

Time and Cézanne's Later Paintings

JULIAN CHEHIRIAN, American University

Abstract: I present scholarship on Cézanne's artistic process by George Hamilton, Meyer Schapiro and Joyce Medina in order to analyze his reconstitution of Space (as occurring in *Time*) in several paintings of his late period: "Le Bay from L'Estaque (1886), "Chestnut Trees at Jas de Bouffan" (1885), and "Mont SainteVictoire" (1904). I argue that the ingenuity of Cézanne's artistic representation of *Space* "induration" coincides with and is contemporary to a post Kantian reconstitution of *Space* introduced by the French philosopher Henri Bergson (1859-1941), according to whom *Space* is experienced by Consciousness only in Duration (*Time*).

Preface

If an art historian were asked about the nature of his or her discipline, a variety of perspectives might be conveyed. It could be said that a history of art involves an inquiry into the parameters of its study. In other words, what constitutes an 'artform'. It is difficult to conceive of any one historian occupying a perspectival position allowing them to view the totality of the 'arts' insofar as they are an aspect of a human history. Perhaps this is why such questions are abstracted, their references foreshortened, and their study annexed to a field of philosophy concerning itself with aesthetics, or the meaning, process, and purpose of art or creativity. An art history that narrows its scope in order to study the 'artefact' or the human-created object (to which artistic nature or quality is ascribed) is more imaginable, but still jarring. An art history which positions itself in such a way so as to consider the genealogy of a *particular* form or category of artistic expression, such as

‘painting’, is possible when set within a still immense framework of human traditions and their various developments.

The work of an art historian is conducted in a liminal position: between their perception of an artefact, and their pursuit of an understanding regarding the historical circumstances by which it came to be. This act of experiencing and interpreting artwork is situated within an interpretive process that is itself historical. There is no ‘Art History’. Rather, we have ‘art histories’: competing narratives that range from the broadest perspectives on the discipline to conflicting discourses on the level of an artwork by a particular artist of a particular series of a particular movement of a particular era. Each art history positions itself in a different relation to historical concerns. On the level of the specific artwork, the array of techniques, approaches, and methodologies available to art historians can produce many permutations of interpretation on a single figure, brush-stroke, or a related diary entry by the artist. This paper is bound to the matrix of art historical scholarship, its lexicon, and its approaches to its objects of study. I have sought to trace a line at this moment from a general view of art history towards the characterization of a particular moment within it. It is useful to catch a view of the broader landscape prior to entering a specific cluster of space within it.

Introduction

The movements of this paper occur on the level of a discourse concerning the historical significance of the works of a French artist, Paul Cézanne (1839-1906). The study that frames it has been conducted on the subject of correspondences between artistic modernity and the philosophies of modernity. As such, I approach Cézanne’s work through the problems of artistic practice and philosophical speculation contemporary to his life. The intent of this paper is to present a component of Cézanne’s painting located at the intersection of those two domains, and to argue that a popular thesis on the significance of his art — that his work bridges the impressionism of the previous generation of French artists with the intensification of formal abstraction by artists in the later Cubist movement — is incomplete. What is neglected by the appropriation of his artistic vision to that critical gap in the trajectory of late 19th and early 20th century European art is an awareness of his radical innovations in the representation of *Time*, especially concerning his late period of painting (1882-1904). While the thesis that I criticize is correct to identify the presence of distortion and abstraction (i.e. incongruous lines and the transformation of forms into ‘plastic equivalents’) in his canvases as a profound influence upon later artwork, I believe that his fracturing of the spatial-temporal relations characteristic of the impressionist style of painting is the more significant element of his creative contributions.

I present scholarship on Cézanne’s artistic process by George Hamilton, Meyer Schapiro, and Joyce Medina in order to analyze his reconstitution of *Space* (as occurring in *Time*) in several paintings of his late period: “*View of Gardanne*” (1885), “*Le Bay from L’Estaque*” (1886), and “*Mont Sainte-Victoire*” (1904). I argue that the ingenuity of Cézanne’s artistic representation of *Space* “in-duration” coincides with and is contemporary to a post-Kantian reconstitution of *Space* introduced by the French philosopher Henri Bergson (1859-1941), who asserts that *Space* is experienced by Consciousness only in Duration (*Time*).

