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ABSTRACT

Chemin Des Lauves: The Studies, Motifs, and Garden Secrets of Paul Cézanne

Kimberly McDiarmid
University of Guelph, 2017

Advisor: Dr. Christina Smylitopoulos

Paul Cézanne (1839-1906) is widely known for his post-impressionist landscape paintings depicting mountains, forests, and garden spaces. The artist worked closely with the garden, owning property a property called Chemin des Lauves located in Aix en Provence during the last decade of his life. Despite popular interest of Chemin des Lauves as a tourist destination, a critical examination of Paul Cézanne’s relationship with his garden has yet to be conducted. Using an intermedial approach, this thesis unveils Cézanne’s understanding of his garden, not merely as a setting, but as an artistic process that reflected his experimentation with nineteenth-century colour theory, optical studies, and his concerns with the expressive capability of landscape. This intervention moves beyond a conventional understanding of Cezanne’s appreciation of nature and demonstrates that because of Cézanne’s level of involvement with the garden space, Chemin des Lauves must be considered a painter’s garden.
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Introduction

Cézanne’s Secret Identity: Searching for Truth behind Le Jardin des Lauves

“The Landscape thinks in me,
And I am its consciousness.”¹

Paul Cézanne

The scholarship regarding Paul Cézanne’s (1839-1906) Provençal landscapes is rich and extensive. In the early twentieth century, studies that emphasized Cézanne’s supreme attention to the geometrics of landscape emerged as the leading platform of discourse surrounding the artist. James Feibleman neatly summarizes popular discussions of Cézanne’s landscape painting in one judgement, stating “[He] was undoubtedly a realist who believed that esthetic values exist independently in nature and are to be discovered there by the artist [sic].”² In the past, art historians have taken the studies of Feibleman and likeminded scholars into consideration, applying their sentiments to Cézanne’s Provençal scenes of rocky hillsides and picturesque woodland grounds.³ The emphasis on the impact of the artist’s “realizations” of nature on his finished landscapes has persisted.⁴ For instance, Bridget Riley states that, “[His] realization of these sensations paves the way to an acceptance of an enduring vision of nature as a totality embracing us on equal terms with the trees, the earth, the clouds and sky, defined by the same enigmatic phenomena.”⁵ The twenty-first-century interpretation of Cézanne’s work continues to

¹ Maurice Merleau-Ponty, As quoted in Sense and Non-Sense (Illinois: North Western University, 1964), 17.
revolve around his “vision of nature,” found predominantly in the landscape paintings that characterize the final years of the artist’s career. While a dialogue surrounding landscape is imperative to the overall understanding of the artist’s œuvre, an investigation of Cézanne’s own garden studio at Chemin des Lauves has yet to be fully developed. Despite the ability of Chemin des Lauves to attract local and international tourism in Aix en Provence, accurate information about the artist and his garden is limited to a basic understanding of Cézanne’s relationship with nature as an appreciation for the wild and natural.⁶

Contrary to common perception, it is well-documented that Cézanne’s interest in nature ran deeper than landscape painting. Before becoming an artist, Cézanne considered himself, first, to be an amateur geologist and spent considerable time studying rock types and landscapes alongside the highly regarded scholar and geologist Fortuné Marion (1846-1900).⁷ With this in mind, an examination of Cézanne’s early sketchbooks uncover that the artist practiced scientific methods in his documentation and took particular interest in the geological structures and landscape masses of the French countryside.⁸ Before the artist’s formal introduction to the impressionist painters in 1873, Cézanne focused mainly on the aesthetic structure of the landscapes he painted, reflecting his ability to accurately and intently document the organization of green space.⁹ Take, for example, the oil on canvas painting The Clearing (fig. 1). Painted sometime in 1868, The Clearing is Cézanne’s depiction of the ideal Parisian garden motif—Le Jardin des Tuileries.¹⁰ Each component of the work is given a clear spatial purpose, showcasing the function of properly proportioned public green space. From early in his career, then, it can be

---

⁶ Giulio Carlo Argan, CÉZANNE (New York: Rizzoli International Publications), 68.
⁸ A. Danchev, 96.
demonstrated that Cézanne’s appreciation of the gardening motif was more than basic. The garden was a subject of intense study by the artist from the start, and should therefore be underscored as an important, core motif within the artist’s oeuvre; one that would carry forward throughout the span of Cézanne’s career.

Analysis of Cézanne’s body of paintings and drawings shows that the artist was also interested in self-portraiture and referred to himself as his “most patient model” in comparison to his paying subjects, who endured long and uncomfortable sittings.11 In his memoire nineteenth-century art dealer and biographer Ambroise Vollard (1866-1939) recalled the excruciating experience of sitting for Cézanne as a portrait model, which could last from eight o’clock until eleven in the morning when the portrait was completed, during which no movement or noise was permitted by the sitter.12 Perhaps this is why Cézanne preferred self-portraiture, as he could control the sitter’s urge to “disturb the pose!”13 In the last six years of his career, Cézanne all but abandoned the practice of self-portraiture and instead concentrated mainly on landscape and garden subjects.14 While renowned in this period for his picturesque treatments of landscapes in northern Provençe, it is interesting to note that in the last years of his life, Cézanne completed six oil and three large scale watercolour portraits of the artist’s childhood friend and gardener, Vallier.15 More pointedly, the last painting ever to be completed by the artist was the oil portrait titled The Gardener from 1906 (fig. 2). Vallier worked at Cézanne’s studio garden located at the

12 Ambroise Vollard, “Cézanne’s Studio,” The Soil 1 no. 3 (March, 1917): 102
13 In his memoire Cézanne’s Studio, Vollard states that Cézanne’s sittings would cause fatigue and restlessness, forcing him to “disturb the pose”: “I was careful not to make a single false movement. The immobility, however, caused me to feel drowsy; this I fought victoriously for some time, but finally inclined my head upon my shoulder; equilibrium then ceased… Cézanne ran to me. ‘Unfortunate man! You have disturbed the pose! Really you must be as quiet as an apple, an apple never moves.’ From that day on I used to drink a large glass of black coffee before posing.” Vollard, 102.
14 Danchev, 300.
Art historian Alex Danchev has recently suggested that despite the absence of self-portraiture in the artist’s later works, the painted series of Vallier may, nevertheless, be a reflection of the Cézanne’s perceived self-image. As each work in this portrait series shows Vallier seated in the terrace garden at Chemin des Lauves, these paintings reveal intimate aspects of Cézanne’s personal studio space. More subtly, these portraits unveil two distinct themes not normally associated with Cézanne’s landscape narrative: the artist as a gardener, and the importance of the garden motif to the artist himself.

A comparison between the self-portraiture of Cézanne and his portraits of Vallier supports this argument. Most striking, formally and symbolically, are the similarities between the men in The Gardener Vallier from ca.1902-06 and Self Portrait with a Beret from 1900 (fig. 3). Placed side by side, both men appear bearded and posed in a slight profile. Both Vallier and Cézanne are painted wearing a short black cap. Remarkably, and hitherto overlooked, The Gardener Vallier (ca. 1902-06) is the only painting of the nine works from the series in which Vallier is not wearing his signature straw hat with blue band across the top. Moreover, Cézanne depicts both figures wearing a similar outfit of black overcoat and white undershirt. The convention in portraying Vallier was to depict him wearing garb reflective of his gardening profession, but in the painting in question Cézanne makes an exception. Instead of being shown wearing a white workman’s shirt and blue trousers, Vallier is depicted in a more sophisticated attire. He mirrors almost entirely what Cézanne had worn a few years prior in his own self-portrait. Furthermore, a notable difference is the way in which the artist applies paint in order to shade Vallier’s eyes. In the other paintings of the portrait series, Vallier’s eyes are shaded by his

---

16 Becks-Malorny, 62.
17 Danchev, 305.
18 Refer to portrait The Gardener Vallier from ca. 1906 for an example of this hat.
straw hat. In this work, Cézanne uses *sfumato*, effectively stripping the sitter’s eyes of their individuality and rendering Vallier’s left eye non-existent. This is significant, as Cézanne believed the eyes were the most important feature of a portrait because of their ability to express the personality of a sitter. In the case of Vallier, then, the individuality of the sitter is all but masked by a mysterious identity that cannot be pinned solely to the gardener. I argue that Cézanne’s borrowing of features from the earlier self-portrait is not coincidental. Cézanne created a dual-image, the character of Vallier; through which Cézanne quietly projected himself as the gardener at *Cemin des Lauves*.

A link between the absence of self-portraiture in the last decade of the artist’s *oeuvre* and the sudden emergence of Vallier as a reoccurring portrait sitter raises questions. The first of which asks why Cézanne chose to portray himself in this role during the final stages of his life? Moreover, how does this shift in identity change the ways in which Cézanne’s landscape paintings can be understood? In light of this new reading of Cézanne’s painting strategy, this thesis will demonstrate that *Le Jardin des Lauves*, and the artist’s involvement in its creation, played a significant role in the artist’s artistic process and vocabulary. This is apparent in his beliefs about visually portraying landscape. For example, when writing about landscape painting, the vocabulary used by Cézanne in his sketchbook describes his artistic process as geological in nature, like the way a landscape architect might prepare to design a landscape:

In order to paint a landscape well, I first need to discover its geological structure. I come face-to-face with my motif, I lose myself in it… Gradually the geological structure became clear to me. The strata, the main planes of my picture, establish themselves and mentally I draw their rocky

---

19 Danchev, 310.
Cézanne’s painting process may, in fact, be productively compared against celebrated nineteenth-century English landscape architect Gertrude Jekyll (1843-1932) and her method of garden design. Once Jekyll had thoroughly surveyed the physical landscape and soil, she “set out to organize the grounds, keeping some of the natural groupings of trees and shrubs. Various parts [of the garden] were taken in hand at different times and treated on their individual merits, and the whole afterwards reconciled.”

Both Cézanne and Jekyll had to first understand their composition, establishing their motif within the geological structure of the land. Only then did either the artist or the landscape architect begin to build up individual aspects of their works that would eventually create a cohesive final product. When evaluating the portraits of Vallier as a reflection of the artist’s own personal interest in gardening, then, it is imperative that Cézanne’s artistic process be taken into consideration as a relevant element in the creation of his studio garden at Chemin des Lauves.

The concept of Cézanne’s jardin was conceived in November of 1891 when the artist purchased a plot of land at the base of the Lauves foothills in the north of Aix en Provence. Cézanne claims quite straightforwardly that the studio garden was an aid in his preparatory practice. In a letter addressed to Vollard on 2 April 1902, Cézanne writes that “I am not giving up the pursuit of my study, which involves making efforts that will not be fruitless, I like to think. I have had a studio built on a little plot of land that I bought with that in mind. So I am pursuing my researches…” The horticultural reference that Cézanne makes confidently by

---

22 Becks-Malorny, 95.
23 A. Danchev, 319.
stating that his efforts would not be *fruitless*, leads to him expressing the primary purpose of building the studio at *Les Lauves*: the studio and garden were going to be built for the pursuit of his researches and the study of nature. Thus, the property at *Les Lauves*, including the garden, was intentional and built under the direction of Cézanne. In terms of the artistic approach outlined by Cézanne, securing and designing a studio and garden would have been the equivalent of discovering his subject’s geological structure and coming *vis-à-vis* with his motif—the garden landscape.

While the dialogue around necessary preparatory processes for landscape painting may appear an obvious step towards fully understanding artist intentionality, this has not always been the case when discussing Cézanne’s *oeuvre*. With the exception of a brief period between 1955 and 1965, when Cézanne’s sketchbooks were intensively studied by scholars such as Theodore Reff and Wayne V. Anderson, the importance of Cézanne’s small scale and private studies have been somewhat muted when juxtaposed against his monumental oil paintings.24 Beginning in the 1920’s, emphasis was given to the significance of the three *Bathers* oil paintings that Cézanne had completed and stored in his hillside *Lauves* studio (figs. 4, 5 & 6).25 Scholars identified the role of *Les Lauves* in the creation of these paintings as being nothing more than having the capacity to house these overly large works.26 As time passed, a shift in the discourse lead academics away from their primary analysis of the *Bathers* series and toward a discussion of

---


26 Philip Consinee and Denis Coutagne, *Cézanne in Provence* (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 2006); Nina Maria Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, *Cézanne & Provence: The Painter and His Culture* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003), 239; “The Large Bathers are Cézanne’s culminating Provençal works, embodying the resonances of memory, emotion, and desire, and painted in a studio specifically constructed for them on his native soil.”
Cézanne’s conceptual perceptive imagery in art.\textsuperscript{27} Unlike earlier studies of Cézanne’s career that highlighted only a small group of works, dissecting the artist’s unique approach to perspective encompassed the study of virtually all motif types Cézanne had created.\textsuperscript{28} Specifically, this is the period in which one can begin to see the landscape (and in particular, the \textit{Mont Sainte-Victoire} motif) gain momentum.

The momentum gained from breakthrough studies related to Cézanne’s visual experience never plateaued, and are still present within today’s rhetoric surrounding the artist. Arguably, sight and perception remain the two primary areas of concern when speaking about Cézanne, but with one addition. Today, studies of Cézanne’s work are very often associated with his return to Aix-en-Provence after 1889.\textsuperscript{29} Nearly all scholarly works published after 2003 mention Cézanne’s return from Paris as the most productive and mature phase of the artist’s career, favouring this homecoming period for the study of his widely-known \textit{Mont Sainte-Victoire} oil and watercolour paintings.\textsuperscript{30} Although it is important to credit Cézanne’s relocation to Aix as the catalysing factor that began the final and most important phase of his career, I believe that art historians may be missing an important element behind Cézanne’s artistic intentionality. By prioritizing Cézanne’s finished landscape paintings and making them the center of the majority of the discussions about the artist’s work, the intellectual process behind his painting has not featured as prominently as it should. Cézanne’s 1889 relocation to Aix marks a period in his career of new and creative innovations in his painting techniques. Along with studying

\textsuperscript{29} John C. Gilmour, “Improvisation in Cézanne’s Late Landscapes,” \textit{The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism} 58 no. 2 (Spring, 2000), 191-194.
\textsuperscript{30} Ulrike Becks-Malorny, \textit{Paul Cézanne 1839-1906: Pioneer of Modernism} (Germany: Taschen, 2006); \textit{Cézanne in Britain} (London: the National Gallery, 2006); Philip Consibe & Denis Coutagne.
Cézanne’s final painted products, art historians should also trace the steps through the preliminary processes of creation. A recuperation of the type of study seen in the 1955-1965 period is necessary here, as the preparatory studies made by the artist could reveal more about Cézanne’s intentions with the work than has been considered. In order to fully grasp Cézanne’s unusual technique, it makes sense to examine how Cézanne planned and prepared.

In 2010, the National Gallery of Scotland presented an exhibition titled “Impressionist Gardens.”31 Guest Curator, Clare A. P. Willsdon created the concept of this exhibition in order to bring together two subjects: Impressionist artists and their personal gardens, represented through painted mediums.32 This new fusion between the painter and the painted opened new realms of possibility regarding the influence personal property had on the innovative artists of the impressionist period. This exhibition (along with the accompanying exhibition catalogue) identified an intellectual deficit: where does Cézanne’s jardin at Les Lauves fit into the discussion of the artist’s garden? While not, himself, an impressionist painter, the association between Cézanne and the impressionists is undeniable. In other words, why has there been a fine lens that focuses closely on the gardens of impressionist painters, but not post-impressionist painters, who co-existed and collaborated with each another within the same period under discussion? Keeping the concept of the painter and his garden in mind, this thesis will draw a necessary correlation between Cézanne’s active cultivation of Les Lauves with his studies and paintings of garden landscape motifs. Even though the artist created these motifs after his move to Aix in 1889, it is the works that feature the Mont Sainte-Victorie that receive most of the

31 Clare A. P. Willsdon, Impressionist Gardens (London: Thames and Hudson, 2010), 7
32 Ibid.
credit for the artist’s technique. This research demonstrates that Cézanne applied his extensive knowledge of the natural world to his own Provençal studio garden.

As for the garden itself, Le Jardin des Lauves has been a topic of conversation, not for its intelligent design, but for its seemingly wild and natural appearance. Former curator of the Musée d’Atillier Marianne R. Bourges wrote that “Cézanne’s Garden is like no other garden… it has escaped all intentions except those of nature… Like some of the most beautiful gardens of the world, Cézanne’s garden survives only through nature.” On the surface, Bourges’ assessment seems appropriate. The garden was, and still is, characterized by shrubbery and trees that may read as unmaintained by human hand. However, certain elements of this natural-looking garden rely on regular horticultural care; care which would have been taken seriously by both the artist and his gardener, Vallier. For example, a large portion of the property at Chemin des Lauves was once a sun drenched olive and fig tree orchard. After Cézanne’s death, measures to prevent the ill effects of frost and other seasonal threats to the orchard were not carried out to their fullest extent. When the garden was purchased by Marcel Provence (1829-1951) in 1921, there was a considerable amount of work to be done in order to rehabilitate the garden and restore it to its original condition. But, with proper maintenance, that was evidently carried out during Cézanne’s occupation of the property, the trees could have survived well beyond Cézanne’s lifetime. Thus, the landscape upon which the studio was built was conscientiously maintained by the artist and his staff. Indeed, art historian Albert Boime asserts that Cézanne’s fixation on garden and landscape motifs stemmed from an obsession with both

35 Michel Fraisset, Cézanne’s Studio (Aix en Provence: Atelier de Cézanne, 1999), 18.
owning and controlling the properties he had represented through painting.36 “[O]wning the motif that one painted,” he argued, “had numerous advantages” for the nineteenth-century artist:

the artist never had to go very far in pursuit of a site to render, never had to tolerate the prying eyes of a curious spectator, could easily return in the event of inclement weather, and, above all, could control the character of the landscape by planting, cultivating, and beautifying it to fit his or her taste or removing features that appeared disagreeable.”37

But on how, precisely, Chemin des Lauves was used to in the landscapes Cézanne painted, Boime is silent. The final phase of Cézanne’s career began in 1901, a period that coincides with the building of the artist’s studio and garden at Chemin des Lauves. Boime almost entirely dismisses this period of the artist’s production as merely a time when the artist was capable of owning his own property and living in solitude.38 As such, this thesis offers an epilogue to Boime’s important work by emphasizing the importance of the last decade of Cézanne’s life, when (and where) he was free to exercise this control. The artist planned, sculpted, and eventually created his garden portrait paintings and motifs. To fully examine the implications of this control, analysis of Cézanne’s intention in relation to the landscape is required, particularly in light of nineteenth-century horticultural practices. The study of horticultural practices contemporary to Cézanne is necessary in order to grasp the degree to which Cézanne would have desired to possess control over his land. Boime’s research is an asset to this study, as other scholarly and popular sources tend to focus on the landscapes that Cézanne did not have personal control over, such as those from the La Mont Sainte-Victoire series. Cézanne affectionately

37 Boime, 552.
38 Albert Boime dismisses the last period of Cézanne’s career in one sentence: “It is in this final phase that Cézanne could at last gratify his dual craving to be alone with his thoughts and to come into close and freer touch with his beloved massif, whose own crisply outlined and obstinate desolation must have buttressed his fragile sense of existence,” 567.
called Mont Sainte-Victoire, a mountain in southern France which overlooked Aix-en-Provence “his motif,” despite not actually owning the property in which the mountain stood.\textsuperscript{39} Due to the sheer number of works that Cézanne dedicated to the mountain landscape, there is a tendency for scholars to weigh the importance of this particular motif more heavily than others.\textsuperscript{40} However, Boime’s work helpfully redirects the focus of study back to Cézanne’s artistic process and his personal creative space.

