

© Malcolm Park – Excerpt from 2001 PhD Dissertation:
Ambiguity, and the engagement of spatial illusion within the surface of Manet's paintings

5B. VIEW OF THE 1867 EXPOSITION UNIVERSELLE: Text

In the knowledge that *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle* (Fig.B1) was not exhibited during Manet's lifetime, his final intentions for the work must remain uncertain or at least considered with some caution. Although T.J. Clark has suggested that the painting, with its sketchiness, "pretends... to be not quite a picture, not quite finished",¹ it could be just as easily proposed that the work doesn't pretend to be unfinished at all, but rather, that it existed for over a decade as a work-in-progress, a field of innovative experimentation, which Manet had no intention of either completing or exhibiting. As such, and as an unsigned work,² it would become difficult, indeed impossible, to assume the stage of finality of its existing state or to presume any final intentions for the work. Many of the scholarly commentaries on the work have used the personal and political events of the time to invest the work with presumptions of Manet's purpose and to conclude when and why he stopped working on it, but the painting itself does not provide evidence of, or licence for, such proposals. What the painting's state does allow is an examination of Manet's process and interim manipulations in a way that is not normally available. The analysis here has thus limited its concerns to identifying what the painting depicts and, in doing so, to attempt to establish the way in which Manet constructed this complex and layered panorama.

Background

A background of circumstances and events which surrounded the painting's subject, the Exposition Universelle held in Paris in 1867, certainly provided a context of contemporary issues for Manet at that time and also a chronological framework for his work on *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle*. Situated on the Champ-de-Mars between the Seine and the École de Militaire, the Exposition was "dedicated to progress and peace", represented "a confrontation between the old and the new", and was seen by Napoleon III as a display of France's "prominence in industry and the arts".³ But its

spectacle also camouflaged the tensions of the social, economic and physical changes in the Paris of the Second Empire, and Manet's painting has been seen more as a representation of those undercurrents than as a depiction of a World Fair.⁴

The official celebrations of art held in Paris during 1867, including the Salon held in the Palais de l'Industrie,⁵ the exhibition held as part of the Exposition,⁶ and a commemorative exhibition of Ingres' work held at the École des Beaux-Arts,⁷ also concealed the reality of the changes which were under way in the world of painting. Manet's decision to mount his own private exhibition of over fifty of his own paintings and prints in opposition to the exhibition of establishment art at the Exposition underlined the concerns of many to the judging procedures involved with official art,⁸ as well as confirming the approach to painting by those who, as Émile Zola had noted, "take the new road".⁹ Although not without precedent,¹⁰ Manet's exhibition gave evidence of his self-confidence and determination to have his work set before the public and, notwithstanding the previous criticism of his art from both the establishment and the public alike, he had hoped for success.¹¹ Opened in late May in a temporary pavilion on the Place de l'Alma between the Avenues de l'Alma and Montaigne,¹² and with the critical support of a re-published article from Émile Zola as a brochure,¹³ the exhibition fell short of that expectation. Manet's friend Antonin Proust wrote that "Le public fut cependant sans pitié. Il riait devant ces chefs-d'oeuvre, se réservant sans doute la ressource de pleurer plus tard devant ce qu'il admirait... Jamais, dans aucun temps, il ne s'est vu spectacle d'une injustice aussi révoltante",¹⁴ but Patricia Mainardi has suggested that "Proust's testimony notwithstanding, Manet was simply ignored".¹⁵

Undercurrents of concern about the militarism of the Second Empire were also evident at the time. The contradiction of the siting of the Exposition as a celebration of peace on the Champ-de-Mars, the parade ground for the adjoining École Militaire, was not lost on those concerned with the militaristic aspirations of Napoleon III and brought satirical comment from both caricaturists¹⁶ and writers. And such concerns were highlighted by the news in early July of the execution of Emperor Maximilian in Mexico, during the failed military campaign there. This event became the catalyst for

Manet's series of paintings depicting the very moment of Maximilian's execution by firing squad,¹⁷ with the first version seen by scholars to have been commenced before the end of July¹⁸ and, in the process, to have interrupted the work on *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle*.¹⁹ More personal interludes may also have affected progress on the painting. In August, and apparently as an escape from the disappointment of his own exhibition, Manet had spent some time at the coast at Boulogne and Trouville,²⁰ but on learning of the death of his close friend Charles Baudelaire on 31 August, he had returned to Paris for the funeral held on 2 September.

