

Editorial

THE GIORGIO CINI FOUNDATION

ODDLY enough little publicity has been given outside Italy to the Giorgio Cini Foundation on the Island of S. Giorgio Maggiore, Venice (Fig. 1). The temptation to launch it with a dramatic inaugural ceremony, rivalling a recent occasion in the Palazzo Labia, was resisted; comments in the foreign press have been few and restrained; it has remained reputably and defiantly unsmart. The whole process of its slow and undemonstrative birth has been in marked contrast to the film-star atmosphere of the Piazza and the Lido, and reflects great credit on its instigator, Count Vittorio Cini, who throughout has kept himself resolutely in the background. Yet this Foundation is an epoch-making event in the eventful history of Venice, and if ever there was an excuse for Guardi-like festivities, here was one.

Though the island played a leading part in the story of Venice during the Gothic and Early Renaissance periods, its personality was fixed by Palladio and Longhena, and it is as a Palladian and baroque island that we now think of it. But it was in a sorry state when the Foundation first got to work. The plundering of the island had been going on continuously since the fall of the Venetian Republic. The Austrian government, by converting the buildings into barracks and military headquarters, hastened on the decay. It was still in the hands of the military when it was taken over by the Foundation, which was recognized as a corporate body by a decree of the President of the Republic dated 30th July 1951. Accommodation was found elsewhere for military personnel, and the vast task of rehabilitation began. The Church and adjoining buildings were restored. The offices of the Presidency of the Foundation, situated in the wing formerly used as Guest Quarters of the Monastery, have been filled with appropriate furniture, mostly Seicento, and decorated with paintings from the school of Tintoretto and Bonifazio. A false floor, dividing it into two storeys, has been removed from the Palladian Refectory (c. 1560–3). The monumental bookcases designed by F. Pauc for Longhena's Library (1641–71), which had been removed during the French occupation, are now back in place. Longhena's double staircase, now that later constructions have been removed, can be appreciated

in all its grandeur for the first time. The immensely long Dormitory (before 1494–1535) of Giovanni Buora, with its famous façade overlooking the Riva, has been restored, and the cells leading off it have been partially rebuilt. No impression of the beauty of these interiors can be derived from photographs.¹ On walking down these corridors, one has the sensation that never in the history of the world have sense and grace been so fittingly paired off.

This work of restoration has been just one aspect of a far more broadly conceived plan. The object has been not only to preserve ancient buildings, but to construct within the island a hive of social, cultural, and artistic activity. It is a living organism, not a tidied-up mausoleum. There are buildings, workshops, and playgrounds for students learning trades (boat-building, carpentry, printing, and many others), an indoor and open-air theatre, public gardens, a school for orphans, and a Centre of Culture and Civilization which offers hospitality to congresses and international manifestations, and has embarked on a series of publications of encyclopedias and standard editions of the Classics.

Of particular interest to readers of this Journal is the establishment of an Institute of Art History specializing in Byzantine and Venetian art, which sets out to provide a centre for Italian and foreign students engaged on research. This is not the first occasion on which the idea of an Institute of this nature has been put forward. In 1914 the German Government had planned one along the lines of the German Institute in Florence under the directorship of Von Hadeln, but the scheme was abandoned when war broke out. In 1924 a group of students led by the historian of Venice, Giulio Lorenzetti, had contemplated the creation of an Institute, using the material at the Museo Correr as the foundation for building up a documentary collection, but their efforts were frustrated by lack of funds. The present Institute is now firmly on its feet. Launched in February 1955, its library (the only accessible up-to-date art library in Venice) already exceeds 17,000 volumes, and almost five times as many photographs of works of art associated with Venice. It has announced a series of publications on Venetian art. But in order to be assured of continued success, it depends on the encouragement, advice, and help from students of the history of Venice throughout the world. The Institute of Art History in The Hague owes its success to the collaboration of those who have found it of inestimable value. Its counterpart in Venice relies for its efficiency on the assistance, in the form of information and photographs, of all engaged on Venetian studies, as a token fee for the services it renders.

¹ This is the explanation of the unusual procedure here adopted of reproducing an air photograph.

LAWRENCE GOWING

Notes on the Development of Cézanne

THE Cézanne exhibitions held in Paris and in London in the summer of 1954 provided an opportunity to compare more pictures by the artist than are often to be seen together.¹ In the

¹ The catalogue of the London exhibition was compiled by the writer in collaboration with Mr Ronald Alley. I remain indebted to Mr Alley: he cannot

painting of the later nineteenth century no problem in chronology

be held responsible for the present notes. I am also most grateful for the assistance of Mr Alan Bowness and have profited from many of his suggestions.

It is regretted that publication of this article has been much delayed by shortage of space – Ed.

is more difficult than that of Cézanne, and none is of more importance to our estimate of a great artist. Mr Cooper, to whose help the London exhibition owed much, thus greatly increased our debt by his long and serious examination of the dating of the works in the two exhibitions.² If more loan exhibitions provoked such studies fewer would seem in need of justification. In this light it seems desirable to survey the ground that has been gained and – although Mr Cooper's knowledge is wide and one disagrees with him at one's peril – to discuss some of the many issues about which doubt remains.

The disparate works of Cézanne's twenties include one group of closely related pictures, the portrait of his uncle Dominique painted in what Cézanne is said to have called the *couillarde* style. These are similar in their characteristic palette-knife handling, their clear tone and greyish colour. There are slight differences of style between them but on examination an almost consecutive development becomes apparent. The black contours, for example, which are hardly assimilated in the modelling of the crudest of the pictures (V.75, Lecomte Collection, and V.80, Lady Keynes), remain visible though progressively less obtrusive in the more developed works (V.74, Lecomte); the modelling, similarly, becomes progressively fuller and more complex. We have no direct evidence of the length of time which this development occupied. A portrait of Valabrègue painted in a style related to the Dominique portraits, though cruder and less consistent, was however submitted to the Salon in March 1866 (V.126), and the great portrait of the artist's father reading *L'Événement*, showing the style in its most developed form (V.91, Lecomte), was described by Guillemet to Zola in November of the same year. The rapid execution of some at least of the Dominique portraits is described in the letter (quoted in the London catalogue) written by Valabrègue to Zola in November. It would thus seem that the pictures should be dated very close together. At all events only very positive evidence would justify us in placing between the first (V.75) and the latest (V.91) examples of the *couillarde* style such a picture as the portrait of *Achille Empereire* in which none of the *couillarde* characteristics appear.

