

Verbal representation of Paul Cézanne's art in Julian Barnes's, John Berger's and Patrick Heron's essays: a cognitive poetic analysis

T. V. Lunyova

Kyiv National Linguistic University, Kyiv, Ukraine
Corresponding author. E-mail: lunyovat@gmail.com

Paper received 14.02.21; Accepted for publication 25.02.21.

<https://doi.org/10.31174/SEND-Ph2021-248IX73-13>

Abstract. In the article three essays devoted to Paul Cézanne's paintings are examined with the application of cognitive poetic methodology. Both the similarities and the differences in descriptive ekphrastic representations, interpretative ekphrastic interpretations and metaekphrastic discussions of Cézanne's canvases in the essays by Julian Barnes, John Berger and Patrick Heron have been elucidated as well as cognitive underpinnings of these diverse representations, interpretations and discussions of Cézanne's works have been revealed.

Keywords: *essay, visual art, cognitive poetics, ekphrasis, metaekphrasis, concept, conceptual metaphor, narrative.*

Introduction. The paper brings three essays devoted to the eminent French painter Paul Cézanne, which were written by three different authors, under a cognitive poetic analysis. The research question of how personal interpretations of the visual art can be constructed and verbally expressed is shaped at the junction of the following research areas: the studies of the essay as a genre, research on verbal representation of objects of visual art, and cognitive poetic analysis of meaning construction in verbal texts.

Literature review. The essay as a genre is typically characterised as such a text which enables its author to articulate their own personal ideas and views. Essays are used to express a new, subjective statement about something [14, p. 49]; arguments in essays go beyond standard patterns, they are unique as chosen and developed by the authors [8, p. 19]. An essay presupposes an interpretation rather than a description of various facts [5, p. 99], to provide such an interpretation the author chooses information which is relevant from their point of view [Ibid.].

The buoying area of the research on verbal representation of objects of visual art is shaped as the studies of ekphrasis which can be defined as "description of a work of art" [17, p. 70]. Depending on the content of the ekphrases, they are subdivided into descriptive and interpretative ones [18]. Descriptive ekphrasis renders what is depicted in the painting, represents its visual aspect while interpretative ekphrasis offers an interpretation of the deeper symbolic meaning of the work of art [Ibid.].

Since ekphrasis constitutes only a part of the meaning of essays on visual art, together with Prof. Olga Vorobyova we suggested introducing the term *metaekphrasis* to account for such contexts which are semantically related to ekphrasis without being the ekphrasis per se and which constitute "discussion of or meditation on existential, aesthetic, artistic, cultural, social, political, as well as psychological issues prompted by the ekphrastic representation of a work of art" [16, p. 343]. The concept of metaekphrasis as a research tool has been since employed in my study of Julian Barnes's essayistic account of one of Édouard Manet's paintings [11] and will be further developed in this paper. To illustrate the difference between ekphrastic and metaekphrastic essayistic contexts let us consider two extracts from Patrick Heron's essay on Paul Cézanne that will be discussed in detail in this paper, e.g.: "The Gulf of Marseille Seen from l'Estaque (c. 1886) is surely one of the greatest landscapes involving the sea of all time. One could

stare all day into that blue area of a hundred movements of the brush which is the sea..." [6, p. 142] and "One could call it the development of a multi-directional perspective, and the abandonment of that single perspective which had reigned from the Renaissance" [op. cit., p. 144]. The former passage is an ekphrastic representation since it names explicitly one of Cézanne's paintings (*The Gulf of Marseille Seen from l'Estaque*), classifies it as a landscape (*one of the greatest landscapes*) and refers to the physical object depicted in the painting (*the sea*). The latter passage is a metaekphrasis because it offers a discussion of the development of some pictorial means (*the development of a multi-directional perspective*) in the art-historical context (*from the Renaissance*).

