in his
mid-thirties in the late 1850s, exhibited five canvases at the 1861 Salon, a series of domestic
and kitchen scenes comprising *Basse-cour*, *Cuisinier comptable*, *Cuisiniers à l’heure de
dîner*, *Intérieur de cuisine*, *Le Joyeux cuisinier*, and *Oeuvres au repos*: Janson (ed.),
*Catalogues of the Paris Salon: 1673 to 1881*, op. cit., vol. 42 [1861], p. 324. Having been rejected from
the 1859 Salon, an occasion prompting his mentor, the above-mentioned Bonvin, to exhibit
him, along with other similarly-refused paintings by young painters including the below-
mentioned Alphonse Legros, Henri Fantin-Latour, and James McNeill Whistler,
independently in his studio, this was Ribot’s first, but by no means last appearance at the
Salon: Weisberg [?], ‘Biographies,’ op. cit., pp. 274, 309. On Ribot’s religious paintings and
Mary Tompkins Lewis’s suggestion of their relation to Cézanne’s own early religious imagery,
sec: above, section 3D. For his part, Alphonse Legros exhibited at the 1861 Salon *Ex-voto*
the other younger artists ostensibly within the extended reach of that circle but soon to forge a somewhat separate and more radicalised identity, a group of stylistically diverse painters perhaps unified only by their common dual, and perhaps until then incompatible, allegiance to the realism of Courbet and the romanticism of Delacroix.54

Of these, Cézanne’s most glaring omission would be Manet, whose *Spanish Singer* (1860), despite being awarded an honourable mention by the Jury, might be seen as marking its executor’s arrival as de facto leader of precisely this group.55 For, it was


Fried, ‘Manet in his generation,’ op. cit., pp. 22–24. Fried labels part of this group the ‘generation of 1863’, after the year corresponding to their ‘moment of maximum visibility’ at the Salon des Refusés: ibid., p. 22; Michael Fried, *Manet’s Modernism: Or, the Face of Painting in the 1860s,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996, pp. 7. It should perhaps be pointed out that many of these painters, such as the above-mentioned Legros and the below-mentioned Henri Fantin-Latour and Carolus-Duran, whilst exhibiting at the Salon des Refusés, simultaneously had paintings accepted by, and therefore on display at, the 1863 Salon: *Catalogue des ouvrages de peinture, sculpture, gravure, lithographie et architecture: Refusés par le Jury de 1863 et exposés, par décision de S. M. l’Empereur au salon annexe, palais des Champs-Élysées, le 15 mai 1863,* Paris: Les Beaux-Arts, 1863, pp. 16–17, 30; Janson (ed.), *Catalogues of the Paris Salon: 1673 to 1881,* op. cit., vol. 43 [1863], pp. 79, 84, 143. For the most thorough treatment on this ‘generation of 1863’ in terms of contemporary artistic contexts, see Michael Fried’s chapter with precisely this title in: Fried, *Manet’s Modernism,* op. cit., pp. 185–261.55
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their viewing of this painting at the 1861 Salon that legendarily impelled Henri Fantin-Latour, Carolus-Duran, and other young exhibitors at the 1861 Salon, including the above-mentioned Legros, to seek out and pay homage en masse to the previously unknown Manet. The subsequent meeting in his studio thereby initiated the genesis of what Fernand Desnoyers would later term, when writing of the artistic currents leading to the controversial Salon des Refusés of 1863, the "nouvelle école." 56

Returning, however, to Cézanne's day-to-day activities, and, specifically, the working regime he might have undertaken upon first arriving in Paris, he seems to have divided his time between mornings at the Académie Suisse, an école libre on the Île de la Cité,

56 'A la précédente Exposition [Salon de 1861] — des reçus, — un groupe de jeunes peintres cédé dessus désignés ['Legros, Fantin, Carolus Duran, Bracquemont, etc.'], s'arrêta coi devant un tableau, représentant Un joueur de guitare espagnol. Cette peinture, qui faisant s'ouvrir grands tans d'yeux et tant de bouches de peintres, était signée d'un nom nouveau, Manet. [...] Il fut décrété séance tenante, par ledit groupe de jeunes peintres, qu'on se porterait en masse chez M. Manet. Cette manifestation éclatante de la nouvelle école eut lieu': Fernand Desnoyers, Salon de Refusés: La Peinture en 1863, Paris: A. Dutil, 1863, pp. 40, 41; Michael Fried, 'Manet in his generation: The face of painting in the 1860s,' Critical Inquiry, vol. 19, no. 1 (autumn 1992), p. 22. For his part, Fantin-Latour exhibited three paintings at the 1861 Salon that, although all titled Étude d'après nature in the catalogue, were, according to the poet and Salon reviewer Valéry Vernier, actually portraits: Janson (ed.), Catalogues of the Paris Salon: 1673 to 1881, op. cit., vol. 42 [1861], p. 128; 'M. Fantin-Latour expose trois portraits qu'il appelle études d'après nature. Pourquoi pas portraits?': Valéry Vernier, 'A travers les portraits,' L'Artiste, nouv. ser., t. 11, livr. 10 (13 May 1861), p. 225. The paintings in question seem to have been Autoportrait assis, la palette à la main (1861) (o/c (81 x 65), Foundation E. G. Bührle, Zurich); Portrait du peintre anglais Ridley (1861) (o/c (72 x 60), WU); and Lisuse (1861) (o/c (100 x 83), Musée d'Orsay); Victoria Fantin-Latour, Catalogue de l'œuvre complet (1849–1904) de Fantin-Latour, Paris: Henri Floury, 1911, p. 24. Although Vernier was generally positive in his few brief comments on Fantin-Latour's paintings, he had harsher criticism for Charles Durant, exhibiting under his newly-changed name Carolus-Duran five paintings: 'Sa couleur voilée, modeste, est un peu triste si l'on veut, mais le peintre cherche l'harmonie et non l'éclat. Sa peinture est de bonne compagnie, ce qui ne l'empêche pas d'être vraie et saisissante avec des moyens on ne peut plus simples. Que M. Fantin regarde son talent en face, et qu'il lui demande un compte strict de tout ce qu'il peut lui donner. Son portrait par lui-même restera une des bonnes peinture de M. C. Duran d'être voilée, elle a plutôt une disposition à être cru et disparate': Vernier, 'A travers les portraits,' op. cit., p. 225. Carolus-Duran had been born Charles-Emile-Auguste Durant, but changed his name to the more exotic version by which he is now known in 1860: John House, 'Carolus-Duran,' Burlington Magazine, vol. 145, no. 1204 (July 2003), p. 536. According to the catalogue of the 1861 Salon, Carolus-Duran exhibited Après le jeu, L'Homme endormi, Portrait de M. le vicomte de C., Portrait de M. F. M., and Portrait de Mme. B...: Janson (ed.), Catalogues of the Paris Salon: 1673 to 1881, op. cit., vol. 42 [1861], p. 120. It is conceivable that Fantin-Latour et Odély, a painting discussed in relation to Cézanne's earliest surviving self-portrait [R 72] Portrait de Paul Cézanne (1862–1864) (fig. SC.1) might have exhibited under the title Portrait de M. F. M... On Cézanne's self-portrait, see section 5C.
mentioned in his letter to Huot cited above, and afternoons at the studio of his Aixois compatriot, and perhaps former teacher, Villevieille. In regards to the former of these institutions, the Académie Suisse, this was a legendarily liberal atelier with a reputation for attracting young Parisian painters of idiosyncratic, if not explicitly anti-academic, bent. At times this has been cited as reason for Cézanne’s registering there upon his arrival in Paris. However, his attendance might as much have been the result of financial and/or social expediency as any desire to associate with the more progressive elements of the Parisian art world. For, Zola had, in his hypothetical budgeting for Cézanne in his letter of the previous month, expressly mentioned the Académie Suisse, noting that it offered the twin benefits not only of being one of the cheaper ateliers in Paris, but also of being frequented by painters Cézanne already knew from Aix; for instance, the ubiquitous Chaillan, who probably passed this information onto Zola in the first place. Indeed, the Académie Suisse might have been the only école libre Cézanne was even aware of.

57. Suisse m’occupé de six heures du matin jusqu’à onze’: Cézanne, letter to Huot, 4 June 1861, op. cit., p. 156; ‘Le matin Paul va chez Suisse, moi je reste à écrire dans ma chambre. A onze heures nous déjeunons, chacun de notre côté. Parfois à midi, je vais chez lui, et alors il travaille à mon portrait. Puis il va dessiner le reste du jour chez Villevieille’: Zola, letter to Baille, 10 June 1861, op. cit., p. 293.


59. Nina Athanassoglou-Kallmyer describes Cézanne’s enrolment at the Académie Suisse as ‘consistent’ with Cézanne’s presumed ‘repudiation of State-sponsored institutions, such as the Institut and the École des Beaux-Arts’: Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, ‘An artistic and political manifesto for Cézanne,’ op. cit., p. 486; Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., p. 79.

60. Jean-Baptiste Chaillan was a former co-student of Cézanne’s at the École de Dessin in Aix; there is a caricature, [Ch 51] Studies, Including an Angel (1858–1859) (pencil and ink on sketchbook page (23 x 15), Musée du Louvre, Paris), in one of Cézanne’s early sketchbook’s depicting an angel presenting a wreath to an artist, with the inscription ‘A messenger straight from heaven awards Chaillan the crown for Painting’: Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 64. Chaillan was awarded first prizes for l’Ornement dessine d’après le plâtre and Étude de l’ornement copié: Ély, ‘Cézanne, l’École de Dessin et le Musée d’Aix,’ op. cit., p. 154. He seems to have travelled to Paris by 1860, where, like Cézanne’s other co-student, Auguste Tréphère, he attempted to become a painter, although less successfully: Thomson, ‘Tableau chronologique,’ op. cit., p. 124; Becker, ‘Notices biographiques,’ op. cit., p. 545. He was mentioned frequently by Zola in his letters to Cézanne of 1860, often in
In any case, regardless of the reasons underlying his decision to enrol there, the Académie Suisse, like the École de Dessin in Aix before it, seems to have provided Cézanne with the primary social context within and by which he forged, at least while in Paris, his closest friendships. It was there that Cézanne apparently met and befriended, perhaps as early as his first visit to Paris in 1861, the painters Camille Pissarro, Francisco Oller, Armand Guillaumin, and Antoine Guillemet, all of whom were arguably to have considerable and decisive influences on Cézanne’s artistic development during the 1860s. All were dedicated landscapists with apparently and in line with this, progressive, or at the very least, anti-academic, ideas on painting. It was also where, whether on his first or second trip to Paris, that Cézanne would meet Achille Emperaire, the Aixois painter featured in Cézanne’s later Portrait du peintre Achille Emperaire (fig. 6A.13(b)), discussed in chapter six.

In terms of the artistic training available at the Académie Suisse, neither formal instruction nor structured critique by resident or visiting masters was offered, the monthly fee merely providing enrollees with access to the equipment and, more importantly, the models in front of which they might refine their skills under their own guidance.

---

relation to Chaillan’s various artistic activities; it also seems, from a comment in one of Zola’s letters that Chaillan might also have been corresponding with Cézanne. In regard to Chaillan and the Académie Suisse, take for instance, Zola’s remarks; ‘Chaque jour il [Chaillan] se rend chez le père Suisse, depuis le matin 6 heures jusqu’à 11 heures’ and ‘Tu as ensuite ton atelier à payer; celui Suisse, un des moins chers...’: Zola, letter to Cézanne, 26 April 1860, op. cit., p. 151; Zola, letter to Cézanne, 3 March [1861], op. cit., p. 272.


Arts, the production of académies. For, it was through the académie that, in the eyes of many artists and professors alike, that an aspiring painter's talent was measured.

In terms of Cézanne's own intentions regarding entrance to the École des Beaux-Arts, he did later remark, as noted above, having twice made unsuccessful attempts, albeit without specifying when these might have occurred. If ever such an attempt is raised in Cézanne's biographies, it is usually coupled with the presumption it was a condition of his father's continued financial support, implying, thereby and without perhaps due evidence, that it was a course of action intrinsically antithetic to Cézanne's personality and aspirations. In any case, if he did apply, he was unsuccessful; and indeed, despite none of the académies he might be presumed to have executed during his first trip to Paris seemingly having survived, there is certainly evidence Cézanne's drawing abilities were not, at the time, up to the École des Beaux-Arts' exacting standards. For, as Pissarro later famously recalled, in

64 Boime, The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth Century, op. cit., pp. 19, 24. The concours des places were held at the beginning of every academic semester and were the means by which admission to the Académie's École des Beaux-Arts was determined; students were required to draw or sculpt from life within a set time frame and produce works conforming to the standards set by the Académie; up to 400 applicants might attend any one concours but only 130 applicants were accepted, including sculptors. Successful applicants were then provisionally enrolled in the École des Beaux-Arts and could use its premises, but were not fully enrolled until they had successfully competed in the concours d'émulation. Full enrolment also required a letter from one of the École's drawing masters: Règlements de l'École Royale et Spéciale des Beaux-Arts, Paris: n.p., 1839, Chapter 2, Article 6, cited in Boime, The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth Century, op. cit., pp. 191 nn. 5, 7; Boime, The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth Century, op. cit., pp. 19–20; Albert Boime, 'The teaching reforms of 1863 and the origins of modernism in France,' The Art Quarterly, vol. 1, no. 1 (1977), p. 12.


66 'I have twice presented myself to the École [des Beaux-Arts], but I do not get the proportions right': Rivière and Schnerb, op. cit., p. 59. Julie Lawrence Cochran's translation is, 'I applied twice to the École des Beaux-Arts, but I can't pull a composition together': Doran (ed.), op. cit., p. 86.

67 'Eagerly accepting his father's condition that he should inscribe himself for the entrance examination of the Beaux Arts school': George Slocombe, Rebels of Art: Manet to Matisse, New York: Robert M. McBride and Company, 1939, p. 95; 'A condition of paternal support may have been that Cézanne prepare for the École des Beaux-Arts entrance exams': Andersen, The Youth of Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 143. A slightly different perspective on Cézanne's attitude toward admission into the École des Beaux-Arts, and one perhaps closer to the view closer to the one formed here, is offered by Ambroise Vollard, albeit, it seems, in regard to Cézanne's presumed second attempt in 1863: '[Cézanne] was impatient to take the measure of his talent and presented himself for the entrance examination to the École des Beaux-Arts': Vollard, Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 24.
precisely the anecdote often used to date their first meeting to 1861 cited above, Cézanne’s life drawings were ‘ridiculed by the impotents of the school.’

Camille Pissarro, letter to Lucien Pissarro, 4 December 1895, cited in Camille Pissarro, Correspondance de Camille Pissarro, edited by Janine Bailly-Herzberg, vol. 4, Paris: Editions du Valhermeil, 1989, p. 128, Robert Ratcliffe translates those deriding Cézanne’s works as ‘all the important artists’, John Rewald presumes them to be those at the Académie Suisse likewise attending the École des Beaux-Arts: Ratcliffe, Cézanne’s Working Methods, op. cit., p. 66; Rewald, History of Impressionism, op. cit., p. 62. Given Pissarro’s comments were written nearly thirty-five years after the events they refer to, as well as the lack of other positive evidence as to when Cézanne and Pissarro might first have met, it is not unforeseeable that Pissarro had his years mixed up, and was instead remembering events from Cézanne’s second visit to Paris in the years 1862–1864, when his académies do indeed seem to have become deliberately more unorthodox and un-academic; see section 5A.
4B: Aix, 1862

Whether it was humiliations of the kind reported by Pissarro, a failure in the École des Beaux-Arts coucours de places, as is often suggested, or, even, and as is suggested below, part of a prepared plan, Cézanne returned to Aix-en-Provence less than six months after arriving in Paris. He then apparently took up, soon after this return, a position as a clerk in his father’s bank. 69 According to a letter from Zola to Baille, Cézanne, seemingly frustrated by life in the capital, had threatened an earlier return on at least two previous occasions. 70 The same letter also detailed a ploy of Zola’s to keep Cézanne in Paris, suggesting he paint his portrait, an offer Cézanne apparently enthusiastically took up. After some description of these sessions, Zola then related how he had turned up to one of his regular sitting sessions only to find Cézanne sulkily packing his trunk and saying he was leaving the following day. 71 ‘What about my portrait?’ Zola had asked; ‘I’ve just wiped it out,’ Cézanne replied. 72 They then

69 Rewald, Cézanne et Zola, op. cit., p. 30. Rarely is Cézanne’s employment, albeit seemingly brief, in his father’s bank mentioned without the subsequent inclusion of a fragment of verse quoted by Joachim Gasquet as purportedly ‘scrawled above a column of figures in the ledger [of the accounts of Cézanne’s father’s bank]’, ‘Cézanne le banquier ne voit pas sans frémir, / Derrière son comptoir naître un peintre à venir [Cézanne the banker does not see without quivering, / Behind his counter being born a painter to come]’; Gasquet, op. cit., p. 64. Jean-Michel Royer, following Bruno Ely, prefers the translation ‘Cézanne the banker, we see him growing fainter, / To find behind his counter, the birth of a painter’; Ely, ‘The purchase and sale of the Jas de Bouffan,’ op. cit., p. 31; Royer, op. cit., p. 151 n. 2. The translation offered in the latest of John Rewald’s biographies is ‘The banker Cézanne does not see without fear / Behind his desk a painter appear’; Rewald, Cézanne: A Biography, op. cit., p. 34.

70 ‘Lorsqu’il fait mauvais, il ne parle rien moins que de retourner à Aix et de se faire commis dans une maison de commerce. Il me faut alors de grands discours pour lui prouver la sottise d’un tel retour; il en convient facilement et se remet au travail. Cependant, cette idée le ronge; deux fois déjà, il a été sur le point de partir; je crains qu’il ne m’échappe d’un instant à l’autre’: Zola, letter to Baille, [end of June/beginning of July] 1861, op. cit., p. 300. The dating used here (end of June/beginning of July 1861) is according to that given in Correspondance; for Collette Becker’s reasoning for this dating, which include its mention of an exam to be sat by Baille on 12 July and its relation to Zola’s letter to Baille definitively dated to 18 July, see: Becker, ‘[notes,]’ op. cit., p. 303 n. 1. John Rewald, with Wayne Andersen, for instance, following, dates the letter to August 1861, and therefore after the 18 July letter: Rewald, Letters, op. cit., p. 96; Andersen, The Youth of Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 149.

71 ‘... je vois la malle ouverte, les tiroirs à demi vides; Paul, d’un visage sombre, bousculait les objets et les entassait sans ordre dans la malle. Puis il me dit tranquillement “Je pars demain”: ’; Zola, letter to Baille, [end of June/beginning of July] 1861, op. cit., p. 300.

went out to lunch and apparently Zola talked his friend around, or at least enough not to leave immediately. He then ended his letter with the lines:

Undoubtedly, Paul will stay in Paris until September; but is that his final decision? I have some hope, however, that he will not change it. 73

Although these comments might seem to imply Cézanne’s return to Aix in September had been planned all along, and that Zola was merely expressing fears Cézanne was going to leave sooner, this is rarely presumed the case. Cézanne’s ultimate quitting of Paris is not only often deemed a decision made explicitly in response to his unhappiness there, but also, thereby and by extension, as an act signalling a similar emotive capitulation in regards to his intentions of pursuing a career in painting. Hence, John Rewald describes Cézanne’s departure as ‘giving up art once and for all’ and Jack Lindsay remarks ‘Paul must have felt [...] his visit had been a total failure and that he had no future as an artist.’ 74

Whether or not such an abdication was the case, within months of returning to Aix-en-Provence Cézanne had again begun attending drawing classes at the École de Dessin. 75 Indeed, the only surviving drawn académies purportedly executed by Cézanne at that institution are all dated from the year following his return, 1862. These comprise the four drawings catalogued by Adrien Chappuis as [Ch 75–78] Male Nude (1862) (figs 4B.3–4, 4B.8–9), along with several other sheets now in private collections and not included in Chappuis’s catalogue (figs 4B.1–2, 4B.7). 76

---

74 Rewald, Paul Cézanne: A Biography, op. cit., p. 29; Rewald, History of Impressionism, op. cit., p. 62; Lindsay, Cézanne, op. cit., p. 83.
75 Ely, ‘Cézanne, l’École de Dessin et le Musée d’Aix,’ op. cit., p. 161. The life drawing classes attended by Cézanne at the École were by no means, however, a full-time endeavour. Classes were two hours long but held only three times a week, on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays; in the summer months they ran between six and eight in the morning, and in the winter, between seven and nine in the evening: loc. cit.; Rewald, Cézanne: A Biography, op. cit., p. 22; Ely, ‘Cézanne’s youth,’ op. cit., p. 58. Compared with the regimes Cézanne had set for himself during his stay in Paris, this seems certainly not an arduous commitment.
76 The three drawings reproduced here as (figs 4B.1–2, 4B.7) and not catalogued by Chappuis are taken from: Ely, ‘Cézanne, l’École de dessin et le Musée d’Aix,’ op. cit., pp. 159, 163.
In terms of evidence from Cézanne’s correspondence regarding the sessions in which these académies were produced, his attitude seems light-hearted. When back in Paris on his second, more extended stay, he wrote in a jesting spirit to Coste and Villevieille, who had by then returned to Aix, asking, in apparent reference to these classes:

"How are those academic school evenings going, tell me who is the unfortunate creature holding those X-shaped poses or holding their stomach in for you; are the two horrors from last year still around?" 77

The ‘two horrors’ mentioned were most likely the models featured in Cézanne’s surviving 1862 académies, both of whom are bearded, but one with a slightly higher forehead and with more hooded eyes. 78 In terms of the sophistication or not of these attempts, John Rewald, for one, is in no doubt regarding their quality.

"Were it not that the authors had to sign their works, it would be impossible to distinguish Cézanne’s boring studies from those of his classmates." 79


78 Gustave Coquiot cites the model depicted in [Ch 78] *Male Nude* (1862) (fig. 4B.4), a drawing he owned for a period, as named Meissonier; according to his widow, Coquiot had been given Cézanne’s académie in 1914 by the sculptor Henri Pontier, whom had himself been given it in an exchange with Cézanne for one of Pontier’s own académies when they were fellow students at the Aix École de Dessin: Adrien Chappuis, *Dessins de Cézanne*, introduction by C.-F. Ramuz, Lausanne: H.-L. Mermod, 1957, p. 76; Bruno Ely, ‘[Catalogue notes for [Ch 76] *Male Nude* (1862)]’ in Bruno Ely, Sylvie Gache-Patin, Denis Coutagne et al., ‘Catalogue des œuvres de Cézanne conservées au Musée Granet d’Aix-en-Provence,’ in Denis Coutagne et al., *Cézanne au Musée d’Aix*, op. cit., p. 236. Although the context of Coquiot’s mention of the académie is in a discussion of the drawing professor Joseph Gilbert, Chappuis describes the class Cézanne and Pontier shared as one given by Villevieille: loc. cit. Henri Pontier was the same sculptor who, as successor to Joseph Gilbert’s son, Honoré Gilbert, to the directorship of the Musée d’Aix from 1892 up until his death in 1925, famously declared he would never allow a work by Cézanne to enter the museum’s collection: Ely, ‘Cézanne, l’École de Dessin et le Musée d’Aix,’ op. cit., p. 200.

Ironically, although not disagreeing with Rewald’s appraisal of the worth of the cited académies, Wayne Andersen sees the very presence of Cézanne’s signature as suspicious.

Andersen’s doubts, however, seem not to account for the other drawings in the Musée Granet joint store of drawings that are, as noted by John Rewald above, likewise signed, but by Cézanne’s far less famous peers (figs 4B.5, 4B.10). In fact, all académies retained by the Aix École de Dessin that thereby entered the collection of the Musée Granet were not mere ‘studio assignments’ as Andersen implies, but, instead, as evidenced by the initial ‘C’ inscribed on all, as is also the case, according to Bruno Ely, for the other 1862 académies presumed to be by Cézanne and now in private collections, works entered by students in the annual concours, and thereby, surely, examples of if not their best work, at least their most concertedly academic.

However, aside from a difference of opinion regarding the credibility of their purported attribution, Rewald and Andersen do, as mentioned above, agree on in terms of the quality, or not, of those académies in question: in short, they are drawings neither exemplary nor idiosyncratic. Comparing the attempts purportedly signed by Cézanne with those by his peers, for example the académies of Numa Coste and Jules Gibert (figs 4B.5, 4B.10) also in the collection of the Musée Granet and not only executed around the same time as those suggested to be by Cézanne, but also, seemingly, after the same models, there is, as Rewald is cited above as observing, little to tell them apart.

80 Andersen, The Youth of Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 100.
81 For example, those of Numa Coste, Justin Gabet, Philippe Solari, Joseph Huot, and Jules Gibert reproduced in: Ely, ‘Cézanne, l'École de dessins et le Musée d'Aix,’ op. cit., p. 160.
82 Ely, ‘[Catalogue notes for [Ch 76] Male Nude (1862)],’ op. cit., p. 236.
Nevertheless, and perhaps pace both Rewald and Andersen's claims, some, albeit slight, differences might be noticed. For instance, and perhaps most markedly, all of the académies attributed to Cézanne that include depictions of the genitals—that is, (figs 4B.2–3, 4B.7–10)—exhibit the same inhibition in regard to the portrayal of those genitals. This is particularly obvious if comparing, for example, Cézanne's efforts in (Ch 76–77) Male Nude (1862) (figs 4B.8–9) with Coste's (fig. 4B.10), after a model, perhaps the same one, standing in a similar position. 83 Although drawing conclusions regarding the cause of this restraint—whether childish jesting at the models' expense or a naïvely repressive nervousness—might be impossible, the habit is nevertheless one that seems to recur in later, but by no means all, of Cézanne's académiers; for instance (Ch 100) Male Nude, Leaning on His Elbow (1863–1866) (fig. 5A.22), (Ch 101) Seated Nude Model Leaning on His Elbow (c.1863) (fig. 5A.21), (Ch) Study of a Male Nude (c.1863) (fig. 5A.28(a)), and (Ch) Academic Study of a Male Nude with his Right Hand Clenched across his Chest (c.1863) (fig. 5A.28(b)). 84

Related to this difficulty with parts-to-whole ratios, although perhaps more a result of technical deficiencies rather than issues of depicted content, is a slight propensity in Cézanne's 1862 académies to display the awkwardly-articulated proportional relations noted as present in certain of his painted copies discussed last chapter. Hence, and again staying with the comparison between the académie purportedly by Cézanne and that by Coste (figs 4B.9–10), the lower parts of the legs, for instance, seem noticeably shorter in the former; and again, as was discussed in regard to Cézanne's presumed earlier oil Nu académique (fig. 3A.5), there also seems an intrinsic difficulty in resolving transitions between limbs, particularly at the hip, and the torso, perhaps best exemplified by the faults in the right-hand half of Étude d'après le modèle vivant (fig. 4B.7).

83 As Henri Loyrette remarks of [Ch 76] Male Nude (1862) (fig. 4B.9): 'although the figure represented is a strapping fellow with a beard, his male organ has been reduced to a cherub's foreskin': Henri Loyrette, 'Catalogue notes,' in Cachin et al., op. cit., p. 80.

84 See section 5A. For more a possibly more 'normal' appearing effort, see, for instance: (Ch 111) Male Nude and Caricature (1863–1866) (fig. 5A.25(a)). For a discussion of Cézanne's depiction of genitals and phalli more generally, see: Geist, Interpreting Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 41–44, 99–100. See also Wayne Andersen's meditations upon the tiny but apparently erect penis seen in [Ch 380 (b)] (detail) Study of a Bather (1874–1877) (pencil on sketchbook page (21.7 x 12.4), Art Institute, Chicago), which he suggests, partly based upon this penis, was inspired by the drowned Leander figure in Heinrich Vorsterman's drawn copy of Rubens' Hero and Leander; now, as it was in Cézanne’s time, in the collection of the Louvre: Andersen, Cézanne and the Eternal Feminine, op. cit., pp. 115–125.
Whereas the former of these just-cited divergences from the academic ideal might be deemed an idiosyncrasy peculiar to Cézanne, thereby suggesting, perhaps, further support, contra Andersen, for the attribution of these académies to the painter, the latter difficulty of meshing parts to whole, of the ensemble juste, to appropriate the terminology of the time, was not one confined to Cézanne. As Albert Boime points out, this stage in the sequence of academic drawing instruction—the transition from drawing parts of the figure after engravings and/or plaster casts to drawing whole figures after a live model—was often the most difficult for students to negotiate successfully.\(^{85}\) The faults resulting from these difficulties, precisely those related to parts-to-whole ratios just noted of Cézanne’s 1862 académies, has been suggested by Boime, thereby, as a specific consequence of, and, as such, perhaps inherent flaw in, the academic training of artists.\(^ {86}\) In being well-versed in the considered and patient copying of fragmented body parts, students often found it hard to conceive of figures as other then assemblages of fragments collaged together, an effect only exacerbated by the use of standardized poses.

However, although the académies of 1862 attributed to Cézanne might be seen as displaying both the benefits and faults of academic training, what they might not display, as with the studies after statuary presumed to have been drawn several years earlier, is any inkling that their executor was as yet resistant to the principles upon which the production of such académies were based. That is, and by way of extension to this point, any awkwardness of execution perceived manifested could be deemed an imprint of their executor’s authentically-applied technical ability. Cézanne might seem to have been trying his best.

However, for some, the situation regarding Cézanne’s drawing abilities at this time, and in regard to the académies just discussed, is more nuanced. Hence, the conventionality they display is conceived of, by Bruno Ely for instance, as resulting from a necessarily and deliberately suppressive act on their executor’s behalf, Cézanne deemed to be consciously denying the expression of a Romantic line presumed,

---


thereby, without it yet having emerged, more authentically his. Any subsequent awkwardness was thereby an inherent resistance to the constraints of this ‘anonymous style of academicism’, a mark of self-repression, as it were. Thus, it is a characterisation that pre-empts, albeit in a subtly inverted form, certain tendencies to see Cézanne’s ‘romantic’ canvases of the late 1860s and early 1870s as prototypically expressionistic. For, in such interpretations, form is deemed irrepresibly distended by their executor’s inability to match the presumed turbulence of his psyche, and therefore the emotive content deemed being attempted to be conveyed through expression, with the technical means by which that expression might be articulated.

In this view, then, the awkwardness of the later canvases is deemed the result of cathartic excess, whereas the awkwardness of his earlier académies is seen, by Ely, for instance, as the result of repressed sublimation. What both interpretations share is the perception of a disjunction between a presumed authentic content and the technique through which that content is mediated, one exceeding the other in both cases, and deformation, as a result, visibilizing that gap.

However, in the case of the early académies, in choosing ‘to hold his hand [and] personal expression, to repress for the moment his personality’ Cézanne might thereby be being seen, in a sense, as enacting a parody of academic technique. The question might remain, then, to invert the analogy in regard to the interpretation of his later canvases, to what extent they might likewise be conceived of as parodies, but of bad technique.

87 'Lorsqu’il revient à Aix, Cézanne retombe dans les ponçefs académiques, aux strictes règles et méthodes d’un dessin d’imitation. Son échec au concours d’entrée à l’École des Beaux-Arts de Paris joue peut-être un rôle important dans ce retour aux normes académiques. Il s’oblige sans doute à retenir sa main, son expression personelle, à refouler sa personnalité pour retomber dans le style anonyme de l’académisme du moment’: Ely, [Catalogue notes for [Ch 76] Male Nude (1862)], op. cit., p. 237.
88 ‘This phase [Cézanne’s palette-knife works of the late 1860s] was not only the invention of modern expressionism, although it was incidentally that; the idea of art as emotional ejaculation made its first appearance at this moment’: Gowing, ‘The early work of Paul Cézanne,’ op. cit., p. 10.
89 ‘...à retenir sa main, son expression personelle, à refouler sa personnalité’: Ely, [Catalogue notes for [Ch 76] Male Nude (1862)], op. cit., p. 237.
As suggested above, Cézanne is presumed, after completing his *Les Quatre Saisons* (figs 3E.11–14) mural panels in the apse of the grand salon of the Jas de Bouffan, to have begun decorating the long walls of that same room (fig. 3E.4). Four of these murals, the two large landscapes flanking the apse, [R 28–30] *La Ferme, Chute d'eau*, and *Le Baigneur au rocher* (1862–1864, 1867–1869) (fig. 4C.1) and [R 34–41] *Paysage romantique aux pêcheurs* (1862–1864) (fig. 4C.3), and another featuring mostly sky in the central section of the eastern wall, presumably over the fireplace, [R 31] *Entrée du château* (1862–1864) (fig. 4C.7), as well as a copy after a Lancret engraving to the right of this, [R 23] *Le Jeu de cache-cache, d'après Lancret* (1862–1864) (fig. 4C.13), are the focus of the following section. Of most interest is the degree to which Cézanne might be seen as having derived his works from the work of other artists, again, it seems, through the medium of printed reproduction and, again, possibly involving elements of pastiche. Also raised will be the issue of Cézanne's possible intentions in executing these more conventional components of his decorative ensemble, particularly in terms of how they have been interpreted either as the attempt to articulate an informed and consciously thematic unity or as satirical parody of such schemes.

In turning first to the mural filling the entire panel between the alcove and the French window in the middle of the western wall, without implying thereby that this was the order in which Cézanne approached the decoration of the long walls of the salon, Cézanne depicted, beneath the apparently later addition of [R 29] *Le Baigneur au rocher* (1867–1869) (fig. 6B.3), a landscape featuring a pooling stream with foreground waterfall cascading over rocks and set before a hill framed by inward curving trees and topped by some sort of house, a composition now only known through a photograph (fig. 3E.7) taken before the excision of the nude in 1912.}

---

90 On [R 4–7] *Les Quatre Saisons* (1860–1861) (figs 3E.11–14), see section 3E.
91 On the mural's placement and the excision of the bather, see section 3E.
In terms of these motifs, but ignoring the inserted bathers, the mural includes many of the elements commonly deployed in seventeenth-century Dutch depictions of Nordic vistas, a landscape subgenre virtually single-handedly invented by Allart van Everdingen and characterized by large-scaled vertically-oriented format and featuring cascading waterfalls, rocky outcrops, pine forests, fir trees, distant snow-capped mountains, and ramshackle trappers’ huts. Cézanne’s mural repeats not only these motifs, but also the general arrangement of just one such painting, a work by one of Everdingen’s followers Jacob van Ruisdael, *Waterfall in a Rocky Landscape with a Bridge and a Half-Timbered House* (late 1660s) (fig. 4C.2), now in the collection of the National Gallery in London.

In attempting to account for these similarities, it is impossible, again, not to raise the possibility of recourse to engraved reproductions, Cézanne being unable to have ever seen Ruisdael’s painting in the flesh. However, he might have seen the mezzotint made of it by J.J. Friedhoff in the 1790s, or a reversed publication of Johann Theophilus Prestel’s aquatint of c.1802. Whatever his source, if Cézanne did copy

---


93 Mary Tompkins Lewis seems first to have noticed this similarity between Cézanne’s mural and Ruisdael’s *Waterfall in a Rocky Landscape with a Bridge and a Half-Timbered House* (late 1660s) (fig. 4C.2); she also cites Ruisdael’s *Waterfall with a Half-Timbered House and Castle* (c.1660–1670) (o/c (101 x 86), National Gallery, London) and *A Scandinavian Landscape With A Wood Beside A Torrent And A Waterfall, A Cottage Beyond* (c.1660–1670) (o/c (n/d), PC). Lewis, ‘Cézanne’s paintings in the Grand Salon,’ op. cit., p. 83. *Waterfall in a Rocky Landscape with a Bridge and a Half-Timbered House* (late 1660s) (fig. 4C.2) was apparently extended by an unknown hand before 1792, giving it dimensions of 103.5 x 86.9; since the known printed reproductions of the painting were all executed after this date, and the added strips removed only in 1959, if Cézanne did copy from such a print, it would presumably have been from the larger dimensioned version of the painting: Seymour Slive, *Jacob van Ruisdael: A Complete Catalogue of His Paintings, Drawings and Etchings*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001, pp. 204–205. The reproduction of the painting used here is of the painting with the added strips removed.

94 The painting remained in Germany, where it was first purchased, until 1859, when it was sold to the National Gallery, London: Slive, *Jacob van Ruisdael: A Complete Catalogue of His Paintings, Drawings and Etchings*, op. cit., p. 204.

95 Slive, *Jacob van Ruisdael: A Complete Catalogue of His Paintings, Drawings and Etchings*, op. cit., p. 204. Various engravings after Ruisdael’s works were also published in Charles Blanc’s 1861 *École hollandaise* volumes of *L’Histoire des peintres de toutes les écoles*, which, although not including the landscape here compared to Cézanne’s mural, did, as noted
Ruisdael, who in turn seems to have arrived at his own Nordic landscape imagery by pastiching motifs appropriated from Everdingen, he seems to have done so in a particular way related to format and arrangement rather than to detail.\(^96\) That is, what might be repeated of Ruisdael’s painting in Cézanne’s mural is the structuring of the components; it might, in short, copy of pattern by which Ruisdael pastiched Everdingen, rather than of the elements so pastiched.

Hence, in the Ruisdael painting a building is depicted upon a hill, partially obscured by a copse of trees to the right and in front and with three firs to the left; in Cézanne’s mural a building is likewise depicted, but with a different roof-line, an enlarged façade, and with the trees reduced in number and simplified, the copse to the right reduced to a pair, the trio of firs to the left likewise. In terms of the hill upon which the building sits, in Cézanne’s version, it has also been considerably simplified; minor details like rocks and bushes are removed and there is no trace of the track with its diminutive retreating figure that features in the Ruisdael canvas. There is closer congruency between the works on the right-hand side of the pool and cascade, particularly in terms of the general placement and outline of the rocks, but the water in Cézanne’s is more slickly uniform, the messy tumult of Ruisdael’s waterfall neated. Unfortunately, no comparison can be made for the left side of the same pool, which in Cézanne’s mural is obscured by the insertion of the nude bather and accompanying drapery, either a towel or discarded clothing. However, there is a possibility that the bather’s outstretched arms conceal a bridge or dam that is similarly positioned in the Ruisdael painting, an odd brown disk above the bather’s left shoulder and a brownish

by Mary Tompkins Lewis, include an engraving after another of his waterfall paintings, *The Cascade*: Charles Blanc, *Histoire des peintres de toutes les écoles*: École hollandaise, two volumes, Paris: Jules Renouard, 1861; Lewis, ‘Cézanne’s paintings in the Grand Salon,’ op. cit., p. 83. The sixteen pages devoted to Ruisdael in Charles Blanc’s 1861 compilation École hollandaise were previously published as two stand-alone issues of *L’Histoire des peintres de toutes les écoles*, numbers 54 and 55; presuming a twice-monthly publication schedule, these could have been published as early as 1852: Unattributed author, ‘[Advertisement for Histoires des peintres de toutes les écoles giving lists of featured artist by issue number],’ Gazette des Beaux-Arts, t. 17, livr. 102 (1 December 1864), p. 576 ter.

streak between the right arm and the approaching stream above perhaps the remains of such a structure.

If working from an engraving, then, Cézanne, in returning the imagery to the grand scale presumed of its originary contexts in monumental Nordic landscape, seems simultaneously to have instigated a simplification more readily-associated, by virtue of the contingencies of reduction implicit in that medium, with engraved reproduction. Likewise, the tendency for this simplification, along with a stretching upwards of the forms—the building is taller, the hill is taller, the trees are taller—leads to an inevitable flattening, the deep thrust into the distance towards the point from which the river comes, in Ruisdael’s version, lost. This would seem, thereby, a repetition of precisely the enlarged repetition-of-simplification and tendency toward decorative abstraction already noted in regard to his above-discussed copy Le Deux enfants, d’après Prud’hon (fig. 3D.5). It would also seem a gesture of format repetition likewise noted in his two presumed earlier watermill landscapes (figs 3D.17–18). In relation to these, as Mary Tompkins Lewis has pointed out, landscapes with watermills also figured predominantly in van Ruisdael’s œuvre, as well as his student Meindert Hobbema.

However, in invoking precisely this more general sense of coalescing genre (Hobbema inspired by Ruisdael, Ruisdael inspired by Everdingen), and, therefore, the move from depicting landscapes to depicting images of landscape, Cézanne’s mural might as easily have resulted from copying, or even pastiching, another artist’s pastiche of Ruisdael, or Ruisdael’s peers, or, even, the original author of the convention, Everdingen. Although the pursuit of such infinitely regressive vexations might seem inextricably abstruse, what its very presence does serve to highlight is the degree to which the copying of imagery diverts interpretation from what is represented to the structures through which representation occurs; the landscape depicted is no longer a sign of a particular place, but a sign of a particular style. Moreover, the content

97 See section 3D.
98 See section 3D.
100 Ruisdael’s Nordic waterfall scenes numbered over 150, most variations on the arrangement of the same set of motifs derived from Everdingen’s paintings: Slive, Jacob van Ruisdael: A Complete Catalogue of His Paintings, Drawings and Etchings, op. cit., pp. 153–208.
referred to by this sign is presumed an essential component of the artist’s presumed self-conscious deployment of it. Hence, in terms of Cézanne’s waterfall mural, Mary Tompkins Lewis can see the Nordic landscapes of Ruisdael evoked by it as a means of providing a deliberate and ‘dramatic Baroque contrast’ to the ‘naively classical’ mural _Paysage romantique aux pêcheurs_ (fig. 4C.3), opposite it and discussed immediately below.\(^{101}\) The eclecticism of Cézanne’s early taste, as embodied by his murals in the Jas de Bouffan, is perceived, at least by Lewis, in terms of a structured message.

In terms of this just-noted ‘naively classical’ mural, _Paysage romantique aux pêcheurs_ (fig. 4C.3), this is presumed to have been painted around the same time as the above-suggested paraphrase of Ruisdael, positioned at the northern end of the eastern wall opposite, and depicting a flooded river with flanking trees, foreground fishermen, an oddly-squared donjon in the middle distance, and, further off and before a clouded sky flushed orange and pink with the setting sun, a spire.\(^{102}\) Apparently covered by wallpaper after Léonce Bénédite’s visit to the Jas de Bouffan in 1907, or perhaps, as suggested above, even before, the mural remained hidden until the mid-1950s, when it was uncovered and Douglas Cooper published an article, cited above, announcing its re-discovery.\(^{103}\) Subsequently, it was detached from the wall in eight separate pieces and the component parts mounted on canvas and sold at a Paris auction in 1960, alongside the two components [R 28] _La Ferme_ (1862–1864) and [R 30] _Chute d’eau_ (1862–1864) salvaged from the remains of the waterfall landscape opposite and just-discussed (fig. 4C.1).\(^{104}\) That same auction also saw the sale of yet another Jas de Bouffan mural, presumably discovered around the same time as the larger _Paysage_
romantique aux pêcheurs (fig. 4C.3), but not mentioned in Cooper's article, [R 31]
Entrée du château (1862–1864) (fig. 4C.7). 105

According to Mary Tompkins Lewis, this latter mural, described by John Rewald as
continuing Paysage romantique aux pêcheurs to the right and placing it, thereby,
above the fireplace (fig. 3E.4), was but the upper half of a larger mural assumed by
her to have originally been of the same general dimensions as that landscape to its left
and the waterfall mural opposite, both of which, in their original undivided states,
were around three-and-a-half metres tall and two-and-a-half metres wide. 106 Although
unstated, her assertion would thereby seem to be that the mural was executed before,
and then partially destroyed by, the installation of the fireplace. 107

In any case, integral to Lewis’ propensity to see Entrée du château (fig. 4C.7) as a
fragment is her suggestion that the mural it originally formed part of was not only a
pendant to Paysage romantique aux pêcheurs (fig. 4C.3) to its left, but also that the
pair thus formed were deliberately contrived by Cézanne as a times-of-the-day
ensemble, repeating seemingly, at least in spirit, the gesture of decorative seriality
already assumed to have been enacted by him in the nearby Les Quatre Saisons (figs
3E.11–14). 108 However, if Lewis’ intuitions are correct regarding such an intention,
Cézanne’s articulation as a single pair of murals is decidedly unconventional; the
times-of-the-day conceit, since its inauguration with Michelangelo Buonarroti’s
sarcophagal decorations in the Cappelle Medicee, usually deployed, and often
dependent upon, in terms of its assorted thematic and allegorical connotations, a
quaternary format. 109 Although not denying Cézanne would have been aware of
precisely these traditions through the convention’s various baroque and eighteenth-
century incarnations, some of which are mentioned below, Lewis prefers instead, then,

105 Galerie Charpentier, op. cit., [no. 66].
106 Lewis, ‘Cézanne’s paintings in the Grand Salon at Jas de Bouffan,’ op. cit., pp. 77, 80–81.
107 Although no other discussion of [R 31] Entrée du château (1862–1864) (fig. 4C.7) raises
the possibility of it being a fragment of a much larger work, such discussions have, previous to
Lewis’s carefully-considered analysis, been cursory at best.
108 ibid., pp. 77.
109 Michelangelo Buonarroti, Aurora, Giorno, Crepuscolo, and Notte (1520–1534), marble
statues from the tombs of Giuliano and Lorenzo de’ Medici, Sagrestia Nuova, Basilica di San
Lorenzo, Florence. On the history of the times-of-the-day convention up to the mid-eighteenth
century, particularly in graphic art, see: Sean Shesgreen, Hogarth and the Times-of-the-Day
to see the inspiration for Cézanne’s murals in the work of Claude Lorrain, a painter who, although often utilising time as an important structuring element in his work, never in fact executed a times-of-the-day series.\textsuperscript{110} That is, although invoking the times-of-the-day conceit as a motivating force for their execution, Lewis sees Cézanne’s two murals as dependent upon works conceived outside that tradition. Specifically, she cites similarities between the larger mural and certain of Lorrain’s depictions of the Tobias and the Angel episode from the Book of Tobit, in particular the earliest of these, the vertically-formatted version now in the collection of the Prado, \textit{Landscape with Tobias and the Angel} (1639–1640) (fig. 4C.4(a)).\textsuperscript{111}

When comparing \textit{Paysage romantique aux pêcheurs} (fig. 4C.3) with this painting, Lewis not only identifies the similar formats—flanking trees on the right, tall middle-distance building above denser foliage on the left, spectacular backing motif of a setting sun beyond, etc.—as evidence of formal dependency, but also contends that this dependency extended to the thematic. Hence, Cézanne is suggested as having intended his mural not only as an expression of ‘evening’, as Lorrain’s canvas did, but also as a deliberately-paired juxtaposition to the ‘dawn’ presumed expressed by \textit{Entrée du château} (fig. 4C.7), just as Lorrain’s \textit{Port of Ostia with the Embarkation of St Paul} (1639–1640) (fig. 4C.4(b)), pendant to \textit{Landscape with Tobias and the Angel} (fig. 4C.5).

\textsuperscript{110} Although four of Lorrain’s paintings commissioned for Henri van Halmale, including his \textit{Landscape with Tobias and the Angel} (1663) (fig. 4C.5) mentioned again below, were catalogued together under the title \textit{Four Times of the Day} by at least the end of the eighteenth century, this has been shown to have been a misnomer reflecting a retrospective desire for thematic contiguity outside the painting’s original intentions: Marcel Roethlisberger, \textit{Claude Lorrain: The Paintings}, New York: Hacker Art Books, 1979, vol. 1, pp. 361–362, 399, 426–427, (cat. nos [LV 154, 160, 169, 181]); Shesgreen, \textit{Hogarth and the Times-of-the-Day Tradition}, op. cit., p. 72. Mary Tompkins Lewis sees the binary format of Lorrain’s pendant pairs as no impediment to their ‘clearly functioning’ as times-of-the-day paintings: Lewis, ‘Cézanne’s paintings in the Grand Salon at Jas de Bouffan,’ op. cit., p. 80.

\textsuperscript{111} ‘And as they went on their journey, they came in the evening to the river Tigris, and they lodged there. And when the young man went down to wash himself, a fish leaped out of the river, and would have devoured him. Then the angel said unto him, “Take the fish.” And the young man laid hold of the fish, and drew it to land. To whom the angel said, “Open the fish, and take the heart and the liver and the gall, and put them up safely.” So the young man did as the angel commanded him; and when they had roasted the fish, they did eat it: then they both went on their way, till they drew near to Ecbatane’: The Book of Tobit, 6:1–5. In the Prado canvas, see: Roethlisberger, \textit{Claude Lorrain: The Paintings}, op. cit., pp. 185–186 (cat. no. [LV 50]). On Lewis’s suggestion of a relation to Cézanne’s mural, see: Lewis, ‘Cézanne’s paintings in the Grand Salon at Jas de Bouffan,’ op. cit., p. 80. Lewis seems to imply Lorrain painted a number of upright versions of the Tobias and the Angel theme, but this is not the case.
Cézanne is suggested, in copying a Claudian intra-canvas compositional format, to have also copied the Claudian extra-canvas decorative context in which the copied format originally participated.

In terms of certain details within Cézanne’s mural, Lewis also suggests Lorrain’s horizontally-oriented version of the Tobit episode, the Hermitage Landscape with Tobias and the Angel (1663) (fig. 4C.5), might have inspired Cézanne’s inclusion of a barque in the middle-distance (fig. 4C.3). Her contention thereby would seem to be that Cézanne pasted this element—the centrally-placed barque—into a format borrowed from the Prado painting in a deliberate attempt to articulate his painting in terms of a serial convention. That is, a content ascribed as underlying the image appropriated is presumed to have functioned as the motivation for Cézanne’s appropriating those elements in the first place. Cézanne is imagined to have desired to paint a decorative ‘Times of the Day’ ensemble, and thereby chosen to extract elements from famous examples.

112 Lewis, ‘Cézanne’s paintings in the Grand Salon at Jas de Bouffan,’ op. cit., pp. 80–81. Landscape with Tobias and the Angel (1639–1640) (fig. 4C.4(a)), along with at least one of Lorrain’s two other painted versions of the scene, the horizontally-oriented Landscape with Tobias and the Angel (1663) (fig. 5C.5), now in the collection of the Hermitage, was part of a commissioned pendant pair that, by virtue of this binary format, allowed Lorrain, as with various of his other paired canvases dealing with Biblical scenes, not only to draw thematic links across paintings so-partnered according to the narratives they depicted, but also to contrast and/or harmonise the formal devices through which these narratives were articulated: Marcel Roethlisberger, ‘The dimension of time in the art of Claude Lorrain,’ Artibus et Historiae, vol. 10, no. 20 (1989), pp. 81, 83, 91 n. 20. Hence, the narrative context of the Tobias and the Angel episode offered the opportunity, apart from the signal excuse to depict a dramatically-clouded sunset with accompanying dusky evening light, to contrast this romantic atmosphere, as well as the compositional format structuring the scene, with, in the case of the painting partnered with the Prado Landscape with Tobias and the Angel (1639–1640) (fig. 4C.4(a)) commissioned by Philip IV of Spain, the cooler and sharper light of dawn depicted Part of Ostia with the Embarkation of St Paul (1639–1640) (fig. 4C.4(b)), and, in the case of Landscape with Tobias and the Angel (1663) (fig. 5C.5), commissioned by Henri van Halmale and now in the Hermitage, the brighter and clearer light of afternoon depicted in Landscape with the Rest on the Flight into Egypt (1661) (o/c (116 x 159.6), State Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg): Roethlisberger, Claude Lorrain: The Paintings, op. cit., pp. 184–186, 361–365, 379–381 (cat. nos [LV 49, 50, 154, 160]). The only other surviving painting by Lorrain of the Tobias and the Angel episode, Landscape with Tobias and the Angel (1642) (o/c (97 x 135), PC), presumed lost until the 1980s, is also cited by Roethlisberger, albeit tentatively, as a possible part of a pendant pair, associating it with Pastoral Landscape (1642) (o/c (97 x 131), Gemäldegalerie, Berlin): ibid., pp. 206–208, (cat. nos [LV 64, 65]): Marcel Roethlisberger, ‘Claude Lorrain. Nouveaux dessins, tableaux et lettres,’ Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art Français, Année 1986 (1988), pp. 33–35.
In terms of how Cézanne might have seen the Claudean imagery he is proposed by Lewis to have pastiched, having, again, and as with the waterfall mural discussed above, no access to the originals, Lewis suggests, for the Hermitage version containing the middle-distance barque (fig. 4C.5), an engraving in Charles Blanc’s *Histoire des peintres de toutes les écoles: École française*.113

For the vertically-oriented Prado version, from which Cézanne is presumed to have copied the general layout of *Paysage romantique aux pêcheurs* (fig. 4C.3), Lewis does not posit a possible source. However, although it is unlikely Cézanne would have access to Richard Earlom’s engraving of Lorrain’s drawing of the painting in his *Liber Veritas*, published in London in 1777, and then again in 1810, he might have had access to a lithograph made after the painting by Ph*[?]* Blanchard in the mid-nineteenth century.114 In any case, if Lewis’s intuitions are correct, Cézanne was, in constructing his mural, combining elements from relatively disparate sources, at least in terms of their engraved versions. Moreover, they were sources united only, apart from being engraved after works by Lorrain, by their treatment of the same episode, ironically exactly the feature not included in Cézanne’s purported pastiche. Hence, in narrowing the identification of Cézanne’s inspiration for *Paysage romantique aux pêcheurs* (fig. 4C.3) to Lorrain’s *Tobias and the Angel* depictions (figs 4C.4(a), 4C.5), precisely that narrative context which is both specific to those works as well as the very pretext for their standing as sign for ‘morning’, must be excised.