Paul Cézanne

A biographical layer is essential for an adequate exposition of the ideas that form this project. This section introduces Paul Cézanne and his development as an artist who in 1870 would paint *Luncheon on the Grass*, in 1872 *The House of the Hanged Man*, 1886 *The Bay from L’Estaque*, and by 1904 a canvas of the series *Mont Sainte-Victoire*. Cézanne, like many of the modern masters (e.g.

Renoir, Van Gogh, Gauguin) passed through a variety of artistic phases¹ before arriving at the ‘style’ for which we have most come to recognize his creative and technical ingenuity. Cézanne’s origin is the southern city of ‘Aix-en-Provence’². His departure from that region and his arrival in Paris as a twenty-two year old with aspirations to paint is perhaps the notable movement in this early phase of his life, at least insofar as my study is concerned. In the 1870s, the impressionist Camille Pissarro drew Cézanne away from the dark and internally driven phase of work from which the *Luncheon on the Grass*’ surfaces; “At Pissarro’s side in southern Normandy and in direct contact with nature, Cézanne began to liberate himself into the discipline of seeing”³. While Cézanne is influenced by Pissarro’s way of perceiving and painting during what is referred to as Cézanne’s ‘impressionist period’, his development of a personal, idiosyncratic style is intelligible at this stage⁴. At the third Impressionist exhibition in 1877, Cézanne’s work was not well received. He “retreated to Provence and pursued his own independent goals in isolation and quietude”⁵, there entering a phase of work that would produce *The Bay from L’Estaque* — ‘a veritable icon of modernist innovation’. This painting and many subsequent canvases share a common element: the motif, or the representation of a “portion of the real world so empty of human activity that it permitted him to engage a visual experience purified of everything but artistic values”. Cézanne, in an attempt to ‘discover the logic of nature’ and to express it in the language of painting, arrived at the ‘plastic equivalent’ as a distillation of reality: a reduction of the subject to the cylinder, sphere, and cone — “the structuring abstractions within the variegated shapes, forms, and concretions of visible reality”. The author of that summation (Hunter) presents what I will now identify as the anchor point for the subsequent portions of my thesis: “Having thus dismantled and fragmented the scene, Cézanne could ‘realize’ his sensations in a ‘construction after nature’ i.e., the painting”. This is a glimpse at the practice by which Cézanne transitions away from an impressionist style and approach to painting — an indication of a transformation of vision that would germinate into his representation of *Space* in a new relationship to *Time*.

Division of the Canvas and the Subject

A significant marker in the development of Cézanne’s artistic vision is the severing of the canvas from its subject, where the term ‘severance’ connotes the liberation of a representation from a criterion of resemblance. This criterion can be, for example, the visual language that is deemed appropriate for the depiction of an upper forehead in the domain of classical portraiture, or the language of color as a function of light that is considered a proper syntax for an experience of reality in the domain of impressionist painting. An assertion of the independence of the canvas from ‘its’ subject in Cézanne’s artistic view signals the emergence of an object that is not subordinate to the phenomenon which it has set out to express. With the modification of this practical relationship between the painter and his or her canvas and the subject matter to which he or she responds, the field of possibility for configurations of representation has been expanded.