In the midst of these circumstances and dates, the details of when, from where, and how directly from the motif Manet had actually painted *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle*, either initially or at any subsequent stage, are less than clear. Previous scholarship on these aspects provides a comparative background for the analysis and proposals made here. Many scholars have placed the painting's production in June of 1867,²¹ Theodore Reff extended the period to be "the summer of 1867",²² and although Patricia Mainardi thought that it had been painted "sometime between the opening of the Universal Exposition on April 1 and his [Manet's] departure for Boulogne in August",²³ she also considered that it was "probably done in June after his show had opened on 22 or 24 May, but before he realized that it would not be a success."²⁴ Such a time frame may, however, be far too limited. As discussed in the analysis and proposal below, aspects of the imagery raise the possibility that Manet may have commenced the work prior to the opening of the Exposition and subsequently worked on the canvas after 1867, even into the 1870s.

Although the painting has always been recognised to have spatial compression or disjunctions, these have usually been seen as the result of Manet's interpretation and manipulation of the panoramic vista from one viewpoint in the Trocadéro area, which was on the opposite side of the Seine to the Exposition site. As part of the preparations for the Exposition, this area of the colline de Chaillot had been lowered and transformed (Fig.B11) from an irregular formation to become an expansive, terraced, open area with a formal road layout, called the Place du Roi-de-Rome²⁵ (Figs.B6, B10, B15, and B19),

and when completed, it became a popular vantage point for sightseers to view the spectacle of the Exposition and Paris.²⁶ It also became the nominal site from which most popular illustrations of the Exposition and its layout were made (Fig.B2). Scholarly opinion about Manet's actual viewpoint in this area has been varied. Sigurd Willoch's suggestion for the viewpoint in 1976, noted in a resumé as "Manet s'était placé à un niveau très élevé du Trocadéro, peut-être au coin de la rue Franklin et de la rue Vineuse",²⁷ was claimed by Patricia Mainardi to be an identification in 1980.²⁸ Both John Richardson and Theodore Reff, however, had proposed lower viewpoints, with Richardson in 1958 incorrectly inferring that Manet had been impressed by Berthe Morisot's later *View of Paris from the Trocadéro* (1872) and "had decided to paint a similar panoramic view from lower down the same hillside",²⁹ and Reff in 1982 claiming that "Manet actually stood halfway down the hillside, closer to the exhibition that was his real subject".³⁰ Conversely, Nigel Blake and Francis Frascina have seen that "the imaginary viewer (which we become) is positioned so as to be looking from the summit of the Butte de Chaillot",³¹ and Robert L. Herbert has suggested that Manet "had stood further back and looked through binoculars".³² Although Herbert's notion is unqualified and non-specific, the analysis below shows how the use of some optical device, be it binoculars or a camera, was most probably involved in the development of the painting's foreground. The extent to which Manet painted the work directly in front of the motif or developed it in his studio is qualified by a specific note in the Register of Léon Leenhoff³³ which indicates that Manet was at the Trocadéro "le matin avant 10 heures",³⁴ and thus infers that he worked at the site on something more time-consuming than his quick pencil sketches. Mainardi, however, has suggested that "if he had painted it "on the motif", it would be his first plein-air picture,"³⁵ and that

Manet's method of picture construction for outdoor subjects during this period... was to develop them in his studio from preliminary sketches and drawings... the View of the Universal Exposition, because of its size... its disjunctive spatial construction, and its disposition of figures, seems to be in the same category.³⁶

