

An Aspect of Cézanne's Reception in Japan

—The Formation and Development of the "Personalist" Interpretation of Cézanne in the 1920s—

NAGAI Takanori

Introduction

Two or three detailed studies have provided a basic understanding of the circumstances surrounding the introduction of Paul Cézanne (1839-1906) in Japan, and the major actors in that process and its time frame.¹⁾ Given the limited space allowed by this essay I do not intend a repetition and organization of these previously presented materials. Rather, I will clarify the process by which Japan's unique image of Cézanne was formed after his full introduction into Japan.

Just as in the case of the reception of Vincent van Gogh (1853-1890) and Paul Gauguin (1848-1903), it seems that there are those who repeatedly note the "humanistic" element in Japan's unique image of Cézanne, in other words, the view that equates the evaluation of the artist's individualistic lifestyle with that of his individualistic painting style and technique.²⁾ Rather than taking this stance, this essay will focus on the "personalist image of Cézanne" which seems to have been formed about the same time as this humanist image. While some critics of the day argued this personalist image of Cézanne in such a manner that it was not clearly differentiated from the "humanist image of Cézanne," I think we can distinguish the personalist from the humanist and note the former's characteristics and its position as the first point of view by which Cézanne was received as an art-related issue. This discussion is also noteworthy for the light it can shed on the manner in which French and Japanese culture interacted at the beginning of this century.

1. Germination

The meaning of the word personality in the context of "personalism" is not necessarily the same as its everyday usage today. From the 1910s to the 1920s, this word was accorded a specific meaning as one of the bases for judgment in art criticism.

Cézanne was first introduced into Japan as one of the Impressionists, and the novelist Shimazaki Tôson (1872-1943) found a "new sensation" in Cézanne ("From Asakusa" [Asakusa yori, in Japanese] in *Waseda Bungaku*, December volume, December 1908, p. 41). The critic and director Shimamura Hôgetsu (1871-1918) noted Cézanne as the one painter among the Impressionists who charged his colors with a strong sense of nature ("A Discussion of Modern European Painting" [Oshû-kindai no kaiga o ronzu, in Japanese] *Waseda Bungaku*, January 1909 edition, pp. 1-23.). Then, in place of these stances which

emphasize that the value of Cézanne's paintings can be found in his expression of sensation and sentiment, a view arose in the 1910s and 1920s which quickly became the overwhelming mainstream opinion—namely that his “personality” or character (*jinkaku* in Japanese) represented the expressive value of his work. Arishima Ikuma (1882–1974), a western style painter and critic, was the first to publish a long essay on Cézanne in 1910, and he paid particular attention to Cézanne's watercolors, noting Cézanne's paintings as the product of sentiment or emotion, and finding his special characteristics in “a recording of the intuitive, individual impression of nature,” and “not the framework of nature, but rather a conception personally derived from nature.” Arishima actually visited the Cézanne retrospective held at the Salon d'Automne in 1907, and on the basis of that experience, summed up the visual experience of Cézanne's paintings in the following statement.

“Unrelated to strong intentions, emphasis on color gradation, the fatigue of repeated application of color, the impression is everywhere, everywhere fresh, and it is as if each place, each instant shows a continuing sense of newly, freshly touching some thing. Whether that part and that whole are independent or unified, they naturally reveal a vigorous authority. When viewing his paintings, one forgets the many faults or inadequacies, as one has the feeling of having been drawn into the midst of his personality.” (“The Painter Paul Cézanne,” [Gaka poru sezannu, in Japanese] in *Shirakaba*, June 1910, vol. 1, no. 3, p. 41)

This note by Arishima reflects an experience of the original works, not just reproductions, and the experiential knowledge gained from his own work in oil aids in his effort to provide a verbalization of the sensitive reflection of Cézanne's technical characteristics and the special emotional characteristics which govern his works. Arishima is unique in that he not only notes the material characteristics of the compositions, he also then proceeds to describe his own viewing experience as “the feeling of having been drawn into the midst of his personality.”

In his 1912 work “Revolutionary Painters” ([Kakumei no gaka, in Japanese] *Shirakaba*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–31), the critic Yanagi Muneyoshi (1889–1961) notes that the arts are reflections of the personality, and further hypothesized that the personality apparent in a work of art is of a higher value than that work's sensations or its techniques. Yet in fact this transfer of values also corresponds to the switch that occurred from the reception of the Impressionists to the reception of the Post Impressionists. Beginning around 1910 art magazines were filled with articles on the Post Impressionists, and the Japanese, in order to accord the Post Impressionists value, were beginning to use the term *jinkaku*, or personality, in place of the traditional value system which used words like “feeling”, or *kokoromochi*, “superb spirit” or *ki-in*, and “refinement” or *shin-in*, to express the value of subjectivity which characterized the Impressionists, finding that this quality resembled Japanese art.

So what did “personality,” or *jinkaku* in Japanese, mean at that time?