¹ Hunter, “*Modern Art*”, p.29

² *ibid.*

³ *ibid.*

⁴ “The impasto remains more substantial than Pissarro’s and already gives more solid definition to form... the way the Impressionist stroke has been rethought in terms of structuring planes of color, rather than colored, flickering atmosphere... and the macabre titled of the work, like the angular view and the stark composition it presents, suggests conflict and even horror, certainly a world at odds with the sun drenched openness and innocent joy of Impressionist art”. (referring to *The House of the Hanged Man*, 1872). *ibid.*

⁵ *ibid.*

“*Le paysage se reflète, s’humanise, se pense en moi. Je l’objective, le projette, le fixe sur ma toile.*” Joyce Medina translates the previous quote from Cézanne’s diary as “*The landscape reflects on itself, is humanized, thinks itself in me. I objectify it, project it, fix it on my canvas*”⁶. It may be fruitful to meditate on this statement in order to come to terms with what it could mean for the person who has imagined it. Cézanne stands in some place within a valley and gazes upon what it presents to his perception. *The landscape reflects on itself*. The landscape is in a state of relation to itself. *It is humanized*. Its immensity is in a sense translated within the parameters of a limited human perception and understanding. *It thinks itself in me*. The landscape — it accrues and expands in the viewer’s experience of it so that he or she may better comprehend its complexity. *I objectify it*. Cézanne begins a sketch on paper or canvas. He projects and puts into form — fixes, essentially — some aspect or collection of aspects — onto his canvas. Medina writes that the landscape and its consciousness ‘exchange places in the development of the creating act that gives form to its aesthetic experience’⁷. Evidence of the consciousness of the artist, she explains, “might disappear altogether except for the object signs on the canvas of *a life of the landscape and of the aesthetically motivated contemplation* that arises as the landscape takes its own form” (i.e., begins to endure on the canvas). A union of the life of the landscape in the creating painter and of the painter in the *created* landscape, for Medina, “is what makes the pictorial synthesis, as a doubly expressive synthesis, a significant form”⁸.

Impressionist Time and Space

In this section I explore the implications of Medina’s interpretation of Cézanne’s statement if, as Medina alleges, it is an encapsulation of a process of creation. Her interpretation, I argue, is more representative of the Impressionist process that Cézanne eclipses than of the transgression of ‘fixed’ spatial and temporal parameters that Cézanne achieves in his painting. In George Hamilton’s “Cézanne, Bergson and the Image of Time”, the author proposes a lost interpretive component by which we can gain an understanding of Cézanne not just as “the painter who released us from the toils of representational painting”, nor just as “the source for much abstract art”. By examining Cézanne’s transformation of Impressionist technique in relation to “certain aspects of late 19th century French philosophical speculation”, the distortions for which he has come to be regarded as a father of modern art and even by some as a ‘proto-Cubist’, according to Hamilton, will be seen “not so much as visual aberrations”, but as a “result of his manner of working and thinking about *Space and Time*”⁹. Hamilton asserts 1) that it is a reasonable assumption that a work of art that constitutes more than just a passing interest “may be related in technique, subject matter or expressed content, to certain aspects of contemporary thought”, and 2) that modern works of “high seriousness will contain some reflection of the dominant post-Kantian interest” in the nature and experience of *Space and Time*. If a theory of impressionism can be abstracted from what is known of the works and practices of those who worked in that style, it can be regarded as mostly positivistic in its interpretation of space and time¹⁰. An Impressionist landscape is a presentation of visual phenomena seen “from a given position in space at a certain moment in time”¹¹. Space, therefore, is

⁶ Medina, “Cézanne and Modernism”, p2.

⁷ *ibid.*

⁸ *ibid.*

⁹ Hamilton, “Cézanne, Bergson and the Image of Time”, p4.

¹⁰ *ibid.*

¹¹ Hamilton cites as examples Monet’s, Pissarro’s or Sisley’s during the 1870’s and 80’s.

restricted to “the place here” and *Time* is synonymous with “the moment now”¹². Impressionist space is timeless — it exists in terms of an instant in which that space is experienced. Hamilton proposes that since impressionism is based on a concept of “instantaneous time in a homogeneous, Newtonian (timeless) space” and Cézanne’s paintings do not indicate to us an Impressionist experience of space, his works must reflect “a different attitude towards space and time”.