As intimated above, however, there were more traditional articulations of the times-of-the-day convention that were also both regionally as well as chronologically closer to Cézanne’s efforts. In particular, there is the work of the Provence-born Claude-Joseph Vernet, who gained a reputation in the eighteenth-century for producing works enacting precisely this convention, as well as the allied genres of marine and harbourside landscapes. Not only did Vernet complete at least four different times-of-the-

---

113 *Claude Lorrain,* in Charles Blanc, *Histoire des peintres de toutes écoles: École française,* t. 1, Paris: Renouard, 1865 [1862-1863], pp. 1–16. The chapter reprinted numbers 25 and 26 of *Histoire des peintres de toutes écoles,* given a twice-monthly publication schedule beginning in 1849, these could have been published as early as 1850: ‘[Advertisement for *Histoire des peintres de toutes les écoles* giving lists of featured artist by issue number],’ op. cit., p. 576 ter.

day—or Les Quatre Heures du jour—decor schemes, including the famous ensemble designed for the Bibliothèque du Dauphin, these series were widely disseminated in reproduction.\textsuperscript{115} Take, for instance, Louis Jacques Cathelin’s ‘ubiquitous’ etched engravings of c.1765 after the over-door decorations installed by Vernet in the library of the duc de Choiseul (fig. 4C.8), or Jacques Aliamet’s engravings of c.1769–1771 (fig. 4C.9). Indeed, the popularity of Vernet’s painted oeuvre in these cheaper and more accessible mediums is testified by the over three hundred prints made after his works (figs 4C.10–11).\textsuperscript{116} Moreover, in addition to Vernet’s efforts in executing decorative panels as part of the often elaborate schemes commissioned for the hôtels of Provence’s aristocratic class, whether or not times-of-the-day, his images were also often used as the basis for tapestry designs, likewise used for similar decorative purposes (fig. 4C.13).\textsuperscript{117}

Now, although few of the engravings would seem possible sources for the background of Paysage romantique aux pêcheurs (fig. 4C.3), chiefly by virtue of their horizontal format and more port-oriented setting, they might have acted as general inspiration or, perhaps, as sources for Cézanne’s foreground fishing figures, none of which occur in Lorrain’s Tobias and the Angel canvases (figs 4C.4 (a), 4C.5).\textsuperscript{118} However, if such a

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{117} Vernet was born in Avignon, the son of a decorative painter, and received his early training executing precisely such schemes in and around Avignon and Aix-en-Provence: ‘Introduction,’ in Conisbee, \textit{Claude-Joseph Vernet}, op. cit., [not paginated]. On paintings definitively identified as by Vernet and installed as decorative elements in Aix-en-Provence hôtels, see, for instance the photograph of his ‘Fontaine de Vaucluse’ and ‘A Roman Arena’ from the salon of the Hôtel de Simiane, published in: Conisbee, \textit{Claude-Joseph Vernet}, op. cit., [not paginated], [nos 3a and 3b].
  \item \textsuperscript{118} Denis Coutagne, in reference, albeit passing, to [R 34–41] \textit{Paysage romantique aux pêcheurs} (1862–1864) (fig. 4C.3), likewise sees a similarity between Cézanne’s mural effort and Provençal Times of the Day imagery, describing it as ‘is in a style reminiscent of the eighteenth-century Provençal painters Joseph Vernet and Henry d’Arles’: Coutagne, ‘The Jas de Bouffan,’ op. cit., p. 80. Cézanne’s interest in Vernet more generally is certainly not unattested, executing, albeit much later in life, a drawn copy, [Ch 676] \textit{After C.-J. Vernet: Woman Bather Seen from the Back} (1884–1887) (pencil on sketchbook page (18.2 x 11.6), PC), after a Vernet painting featuring just such figures, \textit{Le Martin: Les Baigneuses} (1772) (o/c (98 x 162), Musée du Louvre, Paris). Vernet’s painting was commissioned by the Comtesse du Barry as part of the over-door Times of the Day decorations installed in the Pavillon de Louveciennes, a reception building erected in the grounds of the Château de Louveciennes:
\end{itemize}
suggestion were to be made, Cézanne’s appropriation, either directly or in spirit, would seem, through the presumed process of pastiche and as with the figures suggested above as daubed by Cézanne onto his father’s decorated screen, to have lost much of the thematic content seemingly implicit—and perhaps even intrinsic—to those figures in their original context. For, in Vernet’s Times of the Day images, along with his more general port scenes, themes of fishing were often, along with relations to the time of day, also linked to amorous behaviour, the latter theme in particular an important motivating force for the inclusion of such figures in Vernet’s scenes in the first place.119

The other affect of possible figural pastiche identified above in regard to his smaller Dutch landscapes is also present in his mural, a discrepancy in the sizing of figures relative to one another. Hence, if the mural is viewed in its original undivided state or as a reconstruction of the components as they appear today (fig. 4C.7), albeit, it seems, after considerable restoration, Cézanne’s positioning and, in particular, scaling of the constituent figures, in particular the fisherman and woman closest to the bottom edge, is, to say the least, crude.120 In fact, it is not difficult to understand why—separate to any consideration of the contingencies of profit, or the difficulties inherent in removing a large-scale mural in one piece—the decision might have been made to cut the mural up into separate portions, each presenting, thereby and through precisely such excision, slightly more spatially-convincing portions.

In terms of the other large mural on the eastern wall of the Jas de Bouffan’s grand salon, Le Jeu de cache-cache, d’après Lancret (fig. 4C.13), positioned between the fireplace and the door to the main hall and the southern end of the wall, Cézanne’s


119 This is particularly evident, for instance, in the two Vernet designs for tapestries River Landscape with Fisherman Courting a Maid at Edge of River (n.d.) (fig. 4C.12(a)) and Shore Scene with Fishermen and Woman, Palace in Background (n.d.) (fig. 4C.12(b)).

120 John Rewald notes, in regard to the possibility of restoration, that ‘[Robert] Ratcliffe has observed that the angler in the lower right corner shows unmistakable traces of having been retouched by the artist at a much later date’: Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 76.
possible frame of inspirational reference is more obvious; the work is a direct copy of
a print by Nicolas de Larmessin (III), first published around 1735 and after a design by
Nicolas Lancret, Le Jeu de cache-cache mitoulas (fig. 4C.14).121

The image copied by Cézanne, although often described as portraying a dance-step or
a game of hide-and-seek, actually depicts a specific variant of the hide-and-seek game
in which, according to the Dictionnaire de Trévoux of 1771, and as cited by Jennifer
Milam, involved one participant guessing the location of an object—‘le furet’ or
‘ferret’, a ring or some other small thing—hidden in the hands or clothing of
another.122 Hence, in the version of the game depicted by Lancret, the young man to
the right is in the process of wrapping in a handkerchief the object to be hidden from
the girl on the left, who pretends to avert her eyes.123

Whether or not Cézanne was aware that this was what was actually depicted in the
image he was copying, Wayne Andersen has interpreted the mural’s content in terms
of a misunderstanding of this content ironically similar to the process of
decontextualization suggested here as inherent to pastiche and illustrated above in
regard to the use of just this Lancret image in the unattributed Four-Panelled Screen
with Paintings on Canvas (late 1800s) (fig. 3B.14). Hence, in continuing the line of
interpretation began by him in his discussion of Cézanne’s mirliton poem, Andersen
writes;

The girls hide themselves, alluding to their secret places, their privates,
playing hide and seek in the manner of satyrs cruising woodlands to catch
nymphs. Cézanne’s fantasy of the forest nymph is part and parcel of this
game of catch—the mirliton he came upon deep in the woods, caught by

121 Wildenstein, Lancret, op. cit., p. 85, (cat. no. 220), fig. 59. For other of Lancret’s
depictions of the cache-cache mitoulas game, but which were not engraved, see: ibid., p. 85, 86
(cat. nos 221–222), fig. 58).
122 ‘C’est un jeu de jeunes gens, que consiste à mettre quelque chose secrètement entre les
mains, ou dans les habits de quelqu’un de la compagnie; ce qu’on propose à deviner à un
tierce personne’: Antoine Furetière and l’abbé Brillant, Dictionnaire universel français et latin,
vulgairement appelé Dictionnaire de Trévoux [...], Paris: Compagnie des libraires assozés,
141, no. 1158 (September 1999), p. 542.
123 Milam, ‘Fragonard’s Le Furet,’ op. cit., p. 543.
his seductive words, was overcome, even if turning out to be too hot to handle. 124

Hence, the imagery has come to stand for Andersen, by virtue of its being presumed to depict something it actually doesn’t, for a set of theematics likewise presumed embedded within his earlier poem. Cézanne’s interest in the imagery is presumed predicated upon its resonances with his libidinal fantasies. Ironically, however, the actual content of Lancret’s imagery, the hiding of a specific object upon someone’s body, the location of which must then be guessed by another, would seem to allegorize far more neatly, and indeed, surely, entirely more coincidentally, precisely the activity of searching for a specific meaning within such pictures. In presuming a secret is encoded, all kinds of clues can be perceived.

Returning to issues more prosaic, and in terms of formal discrepancies, Cézanne has, in executing his copy simplified, again, the imagery of the engraving, despite increasing its scale considerably. Part of this simplification includes a negation of the subtle twists of the figures, in particular the main female to the left and the male in the centre, who, in Cézanne’s version are somewhat flattened and stiffened. Cézanne also seems to have tilted the whole composition to the right, straightening the stances of both main figures; he has also increased, relative to the foreground figures, the size of the figure group between the main figures, again, effectively flattening the composition slightly (fig. 4C.15). Aside from its scale, which verges on the monumental, the mural also repeats many of the stylistic features noted in regard to Cézanne’s various copies and/or paraphrases presumed executed before Cézanne’s first trip to Paris: for instance, the painting after Prud’hon (fig. 3D.5), and the awkward Fillette au perroquet (fig. 3D.8). It might be worth wondering, then, whether the Lancret mural was completed earlier than the 1862–1864 period suggested by John Rewald, especially as he dates Cézanne’s other Lancret copies—the figures on the decorated screen (figs 3B.9, 3B.12)—to 1859. In turn, this might also raise the possibility that Zola’s 1860 posted comment in regard to the panels he saw in a café in Vitry, ‘like the ones you want to paint at your place’, could have, in fact,

124 Andersen, The Youth of Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 177.
been referencing Le Jeu de cache-cache, d'après Lancret (fig. 4C.13), rather than the usually presumed Les Quatre Saisons (figs 3E.11–14).\textsuperscript{125}

•

Finally, and perhaps regardless of whether Cézanne completed the murals just discussed before or after his second visit to Paris, his intentions in deploying those murals, as an ensemble, have been construed in a number of ways, a variety of interpretive gestures that parallels, thereby, those discussed above in regard to [R 4–7] Les Quatre Saisons (1860–1861) (figs 3E.11–17). Hence, for Mary Tompkins Lewis, for instance, and as just discussed, the more conventional elements of Cézanne’s mural scheme are deemed a sincerely-undertaken and thematically cohesive program. Not only are decorative serial conventions such as the personifications of the seasons and times of the day imagery deemed articulated, but also, perhaps, deliberate contrasts of art-historical references—dark northern baroque is played off against a more idyllic classical pastoral.

For others, however, and in particular Nina Maria Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, the possibly conventional aspects of Cézanne’s mural endeavours are taken not as sign of an attempt to imitate, but to satirize. Hence, in concert with the decorated screen [R 1–3] Paravent avec scènes champêtres et ornements (c.1859) (figs 38.1, 38.6), suggested by her as related to the more expensive tapestries then popularly hung in Provençal manor houses, Cézanne’s murals are seen not only as cheap imitation of the anachronistic and ostentatious decorative schemes of Provençal aristocratic houses (fig. 3B.3), but also as an ironic comment upon such schemes, a critical reflection of the precise social circumstances within which someone of his father’s background, a humble hat maker, might rise to prominence through the acquisition of wealth.\textsuperscript{126}

\textsuperscript{125} ‘Dans ce café […] C’était de grands panneaux comme tu veux en peindre chez toi’ Zola, letter to Cézanne, 13 June 1860, op. cit., p. 175. On this, see section 3E. Lionello Venturi suggests likewise suggests an earlier date range, of 1860–1862: Venturi, Cézanne, son art—son œuvre, op. cit., p. 70 (cat. no. 14).

\textsuperscript{126} Ironically then, in the case of the verso and recto background of the decorated screen, if Theodore Reff’s suggestion is right in regard to Cézanne’s contribution being limited to the inclusion of the figures on the recto, a cheap replica might here be being mistaken for a satirical parody of such a replica. On the decorated screen, see section 3B.
Cézanne's decorative ensemble was sheer make-believe, a tongue-in-cheek replay of the real thing that verged on parody [...]. As such, the maverick decorative scheme of the Jas was a proper metaphor for the maverick background of Louis-Auguste Cézanne [...] and an ironic commentary on the déclassé status of his family.127

This oscillation, then, between interpretations of imagery as manifestation of a sincere addressing of genre forms on the one hand and, on the other, a satirical derision, through parodic imitation, of such genres, stands as encapsulation of precisely the ambivalence possibly inherent whenever citation is present. It is through copying images, rather than producing images of reality, that a content concerning the mediation of imagery as convention is implicit, one that then, through its ability to be, in turn, re-presented or re-perceived as another image that then might stand, also, and perhaps finally, for the infinite and proliferate regress of reflexive irony. The possibility of always seeing something as parodic is, in a sense, a mechanism by which multiply ambivalent meanings might always be implied.

127 Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., p. 140.
Chapter Five

Paris and Aix-en-Provence

1862–1865

'Copying...copying...yes. It’s the only way. But tempérament comes into it too. Painting recognizes its own.'

Cézanne’s aversion to Paris did not last long, and by November, it seems, of 1862, little more than of a year after returning to Aix, he was once more back in the capital. Again, it is often suggested this return to Paris, or at least his father’s continued financial support of it, was contingent upon Cézanne attempting admission, after a presumed earlier failure in 1861, to the École des Beaux-Arts, perhaps aided now by the fuller portfolio his 1862 Aix École de Dessin académies just discussed might have provided. In any case, he seems to have devised a plan whereby his stays in Paris would be tempered by regular returns to Provence, a scheme Zola enthusiastically embraced, at least in writing. And in fact, this is precisely what occurred over the following half decade, Cézanne dividing his time between the north and the south, an oscillation sustained by the allowance provided by his father.

1 Paul Cézanne, quoted in Gasquet, Joachim Gasquet’s Cézanne, op. cit., p. 168.
2 ‘I should really have written to you some time ago, it’s already two months since I left Aix’: Paul Cézanne, letter to Numa Coste and Joseph Villevieille, 5 January 1863, cited and translated in Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented, op. cit., p. 102.
3 Rewald, Paul Cézanne: A Biography, op. cit., p. 30; Becker, ‘[notes],’ in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 325 n. 6; Rewald, Cézanne: A Biography, op. cit., p. 35; Andersen, The Youth of Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 152.
4 ‘J’approuve complètement ton idée de venir travailler à Paris et de te retirer ensuite en Provence. Je crois que c’est une façon de se soustraire aux influences des écoles et de développer quelque originalité si l’on en a.‘: Émile Zola, letter to Paul Cézanne, 29 September 1862, cited in Zola, Correspondance, op. cit., p. 324. For his part, Wayne Andersen seems unconvinced of the genuineness of Zola’s words, writing ‘Zola may not have wholeheartedly approved of Cézanne’s plan to alternate between Paris and Aix, but at this point he would not risk raising a fuss over it, aware that Cézanne was vacillating over a decision to come to Paris at all’: Andersen, The Youth of Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 161.
Hence, having returned to Paris at the end of 1862, Cézanne remained there until the summer of 1864, after which he returned to Aix-en-Provence to stay until, at the latest, the following March, when he was once more in the capital, helping Francisco Oller, an artist friend from the Académie Suisse, deliver his submissions to the 1865 Salon as well as, it is presumed, his own, as yet unidentified, works. It is this period between his arrival in Paris at the end of 1862 and his return in time for the 1865 Salon that is the focus of this chapter, a period, apart from the latter third of 1864, spent mostly in Paris.

In terms of surviving works from this period, John Rewald cites forty-three non-mural paintings possibly executed in the years 1862-1865. Of these, more than half, some twenty-four, are landscapes, four are still-lives, and up to eight are portraits, some of which might be self-portraits. The remaining six paintings are a disparate collection of works comprising two copies after works by other artists, three articulations of relatively conventional pictorial conventions, and a self-portrait after a photograph. It is these works, by virtue of their possible relation to processes of copying, which attracts the bulk of the analysis undertaken below.

In regards to the two direct copies, discussion will centre on the degree to which such engagement might be viewed as repetitions of imagery, rather than as repeated enactments of the representation of similar scenes. Hence, what is of interest is the extent to which Cézanne’s copying can be seen to emphasize the imagic elements of

---

5. However, I’ll work on it a bit more before leaving for Aix, which I don’t think will be until July [1864], unless my father summons me”: Paul Cézanne, letter to Numa Coste, 27 February 1864, cited and translated in Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented, op. cit., p. 106; ‘Vous avez vu Paul et vous avez vu Battle’: Émile Zola, letter to Antony Valabrégue, 6 July 1864, cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. I, op. cit., p. 368; ‘Excuse my not coming to see you, but I am leaving tomorrow for Saint-Germain and I won’t be coming back [in Paris] until Saturday with Oller to bring his pictures to the Salon’: Paul Cézanne, letter to Camille Pissarro, 15 March 1865, cited and translated in Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented, op. cit., p. 107.

6. Lionello Venturi suggests [R 70] Portrait d’homme (1862–1864) (o/c (44 x 32), PC) and [R 73] Tête d’homme (1862–1864) (o/c (46 x 37), PC) are self-portraits: Venturi, Cézanne, son art—son œuvre, op. cit., pp. 72, (cat nos 21, 1509). John Rewald rejects this, noting ‘it seems difficult to identify the model with Cézanne as he appears in the photograph of 1861 [fig. 5C.2] and in his portraits’ [R 72] Portrait de Paul Cézanne (1862–1864) (fig. 5C.1) and [R 77] Portrait de Cézanne aux longs cheveux (c.1865) (fig. 5C.18); Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 82, 83. Rewald also wonders if [R 71] Portrait d’homme barbu (1862–1864) (o/c (35 x 27), Museum of Nagaoka, Niigata) is ‘a study after a sixteenth-century portrait’: ibid., p. 82.
the works he painted after, extending, thereby, what was remarked upon above in regards to the formal and compositional quirks likewise introduced into his copies after engravings discussed in chapter three and five.

Attention will then turn to the three paintings that, although apparently not copied after individual works, might be, and have been, interpreted as either pastiches of various other actual works or, at the very least, paraphrases of conventional pictorial structures. Hence, what is of interest here is the degree to which Cézanne’s appropriation of pictorial convention, as genre and/or classical allegory, for instance, draws attention to, or not, precisely such structures. A comparison is then drawn between the parodic engagement with literary tradition evinced by Cézanne’s earlier poetic attempts discussed in chapter two and his pictorial efforts of the mid- to late 1860s. In turn, this use of pictorial convention will be compared, albeit briefly and rather crudely, to Manet’s, the intention being to preface a possible differentiation between these two artists specifically in terms Cézanne’s copying as emphatically grounded in issues imagic. That is, Cézanne’s activities as possible pasticheur will be characterized as working directly from actual images rather than from life, whereas Manet’s work in a similar vein will be seen more as the assembly of scenes painted from life, but in poses mimicking past art. An attempt is also made to highlight the kinds of formal effects Cézanne’s approach might have entailed, effects then more fully visible in the paintings discussed next chapter. Finally, and still, in a sense, through comparison with Manet’s appropriation with imagery from past art, Cézanne’s peculiarly image-based engagement will be considered in terms of the interpretations it has provoked, particularly the view that it constitutes an authentic imprinting, through transgression, of specific biographical content deemed, thereby, foundationally irrepressible.

However, before any of this discussion can be undertaken, some attention needs to be given to the contexts within which the works discussed were produced, in terms not only of their place within Cézanne’s developing œuvre, but also of contemporary artistic practices more generally. For, as already alluded to, and as will quickly become obvious, an importantly central component of the background to much of the discussion in this and the following chapter are precisely issues of originality in terms of transgression. In short, what is suggested is that it is at the end of the period 1862–1865, that the character of Cézanne as rebel artist, exemplified both by the kinds of
work he was producing as well as their persistent rejection from the Salon, beginning
in 1864 and culminating in the caricature quoted, for instance, at the beginning of next
chapter, would seem to have first emerged. As such, perhaps the most immediately
visible aspect of this move towards transgression, the use of impasto as a self-
authenticating sign of originality will also be discussed, an approach to the application
of paint embodying, in many senses, Cézanne’s oft-cited desire, penned in a letter to
Pissarro at the beginning of 1865, to make the ‘Institut blush with fury and despair’.

Finally, some attempt will also be made to determine the influences past masters
might have had on Cézanne’s aside. Mention will therefore be made of his tandem
copying of paintings by Poussin and Delacroix, an eclectic conjunction standing as
metaphor not only of a development predicated on the conflating of multiple stylistic
and technical approaches, but also, more subtly and in terms of thematics, the
propensity for Cézanne’s early works to embody, almost essentially, ambivalence and,
thereby, aporia, a signalling that is often, and perhaps idiosyncratically, conjoined
with themes of death.

---

7 According to John Rewald, Cézanne submitted works to each Salon of the years 1864–1870,
but was rejected on every occasion. However, the identities of most of these works remain
elusive. The exceptions comprise [R 94] Portrait de Valabrège (spring 1866) (o/c (116 x 98),
National Gallery of Art, Washington), which, according to comments in the letters of Antony
Valabrège and Fortuné Marion was submitted in 1866, and famously referred to by one jury
member as having been ‘painted with a pistol’, and [R 139] Portrait du peintre Achille
Empereur (1867–1868) (fig. 6A.13(b)), which, according to the above-cited Stock caricature
(fig. 6.1), was submitted in 1870: Antony Valabrège, quoted in by Fortuné Marion, in a letter
to Heinrich Morstatt, 12 April 1866, cited in Scolari and Barr, ‘Cézanne d’après les lettres de
Marion a Morstatt 1865–1868,’ op. cit., p. 46; Arnold Mortier, in L’ Europe politique,
scientifique, commerciale, industrielle et littéraire, cited by F. Magnard in ‘Paris au jour le
jour,’ in Le Figaro, 8 April 1867, p. [2]; Zola, letter to Valabrège, 4 April 1867, cited in Zola,
Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 486; Fortuné Marion, letter to Heinrich Morstatt, 27 April
1868, cited in Scolari and Barr, ‘Cézanne d’après les lettres de Marion a Morstatt 1865–1868,’
op. cit., p. 48; Marie Cézanne, letter to Paul Cézanne, 5 April 1869, cited and translated in
Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented edition, op. cit.; Stock, “‘Le Salon’ par Stock,” op.
cit.; Rewald, History of Impressionism, op. cit., pp. 107, 134.

5A: ‘...il peint avec excès’

Of the paintings cited above as possibly executed by Cézanne in the period 1862–1865, only three would seem securely dateable by virtue of their bearing signature dates. These are the portraits [R 75] Tête de femme (portrait présumé de Madame Zola) (1864) (fig. 5A.1) and [R 74] Tête d’homme (1865) (fig. 5A.2), and the still-life [R 82] Le Pain et les œufs (1865). Whether or not the presence of such inscriptions indicate the paintings were submitted to the Salon, perhaps as Cézanne’s otherwise unidentified rejections of 1864 and 1865, or, as Robert Ratcliffe suggests, presented to Cézanne’s friends, they would seem to suggest, at the very least, their being deemed by their creator not only finished, but also worthy attempts. These paintings would
seem to stand, thereby, as important culminating stages in Cézanne’s development, a progressive move towards modes of pictorial expression more idiosyncratic and therefore reflective, perhaps, of Zola’s comment, in response to Cézanne’s proposed plan of splitting his time between Provence and Paris cited at the beginning of this chapter, of the desirability of ‘developing some originality, if one has it.’

Paralleling to an extent Cézanne’s development, and specifically in relation to this notion of originality, this period also marked Zola’s emergence as a vocal and at times controversial art critic. Within a few short years he had transformed from an admirer of spiritualistes such as Ary Scheffer and Jean Goujon into a provocative advocate of naturalism, a reconfiguration of Baudelaire’s link between originality and artistic tempérament perhaps best encapsulated by his 1865 aphorism, ‘a work of art is a corner of creation seen through a tempérament.’ Whether or not Zola’s various writings on art closely reflected Cézanne’s own opinions, the term tempérament seems to have borne specifically important connotations for the artist up until his death, particularly in regard to its relation to authenticating individuality. Hence, he could advise Émile Bernard, in a letter written but a year before his death, ‘we should each try to express ourselves according to our personal tempérament.’

cited in Scolari and Barr, ‘Cézanne après les lettres de Marion à Morstatt,’ op. cit., p. 51; Ratcliffe, Cézanne’s Working Methods, op. cit., p. 230. Henri Loyrette

11 Je crois que c’est une façon de se soustraire aux influences des écoles et de développer quelque originalité si l’on en a’: Zola, letter to Cézanne, 29 September 1862, op. cit., p. 324.

12 ‘Ma définition d’une œuvre d’art serait, si je la formulais: “Une œuvre d’art est un coin de la création vu à travers un tempérament”’: Émile Zola, ‘Prudhon et Courbet,’ in Émile Zola, Mes haines: Causeries litteraires et artistiques; Mon salon (1866); Édouard Manet: Étude biographique et critique. Paris: Bibliothèque Charpentier, 1907, p. 25. Zola’s ‘Prudhon et Courbet’ article was first published in two parts, on 26 July and 31 August 1865, in the Lyonnaise newspaper Le Salut Public. On the importance of tempérament for Baudelaire, take for instance, his comments; ‘Ainsi un point de vue plus large sera l’individualisme bien entendu: commander à l’artiste la naturé et l’expression sincère de son tempérament, aidée par tous les moyens que lui fournît son métier. Qui n’a pas de tempérament n’est pas digne de faire des tableaux, et,—comme nous sommes las des imitateurs, et surtout des éclectiques,—doit entrer comme ouvrier au service d’un peintre à tempérament’: Charles Baudelaire, ‘À quoi bon la critique?’ in Salon de 1846, op. cit., p. 46. Or ‘Dans les scènes touchantes produites par les passions, le grand peintre des temps modernes, si jamais il paraît, donnera à chacune de ses personnes la beauté idéale tirée du tempérament fait pour sentir le plus vivement l’effet de cette passion’: Charles Baudelaire, ‘De l’idéal et du modèle,’ in ibid., p. 81. The term was also taken up by advocates of Realism such as Edmund Durany, whose 1856 declaration that true artists should seek to render their sensation of experience strictly in terms of their tempérament: Edmund Durany, ‘Réalisme,’ Le Réalisme, no. 1 (15 November 1856), pp. 1–2.

13 ‘...cherchons nous exprimer suivant notre tempérament personnel’: Bernurd, ‘Souvenirs sur Paul Cézanne et lettres inédites [part two],’ op. cit., p. 623
In terms of Cézanne's conception during the 1860s of how such expression might best be achieved, this seems initially and most visibly linked to the development of a forceful and emphatic paint application. Hence, a certain progression in regards to increasingly impasted paint surfaces is detectable in his above-cited signed portraits, from the 1864 [R 75] Tête de femme (portrait présumé de Madame Zola) (fig. 5A.1), through the 1865 [R 74] Tête d'homme (fig. 5A.2), and culminating in the paste-like tumult typical of many of his 1866 works, exemplified, perhaps, by [R 116] Portrait de l'artiste (c.1866) (figs 5A.3, 5C.19). Likewise, a similar trajectory towards this same style, later purportedly labelled by Cézanne his 'manière couillarde', is discernible in his landscapes (figs 5A.4–7), an arc albeit dependent for its datings partly upon the signed and dated portraits just described.  

In any case, whenever deemed to have begun, Cézanne's move towards increasingly impasted surfaces and, more specifically, his extensive use of the paint knife, is often compared to Courbet's more extreme textural experiments, and, as such, that painter is often cited as defining influence on Cézanne's adoption of such practices.  

---

14 On the couillarde quote, see: above, p. _ n._. As Robert Ratcliffe and Paul Smith have noted, there seems some resonance between Cézanne's use of the word 'couillarde ['ballsy']' in relation to tempérament and certain of Stendhal's ideas expressed in Histoire de la peinture en Italie, which Cézanne had read by at least 1869. For instance, in that work, Stendhal invoked the ancient conception of artists' individual styles as related to an excess in a particular one of the six humours and, as such, Smith suggests couillarde's testicular overtones might be evidence that Cézanne's early painterly style was an attempt to enact the 'bilious' painter, whom Stendhal 'explicitly acknowledged the influence of the 'seminal humour' on': Paul Smith, 'Cézanne's primitive self and related fictions,' in Charles G. Salas (ed.), The Life and the Work: Art and Biography, Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2007, pp. 2–4. On the possible influence of Stendhal more generally upon Cézanne, particularly later in life, see: Ratcliffe, Cézanne's Working Methods, op. cit., pp. 312–327. On the relation between Zola and Cézanne's conception of tempérament and its identification with a specifically Provençal conception of masculinity, see: Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., pp. 26–28.

15 Cézanne's impasted techniques, especially in his landscapes, has also been occasionally linked to the Provençal landscapists Émile Loubon and Paul Guigou, particularly the latter, whose 'disdain for the finished surface' and 'oily technique' has been compared to some of Cézanne's landscapes of the later 1860s: Lionello Venturi, 'The early style of Cézanne and the Post-Impressionists,' Parnassus, vol. 9, no. 3 (March 1937), p. 18. See also: Venturi, Cézanne, son art—son œuvre, op. cit., p. 16; Lionello Venturi, 'A new appreciation of Monticelli,' Burlington Magazine, vol. 72, no. 419 (February 1938), p. 75; Venturi, Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 55–56. However, although certain of Cézanne's landscapes of the late 1860s and early 1870s, for instance [R 179] Les Quais de Berey (1870–1871) (o/c (73 x 92) PC), bear some resemblance to Guigou's canvases, these are by no means the more emphatically impasted of Cézanne's efforts. That is, if there was influence from Guigou, it seems to have been more in terms of Cézanne's works with less overloaded facture. Venturi also suggests the possibility of
however, might be less direct than is often implied. For, as Christopher Campbell notes, Cézanne’s use of the paint knife was somewhat, but perhaps fundamentally, different to Courbet’s. Hence, whereas the latter used the paint knife chiefly to blend paint hues on the canvas, thereby creating multi-layered textural effects, Cézanne, as well as Pissarro, used that same implement to apply paint in unmodulated hues directly to the canvas, using thick buttery slabs to create not only a more visible paint surface, but also a more homogenous one. In fact, if Cézanne’s early emphasis on visible facture was extrapolated from anyone’s technique, it might as much have come from Manet, Cézanne reportedly telling Denis, for instance and when asked about his transition out of the ‘vehemence’ of his 1860s style, ‘when I begin I endeavour always to paint with a full impasto like Manet, giving the form with the brush. Likewise, Antoine Guillemet, when describing in a letter to Francisco Oller of 1866 certain of Cézanne’s painted studies, compared their extreme surfaces effects not to Courbet, but to Manet; ‘[they] are superb in audacity: it makes Manet look like Ingres.

an affinity between Cézanne’s 1860s impasto with the Marseilles-born Adolphe Monticelli, whom Cézanne certainly became close with on the 1880s, but might have met in Paris in the mid-1860s: Venturi, Cézanne, son arte—son œuvre, op. cit., p. 16. However, Monticelli’s more full-bodied impasto wasn’t developed until well into the 1870s, and his densely flecked and scintillating canvases of the late 1850s and early 1860s have little in common with the knife-applied facture more usually associated with Cézanne’s manière couillarde. Indeed, Monticelli’s paintings of this period are mostly fête-galante scenes reminiscent of Watteau, but painted in a much darker, high-contrast, and far more cursory manner; see, for instance, Scène champêtre—Repas des moissonneurs (c.1858) (o/c 24 x 32), Musée Grobet-Labadie, Marseilles and Figures in the Woods (1857–1862) (o/c 46.2 x 37.5), Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland. If comparison with Cézanne’s canvases of the 1860s can be made, it is chiefly in terms of colouration, and then only in regard to Cézanne’s depictions of nymphs and satyrs, a loosely-painted and dark-tinged series perhaps beginning with the below-discussed [R 76] Loth et ses filles (c.1865 or earlier) (fig. 5B.3). On the possibility of Monticelli meeting Cézanne in the 1860s, but with similar doubts raised regarding anything but the most general stylistic influence between the two painters, see: Charles Garibaldi and Mario Garibaldo, Monticelli, Geneva: Skira, 1991, p. 54. On their later relationship in the 1880s, see: ibid., pp. 133–137.


In that same letter to Oller, Guillemet referred to Cézanne as ‘ton élève’, a phrase leading Joachim Pissarro to suspect Cézanne had in fact been Oller’s student.\(^{19}\) He also points out a change in the formality of Cézanne’s two letters to Pissarro over the years 1865 to 1866, noting this could indicate that even though the latter might have met Cézanne as early as 1861, as mentioned above, ‘It was not until several years later that they actually became close friends.’\(^{20}\) In any case, it seems that by 1866 impasto had become somewhat of a defining badge of these artists’ collective originality, a ‘synecdoche for a manifesto in and of itself’ by which Cézanne, Pissarro, Guillemet, and Oller opposed themselves both to the conventionality of the annual Salon, as well as the less texturally dynamic avant-gardism of the likes of Manet.\(^{21}\) It not only symbolized their revolutionary stance, it was also axiomatically integral to their approach.

\[\text{[I]mpasto and a perfect pitch—this is the only goal you should strive for.}\]
\[\text{[...][G]et hold of the insurrection knife. Let us destroy and build again.}\]
\[\text{[...] Let’s all build up paint with full impasto and dance upon the bellies of these horrified bourgeois.}\]\(^{22}\)

The tendency towards emphasising the paint surface, and, in particular, the affective resonance such practices might be seen as intending to evoke in terms of spontaneity, cannot be disassociated from broader contexts of artistic discourse in Paris at the time. For, painterly finish had come to stand precisely in such contexts as emblem of a dynamic of contestation regarding the notion of originality and its relation to artistic process, a conflict crudely reducible to the opposed poles of academicism, with its

---


\(^{20}\) ‘The first known letter by Cézanne to Pissarro, dated March 15, 1865 […], started with the rather formal expression: “Monsieur Pissarro.” The tone of the letter was solicitous, Cézanne being uncharacteristically polite. […] A year later the formal address, “Monsieur Pissarro,” had become the much more cordial and familiar address: “mon cher ami”’: Pissarro, *Pioneering Modern Painting: Cézanne and Pissarro 1865–1885*, op. cit., p. 40.


\(^{22}\) Guillemet, letter to Oller, 12 September 1866, op. cit., p. 37.
refined and polished surfaces, and the more spontaneous and sketch-like affects favoured by the independents. To paraphrase Albert Boime's characterization of the 1863 Salon des Refusés, perhaps the exemplary and culminating eruptive moment of just this debate, the battle was between sketchers and finishers, between those favouring 'generative' phases of artistic production over 'executive' ones. In terms of its origins, this rupture came, Boime suggests, from within academic practice itself, representing, in a sense, a re-orientation of emphasis towards earlier components of what had once been a continuity of procedure. Hence, the étude (study from life) and esquisse (compositional study), formerly academic preparatory steps, had come to be seen by many younger artists as a useful resource from which affects, as effet, might be plundered in creating a revivified form of painting based on spontaneity. That is, the sketch, or the appearance of having been sketched, began to be seen as a site for presenting both originality and contemporaneity. The preparatory study became already potentially art. For the academics, such a propositional was axiomatically impossible. For them, originality, or at least the 'genius' that was deemed to animate sanctioned artworks, was purely the embodiment of the notion of fini, a term that encapsulated not only the final polishing by which all signs of brushwork in a painting were effaced, but also the deliberately contrived and hierarchically applied composition through which its various parts were co-related, a


24 'A quarrel that began over whether or not a sketch was indicative of ability to execute a finished work seems to have culminated with a quarrel over the relative superiority of one over the other': Boime, The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth Century, op. cit., p. 80. 25 In terms of the distinction between the esquisse and the étude, the former 'was the result of spontaneous inspiration arising from the artist's imagination'; the latter, in contrast, 'grew directly out of nature': ibid., p. 138. Richard Shiff astutely maps this disjunction onto his own distinction between contrasting theories of art based on 'making' and 'finding': 'The esquisse [...] carries the connotation of invention, and intellectual ordering of given elements; the étude seems less self-consciously creative, more of a passive finding or discovery': Shiff, Cézanne and the end of Impressionism, op. cit., p. 74.
structure itself passed down, as imitation, from the ‘original’ genius of the classical period.\[26\]

Aside from providing a generalized context for Cézanne’s development, the raising of terms such as *esquisse* and *étude*, also offers the opportunity to insert a caveat regarding any discussion of Cézanne’s paintings of this period, particularly his landscapes. For, the degree to which such works, particularly those unsigned, might, or, more importantly, might not, represent finished works rather than, for instance, *esquisses* or *études* undertaken as training exercises or preparatory studies for further studio refinement, would seem difficult to determine. Moreover, if the conception of Cézanne as having arrived in Paris in 1861, or even 1862, already a staunch anti-academic is resisted, as is argued above, and keeping in mind the points just raised in regard to the possible integral relation between academic procedure and the development of independent painting as its offshoot, rather than antithesis, the transition from Cézanne’s operation as a clumsy academic to a painter deliberately deploying affects of immediacy in order to express ‘originality’, might likewise be a blurred boundary difficult to define.

In any case, in terms of possible historical triggers for Cézanne’s re-orientation aside, perhaps, from the most likely, his failure to gain acceptance to the École des Beaux-Arts, an obvious candidate is the above-mentioned Salon des Refusés, an event Albert Boime, for instance, suggests ‘may well represent the most decisive institutional development in the progress of modern art.’\[27\] Whether or not Cézanne contributed...

---


\[27\] Boime, ‘The Salon des Refusés and the evolution of modern art,’ op. cit., p. 411. Ordered by Napoléon III in response to complaints received regarding the unusually harsh Salon selection for that year, the Salon des Refusés enabled artists to display, under official aegis, rejected works in an annexe of the actual Salon, a decision made, it seems, partly to mollify dissent, and partly to demonstrate the Jury’s wisdom by displaying the worst contributions most prominently; *‘De nombreuses réclamations sont parvenues à l’empereur au sujet des œuvres d’art qui ont été refusées par le jury de l’Exposition. Sa Majesté, voulant laisser le public juge de la légitimité de ces réclamations, a décidé que les œuvres d’art qui ont été refusées seraient exposées dans une autre partie du Palais de l’Industrie*’ extract from a notice published in *Le Moniteur*, 24 April, 1863, reprinted in *Catalogue des ouvrages de peinture, sculpture, gravure, lithographie et architecture refusés par le Jury de 1863 et exposés, par décision de S. M. l’Empereur, au Salon annexe*, exhibition catalogue (Palais de l’Industrie, Paris, 15 May–?), Paris: Les Beaux-Arts, 1863, p. [1]; Boime, ‘The Salon des Refusés and the evolution of modern art,’ op. cit., pp. 413–415. Artists were also given the option to withdraw their works, which many promptly did, some 600 of the rejected works not appearing.
works to that exhibition, as is often suggested, the event certainly seems to have fired
his imagination. Hence, Zola could still recall, in preparatory notes for his novel
*L'Œuvre* made twenty years after the fact, returning from the exhibition with Cézanne
and the 'great discussions' they had. Then, in 1866, with its viability of the Refusés
as an on-going enterprise lapsing following a dismal 1864 season, Cézanne could
famously write, twice, to Émilien Nieuwerkerke, the Surintendant des Beaux-Arts,
demanding its reinstatement. The 1863 exhibition seems to have offered Cézanne,
as it did for many young artists of the time, a fraternal validation, giving indication
that forms and styles outside the strictly academic were not only possible, but also,
through the scandal the show provoked, capable of gaining attention. For an artist
perhaps coming to the realization that their capabilities might not be up to the rigorous
standards of the École des Beaux-Arts and the academicism it promulgated, such an
example might well have been inspiring in the extreme. In fact, Théophile Thoré's

---

in the catalogue; 'Cette Exposition s'ouvrira le 15 mai. Les artistes ont fust qu’au 7 mai pour
retirer leurs œuvres. Passé ce délai, leurs tableaux seront considérés comme non retirés, et
seront placés dans les galeries': extract from a notice published in *Le Moniteur*, 24 April,
1863, op. cit., p. [i]; Boime, 'The Salon des Refusés and the evolution of modern art,' op. cit.,
p. 413.

28 For suggestions of Cézanne exhibiting at the 1863 Salon des Refusés, see: Rewald, *History
of Impressionism*, op. cit., p. 82; Rewald, *Paul Cézanne: A Biography*, op. cit., p. 37; Lewis,
*Cézanne’s Early Imagery*, op. cit., p. 115; Verdi, *Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 27. The evidence for
Cézanne’s participation is, however, ambiguous to say the least. His name doesn’t appear in
the catalogue, but the catalogue is known to have been incomplete. In terms of possible
positive evidence, this seems restricted to an exchange occurring several years later in the
pages of *Le Figaro*, when Francis Magnard included extracts from an article by Arnold Mortier
that had recently published in the ‘yellow dwarf’, the Frankfurt journal *L'Europe politique*,
in his own ‘Paris au jour le jour’ column of 8 April 1867. The extracts mentioned that Cézanne,
mistakenly called ‘M. Séasme’ was ‘le même qui provoqua, en 1863, une hilarité générale au
Salon des refusés—toujours!—par une toile représentant deux pieds de cochon en croix’:
Arnold Mortier, cited by F. Magnard in ‘Paris au jour le jour,’ *Le Figaro*, 8 April 1867, p. [2];
Four days later, *Le Figaro* printed a letter of Zola’s, in which his friend indignantly defended
him, ‘Je vous avoue que j’ai eu quelque peine à reconnaître sous le masque qu’on lui a collé
au visage, un de mes camarades de collège [sic]. M. Paul Cézanne [sic], qui n’a pas le
moindre pied de cochon dans son bagage artistique, jusqu’à présent du moins. [...] Il est vrai
que M. Paul Cézanne [sic] ne s’appellerait jamais M. Séasme, et que, quoi qu’il arrive, il ne
sera jamais l’auteur de “deux pieds de cochon en croix”’: Émile Zola, cited in
‘Correspondance,’ *Le Figaro*, 12 April 1867, [p. 2]. Hence, although Zola did not deny
Cézanne exhibited at the Salon des Refusés, he did reject the only recorded attribution of a
painting by Cézanne at that show. There was a painting listed in the Salon des Refusés
catalogue entitled *Pieds de porc*, but this was by the otherwise unknown painter Robert
Graham: *Catalogue des ouvrages de peinture, sculpture, gravure, lithographie et architecture
refusés par le Jury de 1863*, op. cit., p. 21 (cat. 201).

29 Zola, *Le Dossier préparatoire du roman [L’Œuvre]*, op. cit., p. 163, cited and translated in

30 Paul Cézanne, letter to Émilien Nieuwerkerke, 19 April 1866, cited and translated in
attempt to encapsulate, in his review of the Salon des Refusés, precisely what unified
the work displayed in an otherwise disparate show, might well be taken as a
description of Cézanne's painting of the late 1860s.

Instead of seeking [...] what the lovers of classicism call fini, they aspire to
expressing effet in all its striking unity, unworried by the correction of
lines or the minutiae of details.31

The Salon des Refusés was also the primary impetus by which Manet's place as de
facto leader of the 'nouvelle école' of the mid-1860s, and thereby avant-garde
exemplar, was cemented, mostly by virtue of his Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe (1863) (fig.
5A.8) submission, a painting famously appropriating, although this was not
necessarily noted at the time, the river gods group from Marcantonio Raimondi's
Judgement of Paris (fig. 5A.9) an engraving itself after a lost design by Raffaello
Sanzio.32 Aside from any other possible influence Manet's example might have
offered Cézanne, in terms both of his positioning within the art world as well as his
transgressive approach to painting, it is worth noting this coincident engagement with
engraved imagery after past art, offering, as it does, a useful opportunity to foreground
some possibly intrinsic differences in Manet and Cézanne's respective articulations of
such engagement.

Manet's practice of copying after engravings, at least as epitomized by Le Déjeuner
sur l'herbe (fig. 5A.8), would appear to have been grounded in the repeating of poses

31 'Au lieu de chercher ... ce que les amateurs classiques appellent le fini, on aspire à rendre
l'effet dans son unité frappante, sans souci de la correction des lignes ni de la minutie des
art,' op. cit., p. 414.

32 On Manet's notoriety on the back of his appearance at the 1863 Salon des Refusés, see, for
instance: Desnoyers, Salon de Refusés: La Peinture en 1863, op. cit., p. 41; Fried, 'Manet in
his generation,' op. cit., pp. 22–24. The literature on Manet's appropriation of the figure group
from the Raimondi engraving (fig. 5A.9) in Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe (1863) (fig. 5A.8) is vast;
see, for instance: Alain Krell, 'Manet's "Déjeuner sur l'herbe: A reappraisal," Art Bulletin,
Investigation of the Artist's Working Processes, introductory essay by John House, exhibition
Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1996, pp. 61–76; Joanna Szczepinska-Tramer, 'Manet et
Lassoe, 'Edouard Manet's "Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe" as a veiled allegory of painting,' Artibus
from the images copied rather than the copying of the images themselves. That is, he painted his models, at least in the case of the human figures, in poses mimicking those held in the cited engravings, rather than painting directly from the engravings themselves, or from drawn studies after these. The transformative aspect of such appropriation formally, then, is in terms still specific to a relation with reality, albeit one deliberately staged in order to invoke, apparently, themes of contemporaneity. Hence, and in line with this, certain of the more transgressive aspects of Manet’s style seem borrowed from photography, for instance the peculiar flattening and increased contrast imitative, it seems, of frontal flash lighting. Importantly, however, such affects were applied to the depiction of three dimensional models. In contrast, Cézanne’s involvement with pastiche would seem more consistently an interaction with two-dimensionality, the transformative aspect of the resultant works, in terms of formal deformation, derived from the inherently two-dimensional aspects of his models. In short, and in regard to the citation of past art, whereas Manet might still be seen as imaging a present, albeit deliberately artificial, actuality, Cézanne might be seen as actualizing the presence of imagery.

Returning to matters more biographical, and, in particular, the tracing of Cézanne’s move away from more conventional modes of painterly approach, Cézanne, according to Ambroise Vollard, immediately upon his return to the capital at the end of 1862, once again sat the École de Beaux-Arts concours de. He was, however, unsuccessful, Vollard quoting one of the examiners, a certain Mottez, who purportedly noted ‘Cézanne has the proper tempérament for a colourist; [but] unfortunately, his

33 Hence, in regards to the central figure group of Le Déjeuner sur l’herbe (1863) (fig. 5A.8), this was arranged in Manet’s studio with Victorine Merent posing as the nude, Manet’s future brother-in-law Ferdinand Leenhoff as the central male, and either of Manet’s brothers Eugene or Gustave for the male on the right: Margaret Armbrust-Seibert, A Biography of Victorine-Meurent and Her Role in the Art of Edouard Manet, Columbus: Ohio State University, 1986, vol. 1, pp. 121–158; Henri Loyrette, ‘[Catalogue notes for] Édouard Manet: “Le Déjeuner sur l’herbe”’, in Tinterow and Loyrette, Origins of Impressionism, op. cit., p. 402.


work is extreme.\(^{36}\) A few months later, Cézanne wrote a letter to Numa Coste, the only one surviving in his hand from that year, in which he included the following, possibly snide, remark:

According to [Jausserau] Félicien [a mutual friend from the Aix École de Dessin who was in Paris], Truphème has dethroned Delacroix, [he] is the only one who knows colour, and, thanks to a certain letter, is going to attend the Beaux-Arts. Don’t think I envy him.\(^{37}\)

That same letter also included vaguely disparaging remarks about the academician Émile Signol, the studio of which another former Aixois École de Dessin student, Aimable Lombard, was enrolled in.\(^{38}\) Hence, at least a wry ambivalence seems to have begun marking Cézanne’s attitude towards the Académie upon his return to Paris, perhaps as a result of his failing to gain entrance.

Nevertheless, as with his earlier sojourn, Cézanne tempered his program of self-directed study at the Académie Suisse with more conventional sessions with the Avignon-born Joseph-Thomas Chautard, an academic painter and friend of Cézanne’s old mentor Villevieille.\(^{39}\) That he would still actively seek the advice of an older...

---

\(^{36}\) ‘Cézanne a un tempérament de coloriste; par malheur, il peint avec excès’: [?] Mottez, quoted in Vollard, Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 24.

\(^{37}\) Paul Cézanne, letter to Numa Coste and Joseph-François Villevieille, 5 January 1863, cited and translated in Cézanne, Letters, revised and augmented, op. cit., p. 103. Translation modified slightly. As noted above in chapter three, Auguste Truphème was one of the success stories of the Aix-en-Provence École de Dessin, gaining not only a bursary of 800 francs from the civic authorities at the end of 1861 allowing him to travel to Paris but, also, as Cézanne’s comment makes clear in this letter, admission to the Académie des Beaux-Arts, presumably with the assistance of a letter from an unmentioned quarter, most likely an academician, inscription in that institution requiring not only successful participation in the Concours des places but also a letter of recommendation from a master: Règlements de l’École Royale et Spéciale des Beaux-Arts, Paris: n.p., 1839, Chapter 2, Article 6, cited in Boime, The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth Century, London: Phaidon, 1971, pp. 23, 191 nn. 5, 7; Ely, ‘Cézanne, l’École de Dessin et le Musée d’Aix,’ op. cit., p. 151. As part of the requirements of the scholarship, Truphème submitted a painting illustrating his progress, his study for Le Supplice de Prométhée, to the Musée d’Aix in 1865: loc. cit.

\(^{38}\) Lombard returned to Paris about a month ago, I learned, not without some difficulty, that he was attending Signol’s studio. That worthy gentleman provides rather conventional instruction that enables one to do what he does; it’s very pretty, but hardly admirable. To think that an intelligent young man should come to Paris only to be led astray’: Cézanne, letter to Coste and Villevieille, 5 January 1863, op. cit., p. 103.

\(^{39}\) As in the past [...] I’m going to the Suisse in the mornings from 8 to 1 and in the evenings from 7 to 10 [...] I go fairly often to see Monsieur Chautard, who is kind enough to go over my studies for me. The day after Christmas I had supper at their place, where I sampled the apéritif
painter emphatically outside avant-garde circles would thereby seem to suggest that he was not ready to entirely reject the skills academic training might offer. Likewise, he also continued his pre-Parisian habit of copying after other artists’ works in museums, registering for a copier’s pass at the Louvre at the end of 1863 and receiving permission, several months later, to paint after Nicolas Poussin’s famous pastoral *Et in Arcadia ego* (1638–1640) (fig. 5A.10). If Cézanne took up this opportunity, however, the resulting painting seems not to have survived, although a persistent interest in the imagery of Poussin’s canvas seems certainly attested, Cézanne executing, albeit only in fragmentary form, two sketched studies after the same work later in his career and owning, at the time of his death, a photographed reproduction of the painting you sent him, my good Monsieur Villevieille’: Paul Cézanne, letter to Numa Coste and Joseph Villevieille, 5 January 1863, cited and translated in Cézanne, *Letters*, revised and augmented, op. cit., p. 102. Joseph-Thomas Chautard (1821–?) was a student of Henri Lehmann and a candidate for the Académie’s Grand Prix de Rome in 1848; he exhibited paintings in the salons of 1866, 1867, 1868, his *Mise au tombeau* (1866) (o/c (140 x 195), Musée national du château de Pau, Pau) was purchased by the state from the 1866 Salon: Sybille Bellamy-Brown (ed.), *Procès-verbaux de l’Académie des beaux-arts. Tome huitième, 1845–1849*, Paris: École des chartes, 2008, pp. 309, 603.

40 *Cartes d’élèves, 1863, I.I.10*, card no. 2097. Archives du Louvre, cited and translated in Theodore Reff, ‘Copyists in the Louvre,’ *Art Bulletin*, vol. 46, no. 4 (December 1964), p. 555; *Enregistrement des copies de tableaux, Écoles française, allemande, flamande, hollandaise, et anglaise, 1863*, Archives du Louvre, p. 38, cited and translated in loc. cit; Cahn, ‘Chronology,’ op. cit., p. 532. Copying works within the Louvre was prohibited without permission from the Musée’s administrative office, which kept a series of registers recording the names of those requesting permission to copy, the address of the copyist, their teacher’s name, and the works they intended to copy: Reff, ‘Copyists in the Louvre,’ op. cit., p. 554. The relevant registers for the period 1850–1870 were *Registre des cartes d’artistes, 1850–1859 and 1860–63*, *Registre des cartes d’élèves, 1850–1859, 1860–1864, and 1865–1869*, *Registre des cartes des permissions de travaille, 1852–1860 and 1861–1865*, *Répertoire des cartes d’artistes, d’élèves, et permissions, 1853–1857 and 1858–1862*, *Enregistrement des copies de tableaux, Écoles italienne et espagnole, 1851–1856, Écoles française, allemande, flamande, hollandaise, et anglaise, 1851–1869*; ibid., pp. 554, 554 nn. 28, 29, 31. Cézanne inscribed himself as ‘student of Chesneau’, a reference it would seem, perhaps humorously intended, to the art critic Ernest Chesneau, who, although tentatively supportive of progressive art of the period, had described, for instance, in his review of the 1863 Salon des Refusés, that exhibition as the ‘salon des voizins’, condescendingly ending his article with the words ‘Does not art-criticism owe to itself the demonstration of compassion in regard to deformities of art that are not infectious, as in life one close eyes on the deformities of people one likes? One does not laugh at one’s ill friends, one nurses them [La critique ne se doit-elle pas à elle-même de se montrer pitoyable aux difformités de l’art qui ne sont pas contagieuses, comme dans la vie on ferme les yeux sur les difformités des gens que l’on aime? On ne rit pas de ses amis malades, on les soigne’]; Ernest Chesneau, ‘Salon annexe des ouvrages d’art refusés par le jury,’ *Le Constitutionnel*, 19 May 1863, p. [2]. Chesneau’s article, which in part discussed Manet’s contribution to the Salon des Refusés, was reprinted as the fifth chapter of his *L’Art et les artistes modernes en France et Angleterre*, published in the following year; Ernest Chesneau, ‘Salon annexe des ouvrages d’art refusés par le jury,’ in *L’Art et les artistes modernes en France et Angleterre*, Paris: Didier, 1864, pp. 182–197.
Despite this, Theodore Reff, for one, has expressed surprise that Cézanne would have chosen to copy Poussin's painting in 1864, indicating, thereby, an interest in styles outside his usually presumed romanticism. Aside from resisting the notion that an appreciation for Poussin would only develop later in Cézanne's life, as Reff suggests, Cézanne's 1864 interest in *Et in Arcadia ego* (fig. 5A.10) might also have simply been thematic. For, as evocation of the melancholic realization of death's inevitability, even in Arcadia, the painting would seem contiguous with Cézanne's own oft-cited fascination with the motif of death, and his interest in the antique pastoral. One interpretation of Poussin's painting's title, 'Even in Arcadia...