The relation of this homogeneous group to the other masterpiece of the sixties, the portrait of *Achille Empereire*, is not easy to determine. Any normal view of stylistic development would suggest that the *Empereire* preceded the *Louis Auguste*. The latter is comparatively sophisticated, subtle in tone and highly painterly in style, the former is in each respect more primitive: the juxtaposition of the two pictures at the Orangerie seemed at first sight to leave little room for doubt. Cézanne's development in the seventies was, however, far from normal and the available evidence leads to an unexpected conclusion.

In the first place, the evolution of Cézanne's style up to the *couillarde* phase, and in the year after it, can be followed in outline through documented pictures.

The earliest pictures which we have (apart from a painted screen) are the *Four Seasons* from the *Jas de Bouffan* (Petit Palais) and the academic juvenilia in a similar style, represented at the Orangerie by *La Femme au Perroquet* (V.99, Lecomte). The dating proposed for the decorations of the *Jas de Bouffan* has already been revised by Mr Cooper.³ A letter from Zola to Baille shows that a number of panels, no doubt those of the *Seasons*, were to be seen in September 1860. The rather more developed *Pêcheurs*, recently uncovered, and the landscape into which a *Baigneur* was afterwards painted (V.83) seem to date from a little later, possibly from after the visit to Paris in 1861. A much clearer reflection of artistic experience, and in particular a rudimentary knowledge of the heavily modelled realistic style current in Paris, appears

in the full length portrait of Louis Auguste Cézanne in profile (V.25). This may well date from after the second visit to Paris, which began in November 1862 when Cézanne left Aix to embark on the profession of painter. It can, however, hardly belong to the same time as the portrait dated in 1864 (V.22). There is no record that Cézanne returned to Aix in 1863, as he did in the five summers following, but the balance of probability is not against it, and the first portrait of Louis Auguste may well have been painted during a stay in that year.

The portrait of 1864 is altogether more experienced, particularly in arrangement, although the touch is still laboured, a characteristic which becomes increasingly noticeable in the stringy handling of the still life dated in 1865 (V.59). The reaction from this laborious style appears in the *couillarde* facture of the following year, of which the so-called *Self-Portrait* (V.81, Lecomte) and the landscapes in the same manner (e.g. V.34) are perhaps the first examples.

The evolution of style after the Lecomte portrait of Louis Auguste of 1866 is best indicated not, as Cooper suggests, by *Les Artistes* (this picture, which was sketched in Cézanne's letter to Zola of 19th October 1866, and may thus be added to the fixed points in the chronology which Cooper lists, is evidently of the same time as the portrait) but by the next dated work, *L'Enlèvement* of 1876. Here the palette knife handling is abandoned for a style based on long strokes of the brush which develop from the manner of 1865. It is indeed hardly possible to be sure whether the *Tête de Vieillard* (V.17, Lecomte) was painted immediately before the *couillarde* pictures or, as seems more probable, in 1867. The touch in *L'Enlèvement* and in the portrait of the negro Scipion (V.100, São Paulo), which seems to have been painted a little later, at about the time when Solari was engaged on a similar subject from the same model is, however, much freer. Long brush strokes curl passionately round the forms: the rhythmical vigour which became characteristic of Cézanne's mature handling is fully seen for the first time.

The sequence of styles up to 1867 thus leaves no place for the Lecomte portrait of *Achille Empereire*. The probability that it is later in date is confirmed by an important piece of evidence: the portrait of *Empereire* was, with a nude now lost, submitted and rejected at the Salon of 1870. It would be hard to believe that Cézanne, in the defiant mood in which he was interviewed by the correspondent of the *Album Stock*,⁴ sent to the Salon a picture in a style outdated by such works as the second portrait of Louis Auguste, *L'Enlèvement* and *Le Nègre Scipion*.

It thus seems likely that the great portrait of *Empereire* dates from 1868: in the following year there is evidence of a further and distinct development. The date of the portrait may also lead us to reconsider *Le Christ aux Limbes* (V.84, Lecomte), and *La Douleur* (V.86, Louvre) from which it is now divided, usually thought to date from considerably earlier. The colour of the decoration, with areas of red and blue embodied in a scheme of black and white, is basically that of the portrait. Moreover, details of the decoration are much closer to the characteristic forms of this time than to anything in the first half of the decade or the *couillarde* phase: the head and hand of *La Douleur* are connected with the same passage in the *Nègre* and there is similar drawing in the *Empereire*. We must, in fact, reckon with the possibility that the decoration and *L'Autopsie* (V.105, Lecomte), despite their crudity, date from 1867 or 1868, and that the passionate style of *L'Enlèvement* and *Le Nègre* was in them pursued, in a harsher tonality, to its unbridled extremity.

Our knowledge of the style of 1869 depends not only on the fact that the *Alexis lisant à Zola* (V.117, São Paulo) was painted between September 1869 and the following July, but on a

² THE BURLINGTON MAGAZINE, xcvi [1954], pp.344–9, 378–83.

³ L'Œil, 2 [February 1955], pp.13–16, 46.

⁴ JOHN REWALD: 'Un article inédit sur Paul Cézanne', *Arts*, 473 [21st–27th July 1954], p.8.

piece of evidence which Cooper has missed, a water-colour done for Madame Zola in April⁵ which is closely related to the *Usine près de la Sainte-Victoire* (V.58). The style of the picture in fact agrees well with *Alexis lisant*. A more significant picture, *La Tranchée*, may be separated from the group painted in the following years, and also assigned to 1869. *La Tranchée* leads directly toward *La Pendule Noire* (V.69 and to V.70) which seems to have been painted in 1870.

In this light many accepted ideas about the character of Cézanne's art in the sixties seem to be in need of revision. Cézanne made the style of his contemporaries into *une chose durable comme l'art des musées* not once but twice. The style current in the sixties provided the foundation for a development which culminated in the *Empereur* and the *Pendule Noire*. Early in the seventies he found in impressionism the starting-point for the evolution which continued throughout the rest of his life. It will be clear – indeed the existence of such pictures as the *Tentation* (V.103), painted some three years after *L'Enlèvement*, is sufficient evidence – that the first phase cannot be understood as a progressive development away from pictures that are merely heavy-handed towards ones that are increasingly 'nicely painted'. Cézanne's progress was less academic. At any moment, under internal pressure, an outburst of romantic fury might sweep all traces of refinement and conventional artistic education from his style.