Bergsonian Philosophy and Cézanne’s Painting

In this section, I present Hamilton’s interpretation of Cézanne’s artwork as the pictorial equivalent of the Bergsonian concept of *Space* as only known in and through *Time*. I expand these concepts in preparation for my later analysis of specific canvases by Cézanne. *Time*, for the German Enlightenment philosopher Immanuel Kant, in addition to *Space*, is a parameter within which all experience occurs. *Time* and *Space* are forms outside of which human experience cannot occur; they are fundamental to human experience. Bergson’s reconstitution of those two parameters involves the dependence of an experience of *Space* to one’s being Conscious in *Time*. For Bergson, consciousness is continuous and its tempo is so variable that analytic, spatialized time (i.e. of clocks) has little relation to the time through which we live¹³. There is no “instantaneous present” as the Impressionists believe, in this conceptualization of *Time*, because “an instant can only be experienced as a sensation, as an impression, but not as a psychic feeling.” This fluid and extended consciousness is located by Bergson in time — but that time is conceived as “Duration rather than as a sequence of successive but separate moments”. Duration, Hamilton notes, is to be understood as a “process, continuous becoming”. The synthesis of this aspect of Bergson’s philosophy and certain paintings by Cézanne (most prevalent in his late period: 1882-1904) is the artist’s achievement of a pictorial realization of *Time* as *Duration* rather than as *Instantaneous Succession*¹⁴. Now, let us examine Hamilton’s comparison of Impressionism’s Instantaneous Succession and Cézanne’s representation of Duration in terms of the practices from which these expressions follow. In a typical Impressionistic canvas by Monet, a moment is observed and is recorded quite quickly — for in the next instant, quite a different moment has arranged itself before the painter. Impressionist practice “requires the development of a dexterous handling in order to record as quickly as possible the appearance of a given motif at one particular moment”. As speed is essential, a sense of space must be rendered in a “stable perspectival system”¹⁵. Cézanne’s painting, on the other hand, is the record of an optical experience over a period of time. *Space* is not given “once and for all as a timeless substance, but is gradually discovered *as* and *in* Duration — in a process of becoming which involves memory (of successive experiences of Space)”.

Whereas the surface of an Impressionist painting is the “sum of all the visual sensations received at one instant, the *entire pictorial surface* of a Cézanne”, Hamilton argues, a Cézanne painting is “the sum of *continuous* perceptions of space in the *mode of time*”. If we accept that a painting by Cézanne is a record of ‘cumulative visual experiences recorded at different moments or periods of time’, then we may also accept that those experiences have not occurred in the same locations in space. Hamilton successfully reconstitutes the significance of Cézanne’s distortions by highlighting this element of a dynamic and unstable perspectival position. Less radical than Cézanne’s probing

¹² Mirroring Medina’s interpretation of Cézanne, Hamilton writes: “the Impressionist painter has chosen to function as an apparatus for registering an impression (in the sense of an effect imprinted on the organs of sight) of objects extended in a space which exists apart from his consciousness.” *ibid.*

¹³ “Cézanne, Bergson and the Image of Time”, p6.

¹⁴ *ibid.*

¹⁵ “Cézanne, Bergson and the Image of Time”, p7.