41 The later drawn copies are: [Ch 1011] *After Poussin: Arcadian Shepherd* (1887–1890) (pencil on sketchbook page (20.9 x 12.2), Kunstmuseum, Basel) and [Ch 1012], *After Poussin: Arcadian Shepherdess* (1887–1890) (pencil on sketchbook page (20.2 x 12.2), Kunstmuseum, Basel). On Cézanne's possession of a photograph of the work, see: Reff, 'Reproductions and books in Cézanne's studio,' op. cit., p. 304. Note also the comments of R. P. Rivière and Jacques Félix Simon Schnerb, who, when visiting Cézanne in 1905 observed 'At home he had on his wall a photograph of Poussin's *Bergers d'Arcadie*, the beauty of the subject pleased him. He loved Poussin, in whom reason guided a great natural facility': Rivière and Schnerb, 'L'Atelier de Paul Cézanne,' op. cit., p. 90.

42 Reff, 'Copyists in the Louvre,' op. cit., p. 555. In regards to Poussin's reputation amongst progressives in the 1860s, and thereby perhaps lessening the oft-presumed disjunction between Cézanne's early possible appreciation for Poussin and his admiration for Delacroix, discussed below, Richard Shiff points out that Poussin's exemplarity as an 'original classic' entailed he could be revered by academic and progressive alike, offering, in terms of he latter, 'a model for those who desire[d] artistic rejuvenation and independence': Shiff, *Cézanne and the End of Impressionism*, op. cit., p. 177. As part of this characterization, Shiff cites Paul Mantz's pertinent 1858 observation that Poussin's 'vigorous return to antique art constitutes the better part of his originality': Paul Mantz, 'Un nouveau livre sur le Poussin—1,' *L'Artiste*, nouv. ser. t. 4, livr. 3 (23 May 1858), p. 41, cited and translated in loc. cit.

43 Reff suggests Cézanne's interest in Poussin was only partial and acquired much later in life; on this, as well as Cézanne's relation to Poussin's work, particularly as articulated as a comparison between the two painter's purported classicism, a gesture beginning, for instance, in the writings of Émile Bernard and Maurice Denis, see; Reff, 'Cézanne and Poussin,' op. cit., pp. 150–174; Shiff, *Cézanne and the End of Impressionism*, op. cit., pp. 175–184; Richard Kendall, 'The figure in the landscape,' in Richard Kendall (ed.), *Cézanne and Poussin: A Symposium*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993, pp. 88–108.

am I [death], could even seem a distinct echo of the inscription ‘Mort règne en ces lieux’ included in Cézanne’s drawing posted to Zola at the beginning of 1859 (fig. 2.3). 

Adding to the impression of Cézanne’s early eclecticism of taste is his apparent copying, around the same time he was receiving permission to paint after Poussin, Delacroix. Hence, in a letter to Numa Coste of late February 1864 he wrote of not having touched his ‘galette after Delacroix’ for two months, a mention sometimes taken as reference to [R 172] La Barque de Dante, d’après Delacroix (c.1870), painted after Delacroix’s famous 1822 canvas (fig. 5A.11). John Rewald, for one,

45 On this drawing and Cézanne’s attached dialogue and poem, see section 2E.
46 Paul Cézanne, letter to Numa Coste, 27 February 1864, cited and translated in Cézanne, *Letters*, revised and augmented, op. cit., p. 105. In the most recent English edition of *Letters*, the word ‘galette’ is not included, being described as ‘undecipherable’: loc. cit. In Rewald’s biography of the artist, which likewise includes an extract of the letter, the word is again not included and described as ‘illegible’: Rewald, *Paul Cézanne: A Biography*, op. cit., p. 40. Robert Ratcliffe and Wayne Andersen, however, claim the missing word is ‘galette’, meaning, according to the latter, ‘tart, or any tasty morsel’: Ratcliffe, *Cézanne’s Working Methods*, op. cit., p. 4; Andersen, *The Youth of Cézanne and Zola*, op. cit., p. 212. Cézanne used the word again, in a letter to Zola of 1866, to describe a sketch he had included of a painting of his sister Rose; in *Letters*, this later use of the word ‘galette’ is translated as ‘waffle’: Paul Cézanne, letter to Émile Zola, [c.19 October 1866], cited and translated in Cézanne, *Letters*, revised and augmented, op. cit., p. 118. For suggestions of a possible relation between [R 172] La Barque de Dante, d’après Delacroix (c.1870) (o/c (25 x 33), PC) and Cézanne’s 1864 comment, see: Ratcliffe, *Cézanne’s Working Methods*, op. cit., p. 4; Sarah Lichtenstein, *‘Cézanne and Delacroix’,* *Art Bulletin*, vol. 46, no. 1 (March 1964), p. 56 n. 6; Gowing, ‘The early work of Paul Cézanne,’ op. cit., p. 9; Gowing, [Catalogue notes for] “The Barque of Dante”,’ in Gowing et al., *Cézanne: The Early Years 1859–1872*, op. cit., p. 78. Sarah Lichtenstein later rejected her earlier suggestion of this possible relation: Lichtenstein, ‘Cézanne’s copies and variants after Delacroix,’ op. cit., p. 117. Wayne Andersen and Isabelle Cahn both suggest the galette mentioned by Cézanne in his 1864 letter was after Delacroix’s La Barque de Dante (1822) (fig. 5A.11) without stating whether or not they likewise think the result was the surviving [R 172] La Barque de Dante, d’après Delacroix (c.1870) (o/c (25 x 33), PC): Cahn, ‘Chronology’, op. cit., p. 532; Andersen, *The Youth of Cézanne and Zola*, op. cit., p. 212. Interestingly, almost exactly two months before Cézanne had made his comment about not touching his galette after Delacroix for precisely this period of time, the *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* had published, in accompaniment to the first installment of a two-part article on Delacroix by Charles Blanc, a wood engraving by Pisan after *La Barque de Dante* (1822) (fig. 5A.11): Charles Blanc, ‘Eugène Delacroix (premier article),’ *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, t. 16, livr. 1 (1 January 1864), pp. 1–27. The reproductions after Delacroix’s works accompanying that article comprised: *La Barque du [sic] Dante*, wood engraving by Pisan after a drawing by Alphonse Masson (p. 9); *Le Massacre de Scio, tableau d’Eugène Delacroix*, wood engraving by Pisan after a drawing by Alphonse Masson (p. 13); *Deux médailles dessinées par Eugène Delacroix, d’après des antiques* (p. 19); *La Noce juive, tableau d’Eugène Delacroix*, wood engraving by Pisan after a drawing by Alphonse Masson (p. 25). Pisan’s engraving after *La Barque de Dante* had been first published in a 23 June 1855 issue of *L’Illustration*: Lee Johnson, *The Paintings of Eugène Delacroix: A Critical Catalogue: 1816–1831: Volume I: Text*, Oxford: Clarendin, 1981–1989, p. 73.
however, rejects such a connection, mostly on stylistic grounds, and prefers, like Lionello Venturi before him, to date the surviving copy to, at the earliest, a half-decade after Cézanne had written to Coste.\textsuperscript{47}

In any case, aside from Truphème's boastful comparison quoted by Cézanne and cited above, the reference still stands as Cézanne's earliest known expression of interest in the work of a painter whom he would hold in high regard for the rest of his life.\textsuperscript{48} Not only would he later collect Delacroix's paintings, as well as prints after them, he would also execute, across the span of his career, some twenty-seven drawn and painted copies and/or paraphrases after the master, many of which, like the Poussin canvas just mentioned, dealt intrinsically with the motif of death.\textsuperscript{49} Hence, and for instance, less than ten years after writing his letter, Cézanne would, according to Rewald's datings, not only copy Delacroix's depiction of Dante and Virgil travelling through hell, but also a painted paraphrase, as well as two drawn studies, of various of

---

\textsuperscript{47} Rewald, \emph{The Paintings of Paul Cézanne}, op. cit., p. 138. Venturi dated the painting '1870-1873'; Venturi, \emph{Cézanne, son art—son œuvre}, op. cit., p. 94 (cat. no. 125). Wayne Andersen, in a 1964 article, likewise suggests an early 1870s date for [R 172] \emph{La Barque de Dante, d'après Delacroix} (c.1870) (oil (25 x 33), PC), but based on an anecdote of Antonin Personnaz passed on to him by Kenneth Clark, that the former had, while visiting the Louvre with Pissarro, encountered Cézanne copying \emph{La Barque de Dante} (1822) (fig. 5A.11), at which point Pissarro had suggested Cézanne come with him to Pontoise; from this, Andersen thus surmises the date of Personnaz's remembered encounter as spring 1872, from which he then proposes the same date for [R 172] \emph{La Barque de Dante, d'après Delacroix} (c.1870) (oil (25 x 33), PC): Wayne Andersen, 'A Cézanne self-portrait drawing reidentified,' \emph{Burlington Magazine}, vol. 106, no. 735 (June 1964), pp. 285, 285 n. 4. As Theodore Reff and John Rewald point out, however, this reminiscence would seem faulty; the Delacroix painting was until 1874 in the Luxembourg rather than the Louvre, and there is, apart from the Personnaz anecdote, no evidence Cézanne did any painted copying in the Louvre after the mid-1860s anyway: Reff, 'Copyists in the Louvre,' op. cit., p. 555; Rewald, \emph{The Paintings of Paul Cézanne}, op. cit., p. 138. None of this, aside from Rewald's observation that an 1872 date for the painting seems too late on purely stylistic grounds, would rule out the possibility that Personnaz had in fact seen Cézanne copying \emph{La Barque de Dante} in the spring of 1872, but had simply, over the intervening years, mixed up his museums, encountering Cézanne in the Luxembourg, rather than the Louvre.

\textsuperscript{48} As cited above, Cézanne had mentioned Delacroix in an earlier letter, of 5 January 1863, but in more general terms of quoting another, 'According to Félicien, Truphème has dethroned Delacroix': Cézanne, letter to Numa Coste and Joseph-François Villevieille, 5 January 1863, cited and translated in Cézanne, \emph{Letters}, revised and augmented, op. cit., p. 103. As discussed below, Mary Tompkins Lewis has cited the possible influence of Delacroix on Cézanne's [R 92] \emph{Le Jugement de Pâris} (1862-1864) (fig. 5B.27), which she follows Lawrence Gowing's suggestion of a c.1861 dating for, as evidence of an even earlier interest in Delacroix; on this, see section 5B.

\textsuperscript{49} The reckoning is Sarah Lichtenstein's, from: Sarah Lichtenstein, 'Cézanne's copies and variants after Delacroix,' \emph{Apollo}, vol. 101, no. 156 (February 1975), p. 116.
the same artist’s portrayals of Hamlet and Horatio in the cemetery. Moreover, perhaps more poignantly, he carried a life-long desire to complete a monumentally-scaled *Apothéose de Delacroix*, a famously unfulfilled project to which seem related a

50 The painted paraphrase is *Hamlet et Horatio, d’après Delacroix* (1873–1874) (oil on paper mounted on canvas (21.9 x 19.4), PC); the drawn studies [Ch 325] *After Delacroix: ‘Hamlet and Horatio’* (1873) (black crayon on paper (25.5 x 24), PC) and [Ch 326] *After Delacroix: ‘Hamlet and Horatio’* (1873) (black crayon on blister paper (12.4 x 17), PC). Sarah Lichtenstein and Theodore Reff cite the painted paraphrase as related to Delacroix’s 1839 painting *Hamlet et Horatio au cimetière* (1839) (o/c (81.5 x 65.4), Musée du Louvre, Paris): Lichtenstein, ‘Cézanne and Delacroix,’ op. cit., p. 56 n. 6; Lichtenstein, ‘Cézanne’s copies and variants after Delacroix,’ op. cit., p. 119; Reff, ‘Cézanne: The severed head and the skull,’ op. cit., pp. 92–93. As this canvas was in private collections until its acquisition by the Louvre in 1993, however, if Cézanne based his painting upon its imagery, he must have relied on a reproduction, of which there were several, including a version published, for instance, in an 1860 issue of *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* and a photograph in Théophile Silvestre’s *Histoire des artistes vivants* series: *Hamlet devant les fossoyeurs, tableau du cabinet de M. Cottier*, engraving, by Pisan, after a drawing by Alphonse Masson, after Eugène Delacroix, published in *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, t. 5, livr. 4 (15 February 1860), p. 201; *Hamlet et les fossoyeurs. Tableau tiré de la Galerie de Mr Maurice Cottier* (1853), photograph by Victor Laisné, published in Théophile Silvestre, *Histoire des artistes vivants, français et étrangers, peintres, sculpteurs, architectes, graveurs, photographes. Études d’après nature*, nos 3–7 (?) (September 1853–April 1854?), plate 26. Silvestre’s *Histoire des artistes vivants* was an ambitious but short-lived series published, it seems, across the years 1853–1854. It featured commissioned photographed portraits of the artists each issue was devoted to, as well as photographs of their works. A cheaper version of the series was also re-published in 1856 but featuring, in place of the photographs, woodcut engravings after these. On Silvestre’s series more generally, see: Michèle Hanooch, ‘Théophile Silvestre’s “Histoire des artistes vivants”: Art Criticism and Photography,’ *Art Bulletin*, vol. 88, no. 4 (December 2006), pp. 729–755. Returning to Cézanne’s painted paraphrase, neither the just-cited woodcut, nor original painting, nor any other of the various reproductions made after it include in their depiction a scythe carried by one of the grave-diggers, as Cézanne’s does. Hence, recourse to an autograph lithograph by Delacroix from 1843, which does include such a feature, seems more likely, albeit, perhaps, through the intermediary of a published engraving of this, to account for a reversal: Eugène Delacroix, *Hamlet et Horatio devant les fossoyeurs* (1843), lithograph (28.6 x 21.4), Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris. John Rewald suggests Cézanne’s painting was based on a different version of the same scene by Delacroix, an 1828 autograph lithograph of which an impression was reportedly owned by Cézanne’s friend and patron Paul Gachet, *Hamlet contemplant le crâne de Yorick* (1828) (lithograph (36 x 27), Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris): Paul Ferdinand Gachet, Cézanne à Auvers: Cézanne graveur, Paris: Les Beaux-Arts, 1952, [not paginated]; Rewald, *The Paintings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 167. However, although Cézanne certainly seems to have drawn the two studies mentioned above—*After Delacroix: ‘Hamlet and Horatio’* (1873) (black crayon on paper (25.5 x 24), PC) and *After Delacroix: ‘Hamlet and Horatio’* (1873) (black crayon on blister paper (12.4 x 17), PC)—after this lithograph, its horizontal format, positioning of the standing figures, number of depicted grave-diggers, and the general outline of the background horizon make it unlikely to have been related to his painted version. On the drawings, see: Berthold, *Cézanne und die alien Meister*, op. cit., (cat. nos 244–245); Lichtenstein, ‘Cézanne and Delacroix,’ op. cit., p. 56 n. 6; Chappuis, *The Drawings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 118; Lichtenstein, ‘Cézanne’s copies and variants after Delacroix,’ op. cit., p. 119.
handful of surviving studies and painted sketches, some of which date back as far as the late 1860s.\footnote{51}{Jede l'ai dit déjà: le talent de Redon me plait beaucoup et je suis de cœur avec lui pour sentir et admirer Delacroix. Je ne sais si ma précaire santé me permettra de réaliser jamais mon rêve de faire son apotheose: Paul Cézanne, letter to Émile Bernard, 12 May 1904, reprinted in Bernard, Souvenirs sur Paul Cézanne et lettres inédites [part two], p. 618. The surviving sketches perhaps related to this planned painting, with Rewald's dates, are: [RWC 68] Apotheose de Delacroix (1878–1880 and later) (pencil, ink, and watercolour on paper (20 x 22), PC) and [R 746] Apotheose de Delacroix (1890–1894) (oil (27 x 35), Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence). However, the dating and hence relationship to each other of these painted sketches, is a contested field of inquiry; on the surviving painted sketches, as well as the likelihood or not of a painting featured in a photograph of Cézanne seated before his easel and dated, according to the recollections of his son, to 1894, being a separate work, see: Lichtenstein, Cézanne and Delacroix, op. cit., p. 55 n. 3; Theodore Reff, \''[Letters to the editor],' Art Bulletin, vol. 46, no. 3 (September 1964), p. 425; Sarah Lichtenstein, \'[Letters to the editor],' Art Bulletin, vol. 46, no. 3 (September 1964), p. 426; Wayne V. Andersen, Cézanne, Tanguy, Choquet [sic], Art Bulletin, vol. 49, no. 2 (June 1967), pp. 137–138; Robert Ratcliffe, \'Catalogue notes,' in Watercolour and Pencil Drawings by Cézanne: An Exhibition Organized by Northern Arts and the Arts Council of Great Britain, exhibition catalogue (Laing Art Gallery, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 19 September–4 November 1973; Hayward Gallery, London, 13 November–30 December 1973), London: Lund Humphries, 1973, cat. no. 35, pp. 156–157; Rewald, Paul Cézanne: The Watercolours, op. cit., pp. 102–103; Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 106–109; Reff, \'Review of \'The Paintings of Paul Cézanne,'\' op. cit., p. 801. Certain study elements related to these paintings, and, thereby, perhaps, the planned one, also survive: [Ch 174 (a–d)] (details) Man Kneeling, His Arms Raised (1866–1867) (soft pencil on sketchbook page (11.7 x 23.7), Kunstmuseum, Basel); and [RWC 69] Victor Choquet et un ange, étude pour \'L'Apothése de Delacroix\' (1878–1880 or later) (pencil, pen with India ink, gouache, and watercolour on sketchbook page (15.2 x 23.5), PC). On [Ch 174 (a–d)]'s possible relation to [R 746], see: Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 85.}

Testifying further to this interest in Delacroix beyond his actual works, Cézanne also seems to have executed, around the time he was writing to Coste, two portrait sketches of his hero, the signed [Ch 155] Portrait of Eugène Delacroix (1864–1866) (fig. 5A.14) and the detail from a page of unrelated studies [Ch 156(a)] (detail) Portrait of Delacroix (1864–1868) (fig. 5A.18).\footnote{52}{Adrien Chappuis questions the authenticity of the signature on [Ch 155] Portrait of Eugène Delacroix (1864–1866) (fig. 5A.14), but deems the drawing itself an authentic Cézanne: Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 82. Sarah Lichtenstein, although making no comment on the signature, agrees with Chappuis in regards to the attribution to Cézanne, offering up as evidence its similarity to the other Delacroix portrait, [Ch 156 (a)] (detail) Portrait of Delacroix (1864–1868) (fig. 5A.18), and, in particular, the style of the drawings on the sketch's verso, [Ch 192] Studies of Figures in Movement (1866–1869) (crayon on sketchbook page (18 x 24), Musée Calvet, Avignon): Sarah Lichtenstein, \'An unpublished portrait of Delacroix, and some figure sketches, by Cézanne,' Master Drawings, vol. 4, no. 1 (spring 1966), pp. 39–40.} In doing so, he thereby seems to have been enacting the same gesture of deference contemporaneously performed by Henri Fantin-Latour, whose 1864 Salon submission Homage de Delacroix (1864) (fig. 5A.10).
5A.12) depicted, as self-authenticating declamation of precedent, Fantin-Latour and his peers arranged around a portrait of the recently deceased painter, itself copied from a photograph of Delacroix taken by Victor Laisné in 1852 (fig. 5A.13). 53

In so embracing Delacroix as their ‘talismanic leader’, the emergent avant-garde reflected not only a desired kinship with that artist’s romantic individualism, but also the defining impact Delacroix’s work might offer contemporary artists in terms of technical originality. This was particularly the case following the massive posthumous sale of Delacroix’s studio effects at the Hôtel Drouot in February 1864, where literally thousands of drawings, as well as numerous unfinished paintings, compositional sketches, and observational studies went on display. 54 Offering inspiring insight into the painter’s creative process, the exhibits not only emphasized Delacroix’s dynamic and prolific genius, but also, importantly, offered young painters direct examples of precisely the kinds of intuitive and spontaneous affects they might


54 *Catalogue de la vente qui aura lieu par suite du décès de Eugène Delacroix*, exhibition catalogue (Hôtel Drouot, Paris, 16–29 February 1864), Paris: Imprimerie de J. Claye, 1864; Nina Maria Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, ‘Cézanne and Delacroix’s posthumous reputation,’ *Art Bulletin*, vol. 87, no. 1 (March 2005), p. 111. The exhibition and sale was staggered over a week: the paintings on 16–19 February, the drawings on 21–27 February, and the watercolours and prints on 28–29 February. The catalogue lists over 800 paintings, including unfinished works, studies, and copies. In terms of drawings, watercolours and prints, over 6000 individual sheets were included, as well as numerous of the master’s sketchbooks. Also sold was Delacroix’s collection of works by other painters, including, for instance, Gericault, many of which were themselves copies after other painters. See, also: Hubert Wellington, ‘Introduction,’ in Eugène Delacroix, *The Journal of Eugène Delacroix: A Selection*, edited by Hubert Wellington, translated by Lucy Norton, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980, p. xxviii. There was also a large retrospective exhibition of Delacroix’s paintings held later in the same year, organized by the Société Nationale des Beaux-Arts and featuring many works held in private collections: *Exposition des œuvres d’Eugène Delacroix [organisée par le] Société Nationale des Beaux-Arts*, exhibition catalogue (Gallery Martinet, Paris, August 1864), Paris: Imprimerie de J. Claye, 1864.
have been seeking as expressive form. As Frédéric Bazille, who had befriended Cézanne in 1863, could write, for instance, after visiting the sale, ‘You would not believe how much I learn looking at his pictures, one of these sessions is worth a month’s work.’ In fact, Robert Ratcliffe wonders if it was not Bazille who ‘opened Cézanne’s eyes’ to the potentialities of Delacroix’s example in the first place.

Whatever Cézanne’s relation to the avant-garde, and whether or not he was inspired by their own embrace of Delacroix, Cézanne’s purported portrait sketches of the master were, according to Sara Lichtenstein, possibly, like the portrait in Fantin-Latour’s Homage de Delacroix (1864) (fig. 5A.12), derived from photographs. In particular, Lichtenstein cites two portraits taken by Eugène Durieu in 1857 (fig. 5A.15) and 1858 (fig. 5A.19), after which she proposes Portrait of Eugène Delacroix (fig. 5A.14) and Portrait of Delacroix (fig. 5A.18) were copied, respectively.

55 ‘Vous ne sauriez croire combien j’apprends à regarder ses tableaux, une de ces séances vaut un mois de travail,’ Frédéric Bazille, letter to his parents, 25 February 1864, cited in Ratcliffe, Cézanne’s Working Methods, op. cit., p. 69. Cézanne’s acquaintance with Bazille by at least 1863 is based on the recollections of Auguste Renoir; ‘That year [1863] I became acquainted with Cézanne. I then had a small artist’s studio on the rue de la Cindamine, in the Batignolles district. [Frédéric] Bazille and I shared that studio. Bazille was returning one day and was accompanied by two young men: ‘I am bringing you two great new recruits!’ They were Cézanne and Pissarro’. Auguste Renoir, quoted in Ambroise Vollard, Auguste Renoir (1841-1919), Paris: Éditions G. Crès, 1920, pp. 32-33, cited and translated in Pissarro, Pioneering Modern Painting. Cézanne and Pissarro, op. cit., p. 29.

56 Ratcliffe, Cézanne’s Working Methods, op. cit., p. 69.


58 loc. cit. Adrien Chappuis agrees with Lichtenstein’s identifications regarding sources for the Cézanne sketches but suggests [Ch 156(a)] (detail) Portrait of Delacroix (1864–1868) (fig. 5A.18) was ‘more likely’ from a reproduction of the photograph cited by Lichtenstein than from the photograph itself; whether an engraving or some other such non-photographic medium is thereby implied is not elaborated upon: Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 82. Nina Maria Athanassoglou-Kallmyer mentions both sketches in passing, but seems to imply they were after the same Durieu photograph: Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, ‘Cézanne and Delacroix’s Posthumous Reputation,’ Art Bulletin, vol. 87, no. 1 (March 2005), pp. 111, 126 n. 3. Although the likelihood or not of Cézanne having easy access to Durieu’s photograph is an issue not touched upon by Lichtenstein, if the photographs were difficult to obtain, it is always possible Cézanne might have had recourse to engraved reproductions, for instance, in the case of the 1857 photograph (fig. 5A.15), the version by Alphonse Masson published in an 1859 edition of L’Artiste (fig. 5A.16). In regards to Eugène Durieu, he was not only an accomplished amateur photographer and close friend of Delacroix, but also collaborated with the artist throughout the 1850s in posing, taking, and compiling series of nude photographic studies as albums intended, partly, as painting aids. On Delacroix and his use and/or interest in photography, see: Van Deren Coke, ‘Two Delacroix drawings made from photographs,’ Art Journal, vol. 21, no. 3 (spring 1962), pp. 172-174; Sylvie Aubenas, ‘Les Photographies d’Eugène Delacroix,’ Revue de l’Art, no. 127 (2000-2001), pp. 62–69; Christophe Leribault (ed.), Delacroix et la photographie, with contributions by Sylvie
However, as Lichtenstein herself notes, such are the differences between Cézanne’s drawings and the photographs, that a relation ‘is not apparent at first glance.’ Nevertheless, the similarities are enough for her to propose such a connection, and the deviations are taken, thereby, as evidence of Cézanne’s developing style and deliberately transformative eye.

What these differences might also indicate, however, is the possibility of Cézanne’s recourse to other forms of imagery. Hence, there are similarities between Portrait of Eugène Delacroix (fig. 5A.14) and a Jean Gigoux woodcut (fig. 5A.17), particularly in the shape and outline of the hair, the length of the chin, and the outline of the right side of the face, that are not present in the photograph. Likewise, Portrait of Delacroix (fig. 5A.18) seems to bear closer resemblance, in terms of the oddly thickened nose, broader chin, and general outline of the hair and forehead, to Félix Bracquemond’s etched Portrait de Eugène Delacroix (1863) (fig. 5A.20) than to the photograph suggested by Lichtenstein (fig. 5A.19).

If they were portraits of Delacroix derived from imagery, Cézanne’s sketches nevertheless undoubtedly embodied some degree of transformation, perhaps even, in the case of Portrait of Eugène Delacroix (fig. 5A.14), conflation with his own features. Whether or not the degree to which these transformative details reflected,
then, affects repeated from print imagery, as just described, or Cézanne’s developing originality of approach applied when drawing from photographs, they nevertheless were derived in relation to imagery, rather than reality. Affects of spontaneous deformation more usually associated with the étude, the sketch from life, were being deployed in his depictions of imagery. Hence, he was not simply copying images, but sketching from them. In short, and to paraphrase Zola’s aphorism quoted above, the ‘corner of creation’ through which Cézanne’s tempérament might be seen expressed was, in such instances, not nature, but images of that nature often produced by others. Indeed, precisely this transformative gesture would seem likewise deployed in his earliest surviving painted self-portrait [R 72] Portrait de Paul Cézanne (1862–1864) (fig. 5C.1), a work, as discussed below, that was also executed after reproduced imagery, in this case definitively, it would seem, a photograph (fig. 5C.2).

Turning to drawings more usually presumed after live models, Adrien Chappuis suggests sixteen sheets of Cézanne’s académies were executed in the period 1862–1864, presumably at the Académie Suisse. To these can be added two drawings (figs 5A.28(a–b)) now in the collections of the Fitzwilliam and Ashmolean Museums and not catalogued by Chappuis, but likewise presumed executed at the Académie Suisse during Cézanne’s second stay in Paris.

---

63. 'Ma définition d’une oeuvre d’art serait, si je la formulais: “Une oeuvre d’art est un coin de la création vu à travers un tempérament”': Zola, 'Prudhon et Courbet,' op. cit., p. 25.

64. These are: [Ch 79] Seated Nude Model, Seen Back View (1862–1864) (fig. 5A.23), [Ch 80] Male Nude (1862–1864) (fig. 5A.24), [Ch 81] Man Lying on the Ground (1862–1865) (black crayon on laid paper (22.7 x 29.9), Boymans-van Beuningen Museum, Rotterdam), [Ch 93] Male Nude (1862–1865) (charcoal on paper (50.2 x 34), WU), [Ch 94] Male Nude (1863–1866) (charcoal on laid paper (28.5 x 19), WU), [Ch 95] Reclining Male Nude, Back View (1863–1865) (charcoal (n-d), WU), [Ch 96] Study of Nudes Diving (1863–1866) (pencil on paper (18 x 27), PC), [Ch 97] Male Nude (1863–1866) (fig. 5A.27(a), WU), [Ch 98] Male Nude (1863–1866) (fig. 5A.27(b)), [Ch 99] Male Nude (1863–1866) (fig. 5A.27(c)), [Ch 100] Male Nude, Leaning on His Elbow (1863–1866) (fig. 5A.22), [Ch 101] Seated Nude Model Leaning on His Elbow (c. 1863) (fig. 5A.21), [Ch 103] Male Nude, Back View (1863–1865) (pencil on sketchbook page (18 x 24), Hammer Galleries, New York), [Ch 107] Academy Studies: Feet and Knees (1864–1859) (black crayon on paper (31 x 48), WU), [Ch 108] Academy Studies: Head and Knees (1864–1869) (black crayon on laid paper), PC), [Ch 111] Male Nude and Caricature (1863–1866) (fig. 5A.25(a)).

As a group, and in line with some of the comments made above in regards to Cézanne’s move towards increasingly transgressive painterly approaches, these drawings display a considerable increase in diversity and freedom of expression compared to Cézanne’s earlier efforts discussed in chapter four (figs 4B.1–5, 4B.7–9). Some reflection of contemporary developments also seems evident, Cézanne like many artists of the time, including students at the École des Beaux-Arts, turning increasingly to the coarser and more spontaneous affects attainable through the use of charcoal rather than pencil. There is also evidence of some abandonment, perhaps deliberately and progressively, of the tighter and more concluding stages of academic technique, in particular the application of demi-teintes, along with the concomitant process of shading off, for the purpose of evoking volume. Hence, there is not only an increased emphasis on high-keyed contrasts and cursory but emphatic outlining, but also an allied phasing out of any interest in the delineation of surfaces. Hence, although in the case of, for instance, [Ch 101] Seated Nude Model Leaning on His Elbow (c.1863) (fig. 5A.21), [Ch 100] Male Nude, Leaning on His Elbow (1863–1866) (fig. 5A.22), and [Ch 79] (detail of) Seated Nude Model (1862–1864) (fig. 5A.23), some attempt has been made to trace the contours of surfaces through shading and modeling, in others, for instance [Ch] Study of a Male Nude (c.1863) (fig. 5A.28(a)) and [Ch] Academic Study of a Male Nude with his Right Hand Clenched across his Chest (c.1863) (fig. 5A.28(b)), the depiction of elements within the outline has been reduced to the mere noting of highlights such as the knees and iliac furrows. Combined with this graphic simplification, an increased tendency towards exaggeration is also evident, an affective presence ironically marked by the odd presence, on one of the sheets, of a caricature (fig. 5A.25(a)) mimicking, it seems, the work of artists such as Eugène Giraud (fig. 5A.26).

In regards to this increased emphasis on outline and coincident tendency toward exaggeration, it is also interesting to note the degree to which many of Cézanne’s académies of this period depict identical poses. Take, for instance, the pair [Ch 111] (detail of) Male Nude and Caricature (1863–1866) and [Ch 112] Male Nude (1867–1868) (figs 5A.25(a–b)), and the trio [Ch 77] Male Nude (1863–1866), [Ch 98] Male

---

66 See section 4B.
67 Nina Maria Athanassoglou-Kallmyer sees the conjunction as an ‘irreverent attempt to debunk the traditional académie exercise’; Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., p. 80.
Nude (1863–1866), and [Ch 99] Male Nude (1863–1866) (figs 5A.27(a–c)). Although such drawings might simply be depictions of the same model holding the same pose, it is also possible to see them as copies of one another. In the case of the first-mentioned pair (figs 5A.25(a–b)), for instance, this would in fact seem a necessary conclusion, at least if Chappuis’s date ranges, which do not overlap, are accepted. The suggested later drawing (fig. 5A.25(b)), then, by virtue of its similarity to the earlier, more complete drawing (fig. 5A.25(a)), surely its copy, rather than the coincidental repetition of a similar pose. Likewise, in terms of the trio of drawings (figs 5A.27(a–c)) seemingly depicting the same model as in the pair of drawings just described, the same observation might be made. That is, the less complete, but more dynamic, versions (figs 5A.27(a–b)), might not be exploratory studies in a series leading to the more complete version (fig. 5A.27(c)), but, rather, works derived, as copies, from it. Again, the same possible relation might also be suggested for the Fitzwilliam and Ashmolean pair (figs 5A.28(a–b)), which depict a model holding what appears to be a pose typical of Roman orators. 68 Hence, in discussing precisely this pair of académies, Christopher Lloyd notes how the left side of the torso depicted in the Ashmolean version (fig. 5A.28(b)) is ‘awkwardly realized’, in terms of anatomical correctness, in relation to the opposite shoulder, a relation that is ‘corrected’ in the Fitzwilliam version (fig. 5A.28(a)), with, however, a subsequent loss in ‘creative force’. 69 Now, although Lloyd does not proffer any explicit suggestion regarding the chronology of the drawings, there is a sense in which this contrast between the more ‘correct’ drawing (fig. 5A.28(a)) and the more visually arresting version with its ‘aggressive’ and ‘compulsive’ distortions heralding a ‘search for a new sense of style’ (fig. 5A.28(b)), nevertheless implies a certain evolutionary arc. 70

In any case, regardless of the order within which they were executed, it is pertinent to point out the degree to which the elements emphasized across series are specifically linear. For instance, in the case of the trio of Male Nudes (figs 5A.27(a–c)), the line defining the edge of the shadow falling across the neck and shoulder is given prominence in all three drawings, but attains, in the less complete versions (figs

---

69 loc. cit.
70 loc. cit. Interestingly, the face in the more drawing with the more ‘correct’ torso (fig. 5A.28(a)) is less structurally coherent than its partner (fig. 5A.28(b)).
5A.27(a–b) a degree of decorative independence completely outside any structural or illusory purpose. It is as if, in repeating imagery, the intrinsically graphical aspects of the process of drawing were not merely increasingly emphasized, but consciously extracted, as if the resultant deformations—the decorative linearity, exaggeration of outline, and simplification, etc.—were affects gleaned as much from drawing from drawings as drawing after life. In short, certain of the drawings just discussed, in particular those more indicative of his future styles, might not be, strictly speaking, académies but, rather, études executed after these. That these same drawings, or drawings like them, might then have served as the models for his later monumental Baigneuses paintings, as described, for instance, by Louise Krumrine, might also, thereby, indicate the degree to which a certain procedural reflexivity was inserted into his practice early on, as if here, in the mid-1860s, Cézanne’s practice began to appear as less the depiction of things as the depiction of pictures of things.71

5B: Painted copies and paraphrases, 1862–1864

Of the forty-three non-mural paintings suggested by John Rewald as possibly executed in the period 1862–1865, only two would seem copies, in the traditional sense, of paintings by other artists: [R 22] *Pêches dans un plat* (1862–1864) (fig. 5B.1) and [R 27] *Vue de Colisée à Rome, d’après F.-M. Granet* (1863–1865) (fig. 5B.4), which repeat imagery, respectively, of paintings in the collections of the Musée d’Aix and the Louvre, although in the latter case the copy seems to have been made after an engraved reproduction rather than the painting itself.72

In terms of *Pêches dans un plat* (fig. 5B.1), this reproduces the central section of a still-life attributed, at the time Cézanne is proposed by John Rewald to have copied it, to the seventeenth-century Aixois painter Laurent Fauchier (fig. 5B.2).73 Although perhaps following its model more closely than his earlier efforts executed after works in the Musée d’Aix and discussed above in chapter three, Cézanne’s copied still-life (fig. 5B.1) nevertheless diverges in interesting—albeit compared to those earlier efforts, perhaps slightly differing—ways.74 What such deviations would still seem to show is, however, a pictorial interaction stressing the status of its model as intrinsically imagic.

---

72 Whether either of these efforts, and in particular [R 22] *Pêches dans un plat* (1862–1864) (fig. 5B.1), the only of the pair definitively executed while Cézanne was in the south by virtue of its model being in the collection of the Musée d’Aix, was the copy Zola wrote of ‘waiting for’ in a letter from Paris in September 1862, is impossible to tell: ‘J’attends toujours aussi la copie de Paul’: Émile Zola, letter to Baptistin Baille and Paul Cézanne, 18 September 1862, cited in Zola, Correspondance, t. 1, op. cit., p. 321.

73 Honoré Gibert, *Catalogue du musée d’Aix (Bouches-du-Rhône)*, Aix: Achille Makaire, 1862, cat. no. 37. Subsequently, the painting has been given various attributions, ranging from Aelbert Cuyp to anonymous French painters of the seventeenth or eighteenth century. A list of these vacillating attributions is provided by Bruno Ely in: Ely, ‘Cézanne, l’École de Dessin et le Musée d’Aix,’ op. cit., pp. 202–203 n 71. Achille Emperaire, whom, as noted above, Cézanne met around this time in Paris and who had studied at the Aix École de Dessin ten years before Cézanne, also apparently produced a copy after this same still-life: Ely, ‘Cézanne, l’École de Dessin et le Musée d’Aix,’ op. cit., p. 171; Rewald, *The Paintings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 71.

74 On Cézanne’s copies after paintings in the Musée d’Aix, see section 3D.
The most conspicuous difference between *Pêches dans un plat* (fig. 5B.1) and its model is its cropping and orientation. Hence, the entire scene is rotated fifteen degrees clockwise, bringing the rim of the fruit-bowl, for instance, which is angled up to the right in the original, into parallel with the horizontal edges. Nevertheless, and despite the overall dimensions of Cézanne’s painting being smaller precisely by virtue of this cropping, the imagery is still reproduced at the same scale. 75 That is, if the two paintings are overlain at identical reproductive ratios, with Cézanne’s copy re-rotated and at half-transparency, the contours of the paintings’ imagery match almost perfectly (fig. 5B.3). Hence, in being copied, the imagery was modified not in terms of distortions of internal form and relations, as was suggested as the case with some of his earlier copies, but in simpler and more discretely two-dimensional terms.

Without having direct access to Cézanne’s painting, however, and thereby indicators such as weave direction, it is, unfortunately, impossible to determine whether, in the case of both processes, but particularly rotation, these modifications occurred before Cézanne began his painting or after; whether he conceived of the image he was going to paint as already cropped and rotated when beginning to paint—and so painted it as cropped and rotated—or rotated and cropped the canvas after having painted the imagery as oriented in the original. 76 In either case, the imagery seems to have been treated by Cézanne intrinsically in terms of how that imagery presented itself to him in the first place: as a flat object manipulable as such. In short, *Pêches dans un plat* (fig. 5B.1) seems a painted copy of a painted image, rather than re-painting of a copied scene.

---

75 The dimensions of the original painting are 37.6 x 45, those for Cézanne’s copy are 18 x 24: Rewald, *The Paintings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 71.
76 That some physical cropping, in addition to imagic, might have occurred could be argued as suggested by the copy’s dimensions deviating from the standard canvas sizes sold in French art-supply shops of the period; the closest, yet larger, size to Cézanne’s work being the No. 2 ‘figure’ size canvas, the dimensions of which were 24 x 19 cm: Walter Feilchenfeldt, ‘On sizes and subjects,’ in Rewald, *The Paintings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 16. However, if this is the case, this would seem to be a feature of most of Cézanne’s pre-Parisian paintings. Of the twelve canvases suggested by Rewald as possibly executed before Cézanne’s first trip to Paris in 1861 and with known dimensions, only three, [R 14] *Scène d’intérieur* (c.1860) (fig. 3D.10) (no. 8 ‘figure’), [R 15] *Les Deux enfants, d’après Prud’hon*, (1860) (fig. 3D.5) (no. 10 ‘figure’), and [R 18] *Cavalier et berger dans un paysage montagneux* (c.1860) (fig. 3D.27) (no. 8 ‘figure’), are of dimensions consistent with these standard sizes.
The other of the above-cited copies surviving, albeit only in reproduction and with doubts regarding its attribution to Cézanne, is the unknown-dimensioned *Vue de Colysée à Rome, d'après F.-M. Granet* (fig. 5B.4), based, it seems, upon François-Marius Granet’s painting *Vue intérieure du Colisée à Rome* (1804) (fig. 5B.5) in the collection of the Louvre. As with the Prud’hon copy discussed in chapter three, however, the reversed imagery in Cézanne’s copy suggests recourse to a printed reproduction after Granet’s work, rather than the painting itself.77 Ironically, the most likely candidate for such a print, Marius Reinaud’s *Intérieur du Colisée* (1813) (fig. 5B.6), itself is likewise unlikely to have been executed after Granet’s painting, but, instead, one or more of his various drawn studies for it, for instance *Vue du Colisée du côté de Saint-Jean-de-Latran* (c.1802–1803) (fig. 5B.7) or *Vue de l’intérieur du Colisée* (c.1802–1803) (fig. 5B.8).78 In any case, relative to both the engraving after it is presumed copied, as well as the drawings presumably copied by the engraving, Cézanne’s effort introduces, again, certain idiosyncrasies of form earlier noticed in regard to his other copies after engravings discussed in chapters four and five.

In regards to the attribution of *Vue de Colysée à Rome, d’après F.-M. Granet* (fig. 5B.4), Theodore Reff, the very scholar responsible for identifying the Reinaud engraving (fig. 5B.6) as the work inspiring the painted copy, cites the rarity of that print as part-evidence for rejecting Cézanne’s involvement. For, he notes, only one

---

77 Gowing, ‘The early work of Paul Cézanne,’ op. cit., p. 7; Rewald, *The Paintings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 73. On [R 15] *Le Deux enfants, d’après Prud’hon* (c.1860) (fig. 3D.5), see section 3D.

78 Theodore Reff, ‘[Review of] The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, A Catalogue Raisonné by Paul Cézanne,’ *Burlington Magazine*, vol. 139, no. 1136 (November 1997), p. 801. The datings for Granet’s drawings are my own tentative suggestion, derived from the artist’s journal, and, in particular his descriptions of his first few days in Rome, where he arrived in 1802: ‘Finally, after visiting all there was to see, I decided to begin some studies from nature. I chose the Colosseum. That monument had struck me as so handsome both for its remarkable form and vegetation that enveloped its ruins, and it produced such enchanting effect against the sky! You find growing on it yellow wallflowers, acanthus with its handsome stems and its leaves so beautifully edged, honeysuckle, violets—in short, such a quantity of flowers you could put together a guide to the plants from them. Alongside this wealth, you have shadowy passages, with a light so well contrived that no painter with a modicum of taste for colour and effect could resist the urge to do studies of it. / The next day, I came to grips with this noble subject, and strove to copy it faithfully’: François-Marius Granet, ‘Memoirs of the painter Granet,’ translated and annotated by Joseph Focarino, in Edgar Munhall, *François-Marius Granet: Watercolours from the Musée Granet at Aix-en-Provence*, exhibition catalogue (The Frick Collection, New York, 21 November 1988–15 January 1989; Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland, 7 February–19 March 1989; The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco (California Palace of the Legion of Honor, Achenbach Foundation for Graphic Arts), San Francisco, 1 April 1989–28 May 1989), New York: The Frick Collection, 1988, p. 21.
known impression of the print existed in Paris during the early 1860s, in the collection of the Cabinet Estampes in the Bibliothèque Nationale, an institution in which Cézanne is unlikely to have been allowed to execute a painted copy.\textsuperscript{79}

However, and leaving aside the more considerable doubt raised by Reff in regards to the copy's unknown provenance before 1948, the location of the Paris print might not, however, stand alone as sufficient reason for rejecting the possibility of Cézanne's executing a copy after it, or, more pertinently, some other impression of the same or related print.\textsuperscript{80} For, although the entry in a 1960 Cabinet des Dessins catalogue for the Granet drawing suggested by Reff as inspiring Reinaud's print mentions only two impressions of engravings after it, noted precisely by Reff in order to characterize the print's rarity, one of these is listed as being in the collection of the Musée Granet.\textsuperscript{81} No indication is given by Reff as to why Cézanne couldn't have copied this impression, particularly given his above-discussed practice of copying works from that institution when enrolled in the attached École de Dessin. Moreover, in a catalogue of Reinaud's printed œuvre published in the 1897/1898 edition of Mémoires de l'Académie des sciences, agriculture, arts et belles-lettres d'Aix, Reinaud is described as having executed more than one variant of Granet's Vue de Colisée composition, including reversals.\textsuperscript{82} One such version was even printed in that catalogue, proofed from a plate then in the collection of the catalogue's author, the Aixois print collector Raymond Ferrier (fig. 5B.9).\textsuperscript{83} Although almost identical to the above-mentioned Bibliothèque Nationale print (fig. 5B.6), there are, however,

\textsuperscript{79} Reff, ‘[Review of] The Paintings of Paul Cézanne,’ op. cit., p. 801.
\textsuperscript{80} Reff also cites as suspicious the painting's facture, which he describes, contra Lawrence Gowing's characterisation of being 'absolutely characteristic of the early Paris years', as 'uncharacteristically thin': Lawrence Gowing, letter to John Rewald, 27 January 1977, cited in Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 73; Reff, '[Review of] The Paintings of Paul Cézanne,' op. cit., p. 801.
\textsuperscript{82} ‘Ce même sujet a été traité plusieurs fois très heureusement, mais avec variantes et même en remenant la composition': Raymond Ferrier, ‘Catalogue de l'œuvre de Marius Reinaud,' Mémoires de l'Académie des sciences, agriculture, arts et belles-lettres d'Aix, t. 17 (1897/1898), p. 69.
\textsuperscript{83} Le Colisée, etching by Marius Reinaud after François-Marius Granet, published in ibid., p. 68 bis.
differences, including, most obviously, and perhaps ironically, reversal. That other versions and/or states of the Reinaud print, and therefore impressions above and beyond those listed in the 1960 Cabinet des Dessins catalogue cited by Reff, might have existed does not indicate Cézanne, even if he had access to them, did copy them. Nevertheless, it certainly doesn’t discount the possibility.

In any case, and still leaving aside Reff’s doubts regarding attribution, interesting formal comparisons can still be made between Vue de Colisée à Rome, d’après F.-M. Granet (fig. 5B.4), and the etching it seems to have been copied after, as well as, in turn, that etching’s relation to the Granet drawings it, in turn, seems to have been inspired by. That is; if a reversal of one of Granet’s drawings, the etching, and the painted copy presumed by Cézanne are placed side-by-side and compared in sequence of execution (fig. 5B.10), a certain cluster of compositional quirks becomes visible that, in combination, serve to tilt the top of the picture toward the viewer, an affect of flattening progressively more prevalent. Hence, the top of the oblong box-like structure at the foot of the arch at the left becomes increasingly visible; the angle of the left-hand edging of the paving leading into the Colosseum’s interior becomes more vertical; the width of the underside of the arch becomes more uniform across its span; and the wall of the Colosseum in the distance becomes squatter and thereby seemingly further off. In fact, by the version attributed to Cézanne, the distortions are such that it appears the artist has either failed to understand the architecture being depicted or has made no attempt to translate such understanding in terms of coherent spatial cues. As Lawrence Gowing observes in regard precisely to this, ‘Cézanne did not understand that Granet’s picture was a view within the Colosseum across the arena.’ It is as if, in the process of the etching being copied as a painting, those affects of distortion introduced by the etching after it, at least relative to its presumed drawn model/s, was itself then exacerbated in Cézanne’s painted copy.

Finally, Cézanne’s copy also repeats the excision of narrative present in Granet’s painting that is likewise excised in the engravings, which were executed after Granet’s

84 Hence, for instance, in the Bibliothèque Nationale print (fig. 5B.6), relative to the Mémoires de l’Académie des sciences print (fig. 5B.9), the foliage extends further around both sides of the arch, and reaches further across the space beneath, relative to the far wall of the Colosseum. The line of the shadow on the underside of the arch is also straighter in the Bibliothèque Nationale print (fig. 5B.6) than in the Mémoires de l’Académie des sciences (fig. 5B.9).
85 Gowing, ‘The early work of Paul Cézanne,’ op. cit., p. 7.
studies rather than that final conception. Hence, the presence of the crucified Christ statue underneath the archway is emphasized by Granet by the praying figures, whereas in his drawings and, in particular, the engravings after them, that same statue tends to disappear into the shadows of the decorative edging around it. Indeed, in Cézanne’s painting, it is difficult to tell to what degree the executor saw the smudges of lighter-coloured shapes as a crucifixion, some other kind of statue, or merely a pattern of shapes simply repeated.

In terms of the three paintings mentioned above as seemingly not direct copies but possibly involving elements of pastiche, these are [R 26] La Femme au perroquet (1862–1864) (fig. 5B.11), [R 92] Le Jugement de Paris (1862–1864) (fig. 5B.27), and [R 76] Loth et ses filles (c.1865 or earlier) (fig. 5B.39). The presence of this possibility comes mostly by virtue of the works’ seeming engagement with specific pictorial, and thereby intrinsically imagic, conventions: seventeenth-century Dutch niche-painting, classical allegory, and biblical narrative respectively. Hence, a degree of continuity might be suggested with Cézanne’s earlier paintings suggested above in chapter three as likewise possibly involving elements of pastiche and/or paraphrase. 86

What might distinguish the efforts discussed here, however, and in particular La Femme au perroquet (fig. 5B.11) and Le Jugement de Paris (fig. 5B.27), is articulation through styles of paint application similar, in some respects, to Cézanne’s apparently deliberate developing move toward impasted surfaces in his portraits and landscapes of the same period mentioned above. 87 However, by combining this increasingly transgressive painterly approach with conventional pictorial traditions—this conflation of affects of spontaneity with arrangements of seemingly imaginary scenes depicting canonic themes rather than scenes studied, for instance, from life—an

86 For instance, the figures [R 1] Paravent avec scènes champêtres et ornements [recto] (c.1859) (fig. 3B.1), [R 10] Jeune fille en méditation (c.1860) (fig. 3D.19), [R 16] Paysage avec moulin (c.1860) (fig. 3D.17), [R 17] Paysage avec moulin (c.1860) (fig. 3D.18), and [R 18] Chevalier et berger dans un paysage Montagneux (c.1860) (fig. 3D.27). See section 3D.

87 In regards to comparisons with those paintings discussed in chapter three, an exception might be [R 10] Jeune fille en méditation (c.1860) (fig. 3D.19), which seems, aside from the embarrassingly awkward depiction of the chair, to come close to the cursory brushwork of [R 26] La Femme au perroquet (1862–1864) (fig. 5B.11) and [R 92] Le Jugement de Paris (1862–1864) (fig. 5B.27). Without a colour reproduction, it is difficult to comment on any possible affinity in terms of palette.
odd juxtaposition might be seen as being evoked. Originality is being presented in terms of a reaction to tradition, as imagery, rather than to reality. In short, if not *esquisses* in the traditional sense, a possibility that should not be neglected, the rather odd possibility is presented by which Cézanne has painted pastiches of *études*, or, perhaps, more complicatedly, through precisely this same conflation, *études* of pastiches. In any case, all three paintings discussed below would seem intrinsically depictions of pictures, albeit, perhaps, in contrast to the pair just discussed, imagined ones rather than actual, and as such, in being possibly re-presentations of structuring form (pictorial convention, genre, etc.), might all thereby comment ironically upon the presence of such, or at least, the possibility of being viewed as thus.

*•*

In terms of the first of these three works, *La Femme au perroquet* (fig. 5B.11), Cézanne's panel immediately brings to mind, in terms of format and included motifs, certain conventions of seventeenth-century Dutch genre. Hence, its layout seems a conscious adoption of the niche-painting format popularised by Gerrit Dou, and the motif elements included—girl, bird being fed, birdcage, climbing vine—precisely the kinds commonly found, whether individually or in combination, not only in seventeenth-century Dutch genre more generally, but also in the specific context of the niche-painting conceit itself (figs 5B.13, 5B.16, 5B.17).\(^\text{88}\) Whether coincidentally, or

\(^{88}\) The niche-painting conceit—*nisstuk* ('niche-piece') or *venstemis* ('window-niche')—featured panels, often contrived as pendant pairs, depicting views into domestic interiors through open apertures, the figures always included in these depictions and framed by such apertures usually portrayed holding up, or standing amongst, objects not only allowing the artist to display the full range of their veristic virtuosity (reflective surfaces, lush carpets, etc.), but also presumed to have particular symbolically-resonant relevance. Although certainly responsible for the spread of the format as a self-consciously independent subgenre, Dou can probably not claim responsibility for its invention, the conceit seemingly conflating earlier portraiture formats with the more general and ephemerally-encoded genre mode. On this, as well as invention and role of the framing aperture in the presentation of images as discrete and possibly encoded forms, particularly in regard to the work of Gabriel Metsu, see: Franklin Robinson, *Gabriel Metsu (1629-1667): A Study of his Place in Dutch Genre Painting of the Golden Age*, New York: A. Shram, 1974, pp. 89-91. On the conflation of portraiture with the presumed encoding endemic to genre in late seventeenth-century Dutch painting more generally, see: David R. Smith, 'Irony and civility: Notes on the convergence of genre and portraiture in seventeenth-century Dutch painting,' *Art Bulletin*, vol. 69, no. 3 (September 1987), pp. 407-430. In terms of the motifs depicted in Cézanne's panel, Lionello Venturi, in the notes for [R 26] *La Femme au perroquet* (1862–1864) (fig. 5B.11) in his catalogue raisonné, states that, although the bird was certainly not a parrot, he preferred to keep the traditional title ('Oiseau vert, qui n'est pas un perroquet, mais nous conservons le titre traditionnel'); Rewald, likewise does the same, although he did choose to change the title of
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as a deliberate repetition either of an initial gesture of appropriation or the image presumed resulting from it, these same motif elements were again included by Cézanne in a later canvas, [R 641] Jeune fille à la volière (c.1888 or later) (fig. 5B.14). Despite the usually-presumed two-decade gap in their execution dates, the two works are thereby almost always discussed in conjunction. Hence, Mary Tompkins Lewis, for instance, can describe the pair as virtual pendants, a description part-made as part of her suggestion that, in executing both, Cézanne was not only explicitly referencing Dutch genre painting, but also, in doing so, enacting ‘appropriate and informed renderings’ of that tradition.