It is, for example, not easy to be sure from its handling that *La Barque de Dante* after Delacroix was not painted in the first rather than the second half of the decade. Cooper suggests a date of c.1867–8, but it is evident that by this time, and indeed in the preceding year, Cézanne's handling was highly personal and characteristic: it seems likely that it would have left its mark on anything he touched. The letter of 27th February 1864, is excellent evidence that Delacroix was already of importance to him and the time of the letter or the following year (when Cézanne's use of the brush was already very far from incompetent) still seems a possible date for the copy. *L'Orgie* (V.92, Lecomte) must, however, belong to a very different phase. It is bright in colour, high in tone, and painted with a dry, loaded touch which has no parallel among the works of Cézanne's twenties. Such a tonality could hardly be found in any painter before the general lightening of the impressionist palette at the end of the sixties, and Cézanne did not reach this point until two or three years later. *L'Orgie* has not the romantic force of Cézanne's compositions of the sixties, it is nearer in mood to the second version of *Une Moderne Olympia* (V.225, Louvre) which seems to date from about 1873. *L'Orgie* was evidently painted earlier.

The authenticity, and *a fortiori* the date, of the *Clairière* (V.1514, Mr Edgar Ivens) remain, as Cooper points out, uncertain. But the picture has a dignity and a certainty of colour – one may detect, too, a rather personal combination of density and emptiness – which speak for a painter of quality and suggest Cézanne. A date of about 1867 was suggested in the London catalogue, but it may well have been painted two years earlier.

The dark inward disturbance which again overtook Cézanne's style in 1870–1 is reflected both in landscapes and in such compositions as the dated *Pastorale* (V.104 – Cooper's reference is to quite a different picture) and the *Tentation*. The group is clearly defined and *La Moulin à Huile* falls clearly into place at the beginning of the next phase, the crucial period spent in the North between 1872 and 1874. Among the pictures painted at Pontoise and Auvers, Cooper includes the *Bassin au Jas de Bouffan* (V.160, R. A. Peto), paradoxically but essentially rightly. It is clearly related to the style of the pictures dated 1873 and an undated letter of the period⁶ suggests that Cézanne's finances were dependent on periodical returns to Aix.

⁵ Collection of Madame Emile Zola, Paris, 1925, lot 48. Parke-Bernet, New York, 22nd November 1944, lot 6.

⁶ REWALD, xxx.

The landscapes and still lives of the early seventies form a fairly coherent sequence, but it is not easy to relate the compositions precisely to it. *Vénus et l'Amour* (V.124, Trustees of the late P. M. Turner) and the Lecomte version of the *Tentation de S. Antoine* (V.240) clearly belong together, as Cooper points out, but their touch and tonality would seem to be more related to the landscapes of 1873 than to any subsequent style. In the London catalogue the Laroche self-portrait was assigned to c.1873: on style alone the previous year would seem as probable, and the resemblance to the likeness of Cézanne dating from about 1874 does not argue strongly against it. This picture and the first portrait of *Chocquet* (V.283, Lord Rothschild, dated in London c.1875 but conceivably of the following year) provide two fairly certain points between which must be placed the self-portrait *au fond rose* (V.286, Lecomte), one of Cézanne's masterpieces. It is distinct in style from each of them: in particular it lacks the very recognizable characteristics of the *Chocquet*, its positive, impressionist colour and small, square brush strokes. The Lecomte self-portrait for which Cooper proposes 1875–6, is evidently considerably earlier, and seems, with its relatively broad and rhythmical handling, to be connected with the style of 1873–4: the landscapes of that winter, indeed, show a similar use of tints of venetian red. Cézanne's palette was never so subdued again.

Mr Cooper's suggestion that *L'Allée au Jas de Bouffan* (V.47, Mrs A. E. Pleydell Bouverie) dates from around 1875 is a perceptive one: he may be right. If this problematic picture was indeed painted after the period at Pontoise and Auvers it indicates a sharp reaction against the atmospheric style formed in the north. *L'Allée* is painted, not with the rapid, fugitive touch acquired in 1873, but with fat, definite brush strokes closer to the manner of certain pictures of the previous phase. In the foreground there is a bank of grass rendered in vertical, streaky touches which have no parallel in anything painted during the time of close contact with Pissarro (they are nearer to the handling of much earlier pictures). There is of course other evidence of such a reaction. The *Maison du Pendu* itself, which dates from 1873–4, shows the process of solidification and the trend is evident in the deliberate handling of the *Baigneuses* (V.265, Mme Loeser Calnan, which it is agreed to date 1875, and V.264, Lecomte, possibly painted shortly after it) – and in a landscape of the *Bassin* (V.167) which evidently dates from 1875 or 1876. The solid paint and deep colour of *L'Allée* differ greatly from the broken touch and silvery tone of these pictures, but the date of 1871 proposed in the London catalogue now seems to present even greater difficulties. Perhaps the passage on the right of the picture in which the mass of foliage breaks up and begins to form into separate, delicately drawn leaves, pointing toward the style of 1875–6, is indicative. *L'Allée* seems to belong to an immediately preceding phase: it may have been painted in 1874.

In general the works of the middle years of the decade remained atmospheric in colour and rapid in handling. A landscape of *L'Estaque* (V.168) is evidently one of the two pictures mentioned in a letter to Pissarro of 2nd July 1876, which (as has often been noticed) establishes its date. *Le Mur d'Enceinte* (V.158) is clearly a work of the same phase. On this basis it seems likely that *Au Jas de Bouffan* (V.413, Lecomte, assigned to 1882 by Venturi and to about the same time by Cooper who mysteriously relates it to the Helsinki *Viaduct*) was painted later in the same year, rather than in 1878, which is however possible. The palette and the touch here are still not far from Pissarro. But changes of colour are beginning to indicate structure and bunches of leaves rendered, as it were literally, with a stroke of the brush for each, are giving place to foliage defined by slender indications of the rhythms that form it and of the shapes of sky between. In any event, the style of 1875–6 is sufficiently clear to indicate the way which led to the

crucial developments of 1877, a year about which a considerable difference of opinion seems to remain.