and rendering of multiple points of view for an object is the simple idea of him returning to the studio after creating the first layer of a canvas, and adding new layers to his abstracted “plastic equivalents” of observed forms. The experience of a three dimensional space implies that we exist and move within it. This necessarily includes the experience of time. It is evident that even Cézanne’s movement from one angle of perspective in a valley to another a mere yard to his left implies a process that is experienced in Consciousness and through a Duration of *Time*. According to Hamilton, we can reconstruct the image of *Time* which Cézanne’s paintings constitute by attempting to reconstruct in our understanding the process by which the canvas was created; “The difficulty which the elimination of time incurs for the observer (of a Cézanne) is seen when the multiple points of view” implicit to the process of the painting’s creation “are removed” from the painting¹⁶. The spectator is faced “with the impossible task of trying to comprehend visually the various foci in a single glance”, and so they are driven to an “expressive explanation of the distortions”, assuming them to be “personal decisions of the artist ... (that are) subjective and illogical”.¹⁷ Scholarship that locates those distortions within a certain schema of the developmental course of art history (i.e. one contending that Cézanne’s distortion of line and form are markers of an explicit stylistic transformation in his artistic vision — a precursor to later abstract art) can avoid entirely the contemplation of the focal point of Hamilton’s ingenious interpretation, which is brought to its final movement with the following statement: “If the points of view implicit to the canvas are returned to the painting in the sense that they are imaginatively gathered up again within the consciousness of the artist and spectator, and the painting is considered as much an image of temporal as of spatial experience, *discrepancies* (formal distortions or aberrations) *become truths of experiential vision*”¹⁸. The following passage of Bergson’s ‘L’Évolution Créatrice’ (1907) reasserts the link established here between his philosophy and Cézanne’s painting. It epitomizes Bergson’s concept of Consciousness as occurring in a *Space* which is experienced only in *Time*:

“I say that I change, but the change seems to me to reside in the passage from one state to the next: of each state, taken separately I am apt to think that it remains the same, during all the time that it prevails. Nevertheless, a slight effort of attention would reveal to me that there is no feeling, no idea, no volition which is not undergoing change every moment: if a mental state ceased to vary, its duration would cease to flow. Let us take the most stable of internal states, the visual perception of a motionless external object. The object may remain the same, I may look at it from the same side, at the same angle, in the same light; nevertheless the vision I now have of it differs from that which I have just had, even if only because the one is an instant older than the other. My memory is there which conveys something of the past into the present”¹⁹.

Interpretations of Paintings

Meyer Schapiro presents narrative interpretations of a selection of Cézanne’s paintings from 1866 to 1906 in “*Paul Cézanne*”. In his analysis of landscapes and townscapes, he sometimes refers to photographs of those locations by the art historian John Rewald. This allows for dynamic and referential examinations of the processes and attributes of Cézanne’s artistic vision. In these next sections, I examine Schapiro’s writings on three paintings from Cézanne’s late period: “*View of*

¹⁶ “*Cézanne, Bergson and the Image of Time*”, p8.

¹⁷ *ibid.*

¹⁸ “*Cézanne, “Bergson and the Image of Time*”, p11.

¹⁹ Bergson, “*L’Évolution Créatrice*”

Gardanne” (1885), *Le Bay from L’Estaque*” (1886), and *Mont Sainte-Victoire*” (1904). My intent is to identify correspondences and oppositions between the artistic processes detailed in his interpretations, and the set of distinctions that I introduce in this paper between relations of *Time* and *Space* in Impressionist painting and relations of *Time* and *Space* in Bergson’s theory.

Painting One: ‘View of Gardanne’

This oil canvas, painted in 1885, depicts a densely settled town on a steep, rocky elevation. A view of this site in a photograph by John Rewald reveals several principal alterations, which Cézanne committed in the process of the painting’s creation²⁰. The scene has been narrowed, “bringing the distant buildings closer to each other, and accenting the steepness of the hill”. Schapiro notes that “the silhouettes of the trees and the sketchy branching lines” near the bottom of the work are “diagonal like roofs” — a “coordinating relationship” that is not actually reflective of the physical arrangement of the town²¹. The upward movement which drives your eyes above the tops of the trees and towards the church at the top of the composition is intensified by the sweeping curve of the horizon and the striking puncture of the tower in the hollow created by that curve in the topmost band of the painting. Schapiro writes that “the unfinished state of the picture” allows us to see the methods by which Cézanne paints. The drawing in the bottom right quadrant of the canvas reveals that this layer “is not a fixed underlying plan”, but rather, “a piecemeal notation of lines”. Cézanne “draws and paints, paints and draws, without completing the lines”. This dialectic is an indication of the prevalence of a process of creation in Duration as opposed to a one-time rendering of a fixed point within an Instantaneous Succession of *Time*. The work’s state of incompleteness is especially useful for highlighting its gradual creation.