Whether or not in pendant form, the convention of depicting girls with, or feeding, birds in, or out of, cages is a common, oft-revived, and symbolically-resonant one, the allegoric richness of which is partly explained by the same originary context the tradition shared with the just-mentioned niche-painting format, seventeenth-century Dutch genre. Given these precedents, it is not surprising that scholars discussing the later, and below-mentioned, [R 641] Jeune fille à la volière (c.1888 or later) (fig. 5B.14) from Venturi’s Fillette à la perruche to Jeune fille à la volière, without, however, explaining why: Venturi, Cézanne, op. cit., p. 88 (cat nos 98–99); Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., pp. 72, 418. In any case, the girl appears to be feeding the bird a grape or berry plucked, it would seem, from a creeper growing around and above the window enframing her, and which might be a grape vine, an ivy, or some other undefined climber; the supposition that whatever is being fed to the bird might have been taken from it is based on the presence of a similarly coloured and shaped object in the vine. As noted above and below, Cézanne’s earlier [R 12] Fillette au perroquet (c.1860) (fig. 3D.8) also depicts a girl feeding a bird, in this case more obviously grapes, and to a parrot. See section 3D.8.

90 Lewis, Cézanne’s Early Imagery, op. cit., p. 137.

91 For, in Dutch genre, such imagery is usually deemed to have encoded specific erotic and/or didactic content; girls or women alongside caged birds interpreted as reference to chastity or honour preserved; the feeding of birds in, or out of, cages, or the attempt to lure free birds with offerings of food to dreams of love or the dangerously naïve acquiescence to the temptations of earthy pleasures, in particular sex; and an empty cage to lost virginity or the remorse resulting from this. This network of meanings is presumed to have derived from, and played upon, the same network of sexual allusions the Dutch words vogel (‘bird’) and vogelen (‘to catch/cage birds’) participated in, the picturing of precisely these motifs allowing, explicitly or not, the carrying-over of linguistic euphemisms from verbal to imagic realms, vogel and vogelen also denoting, colloquially, ‘penis’ and ‘to copulate’, respectively: Eddy de Jongh, ‘Erotica in Vogelperspectief: De dubbelzinnigheid van reeks 17de eeuwse genrevoorstellingen,’ Simiolus, vol. 3, no. 1 (1968–1969), pp. 24–35, 72. In terms of the meanings just-cited ascribed to the motifs, see: Jongh, ‘Erotica in Vogelperspectief,’ op. cit., pp. 48–52, 73; Eddy de Jongh, Tot Lering en Vermaak: Betekenissen van Hollandse...
Cézanne's two woman-with-birdcage paintings have sought inspirational sources in either seventeenth-century Dutch genre or the various eighteenth-and nineteenth-century French revivals of that form. Bruno Ely contends that two paintings, Martin Drolling's *Jeune paysanne sa fenêtre* (c.1800) (fig. 5B.15) and a painting sometimes attributed to Constantine Netscher, *Portrait de la femme d'un Ambassadeur de Suède* (c.1770?) (fig. 5B.12), both acquired by the Musée d'Aix as part of the Bourguignon de Fabregoules bequest in 1863, might have exerted defining influence on Cézanne's efforts, pairing *La Femme au perroquet* (fig. 5B.11) with the portrait of the Swedish Ambassador's wife (fig. 5B.12) and *Jeune fille à la volière* (fig. 5B.14) with the

---


Despite its origins in Dutch genre, the convention's spread to France during the eighteenth-century seems to have occurred without the didacticism usually presumed implicit in its Dutch context; hence, on the one hand, through transposition into idylls and *fête galantes*, rococo artists such as Lancret and Boucher could emphasize the amorous connotations of images of birds and birdcages without necessarily invoking any correliative moralizing content. Take, for example, Nicolas Lancret's *Le Nid d'oiseaux* (c.1730) (oil on panel (15 x20), Musée du Louvre, Paris) and François Boucher's *The Bird Catchers* (1748) (oil on canvas (54.6 x 337.8), J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles). However, at least one exception might be noted: Nicolas Lancret's *The Escaped Bird* (c.1725) (oil on canvas (46.9 x 54.6), Museum of Fine Art, Boston), which seems to retain a Dutch-like moralizing tone in regard to lost virginity. Concurrently, and as mentioned above in regards to Cézanne's *Nous* (fig. 3D.8), the amorous symbolic impetus presumed underpinning the less didactic rococo scenes might well also have been responsible, when mapped onto the eighteenth-century emergent category of portrayals of adolescence, for Jean-Baptiste Greuze's saccharine depictions of girls with birds and birdcages; see: above, see section 3D. For an account that stresses the French literary antecedents and thereby contexts for French rococo birding images, and that thereby downplays the possibility of Dutch precedent and the symbolism often read into them in terms of those presumed precedents, see: Elise Goodman, "Les Jeux innocents": French rococo birding and fishing scenes, *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art*, vol. 23, no. 4 (1995), pp. 251–265. On the other hand, other eighteenth-century artists, particularly when the aim seems to have been to consciously appropriate Dutch forms for an emphasis on chaste middleclass verism, for instance in the domestic genre scenes of Jean-Siméon Chardin, could deploy the same motifs without any invocation of the sexual allusions presumed prevalent in the older tradition: For instance Chardin's *La Seringe* (1751) (oil on canvas (50 x 43), Musée du Louvre, Paris). By the nineteenth century, and in relation to this latter inflection of meaning, caged and pet birds could also come to symbolize the acquiescence of women to subservient domesticity on condition they were treated well, as for instance seems to be the case with Charles Chaplin's *Le Dîner au perroquet* (fig. 5B.25). Elaine Shefer suggests precisely such thematic underpinning in certain works by Chaplin's English contemporary Walter Deverell: Elaine Shefer, 'Deverell, Rosetti, Sidal, and "The Bird in a Cage":' *Art Bulletin*, vol. 67, no. 3 (September 1985), pp. 437-441.
Drolling panel (fig. 5B.15). In making such a contention, however, Ely must likewise change Rewald's suggested dating of 1862–1864 for La Femme au perroquet (fig. 5B.11), placing it beyond 1866, at the earliest, the year the Bourguignon de Fabregoules bequest first went on public display.

Aside from the issue of dating, however, Mary Tompkins Lewis, for her part, finds further difficulties in accepting either of Ely's suggestions. For, identifying two possible modes of citation, the copying of format and the copying of symbolic inclusions, Lewis notes that neither of Cézanne's paintings seems to have enacted both impulses simultaneously in relation to the panels cited by Ely. Instead, thereby,

93 Ely, 'Cézanne, l'École de Dessin et le Musée d'Aix,' op. cit., pp. 178–180. Both the panels cited by Ely depict young girls enclosed and enframed by a window or balcony-opening and accompanied by birds within a cage or, in the case of the Portrait de la femme d'un Ambassadeur de Suède (fig. 5B.12), restrained by a leash. Aside from noting these broad similarities of layout, which, at least in the case of the Drolling panel (fig. 5B.15), seem to revive aspects of the niche-painting conceit seemingly appropriated by Cézanne in [R 26] La Femme au perroquet (1862–1864) (fig. 5B.11), Ely also perceives specific correspondences between the Musée d'Aix panels and Cézanne's paintings in terms of motif that, in turn, are presumed to imply the conveyance of a similarly-encoded content. Hence, in regard to the Drolling panel (fig. 5B.15) paired with [R 641]. Jeune fille à la volière (c.1888 or later) (fig. 5B.14), the depicted girls' similarly bent-arm pose is observed, as is also, perhaps more convincingly, the almost identically-positioned—but surely not identically-depicted—birdcages and foregrounded potted plants, combined symbols, for Ely, of prudently restrained sexuality. This possible theme of confused innocence on the brink of adolescence perceived as underlying both Cézanne's painting and the panel presumed to have inspired it is then reinforced by Ely's suggestion that the girl depicted might in fact be Cézanne's sister Rose, who would have been twelve in the year that Ely contends the picture was painted, 1866. This dating for Jeune fille à la volière (fig. 5B.14), however, differs markedly from those suggested by Lionello Venturi and John Rewald; Venturi dates the painting 'c.1888' and Rewald 'c.1888 or later': Venturi, Cézanne, son art—son œuvre, op. cit., p. 88 (cat. no. 98); Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 418. Venturi may have intended, according to the entry for the painting in Rewald's catalogue raisonné, to change his initial dating to '1866' in preparation for his revised—but never-completed—catalogue raisonné; Rewald, although noting this intention, does not discuss why he chooses Venturi's initial dating over the purportedly revised one: loc. cit. If Cézanne had painted Jeune fille à la volière (fig. 5B.14) in the late 1880s, his sister Rose would have been in her mid-thirties. Ely initially gives execution dates for both La Femme au perroquet (fig. 5B.11) and Jeune fille à la volière (fig. 5B.14) of '1864–1868', but in discussing the Rose portrait possibility for Jeune fille à la volière (fig. 5B.14), narrows this to 'c.1866', based, it seems, as noted below, on opening of the Musée d'Aix annex housing the Bourguignon de Fabregoules bequest: Ely, 'Cézanne, l'École de Dessin et le Musée d'Aix,' op. cit., pp. 180, 204 nn. 101–102.

94 ibid., p. 180. On the Bourguignon de Fabregoules bequest and its housing from in the former chapel of the Pénitants Blancs, a building annexed by the Musée d'Aix in 1866 expressly for this purpose, see section 3A. On Ely's dating of [R 26] La Femme au perroquet (1862–1864) (fig. 5B.11), and, indeed, [R 641] Jeune fille à la volière (c.1888 or later) (fig. 5B.14), see n. 93 immediately above.

95 Hence, although agreeing that [R 641] Jeune fille à la volière (c.1888 or later) (fig. 5B.14), which she follows Venturi's original c.1888 date for, does bear compositional similarity to
Lewis prefers to suggest more authentically seventeenth-century Dutch—but less direct—sources, engravings after works by Caspar Netscher and Gerrit Dou published in Charles Blanc’s École hollandaise of 1861 (figs 5B.13, 5B.16). In drawing such comparison, Lewis extends her thesis, mentioned above, that Cézanne not only deliberately sought to ‘underscore’ the ‘Dutch baroque origins’ of girl-with-bird and girl-with-birdcage imagery when concocting La Femme au perroquet (fig. 5B.11) and Jeune fille à la volière (fig. 5B.14), but also, in doing so, ‘studiously followed the forms’ of that convention precisely in terms of those origins.

Any suggestion that Cézanne might have consulted engravings after seventeenth-century Dutch genre works in creating his own work is not an unwarranted one, given precisely what has been already said in regard both to such a practice underpinning many of Cézanne’s other painted efforts of the period, as well as the apparent recurrent possibility of his referencing, in precisely these instances, Blanc’s encyclopaedic Histoires des peintres de toutes les écoles. Nevertheless, in the case of Lewis’s suggestions, neither of the engravings cited by her would seem any more compelling an inspirational candidate for either of Cézanne’s woman-with-birdcage images than the panels suggested by Ely, and, ironically, for exactly the reasons used by Lewis in rejecting those. That is, neither of Cézanne’s works would

---

Drolling’s Jeune paysanne sa fenêtre (fig. 5B.15), Lewis notes a ‘quite different’ treatment of the theme, presumably referencing the fact that the girl in the Drolling painting is not actually feeding a bird; conversely, in considering the other of Ely’s pairings [R 26] La Femme au perroquet (1862–1864) (fig. 5B.11) and Portrait de la femme d’un Ambassadeur de Suède (fig. 5B.12)—Lewis sees, after noting a similar theme, no connection compositionally: Lewis, Cézanne’s Early Imagery, op. cit., p. 137.

96 Charles Blanc, Histoires des peintres de toutes les écoles: École hollandaise, Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1861, t. 2, pp. 3, 21; Lewis, Cézanne’s Early Imagery, op. cit., p. 137. Numbers 139–140 and 151–152 of the series version of Histoires des peintres de toutes les écoles were devoted to Dou and Netscher respectively: “[Advertisement for Histoires des peintres de toutes les écoles giving lists of featured artist by issue number],” Gazette des Beaux-Arts, t. 17, livr. 102 (1 December 1864), p. 576 ter. Given the commencement date of the series in 1849 and presuming a twice monthly publication schedule, the issues on Dou could have been published as early as 1854, the issues on Netscher as early as 1855. The Dou engraving reproduced here (fig. 5B.16) is reversed in relation to the engraving published by Charles Blanc; for a reproduction of the Blanc version, see: Lewis, Cézanne’s Early Imagery, op. cit., p. 136 fig. 62. All engravings would seem to be after Dou’s A Maid servant Scouring a Pan (1663) (oil on panel (16.6 x 13.1), Collection of her Majesty the Queen, London), which, in orientation, is the same as the Blanc engraving reproduced by Lewis. The engraving after Netscher (6B.13) seems related to the painting A Lady with a Parrot and a Gentleman with a Monkey (1664) (oil (35 x 28.3), Columbus Museum of Art, Columbus), which features a woman similarly posed and passing oysters from a plate held in her hand, with a male figure to her side and slightly behind feeding a monkey perched on the window ledge.

97 Lewis, Cézanne’s Early Imagery, op. cit., pp. 133, 137.
simultaneously seem to repeat both the compositional layout and symbolic specifics of the engravings she cites. 

Now, the objections just-raised concerning the works suggested by Ely and Lewis as sources are by no means made in order to reject any possible influencing relation on behalf of those works, but, instead, merely to indicate that if such influence did exist, it was not through the medium of a single source, but through the possible pastiching of elements from multiple works with possibly inherently different underlying themes, mixing, thereby, format and included symbolic components ad hoc. Hence, specifically in the case of La Femme au perroquet (fig. 5B.11) and in regard to format, pose, and motif inclusion, a plethora of other possible sources might be cited.

---

98 Hence, although a comparison between [R 26] La Femme au perroquet (1862–1864) (fig. 5B.11) and the engraving of the same name after Caspar Netscher suggested by Lewis (fig. 5B.13) does show similarities in both format and certain symbolic inclusions, there are, nevertheless, still possibly symbolically-relevant differences. For instance, the bird the young girl feeds in Cézanne’s panel is distinctly not a parrot, as it emphatically is in the engraving, and is perched on her hand rather than emerging from its cage. Moreover, the engraving lacks the proliferate vine foliage from which, in Cézanne’s panel, the grape or berry being fed to the bird seems to have been plucked, whilst Cézanne’s painting lacks the erotically-charged plate of oysters depicted in the engraving. On the other hand, any suggestion of a dependency for La Femme au perroquet (fig. 5B.11) on the other of the engravings cited by Lewis, Dou’s La Ménagère hollandaise (fig. 5B.16), would seem even more forced. For, aside, again, from the similar niche-format, there are, again, important symbolic inclusions in the Dou engraving—the absence of a bird and the overturned pitcher—that are absent from Cézanne’s painting. Hence, the engraving would seem to imply, at least in terms of the conventions of encoding usually presumed to underpin Dutch genre, a theme different to that similarly presumed of Cézanne’s painting, allegorising the results of dubious behaviour rather than presenting an allegory of dubious behaviour being enacted; representing, in short, lost, rather than risked, virginity. In regards to [R 641] Jeune fille à la volière (c.1888 or later) (fig. 5B.14), a possible dependency on either of the engravings cited by Lewis would seem, again, no less problematic than the dependency on Martin Drolling’s Jeune paysanne à sa fenêtre (fig. 5B.15) suggested by Ely, at least in terms of the same criteria applied by Lewis in questioning Ely’s suggested source, a ‘quite different’ treatment of the theme. For, in terms of the Dou engraving, and despite the positioning of the birdcage corresponding with that of the birdcage in Cézanne’s painting, little else indicates a connection between the works, thematic or otherwise. Cézanne’s canvas, unlike his panel, seemingly only ostensibly utilizes a niche format, merely mirroring such an arrangement without necessarily quoting it directly, and, moreover and perhaps more importantly, by virtue of the bird depicted safely ensconced within its cage, would seem to imply an almost diametrically-opposed thematic to that encoded by Dou’s imagery. That is, in terms of meanings presumed implicit in Dutch genre, Jeune fille à la volière (fig. 5B.14) would seem to symbolize virginity secured, rather than, as in the Dou engraving, irrecoverably lost, as the overturned pitcher and empty birdcage would seem to imply. And, although there are also basic correspondences of layout, albeit reversed, between Jeune fille à la volière (fig. 5B.14) and the other engraving cited by Lewis, La Femme au perroquet after Netscher (fig. 5B.13), there are, once more, possibly considerable symbolic differences. Again, Cézanne’s painting depicts neither a parrot, as Lewis contends it does, nor shows that bird, whatever its breed, being fed by the girl, who, instead, seems to be gesturing at someone or something not pictured within the frame, motioning off-screen, as it were.
including examples of Dutch niche-painting (fig. 5B.17), Dutch genre more generally (fig. 5B.19), contemporary repetitions of those forms (fig. 5B.22), and, even, works from entirely outside either the Dutch genre tradition (fig. 5B.18) or, even further afield, fine art (fig. 5B.20).

A similar caveat might also be applied, albeit more broadly, to the possible meanings, as presumed thematic, attributed to most instances of Dutch genre citation in mid-nineteenth-century French contexts, particularly in regard to the specifics of any given motif's symbolic intent. For, given the degree to which the production and consumption of Dutch genre imagery in its original context can be deemed predicated upon the very presence of encoding is, itself, a contested field of study, let alone the specifics of the content presumed so-encoded, it would seem hasty to conclude that the persistent repetition of such motifs reflected a concurrent persistent repetition of intended theme. That is, to characterize repetition of Dutch imagery as always

99 In regards to possible influence from niche-paintings, take, for instance, Gabriel Metsu's Woman with Sewing in a Niche (c.17th) (fig. 5B.17), the format of which, and in particular the shape and positioning of the birdcage, as well as the inclusion of a climbing vine on the right, seems closer to [R 26] La Femme au perroquet (1862–1864) (fig. 5B.11) than those works suggested by Ely or Lewis. For other niche-paintings including the vine motif on the right, see also, for instance: Gerrit Dou, Lady Gathering Grapes (1662) (o/p 38 x 29), Galleria Sabauda, Turin; Willem van Mieris, Le Bulles de savon (c.1710) (o/p 32 x 27), Musée du Louvre, Paris; and unknown copier after Frans van Mieris, The Old Fiddler (c18th) (o/p 28.9 x 22.9), National Gallery, London. In terms of foliage matching the proliferate exuberance of Cézanne's depiction, see: Boy Blowing Bubbles out a Window, mezzotint (1684) after a Frans van Mieris painting (1663) (British Museum, London). In terms of possible sources outside the niche-painting convention but still within Dutch genre, see, in particular Frans van Mieris's Femme à sa toilette, assistée d'une servante noire (1678) (fig. 5B.19), which seems to pre-empt the arm positioning and the general facial outline of the girl depicted in Cézanne's painting. For works outside of Dutch genre, see Titian's Venus Anadyomene (1520) (o/c 75.8 x 57.6), National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh, which likewise pre-empt the positioning of the left arm in Cézanne's painting (and indeed, many Dutch images of women at their toilet). Titian's painting was reproduced as an engraving in La Galerie du Palais-Royal: Gravé d'après les tableaux des différentes écoles qui la composent, published in 1858, and also including reproductions of other paintings also copied by Cézanne: Jacques Couché et al., La Galerie du Palais-Royal, gravé d'après les tableaux des différentes écoles qui la composent, Paris: L'Éditeur, 1858, t. 1, pp. 30, [not paginated] plate. For works entirely outside the field of fine art, take the example of an illustration (fig. 5B.20) published in an 1843 book of poems by Alfred de Musset, Cézanne and Zola's favourite poet of their youth, depicting a girl in a foliage-surrounded niche with a similar tilt of the head, hairline and arm position (albeit in reverse) as that of the girl in Cézanne's panel. Indeed, the pose depicted by Cézanne in [R 26] La Femme au perroquet (1862–1864) (fig. 5B.11) might even be a self-quotation of Cézanne's earlier [R 12] Fillette au perroquet (fig. 3D.8).

100 The foundational interpretation of Dutch genre as fundamentally informed and structured by encoding is Eddy de Jongh's, best summarized in: Eddy de Jongh, 'Realisme en schijnrealisme in de Hollandse schilderkunst van de zeventiende eeuw,' in H. R. Hoetink et al., Rembrandt en zijn tijd, exhibition catalogue (Paleis voor Schone Kunsten, Brussel, 23
somehow likewise involving the same symbolic content later ascribed by art historians to the motif's so-repeated, but in terms of original Dutch contexts, might seem rash.101

Hence, precisely at the moment Cézanne arrived in Paris, Dutch painting was coming to stand both as the epitome of verism as well as the sign for it under the rubric of realism. Thus, partly as the result of the advocacy of critics such as Théophile Thore, the conscious invocation of this past art by artists labelling themselves Realists might be seen as manifesting the somewhat paradoxical attempt to present contemporaneity not only in terms of Dutch genre affects, but indeed, in many cases, by virtue precisely of those affects’ presence.102 Simultaneously, the Realists’ more Salon-friendly

---


102 For an instance of such thematic divergences over time, take Dou’s Girl Chopping Onions (1646) (oil on panel (18 x 14.8), Royal Collection of Her Majesty the Queen, London). As Christopher Lloyd observes: ‘Many of the utensils in the picture—such as the candle, pestle and mortar, and the jug—have clear sexual connotations. [...] All these disparate aspects, however, might be united in a wider meaning personified by the two figures: the small boy standing for innocence and the girl for experience. Yet this was not how it was interpreted when the picture was in France during the eighteenth century. When engraved by Pierre Louis Surtuy the following caption was supplied as imaginary dialogue between the small boy (perhaps seen as Cupid) and the young woman: ‘I am perfectly willing to believe that you are knowledgeable in the delectable art of preparing stews / But I feel even more appetite for you / Than for the stew that you are preparing’: Christopher Lloyd, ‘[Catalogue notes for] “Girl Chopping Onions”,’ in Christopher Lloyd, Enchanting the Eye: Dutch Paintings of the Golden Age, London: Royal Collection, 2004, p. 63.

103 Théophile Thore wrote under the pseudonym William Bürger, a name he adopted sometime after his exile from France in 1849 due to his revolutionary activities; he first published under this name in 1855, and retained it after his return to France in 1859. For his championing of Dutch realism as an ideal model for contemporary French painting, and naturalism in particular, as well as his broader thesis regarding the necessity of a universal and democratically based art, see, for instance: William Bürger [Théophile Thore], ‘Des tendances de l’art au XIXe siècle,’ Revue universelle des arts, livr. 1 (1855), pp. 77–85; William Bürger [Théophile Thore], Musées de la Hollande. I. Amsterdam et la Haye: Études sur l’école hollandaise, Paris: Vve Jules Renouard, 1858; William Bürger [Théophile Thore], Musées de
counterparts, for example Ernest Meissonier, could likewise appropriate similar Dutch imagery but for far less polemic purposes, responding more, it would seem, to an emerging disconnect between bourgeois and academic tastes. In either case, whether deployed as a sign of realism or as an easily consumable anecdotal historicism, what both forms of appropriation would seem to share is the possibility of repeating forms of Dutch pictorial structuring without necessarily either drawing attention to the presence of the structuring so-repeated, or consciously invoking the symbolic meanings they might have carried in their original contexts. However, precisely such a gesture could be deemed discernible in works by more transgressive artists of the time, for instance Manet, whose use of citatory practices during the 1860s would seem to have opened up a deliberately provocative discourse between the representational structuring of imagery this appropriation of tradition might be seen to imply, and the contemporary contexts within which that appropriation, as the emergence of 'modernity', occurred.  

103 The kind of structuring, as a form of supra-imagic context, here alluded to is well-encapsulated by Eddy de Jongh's term Schijnrealisme ('seeming' or 'pseudo-'realism): Jongh, 'Realisme en schijnrealisme,' op. cit., passim. For, as a specific form of visual structuring, this possible presence is an affect itself repeatable as form and, in being so-repeated, might stand not only—although, as just-noted, perhaps mistakenly—as sign for the encodings presumed of Dutch genre, but also, as a sign of Dutch painting more generally and, specifically, the associations ascribed to that school in contemporary contexts. Hence, for instance, the remarks of Marius Chaumelin in regard to Courbet's Woman with a Parrot (1866) (fig. 5B.23) and Manet's Young Lady in 1866 (1866) (fig. 5B.21), two paintings mentioned again below in terms of their possibly transgressive appropriation of past tradition: 'M. Manet, qui n'aurait pas du oublier le panique causée, il y a quelques années, par son chat noir du tableau d'Orphélie, a emprunté le perroquet de son ami Courbet, et l'a placé sur un perchoir, à côté d'une jeune femme en peignoir rose. Ces réalisistes sont capables de tout!' [Manet—who could not forget the panic caused, some years ago, by the black cat in his picture of Orphélia?]—
In raising the example of Manet, and allowing, thereby, a return to consideration of Cézanne’s own possible place in the context of contemporary citatory practices, it is worth now considering a comparison made by Lewis between Cézanne’s *La Femme au perroquet* (fig. 5B.11) and two near-contemporary manifestations of girl-with-parrot imagery that are suggested by her as not only, like Cézanne’s effort, derived from Dutch imagery, but also, importantly, more ‘modern’: Courbet’s *Woman with a Parrot* of 1866 (fig. 5B.23) and Manet’s *Young Lady in 1866* of the same year (fig. 5B.21).\(^\text{105}\) For, without necessarily accepting the context within which Lewis’s comparison is made, the assertion that Cézanne’s painting more ‘studiously followed’ Dutch genre, it is, nevertheless, an illuminating one, showing Cézanne’s engagement with past tradition might have lacked much of the sophisticated conceptual and discursive nuance it is possible to extract from the appropriations of Courbet and, in particular, Manet.\(^\text{106}\)

Hence, in terms of the latter, Manet’s *Young Lady in 1866* (fig. 5B.21), although referencing seventeenth-century Dutch woman-feeding-parrot scenes like van Mieris’s *Woman with a Red Jacket Feeding a Parrot*, or reproductions after it (fig. 5B.24), the motifs deployed seem consciously and deliberately updated.\(^\text{107}\) The model wears contemporary clothing, holds a contemporary man’s monocle, and stands beside a grey Jaco parrot contemporarily prized for its verbal mimicry.\(^\text{108}\) Thereby and likewise, the meanings attributable to these motifs, and hence the narrative their conjunction might imply, has a specifically contemporary quality.\(^\text{109}\) However,

---

\(^{105}\) Lewis, *Cézanne’s Early Imagery*, op. cit., p. 133.

\(^{106}\) Ibid., p. 137.

\(^{107}\) The image reproduced here (fig. 5B.24) is an engraving after van Mieris’s painting published in Blanc’s *École hollandaise* of 1861. On Manet’s apparently frequent recourse to imagery from Blanc’s *Histoire des peintres de toutes les Écoles series*, including those issues collected and reprinted together as *École hollandaise*, see: Reff, “Manet and Blanc’s “Histoire des peintres”,’ op. cit., pp. 456–458.


\(^{109}\) To quote Mona Hadler’s interpretation: ‘the *Woman with a Parrot* is not [...] a courtesan, as she is in [Manet’s earlier] *Olympia*, but appears to be a fashionable Parisian of the 1860s. She wears a peignoir open at the top and jewelry around her neck as if she is in the process of
Manet’s tendency in many of his paintings of the early 1860s to use the same model as he does here, the distinctively-looking Victorine Meurend, along with her frank and frontal posing, the already-alluded-to reference to Dutch genre, and the absence of any background detail, all draws as much attention to the *mise-en-scène* of that implied narrative as to the narrative itself. As an affect, this emphasis on the artificiality of representation, of the being present to an image in the process of being contrived, in turn has the rather unsettling effect of presenting, with oddly compelling clarity, the experience of contemporaneity.\footnote{Take for instance Rolf Lassée’s comments, albeit in regard to *Le Déjeuner sur l’herbe* (1863) (fig. 5A.8) that ‘The very fact that the three main protagonists exude an air, and different signs of, indoor and studio “behaviour” (such as a hat and unabashed nudity) puts them on par with the painter’s beholder, who—naturally—also finds him—or herself[—]in an interior, and an artistic interior at that (a museum, as it is, or a private collection, as it might have been), echoing the studio atmosphere of the group of three. In this way we enter the painting, and become part of it ourselves’: Rolf Lassée, ‘Edouard Manet’s “Déjeuner sur l’herbe” as a veiled allegory of painting,’ *Artibus et Historiae*, vol. 26, no. 51 (2005), p. 214.}

In the case of Courbet’s painting, however, an entirely different but certainly no less subversive form of woman-with-parrot imagery seems to have been articulated.\footnote{Aside from the more brutal differences such as the woman’s nudity, as well as her supine and dishevelled state, Courbet’s engagement with a different thematic might also be seen as signalled by something as simple as the choice to depict the more common green parrot, as opposed to the grey Jaco portrayed by Manet.}

Hence, rather than merely referencing the possibly sexually allusive nature of parrot imagery within seventeenth-century Dutch contexts, Courbet’s painting seems a deliberately contrived culmination of a particular tradition evolving from that source that increasingly emphasized the possibly erotic underpinnings of such imagery, taking it as signal excuse for the voyeuristic depiction of female nudity. Courbet’s painting might be seen, then, as the direct, and deliberate, descendent of Delacroix’s small and intimately erotic *La Femme au perroquet* (1827) (fig. 5B.26). Moreover, in appropriating a pose and form of nudity usually confined to monumental classical allegory, but retaining semblances of genre through the presence of the parrot and realism through the discarded clothing and dishevelled hair, Courbet’s painting seems to stand as, if not a satirical take on the inconsistencies of academic attitudes regarding nudity in art, at least a bald-faced attempt to push the boundaries of what could be got dressing, perhaps getting ready for a ball. [...]

If the flowers are related to the ball—most likely a gift from a gentleman—and the monocle is a man’s monocle, then we are provided with the ambience and the clues to the romantic nature of the shared secrets behind the knowing stare of Victorine and her grey confidant’: ibid., p. 122.
away with. In doing so, like Manet seems likewise to have done through the nudity depicted in Le Déjeuner sur l’herbe (fig. 5A.8), Courbet’s painting brings to the fore a particular, and perhaps intrinsically modern, emphasis on the presence of pictorial ideologies, as conventional structurings of imagery, underlying contemporary representational practices.

Although perhaps not engaging, at least not ostensibly, with the degree of critical discourse Courbet and Manet’s girl-feeding-parrot imagery has just been suggested as enacting, Cézanne’s effort is, nonetheless, transgressive in relation to other contemporaneous repetitions of Dutch genre. Take, for instance, the technically virtuosic if thematically vacuous productions of Alexis van Hamme, for instance in The Poultry Seller (1855) (fig. 5B.22) or the polish of semi-realist reconfigurations of that same source, but through the more circuitous route of reviving Chardin’s eighteenth-century intimism, evidenced, for instance, in Chaplin’s prints (fig. 5B.25). In comparison to these, Cézanne’s panel is glaringly crude, combining, perhaps mischievously, the conventional compositional conceit of niche-painting with the bravura handling of the étude or esquisse.

Although Cézanne’s repetition of Dutch genre is never dissociated from the contemporary context in which precisely such activity was increasingly prevalent, the possibility he was simply repeating such contemporary repetitions is rarely raised, an elision simultaneously excising the possibility of parody aimed either at the imagery’s presumed origins in Dutch genre, or the prevailing contemporary manifestations of that imagery as appropriation. Indeed, it is an odd experience to return to Cézanne’s painting after combing through image after image of Dutch woman-with-a-birdcage or woman-feeding-a-parrot or woman-in-a-vine-surrounded-niche looking for potential sources, let alone the various repetitions of those forms in the various revivals those forms subsequently undertook. In such contexts, Cézanne’s work begins to look like an ironic joke, the bird in the girl’s hand suddenly, and quite comically, out of place.

On Courbet’s relation to the nude, and, in particular, his various skirmishes with the Institut regarding the morality or not of his depictions, see: Petra Ten-Doesschate Chu, ‘Courbet’s Venus and Psyche: uneasy nudity in Second-Empire France,’ Art Journal, vol. 51, no. 1 (spring 1992), pp. 38–44.

See also Chaplin’s prints illustrated (fig. 3D.22) and mentioned in section 3D.
The second of the possible paraphrases executed by Cézanne in the years 1862–1865 is *Le Jugement de Paris* (fig. 5B.27), a small and loosely executed depiction of Paris’s judgement of the relative beauties of Juno, Minerva, and Venus. Like the panel just discussed, John Rewald has suggested this work was inspired by an engraving, although he offers no suggestions as to which. Further, like the panel, for all its apparent engagement with traditional imagery, *Le Jugement de Paris* (fig. 5B.27) would seem to have been executed with a similar spirit of developed experimentation, reflected in terms not only of freer palette, but also of loosely confident brushwork.

Likewise, Cézanne’s treatment compositionally is also unconventional. Hence, although there is some precedence for a division of the goddesses into two groups, with Juno and Minerva departing to the left and leaving the victorious Venus close to Paris, more usually they are arrayed as a single group, often rotated through poses referencing classical representations of the three muses (figs 5B.29–31). Cézanne also departs from standard interpretations by positioning the point of Paris’s judging slightly higher than the goddesses, an arrangement with precedent perhaps only in Paolo Veronese’s version of the scene (fig. 5B.30), which also excises Mercury. Also excluded by Cézanne, but not Veronese, and indeed, few, if any, preceding artists, are the various iconological accoutrements usually used to differentiate the

---

114 Rewald, *The Paintings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 92. He also observes that it would seem to be Cézanne’s oldest surviving grouping of painted nudes in an outdoor setting, an arrangement the artist would later develop an almost serial obsession with through his numerous and often monumental *Baigneuses* paintings: loc. cit.

115 Note the similar paint application and, in particular, palette of [R 92] *Jugement de Paris* (1862–1864) (fig. 5B.27) compared to, for instance, [R 51] *Paysage* (c.1865) (fig. 5A.7).

116 Meyer Schapiro, for instance, describes Cézanne’s effort as ‘an extremely odd conception’: Schapiro, ‘The apples of Cézanne,’ op. cit., p. 38 n. 86.


118 See also a drawing by Ludovici Carracci in the Louvre, which likewise depicts Paris higher than the goddesses he judges, but, unlike as in both the Cézanne and Veronese here mentioned, placed centrally: Ludovici Carracci, *Le Jugement de Paris* (1600–1619) (ink and wash on paper 15.5 x 22.9), Musée du Louvre, Paris.)
goddesses and, thereby, their various rewards offered in return for Paris's favour. Hence, if derived from earlier interpretations of the scene, as Rewald implies is likely, Cézanne would seem to have copied an unconventional source, or, failing that, unconventionally pastiched traditional ones.

In terms of the latter, Theodore Reff, for his part, has proposed a relation to Raimondi's engraving of the same scene (fig. 5B.29), albeit through the intermediary of [Ch 57(d-g)] (details from) Page of Figure Studies (1860–1865) (fig. 5B.28), a drawing that he, along with Adrien Chappuis, suggests is a study for the painting. Hence, the pose of the seated female on the right of Cézanne's image, presumably Venus, is described as 'virtually a mirror image' of Paris in the engraving (fig. 5B.33). Any reference to this engraving is unsurprising, given both its status as exemplar par excellence of the judgement of Paris convention, as well as its disseminative reach as print. However, and without rejecting Reff's suggestion, precisely this exemplarity would seem to entail that making a distinction between copying figures from Raimondi's engraving and copying figures from other images likewise copying it would seem difficult, if not impossible, to make. That is, the arrangement and posing of Raimondi's figures have acquired the character of simulacra, endlessly tying together networks of images provoked, in an original sense, by those figures and poses, but whose relationship to each other, in terms of precedent and chronology, is intractably blurred. In regards to this surplus, Raimondi's engraving might also be seen as standing, synecdochically, for precisely the kind of activity just alluded to, functioning not only as the exemplar pictorial interpretation of judgement of Paris themes, but also, through the primacy of that exemplarity, to canonically sanctioned repetition more broadly.

119 Hence, there is no peacock symbolizing Juno's royalty, no weaponry symbolizing Minerva's prowess at war, and no cupid symbolizing Venus's beauty and/or powers of seduction.

120 Reff, 'Cézanne and Hercules,' op. cit., pp. 38–39; Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 65. As noted below, Mary Tompkins Lewis is not convinced [Ch 57(d-g)] (details from) Page of Figure Studies (1860–1865) (fig. 5B.28) bears relation to the judgement of Paris theme, and, thereby, the painting: Lewis, Cézanne's Early Imagery, op. cit., pp. 76–80. On Lewis's assertion that the drawing actually represents a drunken Lot theme, see below. Meyer Schapiro likewise questions whether the figures in the drawing are Venus and Paris: Schapiro, 'The apples of Cézanne,' op. cit., p. 38 n. 86.

121 Reff, 'Cézanne and Hercules,' op. cit., p. 39.

Indeed, this seems precisely the context within which Manet's own appropriation of Raimondi's imagery in *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe* (fig. 5A.8) might be deemed to have functioned. For, aside from enacting the contemporizing gesture suggested above as underpinning *Young Lady in 1866* (fig. 5B.21), Manet's aim in his slightly earlier and perhaps more provocative *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe* would seem the reference to such activity through, as noted above, the representation of repetition in terms of studio re-enactment. Essential to that intent, then, is not only the appearance of having posed models in positions quoting a canonic image, but also the inescapability of this connection. The quote must not only be obvious, but obviously staged.

In comparison, Cézanne's possible engagement with Raimondi's imagery is more fragmentary. Hence, although Reff can cite a similarity between the poses of Cézanne's Venus and Raimondi's Paris (fig. 5B.33), that same figure is also similar to the Adam of Johan Sadler's engraving after Maarten de Vos's *The Temptation of Adam and Eve* (1579) (fig. 5B.34), itself a possible translation of the Raimondi engraving into a biblical temptation scene. Similarly, comparison might also be

123 As Nils Gösta Sandblad observes; 'It cannot be denied that in *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe* something can be traced of the conflict between the two realities which lay at his [Manet's] disposal. He does not make it quite clear to us whether it is part of Saint-Ouen or a part of the studio in Paris which he wishes to present': Nils Gösta Sandblad, *Manet: Three Studies in Artistic Conception*, Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1954, p. 97. Similarly, Carol Armstrong writes '[*Déjeuner sur l'herbe*] is [...] a not-very-veiled evocation of the painter's world of the studio, replete with the model and her discarded clothes, a still-life arrangement, accoutrements and sets, and family visitors, together with a demonstration of painterly quotations and manners, and of the workings of illusion': Carol Armstrong, 'To paint, to point, to pose. Manet's "Déjeuner sur l'herbe"', in Paul Hayes Tucker (ed.), *Manet's *Déjeuner sur l'Herbe*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1998, pp. 108–109. See also: Rolf Laessie, 'Manet's "Déjeuner sur l'herbe" as veiled allegory of painting,' op. cit., pp. 195–220. 

124 This similarity is mostly in terms of the lower half of the figure, and without reversal. Indeed, precisely the notion of the circuitry of citation just-referred to is well-illustrated by comparing the Adam from de Vos's *Temptation of Adam and Eve* (fig. 5B.34) with Lorrain's *The Judgement of Paris* of the following century (fig. 5B.31). For, although the figure of the seated Paris in Lorrain's depiction might reference the Paris in the Raimondi engraving (fig. 5B.33), it could also as easily be seen as a reversed appropriation of de Vos's Adam (fig. 5B.34); notice, for instance, the twisting of the torso and the positioning of the left arm, which seems closer to the pose in the de Vos painting than in Raimondi's engraving. Marcel Roodhisberger, however, implies all the figures in Lorrain's painting were 'ultimately borrowed from Raphael [...] from the engraving of the same subject': Marcel Roodhisberger, 'The Judgment of Paris by Claude,' *Burlington Magazine*, vol. 108, no. 759 (June 1966), p.
drawn between Cézanne's Venus and the Minerva of Lucas de Heere's *Judgement of Paris* (1534–1584) (fig. 5B.37(a)). There is also some similarity between Cézanne's Venus and Nicolas Mignard's depiction of the same goddess, but in a different scene, in his *Mars et Venus* (1658) (fig. 5B.35) in the Musée d'Aix. In fact, in terms of the convention of which Mignard's painting was but one readily accessible instance, the couple depicted in Cézanne's *Page of Figure Studies* (fig. 5B.32(a)) might be seen not as an unconventional study for a judgement of Paris scene, but as a relatively conventional depiction of Mars and Venus embracing, deploying, for instance, the traditional slung-leg pose symbolizing sexual union. To add to this complexity, the figure in Cézanne's drawing identified by Adrien Chappuis as Minerva (fig. 5BJ6), seems similar to those figures appearing, respectively, as Juno and Venus in de Heere and Lorrain's *Judgement of Paris* paintings (figs 5B.37(a–b)), both of whom are depicted holding variations of the classic *Venus pudica* pose. Comparisons might even be drawn beyond classical *Venus pudicas* to depictions of Mary in traditional Annunciation scenes (figs 5B.38(a–c)), themselves often appropriations of the upper part of that pose. In fact, this circular and pastiche-like reference to poses seems itself mirrored in Cézanne's drawing, having the appearance of two images stuck together rather clumsily (fig. 5B.36), the upper half placed oddly too high and too far to the left relative to the lower.

Hence, if in fact, as Chappuis and Reff both suggest, Cézanne's drawings (fig. 5B.28) were studies for *Le Jugement de Paris* (fig. 5B.27), they would seem derived from a

---

316. Lorrain's Paris figure, wherever appropriated from, then seems to have repeated again in Jean Raoux's *Le Jugement de Paris* in the Salon central of the Palais/Palazzo Giustinian Lolin, Venice.

125 Nicolas Mignard's *Mars et Venus* (1658) (fig. 5B.35) was acquired by the Musée d'Aix as part of the Granet bequest, and therefore could have been seen by Cézanne from 1861 onwards, when the Granet wing was finally opened: Denis Coutagne, '[Catalogue notes for] Nicolas Mignard: "Mars et Venus"," in Coutagne et al., *Musee Granet: Guide des collections*, op. cit., p. 126. On the Granet bequest, see section 3A.

126 For canonic depictions of Mars and Venus embracing, with Venus in Mars's lap in the slung-leg pose, see, for instance: Paolo Veronese, *Mars and Venus* (c.1575) (o/c (47 x 47), Galleria Sabauda, Turin); Paolo Veronese (and workshop), *Mars et Vénus* (c16th) (o/c (142 x 109), Musée Condé, Chantilly); and Luca Giordano, *Mars, Venus, and Cupid* (c.1670) (o/c (152 x 129), Museo e gallerie nazionali di Capodimonte, Naples).

127 See also: Giovanni Caroto, *The Annunciation* (c.1508) (m/c (280 x 142), Museo di Castelvecchio, Verona); Titian, *Annunciation* (1519–1520) (o/p (199 x 176), Cappella di Malchiodi, Treviso Cathedral, Treviso); Joseph Delacroix, *L'Annunciation* (1755) (o/c (86 x 112), Musée Condé, Chantilly).
variety of sources, illustrating, in their original contexts a variety of themes. Indeed, Reff notes precisely this ‘confusion of roles’ in terms of Cézanne’s presumed appropriations of figures, suggesting, in addition to the possible use of Raimondi’s Paris (fig. 5B.34) in Le Jugement de Pâris (fig. 5B.27), the later possible use of Minerva from the same image in his later [R 167] La Tentation de saint Antoine (c.1870) (fig. 6C.20). Moreover, this connection is cited by Reff as part-evidence, through the further parallel of Carracci’s use of the same Raimondi figure, but as Vice, in his Hercules at the Crossroads (c.1596), of Cézanne’s deliberate conflation of the judgement of Paris, choice of Hercules, and temptation of Saint Anthony themes across his œuvre, manifesting, thereby, an expression of a presumed specifically personal context. Hence, the separation of Venus from the other two goddesses in

---

128 The search for possible sources for the figures in Cézanne’s sketch and painting, once undertaken, quickly veers into vertiginous territory. Hence, for instance, the closest of the departing goddesses in Cézanne’s painted version of the scene bears some resemblance to the Venus figure from Giulio Romano’s Preparations for the Wedding Feast of Cupid and Psyche (1527–1530) (fresco, Palazzo del Te, Mantua), an image which Cézanne could never have seen in its frescoed state in the Sala di Psiche of the Palazzo del Te in Mantua, but which he might have had access to through engraved versions such as Preparations for the Wedding Feast of Cupid and Psyche, engraving by Diana Scultori (1575), after a fresco by Giulio Romano (on paper (37.3 x 47.5), British Museum, London). And indeed, if such a reference, however unlikely, was intended, an additional layer of complexity would seem added to Cézanne’s possible appropriation of the Venus figure, at least in terms of its imagic context in Romano’s fresco. For, Venus is pointing, the same gesture here suggested as similar to that enacted by the goddess in Cézanne’s painting, at Mercury receiving an apple from a woman at the end of the banqueting table, an emphatic prefiguration thereby not only Mercury’s receiving of the apple of discord from Jupiter and Paris’s receiving, in turn, that same apple from Mercury, but also Venus’s receiving that apple from Paris as sign of her victory. In the inimitable words of Hubert Damisch, in regards to Romano’s fresco: ‘it is as though Venus were saying in an aside, as a kind of historical gloss: “Make no mistake, this is a gift that is destined for me, and that eventually will come to me, in another fable, another “histoire”; these apples are mine, and I take Mercury as witness to what I say, for he, too, will be of the party!”’ Damisch, The Judgement of Paris, op. cit., p. 255. Ironically, and as an instance of precisely the kind of alterations to meaning the processes of reproduction and/or pastiche might often entail and/or include, in Scultori’s engraving after Romano’s fresco, the woman handing Mercury the apple has been excised, making Venus’s gesture thematically ambiguous.

129 Reff, ‘Cézanne and Hercules,’ op. cit., p. 40. [R 167] La Tentation de saint Antoine (c.1870) (fig. 6C.20) is discussed in section 6C.

130 loc. cit. Reff also raises the example of Carracci’s Hercules at the Crossroads (c.1596) as possible inspiration, through the intermediary of an engraving published in Antonio Niccolini’s Real Museo Borbonico, for certain of the imagic elements in his Cézanne’s possible poetic engagements with the Choice of Hercules myth discussed above in chapter two: Annibale Carracci Hercules at the Crossroads (c.1596) (o/c (167 x 272), Museo e Gallerie Nazionali di Capodimonte, Naples); Hercules at the Crossroads, engraving by B. del Vecchio, after a painting by Annibale Carracci (c.1596) (published in Antonio Niccolini, Real Museo Borbonico, Naples: Stamperia Reale, 1824–1857, vol. 5, pl. 16). As Reff notes: ‘What makes an engraving of Carracci’s ceiling his most probable source [for Cézanne’s ‘tortuous path’ quatrain] is its inclusion of just these features—the steep, winding path to which Virtue points,
Cézanne's painting is taken as a possible collapse of Paris's choice regarding beauty into a Herculean one in terms of career, the same theme, as discussed in chapter two, perceived by Reff as underpinning certain of Cézanne's early poetic attempts. Venus has become Vice, Minerva and Juno Virtue, and the guilt and dread of this choice, depicted as already made in the painting, is deemed then to transform, through the displacement of figures and citations across works, into the dreadful and nightmarish temptations depicted, for instance, in La Tentation de saint Antoine (fig. 6C.20).

Therefore, Reff deems Cézanne's possible appropriations deliberate deployments, almost fetishistically, of the themes implicit in those figures' original contexts. Precisely the kinds of interpretive gestures applied to the citatory acts discussed above as perceived present in his poetic efforts of his pre-Parisian years are now applied to his paintings. In short and finally, returning, again, to a comparison with Manet, the content deemed activated by Cézanne's presumed quotations are in terms of the themes originally expressed by the images they were taken from, whereas, in contrast, the content deemed activated by Manet's quotations are the status of that imagery as canonic repetition per se.

The final of the three paintings possibly executed by Cézanne in the period 1862–1864 and seemingly engaging with past pictorial tradition is [R 76] Loth et ses filles (c.1865 or earlier) (fig. 5B.39), which appears to depict, albeit in terms perhaps more sexually explicit than usual, the episode from Genesis 19: 30–38 in which Lot, befuddled by and the emblems of "shameful pleasure," which are also emblems of the arts, at the feet of Vice": Reff, 'Cézanne and Hercules,' op. cit., pp. 36–37.

131 See section 2D.

132 Reff, 'Cézanne and Hercules,' op. cit., pp. 38–39. Reff also notes the possibility of a pun on the Paris's name; 'Indeed, the young Cezanne, playing unconsciously on a familiar homonym, as he had often played on other words in his poetry and letters, may well have associated the name of the capital with that of the Trojan hero, so that the classical tale of a provincial youth tempted by offers of power, wealth, and love became linked in his imagination with the temptations he himself feared': ibid., p. 39. Reff also cites, in relation to this, Cézanne's above-quoted remarks on Signol's studio made in his 1863 letter to Coste and Villevieille, in which he lamented, in regards to Lombard's enrolment there, 'To think that an intelligent young man should come to Paris only to be led astray': Cézanne, letter to Coste and Villevieille, 5 January 1863, op. cit., p. 103; Reff, 'Cézanne and Hercules,' op. cit., pp. 38–39.
wine, is seduced by his two daughters in a cave outside Zoar. Absent from Lionello Venturi's 1936 catalogue raisonné, the painting was 'newly revealed' at the time of its inclusion in the pivotal 1988 exhibition Cézanne the Early Years 1859–1872, authenticated as a work by Cézanne by the catalogue's author Lawrence Gowing. The basis for this attribution, however, seems as much the painting's provenance—'from a former resident of Aix, who came by original material in the city'—as its subject matter or execution, both of which, as Gowing himself notes, depart considerably from Cézanne's other surviving painted efforts of the period.

These departures are framed by Gowing, however, not as evidence against attribution to Cézanne, but rather as sign of the painter's move towards more personally revealing modes of pictorial expression. Hence, in comparison to what Gowing brands the 'circumspect restraint' of Cézanne's more securely attributable paintings of the period, such as the copies after Frillicé and Prud'hon discussed in chapter three, Lot et ses filles is deemed, by virtue of its sexually explicit content, a less mediated presentation of Cézanne's true character. The painting marks for Gowing, then, through a comparison with Cézanne's early erotic poetry, the moment his 'unbridled fancy' crossed from poetic into visual realms. Mary Tompkins Lewis likewise sees the same continuities and seminality, perceiving in Cézanne's painting, which see follows

133 Lawrence Gowing, ['Catalogue notes for] "Lot and His Daughters",' in Gowing et al., Cézanne: the Early Years 1859–1872, op. cit., p. 74 (cat. no. 3). [30] Lot and his two daughters left Zoar and settled in the mountains, for he was afraid to stay in Zoar. He and his two daughters lived in a cave. [31] One day the older daughter said to the younger, "Our father is old, and there is no man around here to lie with us, as is the custom all over the earth. [32] Let's get our father to drink wine and then lie with him and preserve our family line through our father." [33] That night they got their father to drink wine, and the older daughter went in and lay with him. He was not aware of it when she lay down or when she got up. [34] The next day the older daughter said to the younger, "Last night I lay with my father. Let's get him to drink wine again tonight, and you go in and lie with him so we can preserve our family line through our father." [35] So they got their father to drink wine that night also, and the younger daughter went and lay with him. Again he was not aware of it when she lay down or when she got up. [36] So both of Lot's daughters became pregnant by their father. [37] The older daughter had a son, and she named him Moab; he is the father of the Moabites of today. [38] The younger daughter also had a son, and she named him Ben-Ammi; he is the father of the Ammonites of today': Genesis 19: 30–38.

134 Gowing, 'Lot and His Daughters,' op. cit., p. 74 (cat. no. 3). The painting was sold to a private collector a year after the exhibition at Sotheby's auction: Sotheby's (London), Impressionist and Modern Paintings and Sculpture, Pt. 2: Wednesday, 29 November, 1989, auction catalogue, London: Sotheby's, 1989, cat. no. 234.

135 Gowing, "Lot and His Daughters", op. cit., p. 74 (cat. no. 3).

136 loc. cit.

137 loc. cit.
Gowing’s c.1861 suggested dating for, a conjunction of sex, violence, and ‘dark terror’ deemed previously present only in his poetry and precursive of the thematic underpinnings of his late 1860s ‘fantasy paintings’.\textsuperscript{138} An arc is thereby inscribed linking Cézanne’s poetry to his romantic canvases, one that, passing through its first visual manifestation in the form of \textit{Loth et ses filles} (fig. 5B.39), is deemed grounded in the expression of an authentic personal content, in particular, for instance, the painter’s ‘troubled, youthful sexuality’.\textsuperscript{139} The deviances perceived are thereby noted not merely as originality, but as emphatic imprints of Cézanne’s presumed inner turmoil made increasingly visible through a decrease in the mediation of his imagery as convention. By breaking rules, Cézanne is seen to be better showing his true self.