A deficit in the literature focusing on nineteenth-century garden theory may also be partially responsible for the notion that Cézanne’s garden “escaped all intentions except those of nature.”\textsuperscript{41} Contemporary nineteenth-century garden literature was mainly focused on gardening in the Americas and the more exotic British colonies.\textsuperscript{42} While helpful, particularly when considering the global scope of gardening and its relevance to nineteenth-century society in light of increased industrialization and tensions with urbanity, it is doubtful these texts informed Cézanne’s studio garden in Provence. More helpful is the discourse that addresses the effect of exploration on the gardens of continental Europe. Scholars who consider garden theories relevant to the New World have also engaged with studies that discuss the changing dynamic of European garden design after foreign land exploration to the Americas and beyond, which provided European gardeners exotic alternatives to traditional garden design. These new designs would have been unimaginable in preceding eras, as entirely new plant species were introduced to the

\textsuperscript{39} Becks-Malorny, 67.
\textsuperscript{41} Fell, v.
European landscape. Verification that a new style of gardening erupted during the nineteenth century is well supported by both modern scholarship and the garden advice texts that gained vast popularity in early Victorian England, which were quickly disseminated throughout continental Europe soon after.

In her work, Sarah Bilston claims that early Victorian advice texts tended to highlight the methods by which the gardener could “impose human ideals of order and aestheticism” over the land. Similarly, Juliet Simpson writes about the French fin-de-siècle garden, which combined the wild appearance of nature with the artifice of human manipulation. The fin-de-siècle was also when the Jardin de Peintre, or the ‘Painter’s garden’ was considered an important source of inspiration for artistic creation. Among these painter gardens, impressionist painters, such as Claude Monet (1840-1926) and Pierre-Auguste Renoir (1841-1919) have been praised for their dedication to gardening, a practice that ultimately enhanced their landscape painting techniques. Both Bilson and Simpson convey that the preferred gardening style in the nineteenth century had transitioned into a gardening style of manicured and strategic design. While Cézanne did not consider himself an impressionist painter, he nevertheless associated, practiced, and studied with the impressionist group throughout his career. Cézanne even invited

---

45 Bilston, 6.
47 Willdsom, 19: The Painter’s Garden can be defined as, “the site both grown and painted by the artist, [which] was born with Impressionism.”
48 Simpson, 232.
49 Corey et all, 84.
fellow artists to travel to *Chemin des Lauves* to paint in his studio.\(^{50}\) Yet, curiously *Le Jardin des Lauves* has not been deemed a *Jardin de Peintre*.

Perhaps Cézanne’s *Jardin des Lauves* did not achieve this status because scholars have dismissed the garden as not having the structural elements preferred by new landscape designs during the nineteenth century. However, looking back to eighteenth-century garden theory, similarities are found between *Le Jardin des Lauves* and other English and French gardens from that period. For instance, Cézanne includes wild groves and shrubberies, along with the seemingly random planting of different flower and shrub varieties, which were considered to be traditional elements of the country garden.\(^ {51}\) Coined as “muddling,” this eccentric pattern in horticultural design in fact predates the eighteenth century, but became fashionable as a part of the eighteenth-century aesthetic.\(^ {52}\) French horticultural developments in this period adjusted to include asymmetrical botanical designs that gave less concentration on formal structural aesthetics.\(^ {53}\) Keeping track of traditional country garden elements predating the nineteenth century, Cézanne’s studio at *Chemin des Lauves* had two orchards: the first was an established orchard, which has today grown into a shrubbery, and was second is an olive grove that remains in the central area of the terrace garden.\(^ {54}\) Apart from the more practical purposes of fruit trees, there was an aesthetic purpose to orchard and groves. According to John Phibbs, the inclusion of a grove in the eighteenth-century garden enabled what was called “shredding,” or the affect that the light has on the ground when obstructed by tree branches and foliage.\(^ {55}\) Shredding is a motif

\(^{50}\) Danchev, 348.
\(^{54}\) Fell, 38.
\(^{55}\) J. Phibbs, 177.
that appears repeatedly in Cézanne’s early works depicting public green spaces. In terms of capturing the effects of shredding through paint, one significant piece is the work *Landscape* (ca. 1870-1871) that focuses entirely on the shredding of a tree grove and a winding pathway (fig. 7). The skill and accuracy with which Cézanne executes the appearance, and arguably the experience, of shredding is intriguing and admirable. From a painter’s perspective Cézanne has studied his subject well, applying paint to the canvas surface in a way that embodies how light and shadow appear in nature. This particular work is significant in that the silvery green colouring of the leaves in the trees is reminiscent of the fig tree, suggesting that the artist was familiar with the tree and its capabilities of reacting with light. In conjunction with this observation, according to Elisabeth de Feydeau, the fig tree is known to grow naturally on “south-facing slopes with tree cover to the north.”56 Looking at the sloped landscape of the painting, it is possible that Cézanne’s studies of fig trees informed his later planting at *Les Lauves*. Because this motif can be identified so easily in Cézanne’s garden paintings, it follows that the artist planned his own studio garden space to have the potential of giving off a similar shredding affect.

The shredding of garden groves did not only serve an aesthetic function; shredding also offered practical uses for the individual and the artist while working in the garden. Fig trees, in particular, were planted for their fruit, and favoured, according to De Feydeau, for their “cool shade and aromatic, refreshing scent.”57 One can also see the advantage of shade to an artist known for working long hours out of doors. In the South of France (as well as through the use of greenhouse technology), dried figs were valued for their quality and size, offering an additional
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57 De Feydeau, 184.
economic reward for those with properly cultivated groves.\textsuperscript{58} Also interesting to note are the ancient connections of olive groves that are tied to the South of France. Olive trees, known for their successful cultivation in Mediterranean climates, have been a commodity in Provence for thousands of years. Some surviving species, that continue to bear fruit, are as old as a thousand years.\textsuperscript{59} Historically, olive groves have been heavily cultivated in the South of France for the versatile fruit they provide. The flesh of the olive can be both eaten and applied to the skin as a soothing balm or cream, making it a prized item for the French (among other Mediterranean inhabitants).\textsuperscript{60} Again, the practical purposes of the traditional elements present in Cézanne’s garden, point to a space conductive to comfortable work, study, and economic gain. These traditional elements build the foundation upon which Cézanne carried out his every day routine, and must be considered as an important part of the artist’s practical as well as intellectual process in his project to create artistic renderings of the landscape.

Phibbs credits Mark Laird as a fellow researcher highlighting elements of garden design that borrow from traditions predating the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{61} Although these works apply to the older traditions present within the eighteenth-century garden, Phibbs and Laird’s studies are fundamental to the re-evaluation of Cézanne’s studio garden. \textit{Le Jardin des Lauves} may not yet be deemed a \textit{Jardin de Peintre} because scholars are finding evidence of intentional garden design in the wrong century. Rather than comparing \textit{Le Jardin des Lauves} only to impressionist
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\textsuperscript{58} Adams, 53.
\textsuperscript{61} John Phibbs formally acknowledges Mark Laird for his contribution to eighteenth century garden theory through his seminal work “The Flowering Landscape Garden: English Pleasure Grounds 1720-1800”, which dissects the various popular flower garden and shrubbery designs of the late eighteenth century.
painters and their gardens, Cézanne’s studio garden at Les Lauves needs to be viewed through a lens that encompasses traditional gardening approaches that existed before the fin-de-siècle. I contend that Le Jardin des Lauves was a Jardin de Peintre and served as a preparatory landscape for Cézanne’s future studies, paintings, and techniques. Through his garden, the artist manipulated the textures, colours, variety, and placement of the plant varieties available to him within his local Provençal studio.

Along with landscape painting, portraiture makes up an expansive portion of Cézanne’s oeuvre. And here, too, we find a deficit in the literature. A significant number of his portraits are related to a garden space. In terms of what will be explored through this thesis, portraiture pertaining to Cézanne’s personal relationships, particularly with his wife Marie-Hortense Fiquet Cézanne (1850-1922), will be examined in order to draw conclusions about the impact she had on the garden. Over the course of the artist’s career, Cézanne painted and drew his wife more frequently than any other of his human subjects. However, the unique relationship Cézanne and his wife shared has lead scholars to minimize her role in the artist’s oeuvre. As a result, concentrating on the garden has provided an opportunity to shed light on her position in the artist’s work.

Revealing the highly constructed nature of the garden at Chemin des Lauves, this thesis will unveil Cézanne’s understanding of his garden as element in his artistic process. As Cézanne said, in order to paint a landscape, he needed to come face-to-face with his motif before its potential could be realized. By analyzing the artist’s study practices of botany and geology, understanding his connection to the plants in the garden themselves, and examining the
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63 Cézanne lived away from his wife and son, Paul, for large periods at a time, leaving scholars to speculate negatively about their marriage and family life.
nineteenth-century colour theories and optical studies, this work will demonstrate how the studio garden became a preparatory space for Cézanne. In terms of the methodology implemented throughout this thesis, I will be using a combination of approaches that highlight the intermediality of Cézanne’s artistic practices, including historiography, formal analysis, and the application of theoretical studies to the artworks themselves.

The first chapter, “The Artist & The Garden Motif,” will analyze Cézanne’s sketchbook drawings, his use of potted plants, and the recurrence of the garden motif throughout the artist’s oeuvre. The second chapter, “A Garden of Emotions: The Daisy, The Rose, and The Hydrangea,” will explore the sentimental aspect of what I call Cézanne’s ‘garden portraiture’ of his wife Hortense from a feminist perspective. The final chapter, “Planned Optical Experience: Art and Science in the Nineteenth Century,” considers nineteenth-century garden design implemented by the artist with the planning of Les Lauves in conjunction with contemporary colour and optical theories, in order to clarify the relationship between the two. Together, the chapters of this thesis will shed new light on Cézanne’s preparatory practice and materials, and will ultimately demonstrate that the schema behind Le Jardin des Lauves did not “[escape] all intentions” as it has been initially thought.
Chapter 1
The Artist & the Garden Motif

“Cézanne was led by preference to painting apples and, still more willingly, flowers.”

Ambroise Vollard

Although the literature reflects an urge to characterize Cézanne’s early career in relation to particular locations, there is much to be gained from tracking his movements. From the 1860’s onward, Cézanne routinely moved his practice between Paris and Provence. It was not until 1886, when his father passed away suddenly, that the artist returned permanently to southern France. As such, during the formative years of his career, Cézanne engaged with both Parisian and Provençal cultural motifs in the context of artistic creation. These motifs are reflected in the artist’s work, most especially in his sketchbook drawings and watercolour studies. The National Gallery (Washington, DC) holds a collection of Cézanne’s sketchbooks, all of which contain preliminary drawings that span from his early to late career. In particular, this collection demonstrates a repetition of floral and vegetal motifs, which uncover the artist’s interest in botany within and outside of Provence. These works are revealing because they provide hints of the artist’s inclination toward horticultural subjects. Botany has been defined as the scientific study of flowers and plant life, and is viewed as the science used to better understand the ecological relationships between plant matter and their surrounding environments.
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64 Ambroise Vollard, “Cézanne’s Studio,” The Soil 1, no. 3 (March 1917): 107.
66 The National Gallery of Art in Washington, DC, has a collection of Cézanne’s sketches; in this collection are several studies of peonies, hydrangeas, vegetation and different varieties and roses.
can be understood as one of the three sub-genres of the science of botany, the others being forestry and agronomy, and is often associated with the study, building, and maintenance of gardens and plant-based environments.\(^6^8\) Therefore, when examining the collective contents of Cézanne’s sketchbooks, it is fair to categorize the recurring natural motifs in two ways: first, his detailed studies of individual plants and flowers as subjects of botanic science. Second, his landscape and garden scenes under the sub-category of horticultural design. In this way, Cézanne’s sketchbook drawings have the capacity to evolve from mere copies of nature, to engaged scientific studies of his environmental surroundings.

Considering the frequency that motifs related both to botany and, more specifically, to horticulture crop up throughout Cézanne’s surviving sketchbooks, it is not surprising that his interest in flora would feature in his landscape paintings, and more pointedly, in the terrace garden paintings he completed in Aix. Despite historian Lawrence Gowing’s claim that “only a small proportion of Cézanne’s pictures ever depended on drawings directly,” I believe that the repetition in these two types of motifs types suggest otherwise.\(^6^9\) As such, the aim of this chapter is to examine, and in some ways recast Cézanne’s use of the garden motif, not merely as a study of nature, but more importantly as preparatory work in cultivating his own garden at Chemin des Lauves. Using an historical and contextual approach, this chapter will outline Cézanne’s specific knowledge of garden plants that routinely make appearances within his drawn and painted works. It will also reveal a correlation between the artist’s familiarity with the Parisian garden motif and the structural elements of the artist’s own garden. Cézanne’s garden was not an idyllic natural oasis. Quite the opposite, this chapter will show that Chemin des Lauves was cultivated


strategically, and was informed by the artist’s keen knowledge of perennial plant care and popular gardening techniques employed in Paris during the nineteenth century.

In the art historical discourse surrounding Cézanne, there is an enthusiasm for concentrating on the artist’s preparatory practices. For example, Theodore Reff praises the study of Cézanne’s sketchbooks and claims that without a detailed examination of these materials, tracing the “development from an earlier Impressionist style to the constructive style of his maturity” would not be possible.\textsuperscript{70} Similarly, Richard Schiff uses the sketchbooks as a tool to chronicle Cézanne’s indulgence in sensory experience, a development that appears to peak during the years between 1885 and 1895.\textsuperscript{71} While these sketchbooks are invaluable assets in addressing the artist’s oeuvre, there are supplementary documents beyond the scope of the 1,000 sketches and drawings that he compiled across four decades of his artistic career. Limiting the examination of Cézanne’s preparatory work to works on paper also limits our understanding of his process.

The solution to this myopic focus on sketches is the adoption of an intermedial approach, which captures what is actually an “interart(s)” practice. Defined generically as “phenomena at the point of intersection between different media, or crossing their borders, or for their interconnection,” anticipating intermediality opens up possibilities for different types of media to be examined through one coherent lens.\textsuperscript{72} According to Irina O. Rajewsky, an evolutionary perspective of intermediality allows art and media historians to examine the intersections of

\begin{footnotesize}
\end{footnotesize}
discrete forms of media in order to make comparisons between them from a single viewpoint.\textsuperscript{73} The incorporation of an intermedial perspective enhances the depth of research by comparing two or more types of media that are not typically thought to be of the same level of importance— or, as in the case of the work of Cézanne, thought to have the same level of finish. As such, living flowers are considered in this chapter to be objects of analysis in the medium of gardening, which I argue Cézanne developed for artistic purposes.

George Dickie’s “Institutional Theory” has emerged as a helpful model to think through the issues of intermediality and the garden at Les Lauves.\textsuperscript{74} As quoted in the studies of Stephanie Ross, Dickie’s theory states that works of art “are not characterized in terms of exhibited properties, but rather by reference to contextual features – aspects of the ways people respond to and treat such objects.”\textsuperscript{75} If, as I contend, Cézanne was using his garden as a means of preparatory methodology, the garden in turn must be considered a work of art. The result of this intermedial approach is that thematic motifs surface across all mediums, whether they be preparatory drawings of botanic studies, finished landscape paintings, or the consideration of the horticultural design of the garden at Les Lauves. An examination of these intermedial approaches will show a consistent garden motif across the artist’s entire \textit{oeuvre}, with a particular emphasis on the subjects of potted and cut flowers.

\textbf{The Debate about Silk: Cézanne’s use of Potted Plants}

Popular exhibition material dating from the mid to late years of Cézanne’s career (1875 onward) shows us that painted floral and still life arrangements were considered to be among the

\textsuperscript{73} Irina O. Rajewsky, “Intermediality, Intertextuality, and Remediation: A Literary Perspective on Intermediality,” \textit{Intermédiailités} no. 6 (Autumn, 2006): 47.

\textsuperscript{74} George Dickie, \textit{An Introduction to Aesthetics: An Analytic Approach} (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 50.

most praiseworthy subjects for an artist to show in the commercial sphere. According R. G. Saisselin, the end of the nineteenth century saw an increase in the public interest in “non-verbal” consumer art. What he meant by this term was that an image need not be a replication of idealized reality; more important was the aesthetic quality of the work, which acted as the main factor in attracting a consuming public. In support of this claim, art historians Charles Rosin and Henri Zerner state that towards the latter years of the nineteenth century, “the aesthetic interest [in art] shifted from the objects represented to the means of representation.” As a result, an appreciation for the impressionist and post-impressionist painting styles emerged.

Negative criticism of these two painting styles during the late nineteenth century is widely known and accepted as the general attitude towards these genres within salon settings. However, smaller and lesser known publications reviewing the impressionist salons held opinions of the artists that differ significantly from the more widely accepted and resoundingly poor reception of impressionist and post-impressionist paintings. On 3 May 1879, Charles Grandmougin reviewed the impressionist exhibition for the French publication Revue Réaliste. He wrote:

If the term impressionism, so often abused to describe dull glimpses of the Parisian suburbs, still has any validity in criticism, I would willingly apply it to the students of Français whom I was recently discussing. They have translated, with a very poetic sentiment and a very sound technique, the day dreams inspired in them by daybreak and dusk. Instead of boring themselves in front of the iron bridge at
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78 Ibid., 200.
Argenteuil which, let's face it, is of purely industrial interest, they have rushed directly to grand, unspoiled nature, unsullied by the smoke of factories and not technologised by engineers.\footnote{Ed Lilley, “Red Light on Impressionism? An Overlooked Review from 1879,” \textit{The Burlington Magazine} 149 no. 1250 (May, 2007): 327.}

Grandmougin’s sentiments in this passage demonstrates that while many associate the term impressionism with dull depictions of the Parisian suburb, it can also be a term tied to sound and even rhythmic painting techniques.

Grandmougin’s criticism proves that the reception was not entirely negative. Furthermore, there was a legitimate commercial market for these types of artistic works. Thus, Cézanne’s success in the Salon can be seen as a product of positive reception (intellectual and commercial) of the new visual aesthetic, which began with the start of the impressionist movement. Common to the impressionist painters was the subjects of landscapes or artists’ gardens. One realistic theory behind why there is heavy emphasis placed on floral elements in Cézanne’s sketchbook, then, could be that the study of this material had the most potential to generate profit amongst an impressionist base of consumers. On 30 June 1866, Cézanne wrote to his childhood friend Émile Zola (1840-1902) that he, “[was] more unhappy than ever when [he was] broke.”\footnote{A. Danchev, \textit{The Letters of Paul Cézanne} (Los Angeles: The Getty Museum, 2013), 122.} The artist is known for having an affinity for nature and spent a considerable amount of time studying from nature.\footnote{Pavel Machotka, \textit{Cézanne: Landscape into Art} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996); Sidney Geist, \textit{Interpreting Cézanne} (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988); F. Novotny, “The Late Landscape Paintings,” from \textit{Cézanne: The Late Works} (New York: The Modern Museum of Art, 1977), 107-118.} Nevertheless, it is worthwhile to consider the financial motivation of selling floral pieces at the salon, a goal that would have driven Cézanne to study these elements more intensely than he would have otherwise.\footnote{Nathalia Brodskaya, \textit{Paul Cézanne} (Germany: Parkstone International, 2011), 150: in a footnote in Brodskaya’s book \textit{Paul Cézanne}, it is stated that Cézanne sold a collection of his work to the Feydeau family after its exhibition in 1901—which is now exhibited in part at the Muse D’Orsay in Paris France.}
The availability of flowers to the artist should also be examined. The literature on Cézanne often points to his use of silk or paper flowers for the preparation of his oil paintings and still life studies. This claim is complicated, as the artist is praised both in past and present scholarship for his dedication to studying the intricacies of the natural world. While Cézanne’s handling of artificial flowers is not entirely out of the question, I aim to show that Cézanne must also have used live potted plants for both his studies and his still life motifs, as well as live flowers for many of his completed oil paintings that feature floral elements.