Cognitive poetic approach has been successfully used to analyse ekphrasis as meaning construction by several researchers [1; 9, p. 285-290; 12; 15] as well as employed in Vorobyova's and mine study of John Berger's essayistic ekphrasis and metaekphrasis [16] and in my article on Julian Barnes's essayistic ekphrasis and metaekphrasis [11]. This paper methodologically dwells upon these researches.

The aim of the study is to find out cognitive underpinnings of the different verbal representations, interpretations and discussions of Cézanne's art in the essays written by three different authors.

Material and methods. The material of the research is three essays about Paul Cézanne's art [2; 3; 6]. These texts were written by the three highly acclaimed authors: Julian Barnes – "British critic and author of inventive and intellectual novels" [10], John Berger – "British essayist and cultural thinker as well as a prolific novelist, poet, translator, and screenwriter" [4], and Patrick Heron – "British painter and critic, known for his use of light and vivid colour, who was one of the U.K.'s most prominent post-World War II abstract painters" [13]. The texts chosen for the study were examined with the application of methods of conceptual analysis, analysis in terms of conceptual metaphors, and contextual interpretative analysis.

Results and discussion. Paul Cézanne is acknowledged as "one of the greatest of the Post-Impressionists, whose works and ideas were influential in the aesthetic development of many 20th-century artists and art movements, especially Cubism" [7]. None of the essays under the analysis challenges this view. On the contrary, all the three authors pay tribute to Cézanne and highlight his achievements.

There is much congruity between the three essays as far

as *ekphrastic representation* of Cézanne's paintings is concerned. *Descriptive ekphrasis* in the essays covers Cézanne's colours, the peculiarities of the artist's brushstrokes, the objects painted in his canvases and the types of paintings he created.

All the tree texts give a verbal account of the colours used by the artist by naming these colours, e.g.: "It is also a lot about the colour *blue*: when the Barnes Collection moved into central Philadelphia [...], Cézanne's *blues (and greens)* suddenly shone out in a new – old – way" [2, p. 114], "Let's begin with the *black* found in many of his earliest works..." [3, p. 252], "... the wedges of *ocher and pale red*, [...], merge their sharpness so consummately into the *olive and emerald softness of the trees between*" [6, p. 142]. As the quoted above passages demonstrate, the authors of the essays focus on different colours in Cézanne's paintings which may be accounted for the personal priorities and preferences of the authors. However, it is important that none of the authors fails to mention Cézanne's colours in his essay which can be explained by the significance of colours in Cézanne's art.

All the essays verbally render the characteristic brushstrokes of the painter, e.g.: "Occasionally there might be a *scurry of shorter brushstrokes* animating the branches of a tree..." [2, p. 114], "Then, during the last twenty years of his life, Cézanne begins to apply those *swabs of colour* to the canvas..." [3, p. 253], "...the ubiquitous surface texture, in Cézanne, is almost always comprised of these *clusters of quickly stated, dense stackings of separate brushstrokes*: each group of strokes often largely consisting of one color" [6, p. 140]. While all the authors verbally represent Cézanne's brushstrokes, they choose different approaches to do so. Barnes discusses Cézanne's brushstrokes in terms of movement and constructs the metaphor BRUSHSTROKES ARE OBJECTS THAT MOVE QUICKLY which is verbalised by the word combination *a scurry of shorter brushstrokes*. Berger opts for the metaphor BRUSHSTROKES ARE SMALL PIECES OF SOFT MATERIAL (*apply those swabs of colour to the canvas*) and Heron characterises Cézanne's brushstrokes with the help of the concept CLUSTER (*clusters*) and the metaphor BRUSHSTROKES ARE STACKINGS (*stackings of separate brushstrokes*). All these cognitive means used by the authors to talk about Cézanne's brushstrokes are semantically well-congruent with the key concepts of their essays.