However, a certain paradox seems implicit in such an interpretation, at least in regards to the reflexive nature of the perceived rule-breaking. Hence, in Mary Tompkins Lewis’s analysis of the painting, Cézanne’s activation of certain key motifs indicates not only an awareness of the usual conventions of the theme, but also their deliberate subversion in order to create an imagic ‘travesty’ better reflecting Cézanne’s own ‘heated and intensely private inner vision’.\textsuperscript{140} The articulation of the painting, as convention, seems deemed consciously manipulated, and thereby, surely, possibly parodic, while the content is presumed to have remained viscerally and instinctively authentic.

In terms firstly of Cézanne’s awareness of the conventions deemed subverted in \textit{Loth et ses filles} (fig. 5B.39), Lewis cites the presence of canonic motifs such as the ewer symbolizing Lot’s drunkenness, the distant fires of Sodom’s destruction, the cave-like setting, and the differing hairstyles of Lot’s daughters, braided for the older, flowing for the younger.\textsuperscript{141} Where the composition deviates is the explicitness of the depiction of the seduction, a variation Lewis seems to link with a perceived mood of ‘dark terror’.\textsuperscript{142} However, to see the portrayed act, as Lewis does, as one ‘rife with conflict’ seems overblown, as does her comparison with the morbidly Romantic conjunction of

\textsuperscript{138} Lewis, \textit{Cézanne’s Early Imagery}, op. cit., pp. 70, 75–76, 80.
\textsuperscript{139} ibid., p. 80.
\textsuperscript{140} ibid., p. 80.
\textsuperscript{141} ibid., pp. 70–71. For such conventions, Lewis cites: Joshua Kind, \textit{The Drunken Lot and His Daughters}, unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Columbia University, Columbia, 1967.
\textsuperscript{142} Lewis, \textit{Cézanne’s Early Imagery}, op. cit, p. 75.
sex and violence depicted in Delacroix’s Mort de Sardanapale (fig. 5B.40). For, Lot’s drunken and startled surprise at being suddenly embraced by his daughter seems far closer in spirit to the similarly awkward exchange depicted in his earlier Caricature of ‘Jupiter and Thetis’ (fig. 3E.22), than to the brutal conflation of nakedness and murder invoked by Delacroix. The evocation seems less the sinister ‘dread and force’ perceived by Lewis and more the humorous debaucheries suggested above as burlesqued in Cézanne’s early poetry.

Similarly, Lewis’s suggestion that Delacroix’s grand machine might have inspired the colouration and brushwork of Loth et ses filles seems equally forced. Cézanne is unlikely to have seen Mort de Sardanapale (fig. 5B.40) first-hand during the 1860s, and any interaction with its imagery would seem necessarily confined, as was also presumably the case with his fragmentary drawn copies (Ch 141(a–b, d–e)) (details) After Eugène Delacroix: Sardanapalus (1866–1867) (fig. 5B.43), to either Achille Sirouy’s uncoloured lithograph (fig. 5B.41) or Delacroix’s own drawn sketches for the work, recourse to either offering no indication of palette or brushstroke. Interestingly, Cézanne’s sheet of studies after the Mort de Sardanapale imagery (fig. 5B.43) also contains a depiction of bearded man that Adrien Chappuis describes as a ‘copy from an undetermined model’. Whatever its source, the head seems to have been repeated, a decade later, as the inscrutable watcher in the boat of Cézanne’s [R

143 ibid., pp. 71, 76.
144 See section 3E.
145 Lewis, Cézanne’s Early Imagery, op. cit, p. 71.
146 Mort de Sardanapale (fig. 5B.40) was held in private collections up until its purchase by the Louvre in 1921; it was publicly displayed during the 1860s on only one occasion, at a Boulevard Italiens exhibition running from December 1861 to March 1862, one of the few periods in the first half of the 1860s that Cézanne seems definitively not to have been in Paris: Johnson, The Paintings of Eugène Delacroix, op. cit., vol. 1, cat. no. 125, p. 115. Sarah Lichtenstein, for one, states at one point that Cézanne was in Paris for Delacroix’s 1861–1862 exhibition, although no evidence for this is cited: Lichtenstein, ‘Cézanne and Delacroix,’ op. cit., p. 56 n. 6. Joachim Gasquet reports seeing a framed print after Mort de Sardanapale in one of Cézanne’s studios following his death: Gasquet, Joachim Gasquet’s Cézanne, op. cit., p. 74; Reff, ‘Reproductions and books in Cézanne’s studio,’ op. cit., pp. 304–305. In terms of Delacroix’s sketches for Mort de Sardanapale, twelve sheets were exhibited under the title ‘Sardanapale: Dessin et croquis’ at the 1864 posthumous studio sale mentioned above, and which Cézanne might have visited: Catalogue de la vente qui aura lieu par suite du décès de Eugène Delacroix, op. cit., p. 44 (cat. no. 318).
147 Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 80.
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Les Pêcheurs—Journée de juillet (c.1875) (fig. 5B.44). The study sheet might thereby have been prompted not by an interest in the more violent aspects of Delacroix's Mort de Sardanapale as by the more prosaic function of collecting, on the same sheet, and from possibly multiple sources, depictions of 'Oriental' heads.

Moreover, whether related to Delacroix or not, and in regard to Lewis's assertion of authentically personal content in Loth et ses filles, the suggestion of a 'vehemence' of paint application indicating a 'violent attitude' towards the subject matter seems likewise stretched. For, in comparison to Cézanne's other paintings of the period, and keeping in mind its small scale, the brushwork in Loth et ses filles is, in contrast, decidedly delicate. Nevertheless, Lewis also cites as evidence of Cézanne's 'fascination with the Lot story', and thereby the implication of a certain compulsive attraction to its 'illicit but potent sensuality', the Page of Figure Studies (fig. 5B.28) mentioned above, which she suggests, pace Reff and Chappuis, as comprising studies not for a judgement of Paris scene, but a drunken Lot depiction. Hence, the female identified by Reff as Venus (fig. 5B.32(a)) is, for Lewis, actually Lot's eldest daughter, whilst Minerva (fig. 5B.36) is the younger. As evidence for this, Lewis cites the braided hair and slung-leg position of the seated figure as well as the free flowing hair and bared breast of the standing girl, motifs not only conventionally associated with the role of Minerva in Cézanne’s representations of the story of Lot, but also with the depictions of women in distress that are so often associated with Cézanne’s works from this period. However, it is also possible that Cézanne's interest in the Lot story was sparked by the affective qualities of Veronese's depictions of women in distress, rather than their specific thematic underpinnings.
with Lewis’s identifications, but also repeated, with the exception of the slung-leg posture, in his painting (fig. 5B.39). The slung-leg pose is not, however, confined to, and thereby definitional of, drunken Lot depictions, often used, for instance, and as noted above in regard to precisely these sketches, in canonic coupled portrayals of Mars and Venus (fig. 5B.42). The study sheet could as easily be, then, an initially unrelated combination of fragments derived from multiple works with different thematic content as a deliberate attempt to assemble figures for some specifically preconceived conventional theme.

Returning, finally, to the painting, however, and the conception suggested above, pace Lewis, of its possibly light-heartedly erotic content, it should be noted that Wayne Andersen offers precisely this characterization as part-evidence for rejecting an attribution to Cézanne, describing the work as 'a rather banal example of a biblical theme rendered as provincial pornography.' For Andersen, then, the painting evokes not a troubled conflation of romanticism and biblical narrative, but a slightly off-coloured burlesque. He also sees, however, despite this banality, a degree of competency in the painting beyond Cézanne's capabilities, suggesting the depiction of Lot's legs, for instance, could not have been executed by the young artist 'without imagery to copy from.' Precisely this possibility is not, however, then considered by Andersen, despite there being examples, again from the canon of Mars and Venus imagery (fig. 5B.42), for instance, that might provide candidature. Nevertheless, Andersen's point regarding the non-serious nature of Loth et ses filles (fig. 5B.39) is well made, and if correct, might provide continuities with Cézanne’s early poetry, but in terms of parody rather than the presumption of serious underlying content.

---

152 Lewis, Cézanne's Early Imagery, op. cit., pp. 70–71, 76–79. Lewis cites, as an example of the slung-leg pose used in a drunken Lot depiction Simon Vouet’s Loth et ses filles (1633) (oil (160 x 130), Musée des Beaux-Arts, Strasbourg): Lewis, Cézanne's Early Imagery. op. cit., p. 79.
153 Andersen, The Youth of Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., pp. 298, 508–509 n. 31. The quote is from: ibid., p. 508 n. 31
154 loc. cit.
5C: The photographed self transformed

Perhaps the oddest painting presumed undertaken by Cézanne in the first half of the 1860s is his earliest known surviving painted self-portrait, [R 72] Portrait de Paul Cézanne (1862–1864) (fig. 5C.1), a work executed after a photograph usually presumed to have been taken in Aix several years earlier, in 1861 (fig. 5C.2). Given the vagueness of the evidence used to date both the photograph and the painting, the presumption of a gap between their respective executions seems based on disjunctions between them, particularly in terms of the persona perceived pictured. This difference, made visually manifest through comparison, has for many since come to stand as signal metaphor of Cézanne's transformation during this period. Cézanne is seen as remaking not only himself, but also, retrospectively, the image of himself being made.

In terms of general stylistic affinities, and aside, for a moment comparison with its presumed model, Cézanne’s self-portrait repeats, albeit perhaps ineptly, many of the conventional tropes of French Romantic portraiture, a cluster of affects in many ways exemplified by the more emotive portraits by Théodore Géricault, for instance his Portrait d’homme dit de Lord Byron (early 1800s) (fig. 5C.4) and his late portraits of

---

155 The 1862–1864 date range for the painting’s execution is John Rewald’s suggestion; Lionello Venturi had earlier given a range of 1858–1861, a date, however, that he apparently intended to revise to c.1861, presumably to account for the dating of the photograph, which was made after the publication of his catalogue raisonné Venturi, Cézanne, op. cit., p. 71 [V 18]; Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 83. The photograph was first published, it seems, in Léo Larguier’s book of reminiscences, but without a date; it was then dated by Gertrude Mack as from ‘around 1860’, and then by John Rewald as either from ‘1861’ or ‘c.1861’; neither, however, give any reasons for these dates: Larguier, Le Dimanche avec Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 12; Mack, Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 106 ter; Rewald, Cézanne et Zola, op. cit., p. 16 ter (fig. 3); Rewald, History of Impressionism, op. cit., p. 74; Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 83. Steven Platzman and Nina Maria Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, who follow Rewald’s suggested ‘c.1861’ dating for the photograph, both suggest, perhaps intuitively, that the photograph was taken in Aix: Steven Platzman, Cézanne: The Self-Portraits, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001; Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., p. 16. If the photograph was taken in 1861, however, it could have as easily been taken in Paris, Cézanne spending almost half that year in the capital. In terms of other candidates for the artist’s first self-portrait in any medium, there is a drawing on the frontispiece of a novel once owned by Cézanne’s mother, [Ch] [Caricatures] (n.d.) (fig. 1.1), that has sometimes been described as a self-portrait: Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 198.
mental patients (fig. 5C.5). In such works, there is an emphasis on dramatic expression, stark and high-contrast lighting, dark backgrounds, and loose and often broken brushwork, all features which were then intensified by Géricault’s Romantic inheritors, in particular, and in the more specific context of self-portraiture, Delacroix’s efforts of 1816 and 1837 (figs 5C.6–7). This same tendency towards broader modelling and implicit theatricality not only of pose, but also of painterly application, was likewise taken up by Courbet, particularly in his self-portraits of the 1840s such as Le Désespéré (1841) (fig. 5C.8) and L’Homme à la pipe or Portrait de l’auteur (c.1846) (fig. 5C.9).

Cézanne is unlikely, however, to have seen any of these paintings just-cited, particularly those displaying the heightened intensity of emotion seemingly attempted in his own effort. Hence, if his self-portrait was predicated upon the mimicking of

---

156 Géricault seems to have executed up to ten paintings in this so-called ‘portraits of the insane’ series, but only five now survive; although never intended for public viewing, and virtually unknown until the early twentieth century, the works have come to be considered, in Lorenz Eitner’s words, the transcendent achievement of [Géricault’s] last years: Lorenz E. A. Eitner, Géricault: His Life and Work, London: Orbis Publishing, 1983, p. 241. On the series in general, and a summary of hypotheses concerning their motivation and/or purpose, see: ibid., pp. 241–250.

157 Douglas Lord, ‘French nineteenth-century portraiture,’ The Burlington Magazine, vol. 72, no. 423 (June 1938), p. 259. Indeed, certain of Lord’s comments regarding Géricault’s portrait of Byron could easily be made of Cézanne’s self-portrait; for instance, ‘[t]he clue to character is not the attitude [...] but the obtruding veins, the brooding angry look in the eyes, the pursed lips’; loc. cit. For a similar characterization of Romantic portraiture, but through the slightly different lens of late eighteenth-century British painting, see: Nadia Tschertny, ‘Likeness in Romantic portraiture,’ Art Journal, vol. 46, no. 3 (autumn 1987), pp. 193–199. Delacroix’s debt to Géricault is highlighted by the earlier of the two self-portraits here cited, Autoportrait (c.1816) (fig. 5C.6), being, for many years, attributed to Géricault: catalogue notes for [inv. 893.3], from the online collection database of the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Rouen, accessible at: http://www.rouen-musees.com/Musee-des-Beaux-Arts/Les-collections/Le-romantisme-Autoportrait-96.htm. On the attribution to Delacroix rather than Géricault, and, in particular, its basis on the painting’s similarity to an engraving by Frédéric Villot after a drawing by Delacroix, see: Germain Bazin, Théodore Géricault: Étude critique, documents et catalogue raisonné. Paris: Wildenstein Institute, 1992, t. 5, p. 93. The painting does not, however, appear in Lee Johnson’s catalogue raisonné of Delacroix’s work published in 1981, even in the ‘doubtful works’ section.

158 Géricault’s portraits of the mentally ill remained virtually unseen until the twentieth century, and Courbet’s self-portrait as a young and frustrated painter (fig. 5C.8), apparently a similarly purely private expression, stayed with the artist up until his death; on the provenance and dispersal of Géricault’s portraits of the mentally ill, see: Eitner, Géricault: His Life and Work, op. cit., p. 242. On Courbet’s Le Désespéré (1841) (fig. 5C.8), see: Dominique Font-Réaux et al., Gustave Courbet, exhibition catalogue (Galeries nationales du Grand Palais, Paris, 13 October 2007–28 January 2008; Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 27 February–18 May 2008; Musée Fabre, Montpellier, 14 June–28 September 2008), New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, c.2008. Courbet’s less emotionally-charged self-
the more extreme stylistic features of the paintings just-highlighted, rather than intuitively extrapolating such affects from their author's more conventional and easily-accessible works, it would seem necessarily to have come through the intermediary of younger artists likewise extending, as repetition, those artists' endeavours.

Some similarity might thereby be noted between Cézanne's self-portrait and those of Fantin-Latour, an inveterate autoportraitiste and, briefly, student of Courbet. Take, for instance, Autoportrait (1858) (fig. 5C.10), a painting owned for a period by Cézanne's friend Antoine Guillemet and that has a similar emphasis on dark background and dramatic lighting, as well as the pair Autoportrait (1860) and Autoportrait, la tête légèrement baissée (1861) (fig. 5C.11), both of which depict the same lowered expression and forceful intensity of gaze emphasized in Cézanne's depiction. However, the most startling resonance between Cézanne's painting and the work of his contemporaries is, although a depiction of Fantin-Latour, not by that painter himself, but by his friend Carolus-Duran, in the right-hand half of the latter's double portrait Fantin-Latour et Oulevay (1861) (fig. 5C.12). There, as in portrait L'Homme à la pipe (c.1846) (fig. 5C.9) was exhibited twice in 1861, once Montpellier and Marseille, and hence might have been seen by Cézanne before the date of execution of his own self-portrait suggested by John Rewald. He might also have seen it at Courbet's massive self-subsidized exhibition mounted in a temporary structure on the Rond-Point du Pont de l'Alma in 1867, mentioned again below in regard to that exhibition's inclusion of Les Baigneuses (1853) (fig. 6B.2) the principal figure of which Cézanne is often presumed to have borrowed the pose of for his mural nude [R 29] Le Baigneur au rocher (1867-1869) (fig. 6B.3); on this see section 6B.

159 On Courbet's ill-fated open studio, provoked by a petition from students unhappy with the curriculum of the École des Beaux-Arts but which lasted only two months, from 6 December 1861 to 2 February 1862, and in which Fantin-Latour was enrolled, see: Jack Lindsay, Gustave Courbet: His Life and Art, London: Jupiter, 1977, pp. 170–175. It is one of the ironies of history that Cézanne was not in Paris at precisely this time; whether the young painter would have availed himself of such an opportunity to study under the master is entirely open to conjecture. Of Fantin-Latour's surviving work, twenty-nine are painted self-portraits, twenty-six of these executed in or before 1863: from the same period, some twenty drawn autoportraits also survive: Sylvie Wuhrmann, "En tête à tête avec la nature": Les autoportraits de Fantin-Latour,' in Juliane Cosandier et al., Fantin-Latour: De la réalité au rêve, exhibition catalogue (Fondation de l’Hermitage, Lausanne, 29 June–28 August 2007), Lausanne: Bibliothèque des arts, 2007, p. 27.


161 According to Gonzalo J. Sánchez, Henri-Charles Oulevay, although trained in the École des Beaux-Arts, made his name mostly as a caricaturist, contributing to journals such as Le Journal Amusant, Le Monde pour Rire, and Le Paradis; a friend, apparently, of both Courbet and Gill,
Cézanne’s painting, the inky black of a background void is contrasted with the pallid flesh tones and blazingly-white shirt-collar of the foreground sitter; likewise, there is the same head positioning, pointed—almost demonically-horned—forehead, sullen stare, and juvenile pout (figs 5C.16–17).

In terms of artists closer biographically to Cézanne, some resonance also seems to exist between his effort and an 1859 portrait of Ferdinand Viola (fig. 5C.13) by the Marseillaise painter Monticelli, whom Cézanne might have met in the 1860s. Likewise, there is also affiliation, albeit perhaps resulting from a shared desire to incorporate the tonal advances of Manet’s early 1860s canvases, with the self-portrait of Frédéric Bazille (fig. 5C.14), a painter Cézanne had befriended as early as 1863.

---

he exhibited in most Salons, contributing either paintings, engravings, or lithographs, between 1865 and 1880: Gonzalo J. Sánchez, Organizing Independence: The Artists Federation of the Paris Commune and its Legacy, 1871–1889, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997, pp. 87–88. In regard to the possibility of Cézanne having seen Carolus-Duran’s double portrait before executing his own self-portrait, there is a slim chance the former might have been exhibited at the 1861 Salon, although this would require creative interpretation of the available, albeit scant, evidence. Hence, according to the catalogue of the 1861 Salon, Carolus-Duran exhibited five works, Après le jeu, L’Homme endormi, Portrait de M. le vicomte de C..., Portrait de M. F. M..., and Portrait de Mme. B...: Catalogues of the Paris Salon: 1673 to 1881, op. cit., vol. 42 [1861], p. 120. Of these, only L’Homme endormi would seem identifiable with a surviving work, the painting of that name now in the collection of the Musée des Beaux-Arts in Lille. Given the 1861 date of the Fantin-Latour et Ouelbay double-portrait, however, it is not entirely inconceivable that that painting was also exhibited, albeit mistitled as Portrait de M. F. [sic] M. [O]... This stretching of evidence would also require, however, that Valery Vernier also mixed up the titles of the works he discussed in his article, describing the latter painting as containing a bright red scarf (‘Le meilleur tableau du peintre est le portrait de M. F... M... [sic], dont la cravate rouge attire l’œil vers les hauteurs de la salle’): Vernier, ‘A travers les portraits,’ op. cit., p. 225. The double portrait contains no such device, but L’Homme endormi emphatically does. Unfortunately, I was not able to access perhaps the only comprehensive scholarly account of Carolus-Duran’s œuvre that might quash such extravagant conjecture and/or provide more information on possible links between Cézanne and Carolus-Duran’s biography, Michèle Le Gal’s 1973 unpublished three volume doctoral dissertation for the l’École du Louvre, Carolus-Duran: Sa vie, son œuvre dessiné. 162

As noted above, Cézanne painted with Monticelli in the early 1870s, but might have met him earlier, or, at least, seen his works exhibited in his native Marseille, see section 5A. 163

On Bazille’s positive regard for Manet, take, for instance, the comments included in a letter he sent to his parents shortly after seeing Manet’s 1863 exhibition at the Martinet gallery in Paris, ‘You wouldn’t believe how much I’m learning by looking at these pictures […] One of these sessions is worth a month’s work’: Frédéric Bazille, letter to his parents, 1863, cited and translated in James N. Wood, Impressionism and Post-Impressionism in the Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago: Art Institute of Chicago, 2000, p. 29. Cézanne’s acquaintance with Bazille by at least 1863 is based on the recollections of Auguste Renoir; ‘That year [1863] I became acquainted with Cézanne. I then had a small artist’s studio on the rue de la Cindanne, in the Batignolles district. [Frédéric] Bazille and I shared that studio. Bazille was returning one day and was accompanied by two young men: ’I am bringing you two great new recruits!’ They were Cézanne and Pissarro’: Auguste Renoir, quoted in Ambroise Vollard, Auguste Renoir...
In fact, Richard Shiff raises precisely the example of Bazille, specifically his portrait of Edouard Blau of 1866 (fig. 5C.15), in illustrating an endemic spatial disjunction often present in both Cézanne and Bazille's works more generally, and characterized by Shiff as the result of a desire to present an immediate and unmediated representation of vision. The irony, in the case of Cézanne's self-portrait, is that such distortions, outlined further below, came not whilst attempting to depict a figure in real space, but, rather, a two-dimensional image of one.

In any case, all the just-noted similarities between Cézanne's self-portrait and those of certain of his peers is not raised in order to imply any necessary relation between those works in terms of direct copying, but instead, to suggest the degree to which some affinity might be suggested between Cézanne's visual reconfiguration of himself and the image members of the 'nouvelle école' were likewise and presumably contemporaneously attempting to present of themselves. Hence, whether through parallel evolution or imitation, Cézanne seems to have conflated in his self-portrait many of the disparate strands of influence likewise impelling the more progressive aspects of those artists' work, features resulting, perhaps, as the attempt to strike a middle path between the until-then irreconcilable realism of Courbet and the romanticism of Delacroix, an enacting of Baudelaire's emphasis on contemporaneity but decanted, ironically, through the rising fashion in Paris for the Spanish Baroque in all its seventeenth-century black-backgrounded and dramatically-emotive glory.

---


165 On Fried's appellation for the group forming around Manet, see section 4A.

166 As Michael Fried points out, this program, at least in terms of the attempt to fuse the influences of Courbet and Delacroix is perhaps best exemplified by Fantin-Latour's group-portrait and 1864 Salon submission *Hommage à Delacroix* (1864) (o/c (160 x 250), Musée d'Orsay, Paris), which portrays, among others, Fantin-Latour, Legros, Whistler, and Manet, alongside Baudelaire and those critics perhaps most responsible for championing Courbet's realist cause during the 1850s, Champfleury and Edmond Duranty, all standing around a portrait of Delacroix, who had died the year before: Fried, 'Manet in his generation,' op. cit., pp. 22–24, and in particular, p. 24 n. 3. On the interaction between Spanish painting, particularly of the Baroque, and nineteenth-century French painting, see, in general: Gary Tinterow et al., *Manet/Velázquez: The French Taste for Spanish Painting*, exhibition catalogue
Indeed, such was the emergent avant-garde's perceived indebtedness to the Spanish school that contemporary critics could openly deride Manet for producing, early on, mere pastiches of Velázquez and Goya.  

Likewise, only a year after the close of the date-range of execution suggested by John Rewald in regard to Portrait de Paul Cézanne (fig. 5C.1), Cézanne would also be described, in an article in which his name would be mentioned in the press for the first time, in terms of both his attempted avant-gardism as well as his deliberate indebtedness to the Spanish tenebrists Jusepe de Ribera and Francisco Zurbarán.  

However, whether the possibility of Cézanne's invocation of the Spanish Baroque was a direct response to his experiences in Paris, or an extension of the more distinctly-localized and partly-parochial Provençal baroque revivalism epitomised, for instance, by Monticelli's portrait cited above (fig. 5C.13), would seem a question remaining open.  

In any case, aside from the more extreme emotive affects deployed by Cézanne, the main difference between many, if not all, the portraits or self-portraits so far compared...
here to Cézanne’s effort is that painting’s apparent dependency on a photograph. Whether intentionally or not, Portrait de Paul Cézanne (fig. 5C.1) by virtue of the persistence of that photographed image, if only in reproduction, thereby short-circuits many of the interpretative tropes endemic to self-portraiture and, in fact, often definitional of it. That is, Cézanne cannot, in executing his self-portrait, depict himself scrutinizing himself, but rather, enact, through depiction, the scrutinizing of an image of himself produced, mechanically, by someone else. Nevertheless, the interpretively-provoking aspect of Cézanne’s painting is precisely this existence of an image after which it was presumed executed, a state of affairs offering the rather odd opportunity of comparing a self-portrait directly with its model.

Such a comparison does in fact reveal interesting formal divergences, illustrated, rather crudely, by overlaying the photograph with an outline of the main contours of the painting (fig. 5C.3). Hence, the face has been elongated and rotated slightly clockwise, its left-hand margin thereby straightened and pushed closer to the vertical. The eyes have been decreased in size, made more emphatically circular, and moved together, the iris on the right moved, rather weirdly, upwards. The centre-point of the brow has also been lowered and the eyebrows given a caricaturish arch that, with the sharpened and slightly demonic points of the forehead above, transforms the placid stare captured by the photograph into a scowling leer. The modifications in and around the eyes have also, in sum, rotated the axis of the eye-line clockwise and tipped the front of the head forward, a tilt in turn countered not only by the enlarging of the chin below and the sharpening of the lower lip, which pushes both forward, but also by the lowering of the skull-line. This disassembling of spatial cues is then continued in the right ear, which, compared to the photograph, is folded much closer

---

170 In terms of these affects, take for instance, the venomous reds in the corner of the eyes and the manic, almost goggle-eyed stare.


172 In terms of the left margin of the face, Robert Ratcliffe takes the opposite view to that presented here, seeing a slight tilt to the left in the painting compared to the photograph (‘[Cézanne’s painting] increases the left slope of the left contour of the face’): Ratcliffe, Cézanne’s Working Methods, op. cit., p. 137.
to the picture plane, apparently against the thrust of both the left forehead and the left shoulder, which are likewise pushed forward, the torso in particular twisted around so far as to almost face the viewer frontally. The collar in turn, as well as the shirtfront beneath the jacket, has also been enlarged considerably, increasing the areas available to be coloured white and thereby acting as balancing foil both to the velvety background beyond and the greyish flesh-tones of the face above.

Although the specifics, in terms of degree and rotation, of such discrepancies depend on how the main contour of the painting is enlarged and placed relative to the photograph, there is no denying their presence. And, thereby returning to the notion of disjunction introduced above, it is precisely this transformation as a set of differences that has occupied much of the interpretative attention given the painting over the years. Hence, for Lionello Venturi, the differences between the photograph and Cézanne’s self-portrait are deemed the result of an inept and juveniliey Romantic nature yet to be shed. For many following however, for instance Jack Lindsay, Lawrence Gowing, and John Rewald, the same differences served the more sophisticated purpose of emblematizing the biographical pressures perceived exerted upon Cézanne, their presence thereby marking not only such pressure, but also the instinctively antagonistic reaction they are then presumed to have provoked. More recently the perception of a pictured crisis has been transformed into an even positive and nuanced reading, the distortions seen as wilful and deliberate propagandizing of the young painter’s future artistic direction, a proleptic gesture in which the volcano’s eruption, in Nina Maria Athanassoglou-Kallmyer’s characterization, for instance, is

173 Precisely this combination of distortions seems present in one of Cézanne’s earliest academic studies, [Ch 73] Drawing from a Plaster Cast of an Antique Sacred Bust (1858–1860) (fig. 3A.1); on this drawing see section 3A.
174 ‘Romantisme enfantille: absence de tout style personnel’: Venturi, Cézanne, son art—son œuvre, op. cit., p. 71 (cat. no. 18).
175 Hence, and for instance: ‘The work seems to sum up the desperate, insecure, thwarted mood of this first visit to Paris’: Lindsay, op. cit., p. 83; ‘The intensity of gaze and the dour, grey modelling, flecked with accents of blood-red at emotionally crucial points, leads one to suspect a critical moment in the young man’s fortunes, perhaps a crisis in the plans of the artist-to-be or the emergence of a private determination in the face of his father’s opposition’: Lawrence Gowing, [catalogue notes for] “Self-Portrait,” in Gowing et al., Cézanne, the Early Years 1859–1872, op. cit., p. 72 (cat. no. 2); ‘The rather commonplace subject of the photograph seemed a stranger to Cézanne, who was prey to perpetual doubts, disillusioned by everything and everybody, sad and in a state of revolt against others as well as himself. In this portrait he appeared as he visualised himself. It is the portrait of a man who paid for each hour of hope with days of despair’: Rewald, Paul Cézanne: A Biography, op. cit., p. 28.
prefigured by the depiction of its first glimmering extrusions.\textsuperscript{176} In short, and to borrow Steven Platzman’s encapsulation, Cézanne’s self-portrait is seen as ‘transform[ing] the photograph into a self-image that functions as a visual manifesto of his desire to succeed within the world of the Parisian avant-garde.’\textsuperscript{177}

Now, without dismissing any of these interpretative gestures, and holding them in reserve precisely as illustration of the possible fecundity, in terms of perceived interpretable content, the processes of pastiche and pictorial play might implicitly entail, the possible presence of the pictured disjunction that these analyses seem predicated upon might be approached from yet another direction. That is, instead of a characterization based in terms of the affective facial expression portrayed by the painting in relation to its model, what might be put forward is one in terms of the pictorial relations within the painting itself. For, if Portrait de Paul Cézanne (fig. 5C.1) is examined in terms of the kinds of painterly procedures it might be seen to have been the result of, a rather fragmentary and pastiche-like quality emerges.\textsuperscript{178}

Hence, although some attempt on Cézanne’s behalf might be discerned as having been made to adopt, for instance, old master techniques such as a warm-over-cool-over-warm layering of paint layers, these have only been incompletely and haphazardly applied.\textsuperscript{179} Thus, although a thin red tonal ground seems to have been consistently washed over the entire head, the intervening cool layer, predominantly blue-grey, is confined to the face, being scumbled-on only as far as the right cheekbone, leaving a gap along the right-hand side of the face through which the warmer underpainting

\textsuperscript{176} ‘Livid shadows mould the cheeks. Pure carmine red dots, a match to the glowing carmine lips, set off the white of the slightly globular eyeballs. As a result, the complexion of the skin acquires a morbid resonance; the eyes appear bloodshot; and the pouting lips take on a decidedly vampiric character. The thoughtfully intensity of the gaze now starts to look more like murderous determination. Repose becomes infused with tension, a tension heightened with uncanny underpinnings. Cézanne, the “quiet” provincial, is a volcano ready to explode’: Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., pp. 16–17.

\textsuperscript{177} Steven Platzman, Cézanne: The Self-Portraits, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001, p. 29. For Platzman’s analysis of [R 72] Portrait de Paul Cézanne (1862–1864) (fig. 5C.1), configured, in part, in terms of contemporary discourses on the place of photography in art, see: ibid., pp. 25–31.

\textsuperscript{178} Many of the following comments regarding the technical execution of [R 72] are based on the paraphrasing and/or extrapolating from the detailed technical analysis of the painting undertaken by Robert Ratcliffe in: Ratcliffe, Cézanne’s Working Methods, op. cit., pp. 71–72.

\textsuperscript{179} On Cézanne’s use of tonal grounds and underpainting more generally throughout the 1860s, their relation to old master techniques, and their contrast the more alla prima approaches of, for instance, Monet and Pissarro, see: ibid., pp. 61–90.
remains visible.\footnote{The red tonal ground, apparently a thin wash, was itself applied over an initial white priming.} The layer then painted over the scumbled layer in order to model the main features of the face, thickly-brushed and ranging in colour from warm tans to lemon-yellows, likewise leaves areas of the underlying layers exposed, for instance in parts of the left cheek and forehead.\footnote{This thickly-brushed warm layer models the more prominent features of the face such as the brow ridges, the ridge and ball of the nose, parts of the left cheek including the area beneath the eye and alongside the bridge of the nose, the bulk of the right cheek, all the chin and the neck, and most parts of the forehead beneath the hairline.} Moreover, around the ear, the warm layer, in this case pink-tinged and applied even more heavily than on the face, seems to have been placed directly over the warmer tonal ground without an intervening cool layer, a combination that gives the ear a distinctly different colouration to the rest of the face. The attempt then to model the right side of the face through shadowing with a dull black-grey as likewise only cursorily been attempted, again leaving the rather oddly-warm gap between the right eye and the ear.\footnote{The same greyish-black was also used for sections of the hair (where, again, streaks of warm underpainting shows through), the eyebrows, the moustache, over the right temple and cheek, under the jaw, and, scumbled-in with an olive green, along the right side of the nose. A dark reddish-brown was then applied over areas of black in the hair with a loaded brush, as well as being used, albeit more thinly, to define the lips, and scumbled dryly over the entire jacket area, allowing the warmth of the red under-painting to show through. The shirt collar and -front were filled-in thickly with a heavy layer of white, likewise used to delineate the eyeballs, before flocks of vermilion were applied at the corners of the eye, over most of the lips, and at points on the jacket, defining edges and seams.} Finally, although there is a certain pictorial harmony in the placement of the Rubensian touches of warmth in the shadows, for instance the vermillion smears near the corners of the eyes, these are applied with a crudity and frank brutality that counter any possibility of illusionistic effect.\footnote{Ratcliffe, Cézanne’s Working Methods, op. cit., p. 71.}

In combination, this presentation of badly-implemented techniques gives a decidedly unfinished appearance to the painting, as if having been abandoned, the various formal distortions mentioned above becoming impossible to resolve, within academic terms, as finish. However, someone, whether the painter or another interested party, did in fact seem to have deemed the painting finished, a thick all-over varnish being applied that would seem not only to signal such completion, but also result in an intensification of the pronounced contrasts between the various light and dark
values.\textsuperscript{184} It would also seem to have increased the visual distance between the various incompletely-applied paint layers, thereby highlighting the fragmentary nature of the processes applied in the first place. In short, Cézanne’s self-portrait has gained the appearance of a set of mask-like pieces made not quite to fit and floating uncomfortably above whatever void they were intended to have occluded.

The painting might be seen thereby to enact, deliberately or not, a mechanism by which pictorial tension might allegorize biographical or psychological ones, the various crises implicit in the interpretations outlined above marked thereby, if only partly, by a depicted hiatus, as a picturing of process interrupted. The inscription, then, of personal conflict might come as much through the depiction of symbolic clichés like pouting lips and sultry, vampiric stares, as through the failure to resolve the pictorial attempts to deploy those clichés as a competent and coherent representation. At the same time, the elements so-deployed as distortions of normative representation have a structural coherence (as pictorially, as simplified harmonies of colour, as schematic abstraction of outline, as repetition of shape, as compression of space, etc.) that holds precisely the just-noted irresolution in stasis, rigorously and awkwardly, in perpetuity.

Precisely this self-image presented by Cézanne was, however, but a fleeting one. Within a few short years, the presumed destroyed \textsuperscript{[R 77]} Portrait de Cézanne aux longs chevaux (c.1865) (fig. 5C.18) and a painting perhaps exemplifying the painter’s manière couillarde, \textsuperscript{[R 116]} Portrait de l’artiste (c.1866) (fig. 5C.19), would portray an entirely different image of the artist, both in terms of the persona depicted, as well as the techniques through which that portrayal was articulated.\textsuperscript{185} Hence, the tentatively incomplete experiments with contrasting tonal layers was replaced by an impasted free-for-all that, for all its impetuosity, still manages to retain a degree of

\textsuperscript{184} Ratcliffe, Cézanne’s Working Methods, op. cit., pp. 72–73.

\textsuperscript{185} \textsuperscript{[R 77]} Portrait de Cézanne aux longs chevaux (c.1865) (fig. 5C.18) was, during the German occupation of France in the second world war, hidden, along with many other paintings in the brothers Bernheim-Jeune collection, in a château in the Dordogne; unfortunately, in 1944 the château was looted by the Germans and this painting, among others, was placed on a train subsequently destroyed by allied bombing: Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 85. The work is now known only by a black-and-white reproduction.
illusionistic cohesion decidedly lacking in the earlier effort. And, although some comparison, as noted above and although stretched, might be made between the character depicted in Cézanne’s earliest self-portrait and certain self-depictions of his Parisian peers, no such comparison is possible with the two later self-portraits of the middle part of the 1860s. For, in all his hirsute unruliness, the artist depicted in those works is precisely, and perhaps deliberately, the exact antithesis of the *embourgeoisé* status affected by Manet and others of the Café Guerbois circle, exemplified, for instance, by Fantin-Latour’s group-portrait *Homage de Delacroix* (fig. 5A.12) mentioned above. Now, while for these latter self-portraits the motivation, as simultaneous manifestation, visually, of the artist’s artistic goals and contrived self-image would seem relatively unproblematic, the earlier work, in terms of intentional motivation, 186 To retain the broader continuity of the argument presented in this thesis, the relative structural coherence displayed, for instance, by the head depicted in [R 116] *Portrait de l’artiste* (c.1866) (fig. 5C.19), should not, however, be seen as detached from the pictorial thinking often metaphorized here in terms of pastiche. For, although the head in that painting has a certain illusionistic solidity partly resulting from cursory modelling through shading, the relation between that head, as a volume, and the shoulder and back, presented mainly as a flat, albeit turgidly-factured, surface, is spatially unconvincing. And indeed, there is a certain implicit tension evoked by that disjunction, emblematizing a kind of uncomfortable twisting, that gives the painting a certain visually-arresting quality. 187 Precisely the disjunction here attempted to be highlighted is exemplified, for instance, not only by Steven Plattman’s general characterization of Cézanne’s possibly contrived artistic persona of the 1860s, provided both as background to as well as extrapolation from his in-depth analysis of [R 77] *Portrait de Cézanne aux longs cheveux* (c.1865) (fig. 5C.18) and [R 116] *Portrait de l’artiste* (c.1866) (fig. 5C.19), but also by that same author’s contrasting of those two works with Bazille’s *Self-Portrait* (1865–1866) (fig. 5C.14), a painting here above-compared to Cézanne’s earlier effort. For example: ‘[s]elf-assured, Bazille’s sophisticated countenance reaffirms the legitimacy of his calling and clearly contrasts with Cézanne’s rough, peasantlike presentation of self. Where Cézanne depicts himself with the blunt graceless features of the working classes, Bazille highlights the aquiline profile of his aristocratic nose [...]. Where Cézanne’s thick beard and long hair evoke shades of revolution, Bazille’s well-kept moustache and beard suggest the stability and prosperity presided over by bourgeois values’: Plattman, *Cézanne: The Self-Portraits*, op. cit., pp. 41–42. 188 See also Fantin-Latour’s later *Un atelier aux Batignolles* (1870) (o/c (204 x 273.5), Musée d’Orsay, Paris) and Frédéric Bazille’s *L’Atelier de la rue La Condamine* (1869–1870) (o/c (98 x 128.5), Musée d’Orsay, Paris), where the artists’ studios seem more like bourgeois parlours than sites for artistic creation. Likewise, take Zola’s description of Manet, provided as a kind of exemplification of the conception these artists had of their own place in society: ‘[h]e paints without discouragement, without weariness, marching straight ahead, obeying his natural predilections. Then, he returns home and tastes the calm joys of the modern bourgeoisie; he assiduously frequents society; he lives the life of an ordinary man, except that, maybe, he is even more peaceful and well-bred than most people’: Émile Zola, *Édouard Manet*, Étude biographie et critique (le 1er janvier 1867), in Émile Zola, *Écrits sur l’art*, with annotations by Jean-Pierre Leduc-Adine, Paris: Gallimard, 1991, p. 145, cited and translated in Plattman, *Cézanne: The Self-Portraits*, op. cit., p. 37.
would seem to remain obstinately enigmatic.\textsuperscript{189} For, in view of its status as a presumed retrospective reconfiguration, as a return through repetition to a past photographed moment, the painting might not necessarily sincerely express the romantic antagonism it has been deemed to portray but, rather, satirize it, pillorying its executor’s own juvenile outlook, equivalent, in a sense, to the retrospectively-daubed ‘Ingres’ signatures that, in some interpretations, sarcastically deride Cézanne’s earlier mural efforts?\textsuperscript{190} Ineptitude, in a sense, might not only be defiance, and thereby a means by which a painter ensnared by aporetic biographical forces might express that state of affairs, but also, and always paradoxically, a mockingly self-reflexive and deflective means of remaining ironically distant from any content that might be deemed conveyed by that expression. In a sense, Cézanne might have been parodying his own earlier self, and, through that, perhaps, his peers.

In any case, in terms of art historical discourse and the attempt to characterize the nature of Cézanne’s development in the 1860s and, in particular, his emergence as consciously original, what Portrait de Paul Cézanne (fig. 5C.1) might stand for then is not only the just-alluded-to ambivalence of content and reflexivity of imagic repetition, but also Cézanne’s apparent engagement with, and conflation of, eclectic, and possibly disparate, contextual influences in attempting to find means of expressing such aims. To quote Robert Ratcliffe, and thereby to simultaneously offer up Cézanne’s earliest self-portrait precisely as synecdoche for such observations, particularly in regard to the notion of the pastiching of techniques:

Though much of the turbulence and unrest present in the paintings of the 1860s can be accounted for by the known facts of Cézanne’s unsettled emotional life, the variety of techniques, the frequent crude application of

\textsuperscript{189} As Steven Platzman can only tentatively suggest, in answer to his own question concerning the painting’s possible intended audience, ‘possibly [Cézanne] had in mind his associates at the Académie Suisse, but most probably the work was for his own visual and psychic consumption’: Platzman, Cézanne: The Self-Portraits, op. cit., p. 29. How the painting might fulfill this latter function is not, however, elaborated upon.

\textsuperscript{190} In terms of the destabilizing effect on chronology the possibilities of parody, reflexive return, and copying all have, take Theodore Reff’s astute comment that the best that perhaps should be said in regard to the dating of [R 72] Portrait de Paul Cézanne (1862–1864) (fig. 5C.1) is that, assuming the photograph was taken in 1861, it was executed after this date: ‘[a]fter all another self-portrait ([R 587] Portrait de l’artiste, d’après une photographie (1883–1887) (o/c (55 x 46.3), Carnegie Museum of Art, Pittsburgh) was based on a photograph taken some thirteen years earlier’: Reff, ‘[Review of] The Paintings of Paul Cézanne: A Catalogue Raisonné by John Rewald,” op. cit., p. 800.
painting procedures of apparently opposing principles, seem to be the result of an individual searching for a method among the remnants of a lost tradition.\footnote{\textit{Ratcliffe, Cézanne's Working Methods,} op. cit., p. 97.}

What should be immediately pointed out is that these 'remnants' themselves existed intrinsically and essentially, in front of Cézanne \textit{(en face)}, as, first and foremost, imagic provocation.
Chapter Six

The privilege of provoking criticism

1865–1870

Q: What character from a novel or the theatre [do you most admire]?
A: Frenhofer [sic].

In 1870, a now famous caricature was published in the Paris weekly Album Stock (fig. 6.1), in which Cézanne was depicted alongside his two submissions for the Salon of that year, only one of which, [R 139] Portrait du peintre Achille Emperaire (1867–1868) (fig. 6A.13(b)), still survives. Beneath the caricature was the following text, which seems to sum up neatly Cézanne’s usual characterisation at the end of his first decade as an aspiring artist.

The artists and critics who happened to be at the Palais de l’Industrie on March 20th, the last day for the submission of paintings, will remember the ovation given to two works of a new kind….Courbet, Manet, Monet, all of you who paint with a knife, a brush, a broom, or any other instrument, you are outdistanced! I have the honour to introduce you to your master: M. Cézannes [sic]…Listen to him rather, telling me with a pronounced Provençal accent: ‘yes my dear Sir, I paint as I see, as I feel—and I have very strong sensations. The others, too, feel and see as I do, but they don’t dare….they produce Salon pictures…I dare, M. Stock, I dare…I have the courage of my opinions…and he laughs best who laughs last.’

2 On this canvas, see section 6A.
As was mentioned above in passing, Cézanne’s name had already appeared in the press a few years before, in a review by Marius Roux of Zola’s first novel, *La Confession de Claude*.\(^4\) Published at the end of 1865 in the Provençal newspaper *Memorial d’Aix*, the article described Cézanne as belonging to ‘a school that has the privilege of provoking criticism.’\(^5\) A few months earlier, Antony Valabrègue, who was in Aix at the time, had noted, in a letter to Zola, that Cézanne ‘has changed, for he speaks, he who seemed your silent shadow. He expounds theories, builds up doctrines.’\(^6\) The following year his rejected portrait of Valabrègue was purportedly described by one juror as having been ‘painted with a pistol’, and a year later, in 1867, his two submissions, since lost, were ridiculed in the pages of *Le Figaro*.\(^7\) Cézanne’s annual rejection from the Salon had become, by now, more than a habit; it was a defiant badge of honour.\(^8\) His performance as rebel artist—as a figure who could be, caricatured and quoted, perhaps with the apocryphal and thereby satirically mocking words, ‘Courbet, Manet, Monet, all of you who paint with a knife, a brush, a broom, or any other instrument, you are outdistanced!’—was complete.\(^9\)

---

\(^4\) Roux, ‘La Confession de Claude par Émile Zola,’ op. cit., p. 42; Wechsler, *The Interpretation of Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 3. As also noted above, Judith Wechsler suggests the mention of Cézanne was at the behest of Zola: loc. cit.


\(^7\) ‘Un philistin du jury s’est écrié en voyant mon portrait que c’était peint, non seulement au couteau, mais encore au pistolet’: Antony Valabrègue, quoted in by Fortuné Marion, in a letter to Heinrich Morstatt, 12 April 1866, cited in Scolari and Barr, *Cézanne d’après les lettres de Marion a Morstatt 1865–1868,* op. cit., p. 46; Arnold Mortier, cited by F. Magnard in ‘Paris au jour le jour,’ *Le Figaro*, 8 April 1867, p. [2]; [p. 2]. As noted above, Mortier’s comments had originally been published in the Frankfurt journal *L’Europe politique, scientifique, commerciale, industrielle et littéraire*. Mortier described Cézanne, whom he mistakenly (or perhaps jokingly) referred to as M. Sésame, submitted two works, both titled *Le Grog au vin*: loc. cit. Zola, in his spirited defence of his friend published in *Le Figaro* four days later corrected Mortier, claiming only one of the works was so-titled, the other was called *Ivresse*: Émile Zola, cited in ‘Correspondance,’ *Le Figaro*, 12 April 1867, [p. 2]. On Mortier’s article and Zola’s subsequent defence of the slight it might have caused Cézanne, see section 5A.

\(^8\) Take, for instance, the comments of Marion concerning Cézanne’s 1866 Salon submissions, ‘Cézanne espère n’être pas reçu à l’exposition, et le peintres de sa connaissance lui préparent une ovation’: Fortuné Marion, letter to Heinrich Morstatt, 28 March 1866, cited in Scolari and Barr, ‘Cézanne d’après les lettres de Marion a Morstatt 1865–1868,*’ op. cit., p. 45.

\(^9\) Stock, ‘‘Le Salon’ par Stock,’ op. cit., p. 246.
It this period, the half-decade in which Cézanne's legend as artistic firebrand thumbing his nose at Salon respectability matured, that is the focus of this chapter. By virtue, however, of the increase in the number of works, as well as their diversity ascribed to this period relative to those discussed in previous chapters, attention will be limited, in the main, to those of Cézanne's Jas de Bouffan murals presumed executed in the years 1865–1870. Discussion will centre, again, mostly on the possibility of these works' basis in practices of copying, whether in terms of direct borrowing of elements of imagery or the adoption of certain emphatically transgressive styles. Also examined will be a seemingly persistent presentation of ambivalence, both in terms of the motivations such works might be presumed to have been impelled by, as well as a distinctive visibility in the works themselves, either as over-coded motifs similar to those discussed as present in his early poetry, or as odd, but affectively charged, disjunctions.

Several canvases possibly linked to these murals will also be discussed, in terms specific either to their treatment of similar subject matter or use of similar motifs. A mode of practice, then, that, although endemic to Cézanne's later œuvre, has so far been little touched upon in this thesis, seriality, will be introduced. In particular, attention will be drawn to the construction of possible series of works thematically related, and signalled as such, through the repetition of motifs and/or formats. In a sense, as a form of self-copying, this repetition will, again, be suggested as possibly self-parodic. It will also be shown how such repetitions and displacement of motifs across series creates a similarly allusive network of meanings as the citatory loops alluded to in chapter five. Simultaneously, the imagic basis of precisely these kinds of processes will be discussed, providing possible cause for the forms of distortion likewise noted in Cézanne's other earlier copies and pastiches.

Lastly, the ever possible presence of humour, wryly ironic or otherwise, in Cézanne's pictorial acts will, again, be emphasized, a presence that might not only be further evidence of a deliberately polysemic intent, but also a gently mocking presence in relation to precisely the various kinds of interpretations such multiplying meaning has provoked.

•
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In terms of Cézanne’s movements in the period 1865–1870, he seems to have spent, after travelling from Aix-en-Provence at the beginning of 1865 to submit to the annual Salon, the spring, summer, and possibly autumn of that year in Paris, before returning to Aix-en-Provence in time for Christmas.\(^{10}\) He was back in Paris by mid-February and submitting to the 1866 Salon, after which he remained in and around Paris—including, it seems, several trips to Bennecourt—until mid-August, when he returned to Provence again to spend the remainder of the year.\(^{11}\) By February of the following year, 1867, he was once again in Paris in order to submit to the Salon, before returning in June to Aix-en-Provence with his mother, who had come to Paris to see the Exposition Universelle.\(^{12}\) This routine was repeated in 1868, but with Cézanne returning to Aix-en-Provence slightly earlier than usual, in May.\(^{13}\) He then remained in Provence up until, at the latest, the middle of December 1868, when he was back in


\(^{13}\) ‘J’ai eu le bonheur d’entendre l’ouverture de “Tannhäuser”, de “Lohengrin” et du “Hollandais volant” [which were performed in Paris on 26 January, 23 February, and 19 April respectively]’: Paul Cézanne, postscript to a letter from Fortuné Marioni to Heinrich Morstatt, 24 May 1868, cited in Scolari and Barr, ‘Cézanne d’après les lettres de Marioni a Morstatt 1865–1868,’ op. cit., p. 53; Cahn, ‘Chronology,’ op. cit., p. 535; Cartes d’élèves, 1868, LL11, card no. 2783, Archives du Louvre, cited and translated in Reff, ‘Copyists in the Louvre,’ op. cit., p. 555; Paul Cézanne, letter to Numa Coste, 13 May 1868, cited and translated in Cézanne, Letters, op. cit., p. 129.
Paris and staying there until April 1869. It during this summer in Paris which he is often presumed to have met his future wife Hortense Fiquet. He then travelled briefly to L’Estaque at the end of April, perhaps via Aix-en-Provence, but was in Paris by May, again, to deliver his Salon submissions. The summer months of 1869 were then split between Paris, Bennecourt, and Gloton, where Zola had rented a house. If Cézanne returned to Provence in autumn or winter, which seems unlikely, he was back in Paris by the following March, bringing with him the two Salon submissions that were to be caricatured, as mentioned above in, by the cartoonist Stock.

15 Marie Cézanne, letter to Paul Cézanne, 5 April 1869, cited in Rewald, Cézanne et Zola, op. cit., p. 74.
16 Cahn, 'Chronology,' op. cit., p. 536.
6A: Papa and Emperaire.

Painted directly onto the plaster wall in the apse-like alcove of the grand salon of the Jas de Bouffan, [R 95] Portrait de Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l’artiste (c.1865) (fig. 6A.3), sits, by virtue both of its subject matter and crudely vigorous style, markedly at odds with the antique-flavoured and clumsily-mannerist Les Quatre Saisons surrounding it (fig. 6A.1). Although not necessarily articulated through the practices of copying and/or pastiche so far animating much of the discussion in this thesis, Cézanne’s portrait mural might nevertheless reward consideration in such terms. Firstly, in regard to style, Cézanne’s mural portrait, as seemingly part of his defining mid-1860s move into the transgressive modes of paint application discussed last chapter, is often linked to the influence of Courbet. As has been previously suggested in regards to Cézanne’s apparent repetition of structural forms associated with specific poetic and pictorial genres, this stylistic emulation often noted in his mural portrait might likewise be suggested as possibly manifesting parodic, as well as, 

---

18 If the dimension ratios of [R 95] Portrait de Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l’artiste (c.1865) (fig. 6A.3) as it exists now and as depicted in the photograph of the niche of the grand salon at the Jas de Bouffan (fig. 6A.1) are compared, it becomes obvious that either during, or subsequent to, the mural’s removal from the wall, the painting was cropped, squaring the composition slightly. If an image of the painting in its present state is overlain the photograph, it becomes apparent the cropped sections came mostly from the top, with a much smaller section also removed from the bottom. As noted above, Lawrence Gowing deems the mural portrait to have been executed earlier than John Rewald’s suggested dating of c.1865, preferring to cite, variously, dates of c.1863, 1861–1862, and c.1862; on this, see: Gowing, ‘Notes on the development of Cézanne,’ op. cit., p. 186; Gowing, ‘The early work of Paul Cézanne,’ op. cit., p. 7; Lawrence Gowing, [Catalogue notes for] ‘Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne, Father of the Artist!’, in Gowing et al., Cézanne: the Early Years 1839–1872, op. cit., p. 76 (cat. no. 4). Jean-Michel Royer, although not contesting Rewald’s c.1865 dating, suggests the work was not installed in the niche of the Jas de Bouffan salon until after Louis-Auguste Cézanne’s death in 1886, as a kind of memorial: Royer, ‘The arbor of weeping chestnuts,’ op. cit., p. 160. This would seem, however, to contradict the information regarding the work’s medium given, for instance, by the National Gallery’s online collection database, where it is described as ‘oil on housepaint on plaster mounted on canvas scrim’: Unattributed artist, ‘Key facts [for [R 95] “Portrait de Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l’artiste” (c.1865)],’ online collection database of the National Gallery, London, accessible at: http://www.nationalgallery.org.uk/paintings/paul-cezanne-the-painters-father-louis-auguste-cezanne/*/key-facts. See also: Martin Davies, French School: Early 19th Century, Impressionist, Post-Impressionists, etc., National Gallery catalogues series, London: National Gallery, 1970, pp. 24–25. On [R 4–7] Les Quatre Saisons (1860–1861) (figs 3E.11–12), see section 3E.