The term “personality” when used as a basis for artistic judgment differs somehow from the special characteristics of a person, the individual moral view that regulates a

person's character, personality, speech and conduct.

For example, the western style painter Yamawaki Shintoku (1886–1952) noted in 1911,

“The brush stroke is the shuddering of the nerves, a single brush stroke reflects the entire personality. A single painting must move from a single breath. It must be, in essence, the unity of rhythm.” (“Fragment” [Danpen, in Japanese] in *Shirakaba*, vol. 2, no. 9, p. 106.)

In another context he confronted “technique” and “color, line, form” emphasizing “the painting is the beat of an internal breath, the personality or the entire existence of the human senses.” (*ibid.*, p. 111.) In this context, “personality” is used as the term which indicates the life force of the creator perceived in the depths of a work.

In 1913 Kimura Shōhachi (1893–1958), a western style painter and critic, focused on Cézanne's distinctive brushwork. Rather than commenting on visual effects and material form, he noted the rhythm that is made up of the combination of brush strokes, and thus realized that the experience of appreciating Cézanne's paintings can be found in the sharing of this rhythm.

“When viewing full color reproductions of Cézanne's works, most people first note the strangely vivid, fresh masses created by the conflict between his brushstrokes and his chromatic planes. The flowing movement, inspired by the mutual relationship between the aligning, the juxtaposing, the combining of brushstrokes and color planes on the canvas, wide, or at times, narrow arrays of stroke and color all form the appearance of the composition to which it is hard to assign a single name, and which, even so, clearly strikes the eye. —Thus stated, some people might understand the hints. These are the masses I am referring to. I can't express this very well, I can only find these by using intuition and a good visual sense. These are the first points of view used to pursue the rhythm that seems to overflow Cézanne's paintings. Caught by the eye, concentrating on its indefinable mystique, the continuous indication of, for example, that which represents the nose, eye, mouth, cheek and ear of a portrait, Cézanne's rhythm clearly moves in the viewer.” (“Regarding Paul Cézanne,” [Poru sezannu-ni tsuite, in Japanese] in *Gendai no yōga*, vol. 2, no. 6 and no. 18, October 1913 edition, p. 2)

Kimura's stance which sees the union of the “artist's internal life rhythm” in the masses of Cézanne's paintings borrows the “vitalism” viewpoint expressed by Julius Meier-Graefe (1867–1935) (in his *Impressionisten*, Munich–Leipzig, 1907 and *Paul Cézanne und seine Ahnen*, Munich 1910).³⁾ Kimura avoids the use of the term “personality,” while Yamawaki spoke of paintings in terms of “personality,” and yet each suggested the same standard of appreciation. For Kimura, the value of Cézanne's paintings was not “color, line, composition and conception,” but rather “mass,” and the rhythm which establishes that mass, as this rhythm revealed his individuality. Kimura translated the discussion on the Impressionists by Camille Mauclair (dates unknown) (*The French Impressionists*, London, 1903/*L'impressionisme, son histoire, son esthétique, ses maîtres*, Paris, 1904), and dismissed the Cézanne theory by James Gibbons Huneker (1860–1921) (*Promenade of an Impressionist*, 1910, translated into Japanese in the *Fusain* magazine, a journal published by the group of the same name, to which Kimura belonged) as “dilettante.” He went on

to criticize C. Louis Hind (dates unknown) (*The Post Impressionists*, London, 1911) as a journalist who did not understand the life of an artist, but agreed with Graefe's Cézanne theories which had been introduced in the translations published in 1913 in *Fusain* and *Gendai no yōga*. We can consider this selection by Kimura to have been extremely conscious, and through it see that there was an active acceptance of Graefe's vitalism in the context of the art criticism of the day which was then forming a concept of "personality." We can also consider, on the other hand, that Graefe's viewpoint acted as one of the determining elements of the period's critical context.

A survey of art magazines from the 1910s in regard to Cézanne reveals that there were many examples of art criticism in which "personality" formed one of the bases for the evaluation of a work of art. In the majority of cases, "personality" was used without definition, and if we were to surmise its meaning from the context of the criticism of the day,⁴⁾ "it is the life-force, one that goes beyond visual information, that is intuited as the viewer faces a painting (just as when we touch the Other, we perceive that which differs from verbalized information, another, more intuitive, more bodily information, through which we can discern a multitude of Others)." In sum, "it is the X which is the undifferentiated fusion of the aesthetic values and the special characteristics of a person's existence."

But, if we were to shift our focus to the interpretation of Cézanne that was occurring in France in the 1910s, we would find no new interpretation to replace the image of Cézanne constructed in the midst of the revivalist "neo-traditionalism" formed in the 1900s by Emile Bernard (1868-1941) and Maurice Denis (1870-1943). Indeed we would be most struck by the universality of their interpretation, one which emphasizes Cézanne's classicism, Cézanne's method which discovers the autonomous order of the painting surface itself, as well as the unique order within nature.⁵⁾ While thus a considerable gap existed between the "personality" critiques that were then budding in Japan and the interpretation of Cézanne in France; it was the former that matured as an effective viewpoint by which the Japanese could interpret and evaluate Cézanne. Let us now consider the process of this maturation.