The metaphor BRUSHSTROKES ARE OBJECTS THAT MOVE QUICKLY is not accidental in Barnes's text, rather it accords with the one of the key concepts applied by author in his analysis of Cézanne's paintings – the concept MOVEMENT. This concept is verbalised in the title of Barnes's essay "Cézanne: Does an Apple *Move*?" [2, p. 105] and is used to render Cézanne's attitude to the people and objects he depicted as well as to characterise Cézanne's paintings. To illustrate this point let us consider several quotations from Barnes's essay, e.g.: "Talk, *laugh, move*," Manet used to tell his models: "to look real you must be alive." Cézanne's sitters, by contrast, had to be *guardsmanlike for hours*. When Vollard made the mistake of falling asleep, the painter bawled him out: "Wretch! You've *ruined the pose*! I tell you in all seriousness you must hold it like an apple. Does an apple *move*?" And when another sitter *turned away* to laugh at someone's joke, Cézanne threw down his brush and stormed out" [op.

cit., p. 110]. This passage from Barnes's text, which is metaekphrastic in its nature, reveals Cézanne's approach to painting people by contrasting Manet's practice of making his sitters move and Cézanne's demand that his sitters remain immobile. The concept MOVEMENT is actualised in this quote with the help of several linguistic means: the verb *move* which is used twice, the verbs *talk, laugh, turned away* and the verb *ruined* in combination with the noun *the pose*. The concept IMMOBILITY as the opposite of the concept MOVEMENT is actualised in the discussed passage as well: it is represented by the expression *to be guardsmanlike for hours* and the proposition *you must hold it like an apple*. Further on in his essay Barnes uses both the concept MOVEMENT and the concept IMMOBILITY to reveal the peculiarity Cézanne's portraits, e.g.: "And when they [Cézanne's portraits] succeed, they do so as paintings governed by colour and harmony, rather than as visual descriptions of human beings who do normal human things like *talk, laugh and move*" [op. cit., p. 112]. In the quoted above extract the concept MOVEMENT is actualised with the help of the verb *move* as well as the verbs *do, talk, laugh*. Barnes states in this passage that Cézanne does not depict people in their movement (*rather than as visual descriptions of human beings who do normal human things*). The writer further illustrates this statement by describing two pictures: "The Card Players", e.g.: "Those card players bent over their table *are never actually going to play a card or take a trick*; they may be staring at the best hand they've ever seen, *but the undertaker will arrive before they will be permitted to lay it down*" [op. cit., p. 112] and "Madame Cézanne in a Red Armchair", e.g.: "Mme Cézanne, *strapped into her chair* by her husband's stern command to *immobility*, is not going to reveal her personality to us, however many times he paints her. *She might as well have been his favourite door*" [op. cit., p. 112]. The interpretation of the painting "The Card Players" is grounded in the evocation of the concept IMMOBILITY which is actualised in the hypothetical description of what actions will never happen in the picture (*are never actually going to play a card or take a trick; but the undertaker will arrive before they will be permitted to lay it down*). Similarly, the concept IMMOBILITY is used to interpret the picture "Madame Cézanne in a Red Armchair": this concept is verbalised by the noun *immobility*, the descriptive phrase *strapped into her chair*, the proposition *Mme Cézanne is not going to reveal her personality to us*, and comparison of the portrait with the painting of the door (*She might as well have been his favourite door*).

Berger's metaphor BRUSHSTROKES ARE SMALL PIECES OF SOFT MATERIAL, which is used to characterise Cézanne's brushstrokes, is further developed in the text when the painter's canvases are metaphorically considered as a textile, e.g.: "These colours he takes out *are like woven fabric*, except that, *instead of being made from thread or cotton*, they are made from the traces of paint-brush or palette knife leaves in oil paint" [3, p. 253]. In the quoted passage the underlined verbal means objectify the conceptual metaphor COLOURS ARE FABRIC.