The idea that Cézanne used paper flowers to model his subjects can be traced to an article written by the dealer Ambroise Vollard (1866-1939) titled “Cézanne’s Studio” and has been accepted virtually without question by scholars since the publication’s debut in 1917. According to former curator of the Art Institute of Chicago, Theodore Rousseau Jr., the paper and silk flower argument is predominantly based on the time it took the artist to finish a painted work, which was a period longer than any flower’s lifespan when cut and placed in a vase. However, the production of artificial flowers during the late nineteenth century did not primarily cater to artists or their need for still life and painting props. Rather, silk, mousseline, velvet and satin flowers were hand-crafted by specialists for the specific intention of “embellishing the human body.” By 1890, the epicenter of artificial flower production shifted from Britain to France, where product demand was determined largely by which flowers were favoured for the
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86 Vollard, 107. About Cézanne’s painting practice and the amount of time it took him to complete a painted work, Vollard wrote that, “I have been told that Cézanne made slaves of his models. In fact, I know this from my own experience. From the first stroke of the brush to the end of the sitting, he treated his model as so much still life… Cézanne was lead by preference to painting apples, and still more willingly, flowers, which did not fade for he used only those of paper.”
87 Rousseau, 75.
decoration of clothing each season.\textsuperscript{89} By the late nineteenth century in France, artificial flower production for the fashion industry became so commonplace that the word \textit{fleurist} was coined to refer to a “flower maker,” differentiated from a \textit{bouquettore}, or a florist who worked with natural flowers.\textsuperscript{90} So, while it was possible for Cézanne to acquire silk and paper flowers in France, the culturally accepted purpose for such items were driven by fashion, and not by the demands of visual artists. In light of this, it seems logical to broaden the discussion surrounding the materials Cézanne may have used for the modelling of floral subjects. That the artist may have used potted plants alongside his artificial flowers for his studies is revealing to more than the artist’s preparatory practice. The implications of expanding our understanding of what the artist may have been doing with the materials within and outside of his studio, and his interaction with living plant species, includes considering a new appreciation for Cézanne’s artistic practice in terms of his desire to cultivate and control his garden spaces.

The strategies for depicting flowers in Cézanne still life paintings and studies reveal two approaches: the first follows the convention of the genre, in which cut flowers are arranged in a decorative vase. However, the second seems to be somewhat unique to Cézanne’s \textit{oeuvre}: the flowers are shown growing out of a clay pot or planter.\textsuperscript{91} During 1830’s, academic French painter Eugène Delacroix (1798-1863) began experimenting with cut flowers in his compositions.\textsuperscript{92} Delacroix was respected and admired by notable art critic Charles Baudelaire (1821-1867), who is said to have “missed no opportunity to glorify him.”\textsuperscript{93} This praise elevated

\begin{footnotes}
\item[90] Boxer, 405.
\item[91] Painter Goustave Courbet painted a still life flower arrangement titled \textit{Still Life: Apples, Pears, and Primroses on a Table} (1872) that is similar to Cézanne’s works titled \textit{Pot de fleurs sur une table} (1878-1880) and \textit{Pot de primévères et fruits} (188-1890); all feature a potted primrose plant.
\item[92] Clair A. P. Willsdon, \textit{Impressionist Gardens} (London: Thames & Hudson Ltd., 2010), 22.
\end{footnotes}
the status of Delacroix’s academic still life paintings from an arguably mundane practice to one of popularity and esteem amongst the critics. By 1850, cut flowers in vases or containers became fully adopted into the still life schema, and potted flowers often accompanied scenes of outdoor garden spaces.\textsuperscript{94}

Nonetheless, it should be noted that potted plants were common elements in garden scenes. They were in this period nearly always portrayed along with a human figure, or incorporated as one element contributing to the surrounding natural landscape.\textsuperscript{95} Cézanne’s potted plants, however, are very often portrayed unaccompanied and isolated from the wider landscape, making them a garden still life rather than a garden landscape composition. Cézanne had completed dozens of cut flower still life paintings throughout his lifetime that followed the same standards as his fellow artists, but I argue that his treatment of potted plants is meaningful. Cézanne used potted plants like his contemporaries used arrangements of cut flowers in vases as subjects for decorative still life. It is curious that scholars have not acknowledged the interchangeability of Cézanne’s cut and potted flower arrangements in his paintings.\textsuperscript{96} What follows is an investigation of the artist’s emphasis on the potted plant and the abundance of still life paintings featuring flowers, cut, pruned, and artfully arranged in vases. Crucially, the same flowers can be found both in garden planters as well as in ornate still life arrangements, which suggests that the source of these subjects was the artist’s own garden rather than an artificial substitute.

\textsuperscript{94} Willsdon, 23.
\textsuperscript{95} An example of the incorporation of potted plants within the garden setting, accompanied by a portrait sitter can be demonstrated through the 1888-1889 work titled Geraniums by Frederick Childe Hassam.
In order to explore this theory, I will conduct a formal analysis of the drawings, studies, painted works and materials available to the artist both within and outside of his studio. A good starting point for this analysis is the geranium, painted at various times by the artist throughout his residence in Provence and are depicted as potted plants. Interestingly, this plant is also frequently spotted in the vase arrangements for which Cézanne is so well known. Across the span of his career, Cézanne drew, studied, and painted the geranium on numerous occasions. Able to withstand drought and dry weather conditions, this perennial breed of flower blooms outdoors throughout the warmer summer months. In France, the geranium is capable of surviving throughout the colder, wetter months, especially when transplanted from garden soil to a potted bed container. When transplanted from soil to potted environments, using a foundation of gravel, a controlled micro-environment is achieved. This keeps the circulation of air and moisture at the correct balance for plant sustainment. The diverse conditions in which the geranium can be grown is appealing for the artist on the move, as the plant is fairly transportable and is able to thrive in a contained micro-environment. Cézanne’s studies of the flower are detailed and range from the examination of single planted flowerpots, as seen in the watercolour works titled Geraniums (fig. 8) and Pot of Geraniums (fig. 9), to the watercolour sketches depicting a collection of flowering plants, like Pots of Geraniums (fig. 10) and Flower Pots (fig. 11). In a catalogue entry for the Musée D’Orsay that describes the artist’s fascination with the geranium, Jean-Gilles Berizzi even suggests that Cézanne retreated to his family home at Jas de

97 Sally Roth and Jane Courtier, *Essential Perennials for Every Garden* (China: Toucan Books Ltd., 2015), 143.
98 Roth & Courtier, 47.
100 I propose that when Cézanne moved between Paris and Provence, he may have brought along with him some of his potted plant specimen, as they would be capable of surviving multiple long distance trips.
Bouffan in Aix during the colder winter months in order to study the plant in the gardener’s greenhouse.¹⁰¹

Cézanne’s preoccupation with the geranium plant is not solely demonstrated in his sketchbook and watercolour studies. Potted Plants (fig. 12), for example, is a work that features an outdoor shelf holding five large flower planters. In the bottom left foreground of the composition, one pot is dedicated to geraniums. The distinctive rounded green leaves of the plant are also identifiable in the center background and upper middle portions of the work, which creates a visual harmony in the composition through the repetition of shape and colour. The appearance of the geranium across Cézanne’s oeuvre in combination with the knowledge that Cézanne’s family greenhouse cultivated the plant during the winter months, does more than merely establish an interest in documenting the plant and its importance as a study aid to the artist. It reveals that Cézanne had the means and access to learn how to cultivate the plant. Additionally, it also demonstrates the artist’s unrestricted access to the geranium plant; a point which may add onto Vollard’s initial observation that Cézanne primarily used silk and paper flowers as models for his paintings and drawings.¹⁰² By expanding the parameters of Vollard’s conclusion to potentially include fresh flowers as modelling material, entirely new claims can be made about Cézanne’s methods and practice, especially with respect to the purpose of his garden. To take a positive step toward these new claims, an inventory of the plants included by Cézanne in his still life paintings should be taken so that a proper comparison can be made to his


¹⁰² Here I must interject and say that I do not disagree that Cézanne used silk flowers to model some elements of his still life compositions, and that Vollard’s observations should be heavily considered, as he was Cézanne’s dealer and a contact close to the Cézanne family. However, I do believe that by adding onto Vollard’s observations, a more complete understanding of the artist’s practice will come to light.
botanical studies. Take, for example, the 1873 still life entitled *Géraniums et pieds-d'alouette dans un petit vase de Delft* (fig. 13). Red and white geraniums are depicted painted in a blue vase, alongside violet *pieds-d'alouette*, or larkspur flowers, amidst the recognizably rounded leaves of the geranium plant. When examining this painting, should not the numerous aforementioned studies of potted geraniums completed by the artist be taken into consideration as preparatory work? If the artist, infatuated by nature, had an abundant supply of fresh flowers on hand, which the sheer number of realistically rendered watercolours, drawings, and oil studies suggest, it follows that he used and may even have favoured these over the artificial substitutes when modelling his still life works.

**Cézanne’s Familiarity with Eighteenth-Century Landscapes**

In addition to the prominence of still life painting in the early stages of Cézanne’s creative years, the artist studied and experimented with landscape scenes. Whether the artist was working out of Paris or Provence, public green space appears to be a prevalent motif within the artist’s work. Given Cézanne’s association with the impressionist group, this comes as no surprise. Cézanne had tight personal relationships with impressionist painters and, although he did not identify personally as an impressionist, while in Provence Cézanne often corresponded with and painted alongside Renoir\(^\text{103}\), Camille Pissarro (1830-1903)\(^\text{104}\), and Monet.\(^\text{105}\) While studying in Paris, Cézanne routinely joined the impressionist group at *le Jardin des Tuileries*


\(^{104}\) Becks-Malorny, 20-24: The relationship between Cézanne and Pissarro was interesting, as Cézanne would spend weeks at a time visiting with Pissarro at Pontoise to learn his painting technique.

\(^{105}\) A. Danchev, 218: Although the surviving correspondences are not as strong or frequent between Cézanne and Monet as other individuals, Cézanne had a great respect for Monet. In a letter to Joachim Gasquet on July 8, 1902, Cézanne stated that “I despise all living painters, except Renoir and Monet.”
where they painted *en plein air*.\textsuperscript{106} This association with the impressionists may assist in explaining Cézanne’s early interest in the depiction of urban Parisian green spaces, as they favoured natural scenes of contemporary French life.\textsuperscript{107}

Alongside the impressionist movement, the nineteenth century brought about the expansion of urban Paris. With urban expansion came the integration of green spaces designed to be accessible to the public.\textsuperscript{108} In an effort to improve the aesthetics of Paris, which in this period was reeling from urban expansion, Emperor Napoleon III (1808-1873) wanted Paris to have an elaborate and noteworthy public park to compete with other European metropolitan centers, mainly London, England. According to garden historian Louise Wickham, accessible green spaces were introduced to counteract the process of urban expansion and the spread of an overall impoverished Parisian aesthetic. Inspired by the grandness of Hyde Park in London, Napoleon III insisted that every opportunity to create public green spaces should be seized.\textsuperscript{109} While the establishment of parks and green spaces did not fully address the negative effects of increased urbanity, it did provide an outlet for the public, which improved the general quality of metropolitan life.\textsuperscript{110} For his first public project, Napoleon III tasked the prefect of the Seine Department in France, an administrative body that oversaw Paris and the surrounding area, Baron Georges-Eugène Haussmann (1809-1901) with reconstructing the *Bois de Boulogne*, an expansive park covering nearly 845 hectares situated three kilometers west of Paris’ urban slums (fig. 14).\textsuperscript{111} This commission activated a significant period of government-funded garden

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\item Laura D. Corey et al, *The Art of the Louvre’s Tuileries Garden* (New Haven: University of Yale Press, 2014), 84.
\item Pinkney, 95.
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projects, with one significant design departure, which was specific to the period of the Second Empire: namely, these gardens were not designed in a traditionally French style. Generally, when nineteenth-century French garden aesthetic is discussed within the debate, the French formal jardin a la Français, which is located in the heart of Paris, occupies the pinnacle of design. This style, originally introduced in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and exemplified most notably with le jardin des Tuileries, was landscaped by King Louis XIV (1638-1715) and his gardener André Le Nôtre (1613-1700). The garden is mathematically symmetrical in design and is structured through an overarching grid plan. In addition to these formal elements, the floral components of the garden were maintained to be neat in structure.

While the gardens of Second Empire Paris were maintained by the local government, they did not follow the stylistic guidelines of the French manner. Hired as the head landscape designer for the Bois de Boulogne, Louis-Sulpice Varé (1803-1883) implemented the English romantic garden style in his designs. Characterized by a natural or “wild” aesthetic, the English romantic style is typically referred to as an informal or “overgrown” garden style. Scholar of eighteenth-century landscape theory, Rolland Munroe claims that “The Romantic [landscape] glories in darkly mysterious grottoes and thinly wooded precipices of rock, with little

112 Jardin a la Français directly translates from French to mean “garden in the French manner” in English; Corey et al, 43.
113 Laura D. Corey et al, The Art of the Louvre’s Tuileries Garden (Atlanta: Yale University Press, 2013), 38; Helen M. Fox, André Le Nôtre: Garden Architect to Kings (New York: Crown Publishers Inc., 1963): André Nôtre was born at the Palace of Versailles in 1613, and was the head architect and gardener to the King Louis XIV of France. Nôtre revolutionized the French garden by structuring the Tuileries garden in such a way that broke apart the flatness of the land with shrub and tree clusters for a symmetrical visual experience.
115 Adams, 75.
116 Pinkney, 96.
117 Pinkney, 95.
more than a Gothic 'ruin', a Swiss Cottage, or a hidden Hermit hut to offer refuge.”¹¹⁹ One explanation for why Varé’s design made such a significant departure from the norm could have been the involvement of Scottish garden architect Thomas Blaikie (1751-1838), who originally designed Bois de Boulogne. In 1778, Blaikie was commissioned to build a jardin Anglais within the Bagatelle section of the Bois de Boulogne, which would primarily be composed of English shrubbery, a pavilion, trees, and numerous planted flowers.¹²⁰ In 1783, Blaikie’s garden at the Bois de Boulogne became the highpoint of public interest when the Grand Duke Paul of Russia (1754-1801) visited and commended the garden’s design.¹²¹ Perhaps, then, looking back at the once vibrant Bois de Boulogne, Varé took note of Blaikie’s successful design, ultimately implementing the same garden style in other areas of the park that were being redesigned for Napoleon III. But this connection to English garden design has been lost and, while Napoleon III’s redesign of Parisian spaces were meant to reflect the “new” French garden, it is entirely reasonable to suppose that this design was, in part, a revival.

The opportunity to enjoy public green spaces provided by the government of the Second Empire especially benefitted artists seeking en plein air painting practices; phenomena often associated with the Barbizon and impressionist schools of art.¹²² For the impressionist painters, accessible parks offered “a contemplation of the wider landscape.”¹²³ Specifically, the impressionists favoured the paysages intimes, or intimate landscapes, of enclosed garden spaces, highlighting the separation between the goodness of green space and the outside world.¹²⁴

¹²⁰ Taylor, 60.
¹²¹ Taylor, 85: Here, though, it should be noted that the while the success of Blaikie’s design reached its peak in 1783, its popularity began to fade at the turn of the century.
¹²³ Willsdon, 17.
¹²⁴ Willsdon, 22.
Utilizing spaces such as le Jardin des Tuileries offered artists a taste of idealized nature, while giving their works a sense of relativity to a Parisian audience. As for Cézanne’s own studio garden at Les Lauves, the symbolic separation of the private garden (which in his late life could even be called a sacred garden, owing his newly found religiosity) from the outside world was quite literal, as the half-acre plot of land is physically enclosed by a stone wall surrounding the property.\textsuperscript{125} The privacy of the artist’s own paysages intimes suited him well, as he was known for craving privacy while he worked and studied. According to Vollard, Cézanne was quoted as saying “when I think, I must have quietude.”\textsuperscript{126} The similarities between the painting practices of the impressionists and Cézanne are striking, and it may well be that Cézanne’s interactions with the group early in his career shaped his interest in studying from nature.

To support my claim that Cézanne’s studies were influenced in part by the impressionist practice, I will consider Cézanne’s painting of the Bois de Boulogne. Like Édouard Manet (1832-1883) Cézanne painted a scene depicting a luncheon set in this location.\textsuperscript{127} By studying the aesthetic dynamic of the Bois de Boulogne, the artist built a visual repository of romantic garden references that would be incorporated into the design of his own property at les Lauves. What is curious is that this period of government-funded garden (re)design, using eighteenth-century landscape theory, has been overlooked in considering this period of urban renewal. This means that past royal gardens frequented by artists, such as the Tuileries, are often thought of and discussed, despite evidence that gardens were informed by other stylistic traditions.

\textsuperscript{125} Boime, 558.
\textsuperscript{126} Vollard, 111.
\textsuperscript{127} Refer to Manet’s oil on canvas work titled Le Déjeuner sur l’herbe from 1863 (fig. 15) and Cézanne’s oil on canvas work Le Déjeuner sur l’herbe from ca. 1876 (fig. 16).
Making Connections: Chemin des Lauves and the Parisian Garden

Describing the naturalistic elements of Cézanne’s property at Chemin des Lauves, garden critic and writer Derek Fell recently wrote:

[Cézanne’s] idea of a garden did not envision contrived garden spaces filled with alien plants or such rigid control over nature. He recognized the need for a wall to screen himself and his garden from the outside world; he needed paths to walk around his property… but he wanted a garden as close to nature as possible, short of its becoming a jungle of weeds or a neglected wilderness.\(^{128}\)

Acknowledging the artist’s familiarity with the Parisian aesthetic and eighteenth-century romantic landscape design, Cézanne’s path-filled garden in fact reflects a more controlled environment. After all, the eighteenth-century ‘natural’ landscapes were just as contrived and manipulated as their French counterparts. As such, it is now possible to bridge Cézanne’s knowledge of Second Empire garden elements with the artist’s own garden at Chemin des Lauves. Cézanne’s green spaces at Les Lauves were planned, reflecting eighteenth-century garden design that, nevertheless, required rigid control and premeditated choices made by the artist while governing over his landscape.