Painting Two: ‘Le Bay from L’Estaque’

Hunter writes that it is difficult from our historical vantage point to understand just to what extent this oil painting from 1886 is an icon of the radical becoming of modernism. Of the view represented in *Le Bay from L’Estaque*, Schapiro writes that “without paths or human figures, the world is spread out before [Cézanne’s] eyes, a theme for pure looking; it invites no action, only discernment; it is sunny, but not gay or cheerful — a balance of warmth and coolness, the momentary and the timeless, the stirring and the stable, in perfect harmony and fullness.” It is useful to recall Hunter’s engagement of Cézanne’s use of *motifs*, in this case, the representation of a “portion of the real world so empty of human activity that it permitted [Cézanne] to ‘discover the logic of nature’ and to express it in the language of painting”. In this work, Cézanne “simultaneously affirms the physical reality of the two dimensional space of the canvas and harmonizes it with the three dimensions of nature’s space and its content of solid forms”. He achieves this by loosening and blunting illusionistic techniques typical for the representation of recessional space: converging lines and the progressive blurring of details²². Cézanne’s way of rendering points in space reveals areas near and far in equal detail, the effect of which Hunter describes as a “steady, sourceless brilliance”. Despite this equality in representation, spatial differentiation exists, if not as a subordination to a continuum of proximity, then as a series of relationships between objects in the composition. There is a relationship between the left slant of the roof of the house, which juts from the middle and bottom end of the canvas — rupturing the alignment of the roofs and of the band of

²⁰ Rewald, *Cézanne: a biography*”

²¹ Schapiro, *Paul Cézanne*, p.16

²² Hunter, *Modern Art*, p.31

mountains across the water — and the drifting puff of smoke. In the other direction, the roof directs us to the “slope of the shore”, and the jetty far off in the upper left region of the canvas²³. The significance of spatial differentiation through object relations lies in the process by which these objects were augmented from the phenomena that they originally expressed and reduced to abstractions or plastic equivalents of their basic forms. The terms “augmentation” and “reduction” are the markers of a process. In support of Schapiro’s and Hunter’s interpretations of this painting is a process of deliberation, creation, and re-creation that undergirds the final composition which we see. Most importantly, the spatial differentiations — achieved more so through object relations and converging lines than through blurring and illusionism — suggest the presence of a Conscious viewer who saw those objects in *Space* through Duration (*Time*).

Painting Three: ‘Mont Sainte-Victoire’

Schapiro writes that in this painting, created by Cézanne toward the end of his life, his expression became “passionately freed to the point of ecstatic release.” It can be experienced as the synthesis and culmination of an array of Cézanne’s creative ingenuities and artistic transformations over the course of, but especially in the late period of his painting. If we were to place a grid overlay onto the canvas and to view the painting through it, we could begin to see clusters of space within the landscape of Mont Saint-Victoire as individual renderings of the artist’s dynamic perception of those spaces over the course of his time at the location, and over the course of his meditation and work upon the canvas. When we remove the grid overlay and see the conflation of all constituent spaces within the composition as they appear — contiguous and simultaneous — we lose a vision of *Time*, rather, of the Time(s) which constitute the Durations which bring about the flux, the dynamism, and the transformations of nature that Cézanne has shockingly encapsulated in this shaking image: appearing simultaneously as a series of fragments and as an ideal totality. Perhaps that ideal totality is achieved by Cézanne in the representation not of a singularity of experience in static relation to a fixed parameter of space within a fixed moment of time — as in an Impressionist painting — but rather, by the encapsulation of the many Mont Saint-Victoire(s) existing perceptually, aesthetically, and emotively for him.