Hanging side by side in the London exhibition, the portrait of Chocquet from Columbus, Ohio (V.373), *La Corbeille Renversée* (V.211, Glasgow) and, in spite of its difference in handling, *L'Etang des Sœurs* (V.174, Home House Trustees) revealed a striking unity of style. The group shows the radical development from which Cézanne's mature style grew. On grounds of style and Lucien Pissarro's evidence, which is as definite as in the case of *L'Etang des Sœurs*, the *Nature morte à la Soupière* (V.494, Louvre) must surely also be assigned to the same year. The essential development of 1877 was that the atmospheric tones of impressionism gave place to the intensity of local colour: colour, in fact, gained a kind of autonomy, and form, as if to serve it, became progressively simpler and more block-like. In the Louvre still life a cold yellow reverberates, seeming to press against the contours of the apples and modify their shape: it evokes, through its apple-green half-tones, correspondences everywhere – it is the apex of a chromatic progression which descends through blue-grey and dark blue to black. The picture is a tightly-knit structure of colour, a structure of the kind which was the distinctive discovery of 1877. The Louvre still life was perhaps among the first works of the phase: in succeeding pictures the separate touch characteristic of the impressionist method was also abandoned. The palette-knife handling of *L'Etang des Sœurs* may well have been a necessary stage in the process. In the other pictures, worked with the brush, forms are similarly modelled by rectangular accents of positive colour placed against simplified, schematic contours. The style of 1877 has both a new richness and a simplicity: it has that quality of the primitive which Cézanne, looking back on his whole achievement spoke of in a noble and justified phrase. It is easy to recognize: the portrait of Mme Cézanne (V.292) at Boston evidently dates from 1877, as does an Auvers landscape (V.142) in which a motif of three years earlier is repeated in the new style. A view of the Hermitage at Pontoise (V.170), probably painted beside the dated Pissarro in the Louvre, clearly belongs to the same year, and a number of more important still lifes are painted in the manner of the *Corbeille Renversée*.

From this point onward Cézanne's style, and in particular his handling of paint, was entirely personal: there was never again a close affinity with the manner of any other artist. Cézanne's methodical *facture* seems to have developed continuously and, although an occasional connexion with Renoir is perhaps perceptible, virtually independently: we may expect to find in it reliable indications of the order in which his pictures were painted. Mr Cooper's reference to the 'system of comma-like brush strokes' is interesting, but the curling touch which may be described thus is hardly noticeable before 1880. It seems important to trace a more radical and lasting characteristic of Cézanne's handling, the parallel brush strokes, producing patterns of separate diagonal stripes of colour, of which the forms of the late seventies and early eighties are often built. Impressionist paintings of the mid-seventies, Cézanne's among them, show separate, parallel touches, but Cézanne's systematic use of the device to create a continuity of surface and finally to unite the whole picture is a more considered and personal development. There is no sign of it in the pictures of 1877 which have been discussed: their unity, and the character of their touch, is of a different kind. A clue to the evolution of the style may, however, be found in the large group of still lifes which seems to have been started in the same year.

These still lifes represent, in general, the same objects, often placed on the same chest. In the background, treated more or less freely, one of two wall-papers is often visible, the one a diaper pattern enclosing a cross-shaped lozenge motif, the other decorated with sprays of leaves. Both papers appear many times in

pictures that are clearly contemporary with one another: evidently both decorated rooms in the same apartment. The leaf-pattern is seen in the background of the portrait (V.374) of Louis Guillaume, the shoemaker's son, who lived and in all probability sat in Paris. On inspection, even in the indifferent reproductions available, these pictures are seen to fall into two stylistic groups. In one group (including such still lifes as V.209, 210, 212–14, 363–5, showing the lozenge and diaper pattern, and V.337, 338, 344–6, 348, and 343, showing the leaf-patterned paper) the style of the Columbus *Chocquet*, the Glasgow *Corbeille Renversée*, and the Boston *Madame Cézanne* (in which the lozenge-patterned paper appears), the style in fact of 1877, is clearly recognizable. In the second group (including, with one background V.356 and 358, and with the other V.339, 341 in the Lecomte Collection, 342, 343, formerly in the Cognacq-Jay Collection and 374) the style is changed and the parallel brush strokes appear in fully developed form. In 1877 Cézanne occupied an apartment in Paris at 67 Rue de l'Ouest: he spent much of the year there and in 1879 he was there again for shorter periods. The comparative size of the two groups agrees well with the time spent there in the two years. The evidence clearly indicates that it was there that this sequence of pictures was painted.

The transition, and the development of the *facture* which became a foundation of Cézanne's style, evidently took place during the unhappy year spent in the South in 1878. The process of evolution may perhaps be seen in *Le Moisson* (V.249), evidently painted in the studio from drawings, probably in the winter of 1877–8 (*La Seine à Bercy*, which was surely finished, if not started away from the motif, seems to owe its character to similar circumstances). Possibly the parallel touch was used initially to enforce a pictorial unity in the absence of the direct sensations on which the painter was accustomed to depend. It soon became an integral part of his method: from 1879 onward, for five years or more, there are few pictures which do not show separate parallel brush strokes. It thus seems likely that Venturi's date of 1878 for the little *Bassin* (V.164, Lecomte, assigned by Cooper to 1881–2) is the right one. There is no sign of the new *facture*: the style, though chastened, appears to be descended directly from that of the previous year.⁷ The essential development is seen in the view of L'Estaque in the Louvre (V.428) which I agree with Mr Cooper in dating 1878–9. The very uniformity of the new handling allows the forms more real substance, more of the solidity of life: they are linked together and embodied in the pictorial unity, not by the schematic simplification and flattening of 1877, but by the surface pattern of parallel, separate brush strokes.

1879 seems to have been devoted to the development of this style. The second group of pictures identifiable as having been painted at 67 Rue de l'Ouest is as consistent in handling as the first, and quite distinct from it. If we suppose (as does Mr Cooper, on the basis of a date given in the catalogue of the Viau sale thirty years later) that the Lecomte *Compotier* (V.341) was painted in 1877, the styles assigned to that year became heterogeneous. Moreover, the number of pictures which can be associated with the established works of 1877 is already considerable: to add those which go with the *Compotier* would make the total impossibly large. The stylistic and historical indications agree: it is evident that the *Compotier* (and the other still lifes of the second group) were painted after the return to the North in March 1879. The handling of the Lecomte *Compotier*, the colour (in particular a dark, cold blue) and the heavy forms link it closely, as Mr Cooper observes, with the *Cinq Baigneuses* (V.385)

⁷ The foliage on the left is rendered in a convention derived from the manner of 1875–6. Relics of the same convention are visible in the foreground of the Louvre *L'Estaque*: it does not appear in any later phase.

in the same collection. The first version of *La Lutte d'Amour* (V.379) is in many respects similar, but although it is 'inspired and completely successful' it is also less developed in manner, less substantial and more reminiscent of the rhythm and touch of *Le Moisson* (indeed I doubt if it is the greater picture): it was perhaps painted before rather than after the *Baigneuses* in the same year. The style and tonality of the *Comptoir* (as well as the wall-paper) are also recognizable in the portrait of Louis Guillaume (V.374).