2. Maturation

With the beginning of the 1920s, the philosopher Nishida Kitarō (1870-1945), the art historian, Nakai Sōtarō (1879-1966), the aesthetician Abe Jirō (1883-1959) and others noted the concept of "personality" as a fundamental concept in art, and developed it as a sophisticated philosophy which could connote European aesthetics. Nishida's philosophy, in particular, clearly realized that such gaps which had occurred between the interpretations of Cézanne in France and Japan were actually the fundamental cultural gaps that exist between France and Japan, and he added a philosophical reflection on the concept of personality as one of the basic concepts with which one discusses a Japanese aesthetic understanding.

In his compilation *Art and Ethics* [Geijutsu to dōtoku, in Japanese] (published in 1923,

these articles were first published in seven issues from 1920 to 1923, and the following quotes are translated from the Iwanami Shoten 1950 edition of *The Complete Works of Nishida Kitarō*, vol. 3) Nishida clarified the formation and relationship between truth, virtue and beauty, which have "personality" as their common root, and yet, for Nishida, the "personality" at issue in art is the movement of the life force (synonymous with consciousness and subject) which moves the sensual world, including vision and touch. This life force underlies the world seen by the eye, that of color, form and composition, it is the world not seen by the eye which gives appearance to the world of things seen by the eye.

"A work of art is the manifestation of our internal life force, and it is the construct of our personalities." ("The contents of sentiment, the contents of consciousness," [Kanjiō no naiyō to Ishi no naiyō, in Japanese] *Tetsugaku kenkyū*, no. 61, 1922, in *Art and Ethics* pp. 324.)

"There is no artistic value separate from personality value." (*ibid.*, p. 325.)

"Just as the discovery of personality content at the roots of perception and sensation becomes art, the discovery of personality content at the roots of objective knowledge becomes philosophy." ("The meeting point of truth, virtue and beauty" [Shin-zen-bi no gōitsuten, in Japanese] in *Tetsugaku kenkyū*, no. 66, 1922, in *Art and Ethics* p. 374.)

"The creative act of a plastic artist is nothing more than the formative act of hands and eyes. But, the form seen by the artist is not simply form, it must be an expression of life force. In this manner, the consciousness of life itself which is the formative principle of the sensual world also has moral content." ("Art and Virtue," [Bi to zen, in Japanese] in *Tetsugaku kenkyū* no. 78, 1923, in *Art and Ethics* pp. 486-487.)

In this manner, the concept of personality presented in contrast to the world manifested by the senses is summarized in *From Moving Things to Seeing Things* [Hataraku-mono kara miru-mono e, in Japanese] (1927) as Nishida's unique stance on art appreciation which then developed consistently to the stance which pits western culture as "form" against Asian culture as "formless."

It goes without saying that there are many things to be learned in the gaudy development of western culture which considers forms as existence and formation as virtue. But, isn't there something concealed at the root of the Asian culture formed by our forefathers over the millenia which enables us to see the formless and hear the voiceless? Our hearts ceaselessly seek this out." ("Preface," from *Moving Things to Seeing Things*, 1927, *The Complete Works of Nishida Kitarō* vol. 4, 1949, Iwanami Shoten.)

Nishida also defined personality as the expressive content of art, incorporating the aesthetics of Konrad Fiedler (1841-95) and Henri Bergson (1859-1941) in the Asian view of nature and art, as the life force which is revealed in the state of the union of subject and object.

"When we destroy our network of concepts and stand in the position of pure visual action, then the world of objects of pure plastic art appears. Things are brought to life in this context, and the space is a life force-filled thing. Life force is an aspect of the unity of subject and object, and when we become object, and object becomes us, then life force

appears." ("Truth and Beauty," [Shin to zen, in Japanese] *Kaizō*, February issue, 1924, in *Art and Ethics* p. 513.)

And yet an attitude resembling Nishida's artistic view with its acknowledgement of the existence of art's expressive content between the object and the creating subject had already been born in the context of European modern art at the 19th century and into the beginning of the 20th century.

Richard Shiff (b.1943), an art historian who has analyzed and considered the art criticism from the French Impressionists of the 19th century to the Symbolists, found the germ of the subjective interpretation of nature in the Impressionists, indicated the continuity from the Impressionists to the Symbolists, and then noted the shift of focus from the object to the subject that occurs in the Symbolists. In addition, several contemporary researchers, also concerning the realm of the creation of the work itself, have indicated that after the Impressionists the myth of the objectivity of nature had even crumbled, and that there was a shift to a paradigm in which art's expressive content is sought in the mobile relationship between subject (painter) and object (that which is painted).⁹⁾

If the Impressionists, and later the Post Impressionists, were actively received in Japan, one of the reasons for this reception can be found in the fact that the paradigm shift which had occurred in French art, both in the creation and the appreciation (critique) of art, harmonized with the traditional Japanese framework expressed in such words as "refinement", or *ki-in* in Japanese, and "sensation," or *kokoromochi* in Japanese in which aesthetic consciousness is born from a harmonious relationship between nature, life and humanity.