Heron with his key concept CLUSTER and the metaphor BRUSHSTROKES ARE STACKINGS highlights the separate nature of individual brushstrokes and their grouping in Cézanne's paintings as some pattern. The author consistently develops this idea in his essay, e.g.: "Not pine

needles, or bark-encrusted bending boughs, but separated, single, dry, square-tipped brushstrokes it was that hung in the air before one's eyes. In rhythmic ranks, vibrating gently in all directions, they formed strata of separated color" [6, p. 138]. In the quoted passage the words *separated* and *single* are used to represent Cézanne's brushstrokes as being separate from each other while the word combination *rhythmic ranks* and the word *strata* describe the principle of grouping of the brushstrokes.

All the three essays give account of the objects depicted in Cézanne's canvases by naming these objects, e.g.: "... in old age, he painted female bathers ..." [2, p. 109], "The apples he painted have the autonomy of bodies" [3, p. 254], "each object in a Cézanne landscape – houses, rocks, pines – has a form as carved and definite and weighty as the objects in his still lifes" [6, p. 142].

All the texts under study make references to the types of paintings Cézanne created, e.g.: "So his portraits are the opposite of those made to catch a mood..." [2, p. 110], "This is particularly evident in his still lifes" [3, p. 254], "Now a still life – The Blue Vase (1889-90)" [6, p. 142].

The difference between the three essays lies in the choice of the pictures discussed, referred to and reproduced by the authors of the essays. Barnes refers to Cézanne's "Bathers at Rest" and "Large Bathers" [2, p. 105], discusses the painting "The Card Players" [op. cit., p. 112] and the portraits "Madame Cézanne in a Red Armchair" [Ibid.] and "Henri Gasquet" [op. cit., p. 115] as well as Cézanne's still life with an apple without naming this painting (presumably, it is the famous "Fruit Bowl, Glass and Apples") [op. cit., p. 112-113]. Barnes's essay is accompanied with the reproductions of Cézanne's canvases "The Card Players" [op. cit., p. 111] and "Madame Cézanne in a Red Armchair" [op. cit., p. 113]. Besides, Barnes's text includes the reproduction of the painting "Homage to Cézanne" by Maurice Denis [op. cit., p. 107]. Berger discusses Cézanne's still lifes taken collectively, without singling out one particular painting [3, p. 254] and further describes and discusses several paintings representing human figures and/or landscape without naming the canvases [Ibid.]. Berger's essay includes the reproduction of Cézanne's "La Pendule Noire" [op. cit., p. 253]. Heron describes "The Gulf of Marseilles, seen from L'Estaque" [6, p. 142], "The Blue Vase" [op. cit., p. 143], "Still Life: Flowers in a Vase" [op. cit., p. 144], "Houses in Provence – The Riaux Valley near L'Estaque" [op. cit., p. 145], and "Sea at L'Estaque" [op. cit., p. 146]. The following ten reproductions of Cézanne's canvases are included in Heron's essay: "Rocks at L'estaque" [op. cit., p. 139], "Mont Sainte-Victoire seen from Bellevue" [op. cit., p. 140], "La Montagne Sainte-Victoire" [op. cit., p. 141], "The Gulf of Marseilles, seen from L'Estaque" [op. cit., p. 142], "The Blue Vase" [op. cit., p. 143], "The Maison Maria", "House in Provence, Near Gardanne" [op. cit., p. 144], "Houses in Provence – The Riaux Valley near L'Estaque" [op. cit., p. 145], "Sea at L'Estaque" [op. cit., p. 146], and "Farm in Normandy, Summer (Hattenville)" [op. cit., p. 147].