These spatial disjunctions, which also are essentially the concern of the analysis here, have been seen in various ways by previous scholars. Mainardi, for example, has

seen them in terms of compressions of lateral space and spatial recession, and of mixtures of scales, perspective, and degrees of prominence. A lateral compression had been seen with Manet's omission of the Palais de l'Industrie,³⁷ and one in spatial recession when Manet had

dropped out the middleground completely and jammed together the two areas of maximum interest, the immediate foreground and the distant panorama. Instead of taking a long view, which would clarify the objective spatial relationships, he has thrust the viewer so abruptly into the foreground that the articulation of the Pont d'Iéna, the Seine and the Exposition itself has become almost indecipherable.³⁸

The figures in the foreground have also been seen by Mainardi as a mixture of spaces, scales, and perspective, suggesting that

The workman on the lower left does not appear to be standing on the same ground plane as the women behind him, and the two gentlemen on the right, who seem to be in correct scale to the soldiers, are too large to be that far back from Léon Leenhoff and his dog. Not only do the figures exist in different perspectives from each other, they also seem to be in a different perspective from the panorama... Manet's figures are disruptive of any spatial continuity and can only be seen separately.³⁹

The elimination of the Seine had also been noted by Reff and Herbert in contrasting ways, with Reff suggesting that the lower viewpoint meant that Manet "juxtaposed rather abruptly the gardens and figures on the near shore of the Seine and the trees and exhibition buildings on the far shore, virtually eliminating the river itself and its quays"⁴⁰ while Herbert claimed that the proposed viewpoint further back was suggested by "the disappearance of the river behind the slope in the foreground" and which allowed Manet "to juxtapose the people in the foreground directly to the fair buildings".⁴¹ Anne Coffin Hanson had also seen that the result of Manet's "use of arbitrary figure size" was "to break the sense of spatial unity, to reverse the expectation that the entire scene can be realized all at once, and instead to invite the eye to jump from group to group"⁴² with "the groups... separated by large areas of open space and... disposed not only across the surface but at different distances from the frontal plane".⁴³ And in addition to describing perceived techniques of disjunction, Alan Krell raised the issue of the painting's spatial ambiguity, noting that the painting "plays teasingly with scale and perspective. Nothing, really, is quite right: spaces are ambiguous, figures are

either too big or too small, details rub shoulders with generalities".⁴⁴ Nonetheless, rather than seeing these disjunctions as manipulations of, and omissions from, the view as seen from one viewpoint, the proposal below sees the painting to be a composite image, with nine interlocked and overlaid sections of views, each of reasonable accuracy, from six different viewpoints.

The approaches taken by other scholars on a number of other aspects involved in the analysis and proposals, such as source images and identification, are also of interest. If the painting, with its relatively large canvas, had been mainly created in Manet's studio rather than at the site, the question about possible images which he may have used as source or *aide memoire* other than his own sketches is relevant. As is shown in the analysis below, a number of photographs of the Exposition Universelle were taken from the Trocadéro area at the time of the Exposition Universelle and obviously would have been readily available. And as noted above, many illustrations of diagrammatic views, as if seen from the Trocadéro, appeared in the journals of the day. A possible use of such imagery has been raised by Mainardi and Reff in different ways. Mainardi has suggested that the way in which an Epinal print (Fig.B2) conveyed "the immediacy of near and far seen together" was similar to that of Manet eliminating the middleground,⁴⁵ whereas Reff has claimed that Manet, "like the popular printmakers,... followed a principle of synecdoche, representing the vast urban panorama by a few of its most familiar landmarks".⁴⁶ For this dissertation, a more important question than Manet's possible use of popular imagery is that of the extent to which he worked directly from photographs, using either the imagery to develop notions of pictorial fracture, or photographic prints in a direct cut-and-paste technique. Such a use of photographs, with their accurate perspective, would have facilitated the means to create ambiguity with 'real' views.