The available evidence does not suggest the Cézanne ever used the rooms at 67 Rue de l'Ouest after 1879.⁸ The pictures in the second group of still lifes and portraits painted there are by comparison few, numbering perhaps ten, and their style is, I think, distinct from those of works which may be assigned to 1880 and 1881. Though we can speak only of probability, it seems likely that the whole group dates from 1879. It includes, in addition to the pictures that have been listed, the most famous of those that show the diaper-patterned wall-paper, the self-portrait in the Tate Gallery. Mr Cooper prefers for this picture the date of a year or two later which he suggested in the Courtauld catalogue⁹ (when he supposed that Cézanne was in 1880-1 at 67 Rue de l'Ouest). The new suggestion that the self-portrait may have been begun in one studio and finished in another is difficult to follow: the picture itself, obviously dependent on a particular fall of light and so simply and directly painted that it might be said (in a phrase with which Mr Cooper corrected a mistake of my own) to have flowed from the painter's brush, speaks against it. The relationship to the Boston *Route Tournante* is surely a distant one: the self-portrait lacks both the delicate line and the light, bright colour of 1881. The style and the handling are, in fact, similar to some of the still lifes of the 1879 group. The truth seems to be that the tonality characteristic of the early eighties was evolved more gradually than has been thought.

The handling of the landscapes of this period is related to that of the still lifes. The Louvre *Cour de Ferme à Auvers* (V.326) is the least developed in style (the parallel brush strokes vary in direction according to the planes of the motif): it would seem to be among the first northern works of 1879. *Le Château de Medan* (V.325, Glasgow) is more consistent; though it has still the dry, loaded touch of the Louvre *L'Estante*, the combination of substantial forms with a continuous unity of surface is now perfect. The uniformity of the parallel *facture* is reinforced by a series of vertical and horizontal coincidences, lightly but definitely accented, which pattern the surface like a delicately proportioned yet rigid rectangular grid. In other landscapes a more extended prospect is dealt with in the same style: *Les Peupliers* in the Louvre (V.335) with which a number of other pictures may be associated, seems to be a work of 1879 rather than the following year.

The great self-portrait from Berne (V.366) must be considered in relation to this phase of the development. Mr Cooper has noted its relationship to the Lecomte *Comptoir*, but this, as has been seen, is far from arguing for a date of 1877. The style is in fact distinct: it shows not only the parallel *facture*, which appears in a developed form in the head, but the dark blue tonality of 1879. The possibility that it was painted before the Tate self-portrait cannot be excluded. But there are signs, particularly in the clarity of the flat pattern with its sharply separated rectangular areas of tone, that it belongs to a rather different phase, and perhaps a later one, a phase of whose beginning there is some indication in the pattern of *Château de Medan*. A date of 1879-80 is confirmed by the little portrait of the artist's son (and an abandoned attempt at the same subject; V.281, R. A. Peto, and V.282, C. W. Boise)

whose date is approximately established by the sitter's age. From reproductions one could hardly detect a connexion, but the exhibition revealed close similarities of colour and touch, and few who saw the pictures side by side will doubt that they were painted near together.

The works of the early eighties include one large and fairly homogeneous group, the landscapes painted at Pontoise in 1881. In the course of the exhibition the present writer came to share the view that the Normandy landscapes precede the Pontoise pictures rather than follow them. The date of 1880 given for *Le Verger* (V.447, M. de Ganay) at the Chocquet sale confirms this: Mr Cooper's date thus seems better than that suggested in the London catalogue. The developments of 1880 were evidently various. In *Le Verger* the parallel brush strokes were temporarily almost abandoned: much of the paint is applied in curling touches which may reasonably be called 'comma-like'. These also appear in the small part of the abandoned *Maison à Auvers* (V.148, Lecomte) which approached completion: the picture is as likely to have been painted in 1880 as in the previous year. The most familiar example of this handling, in reproduction at least, is the Berlin *Moulin à Couleuve* (V.324), which though painted in the new style preserves the frontal arrangement of *Le Château de Medan*: it may certainly be dated from 1880-1 and is perhaps one of the Pontoise works of the latter year. The 1881 group was represented at London by the Boston *Route Tournante* (V.329). From reproductions I should be inclined to think that *L'Hermitage à Pontoise* (V.176, Wuppertal), of which Mr Cooper has noted that the execution 'anticipates to some extent the Auvers pictures of 1880-1',¹⁰ is contemporary with it. Lady Keynes' little *Sous-Bois* (V.314) continues the same style with its refined and supple adaptation of the parallel strokes of preceding years and delicate rhythmical drawing: it was probably painted in the autumn of the year. Among the portraits the tonality and rhythm of 1881 are surely apparent, not in the Tate picture so much as in the sketch of Madame Cézanne in a private collection (V.533).

Mr Cooper's criticism of the date of 1883 attached to two L'Estaque subjects in the London catalogue have much force. For the Helsinki *Viaduc* he prefers 1882-3: I would not disagree. The case of the Cardiff *Montagnes en Provence* is more difficult: it is complicated by the summary character of the picture, and by an alteration which appears to have been made to it. Mr Cooper's suggestion of 1878-80 seems to imply a date before March 1879, for we are more than usually well informed of Cézanne's movements at this time and an unrecorded period in the south, though never impossible, is unlikely. It would thus be related to the view of L'Estaque in the Louvre, which is surely not the case. *Le Château de Medan*, with which Mr Cooper compares it, is in design, style and handling hardly less far from the Cardiff picture: it is difficult to think of any parallel to the very bright, definite colour and the advanced structure in this phase. The next possible date, so far as our knowledge of Cézanne's whereabouts goes, is the winter of 1881-2. There is no apparent connexion with Lady Keynes' picture, and only 1882 remains: Cézanne was at L'Estaque with Renoir at the beginning of the year. The absence of similar works and the summary treatment perhaps speak for this short and harassed visit, but the stylistic development is far from clear. Until other works with the characteristics of the *Montagnes en Provence* appear (it would be useful, for example, to compare it with V.416), the problem can hardly be solved. It is rarely possible to relate the nude compositions precisely to the landscape development but the *Baigneuses* (V.381) given by Matisse to the Petit Palais looks like a work of 1881-2.

Recollection of the fine *Rochers* (V.404), probably painted at L'Estaque in 1883, and exhibited shortly before with the São

⁸ On 1st April 1880, on his return to Paris, Cézanne wrote to Zola from 32 in the same street. On 19th June he was still there: he was at the new address at various times in the two following years, and there is no later reference to 67.

⁹ *The Courtauld Collection*, London [1954], p.85.

¹⁰ *THE BURLINGTON MAGAZINE* [April 1955], p.103.