Then, the use of the concept of "personality" replaced the concepts noted above which were applied by these Japanese in their consideration of the Impressionists. While, on the one hand, the concept of "personality" was selected amidst the resonant framework of the union of subject and object found in both Japan and France, we can consider it as a Japanese viewpoint which had matured as "something different in character," as clearly seen in Nishida's statements about the difference between eastern and western cultures. It was here that the "dynamics of union and dispersal" were at work.

Abe Jiro's *Personalism* [Jinkaku-shugi, in Japanese], published in 1922 by Iwanami Shoten emphasizes

"Art works are the symbol of the spiritual life force, and they only hold meaning in their evocation of the resonance of the personality life force in our hearts." (p. 127).

Further, he defined personality as the activities of "the subject," and established the goal of "personalism" as its fusion with a "cosmic life force" that exceeds the subject. Unlike Nishida, he emphasizes the ethical aspect of personality as the basis for anti-materialist thought. Here we can recognize the metamorphosis into the philosophical ethics of humanist art theory in the period after the Shirakaba group when we can also find the development of the concept of personality as ideology. Abe's personality concept was,

of course, not unrelated to the political and philosophical state of the period, and yet this subject will be largely set aside in this context. Here I would like to consider the "act of viewing as the act of resonating with personality" as emphasized by Abe. This is the act of appreciating art that was introduced earlier as having been actually accomplished by Kimura and Yamawaki. It is the same as Nishida's consideration of the act of appreciating as the re-experience of personality (a sense of union with personality), in contrast to Nishida's concept of the act of creating as the manifestation of personality.

"For once we must view objects with the same stance taken by the artist viewing objects, and just as the artist lives within that thing, we must attempt to once, live within that object." (Nishida Kitarō, "Art and Virtue," [Bi to zen, in Japanese] *Tetsugaku Kenkyū*, no. 78, 1922, in *Art and Ethics* p. 485.)

Nishida, while touching upon van Gogh, Henri Matisse (1869-1954), and Max Klinger (1857-1920), got no further in his mention of Cézanne than to indicate Cézanne's difference from the Impressionists, his "absolute Gestaltung," the "Ordnung des Ganzen," which he compared to the Neo-Kantian contributions to the history of philosophy. ("Contemporary Philosophy," the March 1916 first issue of *Tetsugaku Kenkyū*, in *Thought and Experience* [Shisaku to taiken, in Japanese] volume 1 of the *Complete Works of Nishida Kitarō*, Iwanami Shoten, pp. 367-68.) Abe has only one reference to Cézanne; he mentions Cézanne's colors as an example of the "sublime personality." (in *Aesthetics*, [Bigaku, in Japanese], Iwanami Shoten, 1917, p. 246.) The use of Nishida and Abe's concepts of personality as consistent stances for the sake of chronological art historical description, and the use of this viewpoint for the interpretation of Cézanne began with the histories of modern French painting written in the 1920s by Nakaï Sōtarō and by the aesthetician and art historian, Ueda Juzō (1886-1973).

In his *Survey of Modern Art-Complete* [Kindai geijutsu gairon zen, in Japanese] (Nishōdō Shoten, 1922), Nakaï used the concepts of life force and "personality" as central to beauty and creation, as seen in the following.

The sensation of beauty is humanity's sensation of the comprehended active life force in the sensate "thing." (p. 4)

"The creation of art, or rephrased, the act of ceaselessly producing, must be included in the issue of personality which drives this act. The universal value is the personality of this lofty human. This personality which is endlessly creative can in fact be considered an absolute actuality. The spirit, as I have previously mentioned, which creates the object anew is the deepest core of this personality." (p. 11)

Taking Impressionism, along with realism and Neo-Impressionism, as naturalist, Nakaï considered van Gogh, Gauguin, and Cézanne as expressionist. And while naturalism's representation gets no further than that of the sensate world, Nakaï highly valued expressionism with its goals of "the activity of the life force," and the "manifestation of the personality" which surpass this limitation, and he adds to expressionism the philosophi-

cal values of spiritualism set in opposition to materialism (pp. 152-58).