Many previous scholarly identifications of what has been depicted in *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle* illustrate the difference of approach taken in this dissertation. The more familiar buildings of Paris and the Exposition have been identified by others as discrete two-dimensional forms, noted as being included in the painting or not included, but not seen as elements in a particular illusionistic view or as a

three-dimensional object related to other objects within a virtual space. And in one particular instance, the presumed familiarity has either ignored or intentionally contradicted objective information. Prior to a claim by Adolphe Tabarant in 1947 that the balloon seen in the painting's upper right corner was Nadar's *Le Géant*, reference to it had been in general terms. In 1902 Duret had written "en haut, un ballon qui plane",⁴⁷ in 1926 Moreau-Nélaton wrote of "le ballon captif tirait sur sa corde",⁴⁸ and in 1931 Tabarant referred to "un aérostat plane".⁴⁹ In 1947, however, Tabarant expanded the reference to "un aérostat plane, qui est celui de Nadar",⁵⁰ and in doing so provided subsequent scholars with an incorrect point of reference for the identification of Nadar's balloon, *Le Géant*, and an opportunity to intimate that it had been unique in the skies of Paris. Richardson in 1958 confirmed Nadar's role, writing of "a balloon belonging to Manet's friend, the photographer Nadar",⁵¹ while Mainardi stated that "Manet's balloon is that of his friend Nadar. Called *Le Géant*... it was at that time the largest ever built"⁵² and even compounded the incorrect identification by claiming that "the artist actually changed the silhouette of *Le Géant*...".⁵³ In 1985, Clark conjectured that the balloon in both *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle* and Manet's lithograph of 1862, *Le Ballon*, "most probably belonged to the photographer Nadar",⁵⁴ and Herbert in 1988,⁵⁵ Wivel and Wilson-Bareau in 1989,⁵⁶ Cachin in 1991,⁵⁷ and Krell in 1996⁵⁸ were quite specific about Nadar and *Le Géant*. And in 1993, Blake and Frascina had intimated the rarity of balloons by asserting that "What could be identified by the contemporary Parisian – apart, that is, from the panorama of the city – is the photographer Nadar's balloon to the right".⁵⁹ The balloon was neither *Le Géant* nor Nadar's. As the analysis and proposal below confirm, Moreau-Nélaton's 1926 description of "le ballon captif" made specific and correct reference to a *ballon captif* which provided *ascensions* for the paying public at a well-known facility of the time adjacent to the Exposition site, positioned outside the view of the painting to the right. Of course, the balloon can still be referred to symbolically, metaphorically, or metonymically as Nadar's *Le Géant*, and it can be claimed that Manet had painted it to be that balloon, but the very existence of a balloon repeatedly ascending and descending during the course of a day from a position outside

the image of the painting exactly where the restraining cable indicates, makes it clear that Manet simply painted what he had seen. Its artistic relevance is within the context of the depicted image of the painting itself, not within contexts of external speculation.

Analysis

The overall research for this dissertation has identified Manet's repeated use of actual views, interlocked or overlaid to create composite paintings of varying degrees of spatial ambiguity, with the resultant spatial disjunctions not being the result of arbitrary scatterings of elements, but rather, the considered manipulation of views as seen. Although it can be established very quickly that the scene depicted in *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle* is not that of a single, cohesive space, the analysis was carried out to identify those parts of either a single view or of multiple views, if indeed they existed, which may have been brought together in the construction of the painted image. For such an analysis it was required to establish the topography of Paris, the heights and relative elevations of the relevant buildings, monuments and landmarks which may have been involved in the views, and to develop an understanding of contemporary activities, such as aerial ballooning. Details of the research procedures used and the computer modelling of the topography, buildings, monuments and landmarks are given in Appendix 4. The range of buildings and monuments considered was influenced by the decision to not accept, unquestioned and unverified, the previous scholarly identifications and viewpoint proposals, and to more comprehensively understand the relationships of the various elements within the range of particular views and as depicted. Many photographic images of the 1867 Exposition Universelle exist and those selected here as part of the study illustrate the range and nature of the pavilions on the Champ-de-Mars site, and the context of the Exposition in the cityscape of Paris as seen from the colline de Chaillot (Figs.B4–B10, inclusive).⁶⁰ A location plan (Fig.B15), a matching plan using a section of an 1870 map of Paris (Fig.B16), an aerial perspective (Fig.B18) which shows an overview of the site of the painting, including the Trocadéro area, the Exposition site on the Champ-de-Mars as well as the background vista, and an

aerial perspective (Fig.B19) which looks in overview towards the site from beyond the skyline elements, illustrate the area under consideration.