This type of controlled landscape is exemplified in the Serpentine garden. Popular for its “natural and English style,” this garden relied heavily on the strategic planting of horticultural elements in lines that snake around the space.\(^{129}\) Although known to have a natural aesthetic, eighteenth-century gardens more often than not relied on the manipulation of landscape to


produce a natural appearance. This is especially noted by historian Joan Clifford, who wrote about the famous landscape gardener Lancelot “Capability” Brown (1716-1783).\footnote{Turner, 26; Joan Clifford, Capability Brown: An Illustrated Life of Lancelot Brown 1716-1783 (London: Shire Publications Ltd., 1974), 7; Lancelot “Capability” Brown (1716-1783) was a widely popular English landscape designer, holding the position of Royal Gardener at Hampton Court on the Thames, in London, England. His garden designs were praised for their dedication to “artfully controlling” nature, planting gardens as they would appear in an idealized landscape painting.}

Where nature failed, Brown acted. If there were insufficient contours, he moved earth to make them; where no water existed, it was introduced; where no trees grew, new plantations would be placed.\footnote{Clifford, 15.}

A tremendous amount of physical labour, resources, and landscape manoeuvering contributed to the ‘natural’ look of the English school of gardening. Brown, William Kent (1685-1748), and Humphry Repton, (1752-1818), among others\footnote{Jane Brown, The Art and Architecture of English Gardens: Designs for the Gardens from The Collection of the Royal Institute of British Architects 1609 to the Present Day (New York: Rizzoli International Publications Inc., 1989), 44-48: Humphry Repton (1752-1818) was the successor of “Capability” Brown. He also believed in the picturesque landscape movement, and implemented a similar design style in his gardens. Repton is notable for his contribution to landscape architecture through his Red Book series; a comprehensive and interactive collection of bound design books that included watercolours of potential properties Repton would redesign. The books had designs specific to individual properties within the English countryside, and Repton was the first to include a layer of removable parchment that revealed what the property would like before and after his redesign of the space.} wanted beholders to experience their designs like they would a landscape painting.\footnote{One significant publication during this period related to the picturesque movement is Edmund Burke’s 1753 A Philosophical Inquiry into the Origins of the Sublime and the Beautiful. This text outlines the parameters of beauty, setting the tone for the picturesque movement to reflect similar ideals.} The result was picturesque (picture-like), which William Gilpin (1724-1804) theorized as being between the beautiful and the sublime, and included rough textures as well as smooth lines that created visual interest.\footnote{Watkin, 67.} Like Cézanne’s Les Lauves, the English garden was designed to have the appearance of being untouched by man.\footnote{Watkin, 89-91: Here it should be noted that within landscape design, a return to traditional methods of gardening occurs after the mid 1790’s, and popularity picturesque gardens dissipates.}

An examination of the plan of Chemin des Lauves (fig. 17) reveals some key areas.

Similarities between traditional Parisian garden designs, including \emph{le Jardin des Tuileries}, and
the structural elements Cézanne’s private garden space at Les Lauves, are evident. Central to the garden plan is the terraced courtyard, accompanied by the artist’s newly built studio and refurbished cottage, which was original to the property. The south and west walls of the hillside garden are barred by the Verdon Canal and the property consists of a series of walking paths that open into large clearings. Fell describes Cézanne’s property as “perfect - a walled space to create a secluded naturalistic garden like no other, and beyond its walls a natural landscape unmatched anywhere in France.” However, this garden borrows from two main styles of French landscape design; it is spatially reminiscent of de Nôtre’s formal designs made famous by the Jardin de Tuileries, but also possesses elements of romantic green spaces seen elsewhere in Paris during the Second Empire.

Shown in a plan of the Tuileries from 1880 (fig. 18), the garden is a network of passageways that open up into pockets of large clearings, most of which are enclosed within the confines of trees and planted shrubberies. Much like Les Lauves, the Tuileries is also delineated by a walled and terraced south end, which looks out onto the River Seine. The entire Tuileries property can be broken down into a series of quinconce plans. A quinconce garden plan is a grid-like design that highlights five evenly distributed focal points in symmetrical form, with one centrally-placed focal point. Applied to Chemin des Lauves, an interpretation of the quinconce garden design is present. Using the octagonal basin as the central point of interest for the Tuileries plan, comparison of the two quinconce designs reveal the following similarities. First,

---
136 Philip Consibee and Denis Coutagne, Cézanne in Provence (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 230: this work states that there was a cottage already present on the property and that Cézanne had the studio built beside the cottage – although he never used the cottage for personal living quarters, the cottage served as extra storage space for Cézanne’s canvases and artistic materials.
137 Fell, 15.
138 Corey et al, 63.
139 Corey, 21.
the central point of interest at *Chemin des Lauves* is the courtyard. On the northern end of the
garden, the clearings on either side of the bamboo walk are two evenly spaced symmetrical
points, while at the *Tuileries* these two points are the round and semi-rounded clearings on the
north end of the plan. The final two points of symmetry can be identified as the areas labelled
“benches” and “amphitheatre” on the plan for *Les Lauves*, and as the round and semi-rounded
clearings on the south end of the *Tuileries* plan. While the actual function of the two gardens
may not serve the same purpose, it is remarkable how similar they are in design. I argue that the
structure at *Les Lauves* could be understood as appropriation of Parisian green spaces. Cézanne’s
plan becomes an homage to his time spent in Paris, but also clearly followed a plan.

Despite departing in its aesthetic, the garden follows the basic organization of the *jardin
a la Français*, which means that it has a place among nineteenth-century garden design. It is
vital to include in this discussion Cézanne’s use of English landscape, characterized for its
unkempt and wild appearance. One method of gaining a new perspective on this topic is to
review Cézanne’s familiarity with elements of romantic and picturesque garden theories through
his artistic endeavors. Albert Boime once wrote that Cézanne “[addresses] his deepest inclination
to exploit his visual genius to bring the topographical features of his native landscape into some
kind of aesthetic harmony.”\(^\text{140}\) This statement rings true with respect to Cézanne’s cultivation of
the surrounding land at *Les Lauves*, but Boime’s analysis can also be applied to the garden.

Biome’s words resonate most clearly with the modelled landscape of the northern garden
at *Les Lauves*. Now featuring hand rails, fashioned of bamboo, the wooded pathways of the
northern garden at *Chemin des Lauves* are canopied by tree branches above and local vegetation

\(^{140}\) Boime, 558.
below. While it may appear that the northern garden is without human intervention, the canopied
dirt path is a motif with which Cézanne was quite familiar. The artist took particular interest in
“shredding,” the process by which sunlight penetrated the canopy of trees. Repton wrote about
this technique, claiming that artists should carefully study the effect of shredding on matured
trees rather than saplings, as the modelling of sunlight on larger trees has the ability to cast a
certain purple hue of light that is described as imitating the “picturesque.” Evaluating Repton’s
writings about the picturesque, along with his known interest in creating landscapes as paintings,
it is worthwhile to consider Cézanne’s garden under the same lens. Cézanne’s use of shredding at
Les Lauves may reflect Repton’s advice. Remarkably, a common motif in Cézanne’s landscape
paintings in both Parisian and Provençal forest settings, the shredding is rendered with a purple
hue. In examining Cézanne’s catalogue raisonné, it is evident that he painted a series of works
that feature a narrow walking path in combination with mature trees on either side. Relative to
his finished paintings, works such as The Clearing (fig. 1), In The Grounds of Chateau Noir (fig.
19), Snow Melting at Fontainebleau (fig. 20), and Landscape (fig. 7) echo the artist’s desire to
document winding pathways canopied with a patchwork of trees and broken light. The use of
shadow in these works is overwhelmingly present, lending to the viewer the painted illusion of
shredded sunlight along numerous walking pathways. In all of these examples, the purple hue is
apparent.

This motif is also present within Cézanne’s watercolours studies and sketches. One
watercolour in particular titled Le Château de Fontainebleau delicately treats the purple, ochre,

---

141 Humphry Repton, “Fragments on the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening: Fragment XXII of Aspects
and Prospects: From a Report Concerning the Situation For Walwood House, to be erected on a property in the
142 Repton, 109-110.
green and gray hues present under the shredded canopy of the Fontainebleau Forest. Because the shredding motif is found repeatedly in both his studies and finished works, Cézanne may have sought to replicate this motif within his own property. Cézanne purchased *Les Lauves* in order to continue his studies, and with the forested area of the northern garden, Cézanne was able to work with a motif that he presumably found intriguing and, as Boime so eloquently observed, brought it into harmony with the topographical features of his native landscape. As for the pathways that are linked throughout Cézanne’s green space, I propose that the artist constructed them from the numerous images of forest shredding he completed in his many paintings and studies. Therefore, Cézanne’s northern garden is a prime example of how the artist took the natural landscape, considered his artistic motives, and manipulated the space in order to reflect his appreciation of landscape.

It seems that Cézanne has not been given sufficient credit with respect to his botanical studies and his knowledge of horticultural practice and design. Discovering Cézanne’s sources of inspiration for the creation of *Chemin des Lauves*, may in fact demonstrate that the artist had a greater degree of control over the landscape. This, added to his particular interest in specific garden elements, such as potted plants, challenges the notion that Cézanne was a passive participant in his ‘natural’ garden. This chapter demonstrates how Cézanne studied meticulously every aspect of his artistic process, and his garden at *Les Lauves* was no exception.
Chapter 2

A Garden of Emotions: Fiquet Cézanne, the Daisy, and the Hydrangea

For if what you love is absent, none the less
Its images are there, and the sweet name
Sounds in your ears. Ah, cursed images!143

Lucretius

Paul Cézanne had an affinity for poetry that went beyond academic appreciation. The artist is said to have cited the lines of ancient poets from memory, and had a keen interest in the works of Lucretius.144 Lucretius (99 BC-55 BC) was a Roman poet and philosopher who contemplated “sex, cosmology, meteorology, and geology” through his writings, all of which were subjects that fascinated Cézanne.145 But his connection to Lucretius was, in part, a way to cope with the intensity of his emotions. From his early years as a student in Aix, Cézanne considered himself to be a poet over a painter, taking the subjects of love, life, and emotion to paper in methods alternative to drawing.146 The artist wrote countless unpublished poems in his letters to his boyhood friend, Emile Zola. In terms of nineteenth-century inspiration, Cézanne favoured the work of fellow poet Charles Baudelaire.147 Much like Baudelaire, Cézanne’s poetic style could be characterized as erotically charged fantasy, and often drew upon delightful

143 A. Danchev, The Letters of Paul Cézanne (Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum, 2013), 17: Cézanne admired Lucretius as one of his favourite poets; Danchev cites Cézanne paraphrasing the epic poem De Rerum Natura (The Nature of Things) in a letter to Emile Zola in 1885.
144 Conversations with Cézanne, 205.
145 Alex Danchev, Cézanne: A Life (New York: Pantheon Books, 20212), 231.
146 John Rewald, Paul Cézanne’s Letters (New York: Da Capo, 1995), 25: An example of this can be seen in a letter written by Cézanne to Emile Zola on July 19, 1858, where Cézanne writes an entire list of rhyming words that can be used in boutis-rimés poems, or poems that end in rhymes. According to Rewald’s research, Cézanne and Zola frequently sent boutis-rimés to each other through letters.
147 Cézanne’s favourite novel was Fleurs du Mal – a collection of poems by Charles Baudelaire; A. Danchev, 26.
metaphors of nature and beautiful women.\textsuperscript{148} Despite the extensive collection of poems by the artist that express his desire for tenderness and passion, today Cézanne is envisaged as an introvert who lived peacefully and without the need for companionship, particularly near the end of his career.\textsuperscript{149} This statement may be true on some levels, but Cézanne’s correspondence suggest a side of the artist that is more regularly forgotten than acknowledged.\textsuperscript{150} This has contributed to the commonly-held belief that his marriage to Marie-Hortense Fiquet was devoid of love or emotional attachment.\textsuperscript{151} As this chapter will reveal, there is evidence in his \textit{oeuvre} of sentimentality and more.

The first chapter of this thesis advanced key arguments related to the significance of the garden that went beyond the artist’s reflection and inspiration. It established the garden as a physical space that recalled Cézanne’s past experiences, which could also change with Cézanne’s developing needs as an artist. Acknowledging Cézanne’s intermediality revealed the materials, spaces, studies, and concepts that Cézanne drew upon to aid in his artistic endeavours. An intermedial approach will also be beneficial to this chapter, as the emotional landscape of Cézanne’s garden can also be explored. Evaluating the appearance of Cézanne’s wife across

\textsuperscript{148} For example, Cézanne draws on his fascination with nature in an unpublished poem he wrote in a letter to Zola on April 9, 1858, Cézanne wrote: Its foggy; dark and wet; and the pale sun; no longer shines; dazzling us; with tis ruby and opal fire.

\textsuperscript{149} Theodore Rousseau Jr., \textit{Cézanne: Paintings, Watercolours, and Drawings} (Chicago: Art Institute of Chicago, 1951), 41.

\textsuperscript{150} Numerous publications have the correspondences included in them. Central to this study are: A. Danchev, \textit{The Letters of Paul Cézanne} (Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum, 2013); Alex Danchev, \textit{Cézanne: A Life} (New York: Pantheon Books, 2012); John Rewald, Paul Cézanne’s Letters (New York: Da Capo, 1995).

\textsuperscript{151} Roger Fry, \textit{Cézanne: A Study of His Development} (New York: The MacMillon Company, 1927), 83: Fry gives an at length description of Cézanne’s interest in females, but makes no mention of the marriage to Fiquet Cézanne – except to comment on her physical attributes and unlikable personality.
various mediums, will offer new opportunities to look at the artist’s *oeuvre* in relation to the connection between the garden and his emotions.  

I will first examine the portraits made of Fiquet Cézanne by her husband between 1876 and 1890, which situate the sitter indoors and then in the garden. Following this, the garden will be examined as an emotional landscape, wherein the artist attached symbolic meaning. Through these examples, the nineteenth-century poetic language of flowers and the subtle, symbolic gestures of floral motif will be explored to draw out Cézanne’s awareness of who he was painting, and how this would have affected his interpretation of the garden as a whole. Through close analysis of sketchbook drawings, as well as finished and unfinished works by the artist this chapter will demonstrate the need to re-interpret Cézanne’s *oeuvre* by considering the complexities of the artist’s personal relationships.

When discussing the relationship between the artist and his garden, it is important to examine the subjects he depicted within the garden setting. During the last 25 years or so of his career (1880-1906), Cézanne fixated on the garden as a subject. However, the research I have conducted shows that the artist depicted remarkably few human sitters within the garden space, despite his interest in making portraits. These included close friend and French art collector Victor Chocquet (1821-1891), who appears in only one garden portrait (*Portrait de Victor Chocquet*, 1889; fig. 21), Cézanne’s gardener Vallier, and Fiquet Cézanne, both of whom appear multiple times in the intimate garden space. This portrait practice has been little studied.

---

152 Hither forth I will address Marie-Hortense Fiquet Cézanne as Fiquet Cézanne. In the past, scholars have tended to address Fiquet Cézanne by her first name, Hortense, instead of by her last name, as her male counterparts have been. It is significant to use ‘Fiquet Cézanne’ in this way to establish equality, as not to refer to her as a mere woman associated with a male artist.

153 Cézanne’s entire painted collection has been filtered into an online catalogue raisonné under the direction of Walter Feilchenfeld, Jayne Warman and David Nash. I have used this catalogue to compare Cézanne’s portraiture throughout this chapter, and the web link can be found here: http://www.cezannecatalogue.com/page/?id=project.
has been only a handful of scholars that consider Fiquet Cézanne’s contributions to the artist’s work overall.154 My research underscores her presence (and persistence) in Cézanne’s artwork and life, despite the urge to focus on the aspects of their relationship which make some critics feel uneasy. The goal of this chapter is not to reconcile their relationship to standards unprepared to deal with them as a couple and, instead, draws connections between the portraits of Fiquet Cézanne and the garden paintings of Cézanne’s late career. This chapter, like others in this thesis, will challenge the notion that Cézanne’s garden was cultivated through a mere appreciation of the natural world. Rather, this chapter aims to uncover the cultural, symbolic, and deeply personal roots of the garden at Les Lauves by following the patterns he clearly set through the portraits he painted of his wife. In light of these patterns, I argue that Cézanne’s garden performed not only a preparatory function, but also had a sentimental purpose.

Who was Marie-Hortense Fiquet Cézanne?

Fiquet Cézanne and Cézanne did not have a conventional relationship. They met in Paris in 1869, and from that point forward they entered an exclusive relationship with one another.155 Cézanne’s father, Louis-Auguste Cézanne (1798-1886), fully supported his son’s decision to relocate to Paris in pursuit of his artistic career. He provided his son with a monthly allowance as a means of ensuring his well-being.156 Monsieur Cézanne, however, did not approve of the lifestyle he believed the Parisian artist lead. That is to say, he did not encourage providing women with housing or money without marriage. If he had discovered his son’s relationship with

Fiquet Cézanne, he would have had reason to revoke his monthly allowance, leaving Cézanne without a source of income. Though the couple did not marry until 1886, they shared a son, Paul (1872-1947), and Cézanne referred to Fiquet Cézanne as Madame Cézanne in his correspondence. For these reasons, Fiquet Cézanne’s connection to the Cézanne family was viewed as illegitimate by his family members. It may have also influenced the later discourse about the artist, as scholars did not seem to understand the nature of Fiquet Cézanne and Cézanne’s life together.

In the past, scholars have not given Fiquet Cézanne much serious attention. There is a trend to defame Fiquet Cézanne’s character, supported by the characterization of her by men close to the post-impressionist art movement of the late nineteenth century. Father Marie-Alain Couturier (life dates unknown), for example, who was a friend of Henri Matisse (1869-1954), openly degraded Fiquet Cézanne by comparing her family’s economic status to her lack of education and knowledge of art.157 Speaking of both Fiquet Cézanne and Madame Aline Charigot Renoir (1859-1915; m. 1890–1915), Couturier said, “these women of simple background serve their heroes as one might judge a simple carpenter who has taken it into his head to construct tables with legs in the air.”158 This emphasis on the humble beginnings of these artists’ wives also suggests that Fiquet Cézanne could not properly comprehend her husband’s genius and may also imply that he ought to be the “hero” of her life. But the influence of these and other comments must be tempered, particularly when weighed against the artist’s treatment of Fiquet Cézanne in his work. Art Historian Roger Fry went so far as to write that she was a “sour-looking bitch of a Madame,” and that neither the artist, nor his friends, took particular

158 Ibid.
interest in her company. Fry’s remark is contrary to an article in the *Gazette des Beaux Arts* from November of 1860, which was written by Cézanne’s niece, Paule Conil (1885-1978). She wrote that Fiquet Cézanne was not well liked by Cézanne’s mother, and, as such, her character had not been portrayed in a positive light. Conil states that she, in fact, had the ability to engage company in conversation, had a good sense of humour, and was exceptionally patient in her demeanour. This outlook on Fiquet Cézanne’s personality has been perpetuated through a combination of the hearsay of Cézanne’s male friends, which has been documented by journalists of the nineteenth century and early scholars in the discourse who have recycled these quotations without the support of concrete evidence. This type of miscommunication can be seen particularly with the lack of context given to the quotes about Fiquet Cézanne that come directly from the artist himself. For example, Cézanne’s quip, “My wife loves only Switzerland and Lemonade,” has been read as insulting of her birthplace, which was close to the French-Swiss border. But clearly there is room for interpretation in this and other comments, from tongue in cheek to affectionate speculation; after all, what is wrong with simply liking lemonade?

As only two letters written by Fiquet Cézanne survive, and there has been little attempt to track the details of her life, it is difficult to discern which characteristics have been crafted through impressionistic scholarship, and which have been drawn from reality. Nevertheless, where many scholars see a stern and unmoved woman used as a model, I see something different. My knowledge of the importance Cézanne placed on the language of flowers communicates a tenderness between husband and wife that has gone unnoticed. There is,

---

159 Amory, 95.
160 Butler, 78.
162 Danchev, 34.
furthermore, an intimacy that can be seen in the portraits of Fiquet Cézanne, which should be associated with the private domesticity that existed between her and her husband, particularly at Les Lauves. I first saw this in the gentle rendering of Fiquet Cézanne’s eyes in the work Portrait of Madame Cézanne (1886), which are, under closer scrutiny, far less stern looking than critics have claimed. There is also, quite frankly, a rather blatant sexist rhetoric that embodies twentieth-century research pertaining to Cézanne’s personal life. Recent scholarship has reflected a shift in the desire to understand Fiquet Cézanne role. Contrary to conventional wisdom, she is well represented within Cézanne’s sketchbook drawings and portraiture studies. She was the subject of at least thirty known portraits completed by her husband between the years 1877 and 1894. What may have caused some confusion is that unlike other partners of great modern artists, who may have struggled alongside their partners, Fiquet Cézanne was not dependant on Cézanne financially. He did not become wealthy until quite late in his career, all the while Fiquet Cézanne worked as a book binder. For extra money, she also occasionally modelled for other artists, which she did even before meeting Cézanne in Paris. The artist feared that his father, the sole supplier of his income, would not approve of his supporting a child out of wedlock, which would leave Cézanne, Fiquet Cézanne, and their son with no money. Instead of coming to terms with this possibility, the artist kept his relationship with Fiquet Cézanne hidden from his parents until fourteen years after their son’s birth. She received little of the allowance Cézanne was given by his father. An artist companion, who did not require

163 Refer to footnote 8 for a list of scholars with relevant research.
164 Susan Sidlauskas, Cézanne’s Other (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2009), 2.
165 Butler, 41.
166 A. Danchev, 153.
167 Danchev, 160-167: In a letter written to Émile Zola on March 23, 1878, Cézanne states that he is in risk of losing his entire allowance from his father, after he discovers Fiquet Cézanne and their son’s existence. He explicitly states in his next letter dated March 28 1878, which was addressed to Zola, that his allowance would be reduced from 200 francs to 100 francs monthly, and he would not be able to send any money to Fiquet Cézanne or Paul, their son.
financial support from her partner, but nevertheless remained his lifelong companion, may have
seemed peculiar to some critics.