19 For instance, Lawrence Gowing describes the mural’s ‘essential lumpiness’ as a debt to Courbet: Gowing, ‘Cézanne’s early work,’ op. cit., p. 7.
perhaps, satirical, intent. Secondly, Cézanne’s mural portrait appears to have embodied, at least in its original context, a disjunctive ambivalence that, like other of his early work discussed above, seems, through the possible presence of sardonic irony, to draw attention to the self-reflexive nature of creative expression. Finally, through the use of motifs and/or postural positionings repeated in later works, Cézanne’s portrait of his father also offers an opportunity to introduce his use of self-repetition and seriality, an impulse that, by implying connections across and between works, seems to support, in terms of presumed embedded meaning, multiple and often conflicting interpretations.

In regards firstly to style, the disparity between Portrait de Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l’artiste and the personifications around it in the apse of the grand salon at the Jas de Bouffan (fig. 6A.1) is usually characterized both as an exemplification of Cézanne’s emergent avant-gardism as well as reflexive commemoration of precisely this transition. \(^{20}\) Given the latter was made manifest through a depiction of his father, and in a spot described by John Rewald, for instance, as ‘the most dominant […] in the entire house’, the portrait is, in turn and in regards to Cézanne’s possible intentions, usually seen as whole-heartedly serious, an effigial gesture enacted with filial reverence. \(^{21}\) A disjunction in purpose is thereby presumed in addition to style. For, although the personifications around the portrait are often suggested, as mentioned above, to encode degrees of satire, the portrait itself, for all its crudity, for all its oddities of imagic context (a man resolutely, even comically, unaware of the awkwardly-produced female figures arranged around him), is rarely similarly deemed possibly parodic. \(^{22}\) Cézanne’s adoption of a more dynamic manner of paint

\(^{20}\) On the Cézanne’s cited move into transgressive paint applications, see section 5A.

\(^{21}\) For instance, ‘The parental authority is thus freely acknowledged here, and on the painter’s own terms, not as something imposed upon him by the paternal tyranny, but rather as a confirmation—and to a certain degree acceptance—of an inescapable reality’: loc. cit. Or, in Lawrence Gowing’s words, ‘The portrait of the formidable master of the house was placed between Summer and Winter in the alcove of the salon in the Jas de Bouffan, one can only suppose to his gratification’: Gowing, “‘Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne, Father of the Artist’,” op. cit., p. 76 (cat. no. 4). Nina Athanassoglou-Kallmyer characterizes the painting thus: “[T]he portrait is awarded the exalted role of traditional effigies of the maitre du logis presiding in aristocratic interiors, albeit cast in the unassuming terms of a provincial bourgeois”: Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., p. 35.

\(^{22}\) An exception, at least in terms of the latter point regarding imagic context, is Gary Wells, who suggests ‘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’: Wells, Metaphorical
Cézanne's adoption of such realist tendencies, although almost always configured in terms of, and therefore implicitly impossible without, the example of Courbet's realism of the 1850s, is still usually described in terms of the defiantly original, one signalled explicitly by the extremes of the work's compositional and stylistic inelegance. Hence, whereas the awkwardness of *Les Quatre Saisons* (figs. 4E.11-14) is taken either as a sign of ineptitude or deliberate parody, in the portrait mural it is taken as authenticating mark of Cézanne's attempt to sincerely express his *tempérament*. The possibility that this originality so expressed was intrinsically ironic seems, however, often to have been elided. In adopting the guise of a realist, Cézanne is presumed not to be parodying, satirically or otherwise, either the forms then enacted or the act of adopting such a guise in the first place. Gaucherie would seem, thereby, to stand, whole-heartedly and ham-fistedly, for sincerity. For some, however, Cézanne's portrait mural is not only simply merely bad, but also possibly deliberately so, an ineptitude enacted as part of a contrived performance intended to present Cézanne as outsider/avant-gardiste extraordinaire.

---


23 For instance, Lawrence Gowing describes the mural as 'the painter's adaptation of the realism of his own time', while John Rewald calls it 'perhaps Cézanne's first great “realistic” work': Gowing, "Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne, Father of the Artist", op. cit., p. 76 (cat. no. 4); Rewald, *The Paintings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 94.

24 "[T]he bulging vigour of the formulation has no similarity to any existing style except the rotund modelling current among the Espagnolist painters working in the wake of Courbet. It is significant that in one of Cézanne's earliest pictures his formulation of solidity should already have been an essentially original, invented one": Gowing, "Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne, Father of the Artist", op. cit., p. 76 (cat. no. 4).

25 On Cézanne's conception of *tempérament*, see section 5A.

26 'Confronted with [Lawrence Gowing's] [...] deluge of praise it is difficult indeed to see what should be self-evident about the National Gallery's *Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne* [fig. 6A.3], with its awkwardness of pose, spatial construction and lighting': Cranshaw and Lewis, 'Wilful ineptitude,' op. cit., p. 129. See also their description of the hand in the portrait, mentioned. In terms of their broader point regarding Cézanne's intentionality, take, for instance: 'Cézanne's career is unusual in that the construction of an identity took chronological precedence over the construction of an œuvre. The early work was subordinated to the successful pursuit of a “reputation”, and that reputation, which is to say the role that the artist
Indeed, this latter possibility of self-conscious performativity does seem resonant with the mural portrait’s original setting; for, it is difficult to imagine that context without invoking precisely the spirit of self-deprecatingly comic ambivalence suggested above as possibly inherent in much of Cézanne’s other early work, such as the images, and, in particular, the mocking phrases of self-praise attached to them, discussed in chapter two. That is, the scene—an angry-looking man awkwardly perched on a chair determinedly reading a newspaper in an empty room while being painted in an apparently sincere, but clumsily so, realist mode—is humorous enough, without the resulting portrayal then being set amongst a collection of juvenilely gawky and chronologically disordered nymphettes falsely signed ‘Ngres’. A wry picturing of earnest failure seems thereby enacted, one similarly noted as possibly present in the Saisons panels, as well as his copy after Frillié (fig. 3D.1) and his self-portrait after a photograph (fig. 5C.1). As with those other efforts, however, and to continue the notion of contiguity, not only is the intentionality or otherwise of this risibility difficult to determine definitively, if deliberately there, the possible target of such humour seems ambiguous. Cézanne might as much have been mocking himself as his subject, as much the styles through which his depictions were articulated as the context within which they were placed.

In addition to this ambivalence of intent, an ambivalence of chronology might also be noted, one seemingly implicit in any presumption of inelegance as a deliberately deployed affect of authenticity. For, despite the contextual incongruities, certain similarities between Cézanne’s mural portrait and the personifications surrounding it nevertheless exist: the pose in the portrait seems a repetition, albeit in reverse, of that in the panel to its immediate right, Hiver (fig. 6A.2). In turn, this seated

chose to play, governed Cézanne’s mode of insertion into the public realm’: Cranshaw and Lewis, ‘Wilful ineptitude,’ op. cit., p. 133. Such characterization might thereby inflect somewhat the usual interpretation of Cézanne’s ‘couillardes’ description, usually presumed to refer to the formal qualities of the work he produced in the 1860s; more simply, it might simply refer to his attitude of attempting to deliberately shock and/or offend bourgeois sensibility. In such case, Cézanne might as much have been describing the performative behaviour [‘balsy’] the production of such work was intrinsically a component of, as describing the work itself. See also, for instance, Antoine Guillermé’s comments regarding the use of the palette knife as an ‘insurrection knife’, quoted in section 5A.

On this aspect of [R 9] Le Baiser de la Muse, d’après Frillié (c.1860) (fig. 3D.1), see section 3D. On the self-portrait, [R 72] Portrait de Paul Cézanne (1862–1864) (figs 5C.1, 5C.16), see section 5C.
personification is a revision of an earlier standing version, pentimenti revealing a ghostly figure costumed and posed like Automne further to the right. It might be worth wondering, then, if the portrait followed the revised personification, or, more interestingly, vice versa. In terms of the latter, however, a perceived stylistic evolution in the opposite direction, from the central to the flanking panels of the Les Quatre Saisons murals, has, as already mentioned, not only been previously presumed, but also cited as evidence that Automne was painted by a more practiced, and therefore later, hand than Hiver. 28 An exemplary illustration is thereby offered of the degree to which the contrasting notions of awkward juvenilia versus deliberate gaucherie might depend on factors outside the visual; a content of presumed intent seems to have, again, become involved. 29

Returning to the portrait itself and, specifically, the form of gaucherie it seems to present, it might be worth noting, as was, again, suggested previously in regard to his self-portrait (fig. 5C.1), the degree to which the work might be unfinished. The hand, for instance, which Roger Cranshaw and Adrian Lewis describe as ‘appalling’ and ‘platter-like’, along with the newspaper it holds, seems, in particular, only sketchily outlined. 30 This is also the case with parts of the arm and legs, where it appears that Cézanne, in working from the outlines inwards, downed tools before reaching the central sections. There is also, and as has been noted with certain of his other works, considerable problems with parts to whole relations: the legs, for instance, are a bizarre and unresolved tangle, seemingly having little relation to the torso. As with his self-portrait, then, Cézanne might be seen to have undertaken an experiment that, 

28 'Été and Hiver show considerably more awkwardness then their more sophisticated companions': Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 68. See also: Gowing, ‘The early work of Paul Cézanne,’ op. cit., pp. 6–7; Gowing, [catalogue notes for] “The Four Seasons’,” op. cit., p. 70. As noted above, Wayne Andersen sees the discrepancies in terms of execution by different artists: see: Andersen, The Youth of Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 101. 29 Hence the crudity of [R 95] Portrait de Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l’artiste (c.1865) (fig. 6A.3) seems to be implied a conscious return to, rather than contemporaneous embodiment of, the crudity of [R 6] Hiver (1860–1861) (figs 3E.13, 6A.2). Interestingly, other features of the Hiver panel also echo aspects of other of Cézanne’s post-1865 work, for instance the thick, almost lumpy, drapery folds.

30 Cranshaw and Lewis, ‘Wilful ineptitude,’ op. cit., p. 129. The description is raised in opposition to Lawrence Gowing’s characterization of the hands in Cézanne’s [R 154] Femmes et fillette dans un intérieur (c.1879) (o/c (91 x 71), Pushkin Museum, Moscow), which Cranshaw and Lewis mistakenly claim was made in regard to [R 95] Portrait de Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l’artiste (c.1865) (fig. 6A.3): Gowing, ‘Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne, Father of the Artist’, op. cit., p. 76 (cat. no. 4); Cranshaw and Lewis, ‘Wilful ineptitude,’ op. cit., p. 129.
as evidenced by his abandoning of the work, led only to failure. Nevertheless, in not destroying the results and leaving the portrait there, in a pivotal position in the room that would later become the salon and presumably, therefore, the very epicentre of his family home, Cézanne seems to have again been, ironically or not, celebrating, on a monumental scale, precisely such irresolution. Inability—specifically in terms of intent as a kind of subjective affective presence being exceeded effortlessly by the constraints of physicality—comes to signify, thereby, and, perhaps, with a degree of perfection, the limits of subjectivity.

In terms of issues more prosaic, and, in particular, the place of Cézanne’s mural portrait amongst his other painted portrayals of his father—[R 101] *Louis-Auguste* Cézanne, *père de l’artiste, lisant ‘L’Événement’* (autumn 1866) (fig. 6A.4) and [R 178] *Portrait de Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l’artiste* (c. 1870) (fig. 6A.5)—this is, compared to its original physical context, decidedly less disjunctive, in terms not only of style, but also of motif repetition. Hence, in all three of his paintings of his father, Cézanne depicts him dressed in the same informal style and wearing the same distinctively-rounded cap; he is also, in all, engrossed in reading a newspaper. This air of dogmatic obliviousness to the act of being depicted is likewise repeated in Cézanne’s drawings; of the ten sheets cited by Adrien Chappuis as including sketches of Louis-Auguste, in every instance, he is likewise in the same attire and either reading, asleep, or writing (figs 6A.6–9). The cumulative effect, when the paintings

---

31 The drawings cited by Chappuis as portraits of his father are: [Ch 178(a)] (detail) *Sketch of the Artist’s Father* (c. 1866) (fig. 6A.6); [Ch 409] *Head and Shoulders of the Artist’s Father* (1877–1880) (fig. 6A.7); [Ch 410(a)] (detail) *The Father of the Artist* (1877–1880) (pencil on sketchbook page (21.7 x 12.4), Art Institute, Chicago); [Ch 411(b)] (detail from) *Page of Studies, Including a Mantel Clock* (1877–1881) (pencil on sketchbook page (12.4 x 21.8), PC); [Ch 412] *Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne* (1879–1881) (black crayon on laid paper (22 x 25), PC); [Ch 413] *Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne* (1879–1882) (fig. 6A.8); [Ch 415(a)] (detail) *The Artist’s Father* (1882–1885) (pencil on sketchbook page (21.7 x 12.4), Art Institute, Chicago); [Ch 661] *Head of Louis-Auguste Cézanne* (1883–1886) (pencil on grey sketchbook page (12.4 x 21.8), PC); [Ch 662(a)] (detail from) *Page of Studies* (1883–1886) (pencil on sketchbook page (21.8 x 12.4), PC); [Ch 662 bis] *Studies of the Artist’s Father* (1883–1886) (fig. 6A.9); [Ch 720(b)] (detail) *Head of Louis-Auguste Cézanne* (1878–1881) (pencil on sketchbook page (21.7 x 12.4), Fogg Art Museum, Cambridge). To these might also be added [Ch 408] *Man Sitting Reading a Newspaper* (1874–1877) (pencil on sketchbook page (21.7 x 12.4), Art Institute, Chicago), which Chappuis describes only as a ‘sketch of a man sitting sideways in an armchair, wearing a large straw hat and holding a newspaper’. Chappuis, *The Drawings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 133. The armchair seems, in terms of shape, similar
and drawings are viewed as a group, is of a man doing one thing and one thing alone, sitting in a room motionless and absorbed.  

This singular persistence evoked by these repeated poses and motifs has provoked various interpretations, not only in terms of the contexts within which the portraits are presumed to have been executed, but also in regards to the meanings ascribed to them, individually and as a series. Hence, on the one hand, for instance, Louis-Auguste’s repeated pose and clothing have been seen as reflecting the contingencies of the circumstances within which the works are presumed to have been executed; on the other, however, they have been seen as part of a deliberately enacted polemical program. A similar gradation of scholarly interpretation in terms of the perceived degree of mediation underpinning Cézanne’s imagery as was noted for his self-portrait discussed last chapter (fig. 5C.16) therefore recurs with the portraits of his father.  

For John Rewald, for instance, what the repetitions capture is merely the habitual routines of Cézanne’s father. Louis-Auguste Cézanne is wearing a cap in all because that was what he always wore, being bald and, ‘like many Frenchmen’, fearful of drafts indoors; he is always engrossed in some activity such as reading because he would only agree to pose for his son provided he could do so. These anecdotal presumptions then, in turn, elicit a series of cozy evocations. Rewald can imagine the ‘peaceful atmosphere’ in the Jas de Bouffan salon and see Cézanne once more ‘reaching for his sketchbook’ to again draw ‘the familiar features and attitude of his motionless father’.  

---

32 This impression is only heightened when it is realised the works span a period of nearly two decades, the earliest being [R 95] Portrait de Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l’artiste (c.1865) (fig. 6A.3), the latest being the two drawings [Ch 662(a)] (detail from) Page of Studies (1883–1886) (pencil on sketchbook page (21.8 x 12.4), PC) and [Ch 662 bis] Studies of the Artist’s Father (1883–1886) (fig. 6A.9).  
33 See section 5C.  
34 Rewald, ‘Cézanne and his father,’ op. cit., 78.  
35 loc. cit.
For Theodore Reff, however, a darker thematic is present; the persistent absorbed disengagement of Cézanne’s father reflects not anecdotal contexts, but graver, psychological ones. A tension presumed in the moment of the works’ production—Cézanne battling to control his sitter’s ‘terrible gaze’—is seen as inscribing a deeper turmoil, an Oedipal dread at being fixed in his father’s view resulting in a parallel inability to portray Louis-Auguste en face. The ‘undefinable tenderness’ Rewald perceives conveyed by Cézanne’s drawings is, then, for Reff, instead, replaced by the charged ambivalence seen previously by him as underpinning the drawing ‘La Mort règne en ces lieux’ (fig. 2.3) discussed in chapter two.

For others, however, the repetitions are reflective not of circumstance, whether anecdotal, in the case of Rewald, or psychological, in the case of Reff, but, rather, are evidence of conscious imagic contrivance. Hence, the sitter’s odd dress and the austerity of his setting stand, for instance, in Nina Athanassoglou-Kallmyer’s estimation as deliberately deployed symbols of Provençal pride. A pointed comparison is thereby suggested as intended between Cézanne’s painted portraits and contemporary depictions of the Parisian bourgeoisie, paintings in which, in contrast to the depictions of Cézanne’s father, the smug and comfortable fashionability of the sitter’s domestic surroundings was emphasized. Provincial stereotyping, and the possibility of mocking satire, is then, however, rejected by noting another repetition, the ‘insistent presence’ of a Parisian newspaper, a reiteration, it is argued, presenting Cézanne’s father as ‘au courant’ of developments in the capital and, as such, ‘the reverse of the provincial drone of metropolitan construction.’ Cézanne is argued, thereby, as having parodied, through inversion, contemporary portrait forms, an intent

36 Reff, ‘Cézanne: The severed head and the skull,’ op. cit., p. 89.
37 loc. cit. Also, from another article: ‘[I]n all of Cézanne’s portraits he is seen reading or dozing, his stern gaze thus averted from his timid son’s’: Reff, ‘The pictures within Cézanne’s pictures,’ op. cit., p. 92.
38 Rewald, ‘Cézanne and his father,’ op. cit., 78. For a summary of Reff’s interpretation of [Ch 37] ‘La Mort règne en ces lieux’ (1859) (fig. 2.3), see section 2E.
40 ibid., pp. 29–33. As an example of such a contrast, Athanassoglou-Kallmyer compares Cézanne’s portraits to Gustave Caillebotte’s Portrait of M. E. D. (1878) (o/c (n/d), PC): ibid., fig. 1.17.
41 ibid., p. 33.
in regard to imagic contexts that is seen as specifically signalled through the use of the cited repeated motifs.

In terms of these repetitions, however, Athanassoglou-Kallmyer's observations, despite their astuteness, retain ambiguities. Hence, the contention that a Parisian daily features in all three painted portraits is stretched; not only is this definitively the case only in *Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l'artiste, lisant 'L'Événement'* (fig. 6A.4), but also the inclusion of the masthead in that painting, as discussed below, can be explained in terms of other biographical contexts. Likewise, the suggestion Cézanne used the cap worn by his father as 'quasi-symbolic headgear of provincial belonging' inadvertentlly highlights an oddity across the series. For, in comparing Cézanne's father's hat, as Athanassoglou-Kallmyer does, with the peaked caps worn, for instance, by the provincials of Gavarni's caricatures or Courbet's portrait of his father, *Régis Courbet* (c.1840) (fig. 6A.10), an interesting elision occurs. Only in Cézanne's drawings is such a cap actually present. In all three of his painted versions, a more rounded and tight-fitting form is shown, and, in surely the most complete of them, *Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l'artiste, lisant 'L'Événement'* (fig. 6A.4), it even lacks a peak. Hence, if it is presumed Cézanne's sketches present a more unmediated reflection of actuality than his paintings, the switch to the rounded cap in the latter would seem to lessen, rather than to emphasize, precisely the kinds of provincial symbolism Athanassoglou-Kallmyer argues are evidence of Cézanne consciously deployed polemic. Moreover, the 'rustic spareness' of the sitter's surrounds in the two larger paintings (figs 6A.3, 6A.11), which Athanassoglou-Kallmyer suggests are deliberately contrived to contrast with the bourgeois interiors of contemporary Parisian portraits, might simply record, in unmediated measure, the surrounds of the paintings' execution in the Jas de Bouffan. As noted above, Cézanne's family did not move into the building until the early 1870s and before this it functioned only as an occasional weekend retreat, the salon, previously used to store fruit or hay, given over to Cézanne as a work space. Indeed, the transition from storeroom-cum-atelier into furnished and wallpapered salon seems tracked in

---

42 'In all three portraits [...] Louis-Auguste appears absorbed in a Parisian newspaper': loc. cit.
44 loc. cit.
45 On this, the Jas de Bouffan's dilapidation at the time of Louis-Auguste's purchase, as well as the salon's previous use as a fruit store, see section 3E.
Cézanne’s own paintings. Compare, for instance, the unrenovated austerity of *Portrait de Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l’artiste* (fig. 6A.3), presumed painted in 1865, with the more comfortable setting of [R 149] *Jeune fille au piano—Ouverture du ‘Tannhäuser’* (1869–1870) (fig. 6A.14), likewise presumed executed in the Jas de Bouffan salon, but around 1870.46

Similarly, the possibility that a studio, rather than provincial salon, was the setting for *Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l’artiste, lisant ‘L’Événement’* (fig. 6A.4), a painting almost certainly executed in the latter half of 1866, might also explain the inclusion, part occluded by the curving upper corner of the armchair, of one of Cézanne’s possibly earliest experiments in overloaded facture, [R 93] *Sucrier, poires et tasse bleue* (1865–1866) (fig. 6A.11(a)). In fact, it might be worth wondering whether the picture depicted in the painting was not, as Lawrence Gowing suggests, ‘already framed’, but, instead, an unstretched canvas pinned to the wall, the white strips on the right and bottom not an awkwardly depicted frame or stretcher rim, but unpainted edges, complete with tack in the corner (fig. 6A.11(b)).47 This might then unsettle, to some extent, not only some of Athanassoglou-Kallmyer and Gowing’s observations, but also Theodore Reff’s, who describes the inclusion of the still-life as Cézanne’s deliberately intended assertion of his art’s ‘right to be seen, even in the Jas de

46 The wallpaper depicted in [R 149] *Jeune fille au piano—Ouverture du ‘Tannhäuser’* (1869–1870) (fig. 6A.14) also seems to appear in the background of [R 178] *Portrait de Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l’artiste* (c.1870) (fig. 6A.5) which, according to John Rewald, was executed around the same time. Theodore Reff, however, suggests the pattern behind Louis-Auguste’s head in *Portrait de Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l’artiste* (fig. 6A.5) is part of a folding screen decorated with neo-rocco designs, which Cézanne, in executing his painting has isolated and enlarged ‘into something dramatically different: half organic and half geometric’: Reff, ‘The pictures within Cézanne’s pictures,’ op. cit., p. 93. Sidney Geist sees this abstraction of the design as a means of encrypting a large mouth about to devour his father’s face: Geist: ‘Interpreting Cézanne,’ op. cit., p. 36.

47 Lawrence Gowing, ‘[catalogue notes for] “Still-life: Sugar Pot, Pears and Blue Cup”’, in Gowing et al., *Cézanne: The Early Years: 1859–1872*, op. cit., p. 96 [cat. no. 14]. If, *pace* Gowing, the painting is deemed unframed, the squaring of the still-life’s composition in the portrait might, thereby, reflect the painting’s proportions before being mounted on its final stretcher. Note also the comments of Henri Loyrette, who describes the still-life depicted in the portrait as unframed—although not necessarily, thereby, unstretched—and perhaps included with a touch of modesty: Henri Loyrette, ‘[Catalogue notes for] “Sugar Bowl, Pears, and Blue Cup”’, in Françoise Cachin et al., *Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 84 (cat. no. 4). For a similar depiction of unstretched canvases pinned to walls, albeit articulated with more clarity and in a painting executed much later, see the above-mentioned [R 757] *Le Fumeur accoude* (c.1891) (fig. 3B.19); on this painting, see section 3B.
Bouffan, his bourgeois family's house. A presumed context of production—an imagined scene, as it were—has dictated, to a degree, the kinds of meaning the artist is presumed to have embedded in his work.

In any case, whether or not a salon or studio is depicted, the self-copying represented by Cézanne's repetition of his still-life is enacted, as with most of his copies so far discussed, with a high degree of transformation (figs 6A.11(a–b)). Hence, the proportions of the repeated painting are far squarer than in actuality and the colours deployed noticeably different. Likewise, the objects depicted have been moved closer together and the curve of the plate lessened, flattening the composition slightly.

For Sidney Geist, as with [R 757] Le Fumeur accoudé (c.1891) (fig. 3B.19), mentioned above in regard to its repetition of imagery from the decorated screen originally owned by Cézanne's father (fig. 3B.5), these transformations are taken to encode explicit, although perhaps unconsciously embedded, biographical content. Hence, the central pear is deemed to have been made more prominent, and thereby subtly deride his father below by associating him with the fruit.

The provocation for such transformation might also have been more simply related to the intrinsically decorative—and therefore imagic—structuring Cézanne's articulation of his portrait of his father seems configured within. As Theodore Reff notes, the squaring of the composition of the repeated still-life, as well as, more importantly, its mere presence, can be seen as asserting the 'flatness and grid-like structure of the whole [...] locking it into the sequence of parallel planes formed by the newspaper,

48 Reff, 'The pictures within Cézanne's pictures,' op. cit., p. 92. Gary Wells's characterization is similar; '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': Wells, *Metaphorical Relevance and Thematic Continuity in the Early Paintings of Paul Cézanne*, 1865–1877, op. cit., p. 45.

49 Reff, 'The pictures within Cézanne's pictures,' op. cit., p. 92. If the suggestion made regarding the painting depicted in the portrait being an unstretched canvas pinned to the wall is taken seriously, the squarer proportions might simply represent the work's proportions before being mounted on a stretcher.

50 On Geist's opinion on [R 348] Le Plat de pommes (c.1877) (fig. 3B.15), see: ibid., pp. 96–98; and in section 3B.

51 Geist, *Interpreting Cézanne*, op. cit., pp. 33–35. Geist cites, hence, the connotations the word 'poire' has in French colloquial slang, as well as the similarity between the Provençal 'pero' for 'pear' and the French for father 'père': ibid., p. 34. For all its ingenuity, however, Geist's theory seems far-fetched; the visual evidence he bases it on (fig. 6A.11) tenuous at best.
the chair, and the wall.\textsuperscript{52} Likewise, the white strips of the lower and right edges of
the included still-life noted above, whatever they are presumed to depict, repeat the
shape and colouration, for instance, of the lower right corners of the newspaper and
armchair. Hence, although perceived by some as an instance of carefully observed
realist endeavour, Cézanne’s portrait seems more a study in abstract division.\textsuperscript{53} An
entire network of repeated forms and simplified shapes seems deliberately deployed in
order to bind the picture, rigidly and decoratively, together, simultaneously rendering
an entirely unfeasible and unrealistic nullification of space. The arms of the chair
have been bent into inverse perspective and Louis-Auguste’s body is so oddly
constructed and awkwardly placed as to be sitting in a darkly mysterious void. A
tension between an apparent intent to deploy a stable imagic structure and the physical
unfeasibility, illusionistically speaking, of the resultant depiction, is thereby invoked,
one that might, in turn, act as an informing affect of content, giving the portrait a
pervading and unsettling undercurrent of unease.

A similar equivocality might also be noted in terms of another instance of imagic
contrivance within Cézanne’s portrait, one perhaps both more specifically
biographical as well as more obviously deliberately deployed: the masthead of the
newspaper read by Cézanne’s father. For, according to Antoine Guillernet’s
description of an earlier version of the painting, added as a postscript to one of
Cézanne’s letters, the masthead originally depicted was \textit{Le Siècle}’s, a long-standing
Republican newspaper particularly popular in the provinces.\textsuperscript{54} As many have
suggested, Cézanne’s decision to change this to \textit{L’Événement}, a short-lived and
gossipy Parisian daily, appears to have been directly related to Zola’s

\textsuperscript{52} Reff, ‘The pictures within Cézanne’s pictures,’ op. cit., pp. 91–92.
\textsuperscript{53} ‘[...] a provincial republican described in direct, realistic terms [...] Cézanne’s father
is casually seated in an ordinary interior, engaged in ordinary activity. [...] In its execution,
style, and choice of subject matter, the portrait of Cézanne’s father is a demonstration in the
naturalistic aesthetic’: Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, ‘An artistic and political manifesto for
Cézanne,’ op. cit., p. 491.
\textsuperscript{54} ‘On his [Cézanne’s] return to Paris you will see some pictures which you will like very
much, among others a portrait of his father in a large armchair which looks very good. The
painting is “blonde” and the effect is splendid; the father looks like a pope on his throne, were
it not that he is reading \textit{Le Siècle}’: Antoine Guillemet, note attached to a letter from Paul
127–128.
contemporaneous activities as art critic. For, it was in the pages of this paper that Zola was provided his most notorious opportunity to act in such a role, writing Salon reviews under the pseudonym 'Claude' that provoked such complaint that the series was suspended after only six instalments. Undeterred, Zola republished his reviews in pamphlet form shortly afterwards as *Mon Salon*, including, as preface, a pointedly effusive dedication to Cézanne. The inclusion of *L'Événement* is presumed, thereby, to have been not only an acknowledgment of Zola's dedication, but also a reciprocal commemoration of the pair's emergent, and presumably partly contiguous, anti-establishment stance the courting of such controversy would seem to reflect.

That such sentiments might be embedded within a portrayal of Cézanne's father, however, and as was noted in regards to Cézanne's other recent portrait of his father, the mural discussed above (fig. 6A.3), interposes an odd, and possibly sly, ambiguity. For, in depicting Louis-Auguste possibly reading a paper containing Zola's writings on art that he would be unlikely to have understood, let alone agreed with, it is difficult to avoid the possibility that Cézanne was mocking, rather than celebrating, his father's provinciality. In co-opting his aging patriarch's reading habits, was Cézanne

---

55 *L'Événement* was founded in 1865 by 'the Barnum of French journalism' Hyppolyte de Villemessant, but only lasted until November 1866, when it was amalgamated with *Le Figaro*: F. W. J. Hemmings, 'Zola's apprenticeship to journalism (1865–1870),' *PMLA*, vol. 71, no. 3 (June 1956), p. 346; Frederick Brown, 'Zola and Manet: 1866,' *The Hudson Review*, vol. 41, no. 1 (spring 1988), p. 79. Villemessant is variously referred in the scholarly literature as Hyppolyte or Henri de Villemessant. On the presumption the inclusion of *L'Événement* was directly related to Zola, take, for instance, the comment of John Rewald that it 'represents without any doubt homage to Zola': Rewald, *The Paintings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 99.

56 L. W. Tancock, 'Some early critical work of Émile Zola: "Livres d'aujourd'hui et de demain" (1866),' *The Modern Language Review*, vol. 42, no. 1 (January 1947), p. 44. Zola had been commissioned to write eighteen articles on the Salon, starting on 27 April: loc. cit. He was already employed by the same paper as a literary critic, and contributed over a hundred book-reviews in a column titled 'Livres d'aujourd'hui et de demain' that appeared semi-regularly from 1 February 1866 to 30 October of that same year; he also wrote, under the pseudonym 'Simplice', a column entitled 'Marbres et Plâtres' that lasted from the end of August until shortly after the paper's merger with *Le Figaro*: Hemmings, 'Zola's apprenticeship to journalism (1865–1870),' op. cit., p. 346. On Zola's column 'Livres d'aujourd'hui et de demain', see: Tancock, 'Some early critical work of Émile Zola,' op. cit., pp. 43–57. Negative reaction to Zola's Salon reviews for *L'Événement* was mostly due to his vociferously scathing indictments of the Salon system and panegyric praise, peppered with allusions to male virility, for the avant-garde. On the possible sexual overtones and machismo of Zola's characterization of the 1860s Parisian avant-garde, see, in particular: Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, *Cézanne and Provence*, op. cit., pp. 26–27.

wryly poking fun at his out-of-touch and conservative, albeit republican, mores? Or was he genuinely, as is the view, for instance, of Theodore Reff, attempting to reconcile in one pictorial space his father's place between his own imagic output, represented by the manifesto-like presence of the still-life on the wall, and the indebtedness of that work to Zola's encouragement, signalled, ironically or not, by the textual citation of a newspaper title? Citation and repetition seem, again, in addition to the possibility of parody, to provide degrees of ambivalence seemingly unelidable.

In addition to these just-discussed possible biographical resonances, the use of text in Cézanne's portrait of his father has also provoked comparison with another of his paintings of the period, [R 139] Portrait du peintre Achille Empereur (1867–1868) (fig. 6A.13(b)), which uses the same typeface as L'Événement's masthead in the inscription 'ACHILLE EMPERAIRe PEINTRE' across the top. Indeed, this

58 Reff, 'The pictures within Cézanne's pictures,' op. cit., pp. 91–92. On the 'manifesto'-like aspects of Cézanne's inclusion of the still-life in his portrait of his father, take, for instance, Lawrence Gowing's observation that [R 93] Sucrerie, poires et tasse bleue (1865–1866) (fig. 6A.13) 'appears like a manifesto of the new style already framed and hanging on the wall in the background of Cézanne's portrait of his father reading L'Événement': Gowing, "Still-life: Sugar Pot, Pears and Blue Cup," op. cit., p. 96 [cat. no. 14]. Or, in Henri Loyrette's words, 'Cézanne turned this small canvas, so unprepossessing yet so novel, into something of a manifesto; as it to drive this home, he placarded it on the wall in the large portrait of his father reading L'Événement': Loyrette, "Sugar Bowl, Pears, and Blue Cup",' op. cit., p. 84 (cat. no. 4).

Aside from the compositional changes enacted in Cézanne's repetition of his still-life, he also seems to have modified his painterly approach. Hence, although Cézanne's portrait of his father is executed in a style typical of his developing 'manière couillarde', the more emphatic impasto of the original still-life has been reduced in the copy. An interesting example might thereby be offered of the intrinsically reflexive regress the painting of painted images seems always to introduce. That is, in re-presenting a painted image in an act many have seen as picturing, ironically or not, an imagic manifesto, as noted above, Cézanne has transformed his own transformation.

60 Hence, Nina Athanassoglou-Kallmyer describes [R 101] Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l'artiste, lisant 'L'Événement' (1866) and [R 139] Portrait du peintre Achille Empereur (1867–1868) (fig. 6A.13(a–b)) as 'linked by the pointed repetition of distinctive visual clues—such as the throne-like armchair with its flowered slipcover and the Bodoni-type lettering, which appears in both': Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, 'An artistic and political manifesto for Cézanne,' op. cit., p. 484. Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, as well as Gary Wells, also cites the paintings similar size, although her suggestion they are 'identical in format and size, both measuring 200 x 122 cm' is difficult to determine definitively, at least in terms of the dimensions given by John Rewald and/or the respective institutions now in possession of the paintings: Wells, Metaphorical Relevance and Thematic Continuity in the Early Paintings of
repetition, as well as the presence of the same armchair with floral-patterned slipcover, has led some to see the works as deliberately contrived pendants, Gary Wells, for instance, suggesting the meaning of Cézanne's portrait of his father (fig. 6A.4) "is not complete unless it is seen in the context of the portrait of Emperaire."\(^{61}\) In terms of the meaning presented by that pairing, a deliberate juxtaposition is deemed intended, Wells seeing a visual allegorization of the 'bourgeois perspective of professional success' depicted in Cézanne's painting of his father, on the one hand, and the more melancholic reality of the bohemian artist presented in the portrait of his friend and fellow painter on the other.\(^{62}\) A similar aporia of choice regarding career choice as that configured in Theodore Reff's interpretation of certain of Cézanne's early poems in terms of the Choice of Hercules myth, discussed in chapter two, is thereby seen repeated here, but in terms more visually conceived.\(^{63}\)

Nina Maria Athanassoglou-Kallmyer likewise sees a pendant relationship between the two paintings (figs 6A.13(a-b)), but interprets the possible juxtaposition as conveying far more sardonically satirical, as well as political, purposes. For, in addition to her characterization of Cézanne's portrait of his father as regionalist polemic,

---


\(^{61}\) Wells, *Metaphorical Relevance and Thematic Continuity in the Early Paintings of Paul Cézanne, 1865–1877*, op. cit., p. 62. Also: 'the relationship between these two paintings is the key to their meaning': ibid., p. 46. Nina Athanassoglou-Kallmyer describes the pair as 'complementary or possibly even pendant images' or '[possibly] conceived as informal pendants': Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, "An artistic and political manifesto for Cézanne," op. cit., pp. 482, 483–484.


\(^{63}\) 'Together, they reveal the dilemma facing Cézanne, the choice of a lifestyle and a career. [...] 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': ibid., p. 62. On Reff's analysis of the Hercules motif in Cézanne's early poetry, see section 2D.
Athanassoglou-Kallmyer also asserts it presents a veritable manifesto of naturalism—a 'sturdy honesty'—that is contrasted not only with contemporary portraits of Parisians, but also the 'sarcastic nihilism' and 'anti-imperial and anti-academic' intent presumed of his portrait of Emperaire. That is, in contrast to the usually presumed sympathetic treatment given the sitter in Portrait du peintre Achille Emperaire (fig. 6A.13(b)), Athanassoglou-Kallmyer argues Cézanne used his misshapen friend as part of a cruel, and quite complicated, parodic invective aimed at the current Emperor of the French. Hence, by virtue of the conflation, among other things, of hieratic presentation, the punning of Emperaire's name with 'emperor' (a joke made even more obvious by spelling it out, literally, across the surface of the picture), and the depiction of a dwarf with a goatee similar to that worn by Napoléon III, Cézanne is seen as repeating combinations often featured in cheap caricatures denigrating 'le petit Napoléon'. There is, then, if this characterization of Cézanne's portrait of Emperaire as caricature rings true, a certain degree of ironically reflexive circuitry; for, as mentioned above, Cézanne's painting of his friend was subsequently itself caricatured in a picture denigrating the artist (fig. 1.1). A kind of imagic full-circle thereby seems to have been enacted.

64 Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, 'An artistic and political manifesto for Cézanne,' op. cit., p. 491.
65 ibid., pp. 488-491.
66 ibid., pp. 489-491; Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., pp. 83-86. According to Sidney Geist, and cited by Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, the pun on Emperaire's name is even more obvious in Provençal, where 'emperaire' was the equivalent to the French 'empeur': Geist, Interpreting Cézanne, op. cit., p. 38; Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, 'An artistic and political manifesto for Cézanne,' op. cit., p. 489. According to Honnorat's 1846-1848 dictionary, however, the Provençal equivalent to 'empeur' was not 'emperaire' but, rather, 'empeur': Honnorat, Dictionnaire provençal-français, op. cit., t. 4 Vocabulaire Français—Provençal, p. 59 (s.v. empeur). Athanassoglou-Kallmyer also notes that Cézanne's portrait of Emperaire is similar, in a very crude sense, to Ingres's Portrait de Napoléon Ier sur l' trône impérial (1806) (œ/c 260 x 163), Musée de l'Armée, Paris, which itself seems to have been deliberately referenced by Ingres's later Jupiter et Thetis (1811) (fig. 3E.23), the painting held in collection of the Musée d'Aix and presumed by many to have been deliberately lampooned, as discussed above, by Cézanne in his early caricature [Ch 50] Caricature of 'Jupiter and Thetis' (1858-1860) (fig. 3E.22); Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, 'An artistic and political manifesto for Cézanne,' op. cit., p. 490; Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., p. 84. That such a conflation might have occurred to Cézanne at precisely this moment might well have been more than coincidental; around the time Cézanne is thought to have been executing his portrait of Achille Emperaire, Ingres's Portrait de Napoléon Ier sur l' trône impérial et Jupiter et Thetis (fig. 3E.23), the latter shipped in all the way from Aix, were both on display at the memorial exhibition of Ingres's work held at the École des Beaux-Arts in April 1867, two months after the artist's death: Catalog des tableaux, études peintes, dessins et croquis de J. A. D. Ingres exposées dans les galeries du Palais l'École impériale des Beaux Arts, Paris; [n. p.], 1867, cited in Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., p. 85.
Regardless of Cézanne’s intentions in terms of a possible relation between Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l’artiste, lisant ‘L’Événement’ and Portrait du peintre Achille Emperaire (figs 6A.13(a–b)), a comparison of just these works does reveal interesting contrasts outside the possibly thematic. For, as is invariably pointed out on any first mention of the sitter in the latter portrait, Achille Emperaire was actually a dwarf; Cézanne’s portrayal of him as larger than Louis-Auguste, relative, at least, to the armchair in which both are seated, would seem, thereby, decidedly odd. 67

Presumably, in interpretations such as that of Athanassoglou-Kallmyer’s summarized above, this discrepancy is deemed a function of the intrinsically hieratic nature of Cézanne’s depiction of his artist friend, a subversion of realism for the sake of the content intended conveyed.

The oddities in scale seemingly present in Portrait du peintre Achille Emperaire (fig. 6A.13(b)) might also, however, serve as illustration of the kinds of formal distortion the application of processes of imagic pastiche might entail. Take, for instance, three of Cézanne’s drawings suggested by Wayne Andersen as studies for the portrait: [Ch 228] Portrait of Achille Emperaire (1867–1870) (fig. 6A.14), [Ch 229] Head of Achille Emperaire (1867–1870) (fig. 6A.15), and [Ch 230] Portrait of Achille Emperaire (1867–1870) (fig. 6A.16). 68 In justifying this relation, Andersen describes how each drawing pre-empt specific, but different, aspects of the painting; hence, if the head of one (fig. 6A.15) is combined with the reversed eyes of another (fig.

---

67 The presence of the same armchair in [R 101] Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l’artiste, lisant ‘L’Événement’ (1866) and [R 139] Portrait du peintre Achille Emperaire (1867–1868) (figs 6A.13(a–b)) is often remarked upon, but rarely this discrepancy in scales of the figures. The one exception is Gary Wells, albeit in the somewhat confusing terms of his comment that ‘in the details of the composition of Portrait du peintre Achille Emperaire (fig. 6A.12)] […] 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’: Wells, Metaphorical Relevance and Thematic Continuity in the Early Paintings of Paul Cézanne, 1865–1877, op. cit., p. 62.

68 Wayne V. Andersen, ‘Cézanne’s portrait drawings from the 1860s,’ Master Drawings, vol. 5, no. 3 (autumn 1967), pp. 272–273. Adrien Chappuis cites only [Ch 229] Head of Achille Emperaire (1867–1870) (fig. 6A.16) as a study for [R 139] Portrait du peintre Achille Emperaire (1867–1868) (fig. 6A.13(b)): Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 100. In all, Chappuis cites six sheets of drawings by Cézanne that seem to include depictions of Emperaire; these are, in addition to those just cited above as mentioned by Wayne Andersen: [Ch 226 (a)] (detail) Achille Emperaire (1867–1870) (pencil on paper (10 x 11), Atelier Cézanne, Aix-en-Provence); [Ch 227 (a)] (detail) Achille Emperaire (1867–1870) (pencil on brownish paper (28.9 x 24.9), Kunstmuseum, Basel); [Ch 242 (b)] (detail) Caricature of Achille Emperaire (1867–1872) (pencil on ruled paper (18 x 15), PC). Chappuis does come close to calling [Ch 228] Portrait of Achille Emperaire (1867–1870) (fig. 6A.14) a study for the painting, describing it as ‘somewhat similar to the canvas’: Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 100.

350
6A.16), and then used to replace the head in the final (fig. 6A.14), a reasonable approximation of the figure depicted in the painting might be attained. The painting could thereby be conceived of as less a depiction of a man sitting in a chair, as a depiction of a set of drawings pasted together to form such a scene. The background, in turn, including the chair, become, then, something fitted later and around such fragments. Indeed, it might be wondered if Emperaire was present at all during the painting of his portrait.

In countenancing such possibilities, the presence of similar distortions, albeit not in regard to scale but instead the positioning and perspectival arrangement of component parts, might also be noticed in *Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l'artiste, lisant* *L’Événement* (fig. 6A.13(a)). Hence, the oddities of figural construction noted above in terms of, for instance, the relationship not only between Louis-Auguste’s legs and the torso, but also, more particularly, between him and the chair in which he is supposed to be sitting, might be deemed a result of a similar pasting of component parts, rather than the depiction of a figural whole observed, as it were, in a particular moment. As such, the upper part of the sitter’s torso seems independently conceived of the legs, and the chair, likewise, independently conceived of both. This is not to say, however, that in possibly utilizing fragmentary sketches in constructing his final

---

69 Andersen, ‘Cézanne’s portrait drawings from the 1860s,’ op. cit., pp. 272–273; Andersen, *Cézanne’s Portrait Drawings*, op. cit., p. 4.

70 Despite the use here of Wayne Andersen’s observations in drawing this analogy of pictorial construction, that scholar, for one, deems the painted portrait as executed from life; ‘Here [in the sketch [Ch 228] (fig. 6A.14)] the viewer’s eye level is on a line with Emperaire’s hands, whereas in the painting it is aligned with the eyes. The study must have been made with Emperaire’s chair placed on a platform, perhaps a model’s stand, but for the final painting the chair is at floor level’: Andersen, *Cézanne’s Portrait Drawings*, op. cit., p. 4. The observation that the sketch must have been made in front of its model raised on a platform by virtue of the drawing’s positioning on the page seems odd; even if both works are conceived of as executed in front of their models, a difference of artist’s view point between sitting (in the case, for instance, of the drawing), and standing (in the case of the painting) would likewise seem to explain the discrepancy. More likely, however, such the changes resulted from the radical difference in the scales of the two works.

71 Notice, for instance, also, the section of wall between the armchair and the jamb of the door, which, upon first appearance seems to be a depiction of faded wallpaper. However, it might be worth wondering if, instead, it is pentimenti of a previous arrangement whereby the chair Louis-Auguste sits in was placed more spatially correctly in terms of the figure sitting in it. In line with this, take also Robert Ratcliffe’s observation that, in regard to the lower edge of the chair, ‘originally the contour receded at a slight angle, to the right of the picture, but the repainting of the areas on either side of the sitter’s trousers has transformed this slight recession into non-continuous lines parallel to the picture base’: Ratcliffe, *Cézanne’s Working Methods*, op. cit., p. 177.
painting, or even merely employing an approach that makes such a possibility visible, that Cézanne was in any way initiating a novel approach to the depiction of the human form, more that in placing such visibility at the fore, Cézanne ensures, thereby, consciously or otherwise, that the arrangement of this visibility, as a form of representation, becomes increasingly a form of content. What is, by increments, never escaped is the impression that what is looked at, fundamentally, is a picture being made.
6B: Le Baigneur and L’Enlèvement

At some point after completing the large landscape mural on the northern end of the western wall of the salon of the Jas de Bouffan, a work suggested above as a paraphrase of a scene by Jacob van Ruisdael (fig. 4C.2), Cézanne painted over it, in the central section and in a style vigorously at odds with the more controlled finish of the landscape beneath, a large naked figure depicted from behind (fig. 6B.1). 72

In its original context (fig. 6B.1), then, Cézanne’s mural inclusion would appear to offer, again, and as with the decorations in the nearby alcove (fig. 6A.1), an oddly disjunctive, and apparently unfinished, instance of artistic transition. It would also seem to present the first instance of a pictorial theme Cézanne would later become famous for, the depiction of naked bathers, often copied from his own earlier drawings or studies after statues of the masters, embedded within landscapes evocative, perhaps, of the pastoral. 73 Nevertheless, despite this apparent seminal status, the anomalous nature of Cézanne’s mural inclusion is enough to have ensured that in the two most comprehensive accounts of Cézanne’s engagement with the Bathers theme—Louise Krumrine’s Paul Cézanne: The Bathers and Aruna D’Souza’s Cézanne’s Bathers—it is not even mentioned. 74

In terms of when Cézanne’s apparent act of mural self-daubing might have occurred, suggestions range from the beginning of the 1860s to the end of that same decade, but in all cases is presumed to have been either contemporaneous with, or slightly later.

---

72 On the mural’s context, physically, within the salon decorative scheme, see above section 3E. On its possible relation with Jacob van Ruisdael’s Waterfall in a Rocky Landscape with a Bridge and a Half-Timbered House (late 1660s) (fig. 4C.2), see section 4C.


than, the execution of the mural portrait of his father discussed above. Similarly, as with the mural portrait, rarely is *Le Baigneur au rocher* (fig. 6B.3) mentioned without the immediate invocation of Courbet's name, particularly in regards to the pose depicted, which is often deemed borrowed from his *Les Baigneuses* (1853) (fig. 6B.2).

In regards to how Cézanne might have seen Courbet's notorious 1853 Salon submission, and thereby be inspired to repeat the pose of its principal figure, the painting was exhibited in Paris only twice in the two decades following its debut at the Salon. Cézanne could not have seen the first of these, held in 1855, but he certainly

---

75 In terms of the dating of [R 29] *Le Baigneur au rocher* (1867–1869) (fig. 6B.3): Lionello Venturi initially suggested the range 1864–1868, but was, according to John Rewald, intending to revise this to 1866–1867; Douglas Cooper suggests the slightly earlier 1864–1865; Lawrence Gowing cites c.1860–1862; John Rewald 1867–1869: Venturi, *Cézanne, son œuvre*, op. cit., p. 84 (cat. no. 83); Cooper, *The Jas de Bouffan*, op. cit., p. 26; Gowing, *The early work of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., pp. 5, 6; Rewald, *The Paintings of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit. p. 73.

76 Courbet's *Les Baigneuses* (fig. 6B.2) was the scandal of the 1853 Salon, legendarily struck by Napoléon III with his riding-crop in disgust and prompting the Empress to quip 'Is she a Percheron mare too?': Lindsay, *Gustave Courbet*, op. cit., p. 103. On the mostly negative contemporary critical reaction to *Les Baigneuses*, particularly in conjunction with its presumed pendant at the 1853 Salon, *Les Lutteurs* (1853) (w/c (252 x 198), Szépmüvészeti Múzeum, Budapest), see: Klaus Herding, *Courbet: To Venture Independence*, translated by John William Gabriel, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991, pp. 20–24, 189–195. For comparisons between Cézanne's mural nude and the main figure from *Les Baigneuses* are made see, for instance: Venturi, *Cézanne, son œuvre*, op. cit., p. 84 (cat. no. 83); Reff, *Reproductions and books in Cézanne's studio*, op. cit., p. 307; Gowing, *The early work of Paul Cézanne*, op. cit., p. 5; Gowing, *"The Four Seasons"*, op. cit., p. 70; Wells, *Metaphorical Relevance and Thematic Continuity in the Early Paintings of Paul Cézanne, 1865–1877*, op. cit., p. 37; Lewis, *Cézanne's Early Imagery*, op. cit., p. 87; Mary Louise Krumrine, *[Review of] Cézanne. Paris and London*, *Burlington Magazine*, vol. 138, no. 1117 (April 1996), p. 266; Lewis, *Cézanne's paintings in the grand salon at Jas de Bouffan*, op. cit., p. 87. Joseph Rishel is less convinced of such a connection, however, and prefers to see affinities between Cézanne's mural nude and Delacroix's œuvre in general: Rishel, *"Bather and Rocks"*, op. cit., p. 96 (cat. no. 10).

77 *Les Baigneuses* (1853) (fig. 6B.2) was purchased by the Montpellier art collector Alfred Bruyas shortly after its exhibition at the 1853 Salon; it was then exhibited three more times before its donation by Bruyas to the Montpellier Muséé Fabre in 1868: in Paris in 1855, in Montpellier in 1860, and in Paris in 1867: Gustave Courbet, *Exhibition et vente de 40 tableaux et 4 dessins de l'oeuvre de M. Gustave Courbet, avenue Montaigne, 7, Champs-Elysées*, exhibition catalogue, Paris: Simon Racpn, 1855, cat. no. 4; Gustave Courbet, *Exposition des oeuvres de M. G. Courbet: Rond-Point du Pont de l'Alma (Champs-Elysées)*, exhibition catalogue (Paris, 1867), Paris: Lebigre-Duquesne frères, 1867, cat. no. 6; Robert Ferrier, *La Vie et l'œuvre de Gustave Courbet: Catalogue raisonné*, Lausanne: La Bibliothéque des Arts, 1977, t. 1, p. 86 (cat. no. 140); Lindsay, *Gustave Courbet*, op. cit., pp. 220–222. Based on this Provenance and exhibition history, Joseph Rishel's suggestion that 'Cézanne could have seen *Les Baigneuses* [...] in Paris during his first or second visit' would seem, thereby, unfounded: Rishel, *"Bather and Rocks"*, op. cit., p. 96 (cat. no. 10).
could have seen the second, the massive self-subsidized retrospective held across the summer of 1867, precisely around the time John Rewald, for instance, suggests Cézanne began his mural inclusion.  

Cézanne might also as easily have relied on a reproduction; and, indeed, a photograph of the painting was found amongst his studio possessions at the time of his death.  

Although it is impossible to tell if this print had been acquired four decades earlier, and thereby in time to have inspired the pose depicted in Cézanne’s mural, it should be noted that Victor Laisné had photographed Courbet’s painting soon after it was finished (fig. 6B.4), the resultant image published shortly afterwards in an issue of Theophile Silvestre’s *Histoire des artistes vivants*.  