Nakai turned to Bernard, Denis and Joachim Gasquet (1873-1921) and their theories of Cézanne in his discussion of Cézanne, converging, fusing (indeed warping) their statements with those focused on "personality." For example, he borrowed from Denis's theory which considers Cézanne's method with its establishment of his own order from the subjective interpretation of the object as a form of classicism that harmonizes subject and object,⁷ then bent the direction of Denis's argument by stating that "in the feeling that thing and heart are as one, he (Cézanne) sought to grasp the all encompassing life force." (p. 165). On this point, it seems that Nakai gained a great number of concepts from Gasquet's Romantic viewpoint which he had translated and introduced in his own discussion of Cézanne as "the artistic view of Cézanne." (pp. 197-209)

Or he borrowed, with modification, Denis' following citation of Louis-Paul-Henri Sérusier's (1864-1927) argument regarding "Cézanne's apples"⁸, which Denis had used in his explanation of the beauty of the autonomous order found in Cézanne's paintings.

"If we consider that we want to eat the apples depicted by ordinary people, the mere sight of Cézanne's apples evokes an "oh how beautiful" exclamation, and thus reveals a deeper actuality. While we may not want to start peeling the fruit, we immediately want to diligently copy it. Here is Cézanne's idealism. Clearly the eye can see the murmuring of the spirit in Cézanne's painting of apples." [Trans. note: translated from S. Nakai's Japanese version of the French]

After quoting the above from Denis, without footnote reference to its source, he developed this idea in the following.

"Through staring at internalized nature, thoroughly, becoming completely nature itself, isn't this the destruction of the small self, the desire to arrive at the eternal higher subject, the absolute spirit. To destroy the small self, to live in nature, these can tentatively be considered as objective, as anti-individualistic. If we were then to consider a level deeper, the completeness of delving into nature means living in an all the larger self, and it means the attaining of an all the higher degree of the subjective. Isn't this all the higher union, the ideal that Cézanne sought to achieve?... If the self and nature are essentially one, and if the self then achieves the cosmic spirit through the thoroughness of the true union of self and nature, then Cézanne's apples are truly both "one" and "all." Aren't they, in their union, raised to a higher realm in which the all can be perceived in the one?" (pp. 165-66)

Rather than influence from Nishida, this interpretation by Nakai reflects the thorough influence of Abe's "Personalism" and Abe's emphasis on the ethical and philosophical meaning of personality.

In the same manner, while his discussion of *The Large Bathers* (Venturi no. 719, Philadelphia Museum of Art) mentions the composition (framework) and palette, he repeats Denis's assertion that the special characteristic of Cézanne's paintings can be found in their "synthesis" as opposed to the dispersal found in the Impressionists (p. 167). And yet Nakai transforms the concept of "synthesis" into something quite different in the

context of his own writing. For Denis "synthesis" is not the transformation of all things in the composition into a singular, but rather is the settling into an order that governs the entire composition, in other words, into "un seul rythme", "une dominante." (activity of the subject; translation from Nakai's Japanese version of the French). If we consider that Denis has taken up the issue of Cézanne's method of ordering (classicism in the true sense) in this one passage, a concept that differs from that of the Synthétists of the period⁹, then in Nakai's context, as can be seen in the words he chose for his translation of the French concepts, he has shifted the emphasis to the subject, or the active, characteristic of the life force that produces the order. We must recognize that in this shift Nakai has re-interpreted Denis's interpretation of Cézanne.

The year after Nakai's publication of his text, Ueda Juzō wrote his *On the History of Modern Painting* [Kindai Kaiga shiron, in Japanese] (Iwanami Shoten, 1923). While rooted in the philosophical basis of Nishida's philosophy,¹⁰ and after clarifying the true character of art and art history, Ueda provided an individual discussion of each of the French modern painters since Jacques-Louis David (1748-1825) (as a non-continuous mountain range of geniuses). This work ends with a description of Cézanne. In the Cézanne passage, he provides a more thorough examination of works than that found in Nakai, proceeding with such structural analysis of the picture plane as "composition," "line," "brushstroke," "principle of construction," etc. He finished these analyses by converging them with the act of verbalization of the special characteristics of "a single spiritual network" (p. 747) and "life force" (p. 731 and others) which he had intuited in the background of the construct.

"The nature viewed by Cézanne, the landscape he sought, was quiet nature. It was also desolate nature. It was nature "without moving things."...And yet that nature itself alone breathed a vigorous life force. That is, it wasn't the strength of the life force like that of Vincent. Compared to his agitation, Cézanne's was completely still. It was not the passion of madness, it is penetrating tension. It was not the whirlpool of agitation, it is the drawn-in depths. And first, it was his characteristic outlines, his brushstrokes that expressed this on the canvas." (p. 728)

"His trees, and many bodies seem to have a powerful standing force, one brought about by their brushstrokes and outlines, their strongly straining life force that seems to break loose from the earth's surface. And yet, his thin strands of hair-like lines, and his sharp, cold life force found in his close application of thin, geometric lines, moreso than the thinly applied, thin, endlessly thin lines, indicate one of the differences by which we can separate him from Vincent. In this cold, piercing style, the life force is in the quiet, silent but strong tension. This life force that stares into our own depths, in its "spiritual" name, can clearly be distinguished from the life force found in Vincent." (p. 734)