Based on these factors, it follows that there must be more to the relationship between
Cézanne and Fiquet Cézanne than meets the eye. To view her in a new light, it is crucial that
scholars consider all elements of Cézanne’s artistic endeavours. Art historian Susan Sidlauskas
does this by explaining Fiquet Cézanne’s role in Cézanne’s paintings through the artist’s use of
colour and form. Sidlauskas wrote:

Fiquet Cézanne was not painted as a beautiful woman, as we are often told. And this absence of beauty is matched by a pointed lack of painterly virtuosity. Cézanne trumps the expectation that a woman’s beauty is reflected in the painter’s ability to paint beautifully. Defying the usual, flattering use of colour in portraiture, he insisted upon colour’s potential to convey other, more complex meanings.\(^{168}\)

Following the lead of Sidlauskas, my work moves toward concentrating on the individual complexities of works representing Fiquet Cézanne as a means of gleaning their significance. This will help to recuperate her significance, personally as well as professionally. For example, we know that she was involved in Cézanne’s business affairs.\(^{169}\) Though we may not know why these erroneous perceptions still exist, I believe it fitting to reconsider the grounds for which her reputation is evaluated. As such, Fiquet Cézanne’s portraits will be analyzed under the same criteria as Cézanne’s other sitters.

\(^{168}\) Sidlauskas, 79.
\(^{169}\) Danchev, 354: In a letter addressed to Emile Bernard on September 10, 1905, Fiquet Cézanne wrote a document on behalf of her husband as a means of conducting business with Bernard. This letter was in regards to Bernard’s commission of 25 drawings by Cézanne, and the letter indicates that she sent a previous letter with enclosed study drafts from her husband. She does this in place of her husband, and should therefore be viewed as having an active role in the artist’s career both through the modeling and economic aspects. Although only two letters written by Fiquet Cézanne remain today, it should be noted that one of them was business related, proving her intelligence and involvement in Cézanne’s life.
As this analysis unfolds, two prominent themes emerge. The first is that colour and form play a larger role than the beautiful in Cézanne’s portraiture, not only the images of Fiquet Cézanne, but in the treatment of all the artist’s subjects. The second relates to colour. Sidlauskas’ argument that Cézanne’s use of colour was a source of complex meaning in his work is important. This complexity accounts for some of the departures the artist makes to conventions of portraiture that idealizes the natural beauty of the sitter, conveyed through their expression. Fiquet Cézanne is sometimes described by critics as having emotionless facial expressions, and because of this, the works are deemed to be vacant of sentimentality. In contrast to this criticism, the portrait of Victor Chocquet is also given an emotionless face, but is not evaluated with the same level of scrutiny as the portraits of the artist’s wife. The disconnect in vocabulary when selecting interpretative language describing the two portrait sitters is unsettling. Why, if both sitters had been rendered with unengaged facial expressions, has Fiquet Cézanne been the focus of negative criticism? Through this analysis, I hope to undermine this negativity. I suggest that colour is not only used as a narrative device within the physical traits of his wife, but that Cézanne created symbolic nuance through colour and object in these works.

The Language of Flowers

Cézanne and Fiquet Cézanne were married on 28 April 1886, at the request of Cézanne’s dying father. Louis-Auguste had discovered his son’s secret relationship, and before his death, wanted to see his grandson, Paul, legitimized. That same year, Cézanne began a portrait of his wife—Portrait of Madame Cézanne (fig. 22). In this bust, styled in a three-quarter profile view, paint is applied evenly across the surface of the work, apart from one section of exposed canvas.

170 S. Sidlauskas, 3.
171 Philip Consibee and Denis Coutagne, Cézanne in Provence (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 100.
located to the right of the sitter’s face. Above the sitter, a subtle white floral motif has been rendered by the artist. At first, it is difficult to discern whether the scene takes place within or outside of the home as the majority of the background has been rendered with little detail.

However, in the top right hand corner of the picture there is what appears to be a window frame. Painted in yellow-ochre and paired with a blue glass pane, the wall immediately surrounding the window emerges in a lighter shade of yellow-ochre. In relation to these features, the space outlining the sitter’s figure, composed of delicate blue, gray, and green strokes of paint, suggest an airy exterior. Finally, in the climbing vine, two white flowers are painted with distinct yellow pollen centers, and closely resemble the shape and structure of the traditional wild daisy (fig. 23). The climbing vine-like greenery, punctuated with floral blooms that frame the top of the figure’s head support my supposition that this portrait is intended to represent Fiquet Cézanne in the outdoors, possibly within a terrace garden setting.

The nineteenth century was a period of revival for, among other forms of artistic expression, the symbolic nature of flowers. Cézanne’s choice of flowers is therefore revealing. There are numerous publications dating to the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries that use the title The Language of Flowers, but important to the French population was the version written by Madame Charlotte de La Tour, whose biographical details are sketchy at best.

---

172 Miss Carruthers of Inverness, Flower Lore: The Teachings of Flowers, Historical, Legendary, Political & Symbolical (Belfast: Hodges, Foster & Figgis, 1879), 166: this concept is explained when the author states the importance of the language of flowers being reintegrated into a society “The language of flowers may be looked upon as one of the lost fine arts, but the numerous allusions to it in our older poets convey the impression that it was once well understood by peer and peasant; so, although now fallen into disuse, it is embalmed in the words of our poets, and can never pass away.”

173 Beverly Seaton, The Language of Flowers: A History (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995); Jack Goody, The Culture of Flowers (Great Britain: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 237; Whittaker and Co., “New Books. Published or Preparing for Publication,” Quarterly Literary Advertiser (1832); 23: what we do know is that she used the pseudonym “La Tour” but the author is believed to have been Louise Cortambert, who was married to the author and physician Pierre Louis Cortambert (1772-1838). In her book The Language of Flowers: A History, Beverly Seaton claims that while it is difficult to say for sure, the parallels between Cortambert’s family status and
Some sources claim that the original publication was produced in London in 1858, but Clair A.P. Willsdon’s research reveals that it was in fact written in France by La Tour in 1819. Further support for this is found in the British journal *Quarterly Literary Advertiser* that states La Tour’s dictionary of French and English plants was the literary source that “the very popular Language of Flowers is founded on.” By 1876, this work had been republished twelve times and translated into numerous English editions, making it widely popular and easily accessible to the average population. The intended audience for this type of book was female readers as they provided an introductory text that made connections between natural history, botany, and gardening in the early nineteenth century. Toward the end of the nineteenth century, however, this practice became used by a much wider audience, and from semi-academic publications emerged a somewhat standardized set of cultural attributions of flowers and plants.

The role that the language of flowers played in France and Britain was strengthened at the turn of the century. A connection between human emotion and the natural world was actively sought and represented through poetry, which inspired the desire for similar literature and cultural meaning to be applied to botanic elements via sentimental flower lore. Along with this adaptation of emotion and language, poets created their own dictionary and lexicons for flowers, which even followed a grammatical structure. In other words, standard guides of floral

---

174 Willsdon, 32.
175 Whittaker and Co., 23.
176 Willsdon, 37.
177 Seaton, 21.
179 Marina Heilmeyer, *The Language of Flowers: Symbols and Myths* (Munich: Prestel Verlag, 2001), 16; Seaton, 158.
180 Goody, 241.
symbolism were created. This momentum continued and was developed throughout the
nineteenth-century by visual artists, who produced flower paintings filled with cultural
significance and symbolism.¹⁸¹

Contributing to the poetic and visual language of flowers, the European Flower Calendar
emerged in the nineteenth-century. This was based on an ancient Japanese tradition, first adopted
in Europe in the medieval period when “agricultural activities” pertaining to each of the twelve
months of the year were depicted.¹⁸² During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, this
transformed into a calendar in which flowers were represented in their “seasonal appearance”
and conveyed a cultural symbol.¹⁸³ The emblem of the daisy symbolized “a love that conquers all
things” and was favoured by “lovers, poets, and children.”¹⁸⁴ A traditional white daisy would be
appropriate, then, to commemorate a couple recently wed. In addition to these attributions, the
colour white typically represents purity and innocence, while the daisy itself is said to bring
humility and candor to those who bear it.¹⁸⁵ This text also identifies the daisy as the official
flower for the month of April.¹⁸⁶ In Cézanne’s painting of his wife, therefore, the daisy may
express an emotional connection between “lovers, poets, and children” as the Cézannes were
married in the month of April, when their son was 14 years old; the daisy unified them under one
symbol.

¹⁸¹Heilmeyer, 17.
¹⁸²Miss Carruthers of Inverness, 91-115: The calendar of flowers and the order of growth is a chapter expansively
explored in this book – the chapter discusses the order of bloom, and is accompanied by poems and a brief
allegorical history for each of the plants mentioned. Similarly, in La Tour’s Language of Flowers, a description of
the seasonal tasks and poems relating to each plant is included as well.
¹⁸³Ernst Lehner and Johanna Lehner, Folklore and Symbolism of Flowers, Plants, and Trees (New York: Tudor
¹⁸⁴Heilmeyer, 56.
¹⁸⁵Seaton, 119.
¹⁸⁶Lehner & Lehner, 100.
The concept that an artist would have used a system of indexed floral meanings is not exclusive to the visual arts. In fact, the nineteenth century brought about numerous European publications that discuss the symbolic and cultural meanings of plants used in both aesthetics and literature alike. The English artist Walter Crane (1845-1915), best known for his storybook illustrations, is an example of an artist who combined literature and the visual arts. In his book works, Crane deployed the symbolic language of flowers in order to depict the possibilities of an utopian Socialist England, which he expressed in, among other genres, children’s literature.\textsuperscript{187} The language of flowers was popular enough at this point in time in Europe that Crane was able to depict anthropomorphized flowers that were read symbolically by a readership that would be familiar with this language without explicitly having to state their socio-political role throughout the text.\textsuperscript{188} Poetry was also adapted to perpetuate the language of flowers through written word.\textsuperscript{189} The text within a poetic work could be used to mimic the symbolic associations with a flower type, applying its meaning to the story being told.\textsuperscript{190} Baudelaire did this ironically though his work, \textit{Fleur du Mal}; the poet wanted to establish imagery through romantic tradition.\textsuperscript{191} However, Baudelaire also wanted to show that floral symbolism could be used in a darker, more sensual, and emotionally-driven manner.\textsuperscript{192} For example, he draws upon the symbolic natural world in the poem, \textit{Echoes}. In this work, Baudelaire references the mighty temple of the

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{188} Seaton, 38.
\bibitem{189} This is made very clear in both Beverly Seaton’s \textit{The Language of Flowers: A History} and Miss Carruthers of Inverness, \textit{Flower Lore: The Teachings of Flowers, Historical, Legendary, Political \\& Symbolical} texts. In addition to this, studies specializing in poetry have also delved into the history of the relationship of written word and nature. An example of this can be seen Kiki N. Daurawala’s text “Poetry and Nature,” from \textit{India International Centre Quarterly} 26, No. 3 (1999): 128-140.
\bibitem{190} One example of this can be seen in the 1786 poem by Robert Burns called \textit{To a Mountain Daisy}, where the daisy’s cultural symbol of innocence is explored through the author’s written word: “Ev’n thou who mourn’st the daisy’s fate, that fate is thine – no distant date; Stern Ruin’s ploughshare drive, elate, Full on they bloom, Till crush’d beneath the furrow’s weight shall be thy doom.”
\bibitem{191} Goody, 238.
\bibitem{192} Juan Ramón Jiménez, \textit{Diary of a Newlywed Poet} (New Jersey: Susquehanna University Press, 2004), 74.
\end{thebibliography}
universe: the forest. He situates the forest as the pillars of the physical world, granting the trees a universal language and common understanding between the human and natural worlds. In shaping his poem through metaphor calling upon the natural world to convey a culturally relevant story, Baudelaire successfully implemented the language of flowers within his work in a sophisticated way. Interestingly, Fleur du Mal was Cézanne’s favourite collection of poems that he owned – he could recite the entire work from start to finish. Similar to Baudelaire’s use of the forest and trees in the work Echo, Cézanne emulates the power of the pine tree in an unpublished poem written in 1858. Erotic rather then sentimental, the artist calls upon Baudelaire’s darker botanic language writing, “I withdraw my sapling; after ten or twelve thrusts; but wriggling her derriere; ‘why are you stopping’.” According to the language of flowers, the pine tree is related to “boldness and fidelity” in a relationship. If applied to Cézanne’s poem, perhaps the pine sapling refers to more than an erotic relationship. The artist’s understanding of the plant was multifaceted and could include a more subtle language of flowers. If this is so, Cézanne’s poetry is both erotic and sentimental, again mirroring the works of his contemporary, Baudelaire. Because of the artist’s obsession with Baudelaire, and Cézanne’s imitation of Baudelaire’s style of writing, it is quite possible that Cézanne would be familiar with the symbolism of botanical references in poetry and the visual arts. After all, Cézanne thought of himself as a natural historian and a poet.

194 Danchev, 36.
195 Ibid., 49-50.
196 Ibid., 50.
197 Lehner & Lehner, 123.
198 A. Danchev, 95-97; Oliver Cummings Farrington, “The Rise of Natural History Museums,” Science 42 no. 1076 (1915): 207; According to Cummings Farrington, natural history and the rise of the natural history museum was extremely popular in European metropolitan areas during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Not only was the purpose of natural history to display the scientific research associated with natural objects, but their cultural
Portraiture and Fiquet Cézanne’s Flowers

One interesting detail about Cézanne’s portraits of Fiquet Cézanne is that she is the only woman painted by the artist\(^\text{199}\) with a flower resembling the daisy.\(^\text{200}\) Cézanne occasionally portrayed these flowers in still life compositions, where they were cut and arranged in a vase, and often were accompanied by other floral elements. These still life paintings are frequently shown indoors, and only represent one aspect of the garden’s purpose. To establish the emotionally significant floral motifs associated with Cézanne’s garden, two works depicting Fiquet Cézanne from a pair of portraits dating from 1888 to 1890 are productively considered. Both paintings, which are appropriately titled *Madame Cézanne in a Red Dress*, depict Fiquet Cézanne wearing a red dress and seated in a front-facing position to the viewer. In her sketchily-rendered hands, she holds a bouquet of small pink flowers.\(^\text{201}\) Though the portraits examined in this chapter were painted before the building of Cézanne’s studio at *Les Lauves*, I believe it is important to identify the trend in Cézanne’s work which show Fiquet Cézanne depicted with flowers. This trend anticipates the garden theme he later develops at *Les Lauves.*

This pair of portraits have not received adequate attention from critics, but the recent energy in the research concerning Fiquet Cézanne shows that scholars have started to examine

---

\(^{199}\) As per Cézanne’s catalogue raisonné, there are 44 portraits that represent females, 28 of which are renditions of Fiquet Cézanne (either a study or a finished painting); of the remaining 16 portraits, 3 are small children and the rest are unnamed women. There are some floral emblems to be seen in the 13 adult portraits, none bear any similarity to the daisy.

\(^{200}\) This is based on my research of all of Cézanne’s known paintings that exist to this date.

\(^{201}\) There is a third portrait that completes this 1888-1890 series titled *Madame Cézanne in a Yellow Chair*. Fiquet Cézanne is seated and is wearing the same dress, but she is not holding a flower in her hands as she is in the other two portraits. For this reason, the third portrait of this series will not be discussed further within the parameters of this project.
aspects of these pictures in greater detail. According to these studies, which include work from Susan Sidlauskas, Dita Amory, and Ruther Butler, the flower held in the hands of Fiquet Cézanne is a pink rose (fig. 24 & 25).202 However, no scholar has attempted to identify the particular species of rose. There are three rose types that historically have been popular among artists as an object of study during the nineteenth century: The *Rosa canina* (the Dog Rose), the French *Rosa gallica* (the Provens Rose), and the *Rosa chinenis* (the Chinese Rose).203 Of these popular rose variations, the Provens Rose is native to the Provençal region of France (fig. 26).204 Due to Cézanne’s frequent (and eventually permanent) stays in Aix, it is likely that the roses used in Cézanne’s still life and portrait paintings are that of the Provens Rose specie.

In accordance with the poetic language of flowers, the pink rose is used to symbolize a love of “perfect happiness,”205 “passion,”206 and “beauty.”207 As a newly married couple, the rose is a valid symbol for the artist to place within portraits of his wife. In fact, it does not appear uncommon for an artist to paint his muse accompanied by such floral insignia. For example, in 1885, Renoir painted a portrait of his wife (fig. 27). In this portrait, Madame Renoir is wearing a straw sunhat, adorned with one pink peony and one pink rose pinned on the right side of the brim. As mentioned in the previous chapter, artificial flowers were popular in women’s fashion during this period.208 The rose was the most prestigious (and not to mention popular) of artificial flowers, and French *fleurist* workshops were known to have produced the highest quality rose

202 Sidlauskas, 192; Butler, 74.
203 Witham Fogg, 110.
205 Carruthers, 124.
207 Seaton, 190.
available to consumers.\textsuperscript{209} Flowers were fastened to hats and dresses and, according to G. M. Oakeshott in 1903, black roses and poppies were reserved for mourning fashions and were in demand year-round.\textsuperscript{210} In this poetic language, the colour black was representative of “death and sadness”\textsuperscript{211} and the poppy for “consolation.”\textsuperscript{212} I believe that the connotations of flowers and plants were known to society, and could explain why they were so very popular in fashion in this period. Therefore, the flowers embellishing Madame Renoir’s hat demonstrates a woman of fashion and symbolic power as the peony symbolises “prosperity and a happy marriage,” making its pairing with a rose appropriate for the portrait of the artist’s wife.\textsuperscript{213}

The argument that these portraits depict a rose can be supported; however, in looking closely, another argument emerges. I suggest, based on Cézanne’s affinity for the symbolism of natural landscape elements, that this flower may not, in fact, be a rose. Much like Baudelaire’s desire to innovate in the language of flowers in poetry, Cézanne’s treatment of the flowers in these portraits may be more complicated. After all, the relationship between Cézanne and his wife was anything but conventional, and the emotional symbolism in Cézanne’s work may be reflective of this reality. Floral identification, while not impossible, is difficult in the first of the \textit{Red Dress} portraits because of Cézanne geometric abstraction of the flowers. The second \textit{Red Dress} portrait, distinguished by date, shows Fiquet Cézanne holding what appears to be the same flower, but with two departures. The first is that there is no greenery accompanying the pink flower. The second is that the petals of the flower are spread over the sitter’s lap as if the flower had been pulled apart, perhaps a result of the busy hands of a woman unused to being idle for so

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item Boxer, 409.
\item Seaton, 159.
\item \textit{Ibid.}, 188.
\item Carruthers, 123.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
long. Examined closer, the flower can be interpreted, not as a single flower, but as multiple flowers. Because this work lacks the same greenery as the other Red Dress portrait, the flowers become a focal point for the viewer.