---

78 Courbet, *Exposition des oeuvres de M. G. Courbet*, op. cit., cat. no. 6. Cézanne was certainly aware of this exhibition, held in a purpose-built structure on the Rond-Point du Pont de l’Alma; for, in a letter to Heinrich Morstatt of July 1867, Fortuné Marion mentioned he was planning, in mid-August, to travel with Cézanne to Paris expressly to see it, along with Manet’s one-man show on the avenue de l’Alma: Fortuné Marion, letter to Heinrich Morstatt, [June or July] 1867, cited in Scolari and Barr, op. cit., p. 49. Alfred Barr and Margaret Scolari suggest, however, that Marion ended up taking this trip on his own, citing a later letter in which Marion, alongside describing his impressions of the Courbet and Manet shows, complained of feeling ‘bien seul’ in Paris: Fortuné Marion, letter to Heinrich Morstatt, 15 August 1867, cited in Scolari and Barr, op. cit., pp. 49, 58. There is no reason to suppose, however, that Cézanne couldn’t already have seen the Courbet show earlier, between its 29 May opening and his presumed mid-June departure from Paris, where he had been since at least February: *Paul, que Garnier a vu à Paris, doit retourner en Provence auprès de nous dans quinze, jours au plus tard*’: Fortuné Marion, letter to Heinrich Morstatt, June 1867, cited in Scolari and Barr, op. cit., p. 40. Gary Wells has also suggested there is slim possibility that Cézanne might have seen *Les Baigneuses* (1853) (fig. 6B.2) at Courbet’s earlier 1860 Montpellier exhibition, mentioned in the footnote immediately above: Wells, *Metaphorical Relevance and Thematic Continuity in the Early Paintings of Paul Cézanne, 1865–1877*, op. cit., p. 99 n. 5. Although there is no evidence Cézanne undertook such a trip to Montpellier, only a couple of hours by rail from Aix-en-Provence, there is none ruling it out. On Cézanne’s activities during 1860, including his dropping out of law school, see chapter three. Likewise, there is no reason to suppose Cézanne couldn’t have travelled to Montpellier to see *Les Baigneuses* (1853) (fig. 6B.2) in the years following Bruyas’s donation of it, along with eight other Courbet canvases, to the Musée Fabre in 1868. On Bruyas’s donation see, in particular: Ernest Michel, *Catalogue des peintres et sculptures exposées dans les galeries du Musée-Fabre de la ville de Montpellier*, Montpellier: Jean Martel Ahné, 1879, pp. xxvi–xxxiv, 95. Among the paintings donated by Bruyas was Courbet’s self-portrait *L’Homme à la pipe* (c.1846) (fig. 5C.9) and Delacroix’s portrait of Michelangelo in his studio (fig. 6C.21), both of which were likewise exhibited at the 1860 Montpellier show. These paintings’ possible relation to other of Cézanne’s paintings is discussed sections 5C and 6C.  

79 Reff, ‘Reproductions and books in Cézanne’s studio,’ op. cit., p. 304.  

80 We have been very busy these days having photographs done of the *Wrestlers*, the *Spinner*, the *Bathers*, as well as my portrait”: Gustave Courbet, letter to his parents, 13 May 1853, cited and translated in Gustave Courbet, *Letters of Gustave Courbet*, edited and translated by Petra ten-Doesschate Chu, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992, pp. 112. On the publication of Laisné’s photograph of *Les Baigneuses*, see: Hanoosh, “Theophile Silvestre’s ‘Histoire des artistes vivants’”*, op. cit., pp. 749, 755 n. 124. Silvestre’s series also published a photograph of Delacroix’s *La Barque de Dante* (fig. 5A.11), another painting that Cézanne copied, albeit far more closely, several years later; ibid., p. 749. Cézanne’s copy is [R 172] *La Barque de*
Any dependency for the mural nude on Les Baigneuses (fig. 6B.2) would seem to require, in any case, little more than a passing familiarity with the original. Cézanne’s mural nude is only loosely similar to Courbet’s, and, even then, confined mostly to the upper parts of the body. Hence, if a deliberate quote, it would seem to represent, through the divergences just noted, either its executor’s faulty memory or a deliberately transformative intent. It might also, as suggested below, indicate Cézanne was quoting the gesture Courbet’s figure makes, rather than the figure itself.

Regardless of how he might have sourced Courbet’s imagery, Cézanne’s motivation in possibly quoting that painter is usually interpreted, as was likewise noted in regard to the mural portrait of his father (fig. 6A.3), as a deliberate and informed act of homage. Specifically, he is presumed to have been manifesting emphatic accord with that painter’s repudiation of academic idealism, which, ironically or not, was also often articulated through the act of pictorial citation. Hence, in works like Les Baigneuses (fig. 6B.2) the realistic portrayal of the naked female body seems combined with compositional formats and postural positionings resonant with classical and/or biblical allegory. As an example of the circuity of reference such citations might illumine, the distinctive thrusting motion made by the figure in Cézanne’s mural could be seen, thus, as repeating not only the gesture similarly made by Courbet’s ‘grosse bourgeoise’, but also the gesture Courbet’s figure itself has often been interpreted as referencing, the gesture of command made by Christ in traditional noli me tangere imagery (fig. 6B.5). By the time Cézanne is presumed to have appropriated it via

Dante, d’après Delacroix (c.1870) (oil (25 x 33), PC); it is mentioned at the beginning of section 5A.

81 It would also imply a procedural approach different to that underpinning his copying of other paintings discussed above, such as Pêches dans un plat (fig. 5B.1) and Vue de Colisée à Rome, d’après F.-M. Granet (fig. 5B.4), which would have required repeated recourse to the original imagery. On these, section 5B..

82 Take, for instance, Mary Tompkins Lewis’s observation that ‘the notoriety that surrounded Courbet’s painting even in Cézanne’s day must have made it a compelling model for a young painter engaged in his own battle with idealized form and subject matter’: Lewis, ‘Cézanne’s paintings in the Grand Salon at Jas de Bouffan,’ op. cit., p. 87.


84 The quote is Delacroix’s; the extract from which it was taken is cited below. On the possible relation between Courbet’s Les Baigneuses and traditional noli me tangere imagery, see, for instance: Werner Hofmann, ‘Courbets Wirklichkeiten,’ in Werner Hofmann and Klaus Herding, Courbet und Deutschland, exhibition catalogue (Hamburger Kunsthalle, Hamburg, 19 October–17 December 1978; Städtische Galerie im Städelischen Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt am
Courbet’s ironic transformation, the gesture might be seen, thereby, as commemoration of precisely this site of contestation staked out by Courbet. The gesture might emblematize, that is, as seems the case in Courbet’s canvas, a disjunctive rupture between academic and realist approaches to the depiction of female nakedness, and, in particular, competing conceptions of appropriate contexts, or not, for this.85

However, and thereby circumventing any necessary reference to Courbet, Cézanne might also have been more simply, and coincidentally, quoting the same gesture, but for his own, and possibly quite different purposes. Indeed, in going further in terms of cursory paint application and a more brutish anatomical formulation, Cézanne would appear to have been inflecting Courbet’s anti-academic project, at least as characterized above, in a different direction. For, despite the charges of crudity often levelled against him, Courbet’s brand of realism still depended, to important degrees, on verisimilitude. The ugliness almost universally perceived as present in his work was more the product of the disjunction between what he and his critics deemed deserving of representation than the technical means through which that representation was deployed.86 Hence, for all the bluster of those condemning him, Courbet was, technically speaking, not a bad painter per se, at least in terms of details, but merely one who depicted vulgar things well, albeit in scenes, academically speaking, badly arranged and lacking coherent conception.87 Cézanne’s mural inclusion, on the other

85 On the irony of this particular strand of rebellious anti-academicism partly initiated by Courbet being played out upon the body of women, but by male artists, see, for instance: Meecham and Sheldon, ‘The nude in modernity and postmodernity,’ op. cit., pp. 109–134.
86 On contemporary conceptions of the ugliness of Courbet’s depictions, see, in particular: Klaus Herding, Courbet: To Venture Independence, translated by John William Gabriel, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991, pp. 6–9. The contrast between Courbet’s aims and this negative reaction, as well as an implicit confirmation of the point just made regarding notions of verisimilitude underlying Courbet’s practice, is perhaps best summarized by Herding’s comment ‘[t]he fact that Courbet did not create an ugly state of affairs but simply tried to reveal it through art, was ignored or suppressed’: ibid., p. 7.
87 A particularly good example of such contemporary characterizations is Delacroix’s perplexity when grappling with his experience of seeing Les Baigneuses (fig. 6B.2) at the 1853 Salon; ‘J’ai été étonné de la vigueur et de la saillie de son principal tableau; mais quel tableau! Quel sujet! La vulgarité des formes ne ferait rien; c’est la vulgarité et l’inutilité de la pensée qui sont abominables; et même au milieu de tout cela, si cette idée, telle quelle, était claire! Que veulent ces deux figures? Une grosse bourgeoise, vue par le dos et toute nue sauf un lambeau de torchon négligemment peint qui couvre le bas des fesses, sort d’une petite
hand, seems to have dispensed with illusionism entirely. As with the portrait of his father nearby (fig. 6A.3), affects of immediacy certainly present in many of Courbet's works—for instance the impasted application of paint, the disproportionate and/or incorrect anatomies, the monumental scaling, the oppressively steep perspective stifling the illusion of space—are not just repeated, but exaggerated almost to the point of caricature. Indeed, Cézanne's mural could as easily be conceived of as a paraphrase of the numerous cartoons made deriding Courbet's nude, for instance Bertall's *La Terrible Savoryarde, par Courbet* (1853) (fig. 6B.6), as of the painting itself. Hence, in addition to its exaggeratedly brusque and vigorous brushwork, Cézanne's apparent transformation of Courbet's figure from female to male is resonant with precisely the kinds of scorn poured on Courbet's canvas by critics as a result of its perceived unflatteringly un-idealized portrayal of femininity.

This is not to say that Cézanne's intention was thereby necessarily similarly satirical, but to highlight the degree to which the articulation of his presumed borrowing emphasized the graphic rather than veristic qualities of the imagery so-appropriated. In so distending the forms presumed repeated, or pastiching only parts of quoted figures, Cézanne's mural nude would seem to draw attention, thereby, to the process

---

*nappe d’eau qui ne semble pas assez profonde seulement pour un bain de pieds. Elle fait un geste qui n’exprime rien, et une autre femme, que l’on suppose sa servante, est assise par terre, occupée à se déchausser. On voit là des bas qu’on vient de tirer; l’un d’eux, je crois, ne l’est qu’à moitié. Il y a entre ces deux figures un échange de pensées qu’on ne peut comprendre. Le paysage est d’une vigueur extraordinaire, mais Courbet n’a fait autre chose que mettre en grand une étude que l’on voit là près de sa toile; il en résulte que les figures y ont été mises ensuite et sans lien avec ce qui les entoure. Ceci se rattache à la question de l’accord des accessoires avec l’objet principal, qui manque à la plupart des grands peintres*:


88 On Bertall’s caricature, as well as others of *Les Baigneuses* by Cham [Amadée-Charles Henri de Noé], Nadar [Gaspar Félix Tournachon], and Quillenbois [Charles-Marie de Sarcus], see: Herding, *Courbet: To Venture Independence*, op. cit., pp. 161, 168, 177, 180, 251 n. 45. On caricatures of Courbet’s work more generally, see, in particular: ibid., pp. 156–187.

of imagic repetition per se. What might be beginning to be pictured is the effect, or, to co-opt—or perhaps pre-empt—Cézanne's own later terminology, the sensation, of perceiving affects themselves, of being moved by the mysteriousness of painting qua image. What might be being appropriated, therefore, are forces of imagery that exceed narrative context. Nevertheless, by virtue of the ever-present possibility of parody, of the ironic distancing this representation of representation seems to implicate in much of Cézanne's work so far discussed, the ambivalence of repetition is nevertheless staunchly retained. That is, and again as with the mural portrait and personifications of the seasons nearby, the possibility of imagic mockery never seems entirely elided, nor its possible target definitively decided.

This possibility of risibility also occurs in terms of the nude's relation to the landscape paraphrase over which it has been painted (fig. 6B.1). Not only does Cézanne's later inclusion, as graffiti-like inscribing, comically nullify any illusion of transparent pictorial surface possibly implied by the earlier landscape, it also configures that exposing in terms of a disjunctive opposing wryly appropriating his own juvenilia. Moreover, in so pasting a figure onto what was presumably a pre-existing landscape, Cézanne seems not only to repeat a process enacted on earlier occasions in his œuvre, for instance with the decorated screen Paravent avec scènes champêtres et ornements (fig. 3B.1) and his c.1860 pastiches of Dutch landscapes (figs 3D.17–18), but also to have emphatically pictured it, an emphasis conveyed as much through technical means, in terms of the disparate modes of painterly approach just described, as thematic, in regards to the disparate historical sources seemingly utilized. There is, as such, a possibility both of a continuity of procedural cut-and-paste as well as of an embodied parodic caricature of just such an approach. A derisively reflexive

---

90 See sections 3B and 3D.

91 Interestingly, the affect of cut-and-paste is also often discernible, although far less obviously, in Courbet's painterly engagement with the nude-in-a-landscape genre. For, as was noted by Delacroix in his criticisms of Les Baigneuses (fig. 6B.2), Courbet's differing painterly treatment of figures comparative to their backgrounds often resulted in a jarring disparity, at least in terms of conventional notions of pictorial unity: 'Le paysage est d'une vigueur extraordinaire, mais Courbet n'a fait autre chose que mettre en grand une étude que l'on voit là près de sa toile: il en résulte que les figures y ont été mises ensuite sans lien avec ce qui les entoure'. Delacroix, [Entry for 15 April 1853], op. cit., p. 18. For a fuller context for this remark, see n. 87 above. Thus, the nude in Les Baigneuses (fig. 6B.2), for all her ruddy colouration and proportional distortions, nevertheless appears carefully, if not compulsively, modelled, a distinct contrast to the landscape behind her, which is painted with far more vigour and diversity of textural dynamism. As such, whereas the resultant work might be described as including a carefully painted nude, albeit awkwardly restrained by academic posing, pasted
revisionism in spirit similar, again, to that suggested above as possibly underpinning his application of the 'ngres' signatures seems, thereby, repeated.92

In terms confined more to self-appropriation and the praxis of seriality, rather than the copying of elements, or stylistic traits, from other artists' works, Cézanne's mural bather, like the mural portrait and portrait of Achille Emperaire discussed above, evokes resonances with other of his works. Take, for instance, the watercolour [RWC 28] Étude de figure (1867–1870) (fig. 6B.7(b)), which by virtue of its similarity to another watercolour, the signed [RWC 30] L'Énlevement (c.1867) (fig. 6B.8(a)), would thereby seem likewise related to the larger canvas the latter, along with the drawings [Ch 200(b–d)] (details) Two Studies for 'The Abduction' (1866–1867) (fig. 6B.8(b)), is presumed a study for, the signed and dated [R 121] L'Énlevement (1867) (fig. 6B.9).93 Now, although on the rare occasion that any of these works are mentioned in discussing Le Baigneur au rocher (figs 6B.3, 6B.8(a)) this is in terms only of general stylistic affinities and, thereby, without any presumption of underlying over a confidently brusque and therefore contemporarily realist landscape, Cézanne's mural (fig. 6B.1), on the other hand, might be described as including a confidently brusque and therefore contemporarily realist nude, or a parody of this, pasted over a carefully painted, albeit awkwardly-restrained, paraphrase of baroque northern landscape painting. On the contrast between Courbet's nudes and backgrounds, see, for instance: Herding, Courbet: To Venture Independence, op. cit., pp. 66–67.

92 For some, however, Cézanne's intent is tragically inept, the nude's contrast with its surroundings symbolizing a mute and frustrated resignation to the impossibilities of fusing decorative structure with naturalistic representation: 'Cézanne allowed himself moments of deep pathos in his letters, but also in pictures like Baigneur au rocher, where a young man, stripped bare, strives poignantly to cleave the landscape, if not to wrench himself into it. [...] Paintings like these signal resignation to a certain kind of failure. In them I think Cézanne realized, over and again, that there would be no proper place, no room for him in that terribly narrow interstice between art and nature where he worked': Kathryn A. Tuma, 'Cézanne and Lucretius at the Red Rock,' Representations, no. 78 (spring 2002), p. 74.

93 Rewald, Paul Cézanne: The Watercolours, op. cit., pp. 89, 90; Henri Loyrette, 'Catalogue notes for 'The Abduction',' in Cachin et al., Cézanne, op. cit., p. 100 (cat. no. 12); Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 109. Rewald's comparison between [R 29] Le Baigneur au rocher (1867–1869) (fig. 6B3) and [RWC 28] Étude de figure (1867–1870) (fig. 6B.7(b)) is made only in terms, however, of their being depictions of a 'related subject': ibid., p. 73. Adrien Chappuis also notes 'certain analogies' between Cézanne's mural nude and the seated figure [Ch 57(a)] (detail from) Page of Figure Studies (1860–1865) (pencil and pen sketchbook page (12.3 x 21.1), High Museum of Art, Atlanta): Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 64. This figure is included on the same sheet of studies (figs 5B.28, 5B.32(a), 5B.36) discussed in chapter five in regards to their possible relation to [R 92] Le Jugement de Paris (1862–1864) (fig. 5B.27) and [R 76] Lot et ses filles (c.1865 or earlier) (fig. 5B.40).
thematic or functional connection, it might pay, nonetheless, to consider just such possibilities. For, if the drawings and watercolours (figs 6B.7(b)–8) are compared with the canvas they are seen to be studies for (fig. 6B.9), similarities, aside from the presence in some of a struggling pair of figures, occur mostly in regards to the general positioning of the body and the legs of the male depicted. However, in terms of the positioning of the arms, the forward thrust of the head, and the angling of the back in this figure, the studies are actually all, seemingly, closer to the mural nude (fig. 6B.7(a)). Moreover, in Mary Tompkins Lewis’s analysis of *L’Enlèvement* (fig. 6B.9), discussed below, certain features argued by her as among those intrinsic to that canvas’s meaning—the heroic nudity, the body of water, the drapery falling from the woman’s grasp and trailing along the ground—might likewise be seen present in the mural.94 It could be suggested, then, that the mural, like the watercolours and drawings just cited, was a study for, or variation of, the canvas, which, by virtue of its signature and dating, would seem the culmination of a gesturing towards some particular pictorial conflation.

This possible visual brainstorming on a monumental scale might also be seen as indicative of the degree to which the murals presumed executed in the Jas de Bouffan after 1865 seem related to more substantially complete canvases. Hence, in addition to the just-noted pairing of *Le Baigneur au rocher* (7B.3) and *L’Enlèvement* (fig. 6B.9), the portrait mural of Cézanne’s father (fig. 6A.3), as noted above, might be seen as related to the canvases *Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l’artiste, lisant ‘L’Événement’* (fig. 6A.4) and [R 178] *Portrait de Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l’artiste* (c.1870). Moreover, the mural [R 141] *Portrait d’Achille Emperaire* (1867–1868) (fig. 6A.17), painted below the copy after Lancret (fig. 4C.13) on the eastern wall (fig. 3E.4), might seem related to the just discussed canvas portrait *Portrait du peintre Achille Emperaire* (fig. 6A.13(b)), even to the point of apparently depicting the subject in an identical red shirt. This would seem to leave only, of the post-c.1865 murals, the mural pair [R 145–146] *Le Christ aux Limbes* and *La Douleur ou La Madeleine* (c.1869) (fig. 6C.3) and the smaller [R 155] *Contraste* (c.1870), the former discussed below, as without canvas doubles.

Before, however, turning to a discussion of these final few murals, it might be worth first continuing an analysis of the canvas version of L'Enlèvement (figs 6B.9), repeating, thereby, not only through the just-noted possible relation to a Jas de Bouffan mural but also the possible use of citatory and pastiche-like practices, the gesture enacted above in regard to the canvases possibly related to Cézanne's portrait mural of his father.

In regards to what is depicted in Cézanne’s ‘most traditional of compositions’, L’Enlèvement (figs 6B.9), interpretations vary, a diversity seemingly dependent as much on the varying painterly precedents suggested as informing or inspiring that depiction, as on the depiction itself. Hence, Mary Tompkins Lewis suggests the painting illustrated Pluto’s abduction of Proserpina, a characterization part-made through reference to Niccolò dell’Abate’s L’Enlèvement de Proserpine (1560) (fig. 6B.10). Various of Delacroix’s abductions or scenes of conflict have also been suggested as inspiration, including his drawing of a design for the decoration of the ceiling of the Hôtel de Ville, reproduced as a woodcut (fig. 6B.11) in one of the 1864 Gazette des Beaux-Arts articles on Delacroix mentioned above, and The Abduction of Rebecca (1846), displayed at his 1864 posthumous sale. Cézanne certainly knew this work, or a reproduction of it such as that printed in L’Artiste (fig. 6B.12), as attested by his fragmentary studies (Ch 117 (a–d)) (details from) Page of Studies (1864–1867) (fig. 6B.13).

95 The quote is Lawrence Gowing’s, from: Lawrence Gowing, ‘[Catalogue notes for] “The Rape (L'Enlèvement)”,’ in Gowing et al., Cézanne: The Early Years, op. cit., p. 132 (cat. no. 31).
98 Adrien Chappuis, for one, deems Cézanne’s sketches after Delacroix’s Abduction of Rebecca (1846) to have been executed after a photograph or engraved reproduction of that work: Adrien Chappuis, ‘Cézanne dessinateur: Copies et illustrations,’ Gazette des Beaux-Arts, vol. 66 (1965), p. 300; Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 75. Lee Johnson lists, in addition to the Hedouin L’Artiste etching reproduced here as (fig. 6B.12), an
accessible to Cézanne as sources, Bruno Ely proposes Giovanni Battista Piazzetta’s *L’Enlèvement de l’Hélène* (c.1725) (fig. 6B.14), a perfect example of late baroque Venetian dynamism acquired by the Musée d’Aix in 1827. 99

Scenes of classically-inspired abductions were also certainly not, however, at the time Cézanne is presumed to have executed his own possible version, confined to the art of the past. Hence, at least two depictions of such scenes were included in the Salon visited by Cézanne during his first trip to Paris in 1861, Alexandre Cabanel’s *Nymphe Enlevée par un faun* (1860) (fig. 6B.15) and Jaroslav Cermák’s *The Abduction of a Herzegovenian Woman* (1861) (fig. 6B.16), both of which might have been mentioned in Cézanne’s poetic description of his impressions of that exhibition discussed in chapter four. 100 In addition, and perhaps ironically, these paintings display exactly the gesture of postural citation here being discussed, both seemingly quoting, at least in the case of the legs of the abducted figure, the same canonically baroque statue, Gian Lorenzo Bernini’s *Il Ratto di Proserpina* (1621–1622), now in the Galleria Borghese. 101 Of course, these possible appropriations were enacted through entirely different painterly means than those argued here as possibly underpinning Cézanne’s own efforts. They might stand, by virtue of their maintenance of coherent spatial illusionism, idealized anatomical form, and polished finish, not only as exemplars of academic modes of visual citation, but also as perfect contrast to, and thereby

---

100. Henri Loyrette is one of the few scholars to suggest a possible connection between Cézanne’s canvas and the Cabanel painting; he does not however, likewise suggest a possible connection in regard to Cermák’s canvas: Henri Loyrette, ‘The nude,’ in Tinterow and Loyrette, *Origins of Impressionism,* op. cit., p. 122; Loyrette, ‘“The Abduction”,’ op. cit., p. 100 (cat. no. 12). In regards to Cézanne’s 1861 poem, Cabanel’s name, who exhibited six paintings at the 1861 Salon, is included in the list of painters concluding that verse and, although Cermák is not mentioned by name, *The Abduction of a Herzegovenian Woman* (1861) (fig. 6. ) might nevertheless have been referred to with the words ‘Ici, d’un Turc brutal la figure abrutie’: Cézanne, letter to Joseph Huot, 4 June 1861, op. cit., p. 157. On Cézanne’s poem, see section 4A.
illustration of, the particular aspect of Cézanne’s early transgressive originality here attempted to be drawn forth.

Moreover, such a comparison is also illuminative in regard to the instances of postural appropriation by Cézanne’s peers Manet and Courbet cited above. For, although perhaps closer than Cézanne’s effort, in terms of technical finesse and regard for some degree of illusionism to the possible appropriations of Cabanel and Cermák just noted, the apparent conceptual content or intention for Manet and Courbet’s use of such borrowing seem different. Hence, for Cabanel and Cermák, the act of quoting postural elements offered a means of signifying the same specific narrative content implicit in those elements’ original contexts, as well as, through being repeated, an implicit acknowledgment of that original’s exemplar status. Poses stand, in such conceptions, as elements of an idealized language of symbolic syntax that, although subtly variable in terms of form and/or combination, nevertheless remains reasonably static in terms of meaning. In contrast, in the case of anti-academic artists such as Manet and Courbet, the repetition of canonic poses—discussed above, for instance, in regards to Manet’s *Le Déjeuner sur l’herbe* (fig. 5A.8) and Courbet’s *Les Baigneuses* (fig. 6B.2)—seems to have been more a combative critique of the pictorial canon. The use of citation, and hence the sanctification of tradition so implied, itself was being questioned.

In regards to Cézanne’s intent in executing *L’Enlèvement* (figs 6B.9), and thereby his possible attitude towards the various conventions he might be seen to either refer to or depict, this has, as already alluded to, provoked a variety of interpretations. Hence, for Mary Tompkins Lewis, Cézanne’s depiction was a deliberate and informed illustration of a specifically literary theme: Pluto’s abduction of Proserpina, particularly as related in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*. In asserting this, Lewis cites, in addition to general antique elements such as heroic nudity, the setting of Cézanne’s painting, which, she suggests, is strikingly similar to Ovid’s description of the scene; the truncated mountain in the background, proposed by some as reference to Mont Sainte-Victoire, is therefore suggested to be the volcano Etna, and the dark waters

---

102 Lewis, *Cézanne’s Early Imagery*, op. cit., p. 156.
before it, Lake Pergus. Lewis also notes the ‘deep blue cloak’ trailing from the female figure’s hand, which could be the garment described by Ovid as ‘riven’ from Proserpina’s shoulder during her abduction.

In terms of the setting, however, Cézanne’s background might also be seen as similar to works dealing with entirely different themes: for instance, Fantin-Latour’s Tannhäuser on Venusberg (1864) (fig. 6B.17), portraying the opening scene of Wagner’s controversial opera and exhibited at the 1864 Salon. Fantin-Latour’s canvas includes a similarly truncated mountain as that in the background of Cézanne’s, as well as a large body of water. Indeed, many of the phrases that Lewis cites from Ovid to describe Cézanne’s L’Énlevement (figs 6B.9), and thereby suggest relation, seem more aptly applied to Fantin-Latour’s depiction of Venusberg. Likewise, in terms of Cézanne’s inclusion of a blue robe, Ovid does not actually describe its colour; the connection with Ovid’s tale is made, then, through dell’Abate’s canonical depiction of the episode, L’Énlevement de Proserpine (1560) (fig. 6B.10), which does depict it so. However, Cézanne could only have seen that painting in reproduction, and, therefore, in monochrome.

---


104 Lewis, Cézanne’s Early Imagery, op. cit., p. 161.


106 For instance, ‘A wood crowns the heights around its waters on every side, and with foliage as with an awning keeps off the sun’s hot rays. The branches afford a pleasing coolness’: Ovid, Metamorphoses, translated by F. J. Miller, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1944, book 5, l. 5, cited in Lewis, Cézanne’s Early Imagery, op. cit., p. 159.

107 Lewis, Cézanne’s Early Imagery, op. cit., p. 161.

108 Although dell’Abate’s canvas is now in the collection of the Louvre, it wasn’t acquired by that institution until 1933, and was, at the time Cézanne is presumed to have executed [R 121] L’Enlevement (fig. 6B.9), in England: Unattributed author, ‘[Catalogue notes for] Abati ou dell’Abate (Niccolo): “L’Enlevement de Proserpine,”’ in Couché et al., La Galerie du Palais-Royal, gravée d’après les tableaux des différentes écoles qui la composent, op. cit., t. 1, p. 76; ‘[Acquisition details for Niccolò dell’Abate’s “L’Enlevement de Proserpine”],’ online database of the collection of the Musée du Louvre, accessible through: http://cartel.fr.louvre.fr/cartel/fr/visite?srv=cart_{fr}{}{rm}_rs&langue=fr&initCriteria=true. In terms of
As further proof of connection between Cézanne's painting and Ovid's tale, Lewis also cites the background figures (fig. 6B.19), which she suggests portray the nymphs Cyane and Arethusa, participants in the episode as told by the poet. Hence, the figure seemingly standing in the water is Cyane, described by Ovid, at the moment of abduction, thus: "Out of her waters' midst she rose waist-high and recognised the goddess. "Stop, stop!" she cried." For Lewis, what is also depicted is the nymph's subsequent dissolving, literally, in grief at Proserpina's departure, turning into the spring that would then bear her name, as well a much later event, her showing Proserpina's mother, Ceres, her missing daughter's girdle, dropped when she was captured. The reclining nude beside her is therefore Arethusa, who, like Cyane, also named a pool in Sicily and soothed Ceres when on her search for a daughter, explaining that she had seen her in hell. Although, as Lewis remarks, an inclusion of these nymphs would certainly seem a means of geographically locating the scene in Sicily, their depiction alongside each other would seem strange. Ovid explicitly states the springs they name were on opposite sides of the same bay, and the nymphs, aside from their subsequent interaction with Ceres, have little other connection. If reproductions of the painting that Cézanne might have had access to, and thereby been inspired by, a reversed engraving was included in the lavish two volume set of engravings published in 1858 and commemorating the former collection of the Galerie du Palais-Royal, dispersed in 1798: L'Enlevement de Proserpine, engraving by Alix (?), after a drawing by Jacques Couché, after the painting by Nicolo dell'Abate, published in Couché et al., La Galerie du Palais-Royal, op. cit., t. I, [not paginated] plate. There is also a drawn version of the same scene by dell'Abate in the Louvre, acquired in 1671; however, it is entirely different in conception to his more famous painted version, showing Pluto carrying off Proserpina in his chariot, and in a predominantly architectural setting: Niccolo dell'Abate, L'Enlevement de Proserpine (16th century), ink and wash on paper (34.5 x 48.8), Musée du Louvre, Paris. 109 Ovid, Metamorphoses, op. cit., book 5, l. 420. 110 Lewis, Cézanne's Early Imagery, op. cit., p. 161. '[Ceres came] again to Sicania [Sicily] and there, in wanderings that led her everywhere, she too reached Cyane; who would have told all, had she not been changed. She longed to tell but had no mouth, no tongue, nor any means of speaking. Even so she gave a clue, clear beyond doubt, and floating on her pool she showed the well-known sash which Persephone had chanced to drop there in the sacred spring. How well the goddess knew it! Then at last she seemed to understand her child was stolen, and tore her ruffled hair and beat her breast': Ovid, Metamorphoses, op. cit., book 5, ll. 464-469. 111 Lewis, Cézanne's Early Imagery, op. cit., p. 163. 'And so it was that, while beneath the earth on my Stygian stream, I saw, myself with my own eyes, glided in your Proserpina. Her looks were sad, and fear still in and yet a queen, and yet of that dark land Empress, and yet her eyes; with power and majesty the consort of the Sovereign lord of Hell': Ovid, Metamorphoses, op. cit., book 5, ll. 492-494. 112 Bacchiadae, where settlers once from Corinthus's isthmus built between two harbours their great battlements. A bay confined by narrow points of land lies between [the springs] Arethusa and Cyane': Ovid, Metamorphoses, op. cit., book 5, l. 407.
Cézanne was deliberately illustrating Ovid, he seems to have done so by conflating multiple scenes.

In any case, Lewis draws further connection to Ovid by citing drawn elements on a page from one of Cézanne’s early sketchbooks, [Ch 199(a)] (details of) Female Nudes (1866–1867) (fig. 6B.20), which are presumed by some to have not only been possible sources for the reclining nude in the background of L’Enlèvement (figs 6B.19), but also, originally derived as studies from a similarly posed figure in Poussin’s Écho et Narcisse (1630) (fig. 6B.21), a painting depicting another of Ovid’s poems and in the collection of the Louvre since 1710. However, in the case even of the more likely of these studies—the darker and more emphatically drawn figure bottom right—Cézanne’s sketch comes close to the pose depicted by Poussin only in the upper half of the body; the legs are twisted up and to the right in a quite different manner. Hence, as was noted above in regard to Cézanne’s possible use of Courbet’s imagery in concocting his mural nude, if the background nymph depicted in L’Enlèvement (fig. 6B.19), along with its presumed study (fig. 6B.20), is to be considered ultimately derived from Poussin’s depiction of Echo, a form of postural pastiche would likewise seem to be presumed; the upper part of Poussin’s figure grafted on to the lower half of a figure holding a different pose, one either invented or copied from another source.

In terms of other possible postural sources for Cézanne’s painting, but in regards to the larger central figures, Sidney Geist has suggested the ‘the similarly posed pair’ in Delacroix’s Hercules Rescuing Alcestis (1862) (fig. 6B.18), albeit depicted from a

113 Lewis, Cézanne’s Early Imagery, op. cit., pp. 162–163. On the relation between the cited sketchbook elements and [R 121] L’Enlèvement (1867) (fig. 6B.19), see: Chappuis, The Drawings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 93. For suggestions of a relation between those same sketchbook elements and Poussin’s Écho et Narcisse (1630) (fig. 6B.21), see: Andersen, ‘Cézanne’s portrait drawings from the 1860’s,’ op. cit., p. 268; Lewis, Cézanne’s Early Imagery, op. cit., p. 162; Andersen, Cézanne and the Eternal Feminine, op. cit., pp. 55–56. For suggestions of a relation between the background figure depicted in Cézanne’s canvas and Poussin’s canvas, see: Berthold, Cézanne und die alten Meister, op. cit., pp. 45, 46; Andersen, Cézanne and Zola, op. cit., p. 288.

114 Ironically, the lower portions of the sketched figure (fig. 6B.20), along with the painted figure from [R 121] L’Enlèvement (1867) (fig. 6B.19) presumed derived from it, comes closer to the foreground river nymph depicted in the dell’Abate painting cited above (fig. 6B.10). This confluence must, however, be coincidental; as noted above, Cézanne could only have had access to dell’Abate’s imagery through reproduction, and the most likely candidate for such a reproduction, published in Jacques Couché’s La Galerie du Palais-Royal, was not only reversed compared to both the Cézanne and dell’Abate depictions, but also portrays the relevant nymph with a far greater twist than is the case in Cézanne’s depictions, both painted and drawn.
different angle, was direct inspiration.\textsuperscript{115} Hence, for Geist what is being portrayed, and thereby made obvious by this presumed link, is not an abduction, but a rescue. Indeed, he sees Cézanne’s canvas as a nothing less than sincere allegorization of his gratitude to Zola, in which he has pictured himself as the female figure and his friend as the hero rescuing him from his critics.\textsuperscript{116} The postural relation cited by Geist is perhaps slight, however; and indeed, similar claims might be made in regard to other images. For instance, there is a similarity, at least in terms of the positioning of the feet, between Cézanne’s heroic nude and a figure in Delacroix’s \textit{Herminie et les bergers} (1859) (fig. 6B.23), or even, albeit in reverse, one of his own earlier \textit{académies} (fig. 6B.24).

Nevertheless, that Geist can perceive an entirely different relationship between the two main figures in Cézanne’s canvas than that seen by, for instance, Lewis, speaks not only for the transference of content the presumption of appropriation often entails, but also for the apparent ambivalence of Cézanne’s representation in the first place. Indeed, without reference to some other literary or pictorial work, it seems difficult to tell exactly what is going on in Cézanne’s picture in the first place. The potentiality to see imagic borrowing in Cézanne’s canvas might then be a result more of the general appearance of his composition, in terms both of this absence of clarity as well its apparently pastiche-like approach, as any specific similarities with other works just noted. Hence, and as with the portraits of his father and Achille Emperaire discussed above (figs 6A.13(a-b)), his figural constructions seem awkward combinations of slightly mismatching portions. As Julius Meier-Graefe notes, the female figure, for instance, appears little more than a ‘a package of arms and legs.’\textsuperscript{117} The striding legs of the male seem to belong to a different figure than the twisted back and elbow of his upper torso, and the hanging arm of the woman he holds enormous and completely out-of-proportion, oddly twisted flat to the surface as if pasted in from some


\textsuperscript{116} As such, Geist invokes Zola’s mid-April 1867 letter written in defence of Cézanne and published in \textit{Le Figaro}, cited: above in section 5A.

completely different picture, an appropriation, almost, from his own much earlier work, itself a copy, *Le Baiser de la Muse, d’après Frillié* (fig. 3D.1).

Related to this, it should also perhaps be noted the degree to which many of Cézanne’s drawn copies after other artists of this period—for instance, his *Page of Studies* (1864–1867) (fig. 6B.13) after Delacroix mentioned above—deal only with fragments, with parts of bodies, rather than entire compositions. Indeed, Cézanne seems often interested, as appears to be the case in the just-cited Delacroix studies, in those parts of depictions where bodies meet, particularly when grappling, whether in rescues, abductions, or apotheosized liftings. As such, in terms specific to *L’Enlevement* (figs 6B.19), and in regards exactly to the seemingly ambivalently defined relationship between the two main figures, an allegorizing seems to have occurred regarding the ambiguities and tensions of human contact. Indeed, precisely this mysteriousness seems to capture perfectly the often tragic ineptitude implicit in much human interaction, perhaps, and in particular, between male and female.

118 Hence, for instance, Cézanne’s studies of Puget’s statue of Perseus lifting up Andromeda in the Louvre, [Ch 83] *After Puget: ‘Perseus Rescuing Andromeda’* ([1864–1867?]) (pencil on paper (20 x 11), PC) and [Ch 84] *After Puget: Andromeda* (1864–1867) (pencil on paper (18.5 x 12.5), PC), and his fragmentary copy after Rubens’s *L’Apothéose d’Henri IV et la proclamation de la régence de la reine, le 14 mai 1610* (1622–1625) (oil (394 x 727), Musée du Louvre, Paris), [Ch 102] *After Rubens: Detail of ‘The Apotheosis of King Henri IV’* (1864–1865) (pencil on paper (40.5 x 30), PC).
As attested by photographs taken before Josse Hessel’s first program of mural removals in 1912 (figs 6C.1–2), the works now titled [R 145] Le Christ aux Limbes (c.1869) (fig. 6C.7) and [R 146] La Douleur ou La Madeleine (c.1869) (fig. 6C.11) originally formed part of the same panel (fig. 6C.3), and therefore, perhaps, the same piece. However, in the process of removal, the works were separated and mounted on different canvases, the gap left in Le Christ aux Limbes by the excision of its partnered La Douleur ou La Madeleine restored in blackish colours, leaving an odd and unsettling shadow in the lower right corner.

In terms of the originally left-hand section, Le Christ aux Limbes (fig. 6C.7), this depicts Christ’s descent into hell as recounted in the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus. The imagery itself is copied from Sebastiano del Piombo’s Descent of Christ into Limbo (1516) (fig. 6C.4), which, being in the collection of the Prado, Cézanne could never have seen. Thus, he must have worked from a reproduction,

As likewise noted above an initial phase of removals occurred in 1912, when, of the murals here discussed, [R 145] Christ aux Limbes (c.1869) and [R 146] La Douleur ou La Madeleine (c.1869) (figs 6C3(b–c) were removed and mounted on separate canvases: Unattributed author, ‘Quatre panneaux décoratifs de Cézanne,’ La Renaissance, (April 1918), pp. 32–34; Mack, Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 148; Cooper, ‘The Jas de Bouffan,’ op. cit., pp. 26–27; Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 67. John Rewald, in his discussion of the dispersal of the murals, implies [R 145] Les Christ aux Limbes (c.1869) (fig. 6C.7) remained behind after the 1912 phase of removals: ibid., p. 67. However, the provenance given by him later for that same painting includes it as belonging, for a period, to Josse Hessel, before being passed onto August Pellerin, who had possession of the painting by the early 1920s: ibid., p. 123; records of the Musée d’Orsay, accessible through the Musée d’Orsay collection database accessible at: http://www.musee-orsay.fr/en/collections/overview.html. Whether this means the painting was detached by Josse Hessel separately from the other murals in the years between 1912 and the early 1920s, is difficult to determine. In a list of works appended by Walter Feilchenfeldt to the 2004 reprint of Rewald’s catalogue raisonné notes related to the Jas de Bouffan murals, [R 145] Les Christ aux Limbes (c.1869) (fig. 6C.7) is included amongst those works described as removed in 1912: Walter Feilchenfeldt, ‘Cézanne’s murals in the Jas de Bouffan: According to John Rewald’s Catalogue Raisonné of the Paintings of Paul Cézanne,’ in Boyer et al., op. cit., p. 97.


Piombo’s canvas was acquired by the Museo Nacional del Prado in 1837: Unattributed author, ‘[Catalogue notes for] Sebastiano del Piombo: “Bajada de Cristo al Limbo”,’ online database of the Museo Nacional del Prado, Barcelona, accessible through:
most likely an engraving published in Charles Blanc’s École espagnole (fig. 6C.5), attributed there, however, to Juan Fernández Navarette. The publication date for that volume, 1869, is, therefore, usually deemed terminus post quem not only for Le Christ aux Limbes, but also La Douleur ou La Madeleine, which originally physically overlapped the former (fig. 6C.2), as noted above.

In any case, Cézanne also seems to have executed after that same engraving a drawing, [Ch 214] After Sebastiano del Piombo: ‘Christ in Limbo’ (1869–1870) (fig. 6C.6), which in many ways comes closer to its presumed model than the mural version. Not only, for instance, is the outline and positioning of Christ’s leading hand in the drawing closer to the engraving than the mural, many of the drawing’s contours can be made to match if overlain it, albeit after a rotation fifteen degrees clockwise. Interestingly, although such rotation enables the angle of the more vertical elements of the pavement Christ stands upon to align with the corresponding elements in the engraving, this is not the case with the horizontal front edge of the same, or the vertical edge of the doorway in the background. To a degree, then, the kinds of distortion suggested above as possibly present in Cézanne’s juvenile depictions of


122 Venturi, Cézanne, son arte—son œuvre, op. cit., p. 84 (cat. no. 84); Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 122.

123 Ratcliffe, Cézanne’s Working Methods, op. cit., pp. 8–9; Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 122. Lawrence Gowing, however, has also raised the possibility that a stand-alone issue of Blanc’s chapter on Navarette might have been published as early as 1867, citing Daumier’s apparent use, in precisely that year, of the same imagery in a lithographic caricature published in Le Charivari; in concert with perceived stylistic affinities between [R 146] La Douleur ou La Madeleine (c.1869) (figs 6C.3, 6C.11) and certain of Cézanne’s 1867 canvases; for instance, the signed and dated [R 121] L’Enlevement (1867) (fig. 6B.6) discussed above; Gowing therefore prefers a c.1867 dating for that mural, as well as its partner [R 145] Le Christ aux Limbes (c.1869) (figs 6C.3, 6C.7): Gowing, ‘The early work of Paul Cézanne,’ op. cit., p. 12. The stylistic affinities cited by Gowing include the ‘drawing of the hands’ in La Douleur ou La Madeleine (figs 6C.3, 6C.11), which he suggests are similar to the hands in L’Enlevement (fig. 6B.9), and the ‘pendulous loops of drapery’, which he notes recall the ‘topped folds’ of the trousers worn by the model in [R 120] Le Nègre Scipion (c.1867) (o/c (107 x 83), Museu de Arte de São Paulo Assis Chateaubriand, Sao Paulo): Gowing, ‘The early work of Paul Cézanne,’ op. cit., p. 12. The Daumier caricature cited by Gowing is Non! mes enfants!... Vous n’êtes pas de cette pièce là; lampooning the presence of the Ottoman Empire at the Paris Exposition Universelle of that year; it was published in Le Charivari, 8 March 1867.
antique warriors, in terms of the rotation of parts two-dimensionally relative to one another, seems present here, in what might have been, by virtue of this transitionary status, a preliminary study for the mural. In line with this, the drawing also seems to pre-empt elements of the mural not present in the engraving: for instance, the positioning and tilt of Adam’s head, the detailing of the inner edge of Christ’s leading leg, and the increased size of his lower chest.124

In terms of differences between the mural and the engraving (figs 6C.5, 6C.7), and leaving aside the possibility of the intermediary of the drawing, these include the mural being proportionally wider and, coincident with this, a small section being excised from the base of the picture. Much of the lower part of the mural’s imagery has also been increased in size relative to the upper portion, as well as, in certain instances, each other.125 Hence, Adam’s arms have become big enough to overlap the pavement upon which Christ stands, unlike in the engraving. Eve’s head has been enlarged considerably and thereby pushed closer to the viewer, as has Adam’s, but without any correlative increase in torso size, diminishing somewhat the Michelangelesque proportions of Piombo’s original.126 Adam also seems to have been depicted with less hair than is the case in both the engraving and the original, but not in the drawing, a factor Theodore Reff cites, along with the changes wrought upon Eve, as evidence Cézanne was deliberately attempting to insert portraits of his parents.127 Reff suggests, thereby, that the scene might have been intended as biographical reconfiguration, as an invocation of a ‘fantasy of filial triumph’ in which the redeeming Christ stands for Cézanne and Adam and Eve for his chastised parents. In turn, this theme signalled by divergence between original and copy is continuous, to a degree, with the interpretation Reff gives Cézanne’s drawing ‘La Mort règne en ces

124 On the other hand, the mural corrects certain errors of the drawing, such as the tilt of Christ’s head. Whether this then indicates the drawing wasn’t used as a study for the mural is difficult to tell.
125 This proportional difference is not present in the drawing.
126 The increase in size of Eve’s head to some extent corrects the decrease in size of her head in the engraving relative to Piombo’s original, surely coincidentally.
127 ‘Christ is like the artist, long-haired and bearded, [...] Adam is like his father, grey-haired and venerable—more so than in Sebastiano’s version—and [...] Eve is like his mother, demurely dressed even here in Limbo’: Reff, ‘Cézanne: The severed head and the skull,’ op. cit., p. 92.
lieux’ (fig. 2.3), discussed in chapter two. Indeed, Reff extends this biographical re-interpretation to the figures in the background of Cézanne’s mural, the obscuring of one of the faces suggested as a means by which the number of figures in the scene could be reduced to five, the same as the number of members of Cézanne’s family. Ironically, and despite this obscuring, the mural merely repeats the initial error of the engraver, who for some reason inserted, rather awkwardly, the third background figure into Piombo’s original in the first place.

In terms of differences in the depiction of Christ, Cézanne has, at least in the mural, moved the back foot considerably further up the pavement and increased the size of his leading leg, giving a somewhat deeper thrust to his forward step, an illusion of spatiality shattered somewhat, however, by the depiction of the arm carrying the victory banner, which, by virtue of lack of shadowing, especially in the elbow and in contrast to those depicted along Christ’s neck, pushes the upper arm likewise forwards, giving Christ’s stance an uncomfortable hunch-backed appearance. Indeed, the lighting in Cézanne’s mural is inconsistent at best, the shadow of Christ’s leading

---

128 loc. cit. On [Ch 37] Symbolic Drawing Inscribed ‘La Mort règne en ces lieux’ (1859) (fig. 2.3) and Reff’s interpretation, see section 2E. Lawrence Gowing also sees some biographical inclusion in terms of the depiction of Eve on the left, but in terms of Cézanne’s sister Marie, a portrait of whom Cézanne’s version is deemed ‘improving considerably on Sebastiano’s type’: Gowing, ‘The early work of Paul Cézanne,’ op. cit., p. 12.

129 Reff, ‘Cézanne: The severed head and the skull,’ op. cit., p. 92. Hence, connection is again made to [Ch 37] Symbolic Drawing Inscribed ‘La Mort règne en ces lieux’ (1859) (fig. 2.3), which, as Reff notes, likewise includes five figures. It might be wondered, however, that, if this were Cézanne’s intention, why he didn’t simply excise the entire figure.

130 In her discussion of the imagery, Mary Tompkins Lewis implies there are three figures in the background of Piombo’s canvas and identifies them as Simeon and his two sons Lucius and Karinus, who, in the Gospel of Nicodemus, narrate, in written form, the events of Christ’s descent, having witnessed it and being resurrected as a result: Lewis, Cézanne’s Early Imagery, op. cit., p. 55. The figures in Piombo’s canvas, of which there are, however, definitely only two, would seem more likely to be The Good Thief Dymas, who is described in the Gospel as ‘bearing upon his shoulders the sign of the cross’, and the John the Baptist, identifiable by his baldness and beard, who preceded Christ’s descent into limbo and proclaimed his imminent arrival: Gospel of Nicodemus 18:3, 26:1. For other prominent depictions of the Good Thief in descent into limbo imagery and identifiable by his carrying a large wooden beam or cross, see, for instance: Giotto, Descent into Limbo (1320–1325) (tempura on panel (45 x 44), Alte Pinakothek, Munich); Andrea Mantegna, Descent into Limbo (1475–1480) (engraving on paper (42 x 32.8), Victoria and Albert Museum, London); Albrecht Dürer, Descent into Limbo (1510) (woodcut on paper (40.1 x 28.3) (Victoria and Albert Museum, London); Alonso Cano, Descent into Limbo (c.1640) (oil on canvas (170 x 119), Los Angeles County Museum, Los Angeles). For depictions of the Good Thief alongside John the Baptist in such imagery, see, for instance: Agnolo Bronzino, Discesa di Cristo al Limbo (1552) (oil on panel, Museo dell’Opera di Santa Croce, Florence). On the latter, see: Robert W. Gaston, ‘Iconography and Portraiture in Bronzino’s “Christ in Limbo”,’ Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz, vol. 27, no. 1 (1983), pp. 53, 56.
arm across his torso, for instance, which helps in pushing the hand above Adam's head illusionistically forward in the original painting, is entirely absent in the mural, a deficiency exaggerating a similar diminishment in the engraving and his drawing after it. Cézanne's mural likewise presents the rather awkward combination of Christ's well-lit rear foot standing upon the shadow cast by his front leg, which, although in the drawing follows the curve of the engraved version closely, in the mural is considerably straightened and pushed toward the vertical. All over, the simplification of shading evidenced in the engraving, and in Cézanne's drawing, has been exaggerated in the mural such that the dynamic and dramatic contrasts deployed throughout, although perhaps initially derived from this simplification of shadowing cues, seems to serve no useful purpose in defining volumes, the delicate tonal chiaroscuro of the original transformed into an affective high-contrast decorative linearity. Precisely this impulse was noted above in regard to certain of Cézanne's 1862–1866 académies. In the mural, however, the flat arabesque-like aspect of outlining has been emphasized by its contrast with the frenetically impasted turmoil of the whitish grey and yellowish brushstrokes colouring and defining the flesh parts contained by it (figs 6C.8–9), an overload of facture that not only nullifies all possibility of tonal modelling, but also offers a visceral movement distinctly at odds with the classical stasis of the pose depicted.

Again, however, as with the mural portrait of his father Portrait de Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de /'artiste (fig. 6A.3) discussed above, it is difficult to tell the degree to which Le Christ aux Limbes (fig. 6C.7) might be considered a finished work, the background figures, for instance, only cursorily introduced, the head to the furthest right little more than an inverted silhouette (fig. 6C.10), through which an orangish layer of underpainting can be seen. The high-keyed contrasts just described defining the foreground figures might thereby represent an intermediate phase in an abandoned sequence of execution, Cézanne perhaps intending to soften the contrasts with more detailed modelling later. However, the sheer viscosity of the applied flesh tones and

131 Take, for instance, the shading on the Christ's leading leg, which, in the Piombo original is carefully and subtly shaded away from the centre line to the edge of the leg. In the engraving, the transition is more abrupt, and stark, the gradation of light to dark so sudden that, in the upper leg, a line of lighter shading has to be reintroduced in order to define the inside edge of the thigh against the dark of the robe behind, a reintroduction repeated in Cézanne's mural as a line of grey.

132 See section 5A.
the subsequent difficulties this would present to any later attempt at over-painting would seem to argue against this.

Whether finished or not, Cézanne seems to have begun the right hand section of his paired murals, *La Douleur ou La Madeleine* (fig. 6C.11), after *Le Christ aux Limbes* (fig. 6C.7), the blue dress worn by the female figure in the former, presumed by many to be Mary Magdalene, impinging noticeably over the pavement upon which Christ walks in the latter. A similar gesture of disjunctive addition as that described above in regard to *Le Baigneur au rocher* (fig. 6B.1) seems to have been repeated, the resulting discrepancies apparently jarring enough to lead those removing the murals to presume them two separate works, and, as such, divide them accordingly. ¹³³

For some, however, Lawrence Gowing and Mary Tompkins Lewis, for instance, such pairing is deemed intentional, the mural in its original form seen as a single thematically coherent unit, a deliberate juxtaposition of the triumphal connotations of Christ’s descent into limbo with the redemptive overtones of Mary Magdalene’s lament at the tomb of Christ. ¹³⁴ Hence, although this combination of particular scenes within the same picture has few, if any, art historical precedents, Lewis asserts it was not only an understandable relation, citing the scenes’ temporal proximity in the

¹³³ Indeed, aside from the more obvious discrepancies in figural proportions and illusionistic continuity, Cézanne’s two murals also differ from one another technically. Hence, although Lewis cites ‘a dim layer of biter blue underpainting that binds them together visually’, the two works seem actually to have slightly different coloured grounds: Lewis, *Cézanne’s Early Imagery*, op. cit., p. 53. Hence, as mentioned above, the underpainting revealed in the unfinished background figures of *Le Christ aux Limbes* (fig. 6C.7) is a pinkish-orange, whereas the bulk of the underpainting in *La Douleur ou La Madeleine* (fig. 6C.11), seen, for instance, in the gaps between the brushstrokes defining the skull (fig. 6C.11), are a dark turquoise green. Robert Ratcliffe notes precisely these differences, mentioning not only the warm underpainting revealed in the background figure, but also another olive green in other parts of the same mural, which he notes ‘is clearly distinguishable from the more turquoise green that lies beneath the Magdalen’: Ratcliffe, *Cézanne’s Working Methods*, op. cit., p. 90. However, the warm orange-pink discernible in parts of *Le Christ aux Limbes*—for instance, just to the right of Christ’s rear leg, as well as parts of his forward knee (fig. 6C.9) and Adam’s hand—does seem to reappear beneath the face of *La Douleur ou La Madeleine* (fig. 6C.11), a presence, Lewis suggests, intended to depict the Magdalen’s ‘bright red’ tears: Lewis, *Cézanne’s Early Imagery*, op. cit., p. 60. Robert Ratcliffe also notes the presence of this under-painting in the Madeleine’s face, but he describes as a ‘warm dull orange-buff’: Ratcliffe, *Cézanne’s Working Methods*, op. cit., p. 89.