Having chosen different paintings for the representation, Barnes, Berger and Heron develop somewhat different lines of argument in their *interpretative ekphrases*. In particular, Barnes highlights the similarity between Cézanne's portraits and still lifes, e.g.: "So Cézanne's por-

traits are all still-lives" [2, p. 112] and particularly emphasises the immobility in Cézanne's portraits, e.g.: "... he lowered or sat on human life to the point where it almost ceases to be animate" [op. cit., p. 114] while acknowledging the existence of the opposite view that Cézanne's still lifes were approaching portraits of living people, e.g.: "Kandinsky wrote that 'Cézanne made a living thing out of a teacup, or rather in a teacup he realized the existence of something alive. He raised still life to such a point that it ceased to be inanimate.'" [op. cit., p. 114] and casting doubts on this point of view, e.g.: "This may be true, but then so is its opposite ..." [op. cit., p. 114]. Berger develops that opinion which Barnes doubts and asserts that Cézanne's still lifes represent the painter's vision of objects as having bodies, e.g.: "Gradually, however Cézanne began to expand the notion or sensation of corporeality, so that it could include things that we do not normally think of as having a body. This is particularly evident in his still lifes. The apples he painted have the autonomy of bodies. Each apple is self-possessed, each has been held in his hand and recognised as unique" [3, p. 254]. Besides, Berger reveals the correspondences between Cézanne's representations of people and landscape and maintains that Cézanne's figures of people are depicted as elements of the landscape while some landscapes are like portraits, e.g.: "His late baigneuses from ranges like mountains. The deserted quarry at Bibémus looks like a portrait" [Ibid.]. Heron, in a reflexive passage at the end of his essay, acknowledges that he mainly discussed Cézanne's landscapes with the aim to explicate Cézanne's original use of colours, e.g.: "In pursuit of an attempted elucidation of, for instance, Cézanne's spatial color, I find I have ignored completely the portraits and very considerably the still lifes, too" [6, p. 147].

Besides the discussed above considerations of Cézanne's paintings of different types, interpretative ekphrasis in the essays is employed to consider the correspondence between the colours in Cézanne's paintings and the colours of the real objects as experienced by general public as well as the role of the colour as a constructive element in Cézanne's canvases. Barnes touches on these issues when he quotes Braque's acknowledgement of Cézanne's achievement, e.g.: "In Cézanne's works we should see not only a new pictorial construction but also – too often forgotten – a new moral suggestion of space" [2, p. 105]. In the quoted passage the concepts NEW (*new*), DEPICTION (*pictorial*), CONSTRUCTION (*construction*), and SPACE (*space*) are used to articulate Cézanne's unique treatment of space in his art. Berger highlights the discrepancies between the colours in Cézanne's paintings and the colours of the objects (*apply those swabs of colour to the canvas, not where they correspond to the local colour of an object*) as well as establishes the connection between Cézanne's colours and the space in his art (*where they can indicate a path for our eyes through space*), e.g.: "... Cézanne begins to apply those swabs of colour to the canvas, not where they correspond to the local colour of an object, but where they can indicate a path for our eyes through space, receding or oncoming" [3, p. 253]. Heron expounds on the non-descriptiveness on Cézanne's colours (*not so much descriptive of the colors and textures of the forms they evoke*) and their role as a space-creating device (*the spatial position those forms occupy in the subject; a space-creating*

plastic device) pointing up the originality and power of such an artistic device (*immense originality and power*), e.g.: “*These strokes, these clusters, are not so much descriptive of the colors and textures of the forms they evoke as of the spatial position those forms occupy in the subject. The separate brushstrokes forming these clusters thus came into existence as a space-creating plastic device, and one of immense originality and power*” [6, p. 140]. As it follows from the discussed passages, all the authors of the essays present Cézanne’s colours as a unique innovative device to create space in the painting rather than to render the colours of the real objects as typically perceived by people. Such unanimity can be attributed to the fact that there is a certain tradition of perceiving and interpreting Cézanne’s canvases, and all the three authors follow this tradition.

A noticeable difference between the three essays under discussion lies in the *metaekphrastic* contexts. Barnes, Berger and Heron express somewhat different opinions on Cézanne’s role in culture and choose three different strategies of constructing the argument in their essays. While Barnes does not give a conclusive answer concerning Cézanne’s influence on art and through art, Berger champions Cézanne as a prophet of a new vision and Heron stands closer to Berger than to Barnes in celebrating Cézanne’s innovations.