Privileging the dishevelled bouquet of mixed flowers reveals an interesting detail. The small, pink specimen, which touches the index and middle fingers of her right-hand has five rounded petals with a distinct darkened center. The petals appear to be sprouting from the pollen center of this plant, making it an entity of its own rather than one rose petal. The shape and structure of this flower suggests that this may, in fact, be a daisy. The rendering of this plant can be likened to the floral motif present in the work Portrait of Madame Cézanne, as well as to still life paintings completed by Cézanne use the daisy in cut flower arrangements. Cézanne’s abstraction of colour should also be mentioned here, as the flowers being held by Fiquet Cézanne are a variant hue of the sitter’s dress. Slight tonal variations in both the dress and the flower’s colourings lead the viewer’s eye away from a closer examination of the floral elements present in this work. The motif appears almost as an extension of the dress—a visual device that makes it difficult to discern where the dress ends and the flower begins. Perhaps this discrepancy, paired with the flat two-dimensionality of Fiquet Cézanne’s painted lap, leads to the assumption that the flower petals are roses, because it is difficult to quickly register what the artist has represented without placing the piece under close inspection. These observations are significant, as they allow new interpretation of Cézanne’s use of emotional symbolism in both his portrait and still life paintings.

214 Refer to the 1901-1903 still life painting titled Flowers in a Vase by Cézanne; daisies are used as a flower filler and bear relative similarity to the small flower seen her lap in the piece Madame Cézanne in a Red Dress.
The idea that there are multiple flower types in the bouquet is intriguing for a number of reasons. First, it is interesting that she holding the flowers in such a way so that displaying each individual flower is possible. There is also something compelling about the way Fiquet Cézanne’s hands are gesturing toward the flowers, instead of holding them tightly in a bouquet. The sheer number of portraits depicting his wife, and demonstrating how she was a welcome guest in his private garden space is also telling.

**About the Garden**

For Cézanne, the studio and garden were private spaces away from the prying eyes of the public.  

To be drawn or painted in such a space would be to enter Cézanne’s personal realm of creation and reflection. As mentioned, there are three sitters who have been documented as models in Cézanne’s garden: his close friend Victor Chocquet, Vallier the gardener, and, of course, the painter’s wife. An argument for why they were so honoured was that they, each, had close ties to the artist personally and professionally. Chocquet, for example, was among the first to invest in Cézanne’s paintings while the artist was alive, but what began as patronage became a friendship that lasted until the painter’s death in 1891. Vallier was a childhood friend of the artist, who became the gardener at *Les Lauves* when Cézanne opened his studio, and also assisted with Cézanne’s personal affairs while the artist was in Aix. Fiquet Cézanne was the only

---

215 A. Danchev, *Cézanne: A Life*, 327: Danchev writes about archaeologist Jules Borély being amongst the few to visit the studio at Les Lauves. He states that “the studio was [Cézanne’s] sanctuary. To be invited was a rare privilege.”

216 Danchev, 129, 213 letter to Renoir explaining Chocquet’s patronage of Cézanne’s landscape paintings,

217 When visiting the studio site at *Les Lauves*, the museum staff confirmed that Vallier had worked at the studio every day, assisting Cézanne with his garden maintenance, but also with various other tasks such as helping move large canvases from the upstairs studio to the garden floor, while also providing the artist with company and personal care when needed.

218 John Rewald, *Paul Cézanne’s Letters* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1995), 214: There is a letter from the spring of 1885 that suggests Cézanne had a second romantic companion, but the existing document is only a draft of the actual letter that was sent in the post. There are no names on this letter, or any indication of who this mystery
romantic companion of the artist once they met in Paris in 1869. Despite Cézanne’s devotion, she has not been treated kindly both in the contemporary and subsequent discourses; Cézanne’s friends were unfriendly, and scholarship followed suit.\textsuperscript{219} What challenges this perception of Fiquet Cézanne’s place in Cézanne’s life and oeuvre is the garden. Because the garden setting at \textit{Les Lauves} has not been examined closely, the impact of her relationship with Cézanne’s has not been fully acknowledged. The emotional relevance of the natural landscape, as expressed in plant life, and the natural landscape’s place in Cézanne’s portraiture is the key to this puzzle.

In many studies and paintings of Fiquet Cézanne, she is pictured in garden settings. These works include \textit{Madame Cézanne in the Garden}, 1880 (fig. 28), \textit{Portrait of Madame Cézanne (In the Garden)} from 1891-1892 (fig. 29), the watercolour study \textit{Portrait of a Woman} from 1902-1906 (fig. 30), and \textit{Portrait of Madame Cézanne}. More remarkable to me than her seemingly expressionless face, which I read as being intimate for its lack of artifice, is that the garden was, indeed, a place of solace for the artist. Repeatedly picturing Fiquet Cézanne in the garden may demonstrate a devotion to the subject as well, perhaps, to the woman. When writing about the plants in his garden in a letter to Renoir, Cézanne said, “the pine is more than a mere pine – it is a memory place.”\textsuperscript{220} As such, the setting of the terrace garden is more than a mere setting—it became Cézanne’s “memory place” of his relationship with an independent woman (with exceedingly busy hands) who lived apart from him. It is possible that the portraits of Fiquet Cézanne can be read, in part, symbolically—the floral language speaks of love and devotion and marriage—and in part, representationally, a surrogate presence for a woman who for reasons that may only have been understood by them, lived separately from the artist. The opening quotation

\begin{quote}
woman may be. Though there has not been sufficient research to make claims to who the letter was addressed, scholars have not attributed reception of it to Fiquet Cézanne in the past.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{219} Butler, 39.
\textsuperscript{220} Danchev, 329.
to this chapter is from a poem by Lucretius, a poet that Cézanne both studied and admired.\textsuperscript{221} The first sentence reads, “For if what you love is absent, none the less Its images are there.” For Cézanne, I believe that though his love was absent, her images remained vibrantly in the garden.

Returning to \textit{Potted Plants} (fig. 12), the work is set in what appears to be the terrace garden of Cézanne’s home. In this painting, the artist depicts two blooming terracotta planters, which have been placed on top of a shelf, and surrounded by climbing ivy and a watering can. Reading the flowers as emblems, as defined by authors such as Madame Charlotte de La Tour and Miss Carruthers of Inverness, who wrote \textit{Flower Lore: The Teachings of Flowers, Historical, Legendary, Political & Symbolical} (1879), reveals something intriguing. Using La Tour’s characterizations, all of the plants represented by the artist have meanings. Ivy, for example, which can be seen climbing the walls of the terrace throughout the background of the painting, emulates the spirits of “matrimony, friendship, and fidelity.”\textsuperscript{222} In addition, geraniums (a favourite subject of Cézanne for both potted and cut flower still life arrangements), which are beginning to sprout from the red terracotta planter to the left of the composition, meant “piety and gentility.”\textsuperscript{223}

Incongruous at first glance, however, is a single daisy that Cézanne places directly below the red terracotta planter. What caught my attention about this daisy is that it does not appear to be attached to any stem, nor is it planted in either container shown in the composition. Instead, the artist paints only the head of the flower, as if it has fallen from an unseen vine and is now captured within the picture plane (fig. 31). Furthermore, despite the interdependence of the

\textsuperscript{221} Danchev, 17.
\textsuperscript{223} La Tour, 12.
potted flowers, which all seem to climb and cling together, the white daisy is painted alone against a yellow-ochre background. Because of the flower’s position, the daisy stands out as a singular entity amongst the many, intersecting garden elements in the painting. This leaves the work with a feeling that the daisy was placed in the composition for a specific reason by the artist. This daisy recalls *Portrait of Madame Cézanne* (fig. 24), in which Fiquet Cézanne is crowned with a vine of climbing daisies. The flowers are placed in their own area of the composition, undisturbed by the surrounding elements of the landscape. In this way, the floral motif makes a statement of its own, suggesting a higher purpose to the work than mere secondary decoration. Knowing Cézanne’s belief in the expressiveness of natural landscape elements, we can conclude that this flower possesses meaning. Thus, the daisy present in *Potted Plants* alludes to a deeper purpose as a symbol for something or *someone*.

Alongside the daisy, the hydrangea also symbolically points to Cézanne’s wife in an interesting way. Deriving from the Latin word *hortulanus*, meaning “the gardener,” the given name “Hortense” (French feminine) became popularized in the nineteenth century, arguably because of widespread interest in gardening in the period.²²⁴ Interestingly, the name “Hortense” also bears a remarkable similarity to the French word *Hortenisa*, which in English means “hydrangea.”²²⁵ The source of his wife’s name would have been known to Cézanne, as he had drawn her with *Hortensia* within his sketchbooks (fig. 32). The nature of this particular drawing is uncomplicatedly intimate. Fiquet Cézanne is rendered with her head resting on a pillow, and she gazes at the artist with an intent yet relaxed facial expression. From the position of the artist, it is almost as if he has drawn his wife while he lies in bed beside her. Her expression is intense,

even bold—the figure’s half-closed eyes and slightly curled lips are suggestive of content contemplation. There is no written context to this drawing in the artist’s sketchbook. However, the intimate setting and delicate rendering of his wife reveals a tenderness not normally associated with Cézanne.

In terms of the symbolism associated with the hydrangea, the French meaning ranges from showing boastfulness to being courageous.226 According to Carruthers, whose books also circulated in France in the period, the hydrangea’s ability to boast and be subtle at the same time supposedly comes from the flower’s nature of being “beautiful without scent and fruit.”227 This description accords with what we know about Fiquet Cézanne’s personality as well as her physical characteristics as an unconventional beauty. White hydrangeas make an appearance in the painting *Potted Plants* (fig. 12). In the work, there are at least three flowering white hydrangea clusters that occupy the central top portion of the composition, with an intriguingly pink cluster below and to the left in the composition. According to La Tour’s *Language of Flowers*, hydrangeas represent heartlessness, adding an interesting twist to the meanings of the marital flowers, because, she argues, marriage is sometimes “not all roses.”228 Nevertheless, I believe that Cézanne would have associated the flower, supported by the sketch, with a kind of tenderness in reference to his wife. In this way, the language of flowers is not necessarily forgotten by Cézanne, but the visual pun is transformed into a display of sentimental affection. As multiple symbols are present in this work, which *reappear* time again in the portraits of Fiquet Cézanne, it seems plausible that this painting engages emotionally with the artist’s wife.

226 Carruthers, 65.
228 La Tour, 25.
The artist repeatedly used symbolism throughout his paintings of flowers, which can be read in reference to his wife and their life together. What has become abundantly clear is that dismissing Cézanne’s wife as insignificant is a missed opportunity to further explore the artist’s relationship, both to symbolism and his companion. Ultimately, this chapter has unearthed a delicate side of Cézanne’s personality and underscored the many ways which the garden served his artistic creation.
Chapter 3

Planned Optical Experience: Art and Science in the Nineteenth Century

“In order to make progress, there is only nature, and the eye is trained through contact with her.”\textsuperscript{229}

\textit{Paul Cézanne} (1904)

The last decade of Cézanne’s life marks a noticeable change in his painting technique. The style of works produced in this period shifted from romantic and impressionistic to an increasingly abstracted optical experience.\textsuperscript{230} It is useful to examine the trend in scholarship that dissects, as it were, the scientific aspects of Cézanne’s artistic practice. There is a trend in twenty-first century scholarship to catalogue Cézanne’s prominent interest in phenomenological experience as the pivoting factor of this late-career.\textsuperscript{231} Mont Sainte-Victoire is painted fifteen times during the final years of Cézanne’s life, and these works are highly praised for their experimentation with phenomenology.\textsuperscript{232} Phenomenology is generally defined as the study of conscious and intentional experience, and is often associated with the visual experience of a first-personal individual. Factors of phenomenology are affected by both the studied object’s context

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{229} Norman Turner, “Curvature in Late Cézanne,” \textit{The Art Bulletin} 63 no. 4 (December, 1981): 665.
\item \textsuperscript{230} R. Schiff, “Mark, Motif, and Materiality: The Cézanne effect in the Twentieth Century,” in \textit{Critical Readings in Impressionism and Post-Impressionism}, ed. M.T. Lewis (California: University of California Press, 2007), 293; Maurice Denis describes the late work of Cézanne as being no longer, “an art of imitation… [He] deliberately restricts himself to rendering the precise coloration of things, the logical relations of their tones, in sum, to painting only abstractions.”
\item \textsuperscript{232} Information retrieved from onsite staff at \textit{Chemin des Lauves} when I visited the site in November, 2016.
\end{itemize}
and surrounding environment.\textsuperscript{233} The works finished at Cézanne’s studio most often associated with the study of phenomenology are those that feature the mountain motif.\textsuperscript{234} These paintings are undeniably significant in tracking the overall change in the artist’s technique. However, I believe to truly understand how this change occurred, Cézanne’s studio and garden at Les Lauves need to be evaluated. Dialogue investigating Cézanne’s interest in optics requires movement beyond existing observations of his popular mountain motif—this chapter does just that.

Cézanne’s studies took place both within and outside of the studio at Les Lauves, and a general visual analysis of the Mont Saint-Victoire motif gives the impression that Cézanne was familiar with current studies of optical and colour theories.\textsuperscript{235} Under the northern facing bay window of the studio’s second floor is a bank of shelves containing what remains of Cézanne’s library. There are no surviving records, but before Cézanne’s death this library held more volumes. However, Cézanne’s son, Paul, sold portions of his father’s library and sketchbooks as a means of income after squandering his inheritance on gambling.\textsuperscript{236} Despite this, all books and artifacts that remain within the studio today were original to the artist, preserved by poet Marcel Provence when he purchased the studio from Cézanne’s son on 25 December 1921.\textsuperscript{237}

\textsuperscript{234} Although the paintings of Mont Saint-Victoire were completed within the studio, there was a separate site up the road from Cézanne’s studio where he studied and painted the motif on a daily basis. The site glorifies Cézanne’s motif work of Mont Saint-Victoire, and has been given a plaque that suggests that during his time at Les Lauves Cézanne’s painting technique shifted to exhibit properties of phenomenological experience. Translated from the original French plaque on this site: “In the first paintings, some elements of the landscape are still identifiable: fields of wheat, routes of the Alps…” (fig. 33).
\textsuperscript{235} A pamphlet given out at Chemin des Lauves reiterates this sentiment. It states: “Let us not forget the garden, where Cézanne regularly came to rest and to find inspiration and where he painted about 40 pieces.”
\textsuperscript{236} Information retrieved from onsite staff at Chemin des Lauves when I visited the site in November, 2016.
\textsuperscript{237} Michel Fraisset, \textit{Cézanne’s Studio} (Los Angeles: Editions Aux Arts, 2004), 23.
utilized only the first floor of the studio, and left the second floor exactly how Cézanne had maintained it, which is how it remains today (fig. 34, 35 and 36).

The existing library is relatively small, consisting of approximately one hundred books. Of the literature present, there are two works that stand out as significant. The first, Le Maîtres d’Autre Puls,\textsuperscript{238} is the only book on the library shelf that is purely associated with science and is a bound excerpt from a larger collection of the Dictionary of Arts and Sciences.\textsuperscript{239} Based on Cézanne’s degree of engagement with this text, speculating that there were very likely additional books similar in scientific content in the artist’s collection seems warranted. The second (and arguably most substantial series of works in the library) is a bound, complete run of the Magasin Pittoresque—illustrated pamphlets containing essays on history, art, natural sciences, as well as travel and industry, dating from 1882 to 1894.\textsuperscript{240} Each volume of this series is heavily annotated by Cézanne, suggesting that the artist was engaged with the material.\textsuperscript{241}

After investigating the contents of the Magasin Pittoresque pamphlets at the studio, it came to my attention that there were three theorists who wrote about optical and colour theories featured in the publication within the frame of the artist’s career: Herman von Helmholtz (1821-

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{238} Translated from French to mean “the Master of the Poles.”
\textsuperscript{239} This is according to the onsite staff at Cézanne’s Studio in Provence.
\textsuperscript{241} At the studio, I was able to manually turn through the pages of the Magasin Pittoresque pamphlets for myself and I saw the annotations made by Cézanne. However, I was only given a short amount of time with the objects and I could not take photographs of the books. Perhaps a later project would allow for more time to transcribe all of the annotations in the entire collected series in order to further prove the importance of these objects, but for the purpose of this thesis, circumstantial evidence provided by the margin annotations works to support my assumptions about the role of these pamphlets – which was to educate Cézanne on the emerging sciences of the day in relation to his artistic practice.
\end{flushright}
1894), Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832), and M. E. Chevreul (1786-1889). These theorists ideas were republished during Cézanne’s career, but, more specifically Helmholtz and Chevreul are written about at least twice in the pamphlets annotated by Cézanne. Therefore, Cézanne’s active engagement in the popular sciences of the nineteenth century, and the literature concerning optics and colour theory, can inform our understanding of his work at Les Lauves. The purpose of this chapter is to highlight the optical sciences and colour theories that Cézanne practically applied to the garden subjects he studied. A vital connection between how the artist used theory in his artistic endeavors and how he ultimately cultivated his landscape will be revealed. My aim is not to discredit previous research done concerning Cézanne, phenomenology, or optics. Rather, this chapter intervenes within the current discourse by expanding the parameters of the conversation within which Cézanne’s works are usually confined. Through this research, the intricacies of Cézanne’s study and cultivation of landscape at Les Lauves will be shown from a perspective not previously considered. Instead of a landscape devoted to the natural growth of vegetation, this chapter will show that garden was a space of cultivation, science, and preparatory measures.

**Perceived Structural Form and Sight**

Art historian Erle Loran states that the artist abandoned all scientific perspective, developing space as it was perceived visually and not through linear or recessional
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242 Using the Princeton Library Digital Database, I was able to electronically view all publications of the *Magasin Pittoresque* dating from 1833-1918; while the library at *Chemin des Lauves* only has volumes dating 1882-1894 remaining, the distinct possibility that earlier issues may have been sold from the original collection by Cézanne’s son Paul prompted an examination of all volumes within the span of the artist’s career.  
243 Helmholtz has an article written about him in the 1882 publication of *Magasin Pittoresque* titled *Curiosités de la Vision* (p. 214-216); Chevreul is mentioned countless times throughout the pamphlet series, but has specific articles written about him both in the 1885 (p. 148) and 1889 publications, where within the latter he was given a featured scientist biography page and article titled *Vitraux de Couleur* (p. 299-300).
calculations. Loran aligns himself with the position of Joyce Brodsky, who claims that Cézanne’s “compositions never made for mere formal exploration, but always lay bare the nature of the visual.” That is not to say that Cézanne condemned the use of scientific theories within his works, but that the main goal was to produce the essence of place instead of a direct reproduction of it. Pierre Bourdieu was the first to title this type of ambiguous space as *habitus*.

Twenty-first century scholar Edward Casey also acknowledges this essence of place as the *habitus*, or a transitionary place between consciousness and self-awareness that allows for the simultaneous occurrence of conscious experience and geographical association.