Conclusion

The ‘*Rouen Cathedral*’ (1892-1894) is a series of canvases by Monet depicting the façade of the cathedral in its different appearances: one captures the cathedral in sunlight, another at the cusp of nightfall, and a third reveals it under the semi-opaque cloak of dawn’s light. It is difficult to imagine how the individual paintings in Monet’s series can be so variegated in tone, effect and color, and be so different from a late painting of Cézanne in terms of the relationships of *Time* and *Space* that they represent. Whereas the Instantaneous Succession that bridges one moment and then another would seemingly inspire work on a *new* painting for Monet (i.e. now the frieze is cast in a blue shadow and the sky has reddened), the experience of an entire day of fluctuation and transformation could be referenced and subsumed within a painting of the Rouen by Cézanne. The spectrum of sensations impressed into the Consciousness of the artist over and in the course of *Time* (a Duration) could be depicted in what is essentially a composite ‘Image of Time’. Liminality in art — a stage in a developmental process which does not fall entirely within the previous or the next paradigm — is often a rich terrain from which to analyze creative material in terms of the internal transformations

²³ Schapiro, “*Paul Cézanne*”, p.18

occurring within the vision of the artist and the corresponding changes to their methods of expression. It is truly as if Bergson were addressing Cézanne's creation of composite images when he writes that "there is no feeling, no idea, no volition which is not undergoing change every moment", and that even our visual perception of a motionless external object (i.e. the crest of a mountain in the distance) differs from the perception of it that we had just previously. By presenting interpretations of Cézanne's artistic process by Medina — who captures from his paintings an Impressionist sensibility, Hamilton — who finds in his canvases composite Images of Time, and Schapiro — who identifies aspects of his paintings coinciding with both models, I believe that I have presented a useful framework for the differentiation of an Impressionistic and a 'Cezannian' rendering of *Space* in its relationship to *Time*, the philosophical-historical significance of that differentiation being the movement from a fundamentally Kantian to a post Kantian, Bergsonian understanding of *Time* and *Space*.

Writing About Art

If in writing about art we reject formulae and search instead for a *way* to write about art, we may be able to say something without barring other possibilities. It seems to me that this is important. And if, following the articulation of our ideas and speculations about the history of art — about human culture, and how certain artifacts came to be — our writing is still eclipsed by what it seeks to account for, then we may have achieved something exciting: characterization, texturing, and expansion of ideas and contexts, but not subordination of phenomenon to analytic schemas. In this way, the empirical, analytical approach and method commits a sacrifice from which I am not sure that it recovers. The explicit and articulable, authoritative by its specificity and clarity, replaces the metaphorical. Whereas the metaphorical (signifying the yet unarticulated inscape of a person's emotional and referential creation or experience of artwork) can contain (as it certainly it does not restrict much within the field of possibility) the mood of a historical and analytical way of perceiving and reflecting, the empirical and analytical approach cannot surrender itself to the breadth of possibility and uncertainty of the metaphorical. Its yearning for precision and certainty may be what drives it and commits it to certain boundaries. These are important ideas to consider when probing for approaches to writing about art, even if the successes and failures of either approach within the domain of scholarship on art influences or compels us to approach the task "as it should be" in an exclusive manner. In future writing on art historical topics, I hope to search for a way to present my ideas clearly but without such confidence for the necessity of those positions over other possible directions from which to approach material.

Bibliography

Hamilton, George. "Cézanne, Bergson and the Image of Time." *College Art Journal* 16.1 (1956): 2-12. Print.

Hendel, Charles. "The Achievement of Bergson." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 10.1 (1940): 269. Print.

Medina, Joyce. "Cézanne and modernism: the poetics of painting." Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1995. Print.

Rewald, John. *Cézanne: a biography*. New York: H.N. Abrams, 1986. Print.

Schapiro, Meyer. *Paul Cézanne*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1988. Print.

Shiff, Richard. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984. Print.

Voris, Linda. "Interpreting Cézanne." *Modernism/Modernity* 19.1 (2012): 73-93. Print.

Williams, Forrest. "Cézanne and French Phenomenology." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 12.4 (1954): 481-492. Print.