Patricia Mainardi had noted the more familiar buildings and structures to be seen in the painting,⁶¹ including the dome of the Panorama National,⁶² Sainte-Clotilde, Notre-Dame, Saint-Louis-des-Invalides, the Panthéon, the École Militaire, the Pont de l'Alma, and Pont d'Iéna, and the most prominent structures of the Exposition, including the Palais de l'Exposition, the Phare des Roches-Douvres, and the Phare Anglais. In addition to those identifications, the analysis has also been able to identify, depicted in their reasonably correct positions on the Parisian skyline, one of the towers of Saint-Sulpice, Saint-Jacques-du-Haut-Pas, the elm tree Orme de Sully, Notre-Dame-du-Val-de-Grâce, and the Observatoire. Below the skyline are also seen the roofs of the Palais des Tuileries and the Palais du Louvre, and the Tour Saint-Jacques. Although positive identification has not been possible because of either the scale of the images or the summary technique used by Manet, it is worth noting that many other buildings and monuments can be seen in those positions where a relevant painted form exists, including the spire of the distant Notre-Dame-de-la-Croix de Ménilmontant, a tower of Saint-Ambroise, the roofs and tower of the Hôtel de Ville, the roof of Saint-Gervais, the roofs and dome of Saint-Paul-Saint-Louis, the spire of Sainte-Chapelle, and the tower of the unfinished Notre-Dame-des-Champs. Within the precinct of the Exposition itself on the Champ-de-Mars and the adjacent river bank, buildings and installations other than those noted by Mainardi have also been used in the analysis, including the Théâtre (as a scale replica of Garnier's Opéra, which was under construction at the time), the Cercle International building for the international journalists, and the riverside buildings of the Restaurant Français, the Hangar des machines marines de la France, and the Hangar des machines marines de la Bretagne. And at the right edge of the painting, beside the figures of the Imperial guardsmen, the excavated cliff facing the Place du Roi-de-Rome, and as seen in the photographs, Figs.B10, B11, and B12, has also been identified.

One aspect of identification involves an omission. It has not previously been noted that the tower of Saint-Germain-des-Prés is not visible in the panorama, but its omission

is important for an understanding of the painting's structure. When commenting on the fact that the Palais de l'Industrie was not depicted by Manet, Patricia Mainardi wrote that although "it was certainly within Manet's field of vision, he has omitted it",⁶³ and in doing so confirmed the proposal that the painting was based upon a single, wide-angle, view which had been manipulated and adjusted, and from which parts of the field of view had been simply deleted.⁶⁴ And Sigurd Willoch's earlier reference to the view from the possible viewpoint on Rue Franklin suggested that Manet "aura resserré la perspective".⁶⁵ But as shown in the proposal below, the view of the Panorama National, then adjacent to the Palais de l'Industrie, is seen as depicted in the painting from a very different position and confirms that the preconception of a dismantled view is an inaccurate one. Rather than making arbitrary omissions as compressions of a unified panoramic view, and in the process forming an image as if by default, Manet created his own cohesive, original space within the surface of the painting by selectively using different parts of different views from different viewpoints. As is often stated in this dissertation, the research has showed that Manet had painted from what he saw, no matter how unrelated his final image may seem to the motif, and he did not usually arbitrarily omit elements for pictorial expediency.

Some elements depicted in the painting, such as the Place du Roi-de-Rome, the dome of the Saint-Louis-des-Invalides, and the aerial balloon provide chronological information towards an understanding of when *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle* may have been produced. The work involved in the reforming of the colline de Chaillot and creation of the Place du Roi-de-Rome in the Trocadéro area was commenced in 1866 and completed shortly before the opening of the Exposition on 1 April,⁶⁶ confirming that at least the foreground of the painting had not been laid in before that date. And during the Exposition various events had been held on the Place, including the celebration of the *fête nationale* on 15 August, for which numerous large and small pavilions had been constructed (Fig.B9). But the degree to which such events may have limited Manet in working directly from the motifs of the Place in the foreground and the Exposition in the background is uncertain. The unusual profile of the Invalides dome in