Phenomenology is certainly seen in works outside of the artist’s studio. I have observed that experimentation occurs most obviously after the year 1892, when the artist had completed the building of his studio at *Les Lauves*. Searching *within* the walls of the studio property, I believe that the less-studied works of the garden speak volumes about the process behind the Cézanne’s changing technique. Although outside the scope of this thesis, it is important to note that while the late paintings of the mountain motif are significant to the artist’s *oeuvre*, they are a polished product of the ongoing study of optical and colour theories investigated *within* the studio garden itself. Without Cézanne’s experimentation with landscape within the garden

---

244 Lorne, 8.
245 Brodsky, 128.
248 Refer to fig. 39, 40 & 41; early paintings of the mountainside motif align themselves with an impressionistic structure, where there are clear and identifiable aspects of the landscape such as trees and buildings. Later paintings of the Mont Saint-Victoire motif are often dematerialized to the phenomenological experience of the painter, and are expressed through the heavy use of colour.
sphere, the magnificence of the Mont Sainte-Victoire motifs would never have reached their full potential.\textsuperscript{249}

Cézanne claimed that two main elements work cohesively in creating the phenomenon of sight: physical vision and experiential vision.\textsuperscript{250} In other words, a scene must be evaluated by the viewer both physically and emotionally in order for sight to occur. Twentieth-century philosopher Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1908-1961) agreed with this aspect of Cézanne’s studies. He explained Cézanne’s visual experiences by determining the artist’s relationship with the “seer,” the “seen,” and the “carnal act of seeing.”\textsuperscript{251} From this analysis, Merleau-Ponty highlights how Cézanne’s perception of structure and proportion calls into question traditional beliefs of “pure space” in art.\textsuperscript{252} Unlike traditional landscape painting, Cézanne’s perspectival experience denies the representation of a focused and unwavering viewing lens. Rather, the eye of the seer is in constant harmony and movement with the physiological motion of the image seen.\textsuperscript{253} Merleau-Ponty claimed that “what [Cézanne] gives us is not just things-there, but things-to-be-seen, and the seer seeing, engaged in the effort to see, evokes on the canvas a kind of… visibility.”\textsuperscript{254} Cézanne’s particular method of perspectival experience supports phenomenological consciousness for the viewer; he offers up a structural form that can be

\textsuperscript{249} Perhaps a future study would allow for deeper analysis of this concept.
\textsuperscript{252} Brodsky, 129.
\textsuperscript{253} Véronique M. Fóti better diagnoses Merleau-Ponty’s concept of vision and painting by claiming that, “[A] painting’s mode of interrogation is unique; for, unlike the constructivist thought of techno-science, it does not and cannot remove itself from the complexities of sensory experience.”; Véronique M. Fóti, “Bound Transcendence and the Invisible: On Merleau-Ponty's Philosophy of Painting,” Symplekē: Rhetoric and the Human Sciences 4 no. 1/2 (1996): 9.
\textsuperscript{254} Bodsky, 130.
perceived and manipulated by the individual viewer. Cézanne explained this phenomenon himself, writing in a letter to his friend Emile Bernard that,

The colouring sensations that give light, in my work, are causes of abstraction that don’t make it possible to cover the canvas, nor to carry on with the delimitation of objects when the points of contact are tenuous, delicate; which means that my image, or painting, is incomplete.255

In other words, through perspectival manipulation, the seer is awakened to the learned qualities of visual experience perpetuated by traditional forms of art. This criticism of the visual experience was not unknown amongst nineteenth-century theorists. In fact, conscious optical experience was a discourse that loomed large beginning in the late eighteenth century, and was carried throughout the nineteenth century.256 I propose that one avenue Cézanne took in educating himself about the theory of optics was through the writings of German physicist Herman von Helmholtz.257 Von Helmholtz had an interest in the philosophy of sight, and in 1867 he wrote the Theory of Physiological Optics.258 In this publication, Helmholtz explores notions of space and optical experience. He proposes that space is a learned phenomenon, and that they eye does not necessarily report a direct reflection of what is being represented in front of the individual.259 Instead, the eye presents a perceived structural form to the seer based on a number of contributing physical and psychological elements.260 To borrow from Merleau-Ponty’s

---

257 Articles featuring Helmholtz are present within the Magasin Pittoresque pamphlets which make up a significant portion of Cézanne’s personal literature collection at Les Lauves.
259 Von Helmholtz, 1-37.
vocabulary, this experiential aspect of vision acts as the “carnal act of seeing,” and is a necessary component of Cézanne’s artistic process.261

Much like Merleau-Ponty and von Helmholtz, Cézanne favoured experimentation with perceptive and optical space. He claimed that “artists don’t perceive all relationships directly, they sense them.”262 To Cézanne, the understanding of spatial interaction was not meant to be a literal reflection of reality, but an experience of phenomenological capability through one’s own sensibility. Despite von Helmholtz being a scientist, he was closely associated with the critique of art and science as cohabitant forces.263 He believed that art, language, and culture could share “psychological truths” with the real world, despite unrealistic depiction through differing mediums.264 He experimented with these theories through sensory experience and the studies of perceived optical form.265 Applying this concept to Cézanne’s practice, consider the work Le Jardin des Lauves (fig. 37). Though seemingly a canvas of abstracted reality, this work does not stray from the realistic or structural integrity of the garden’s retaining wall, nor does it depart from the relative proportional construction that the composition represents. Instead, this painting calls upon the seer to actively engage in the effort and experience of seeing. The seer’s eyes move quickly across the canvas, corresponding to the rough brushstrokes executed by the artist: visible are the vibrant green of the grass, juxtaposed against the violets and oranges of the flowers, which are undoubtedly present against the solid structure of the retaining wall, while above, swirling clouds prepare for an afternoon rain shower.

261 Brodsky, 129.
264 Helmholtz, 5.
265 Warren, 255.
After visiting the garden grounds, myself, I observed that there are four separate retaining walls that could have inspired this painted scene. However, one area, located at the top of the Northern garden struck me as being particularly significant to this work. Using visual analysis and comparison, I can confidently argue that this is the source of Cézanne’s treatment of this scene. The photograph of the original stone wall, which stands to this day, was taken at five o’clock in the evening, at the end of a rainy day (fig. 38). Because of the time of year and the time of day when the photograph was taken, the colours in the sky were beginning to change from daylight to sunset. Standing in front of the wall, the sky was beginning to change hues from gray to purple as the sun prepared to set and the rainclouds rolled out. The experience of seeing the rough stone wall overlaid with greenery resonated heavily with my experience of viewing Cézanne’s garden wall painting. It is a valuable exercise to compare the painted stone wall with the physical site, as the areas that initially appear “abstract” or incomplete on the canvas become, instead, associated with the experiential processes of vision. The picture plane suddenly appears, purposely dematerialized, in order to reinforce the interactive relationship between all elements of the composition. In this way, a dialogue is opened between the “things-to-be-seen” within the piece and the viewer, strengthening the visibility of the seer’s emotional participation in the painting’s coherence.

It is remarkable to me that Cézanne does not improvise any elements of the scene from its original state. There is an urge to categorize what Cézanne has painted as abstraction, but it is sensation and visual cognition that drive the works conducted at Le Jardin des Lauves. Despite the ability of the painting to appeal to the individual viewer, the structural integrity behind the scene has been controlled by the artist from every aspect of its creation. While the finished

266 Refer to site map showing retaining walls.
painting provides a glimpse into the science behind its conception, the viewer should not forget the role that the artist played in the building of the space; both physically and phenomenologically. In one sense, Cézanne’s garden paintings are a direct reflection of nature: the course in which the eye and the brain process imagery is documented fairly closely to how von Helmholtz described his theories of optical experience. However, this work is also staged, in that the artist made specific decisions about the landscape design and maintenance of his garden property, before the painting came into being.\textsuperscript{267} As explained by Merleau-Ponty, past experiences of “pure space” in visual culture leave an everlasting impression on the seer’s ability to associate visual motifs with unrelated spaces.\textsuperscript{268} This may be the case with my personal experience at \textit{Les Lauves} when viewing the stone wall. Through my own research of Cézanne’s studio garden, I identified the essence of the painting almost immediately, despite the ambiguous nature of the scene.

Cézanne is known to have openly commented on his theories about vision and sight. An acquaintance of Cézanne, the American painter Matilda Lewis, wrote a letter in November of 1894 claiming, “he grants that everyone may be as honest and as true to nature from their convictions; he doesn’t believe that everyone should see alike.”\textsuperscript{269} Similarly, von Helmholtz worked diligently to prove that the function of the eye in detecting structural space is directly affected by exterior experiences and sensations.\textsuperscript{270} His \textit{Theory of Space-Perception} states that,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{267} Alex Danchev, \textit{Cézanne: A Life} (New York: Pantheon Books, 2012), 324: Cézanne paid approximately 30,000 francs for the “planting, the landscaping, and the terracing,” of the studio garden. Design wise, the artist demanded “Provençal roof tiles, local stone, and exterior walls the colour of Biblémus sandstone.”
\item \textsuperscript{268} Brodsky, 132.
\item \textsuperscript{269} A. Danchev, The Letters of Paul Cézanne (Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum, 2013), 259.
\item \textsuperscript{270} Charles Sheard, “Hermann Von Helmholtz and his Work in Physiological Optics,” \textit{The Scientific Monthly} 22 no. 4 (Apr., 1926), 374.
\end{itemize}
“our knowledge of the external world is an interpretation or inference from the data of sense.”

When approaching Cézanne’s garden paintings, there is a correlation between von Helmholtz’s optical theories and the essence of interpretation that Lewis claims Cézanne supported. I speculate that through reading material by theorists such as von Helmholtz, Cézanne formulated his own artistic interpretation of theory which he applied to his studies in the garden.

Cézanne’s practical application of von Helmholtz’s theoretical optics is seen again in his watercolour study *Terrace at the Garden at Les Lauves* from circa 1902 (fig. 42). This small-scale study subtly hints at the manipulation of landscape within the work’s framed space. Prominently in this painting are two main elements that do not fall victim to the abstraction of sensational sight: the retaining wall of the terrace courtyard, and two transportable terracotta planters that are placed on top of the terrace wall. It is interesting to me that the only concrete aspects of the garden scene represented are those provided by the artist. Neither the stone wall nor the terracotta planters are natural to the environment of the garden, yet they are the only objects realistically identified within the garden scene. Much like the canvas work titled *Le Jardin des Lauves*, the remainder of this watercolour study is composed of short brush strokes of differing colour and tonal variation placed alongside one another. Through this style of brush stroke, Cézanne’s study alludes to the optical theories of sensational vision by allowing the viewer’s eye to recreate the image despite the broken nature of the lines and colours used. Placing these two works under close scrutiny, it soon becomes impossible to ignore that these works are hybrids comprised of meticulously planned space and abstracted objects situated to explore scientifically-driven theories of visuality. While it is tempting to deem Cézanne’s garden

---

272 Foreign reading material would have been made accessible in France through popular publications such as *Magasin Pittoresque* and *L’Art Libre*.
an oasis of natural growth, the works produced within the space enthusiastically object. However subtle it may be, there is an emphasis placed on the material craftsmanship of the garden which cannot be overshadowed by the separate natural elements of the scene.

**Colour, Luminosity, and Planning a Garden**

Von Helmholtz was not the only scholar Cézanne considered in his studies of art and perception. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe studied and theorized on the physiological implications of colour and light.\(^{273}\) Similar to the position of Merleau-Ponty, Goethe suggested that “visual truth” was not accurately revealed through traditional means of artistic production.\(^{274}\) Goethe’s contributions to art and science began in the early nineteenth century, and his legacy continued well into Cézanne’s active years.\(^{275}\) In 1810, Goethe published his first significant work *Colour Theory*, which revolutionized the understanding of the relationships between lightness, darkness, colour and shadow.\(^{276}\) The influence that theorists like Goethe had, not solely on Cézanne, but on artists of all types during the nineteenth century, must be highlighted. For example, the search for visual truth was a widely popular concept in Western Europe, an undertaking spearheaded by English theorist and art critic John Ruskin.\(^{277}\) In response to Ruskin’s movement, French theorist Michel Foucault (1926-1984) made the claim that the theoretical search for visual truth was one main step towards the “threshold of modernity.”\(^{278}\)
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\(^{273}\) Brownlee, 22.

\(^{274}\) Crary, 7.

\(^{275}\) Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Goethe’s Theory of Colours: Translated from the Original German*, ed. Charles Locke Eastlake (London: J. Murray, 1840); this work is divided into three volumes: *Physiological Colours*, *Physical Colours*, and *Chemical Colours*. For the purpose of this thesis, I have focused on the first two, which consist of components titled “Effects of Light and Darkness on the Eye” (p. 2-5), “Effects of Black and White Objects on the Eye” (p.142-145).

\(^{276}\) Refer to footnote 12 for information about the circulation of Goethe’s texts in the late nineteenth century.


\(^{278}\) Crary, 6.
Thus, theory became a language which spoke cross-culturally during the nineteenth century, and art was certainly not omitted. Naturally, then, scientific and theoretical research was crucial to the onset of modern art. As such, it will be shown that concepts of Goethe’s colour theory are vibrantly evident in Cézanne’s late works.

Goethe’s *Colour Theory* found that colour is “always the product of an admixture of light and shadow,” and that psychological components of vision are observable under artificially isolated conditions.279 As it was shown with von Helmholtz, phenomenological observations that emulate Goethe’s concerns on colour can effectively be traced through Cézanne’s garden subjects at *Les Lauves*. Take for example the oil on canvas work *The Gardener* (fig. 43). A two-dimensional portrait subject is seated against a courtyard wall, and there is no clear recessional plane.280 However, spatial depth is created through the compositional layering of colour and texture. Pavel Machotka describes Cézanne’s function of vision as an allusion to recessive space that is caused by the artist’s reconstruction of diffused lighting. This lighting is present within the shared space of the artist and the sitter, and the art produced by Cézanne during this process is a product of phenomenological experience.281 Cézanne best describes his use of diffused lighting when he wrote, “the sketch and the colour are not distinct anymore; the more you paint and sketch, the more the colours harmonize, the design is more precise. That is what I call experience.”282

279 Crary, 5.
280 The location to which I refer this painting was created is based on speculative evidence from the studio garden itself. There is no specific documentation of this location, but I believe it to be the wall in the alley between the original cottage and Cézanne’s studio (fig. 44).
281 Machotka, 178.
282 Fraisset, 23.
As demonstrated in *The Gardener*, diffused lighting is present in the concentration of
dark pigments that run parallel to the diagonal of the subject’s crossed leg, and towards the
uppermost left register of the work. According to Goethe, concentrations of darker pigment will
appear to be smaller in size than that of the same amount of lighter pigment.\(^{283}\) Examining the
use of diffused light in Cézanne’s composition of *The Gardener*, the artist has used
approximately the same amount of dark and light pigment. More importantly, the jacket worn by
the seated figure is depicted entirely through light pigments, and is placed against the strongest
concentration of dark paint. What has resulted from this pigment selection is exactly what is
outlined in Goethe’s “Effects of Black and White Objects on the Eye.”\(^{284}\) The seated figure
appears larger than the darkened wall that he is placed before, causing an automatic sensory
understanding of recessional distance; though flatly represented through paint, the seated figure
is clearly distinguished as being closer to the seer than the darkened wall of courtyard structure.
Cézanne renders the visual truth of the garden in this work, drawing upon the *habitus* of the
model in order to extract the true optical experience of the seer.

While science is not used in its traditional mode of linear perspective here, it is present
through the artist’s optical experience of sensational vision. By the same token, one cannot forget
the second requirement of Goethe’s *Colour Theory*: that the psychological components of vision
are only observable under “artificially isolated conditions.”\(^{285}\) Juxtaposed against one another,
the terms artificial and natural are difficult to place under the same artistic category in this
painting. However, in his portrait of Vallier, Cézanne incorporates both nature and artifice
equally. Natural elements are carried out through the cultivated aspects of the garden, as well as
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in the application of the natural sciences of optical study, whereas artifice is brought about by the very notion of portraiture and the concept of created garden design. The artist carefully selected the location, the foliage present, the position of the sitter, and the direction of sunlight dictated by the time of day. As such, the conditions in painting this portrait can effectively be deemed “artificially isolated” as the sitter’s experience is not one that would occur in nature. Therefore, while Cézanne is embracing the natural sciences, he remains in control of the overall environment for which he is painting.

Brodsky suggests that Cézanne’s main objective through his creative process was to “try to capture the way that things came into the world through perception.” Because of this, the artist’s technique in his application of colour is strongly tied to his optical studies of phenomenological perception. Merleau-Ponty once wrote:

Cézanne’s painting denies neither science nor tradition… the task before him was, first, to forget all he had ever learned from science and second, through these sciences to recapture the structure of the landscape as an emerging organism.

In a sense, emerging colour theories of the nineteenth century attempted to do the same. At the turn of the eighteenth century, the application of colour in painting became more than an attempt to recreate the ideal; the use of colour became tied, according to Brownlee, to “practice, theory, and increasingly, perception.” Throughout the impressionist movement, artists openly commended the ways in which science assisted in the creation of a new colour theory. A notable example is Camille Pissaro, who wrote that artists needed to “break down tones into constituent elements because optical mixture creates luminosities more intense than the mixture of

---

286 Brodsky, 125.
287 Brodsky, 127.
288 Brownlee, 21.
pigments”. I speculate that Pissarro is referring to his own knowledge of M. E. Chevreul’s optical blending theory from the 1839 publication *Law of Simultaneous Contrast of Colour*. Pissarro’s statement demonstrates that artists did not deny science in their work; a common misconception of some art critics of the modern era. Rather, artists took to scientific texts as a means of developing their skills and enlightening their painting techniques.

Although not technically an Impressionist painter himself, Cézanne was associated closely to the society of artists that exhibited under the Impressionist title. Amongst this group, Cézanne had particularly close relations with Pissarro, a friendship which revolved around the production of artworks and the discussion of scientific theory. In a letter written to Pissarro on 2 July 1876 describing his use of contiguous planes of colour without shading, Cézanne stated that, “the sun is so fierce that the objects seem to be silhouetted not only in black or white, but in blue, red, brown, violet. I may be wrong, but this seems to be the very opposite of modelling.”

Abandoning the typical use of chiaroscuro in painting and replacing the modelling process with that of contiguous colour, Cézanne ventured to apply the basic principles of Chevreul’s *Law of Simultaneous Contrast* to his own painting process. Specifically, Chevreul’s treatise claims that “reciprocal influences of contiguous colours allow for their appearance to be slightly varied from what they really are.” Insofar as the effect that the touching of colours has on visual experience, an overall blending of hues is registered by the eye.
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Art historian Rogers D. Rusk has rightfully questioned the degree to which Chevreul influenced late nineteenth century artists, as his peak period of study was between 1820-1840. However, Georges Roque has demonstrated that a resurgence of Chevreul’s text surfaced with the impressionist and neo-impressionist movements. Roque states that although the 1838 publication of *The Law of Simultaneous Contrast* was out of print by the mid 1860s, it made its way back into the hands of artists towards the end of the nineteenth century. Because of the return of Chevreul’s theoretical text for the specific use of artistic interpretation, it comes as no surprise that Cézanne would have been familiar with its contents. Chevreul drew up several diagrams delineating how specific colours would react with one another, such as the *circle chromatique* – a wheel composed of differing tones derived from the twelve main pyramid colours. These colours are separated by only a thin wedge of white spacing (fig. 46). Because of the distance between each colour and white space, the viewer’s eye blends each complimentary colour on either side of the wheel. Ultimately, Chevreul discovered that when juxtaposed, each imposing colour implements its own complementary colour onto the opposing colour. I speculate that this colour theory is also applicable to the planning and planting of a garden, wherein flowering plants are in close (if not touching) proximity to one another whilst in bloom. As such, when making decisions regarding flowers and vegetation, the artist could have
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298 Refer to footnote 12 for information about the circulation of Chevreul’s theories.
299 Chevreul, 1-10; information extracted from the first chapter of Chevreul’s book titled *Harmony and Contrast of Colours*.
300 Chevreul’s *circle chromatique* is primarily based on the work done by Johann Heinrich Lambert’s publication *Farbenpyramide* from 1722, which was the first document to strategically organize colours based on three main colour components: carmine, Berlin blue, and gamboge. From these base colours, colour combinations can be made to create new colours, which are all shown in the colour pyramid. The base of the pyramid is made up of twelve main colour components (fig. 45). For this study, I have used an English translated version of the publication of *Farbenpyramide* from the original German, which is as follows: Johann Heinrich Lambert, *Farbenpyramide: Translation from Original German Beschreibung einer mit dem Calauischen Wachse ausgemalten Farbenpyramide. With a brief introduction and biographical information on Lambert and Calau*, ed. Rolf Kuehni (2011).
experimented with Chevreul’s colour theory by planting certain items in anticipation of how they would appear in future compositions.