Barnes, on the one hand, emphasises Cézanne’s influence upon other artists. He does it mainly via citing other painters who acknowledge Cézanne’s significance, e.g.: “*Cézanne will have done immense service even to painters whose work is diametrically opposed to his own*” [2, p. 109]. The quoted above passage is taken from the diary of the painter Félix Vallotton and states that Cézanne’s art has importance for all the painters after him, not only his direct followers. Besides, Barnes confirms that Cézanne’s high reputation among his fellow painters is well-deserved, e.g.: “*We see the debts owed and paid to him [Cézanne]. We understand why his fellow artists valued and admired and collected him*” [op. cit., p. 115-116]. On the other hand, Barnes casts doubts on the biographer Alex Danchev’s high esteem for Cézanne. After quoting Danchev’s claim that Cézanne significantly influenced the way people conceptualise the world (e.g.: “*Cézanne’s ‘impact on our world, and our conception of our world, is comparable to that of Marx or Freud*” [op. cit., p. 116]), Barnes denounces it (e.g.: “*This seems more an enthusiastic, loving flourish than a sustainable argument*” [op. cit., p. 116]). He goes on to assert that painting after Cézanne developed in different ways and not all the artist’s successors followed his path (e.g.: “*...painting has continued, and art changed, sometimes building on Cézanne’s discoveries, sometimes not*” [Ibid.]). Barnes leaves the question “*Has our daily vision really become Cézannified?*” [Ibid.] to be answered by the readers (e.g.: “*At this point the reader might, like one of the painter’s card players allowed to unfreeze for a moment, rap the table quietly and murmur, ‘Pass’*” [Ibid.]). Hence, Barnes both brings the claim that Cézanne has changed the way people see the world to the readers’ attention and challenges the validity of this claim. Overall, Barnes uses numerous quotations from other artists, critics, writers, Cézanne’s sitters as well as Cézanne himself to construct the multi-voiced discussion of Cézanne’s role in art.

Berger calls Cézanne a prophet (e.g.: “*He [Cézanne] was a prophet, although like many prophets this was not what he set out to be*” [3, p. 252]) and defines Cézanne’s late works as *prophetic* (e.g., “*Cézanne’s prophetic late works are about creations ...*” [op. cit., p. 253]). Besides, the writer indicates that Cézanne was original in his artistic activity, e.g.: “*This [Cézanne’s exhibition] offers us the chance to look at him, in all his originality, yet again*” [Ibid.] and specifies that the painter was concerned with the question of the visible, e.g.: “*... the story of his love affair, his liaison, with the visible*” [Ibid.]. Berger acknowledges Cézanne’s achievement indirectly, through emphasising the difficulties (*difficult*) of the artist’s work and his perseverance in doing it (*obstinate, persistent*), e.g.: “*Whereas what Cézanne did was obstinate, persistent, difficult*” [Ibid.]. Berger’s strategy to celebrate Cézanne’s achievement is suggestive, he constructs his essay in such a way that the readers could believe in Cézanne being a prophet of the artistic vision. The main means to do it is the conceptual metaphor CÉZANNE’S PAINTING IS TAKING COLOURS OUT OF THE BLACK BOX, e.g.: “*About ten years further into his career, Cézanne begins to take colours out of the black box...*” [Ibid.]. This metaphor is verbalised in the essay four times and serves as the main semantic means of structuring the content of the essay. The scale of Cézanne’s work is amplified through the comparison between the artist creating paintings out of his “black box” and the creation of the universe, e.g.: “*Cézanne’s prophetic late works are about creations – the creation of the world or, if you wish, the universe. I’m tempted now to call the black box, which I see as his starting point, a black hole...*” [Ibid.].