Paulo picture in both galleries, went some way to supply a notable lack in the London and Paris exhibitions. It was proposed in the London catalogue to assign the *Grands Arbres* from the Courtauld Collection (V.475) to the immediately succeeding phase, and perhaps to the year 1884. Mr. Cooper (who in the Courtauld catalogue followed Venturi in suggesting 1885–7) prefers a date of 1886–7. I find his view difficult to follow, not only because the force of the comparisons which he suggests (V.455 and V.477, in themselves disparate in style) escapes me as completely as mine (V.397) does him, but because I believe there to be a radical difference between the pictures painted before 1885 and those painted later.¹¹ The significance of the change in direction in that year has been little studied, and Mr Cooper does not mention it. Indeed, many of his references to the technical evolution of the eighties are, to the present writer, mystifying. Can it really be said that ‘between 1880–4 Cézanne took to using increasingly liquid paint’? The period ends with pictures like the São Paulo *Rochers*, which was painted as solidly as anything he had done since the sixties. The dry touch of the *Château de Medan* is certainly a rarity, but to say that in the following year ‘he took to building up forms with a series of semi-transparent colours laid over each other’ is to telescope the development severely: I know nothing of the kind before the Butler *Vue sur L’Estaque* (V.406) and the technique, by no means as essential a part of Cézanne’s method as some writers have thought, is not often seen until later. Does the ‘mosaic of parallel brush strokes’ really play ‘an increasingly small part’ in the phase which concludes with pictures like the *Maisons à l’Estaque* (V.397)? The parallel *facture* offers, as has been seen, valuable clues to Cézanne’s chronology. In general, touch and handling, being largely involuntary, are among the most constant and indicative elements in an artist’s style, and a chronology in which their character oscillates too rapidly is open to doubt. The similarity of *facture* in the *Maisons* and *Les Grands Arbres* is a more reliable indication than the difference of colour which Mr Cooper notices. Moreover the similarity corresponds to a profound similarity of style. The parallel brush strokes in those pictures render patterns of sharply defined diagonal planes, sequences of tapering, wedge-like shapes which are among the most conclusive of all Cézanne’s formulations. This style is a natural conclusion of the development of the seventies and early eighties. Its very completeness, as well as Cézanne’s changing frame of mind, perhaps forbade its development.

In the next phase light and, initially, volume counted for less and the areas of the picture surface for more. The picture, though at the outset less positively designed, and much less positively painted, was considered in a new sense. Although the touch was initially more tentative, even at first sight atmospheric, and the colour paler, one more element in the impressionist standpoint was, in fact, in course of being discarded. The *Marronniers au Jas de Bouffan* (V.476, Minneapolis), a very deliberately planned picture which takes great liberties with nature, is executed with a disconnected touch that seems to descend from that of a tentative and unfinished picture painted in the summer of 1885 (V.441, with which in the London catalogue it was proposed to place the delicate landscape in the Boise Collection, V.487). The winter of 1885–6 rather than the next thus seems a likely date. A number of other pictures of the Jas de Bouffan in winter and spring belong to the same period (e.g. V.414, 463): all perhaps preceded the Gardanne views and a group of landscapes (e.g. V.409, 410) which seem to have been painted at about the same time. *Le Grand Pin et les Terres Rouges* (V.459, Lecomte),

which, though more positive in colour, has a certain dullness and restraint (only at this point in his whole career is there perhaps something mechanical and repetitive in Cézanne’s work) appears to me closer to this latter group than to the Butler *L’Estaque*.

Straight, parallel touches of the brush remained an essential part of Cézanne’s method, used, to a greater or less extent, in almost every phase of his later work. The diagonal strokes of the style of 1886, the style of the Washington version of the *Montagne Sainte-Victoire au Grand Pin*, are, however, different from those of the first half of the decade. Now the strokes are rubbed (as they never are before 1885) rapidly and drily across the canvas, rather than planted solidly on it in full paste: they are in the nature of a summary routine groundwork, in itself incomplete. The emphasis has changed and the character of the mosaic is now different: it is a mosaic of areas whose contours (most characteristically, the lines of horizon and pine branch) are now designed expressly to agree and lie side by side on the surface of the picture. The number of pictures in this style is considerable but the *Paysage Rocheux* in the Tate, in which handling and style have again solidified, represents a further and distinct development. The connexion here with the Gardanne pictures is by no means close and Cooper’s suggestion that the subject is in the neighbourhood may be discarded. The motif at Aix, though now built over, can be identified: the hills in the background are Les Lauves.

Cézanne’s style was again developing rapidly and it seems very possible that the Tate picture which begins to show the supple handling of the Courtauld *Sainte-Victoire* (though not its tonality or pattern) was painted in the same year as that exceptional masterpiece. The *Sainte-Victoire* was dated 1887 in the London catalogue. Mr Cooper prefers 1887–8 and the margin would be preferable if there were any close relation with the works of 1888, the Chantilly and Marne pictures. This is, however, not the case: still less can the *Sainte-Victoire* be connected with the Cardiff landscape (V.446), in which a still further development is apparent, dated by Cooper in the same year. The Marne pictures were represented in Paris by *Les Pêcheurs à la Ligne* (V.632) whose peculiar character is due to the use of an unprimed canvas. At London it was proposed to relate to the Chantilly pictures another Northern landscape, from the Cassirer Collection (V.633), which shows the use of small groups of parallel strokes arranged criss-cross, in opposing directions, to model the forms of foliage, a device which is hardly seen in any earlier or later phase: the differences seem to be entirely due to the fact that the Cassirer picture, unlike the more familiar examples of the style, is finished. The pictures assigned in London to the period 1888–9 included a near-masterpiece and a very significant one, *Le Grand Pin* (V.669, São Paulo), unfortunately among the pictures which Cooper has not discussed. A picture which he accurately describes, ‘the wishy-washy *Montagne Sainte-Victoire*’ (V.488, Lecomte) may perhaps be of the date which he suggests, the late summer of 1885. But I am more inclined to see it as a repetition, and a dull one, than as a preparatory step towards the great pictures which were painted of the motif in 1886–7, and the drawing of foliage has some of the character, sinuous yet loose, which appears in the Bellevue pictures of 1889 (when Cézanne was again painting in Renoir’s company): 1888–9 seems a possible date. I find it more difficult to follow Cooper’s view of *Baigneurs* (V.390, Lecomte) which he appears, depending again on tonality (though surely not on use of colour), to date c.1881. In the original the handling seemed to me to have the peculiar character of 1888–9: I doubt if the many versions of this famous design were spread over so long a period as Venturi supposed.