Within the structured garden space, Chevreul’s *Law of Simultaneous Contrast* is perhaps most positively demonstrated through Cézanne’s *Le Jardin des Lauves* (fig 37). Cézanne’s application of coloured pigment deliberately follows the disciplined and refined scientific tactic of contrasting colours as it has been defined by Chevreul. Juxtaposed applications of contiguous colour across the pictorial plane of this work demonstrate a harmoniously balanced space in both colour and shape. Towards the lower register of the work, varying tones of green and yellow are present. Though Cézanne has provided the viewer with a flat plane of colour, the colour is consistently broken up by spaces of exposed white canvas. However, the eye of the viewer reads the composition as a one solid plane of applied pigment. Similarly, the same illusion is preformed in the upper right quadrant of Chevreul’s *circle chromatique*, where the diagram depicts varying tones of green and yellow separated. Each colour segment appears to seamlessly transition into the next, as the eye comprehends one continuous plane of colour instead of independent applications of pigment separated by white spaces.

The contiguous placing of colour in *Le Jardin des Lauves* is not limited only to the bottom register; it is used intelligently throughout the entire composition. In the upper-left quadrant of the painting, Cézanne subtly leaves white patches of space between briskly applied tones of blue, purple and salmon paint. Inspected closely, these areas of exposed canvas maintain no paint, yet the eye registers a blending of colour imposed by the surrounding contiguous pigments. Through this technique, the artist has created the transformative illusion that the pictorial plane consists of transgressive shades of continuous colour, when in reality the canvas has not been covered with an even application of paint. It should be speculated here that the
finished product of harmony in this painting is not accidental – based on Cézanne’s control in the planning of his garden space, the artist would have coordinated the colour scheme of the vegetation prior to their planting. Thus, the result of Cézanne’s thoughtfully cultivated garden space is what appears in the final canvas painting.

Not present within literature of Cézanne’s existing library collection is the work of German theorist Ogden Rood (1831-1902). Rood’s 1880 publication *Theory of Modern Chromatics* was widely read and well received and explored new concepts of “purity, luminosity, and hue.” Rood’s text underscores the different effects caused by mixing coloured pigments (fig. 47). He discovered that the effects of contrast within the colour spectrum are not equal amongst themselves, but that there is a stronger contrast between blue, green, and yellow hues when placed against each another. As a result of this publication, many artists sought out Rood’s ideas to strengthen their knowledge on the effects of pigment mixing while creating different hues directly on the canvas. What I find appealing in Rood’s colour spectrum findings is that they align themselves to the typical colours of the garden landscape favoured by Cézanne: blue, green, and yellow. It is also beneficial to examine the work of Rood as his primary principles are sprung from the basic teachings of Chevreul’s colour theory that have already been examined. Rood’s work is a continuation of a theory already accepted and utilized by nineteenth-century artists, and do not work against the established colour techniques already in place during this time. Instead, as I will show, Rood’s theories work in conjunction with Chevreul’s, adding significantly more relevance to the practical application of colour in Cézanne’s garden cultivation.
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Rood’s descriptions of producing visual experience through colours and hues can practically be applied to the physical and planned aspects of Cézanne’s garden. Take for example the artist’s placement of varying greenery and climbing ivy throughout the landscape (Figs. 48 & 49). Rood’s work states that by using small, variant colours, a composition can be transformed into an illuminated piece. He wrote, "... paintings, made up almost entirely of tints that by themselves seem modest and far from brilliant, often strike us as being rich and gorgeous in colour..." In the same way as Rood suggests the close placement of varying paint pigments in an artistic composition, I believe that the close planting of slightly differing vegetation creates the same illusion within a garden setting. This is an effect that remains today in the garden grounds at Les Lauves, and should be examined alongside the garden paintings more closely.

A grouping of planned and essential garden elements that contribute to the testing of Rood’s colour theory are found in Cézanne’s garden paintings. These objects include both natural and material aspects, following the formula previously explored through the works of von Helmholtz, Goethe, and Chevreul. Because of the artist’s use of terracotta planters (many of which remain in the garden today), Cézanne built visually dynamic colour displays that could easily be altered before painting if the desired optical affect was not present. Machotka stated that Cézanne’s variations in colour selection worked in accordance with the structural motif of the subject, which ultimately strengthened the relationship between “hard structure and vegetation.” Following the same pattern, the application of Modern Chromatics is undoubtedly present in the oil on canvas work Potted Plants (fig. 12). Potted Plants situates two medium sized planters atop a shelf in the courtyard of Cézanne’s terrace garden. Present amongst
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the potted plants are three distinct types of greenery: climbing ivy, rosebush foliage, and succulents. While all three plants are native to the surrounding area and able to thrive in the Mediterranean climate of Provence, Cézanne’s knowledge of what he had been planting did not simply end there. Rather, by selecting these three types of foliage, slightly varying in hues of colour, Cézanne created an intentional optical experience; looking at the scene, it becomes somewhat difficult to discern where one plant begins and another ends.

The colours of the planters used by Cézanne are variations of red and yellow tones; yellow, which is considered to be the complimentary colour of green on Rood’s colour chart, and red, which is the complimentary colour of yellow. These slight differences in colour accompanied by a complimentary counterpart are not accidental by the artist; they are a result of a planned composition that aims to achieve pleasing optical harmony and visual truth. The strategic placement of complimentary colours in this work highlight the vibrancy of the vegetation present, depicting the painted scene in a similar way to which the eye would respond in a natural setting. Take for example the geranium leaves located in the red terracotta planter towards the bottom left quadrant of the composition. The leaves are modelled with both green and yellow pigments, giving the appearance that there is sunlight entering the shelved space. Not only does this give the painting a depth of dimensionality, it creates luminosity within the work that is created entirely from the intelligent placement of complimentary colours.

To further this analysis implying Cézanne’s avid use of colour theory, I believe it is necessary to make an intermedial comparison between two styles of works Cézanne completed. Evaluating *Potted Plants* under the lens of Rood’s colour theories is a somewhat simple task,
because the subjects depicted are not abstracted as many of the landscape paintings of Cézanne’s late career have been. However, when *Potted Plants* is juxtaposed against the work *Le Jardin des Lauves*, similar observations about Cézanne’s colour selections can be made. This is crucial, as it may suggest that despite frequent changes in painting technique, Cézanne was consistent with his implementation of colour theories throughout his career. In terms of *Le Jardin des Lauves*, the main proponents of painted pigment in the composition are tonal variations in purple and green. The harsh use of dark purple and indigo paint is contrasted evenly by the large planes of green paint applied to the bottom half of the work. Though abstracted, the eye reads the composition as it would with *Potted Plants*, evaluating the use of light and shadow in the same way. It should be noted that these two paintings would not normally be compared against each other, as *Le Jardin des Lauves* fits into the phenomenological category of Cézanne’s *oeuvre*, whereas *Potted Plants* has been taken as a simple garden still life painting. However, placing these paintings alongside one another reinforces the notion that Cézanne was cognisant of the affects colour theory had both in landscape design and artistic compositions, implementing colour strategies throughout his garden. These canvases reflect the artist’s keen ability to plan his garden compositions following a set of theoretical rules, despite its wild and unkempt physical appearance.

It is useful to analyse the science enacted by Cézanne in the paintings of his studio garden, as it reveals much more than the artist’s appreciation of nature. This chapter has attempted to explore the different ways in which Cézanne studied within a controlled and scientific environment. The studies and paintings produced by the artist behave as evidence in

---
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supporting my claim that *Chemin des Lauves* was not merely an outdoor place of reflectivity. Cézanne’s garden did not surrender itself completely to the intentions of nature, despite how tempting it may be to view the paintings in this way. Through the use of science, Cézanne effectively created a laboratory from nature that he could use to experiment with popular theories. The garden environment was planned, controlled, and had specific purpose when it came to delivering the artifice needed to prepare a composition. While the Mont Sainte-Victoire motif also displays phenomenological elements, the amount of manipulation Cézanne had over the scene was limited. I have shown that Cézanne created his outdoor scenes through precise and planned structure, giving the garden at *Les Lauves* preparatory purpose within his artistic endeavors.
Conclusions

Final Commentary & Future Endeavors

It is not unusual when considering late nineteenth-century garden paintings to connect the scene with the artist who painted it. In cases where the garden belongs to the artist, the space is known as the *Jardin de Peintre*, or the Painter’s Garden. This thesis has examined post-impressionist painter Paul Cézanne’s garden at *Les Lauves* in Aix en Provence, in an attempt to draw parallels between the artist’s interest in the garden motif and the intentionality behind its purpose. As it has been shown, when discussing Cézanne’s relationship with nature academics do not define *Les Lauves* as a *Jardin de Peintre*. Rather, Cézanne’s garden is seen as an homage to the natural that lacked artistic intervention. However, the avenues of this thesis have explored Cézanne’s interest in the garden and its motifs, demonstrating that the artist carefully planned each component of his private green space.

Through an intermedial evaluation of Cézanne’s *oeuvre*, it has become strikingly apparent that horticultural design, botanical studies, emotional sentimentality and scientific endeavours have had significant influence on the way in which the artist treated his garden subject. By acknowledging the wider role that the garden played to the artist, this study has unearthed new meaning for *Les Lauves*. It is now possible to view the building of this garden as both a grounds for Cézanne’s preparatory studies, as well as the culmination of preparatory works that defined the artist’s interest in landscape before the purchase of the property in Aix. This study has attempted to reconcile claims stating that *Les Lauves* was a garden of nature’s intention. As a result, this thesis has shown that *Les Lauves* was consciously created, reflecting the artist’s personal and academic interests through the composition of landscape.
This study of Cézanne’s garden motif has attempted to highlight new ways in which academics may approach the preparatory works and materials of Paul Cézanne, in order to establish the importance of the artist’s personal surroundings to his overall oeuvre. While I believe I have done this with mild success, this thesis has generated a fresh set of research queries brought about by the implications of my intervention—particularly in regards to the role of the artist’s wife Fiquet Cézanne and her relationship with Cézanne’s floral motifs. As I believe this to be a significant intervention within the discourse, this is a subject that I plan to expand upon in the future. Art historians such as Susan Sidlauskas, Ruth Butler, and Dita Amory have taken great strides in showing the positive contributions of Fiquet Cézanne’s presence to Cézanne’s portraiture and figure studies. Through an analysis of the ground-breaking research completed by these academics in conjunction with my intermedial approach of including garden, literary, and sentimental elements to the study of Cézanne’s portraiture, I hope to draw stronger conclusions about the role of Fiquet Cézanne in Cézanne’s artistic endeavours in the future.

While some areas of this study remain outside of the parameters of this particular thesis and require further investigation, I have demonstrated that Cézanne’s garden at Les Lauves is revealing of more than it has been credited with in the past. Through this work, I have traced the artist’s dedication to the garden motif throughout all stages of his career, underscoring his knowledge of Parisian landscape design and appreciation for the picturesque movement. Additionally, I have integrated Cézanne’s poetic and cultural knowledge of publications such as The Language of Flowers and connected them to the formal analysis of his garden landscape and portrait paintings. I have shown that along with his desire to experiment with scientific theories within the canvases of his landscape paintings, Cézanne took an interest in the optical experience of his physical garden. Ultimately, by evaluating Cézanne’s relationship with the garden as
closely as academics have previously studied other motifs (such as *The Bathers* and the *Mont Sainte Victoire*), this thesis has broadened the scope of research related to the process in which Cézanne created art.
Figure 1: Paul Cézanne, *The Clearing*, ca. 1868. Oil on canvas, 64.8 x 54.3 cm. Private Collection.
Figure 2: Paul Cézanne, *The Gardener*, 1902-1906. Oil on canvas, 107.4 x 74.5 cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington D. C.
Figure 3: Paul Cézanne, *Self Portrait with a Beret*, 1900. Oil on canvas, 63.3 x 50.8 cm. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
Figure 4: Paul Cézanne, *Grandes Baigneuses*, 1894-95. Oil on canvas, 136 x 191 cm. National Gallery, London.

Figure 5: Paul Cézanne, *Grandes Baigneuses*, 1895-1906. Oil on Canvas, 133 x 207 cm. Barnes Foundation, Philadelphia.
Figure 6: Paul Cézanne, *Grandes Baigneuses*, 1906. Oil on canvas, 208 x 249 cm. Philadelphia Museum of Art.

Figure 7: Paul Cézanne, *Landscape*, 1870-1871. Oil on canvas, 65 x 53.7 cm.
Figure 8: Paul Cézanne, *Geraniums*, unknown. Watercolour and graphite on paper. Private Collection.

Figure 9: Paul Cézanne, *Pot of Geraniums*, 1885. Pencil, gouache and watercolour on paper, 24 x 35.5 cm. Private Collection.
Figure 10: Paul Cézanne, *Pots of Geraniums*, ca. 1888-1890. Pencil, gouache and watercolour on paper, 30.5 x 28.5 cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington D. C.

Figure 11: Paul Cézanne, *Flower Pots*, ca. 1883-1887. Pencil, gouache and watercolour on paper, 23.5 x 30.7 cm. Musée d’Orsay, Paris.
Figure 12: Paul Cézanne, *Potted Plants*, 1890. Oil on canvas. Private Collection.

Figure 13: Paul Cézanne, *Géraniums et pieds-d'alouette dans un petit vase de Delft*, 1873. Oil on canvas, 52 x 39 cm. Private Collection, France.
Figure 14: Reconstructive map of Napoleon III’s resigned Bois de Boulogne, ca. 1910.
Figure 15: Édouard Manet, *Le déjeuner sur l’herbe*, 1863. Oil on canvas, 208 x 264.5 cm. Musée d’Orsay, Paris.
Figure 16: Paul Cézanne, *Le Déjeuner sur l’herbe*, 1876-1877. Oil on canvas, 35 x 21 cm. Musée de l’Orangerie, Paris.
Figure 18: Plan of Le Jardin de Tuileries. Retrieved from Laura D. Corey et al. The Art of the Louvre’s Tuileries Garden (New Haven: University of Yale Press, 2014).
Figure 19: Paul Cézanne, *In the grounds of Château Noir*, 1898-1900. Oil on canvas, 92 x 73 cm. Musée de l’Orangerie, Paris.

Figure 20: Paul Cézanne, *Melting Snow at Fontainebleau*, 1879-1880. Oil on canvas, 73.6 x 100.6 cm. The Museum of Modern Art, New York.
Figure 21: Paul Cézanne, *Portrait of Victor Chocquet*, c. 1889. Oil on Canvas, 81 x 65 cm. Sforni Collection, Florence.
Figure 22: Paul Cézanne, *Portrait of Madame Cézanne*, c. 1886-1888. Oil on Canvas, 46.4 x 38.4 cm. Philadelphia Museum of Art Collection.
Figure 23: Photograph of a Wild Daisy.
Figure 24: Paul Cézanne, *Madame Cézanne in a Red Dress*, c. 1888-1890. Oil on Canvas, 116 x 89 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
Figure 25: Paul Cézanne, *Madame Cézanne in a Red Dress*, c. 1888-1890. Oil on Canvas, 89 x 70 cm. Museu de Arte de São Paulo Assis Chateaubriand, Brazil.

Figure 26: Photograph of the Provens Rose.
Figure 27: August Renoir, *Portrait of Madame Renoir*, 1885. Oil on Canvas, 65.4 x 54 cm. Philadelphia Museum of Art Collection.
Figure 28: Paul Cézanne, Madame Cézanne in the Garden, c. 1880. Oil on Canvas, 88 x 66 cm. Musée de l'Orangerie, Paris
Figure 29: Paul Cézanne, *Madame Cézanne (In the Garden)*, c. 1891-1892. Oil on Canvas, 92 x 73 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art Collection, New York.
Figure 30: Paul Cézanne, *Portrait of a Woman*, c. 1902-1904. Oil on Canvas, 64 x 53 cm. Stephen Mazoh Collection, New York.

Figure 31: Circled detail of the flower petals included above Hortense’s head in the painting *Portrait of Madame Cézanne*. 
By placing his easel near the path of the daisy, Cézanne chose the highest point of view in relation to the mountain. He returned several times between 1902 and 19026 to complete the eleven oils on canvas and seventeen watercolors, now preserved in the greatest museums of the world and in private collections. In the first paintings, some elements of the landscape are still identifiable: fields of wheat, routes of the Alps, red of the basides, and the electric factory. In February 1904, Emile Bernard accompanied Cézanne "on the motif".

“It was two kilometers from the studio, in view of a valley, at the foot of the bold mountain, which he never ceased to paint with water and oil, and which he very much admired”

Cézanne set himself up in front of the mountain with his easel, his box with paints, his palette and his brushes. He protected himself from the prying eyes of the landscape from the shelter of umbrellas.

A few meters away, he painted the cottage of Jourdan. On October 15, 1906, a storm broke out. Cézanne painted for several hours in the rain. He fainted. A laundry cart brought him back to Rue Bourgeon, and two men had to carry him to his bed. The next morning, early in the morning, he went to the garden of the studio garden to work on a portrait of Vallier under the lime trees. When he came back he was dying.

Cézanne wanted to die while painting. One week later, on the night of October 22 to 23, 1906, he died.”
Figure 34: Photograph of the North Facing interior of Cézanne’s Studio at Les Lauves.
Figure 35: Photograph of the South Facing interior of Cézanne’s Studio at *Les Lauves*. 
Figure 36: Photograph of Cézanne’s personal belongings on the second floor of the studio at Les Lauves.
Figure 37: Paul Cézanne, *Le Jardin des Lauves*, c. 1906. Oil on canvas, 65.4 x 81 cm. Phillips Collection.

Figure 38: Photograph of the retaining wall at top of the northern garden at *Les Lauves*.
Figure 39: Paul Cézanne, *Mont Sainte-Victoire*, 1895. Oil on canvas, 92 x 73 cm. Barnes Foundation Collection.

Figure 40: Paul Cézanne, *Le Mont Sainte-Victoire*, c. 1902. Oil on canvas, 69.8 x 89.5 cm. Philadelphia Museum of Art Collection.
Figure 41: Paul Cézanne, Mont Sainte-Victoire, 1906. Oil on canvas. Private Collection.

Figure 43: Paul Cézanne, *The Gardener*, c. 1900-1906. Oil on canvas, 63 x 52 cm. Tate Gallery Collection.
Figure 44: Photograph of courtyard wall inside of the studio garden at *Les Lauves*.
Figure 45: Johann Heinrich Lambert’s *Farbenpyramide*, 1722.

Figure 46: E. M. Chevreul’s *Circle Chromatique*, c. 1837.
Figure 47: Ogden Rood’s *Theory of Modern Chromatics* Diagrams, c. 1871.

Figure 48: Photograph of the climbing ivy and assorted vegetation at the front door of the studio garden at *Les Lauves*. 
Figure 49: Photograph depicting the assorted vegetation within the studio garden at Les Lauves.
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