Heron first introduces his claim that paintings teach public to see the world (e.g.: “*I have always claimed that painting’s prime function is to dictate to us what the world looks like*” [6, p. 138]) and then reveals Cézanne’s innovations in seeing and representing the visual world, e.g.: “*So when Cézanne resolved visual realities into countless groups of delectably ordered strata of fragmented brushstrokes lying parallel to one another he was magnifying something seen*” [op. cit., p. 139]. Heron utilises the strategy of supporting his claim with the narrative of his personal experience and tells a story of how he visited the place painted by Cézanne and how he was able to see the real landscape exactly in the way Cézanne painted it, e.g.: “*I never visited Aix-en-Provence until the summer of 1962 – and then only for an hour, heading the family car inn what I hoped was the direction of the sacred mountain. We were already outside the town when we swung round a corner to the left... and there it was, even more to the left, at the top of a slight valley and already framed by the boughs of three pines, exactly as Cézanne saw it in the sublime vision at the Courtilaud*” [op. cit., p. 138]. Heron summarises his essay by stating that Cézanne was revolutionary in his approach to treating the visual realities of the world, e.g.: “*I set out in this essay to try to present something of Cézanne’s revolutionary awareness of the visual realities of the world we inhabit*” [op. cit., p. 147] and acknowledging Cézanne’s artistic success one more time, e.g.: “*Yet both these subjects provided Cézanne with challenges and inspiration – and success – equal to those of the landscape*” [Ibid.].

Conclusion. The analysed essays devoted to Paul Cézanne, which were written by Julian Barnes, John Berger, and Patrick Heron, have both similarities and differences in terms of descriptive ekphrastic representations, interpretative ekphrastic interpretations as well as metaekphrastic discussions of Cézanne's works of art. The three authors verbally represent Cézanne's colours and brushstrokes, however they focus on different colours and employ different cognitive means to attest to Cézanne's unique brushstrokes. The differences in the choice of the pictures discussed, referred to and reproduced by the authors of the essays were determined by the authors' intended arguments that are verbalised in the essays as different interpretations of the correlations between Cézanne's paintings of various types. All the three authors, however, are in agreement in interpreting Cézanne's colours as a unique innovative space creating device which can be explained as the authors' subscription to the art-historical and art-critical

tradition of interpreting Cézanne's canvases. Metaekphrastic discussions of Cézanne's role in art and everyday life (in particular, in the domain of perception) are the contexts where the three authors diverge in their evaluation of Cézanne's impact (Berger and Heron are quite close in their assessment while Barnes differs from them) and in the cognitive means they choose to express their evaluations. Overall, all the three authors fully used the potential of the essay as a genre and selected those aspects of the reality that they wanted to discuss (i.e., Cézanne's paintings subjected to representation and interpretation as well as the particular relations between these paintings) and chose the strategies to support the arguments developed in the discussions in their essays (i.e., they opted for various cognitive structures such as the key concepts, conceptual metaphors, or a narrative). Because of the complexity of the relationships between descriptive ekphrasis, interpretative ekphrasis and metaekphrasis in essays about visual art a further research into this issue is needed.