Ueda does not use the term personality as often as Nakai, and he prudently avoids its mingling with the concept of personality with its ethical meaning that can be seen scattered here and there in Nakai in his positive use of the term "artistic personality" (p. 54). Further, he differentiates "artistic values" from biographical facts (the aspect of artist as person) and the artist's own words (artistic view), and we can see how Ueda's Cézanne

discussion, with its stance of picking out the visual construct of the painting surface through the notation of specific works, established a methodological clarity and purity as art history. Further, he distinguished Cézanne's life force from that of van Gogh through such terms as "cold," "piercing tension," "spiritual." The framework or context for Ueda's appreciation (analysis) was born from the larger framework—personalism—which had been presented by Nishida and Abe, and shared by Nakaï. But his product is found there, in his talk of artistic personality, albeit using ethical life force as a metaphor, he developed it as a question of the life force visually internalized, cut off from ethics.

The scope of this essay does not allow room for a consideration of the connection between the formation of the personality-based appreciative method developed by Nishida and the others and the creative context of the arts in Japan at the time, but it is not altogether a coincidence that one model that these authors suggested as material for reflection can be found in "the linear arts of drawing and calligraphy." In 1910, Arishima focused on watercolors, and saw in them Cézanne's personality, while Kimura also took special note of the brushstrokes in Cézanne's paintings. Nishida emphasized that "line painting," like poetry or music, was more expressive of personality than painting, and he compared the expressive content of "line painting" with "*hitsu-i*" or the concept of brush intent in Asian painting as the "phenomenon of subjective imagination." ("From Max Klinger's 'Painting and Line Drawing,'" [Makkusu kuringeru no kaiga to senga, in Japanese] *Geibun*, Year 11, no. 10, 1920, in *Art and Ethics*, p. 286.)¹¹ Ueda also offered oil paintings as examples, drawing out Cézanne's unique life force from the "outlines" and "brushstrokes" which continue to be an important expressive medium that surpasses western art, not only in western art, but also in Japanese art.

We can infer at present that the "personality based interpretation of Cézanne" traced above was a stance constructed amidst a traditional, even actual, artistic context, with regards to the creation and appreciation of calligraphy, ink paintings, *suibokuga* in Japanese, or literati style painting, *nanga*, which use line drawing as their main expressive form.

This context was used to discuss Cézanne, and then was repeatedly used after that. For example, the aesthetician and art critic Kinbara Seigo (1888-1958), albeit never using the concept "personality", introduces Cézanne's techniques as the same as Asian painting techniques in his book *Research on Line as it Occurs in Painting* [Kaiga ni okeru sen no kenkyū, in Japanese] (Kokin Shoin, 1927). This study had as one of its goals the analysis of the expressiveness and the expressive method of the line, and while it is rich with examples drawn from both the works and the art theories of Asian and western art, when the author touches upon the traditional Asian painting method known as the "boned method, or *koppō*" (the composition of a painting with lines), he interprets Cézanne's recommended "composition made up of the simplification, abstraction of the forms of nature" as a form of boned painting method that grasps the "deep life" and "nucleus of life force."

What, then, was the state of the interpretation of Cézanne in France around the time that these "personality based images of Cézanne" were being formed in Japan in the 1920s?

It was around this period that "the interpretations in which the special quality of Cézanne was seen as the method of setting in order his sensations received from nature and composing them in the autonomous ordered picture plane," ("Classicism"; Denis, 1907, or "pure painting"; Sérusier, 1907, Leon Welth (dates unknown), 1914)¹² were established as shared concepts, as introduced in the Cézanne study by Gino Severini (1883-1966) ("Esthétique Cézanne et le Cézannisme" in *L'esprit nouveau*, no. 2 (pp. 1257-1266) and no. 13 (pp. 1462-1466), 1921). This was the period that saw the beginning of the trend toward formalism, the act of verbalizing the analysis of Cézanne's pictorial premises themselves, moving from the analysis of Cézanne's sensations by Bernard and Denis (perceptualism), to the typical form seen in André Lhote (1885-1962) ("L'enseignement de Cézanne," *Nouvelle Revue Française*, no. 1920) and the formalist aspect of his Cézanne theory had already been prefigured in the analyses of Bernard and Denis.¹³ If the formalist interpretation of Cézanne turns its attention to the surface quality of the phenomenon known as Cézanne's paintings, then we can say that the "personality based Cézanne interpretation" turns its eyes to the underside of that same phenomenon.