the painting is explained by scaffolding for restoration work on the dome (Fig.B14), but although it had commenced in 1862 its date of completion is uncertain. One contemporary guide for visitors to Paris stated "On vient de réparer (février 1867)... l'extérieur du dôme",⁶⁷ another reference has claimed it to have been 1868.⁶⁸ Photograph Fig.B6, shows the full height of the scaffolding as seen in the painting at a time when the work on the Place du Roi-de-Rome was complete, and photographs Figs.B4, B5, and B9 show it at a reduced height. With the approximate dating of the photograph Fig.B9 around 15 August, it suggests that if the painting of the Invalides had been made from the motif then it would have been no later than August, 1867, most probably in March prior to the opening of the Exposition, but possibly even no later than February.

A somewhat different period of time during which the object depicted could actually have been seen and painted by Manet is provided by the aerial balloon. As discussed within the wider activities of aerial ballooning in Appendix 3, and as noted above, the balloon as painted, with its restraining cable, is not only quite clearly a *ballon captif*, as described by Moreau-Nélaton, but it is certainly the *ballon captif* which was operated from facilities in Avenue de Suffren. Although unseen outside the painting's frame to the right, these facilities can be seen in three photographs, Figs.B4, B7 and B8.⁶⁹ Constructed by Henry Giffard, the *ballon captif* had been installed at the workshop of M. Flaud at No.42 Avenue de Suffren on 26 September, 1867. For the cost of 20 francs per passenger it provided *ascensions captives* for up to fifteen passengers to a height of approximately 300 metres, with four ten minute ascensions per hour (Fig.J4). Even though its arrival at the site adjacent to the Exposition occurred well after the Exposition's opening, the *ballon captif* became the highlight of the related activities, as indicated by an article of 26 October:

Nous n'hésitons pas à dire que pour être arrivé tard, le ballon captif de MM. Giffard et Flaud n'en est pas moins la chose extra-curieuse et le succès superlatif de l'Exposition. Captif, ce ballon de 21 mètres, presque aussi grand que *le Géant*, contenant 5,000 mètres cubes de gaz, pesant, chargé, 3,500 kil. et retenu dans la main de l'homme à 300 mètres de hauteur, par un câble *progressif* que M. Yon, le cordier de génie, a filé et qui résiste à 50,000 kil. d'effort! Il fait ainsi quatre voyages par heure, aller et retour, de la terre au ciel, en toute sécurité, jour ou nuit; et ce qui seul est plus admirable que lui, c'est le

spectacle dont il nous mène jouir. Je l'ai vu, ce spectacle, et ne l'oublierai jamais.⁷⁰

Although discussed by scholars as a symbol of hope in the future,⁷¹ in the climate of such popular interest and familiarity, the inclusion of the balloon by Manet is as much a topical, contemporary note as any other.⁷² It is of interest to note that although the restraining cable for the balloon is seen in the painting to be from the site in Avenue Suffren, the balloon would not have been seen, or photographed, in its position above the Palais de L'Exposition or with its cable set at such a steep angle. Ascensions with the balloon were never made in windy conditions or were quickly aborted whenever winds arose. If the painting had been commenced prior to the establishment of the *ballon captif* on 26 September without an area available on the right side of the canvas to depict the balloon set vertically above its anchor point, the only way that Manet could have included it in the view was to position it as he did. In doing so he provided clear evidence that the motif of the balloon was added to the work after that date.