The chronology suggested in London for the early 1890’s proved controversial. Mr Cooper, disagreeing with it at almost every point, has proposed another, which may well be better. It seems desirable, none the less, to record some impressions of the

¹¹ I doubt, for example, if the large *Baigneur aux Bras Écartés* (V.549, Lecomte), a difficult picture not mentioned by Cooper in which an earlier motif is provided with a head connected with the portraits of the artist’s son of the first half of the eighties, dates from after 1885 as Venturi supposed.

two exhibitions which leave one doubtful whether he is entirely right. We are agreed, I think, on only one point, the connexion between the *Amour en Plâtre*¹² (Home House Trustees, V.706) and a number of other still lives similar in style and in spatial construction (among them V.625, in the Chester Dale Collection, and the pictures related to it, V.622 and V.749 – Cooper is wrong in quoting me as having dated the last c.1891). Among other characteristics, *L'Amour en Plâtre* and the still lives connected with it have in common their massive and complex curving rhythms, a quality of style related to that of the statuette itself. In the series of *Joueurs de Cartes* this is seen to the full extent only in the version with five figures (V.560) in the Barnes Foundation (and notably in the figure on the left). We may reasonably suppose that the pictures are not far apart in date.

The problem of the early 1890's is that of the relationship of this coherent group to the fixed points at either end of the period, the portraits of Madame Cézanne of 1889–90 and the portrait of Gustave Geffroy of 1895, and to the other pictures of the phase. Is Cooper right in dating the group of still lives 1893–5? (V.611 and 624, he writes 'must be of c.1894; V.707 must be of 1894–5': the imperative recurs, as if the pictures disobeyed). The *Gustave Geffroy* (V.692, Lecomte) shows nothing of their distinctive style, and none of their rhythmical flourish. If Cooper were right, a powerful stylistic momentum would seem to have been arbitrarily broken in 1895. I do not follow his observation that '*L'Amour en Plâtre* cannot be separated from *Nature Morte au Panier*' (V.594) or from *Oignons et Bouteille* (V.730). The first is quite distinct in style, related closely to the late eighties in handling, and in design a rudimentary and chaotic predecessor of the Courtauld picture and its like: it would seem to date from 1890 or little later. The second, in which handling and colour change again and the rhythm loosens, looks like a further development towards the style of 1895.

The figure pictures suggest a similar sequence. Among the most striking impressions at the Orangerie was, to my mind, the connexion – in colour, in style, and in the character of vision – between the Louvre version of the *Joueurs de Cartes* (V.558) and the *Gustave Geffroy*. We hardly need seek a link between them, for there is little gap. The related still life is the *Oignons et Bouteille* which I would date from the same phase. It must be remembered that the whole trend of the portrait style in this period, as the terminal pictures show, was away from the schematic, towards the individual, away from the comparatively generalized vision of the portraits of Madame Cézanne, towards the fuller, more tonal, and more specific style of the *Geffroy*. In this evolution, the *Femme à la Cafetière* is surely not close to the portraits of Madame Cézanne: the most comparable passages, the parallel, vertical folds of the dress and the hands, perhaps go furthest to emphasize the difference. The connexion is rather with the Louvre version of the *Joueurs de Cartes* (which shows the same table and cloth: in Cézanne such indications are often reliable) and with certain still lives (e.g. V.593, 619) whose simplified, accented contours here describe the coffee-pot. Can these pictures, as has often been thought, have been painted around 1890? The obvious contrast with the *Nature Morte au Panier*, which is surely of about this time,

and surely greatly precedes them, makes it doubtful. Of the still lives, one (V.619) seems to follow directly on the Chester Dale group (compare V.624), while the other (V.593) paves the way toward a still life in New York (V.736) which is probably of after 1895.

The chronology that these observations suggest has, however, points of equal difficulty. Although the early sources which date all the *Joueurs de Cartes* from 1892 or earlier are not conclusive (it would be comprehensible that testimony concerning one or both of the large versions should have become attached to them all) the Courtauld *Joueurs* preserves more reminiscences of the style of 1890 than easily agree with the date which the Louvre picture suggests. On the other hand, if Cooper's chronology is right, the *Geffroy* represented a startling reversion to a tonality, style, and vision which had hardly appeared since 1892, and the resolved forms of the *Femme à la Cafetière* preceded, if I understand him, the congested and chaotic ones of the *Nature Morte au Panier* (unless they were contemporary, which would be stranger still).

The profit of this discussion, if there is one, is perhaps a realization of the issues round which Cézanne's development in this period revolved. The affinities on which Mr Cooper's grouping depends seem, so far as I can follow them, to be in great parts affinities of colour, and certainly these are of deep significance, as the painting of the second half of the decade shows. I am inclined to give equal attention to consistency of line, and to the clarification which gave an increasingly systematic design to the radical discoveries of the eighties. The paradoxes which both chronologies seem to imply are, however, in neither case impossible. In this short phase the evolution was certainly complex, and we must reckon with the probability of several anticipations and reversions of style. In the discussion of the early nineties we are dealing with a problem which is radical to stylistic development, and not only in the case of Cézanne – the problem of which elements in a style are continuous and involuntary, and which variable, adopted for the purposes of particular pictures. In this phase of Cézanne I am prepared to find the specific colour and tone of a picture (though not the use of colour) among the variables, but hardly the rhythmic impetus, the vision, or the handling. The impression is, even more than usually, a subjective one, and Mr Cooper's chronology, which implies a different view, may conceivably, for all its difficulties, be more nearly right. My view is, however, rather confirmed by what is constant and what variable in the works painted at Talloires in 1896, two of which (the entry for one, the Courtauld *Lac*, marred by a suggestion which I gladly withdraw) were seen together at the London exhibition.

In the final decade, the margin of disagreement is smaller. For *La Vieille au Chapelet* Cooper (referring to tonality) proposes a date of 1898–1900. The picture was however painted over a period of eighteen months, surely continuous, at Aix, and the date of 1897–8 given in the London catalogue agrees better with the artist's movements. I agree with Gasquet's dating of the great still lives, among which *Pommes et Oranges* (Louvre, V.732) can surely be numbered, from the stay in Paris between the autumn of 1898 and the autumn of 1899. The date of 1900 suggested in London for *Les Grands Arbres* (V.760, Mrs Kessler) may be too early, though hardly, I think, by four years. I would group the final works rather differently from Cooper. The portrait of Vallier in the peaked cap (which he dates 1905–6: V.716, Lecomte) seems to me little later than the Lecomte *Grandes Baigneuses* (V.721) which he dates 1903–4 (and relates to *Les Grands Arbres*, which seems out of place in this company). In both the line is bathed and softened in a greenish-blue penumbra, and the habitual violet mutations are temporarily subdued. This phase may reasonably be dated 1904–5, for its colour and touch

¹² Cooper accepts the identification of the canvas in the left background of *L'Amour en Plâtre* as the still life in the Chester Dale Collection, but it is not clear that he has even now quite seen the point of the picture. 'Gowing' he writes, 'seems to assume that Cézanne copied his own picture meticulously.' No one, I think, assumes that Cézanne copied anything meticulously. Cooper seems to assume that it is an accident that the reddish band crossing the picture-within-the-picture (at an angle which, by a characteristic dislocation of perspective, breaks its plane and introduces the possibility of another) is introduced at just the point where a red band crosses the actual canvas. In fact, such double meanings are typical, and essential. The onion-stalk which changes colour precisely at the edge of the picture behind it and melts deceptively into the leg of the painted table, as if to support the painted cloth, is part of the same system.

seem to lead directly to the style of 1905: the head of the Lecomte *Vallier* is defined rather as are the forms of the last views of the Sainte-Victoire and the green-blue (now combining again with violet) remains a basis of Sir Kenneth Clark's *Château Noir* (V.797).