3. Rebirth-In place of a conclusion

In his *Cézanne Memos* [Sezannu oboegaki, in Japanese] published by Chūō Kōronsha in 1949, the western style painter Itō Ren (1898-1983) clearly expressed the stance that we should be aware of the resemblance between ink painting (*suibokuga*) and Cézanne's works when we consider Cézanne's arts, and he compared and analyzed the special formal characteristics of Cézanne and ink painting. He then emphasized the expressive content of Cézanne's paintings as a "cosmic life force" that resembles the "breath of life," or *ki-in seidō* in Japanese, that is born from the harmonization of the artist's life force rhythm with the rhythm of nature. In this sense he revived the traditional Japanese artistic appreciation system in terms of Cézanne.

Art historian Nakayama Kimio (b. 1927), in the autumn 1956 edition of *Mizue* (special edition 13, Cézanne special issue), freely used the results of Cézanne research in the west (biographical facts, formal analysis, and technical analysis) and provided a detailed introduction to Cézanne's oeuvre from his earliest works through his last years. He did not suggest either the concept of personality or a resemblance to Asian painting in this study of Cézanne. However, in the nature shown by Cézanne, he saw "people are one part of the world, the world is one part of people, the common state of humanity and things" and he sensed the infinite cosmos that the viewer connotes in Cézanne's compositions. He defined this as the special quality of Cézanne's arts. This presents an echo of the "personalism" offered by Nishida, Abe, Nakaï and others, further it accords with the Cézanne theories posed in France from the 1940s through the 1960s. It resonates with the work of Liliane Brion-Guerry (b. 1916), whose works were also introduced by Nakayama¹⁴, and who suggests a resemblance between Chinese painting and Cézanne's painting. And Nakayama's text is in tune with those of Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1908-1961) who acclaimed Cézanne as a model of understanding or cognition that overcomes the traditional western

ways of thinking, dualism as well as the scientific, noting that Cézanne's paintings are an act of recognition that resembles the act of inventing a new language about the real given, the not yet verbalized.¹⁵⁾

Yoshida Hidekazu (b. 1913), in his *Cézanne Story I, II* [Sezannu monogatari I, II, in Japanese] (Chûô Kôronsha, 1986), referring to the work of Brion-Guerry, indicates the commonalities to be found between the lively ink painting of China (*hatsuboku-ga* in Japanese, a style in which the brush is loaded with ink and allowed to race across the page unhindered) and the watercolors of Cézanne's last years. In this regard, he notes that one painting (*Still Life with Apples, Bottle, Glass and Chairs*, Venturi Nr. 1155, Courtauld Institute Galleries, London) provides the gate from "the world of things with form" to the "formless world," or the "world that surpasses form" ("the place where cosmic things breathe with their endless expansion").

In such references, we can note how the image of Cézanne sensitively perceived and formulated by the Japanese of the 1920s was independently discovered by the French amidst the history of the interpretation of Cézanne in France, and through this, we can verify the process by which the Japanese re-encountered the traditional image of Cézanne, and reconfirmed it. In sum, this was a move from the "process of alignment and disagreement" of the past to a "process of re-alignment."¹⁶⁾

1) See Nagai Takanori. *The Cézannism in Japan around the 1910s (the Reception and Introduction of the Arts of Cézanne)*, Report on Research conducted under the Auspices of the Scientific Research Grants for 1989, [in Japanese] March 1990.

2) Honda Shûgo, *The Literature of the Shirakaba Group*, Shinchôsha, 1960, (in Japanese, in vol. 17 of *Shôwa bungaku zenshû*, Shogakukan, 1989). Takashina Shûji, "Shirakaba and Modern Art," (in Japanese) *Kikan Geijutsu*, (nos. 21, 22, 25), February and March 1972, February 1973 (in *Art Consciousness in Modern Japan*, Seidosha, 1993.) See the following for the reconsideration of the Shirakaba centered reception of Cézanne. Inaga Shigemi, "Shirakaba and the Plastic Arts: Centering on a reconsideration of the 'understanding' of Cézanne (in Japanese)," *Hikaku Bungaku Kenkyû*, Vol. 38, ed. by Nihon hikaku bungaku kai, 1995, pp. 76-91.

3) Maeda Fujio, "Vitalism and Fin de siècle Art —Berlin in the 1890s and Meier Graefe," (in Japanese) *Munch, Kollwitz and Barlach Theorist Meier-Graefe and Fin-de-Siècle Berlin*, (ex. cat.), Shûyû Gallery, 1993.

4) See pp. 22-25 of note 1.

5) See Nagai Takanori, "Early 1920s Japan and French Cézannism: From Perceptualism to Formalism/From Perceptualism to Personalism," [in Japanese] *Annual of the Kajima Foundation for the Arts* (for the year 1995) (no. 13, separate volume *Kajima Bijutsu Kenkyû*, November 1996, pp. 173-187.

6) See Richard Shiff, "The End of Impressionism: A Study in Theories of Artistic Expression," in *Art Quarterly*, 1978, 1. no. 4, pp. 338-78; *Cézanne and the End of Impressionism, A Study of The Theory, Technique, and Critical Evaluation of Modern Art*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1984 (the French translation by Jean-François Allain published in 1995 by Flammarion includes two other recent texts); Nagai Takanori, "Research Notes, The Art Theories of Gustave Moreau (1826 - 1898) - The Image of Moreau in Critical Space (1), *Miru*, vol. 336, (2) *Miru*, vol. 337 [in Japanese], June to July, 1995 issues.