REFERENCES

1. Andreeva K.A., Beloborod'ko E.K. New approach to very traditional notion "ekphrasis": in the dialogue of linguistics and art // *Universum: Philology and arts studies*. 2016. No 11 (33) // Андреева К.А., Белобородько Е.К. Новые подходы к вполне традиционному понятию "экфразис": в диалоге лингвистики и искусства // *Universum: Филология и искусствоведение*. 2016. № 11 (33). Available at: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/novye-podhody-k-vpolne-traditsionnomu-ponyatiyu-ekfrazis-v-dialoge-lingvistiki-i-iskusstva>
2. Barnes J. *Cézanne: Does an Apple Move?* // Barnes J. *Keeping an Eye Open: Essays on Art*. New York: Vintage International, Vintage Books, 2015/2017. P. 105-116.
3. Berger J. *Paul Cézanne* // Berger J. *Portraits: John Berger on Artists* / Ed. T. Overton. London, New York: Verso, 2015. P. 252-254.
4. Blumberg N. *John Berger* // *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Available at: <https://www.britannica.com/biography/John-Berger>
5. Gnatjuk M. Genre and subject paradigm of the modern essays // *Literary studies*. 2015. Issue 1(1). P. 96-104 // Гнатюк М.М. Жанрово-тематична парадигма сучасної есеїстики. Літературознавчі студії. 2015. Вип. 1(1). С. 96-104.
6. Heron P. *Paul Cézanne* // *Writers on Artists*. London, New York, Delhi, Sydney, Munich, Paris, Johannesburg: DK Publishing, 2001. P. 138-147.
7. Huyghe R. *Paul Cézanne* // *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Available at: <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Paul-Cezanne>
8. Ivanova N. Peculiarities of the essay as a genre of non-fiction // *Word and Time*. 2007. No 9. P. 15-25 // Іванова Н. Специфіка есею як жанру художньо-небелетристичної літератури. Слово і Час. 2007. №9. С. 15-25.
9. Izotova N.P. Ludic stylistics of contemporary English fictional narrative from a linguistic perspective: A study of J.M. Coetzee's novels: Thesis for the Doctor's degree in Philology. Speciality 10.02.04 – Germanic languages. Kyiv: Kyiv National Linguistic University, 2018. 458 p. // Изотова Н.П. Игровая стилистика сучасного англомовного художнього нарративу в лінгвістичному висвітленні (на матеріалі романів Дж.М. Кутзее): Дисертація на здобуття наукового ступеня доктора філологічних наук. Спеціальність 10.02.04 – германські мови. Київ: Київський національний лінгвістичний
10. Julian Barnes // *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Available at: <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Julian-Barnes>
11. Lunyova T. Ekphrasis and metaekphrasis in Julian Barnes's essayistic account of Édouard Manet's paintings of the execution of Emperor Maximilian: a cognitive poetic analysis // *Science and Education: A New Dimension. Philology*. 2020. November 2020. VIII (72). Issue 241. P. 37-40.
12. Panagiotidou M-E. Ekphrasis, cognition, and iconicity: An analysis of W. D. Snodgrass's "Van Gogh: 'The starry night'" // *Dimensions of iconicity* / Eds. A. Zirker, M. Bauer, O. Fischer, C. Ljungberg. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2017. P. 135-150.
13. Patrick Heron // *Encyclopaedia Britannica Academic*. Available at: <https://academic-eb-com.eres.qnl.qa/levels/collegiate/article/Patrick-Heron/342322>
14. Shebelis S. Theoretical aspects of the essay as a genre // *Word and Time*. 2007. No 11. P. 48-56 // Шебеліст С. Теоретичні аспекти жанру есею. Слово і Час. 2007. №11. С. 48-56.
15. Verdonk P. Painting, poetry, parallelism: Ekphrasis, stylistics and cognitive poetics // *Language and Literature*. 2005. No 14 (3), P. 231-244.
16. Vorobyova O., Lunyova T. Verbal and non-verbal facets of metaekphrastic writing: A cognitive study of John Berger's essays on visual art // *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava*. Trnava: University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava, 2020. Volume V. Issue 2. December 2020. P. 335–381.
17. Webb R. *Ekphrasis, imagination and persuasion in ancient rhetorical theory and practice*. London and New York: Routledge, 2009/ 2016. 238 p.
18. Yatsenko E.V. "Love painting, poets..." Ekphrasis as an artistic worldview model // *Issues in philosophy*. 2011 // Яценко Е.В. "Любите живопись, поэты...". Экфразис как художественно-мировоззренческая модель // *Вопросы философии*. 2011. Available at: http://vphil.ru/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=427