In the last year a sharper line and more positive colour return. The works of 1906 include not only the portrait of Vallier now in a Chicago collection (V.718) but also that in the Tate Gallery (V.715) which is closely connected, not so much with the *Château Noir* as Cooper suggests, as with *Le Cabanon de Jourdan* (V.805) Cézanne's last picture.

Discussion of Cézanne's chronology was overdue and in the present debate there is only one difference of opinion which I regret, that concerning the greatness of the artist. The provocative remark which Mr Cooper misquoted from the beginning of the introduction to the London catalogue did not, of course, say quite what he supposes. The point was that anyone who finds it easy to frame value judgements which disparage Cézanne has missed something of prime value in the thought of the time – and the proposition seems to me to stand. Cooper may, nevertheless (to remove the debate back upon substantial ground), find in Cézanne's painting less meaning than some of us suppose it to hold, and attach less importance to what he finds. That would be regrettable, but it could perhaps be understood. If we follow his

chronology many of the peaks of Cézanne's achievement, the pictures on which we depend most for our knowledge of him, are to my mind a little reduced, because less comprehensible. Seen through his eyes, the scattered *couillarde* pictures, the *Achille Empereur*, the *Cézanne au fond rose*, the achievement of 1877 and of 1879, the Courtauld *Grands Arbres*, even the *Vieille au Chapelet*, look a little less significant; even the style of the last years does not unfold with quite its true continuous grandeur. One is not persuaded that his chronology is the better by the fact that its author likes the artist less well.

The impression that there is for our purpose more *painting* in Cézanne's painting than in that of anyone before him, and less of anything else, is no doubt an illusion, due to our proximity to him. But one can hardly find another artist who not only bulked so large fifty years afterwards, but whose development turned at every stage upon issues which remained so profoundly significant. Mr. Cooper ends with a distinction, one which for him reflects upon Cézanne:

'Cézanne does not open up new worlds for the spectator as do, say, Titian, Rubens, or Rembrandt. He opens our eyes to the inspiring possibility of seeing familiar objects in a new way.'

It has been the continual achievement of great painting to prove that this antithesis is a false one. A painter's world is none other than our own.

ANITA BROOKNER

Jean-Baptiste Greuze—I I

AFTER his humiliating experience in 1769, Greuze appears to have left Paris and gone back to Tournus. There is a drawing of good pedigree in the David-Weill Collection bearing the inscription *Greuze retrouvant sa mère après vingt ans d'absence*, which is very close in style to the Laborde drawings of 1769. His problem, on his return to Paris, was the considerable one of how to remain in the public eye and attract commissions without going back on his promise never to exhibit again in the Salon. He solved this by the simple expedient of holding a private Salon, always timed to coincide with the official one, in his own studio.¹ During the 1770's this proved extremely successful. Not only did Greuze enjoy the shaky popularity of one who has openly flouted the conventions, but fortune brought to his door (literally) three distinguished foreign visitors who already knew him by reputation. In 1771, Gustav III of Sweden, in Paris for confidential talks with the Duc de Choiseul, visited his studio, to be followed in 1777 by Benjamin Franklin, who sat to him for a portrait, and in the same year by Marie-Antoinette's brother, the Emperor Joseph II. On 31st May 1777, Métra noted in his diary: '*Une foule de curieux s'est portée avec empressement chez le célèbre Greuze pour voir son nouveau tableau du Fils Ingrat . . . mais cet artiste n'a permis l'entrée de sa maison qu'à ses amis et aux Princes du sang*'.²

We have only a handful of dated works from the 1770's, although the period contains some of Greuze's most famous pictures. *La Cruche Cassée*, which was not exhibited until 1777, was finished and engraved by 1773. With this, or a little

anterior to it, may be grouped *La Vertu Chancelante* (Wildenstein), in which a young girl is seen sitting in a garret pondering the sinister gift of a gold watch, the impressive semi-classical head in M. Wildenstein's private collection (Fig.2), the portrait of Mme de Porcin (Angers) and the Wallace companion pictures of the little boy dressed as a sailor and the girl with a gauze scarf. The portraits of Franklin, of which versions seem to exist all over America, of Paul Stroganoff (Besançon), and of the Comte de Saint-Morys and his son (Nantes), all date from 1778. The most significant production of these years, however, consists of no less than six large genre paintings: *Le Gâteau des Rois* (1774, Montpellier), *La Dame de Charité* (1775, Lyon), *La Malédiction Paternelle* (1777, Louvre), *Le Fils Puni* (1778, Louvre), *Le Testament Déchiré*, which Flipart was engraving just before his death in 1782 (present owner unknown), and *Le Retour de l'Ivrogne* (Wildenstein), which passed through the sale of the Marquis de Véri in 1785 and which is closely connected in style with *Le Fils Puni*.

Le Gâteau des Rois was a private commission from the Duc de Cossé-Brissac, and is therefore less of a brain child than the other independently painted works. It is, in fact, a piece in the style of *L'Accordée de Village*, tender and muggy in sentiment and undistinguished in execution. There is one point of interest about the composition. Like all other large pictures of this decade, with the partial exception of *La Malédiction Paternelle*, it is horizontal and frieze-like, as against the shallow semi-circular emphases of *L'Accordée de Village*, *Le Paralytique*, and *La Mère Bien-aimée*. This seems to indicate that Greuze resented the slurs made by the critics on his ability to compose a classical picture, and concentrated on a markedly Poussinesque type of composition.

¹ LE BAS, notes to the 1789 edition of his engravings.

² MÉTRA: *Correspondance secrète, politique et littéraire ou Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire des Cours, des Sociétés et de la Littérature en France depuis la Mort de Louis XV*, 18 vols., London [1787].