Easter narrative, but also a combination ‘by no means unique’ relative to other media, noting a suggested prevalence of precisely this conflation of episodes in vernacular Easter passion plays.  

However, if such was Cézanne’s aim, and La Douleur ou La Madeleine (fig. 6C.11) was thereby intended as a scene of Magdalene’s lamentation, Cézanne’s articulation would seem unusual. His figure lacks the Magdalene’s iconographically distinguishing free-flowing auburn hair, as well as her normally red-coloured dress and alabaster ointment jar. Moreover, although her grief-stricken pose does suggest a lamentation, the presence of a memento mori skull and the cave-like darkness of her surrounds indicate, instead, a depiction of her as an ascetic penitent, a configuration somewhat removed from the passion narrative. In turn, however, this would cleave precisely the temporal association underpinning its scenic conflation with the descent into limbo episode in liturgical drama that is cited by Lewis as a parallel to Cézanne’s endeavour.

In regards to possible visual sources for La Douleur ou La Madeleine (fig. 6C.11), and separate to its relation to Le Christ aux Limbes (fig. 6C.7), an issue discussed again below, several have been cited. Usually, it is compared to, and indeed often suggested as inspired by, Domenico Fetti’s La Mélancolie (1620) (fig. 6C.12) in the Louvre, a painting often mistakenly presumed to be a penitent Magdalene. The possibility of

---

135 Lewis, ‘Cézanne’s “Harrowing of Hell” and “The Magdalen”,’ op. cit., p. 176; Lewis, Cézanne’s Early Imagery, op. cit., p. 56. Lewis cites, for instance, the medieval Ordo Paschalis produced in Klosterneuberg, in which the descent into Limbo and the lament of Magdalene were combined in the same scene: loc. cit. She suggests many medieval Easter plays were ‘divided onto episodes that occupied specific areas of the stage [...] and through this configuration permitted dialogue between the participants in the different events. The harrowing of hell [descent into Limbo] and the lament at the tomb may, in fact, have been placed physically close to one another in some dialgued versions of the Easter story, allowing for just such an interchange’; Lewis then suggests that the Easter plays known to have been performed in Aix-en-Provence during Cézanne’s youth, although having no surviving texts, might have continued this tradition: loc. cit.


more local sources has also, however, been raised, including a study presumed, at the
time Cézanne was completing his mural, to be by the Provençal-born Pierre-Hubert
Subleyras, *Sainte Madeleine* (c.18oth) (fig. 6C.13), acquired by the Musée d’Aix as part
of the Bourguignon de Fabregoules bequest, along with fourteen other images of the
Magdalene, three of which, including the study just cited, were penitent scenes.\(^{138}\)
Cézanne would certainly have had an opportunity to see the work, mentioning in a
letter to Zola a visit to the display of the bequest late in 1866.\(^{139}\) He was, however,
unimpressed, concluding ‘I thought everything was bad. It is very consoling.’\(^{140}\)
Nevertheless, as Carol Solomon Kiefer points out, Cézanne’s mural (fig. 6C.11) does
share certain similarities with the study (fig. 6C.13), including a comparable emphasis
on a large, lone figure in a darkened space and the similar placement of a skull on a
bench or table.\(^{141}\) Likewise, the older work pre-empts not only Cézanne’s
iconographically unusual blue dress, but also the exaggerated pose, particularly the
thick triangulated depiction of the shoulder, the closed eyes, and the positioning of the
head.\(^{142}\) Other of Subleyras’s Madeleines, for instance as portrayed in his
monumental *Le Repas chez Simon* (1737) (fig. 6C.14) canvas in the Louvre, also seem
similar to Cézanne’s conception, as does a depiction of her by Michel Serre, *Sainte
Madeleine aux pieds du Christ* (early c.18oth) (fig. 6C.15), in a painting displayed in the
Aix-en-Provence church dedicated to her.

Nina Maria Athanassoglou-Kallmyer also raises the possibility of local influence on
*La Douleur ou La Madeleine* (fig. 6C.11), but in the more general terms of vernacular
traditions through which high art sources such as Fetti’s *La Mélancolie* (fig. 6C.12)
might have been refracted. The mural is thereby seen as an example of Cézanne’s
‘consistent attempt to re-root mainstream prototypes into a regional aesthetic

---

\(^{138}\) Carol Solomon Kiefer, ‘Cézanne’s “Magdalen”: A new source in the Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence,’ *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, ser. 6, vol. 103 (February 1984), pp. 92, 93; Ely, ‘Cézanne, l’École de Dessin et le Musée d’Aix,’ op. cit., p. 177. On the Bourguignon de Fabregoules bequest, see section 3A. According to Kiefer the work ‘in recent years was reattributed to a student of Michel-François Dandré-Bardon (prob. an early work of Pierre Peyron)’: Kiefer, ‘Cézanne’s “Magdalen”,’ op. cit., p. 94 n. 12.


\(^{140}\) loc. cit.

\(^{141}\) Kiefer, ‘Cézanne’s “Magdalen”,’ op. cit., p. 93.

\(^{142}\) loc. cit.
context.\textsuperscript{143} In prefacing this possibility of regionalist emphasis, Athanassoglou-Kallmyer stresses, as do Lewis and Kiefer, the Magdalene’s particular prominence in Provençal folklore, both as patron saint of the province and as focus of several local pilgrimage sites. Her relics, including a prominently displayed skull (fig. 6C.16), are held in a church just west of Aix-en-Provence, and the cave in which she legendarily spent the last three decades of her life just south of this.\textsuperscript{144} Indeed, the darkened space depicted by Cézanne in his mural is sometimes suggested as specific reference to that landmark.\textsuperscript{145}

In terms of the specific regional vernacular precedents possibly related to Mary Magdalene’s Provençal prominence, Athanassoglou-Kallmyer cites Cézanne’s use of the three teardrop shapes above the figure’s bowed head, which she suggests are illustrations of the tradition, popular in Provence, that the Magdalene’s tears upon being shed during her lamentation at the tomb, transformed into diamonds and pearls.\textsuperscript{146} Athanassoglou-Kallmyer also compares the anomalous figural disproportion and illusionistic disjunction of \textit{La Douleur ou La Madeleine} (fig. 6C.11) with the adjoining \textit{Le Christ aux Limbes} (fig. 6C.7) with local ex-voto imagery, pilgrimage mementos, and commemorative popular prints, in all of which the

\textsuperscript{143} Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, \textit{Cézanne and Provence}, op. cit., p. 70.
\textsuperscript{144} On the prominence of Mary Magdalene in Provence, see also, for instance: Joseph Bérenger, \textit{Sainte Marie-Madeleine en Provence}. Marseille: Impr. Marseillaise, 1925; Jean-Paul Clébert, \textit{Marie-Madeleine en Provence}. Paris: Lebaud, 1998. On the history of her relics and their connection to Saint-Maximin-la-Sainte-Baume, as well as the church there that now holds them, Baslique sainte Marie-Madeleine, see: Yves Bridonneau, \textit{Le Tombeau de Marie-Madeleine, Saint-Maximin, La-Sainte-Baume, troisième tombeau de la chrétienté: La Tradition provençale}, Aix-en-Provence, Edisud, 2006. The cave is La Grotte de la Saint-Baume, and remains a prominent pilgrimage destination.
\textsuperscript{145} Kiefer, ‘Cézanne’s "Magdalen"’, op. cit., p. 93.
\textsuperscript{146} Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, \textit{Cézanne and Provence}, op. cit., pp. 70-71. Athanassoglou-Kallmyer cites passages in a seventeenth-century poem by the Provençal-born César Nostredame and passages from Frédéric Mistral’s epic 1859 Provençal verse-novel \textit{Mirèio} as evidence of this: ‘
Magdalene is often depicted surrounded by smaller and incongruously arranged scenes from her life. Cézanne's murals are thus deemed a single scene, conflated not, however, as it is for Gowing and Lewis, through abstractive thematic connections, but rather through the conventions of Provençal ex-voto imagery.

Theodore Reff likewise sees the murals as deliberately linked, but argues against an identification of the figure in La Douleur ou La Madeleine (fig. 6C.11) as Mary Magdalene. He argues that the 'intensity of the emotion' depicted is 'more like a tragic bereavement than remorse for past sins', and notes the presence of the object against which the figure leans, which he suggests is a coffin 'covered with a shroud'. The skull is thereby not the momento mori of a penitent Magdalene scene, but, instead, the head of the body inside the coffin 'strangely rotated and deformed.' Reff makes a connection, then, through the presence of this skull/head, to the meanings presumed embedded by the severed head in the earlier-discussed 'La Mort règne en ces lieux' drawing (fig. 2.3). He also cites, in arguing for a more generalized thematic of mourning underpinning La Douleur ou La Madeleine (fig. 6C.11) a series of apparently contemporaneous sketches of Cézanne, which, in more explicitly depicting a woman mourning by a coffin, might, thereby, be studies working towards the conception presented in the mural.

In terms of the tear-shaped symbols in the mural, proposed by Lewis and Athanassoglou-Kallmyer as explicit references to the Magdalene, Reff suggests they are instead more generalized symbols of mourning, emblems traditionally sewn, for instance, on funeral drapes, and cites as evidence of this use their presence on the cloth over the coffin depicted in Courbet's famous Un enterrement à Ornans (1849–1850) (fig. 6C.17). The ubiquitousness of such a symbolic connection is then reiterated by citing the reappearance of the symbols in Bertall's caricature of

147 Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Cézanne and Provence, op. cit., p. 71. As noted above, Athanassoglou-Kallmyer makes a similar comparison between ex-voto imagery and Cézanne's [R 111] La Visitation (c.1860) (fig. 3D.23); on this, see section 3D.
148 Reff, 'Cézanne: The severed head and the skull,' op. cit., p. 91.
149 loc. cit.
150 loc. cit.
151 loc. cit. The drawings are: [Ch 176] Figures Near a Coffin (1866–1868) (pencil on sketchbook page (24 x 17.7), Kunstmuseum, Basel) and [Ch 177] Woman Beside a Coffin (c.1866) (pencil on sketchbook page (23.6 x 17.7), Kunstmuseum, Basel).
152 loc. cit.
Courbet's painting, where they stand in place of the mourners (fig. 6C.18).\textsuperscript{153} The same symbols were also prominently present, and perhaps as a result of a similarly realist-inspired interest in the accurate depiction of peasant ritual paraphernalia, on a votive emblem in Legros's already-mentioned \textit{Ex-Voto} (1860) (figs 3D.20, 6C.19), which was exhibited at the 1861 Salon that Cézanne visited during his first trip to Paris.\textsuperscript{154} Whether or not Cézanne was thereby referring to the Magdalene or to a more general theme of mourning, his use of the tear symbols would seem, however, somewhat different to that evidenced in either Courbet or Legros's canvases. In these, they merely decorate an object depicted within the painting, whereas in Cézanne's, by contrast, the symbolic invocation is direct. The emblems decorate the surface of the painting itself, as if the executor was enacting a talismanic act, rather than depicting one. Painting has been allegorized as a raw and ritualistic bravura enactment.

Specifically in terms of such odd conflations, Cézanne's odd mural pairing (fig. 6C.3(b-c)) seems to embody mostly only, it seems, an excess of meaning, one difficult to characterize without recourse, again, to analogies of pastiche. Not only does the panel \textit{in toto} appear to have been enacted through precisely this procedure on a grand scale, components of dramatically different scales and perspectival views being planted, literally, side-by-side, but also motifs of possibly symbolic importance, but derived from divergent sources—for instance: high art, ex-voto conventions, and Provençal poetry—seem to have been employed, although often in confusingly irresolute ways.\textsuperscript{155} Although the vigour of the brushwork evokes violent movement and a praxis of frenzied application, the timeless stasis of the image's composition, particularly in the copied Christ, holds it all in a kind of tense and almost hallucinatory abeyance. Ambivalence incarnate seems presented, as with the nearby mural nude and landscape (fig. 6B.1) to the right of it in the Jas de Bouffan, as well as, on the left (fig. 6B.1).

\textsuperscript{153} ibid., p. 91.
\textsuperscript{154} See section 4A. Interestingly, although surely unknown to Cézanne, Legros's painting 'originally [...] depicted a group of women kneeling before a coffin in a dark interior; Legros soon changed his mind, but in a strong light [...] the coffin can be seen showing though from underneath': Fried, 'Manet in his generation,' op. cit., p. 25. Fried cites, for this information: Timothy Wilcox, \textit{Alphonse Legros (1837--1911)}, exhibition catalogue (Musée des Beaux-Arts de Dijon, Dijon, 12 December 1987--15 February 1988), Dijon: Le MUSE, 1987, pp. 49--51.
\textsuperscript{155} Lawrence Gowing argues an illusionistically consistent depiction of space might still be readable in Cézanne's paired murals: 'Magdalene being placed on a rostrum higher and closer then the narrative scene to the left': Gowing, 'The early work of Paul Cézanne,' op. cit., p. 12.
A similar religious-based re-configuration, likewise possibly articulated through acts of multiple citation, also seems to underpin [R 167] La Tentation de saint Antoine (c.1870) (fig. 6C.20), a dark and brooding canvas executed by Cézanne as part of a spate of similarly enigmatic multi-figured compositions produced around 1870, precisely when, as noted at the beginning of this chapter, he is presumed to have met his future wife Hortense Fiquet. Like those paintings, it also embodies precisely the same tense and mysteriously aporetic space so proliferate of meaning just described as presented in the paired mural above, and, again, mostly through the possibility of encodings gleaned from the presumption of deliberate citation.

In terms of such meanings, like the earlier-discussed Le Jugement de Pâris (fig. 5B.27), his La Tentation de saint Antoine (fig. 6C.20) seems to have dealt with a conventional pictorial theme, but in a quite unorthodox manner. Moreover, it was one, like the abductions above, well-suited to mid-nineteenth-century tastes, combining, as it did, sanctioned eroticism, religiosity, and—in the deserts of Egypt where the hermit Saint Anthony battled the devil and his temptations—exotic locations. In terms of transgression, Cézanne's transformation of the scene is most obvious in the marginalization of Saint Anthony's confrontation with the naked temptress, confined as it is to the upper left; while most of the painting is devoted,
instead, to three nudes holding highly stylized poses and arranged in a tightly contrived, and almost rotationally symmetrical, grouping. 158

For Theodore Reff, this novel arrangement suggests a deliberate division into two separate scenes, the marginal pairing being Saint Anthony’s seduction ‘observed from without’, the foreground group the same event, but viewed from within, from the point of view of the hallucinating Saint. 159 However, the nude in the bottom right corner, by recalling the pose of the seated shepherd in a Judgement of Paris scene, invokes for Reff another possible scenic division in terms specific to that theme, the three other nudes becoming the rotated goddesses of conventional articulations of the scene. 160 Reff stresses this further by suggesting a possible correspondence between the furthest of the nudes in Cézanne’s painting and Minerva in Raimondi’s canonic engraving (fig. 5B.29). As noted above, this is used as evidence, then, to suggest Cézanne conflated traditions of temptation and judgement to succinctly allegorize his own thereby presumed charged ambivalence to women, sex, and guilt. 161 A double-coding is therefore deemed to have occurred, with Cézanne including depictions of himself both as the bald Saint at the back confronted by the nude, as well as the ambiguously sexed nude in the corner, whose disinterested gloom recalls, through a pose in Delacroix’s Michel-Ange dans son atelier (1850), particularly as it appears, in reverse, in a lithograph after the painting by Laurens (fig. 6C.21), the traditional personification Delacroix’s figure in turn itself quotes, Melancholia. 162 Cézanne, in such views, presents himself as both fearful of, and bored by, women.

158 John Rewald notes the triangular grouping of the foreground nudes pre-empts, to an extent, some of the painter’s later Bathers compositions: Rewald, The Paintings of Paul Cézanne, op. cit., p. 135.
159 Reff, ‘Cézanne, Flaubert, St. Anthony, and the Queen of Sheba,’ op. cit., pp. 117.
160 Reff, ‘Cézanne and Hercules,’ op. cit., p. 40.
161 ‘We sense in this detached figure Cézanne himself, depicting neither the sensual appeal of the central portion nor the ascetic withdrawal of the left, but his own associations of remorse or guilt: ibid., p. 117. Or: ‘into this enigmatic being, who does not participate in the temptation but seems to reflect on it morosely in a Baudelairean mood, Cézanne may well have projected his own ambivalent feelings, as if the insistent sensuality of the scene had elicited a guilty reaction’: Reff, ‘Cézanne and Hercules,’ op. cit., p. 40.
162 Reff, ‘Cézanne and Hercules,’ op. cit., p. 40. Delacroix’s Michel-Ange dans son atelier (1850) (o/c (41 x 33.5), Musée Fabre, Montpellier) was exhibited in Delacroix’s posthumous retrospective held in Paris in 1864, precisely the year, as noted above, in which Cézanne wrote of painting a ‘galette’ after the painter: Unattributed author, ‘[Details notice for] “Michel-Ange dans son atelier”,’ online collection database of the Musée Fabre, Montpellier, accessible through: http://museefabre-en.montpellier-agglo.com/index.php/etudier/recherche_d_oeuvres. On Cézanne’s comments regarding his apparent 1864 copying of Delacroix, see section 4A.
To add further complexity to this circuit of possible meaning, the head of that same figure has also been suggested as bearing resemblance to an abandoned portrait of Zola presumed executed by Cézanne in the early 1860s (fig. 6C.22). A kind of pastiche-like construction, where Delacroix’s pose and the painter’s own image of his friend’s head were combined, might be seen, then, to have been affected. In terms of the chubby nudity of the figure, some have seen this as a reference to hermaphroditism, both in terms of appearance, as well as of symbolic accoutrements. For instance, Louis Krumrine, in terms of the latter, suggest the bright yellow splashes of colour in the corner beneath the figure are flames, part-standing thereby for the primordial conflation that in Greek alchemy preceded the division of male spiritus from female anima. In so presenting an ambivalent duality, Krumrine sees Cézanne signalling, then, not only the reference to Zola, but also his own projection of one side of his ambivalence to women onto that friend; the other half, his dread and fear, remains with the Saint at the back, standing more singularly for balding Cézanne himself. However, the rotund and flaccid nudity of the figure could also, however, more simply relate to depictions of Silenus, for instance as in Ribera’s depiction of the god (fig. 6C.23).

Although the reproduction here is taken from an 1875 edition of Album de Galerie Bruyas, Reff observes that an earlier state of Laurens’s lithograph was published in 1868: Reff, ‘Cézanne and Hercules,’ op. cit., p. 40.

On the similarity between the portrait of Zola and the nude in [R 167] La Tentation de saint Antoine (c.1870) (fig. 6C.20), see: Reff, ‘Cézanne, Flaubert, St Anthony, the Queen of Sheba,’ op. cit., p. 117 n. 40; Krumrine, Paul Cézanne: The Bathers, op. cit., p. 53.

Reff, ‘Cézanne and Hercules,’ op. cit., p. 40; Krumrine, Paul Cézanne: The Bathers, op. cit., p. 53.

Krumrine does also suggest, more prosaically, that the flames, if that’s what they are, might stand for Saint Anthony’s Fire, one of whose connotations was syphilis: ibid., pp. 51–52.

The bald Saint also has a certain similarity to the bald man smoking a pipe and observing a group picnicking in the equally ambiguous, and contemporary, [R 164] Déjeuner sur l’herbe (c.1870) (oil on canvas, 60 x 81, PC), which also contains a presumed self-portrait of Cézanne, in the foreground. This painting seems additionally related to [R 167] La Tentation de saint Antoine (c.1870) (fig. 6C.20) through the positioning of a similar tree on the right, albeit smaller and bending in the opposite direction, as well as coupling of male and female in the upper left corner opposed to a foreground grouping of figures. Gary Wells also notes a similarity between these works in terms of their general theme of encounters between males and females, style, palette, and size: Wells, Metaphorical Relevance and Thematic Continuity in the Early Paintings of Paul Cézanne, 1865–1877, op. cit., p. 194.

Cézanne could not have seen Ribera’s canvas, but he might have seen an engraving after it, or another similar depiction, for instance Peter Paul Ruben’s Der trinkene Silen (1616/17) (oil on canvas, 212 x 214,5, Alte Pinakothec, Munich).
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by this worthy, tutor to the wine god Dionysus and a drunkard who became prophetic when intoxicated, would surely not be out of place in a depiction of temptation. In which case, the possible conflation with Zola's features might suggest simple, and possibly very blatant, jest. It would also offer up exactly the impression of ambivalent and ad hoc quotation argued here as increasingly difficult to resist when looking at Cézanne's paintings.

In short, Cézanne's enigmatic canvas is an exemplar, in many ways, of his late 1860s output, and in particular, its encoding of a plethora of possible meaning. Indeed, what has been brutally summarized above is but a fraction of the convoluted theorizing that has been enacted in order to extract meaning from its darkly opaque surface. As a collection of oddly sourced parts, whether actually pastiched or merely given the appearance of this through a parodying of the gestures depicted in canonic works of art, Cézanne's work nevertheless does not descend into the cacophonic. Even a depiction of one of the women as a virtual dog, squatting at the front of the canvas with her rear to the viewer and over an unfortunately placed curl of drapery that gives the impression, when viewed with the right ribald sense of blague, that she is passing wind, is somehow also simultaneously serious, bound up with the impression of innate complex meaning, and perhaps, most importantly, Cézanne's inherent decorative desire to structure his pictures totality. Even though the parts are broken, awkwardly rendered bits, full of all kinds of odd torsions and improbable twists, when moved about by their maker on the surface of a painting, somehow they are made, eventually, to fit, if only in terms purely imagic. As Richard Shiff astutely observes, by way of conclusion to one of his essays, albeit in regard to Cézanne's œuvre more generally:

Cézanne's technique revealed this modernist principle, at once pure and transgressive: painting left to its own devices is all motif, all excess. To those early viewers who noticed what Cézanne's art made happen, the effect was either wondrous or risible and just as likely, both.168

Conclusion

'Conversations about art are almost always useless.'

Reflecting to a degree, and perhaps with a certain irony, precisely the nature of the material covered by it, this thesis has, unfortunately, no single defining conclusion. Instead, what has hopefully been provided is a set of illustrations of the means by which Cézanne's early œuvre, both poetic and pictorial, might be related by particular continuities of practices related to copying. These processes, then, or analogies of them, in being enacted are argued to have created artworks carrying potentially self-consciously irresolute and proliferating meaning. In short, what has been of major concern is the notion of repetition, both in terms of individual motifs or part-motifs as well as the structuring wholes normally binding these together, for instance as genre or pictorial convention. Further, what has been stressed is the degree to which the performing of these repetitions, when perceived as citation, pastiche, or parody, might visibilize a content increasingly focussed on the process of representation itself. Affects of perceived intent, as well as of perceived praxis become thus, as now themselves represented forms, the prevalent focus of a work's interpretation. Not only does this make multiple layers of readings implicitly possible, depending on presumptions, for instance, of authorial posture, but also such multiplicity itself, in turn, embeds a particular affective presence of its own, as a kind of ambivalence, sometimes risible, sometimes tragic, but always aporetic.

In regard to such observations, the nature of much of Cézanne's creative output in his first decade as aspiring artist, but particularly in terms of his paintings of the late 1860s, has been suggested, thereby, to aim not for the conveyance of single specific preconceived meanings, but, instead, a proliferation of meaning that in turn seems to allegorize confusion, to celebrate a polysemic state held, however, in tense awkward

---

pictorial stasis. It is, in many ways, then, in terms of this thematic ambivalence that Cézanne’s early poetry and posted images is related to his canvases of a decade later.

In regards to Cézanne’s painterly development towards this point, however, although often dependent on similar impulses of copying as that of his early poetry and posted images, this appears to have initially proceeded without the degree of ironic reflexivity apparently present in those. Moreover, it seems unnecessary to presume his aspirations were at the outset particularly avant-garde. However, once in Paris, at least on his second trip, he seems to have embraced just such an endeavour, perhaps even strategically, once realizing his talent was not suited to the academic. In terms of finding his originality, as rebel artist, what has also been argued is the possibility of a persistence of certain formal aspects related to his early practices of copying and pastiching. An emphatic picturing of pictures, rather than of external reality, seems to have been undertaken, and forms of distortion implicit to such repetition—illusionistic flattening, figural disproportion, and disjunctive conflation—appear to have increasingly been emphasized, as if consciously and reflexively re-appropriating an original awe for the purely imagic. Moreover, the diversity of Cézanne’s early pictorial models, from high art to low, from pornographic burlesques to vernacular religious tradition, as well as all forms of reproductive media, in particular, engravings, is offered as evidence of Cézanne’s innate eclectic taste as well as his apparently eager and perhaps instinctive impulse to expand the repertoire usually associated with artistic practice in Paris during the 1860s.

Relating further to this notion of parody, also noted has been a certain impulse to read specific and often deeply personal biographical content in manu of Cézanne’s early creations, in particular his poems. Although these interpretations have not been rejected out-right, an attempt has been made to show how often they depend on presumptions of intent that might not be wholly sustainable. The possibility, then, that the character of Cézanne as presented in art-historical discourse has been as much a creation of the ironic posturing of his early poetry and painting as matters of historical fact, is suggested.

Moreover and often directly connected with this, in articulating itself so often in terms of apparent citation and parodic inversion, of the reflexive use of pastiche-like
encodings and appropriation of canonic imagery in often inappropriate and seemingly diligently crude ways, Cézanne's practice might be seen as never entirely erasing the possibility of mockery or wry self-abasement. Risibility seems always potentially present.
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POÈME INÉDIT

C'était au fond d'un bois
Quand j'entendis sa voix brillante
Chanter et répéter trois fois
Une chansonnette charmante
Sur l'air du mirliton, etc.

J'aperçois une pucelle
Ayant un beau mirliton
En la contemplant si belle
Je sentis un doux frisson
Pour un mirliton, etc.

Ses grâces sont merveilleuses
Et son port majestueux,
Sur ses lèvres amoureuses
Errer un sourire gracieux
Gentil mirliton, etc.

Je résous de l'entreprendre,
J'avance résolument:
Et je tiens ce discours tendre
A cet objet charmant:
Gentil mirliton, etc.

Ne serais-tu pas venue,
Inexprimable beauté,
Des régions de la nue,
Faire ma félicité?
Joli mirliton, etc.

Cette taille de déesse,
Ces yeux, ce front, tout enfin
De tes attraits la finesse
En toi tout semble divin.
Joli mirliton, etc.

Ta démarche aussi légère
Que le vol du papillon
Devance aisément, ma chère,
Le souffle de l'aquilon,
Joli mirliton, etc.

L'impériale couronne
N'irait pas mal à ton front.
Ton mollet, je le soupconne
Doit être d'un tour bien rond.
Joli mirliton, etc.

Grâce à cette flatterie,
Elle tombe en pâmoison.
Tandis qu'elle est engourdie,
J'explore son mirliton.
O doux mirliton, etc.

Puis revenant à la vie
Sous mes vigoureux efforts,
Elle se trouve ébahie
De me sentir sur son corps.
O doux mirliton, etc.

Elle rougit et soupire
Lève des yeux languoureux
Qui semblaient vouloir me dire
"Je me complais à ces jeux."
Gentil mirliton, etc.

Au bout de la jouissance
Loin de dire: "C'est assez."
Sissant que je recommence
Elle me dit: "Enfoncez."
Gentil mirliton, etc.

Je retirerai ma sapière,
Après dix ou douze coups—
Mais trémoussant du derrière:
"Pourquoi vous arrêtez-vous?"
Dis ce mirliton, etc.
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(61 x 47), Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence.

fig. 4B.10
Numa Coste, (detail of) *Etude d’après le modèle vivant* (1863–1864),
Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence.
fig. 4C.1
reconstruction of the mural [R 28–30] La Ferme, Chute d'eau, and Le Baigneur au rocher (1862–1864, 1867–1869)
before its disassembling in 1912.

fig. 4C.2
Jacob van Ruisdael, A Waterfall in a Rocky Landscape with a Bridge and a Half-Timbered House (late 1660s), o/c (98.5 x 85), National Gallery, London.
fig. 4C.3
Paul Cézanne, [R 34–41] *Paysage romantique aux pêcheurs* (1862–1864), mural (c.362 x 250), before its dissembling in the 1950s.
fig. 4C.4
(a) Claude Lorrain, *Landscape with Tobias and the Angel* (1639–1640), o/c (211 x 145), Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid.
(b) Claude Lorrain, *Port of Ostia with the Embarkation of St Paul* (1639–1640), o/c (211 x 145), Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid.

fig. 4C.5
Claude Lorrain, *Landscape with Tobias and the Angel* (1663), o/c (116 x 153.5), State Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg.
fig. 4C.6
Mural components as they appear today, reproduced at identical reproductive scales and positioned as in the original mural.
(b) Paul Cézanne, [R 40] *La Pêcheuse* (1862–1864), m/c (55 x 70), WU.
(c) Paul Cézanne, [R 41] *Le Pêcheur* (1862–1864), m/c (61 x 68.5), WU.

fig. 4C.7
Paul Cézanne, [R 31] *Entrée du château* (1862–1864), m/c (153 x 260), PC.
Les Quatre heures du jour: Le Matin (c.1765), engraving by Louis Jacques Cathelin after Claude Joseph Vernet (44.7 x 56.9), Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

Les Quatre heures du jour: Le Matin (c.1769), engraving by Jacques Allamet after Claude Joseph Vernet (29.5 x 43), Musée Magnin, Dijon.

Fishermen, etched engraving by Francesco Pedro, after Claude Joseph Vernet (33.8 x 42.8), Achenbach Foundation for Graphic Arts, San Francisco.
Fig. 4C.11
*Peche du jour*, engraving by Yves le Gouaz, after Claude Joseph Vernet (46 x 36).

Fig. 4C.12
(a) *River Landscape with Fisherman Courting a Maid at Edge of River* (n.d.), Aubusson tapestry after design by Claude Joseph Vernet (200 x 274), WU.
(b) *Shore Scene with Fishermen and Woman, Palace in Background* (n.d.), Aubusson tapestry after design by Claude Joseph Vernet (234 x 251), WU.
fig. 4C.13
Paul Cézanne, [R 23] *Le Jeu de cache-cache, d'après Lancret* (1862–1864), m/c (165 x 218), PC.

fig. 4C.14
*Le Jeu de cache-cache mitoulas* (c.1735–1740), engraving by Nicolas de Larmessin (III), after Nicolas Lancret, Museum Boijmans van Beuningen, Rotterdam.

fig. 4C.15
Outline of fig. 4C.14 overlain fig. 4C.13.
fig. 5A.1
Paul Cézanne, [R 75] Tête de femme
(portrait présumé de Madame Zola) (1864), o/c (46 x 38), PC.

fig. 5A.2
Paul Cézanne, [R 74] Tête d’homme (1865),
o/c (41 x 33), Detroit Institute of Art, Detroit.

fig. 5A.3
Paul Cézanne, [R 116] Portrait de l’artiste (c.1866),
o/c (45 x 41), PC.
fig. SA.4
Paul Cézanne, [R 24] La Tour de César (c. 1862), oil on paper mounted on canvas (19 x 30), Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence.

fig. SA.5
Paul Cézanne, [R 44] La voûte (1862–1864), o/c (43.5 x 41), PC.

fig. SA.6
Paul Cézanne, [R 57] Paysage (c. 1865), o/c (26.5 x 35)

fig. SA.7
Paul Cézanne, [R 51] Paysage (c. 1865)
fig. 5A.8

fig. 5A.9
(detail from) *The Judgement of Paris* (c.1510–1520), engraving by Marcantonio Raimondi, after a design by Raffaelo Sanzio, on paper (29.1 x 43.7), Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

fig. 5A.10
fig. 5A.11
Eugène Delacroix, La Barque de Dante (1822), o/c (189 x 241.5), Musée du Louvre, Paris.

fig. 5A.12
Henri Fantin-Latour, Homage de Delacroix (1864), o/c (160 x 250), Musée d’Orsay, Paris.

fig. 5A.13
fig. 5A.14
Paul Cézanne, [Ch 155] (detail of)
*Portrait of Eugène Delacroix* (1864–1866),
pencil and soft crayon on paper (14 x 13),
Musée Calvet, Avignon.

fig. 5A.15
Eugène Durieu, (detail of)
*Portrait d'Eugène Delacroix* (c.1857),
photograph (n/d).

fig. 5A.16
(detail of) *Portrait de M. Eugène Delacroix*,
engraving by Alphonse Masson,
published in *L'Artiste*, nouv. ser., t. 7,
livr. 4 (22 May 1859), p. 64 bis.

fig. 5A.17
Jean Gigoux, (rotated detail of)
*Portrait d'Eugène Delacroix*, woodcut
published in *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*,
t. 16, livr. 1 (1 January 1864), p. 6 bis.
fig. 5A.18
Paul Cézanne, [Ch 156(a)] (detail of) Portrait of Delacroix (1866–1868), pencil on sketchbook page (18 x 24), Kunstmuseum, Basel.

fig. 5A.19
Eugène Durieu, (detail of) Portrait d’Eugène Delacroix (c.1858), photograph (n/d).

fig. 5A.20
Félix Bracquemond, (detail of) Portrait of Eugène Delacroix (1863), etching (8.4 x 6.6), Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, San Francisco.
fig. 5A.21
Paul Cézanne, (Ch 101) Seated Nude Model Leaning on His Elbow (c.1863), black crayon on blue paper (30 x 45), PC.

fig. 5A.22
Paul Cézanne, (Ch 100) Male Nude, Leaning on His Elbow (1863-1866), soft black pencil on thin blue paper (31 x 40), Bridgestone Gallery, Tokyo.

fig. 5A.23
Paul Cézanne, (Ch 79) (detail of) Seated Nude Model (1862-1864), pencil on laid paper (61 x 46), PC.
fig. 5A.24
Paul Cézanne, [Ch 80] Male Nude (1862–1864), charcoal on grey paper (45.7 x 27.9), WU.

fig. 5A.25
(a) Paul Cézanne, [Ch 111] (detail of) Male Nude and Caricature (1863–1866), charcoal on paper (50 x 30), PC.
(b) Paul Cézanne, [Ch 112] Male Nude (1867–1868), charcoal on paper (41.3 x 29.9), Kunstmuseum, Basel.

fig. 5A.26
(a) Eugène Giraud, Portrait charge de Charles Giraud (1860), w/c (n/d), Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris.
(b) Eugène Giraud, Portrait charge de Meissonier (1860) w/c (n/d), Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris.
fig. 5A.27
(a) Paul Cézanne, [Ch 97] (detail of) *Male Nude* (1863–1866), charcoal on paper (49 x 31), PC.
(b) Paul Cézanne, [Ch 98] (detail of) *Male Nude* (1863–1866), charcoal on paper (49 x 31), PC.
(c) Paul Cézanne, [Ch 99] (detail of) *Male Nude* (1863–1866), black chalk on paper (49 x 31), Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.
fig. 5A.28

(a) Paul Cézanne, [Gh] (detail of) Study of a Male Nude (c.1863), black chalk on paper (49.2 x 30.7), Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge

(b) Paul Cézanne, [Gh] (detail of) Academic Study of a Male Nude with his Right Hand Clenched across his Chest (c.1863), charcoal on paper (48 x 29.5), Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.
fig. 5B.1
Paul Cézanne, [R 22] *Pêches dans un plat* (1862–1864), o/c (18 x 24), PC.

fig. 5B.2
École française 17e siècle (?), *Pêches sur un plat* (1600s?), o/p (37.6 x 45), Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence.

fig. 5B.3
figs 6B.1 and 6B.2 at identical reproductive scales, with fig. 5B.1 rotated and overlain at half-transparency.
fig. 5B.4
Paul Cézanne, [R 27] *Vue de Coïsée à Rome, d’après F.-M. Granet* (1863–1865), o/c (n/d), WU.

fig. 5B.5

fig. 5B.6
fig. 5B.7
François-Marius Granet,
*Vue du Colisée du côté de Saint-Jean-de-Latran* (c.1802–1803), ink and wash on paper (27 x 20.5), Musée du Louvre, Paris.

fig. 5B.8
François-Marius Granet, *Vue de l’intérieure du Colisée* (c.1802–1803), pencil, wash, and ink on paper (30.5 x 43.5), Musée du Louvre, Paris.

fig. 5B.9
fig. 5B.10

comparison of

(a) (reversed detail of) François-Marius Granet, *Vue du Colisée du côté de Saint-Jean-de-Latran* (c.1802–1803), ink and wash on paper (27 x 20.5), Musée du Louvre, Paris.


(c) Paul Cézanne, [R 27] *Vue de Colisée à Rome, d’après F.-M. Granet* (1863–1865), o/c (n/d), WU.
fig. 5B.11
Paul Cézanne, [R 26] La Femme au perroquet (1862–1864), o/p (28 x 20), PC.

fig. 5B.12
attributed to Constantine Netscher, Portrait de la femme d’un Ambassadeur de Suède (c.1770?), oil on copper (33.8 x 26.1), Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence.

fig. 5B.13
fig. 5B.14
Paul Cézanne, [R 641]. *Jeune fille à la volière* (c.1888 or later), o/c (45 x 37), Barnes Foundation, Merion.

fig. 5B.15
Martin Drolling, *Jeune paysanne à sa fenêtre* (c.1800), o/p (30.7 x 25.3), Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence.

fig. 5B.16
*La Ménagère hollandaise*, engraving by Jean Georges Wille (1757), after a painting by Gerrit Dou (1663), British Museum, London.
fig. 5B.17
Gabriel Metsu, *Woman with Sewing in a Niche* (c17th), o/p (28.5 x 22), Pushkin State Museum, Moscow.

fig. 5B.18
Frans van Mieris, *Femme à sa toilette, assistée d’une servante noire* (1678), oil on panel (27 x 22), Musée du Louvre, Paris.

fig. 5B.19
Frans van Mieris, *Femme à sa toilette, assistée d’une servante noire* (1678), oil on panel (27 x 22), Musée du Louvre, Paris.

fig. 5B.20
(detail of) [Illustration for the sonnet 'Marie'], engraving by Brugnet [?], published in Alfred de Musset et al., *Voyage où il vous plaira*, Paris: J. Hetzel, 1843, p. 17.
fig. 5B.21
Edouard Manet, *Young Lady in 1866* (1866),
o/c (185.1 x 128.6), Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

fig. 5B.22
Alexis van Hamme, *The Poultry Seller* (1855),
o/p (65.5 x 53), Brighton Museum and Art Gallery, Brighton.

fig. 5B.23
Gustave Courbet, *Woman with a Parrot* (1866),
o/c (129.5 x 195.6), Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
fig. 5B.24

fig. 5B.25

fig. 5B.26
Eugène Delacroix, *La Femme au perroquet* (1827), o/c (24.5 x 32.5), Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lyons.
fig. 5B.27
Paul Cézanne, [R 92] Le Jugement de Pâris (1862–1864), o/c (15 x 21), PC.

fig. 5B.28
Paul Cézanne, [Ch 57(d–g)] (details from)
Page of Figure Studies (1860–1865),
pencil and pen sketchbook page (12.3 x 21.1),
High Museum of Art, Atlanta.
The Judgement of Paris (c.1510–1520), engraving by Marcantonio Raimondi, after a design by Raffaelo Sanzio, on paper (29.1 x 43.7), Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

Paolo Veronese, The Judgement of Paris (c.1590), o/c (101.6 x 116.6), Bucknell University Art Gallery, Lewisburg.

Claude Lorrain, (detail of Paris, Cupid, Venus, Juno, and from) The Judgement of Paris (1645/1646), o/c (112.3 x 149.5), National Gallery of Art, Washington.
fig. 5B.32
(a) Detail of fig. 5B.28.
(b) Detail of fig. 5B.27.

fig. 5B.33
Detail of fig. 5B.29.

fig. 5B.34
(Detail of) The Temptation of Adam and Eve (1579), engraving by Johan Sadeler (21.3 x 16.8), after a drawing by Maarten de Vos, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris.

fig. 5B.35
Nicolas Mignard, Mars et Vénus (1658), o/c (Ω 132), Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence.
fig. 5B.36
Detail of fig. 5B.28.

fig. 5B.37
(a) Lucas de Heere, (detail of Juno and Minerva)
_The Judgement of Paris_ (1534–1584),
o/p (94 x 134.6), PC.
(b) Claude Lorrain, (detail of Venus)
_The Judgement of Paris_ (1645/1646),
o/c (112.3 x 149.5), National Gallery of Art, Washington.

fig. 5B.38
(a) Daniele Crespi, (detail of) _L’Annunziata_ (c.1620),
o/p (48 x 68.5), Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence.
(b) (detail of) _The Annunciation_ (1579), engraving by Orazio Sammacchini, after a painting by Agostino Carracci, on paper (44.8 x 33.4).
(c) Unattributed artist, _L’Annunciation_ (c.1830),
coloured woodcut print (45.6 x 34.2),
Musée de l’Image, Epinal.
fig. 5B.39
Paul Cézanne, [R 76] Lot et ses filles (c. 1865 or earlier), o/c (23.6 x 28.7), PC.

fig. 5B.40
Eugène Delacroix, (detail from) Mort de Sardanapale (1827), o/c (392 x 496), Musée du Louvre, Paris.

fig. 5B.41
(detail of) Mort de Sardanapale (1861), lithograph by Achille Sirouy, after the painting by Eugène Delacroix, lithograph on paper (42.9 x 53.8), British Museum, London.
fig. 5C.1
Paul Cézanne, [R 72] Portrait de Paul Cézanne (1862–1864), o/c (44 x 37), PC.

fig. 5C.2
Unattributed, (detail of) Paul Cézanne, photograph (c.1861?).

fig. 5C.3
Major contours of fig. 5C.1 overlying (detail of) fig. 5C.2.
fig. 5C.4
Théodore Géricault, *Portrait d’homme dit de Lord Byron* (early 1800s), o/c (61 x 49), Musée Fabre, Montpellier.

fig. 5C.5
Théodore Géricault, *Monomanie du vol* (c.1822), o/c (60 x 50.1), Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Ghent.

fig. 5C.6
Eugène Delacroix, *Autoportrait* (c.1816), o/c (50.5 x 60.5), Musée des Beaux-Arts, Rouen.

fig. 5C.7
Eugène Delacroix, *Portrait de l’artiste* (c.1837), o/c (55 x 64), Musée du Louvre, Paris.
fig. 5C.8
Gustave Courbet, *Le Désespéré* (1841),
o/c (45 x 54), PC.

fig. 5C.9
Gustave Courbet, *L'Homme à la pipe* (c.1846),
o/c (45 x 37), Musée Fabre, Montpellier.

fig. 5C.10
Henri Fantin-Latour, *Autoportrait* (1858),
o/c (40.7 x 32.7), National Gallery, Washington.

fig. 5C.11
Henri Fantin-Latour, *Autoportrait, la tête légèrement baissée* (1861), o/c (25.1 x 21.4),
National Gallery, Washington.
fig. 5C.12
Carolus-Duran [Charles Durant], Fantin-Latour et Oulevay (1861), o/c (50.1 x 61), Musée d’Orsay, Paris.

fig. 5C.13
Adolphe Monticelli, Portrait présumé du peintre Ferdinand Viola (c.1859), o/c (48 x 39), Musée des Beaux-arts, Marseille.

fig. 5C.14
Frédéric Bazille, (detail of) Self-Portrait (1865–1866), o/c (108.9 x 71.1), Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago.

fig. 5C.15
Frédéric Bazille, Edouard Blau (1866), o/c (59.5 x 43.2), National Gallery of Art, Washington.
fig. 5C.16
Paul Cézanne, [R 72] Portrait de Paul Cézanne (1862–1864), o/c (44 x 37), PC.

fig. 5C.17
Caro-Duran [Charles Durant], (detail of Fantin-Latour from) Fantin-Latour et Oulevay (1861), o/c (50.1 x 61), Musée d’Orsay, Paris.

fig. 5C.18
Paul Cézanne, [R 77] Portrait de Cézanne aux longs cheveux (c.1865), o/c (41 x 32), presumed destroyed.

fig. 5C.19
Paul Cézanne, [R 116] Portrait de l’artiste (c.1866), o/c 45 x 41), PC.
fig. 6.1
fig. 6A.1
The alcove in the grand salon of the Jas de Bouffan, as it appeared in c. 1900.

fig. 6A.2
fig. 6A.3
Paul Cézanne, [R 95] Portrait de Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l'artiste (c.1865), m/c (167.6 x 114.3), National Gallery, London.
Paul Cézanne, [R 101] *Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l'artiste, lisant 'L'Événement'* (autumn 1866), o/c (200 x 120), National Gallery of Art, Washington.
fig. 6A.5
Paul Cézanne, [R 178] Portrait de Louis-Auguste Cézanne, père de l’artiste (c.1870), o/c (55 x 46), PC.

fig. 6A.6
Paul Cézanne, [Ch 178(a)] (detail) Sketch of the Artist’s Father (c.1866), pen on sketchbook page (17.6 x 23.5), Kunstmuseum, Basel.

fig. 6A.7
Paul Cézanne, [Ch 409] (detail of) Head and Shoulders of the Artist’s Father (1877–1880), pencil on sketchbook page (21.7 x 12.4), Art Institute, Chicago.
fig. 6A.8
Paul Cézanne, [Ch 413] Portrait of Louis-Auguste Cézanne (1879–1882), pencil on sketchbook page (20.7 x 12.5), PC.

fig. 6A.9
Paul Cézanne, [Ch 662 bis] Studies of the Artist's Father (1883–1886), pencil on paper (27 x 17.5), PC.

fig. 6A.10
Gustave Courbet, Portrait of the Artist's Father, Régis Courbet (c.1840), a/c (n/d), PC.
fig. 6A.11
(a) Paul Cézanne, [R 93] Sucrier, poires et tasse bleue
(1865–1866), o/c (30 x 41), Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence.
(b) Paul Cézanne, [R 101] (detail of) Louis-Auguste Cézanne,
père de l'artiste, lisant 'L'Événement' (fig. 6A.4)

fig. 6A.12
Paul Cézanne, [R 149] Jeune fille au piano—Ouverture du 'Tannhäuser'
(1869–1870), o/c (57 x 92), State Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg.

(b) Paul Cézanne, [R 139] *Portrait du peintre Achille Emperaire* (1867–1868), o/c (200 x 122), Musée d’Orsay, Paris.
fig. 6A.14
Paul Cézanne, [Ch 228] *Portrait of Achille Emperaire* (1867–1870), charcoal on grey laid paper (30.6 x 24.1), Kunstmuseum, Basel.

fig. 6A.15
Paul Cézanne, [Ch 229] *Head of Achille Emperaire* (1867–1870), charcoal on paper (43.2 x 31.9), Kunstmuseum, Basel.

fig. 6A.16
Paul Cézanne, [Ch 230] (detail of) *Portrait of Achille Emperaire* (1867–1870), charcoal, pencil, and white colour on laid paper (49 x 31), Musée du Louvre, Paris.

fig. 6A.17
Paul Cézanne, [R 141] *Portrait d’Achille Emperaire* (1867–1868), m/c (42 x 40), PC.
fig. 6B.1
reconstruction of the mural [R 28–30] La Ferme, Chute d’eau, and Le Baigneur au rocher before dissembling.

fig. 6B.2
Gustave Courbet, Les Baigneuses (1853), o/c (227 x 290), Musée Fabre, Montpellier.
fig. 6B.3
Paul Cézanne, [R 29] *Le Baigneur au rocher* (1867–1869), m/c (167.5 x 113), Chrysler Art Museum, Norfolk.
fig. 6B.4

fig. 6B.5
Agnolo Bronzino, *Noli me tangere* (1531), o/p (289 x 184), Musée du Louvre, Paris.

fig. 6B.6
fig. 6B.7
(a) Detail of fig. 6B.3.
(b) Paul Cézanne, [RWC 28] Étude de figure (1867–1870), w/c (n/d), WU.

fig. 6B.8
(a) Paul Cézanne, [RWC 30] L’Enlèvement (c.1867), pen, India ink, and w/c on paper (7 x 12.7), PC.
(b) Paul Cézanne, [Ch 200(b–d)] (details) Two Studies for ‘The Abduction’ (1866–1867), pencil on paper (n/d), PC.
fig. 6B.9
Paul Cézanne, [R 121] L'Enlèvement (1867), o/c (90.5 x 117), Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.

fig. 6B.10
Niccolò dell'Abate, L'Enlèvement de Proserpine (1560), o/c (196 x 250), Musée du Louvre, Paris.
fig. 6B.11
Hercule et Antée, woodcut by M. Pothey, after a drawing by Eugène Delacroix, published in Gazette des Beaux-Arts, t. 16, livr. 2 (1 February 1864), p. 121.

fig. 6B.12

fig. 6B.13
Paul Cézanne, [Ch 117 (c–d)] (details from) After Delacroix (1864–1867), black crayon on sketchbook page (18 x 24), WU.
fig. 6B.14
Giovanni Battista Piazzetta, L’Enlèvement de d’Hélène (c.1725), o/c (235 x 179.3), Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence.

fig. 6B.15
Alexandre Cabanel, Nymphé Enlevée par un faun (1860), o/c (245 x 142), Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lille.

fig. 6B.16
Jaroslav Cermák, The Abduction of a Herzogovian Woman (1861), o/c (n/d), Dahesh Museum, New York.
fig. 6B.17
Henri Fantin-Latour, Tannhäuser on Venusberg (1864), o/c (95.2 x 127), Los Angeles County Museum, Los Angeles.

fig. 6B.18
Eugène Delacroix, Hercules Rescuing Alcestis (1862), oil on cardboard (32.4 x 49), Phillips Collection, Washington.
fig. 6B.19
Detail of fig. 6B.9.

Paul Cézanne, [Ch 199(a)] (details of) Female Nudes (1866–1867), pencil on sketchbook page (23.4 x 17.7), Kunstmuseum, Basel.

fig. 6B.20

fig. 6B.21
Nicolas Poussin, (detail from) Écho et Narcisse (1630), o/c (74 x 100), Musée du Louvre, Paris.
fig. 6B.22
Detail of fig. 6B.9

fig. 6B.23
Eugène Delacroix, (detail of) 
*Herminie et les bergers* (1859), o/c (82 x 104), Nationalmuseum, Stockholm.

fig. 6B.24
Paul Cézanne, [Ch 80] *Male Nude* (1862–1864), charcoal on grey paper (45.7 x 27.9), WU.

fig. 6B.25
Paul Cézanne, (detail from) [R 9] *Le Baiser de la Muse, d’après Frillié* (c.1860), o/c (82 x 66), Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence.
fig. 6C.1
Western wall of the grand salon at the Jas de Bouffan, sometime before 1912.

fig. 6C.2
Reconstruction, to scale, of the murals on the wall of the central panel of the Jas de Bouffan salon before removal

(a) Paul Cézanne, [R 155] *Contraste* (c.1870), m/c (50 x 40), PC.
(b–c) [R 145] *Le Christ aux Limbes* and [R 146] *La Douleur*
fig. 6C.4
Sebastiano del Piombo, *Descent of Christ into Limbo* (1516), o/c (226 x 114), Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid.

fig. 6C.5

fig. 6C.6
Paul Cézanne, [Ch 214]
*After Sebastiano del Piombo: Christ in Limbo* (1869–1870), pencil on laid paper (23.5 x 11), PC.

fig. 6C.7
Paul Cézanne, [R 145] *Le Christ aux limbes* (c.1869), m/c (170 x 97), Musée d'Orsay, Paris.
fig. 6C.8
Paul Cézanne, [R 145] (detail of) *Le Christ aux limbes* (c.1869), m/c (170 x 97), Musée d'Orsay, Paris.

fig. 6C.9
Paul Cézanne, [R 145] (detail of) *Le Christ aux limbes* (c.1869), m/c (170 x 97), Musée d'Orsay, Paris.

fig. 6C.10
Paul Cézanne, [R 145] (detail of) *Le Christ aux limbes* (c.1869), m/c (170 x 97), Musée d'Orsay, Paris.
fig. 6C.11
Paul Cézanne, [R 146] La Douleur ou La Madeleine (c.1869), m/c (165 x 124), Musée d'Orsay, Paris.
fig. 6C.12
Domenico Fetti, *La Melancolie* (c. 1620), o/c (171 x 128), Musée du Louvre, Paris.

fig. 6C.13
[Attributed to] Pierre-Hubert Subleyras, *La Madeleine* (c. 18th), o/c (45 x 32.5), Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence.

fig. 6C.14

fig. 6C.15
Michel Serre, *Sainte Madeleine aux pieds du Christ* (early 18th), o/c (270 x 470), L’Église sainte Marie-Madeleine, Aix-en-Provence.
fig. 6C.16
Relic skull of Mary Magdalene, in the crypt of the Basilique sainte Marie-Madeleine, Saint-Maximin-la-Sanite-Baume.

fig. 6C.17
Gustave Courbet, (detail of cloth covering coffin in) *Un enterrement à Ornans* (1849–1850), o/c (315 x 668), Musée d’Orsay, Paris.

fig. 6C.18

fig. 6C.19
Alphonse Legros, (detail of) *Ex-Voto* (1860), o/c (174 x 197), Musée des Beaux-Arts de Dijon, Dijon.
fig. 6C.20
Paul Cézanne, [R 167] *La Tentation de saint Antoine* (c. 1870)

fig. 6C.21
*Michel-Ange dans son atelier* (1851), lithograph by J. Laurens (24.8 x 19.8), after Eugène Delacroix.

fig. 6C.22
Paul Cézanne, [R 78] *Portrait d’Émile Zola* (1862–1864) (o/c 26 x 21), PC

fig. 6C.23
Jusepe de Ribera, (detail from) *Drunken Silenus* (1626), o/c (185 x 229), Museo e gallerie nazionali di Capodimonte, Naples.
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