7) Maurice Denis, "Cézanne", in *L'Occident*, no. 70, September 1907, reprinted in *Le Ciel et L'arcadie*, by Jean Paul Bouillon, 1993, p. 133. For Denis' theory of Art, see also Shigemi Inaga, "L'histoire saisie par l'artiste Maurice Denis, historiographe du symbolisme", dans *Des mots et des couleurs-II-*, Textes réunis par Jean-Pierre Guillermin, Presses Universitaires de Lille, 1986 (orig. text. march 1982), pp. 197-

236.

8) Paul Sérusier, cited by Maurice Denis, *ibid.*, p. 139.

9) Maurice Denis, *ibid.*, p. 147: "Synthétiser ce n'est pas nécessairement simplifier dans le sens de supprimer certaines parties de l'objet: c'est simplifier dans le sens de rendre intelligible. C'est, en somme, hiérarchiser: soumettre chaque tableau à un seul rythme, à une dominante, sacrifier, subordonner-généraliser."

10) See Iwaki Ken'ichi, "Ueda Juzô's Aesthetic Thoughts-The Reception and Dismantlement of mid-period Nishida Philosophy," research paper [in Japanese] presented at the Western Division of the Aesthetics Society, 209th Research Report Meeting (July 6, 1996, Dôshisha University).

11) In this same manner, see also Nishida Kitarô's writings on calligraphy, "...and there is no art that lacks an expression of the artist's personality. Although it goes without saying in the case of things like painting and sculpture, and also for those like music, we can consider these things to have many objective limitations. However, in the case of calligraphy, these are extremely few, and through their visceral sense, the characters which are created from the simplest of lines and dots freely express the lively movement of the life forces of the artist-self." "The Aesthetics of Calligraphy," *Toku'un*, no. 3, 1930, *Thinking and Experience* (2) Zoku shisaku to taiken, in Japanese, in *The Complete Works of Nishida Kitarô*, vol. 12, Iwanami Shoten, 1950, pp. 150-151.

12) Maurice Denis, "Cézanne", *op. cit.* pp. 129-150. Sérusier, in M. Denis, *op. cit.*, p. 139. Leon Welth, "Cézanne", in *Cézanne*, Bernhem, -Jeune, eds., 1914, pp. 41-50.

13) See note 5.

14) Liliane Brion-Guerry, *Cézanne et l'expression de l'espace*, Paris, 1966, (orig. ed. 1950)

15) Maurice Merleau-Ponty, "Le doute de Cézanne," *Fontaine*, no. 48, December 1948, *L'Oeil et l'esprit*, Paris, 1960, etc.

16) The potential of the Cézanne interpretation attempted by Nagai and Ueda does not lie in the verbalization of the contents of personality (life force), nor in the limitation of its active forms to lines and brush strokes, but in to what extent we can re-experience and verbalize the way of the act of personality (life force) through the "active subject" in a Nishidaian manner (in *Art and Ethics*). This remains a topic for further inquiry. For information on some attempts made from this viewpoint and some indications by the author or western scholars, see Nagai, "The Problem of Time as it Occurs in Cézanne's Paintings," [in Japanese] *Theory and History of Art*, Shibunkaku, 1990, pp. 385-394. Augustin Berque, translated by Shinoda Katsuhide into the Japanese as *Nippon no Fûkei, Seiyô no keikan soshite Zôkei no jidai*, Kôdansha, 1990. Norman Bryson, *Looking at the Overlooked, Four Essays on Still Life Painting*, Cambridge, Mass., 1990, pp. 81-83.

Note: This article was written on the basis of the results of a survey and study conducted under the auspices of support (support for survey research in art) offered by the Kajima Foundation for the Arts. I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to the Foundation. This article was originally published in the Japanese journal, *Eureka-Poetry and Criticism*, September 1996 edition, special issue on Cézanne. I would like to express my gratitude to Seido Publishers for their permission to publish this English translation of the original article.

Partial modification has been made to the text for this English edition.

As a general rule, the titles of journals, books and art objects were in *italic* form, and when they were originally in Japanese, they have been translated, and then appended with the romanized version of their original Japanese form. (however, these romanizations have been omitted in the footnotes). Japanese titles of journals and publisher names have been left in their romanized form. Keywords in the text have been appended with the romanized form of the original Japanese. (ex. *Jinkaku* for personality). Quotation marks are used for emphasis, and to highlight quoted passages and article titles.

Completed 1 March 1997

Translated by Martha J. McClintock, with the supervision of the author
(Senior Curator, Research Center, The National Museum of Modern Art, Kyoto)