The sight of a balloon in the sky above the Exposition was thus not unusual, and when seen in the context of the balloon flights above Paris in the years prior to, and particularly in the months during, the Exposition, any suggestion that a balloon depicted by Manet would necessarily be Nadar's *Le Géant* does not reflect the reality. In fact, during the period of the Exposition many free flights⁷³ were made from various venues. As discussed in more detail in Appendix 3, from May to July seven free flights were undertaken by the Godard brothers from the Hippodrome at Place d'Eylau, *Le Géant* made three flights from June to August leaving the Esplanade des Invalides, and the balloon *L'Impériale* not only was used as a *ballon captif* above the Esplanade des Invalides but also made free flights from there, on at least one occasion with *Le Géant*.⁷⁴ The incidence of flights can be gauged from a description by Camille Flammarion of a flight made in June, 1867, during which he observed two other balloons, *Le Géant* flown by Nadar and the other by Louis Godard, also in the sky making parallel flights.⁷⁵ Such activities have implications for an understanding of the painting. The dates of the operation of the *ballon captif* from the facility at Avenue de Suffren certainly place any direct sighting of that balloon or the availability of any photographic image of it to a

date after 26 September, meaning that either the painting was not commenced until after that date or, as more likely, the balloon was a progressive, or later, addition.

Aerial balloons also may have had a more direct involvement in the production of the painting. Analysis has showed that the painting was constructed as a composite of nine different perspective views taken from six different viewpoints. The main structure of the background panorama was based upon three views from two separate viewpoints in buildings on the western side of Rue Franklin overlooking the newly-formed Place du Roi-de-Rome, and the foreground was based upon a view taken from a grassed bank on the eastern side of Rue Franklin, which had been formed as part of the excavation work required to form the Place. The latter viewpoint is considered by this writer to have been the one from which Manet, seated on the grass, worked directly in front of the motif, making his typical small sketches for future use in the studio. From there he would have also observed and noted the various groups of sightseers and a gardener, requested Léon Leenhoff to walk with his dog on the curved road towards him, sketched the form of the roads, garden and grassed areas of the Place, and assessed how a foreground, at a much larger scale than it appeared, could be set within the painting in front of the background of the Exposition and the panorama of Paris. Even some elements of the background, such as the height of the Phare Anglais were determined from this vantage point. At the left-hand side of the painting, the background also included a series of four views, all of which were set adjacent to each other on the canvas and taken from elevated positions that could only have been from aerial balloons. And an area which is little more than a few summary brush marks on the primed ground at the left-edge of the painting below the Pont de l'Alma and the Seine river is seen either as a part of the canvas which was to be painted as a fifth aerial view, or left unpainted as self-referential evidence of the means by which the painting was constructed.⁷⁶

Although the views as used were different in scale and set at relative height positions on the canvas which contradicted even the eye levels of their various perspectives, they were juxtaposed in such a way that a sense of a cohesive view from one viewpoint was *almost* conveyed. A sense of disjunction is somewhat enhanced, however, by the depiction of the separate groups and figures in the foreground – with each seemingly painted as isolated, self-contained pictorial elements, and with no narrative interaction between them.

The nature of such a proposed composite raises, however, many questions. To what extent, it can be asked, did Manet use photographic images in his construction of the painting? If the views from an aerial balloon are valid, how were those views recorded, and by whom? As sketches by Manet himself? As photographs by his friend Nadar a full year before his self-proclaimed success in aerial photography in 1868? And if the painting is a composite of juxtaposed views, was it worked out on the canvas or with a prior cut-and-paste technique using photographs?

Many photographs of the Exposition were taken from the vicinity of Rue Franklin, and thus ready-made and accurate visual images were available for reference. Of these photographs, three (Figs.B4, B5, and B6) have been used in the analysis to verify the accuracy of the computer modelling and to clarify many of the detail aspects of the work, and in the process the positions of the three viewpoints for the photographs at Nos.14, 22, and 35 Rue Franklin, respectively, were established.⁷⁷ A computer-generated perspective view from No.14 with the viewpoint (SP7) set at 20.5 metres above ground, is seen in Fig.B21, and is included for comparison with the photograph from the same position. These viewpoints of the photographs, as seen on the site plan (Fig.B19), in fact occur on either side of, and at similar heights to, the positions of the proposed viewpoints for the views which were used by Manet to establish the main compositional structure of his painting. With the existence of these many photographs confirming that professional photographers had realised that a market existed for images of the Exposition, then it is more likely that the views used by Manet, established to have been from two other buildings in Rue Franklin, at No.25 and No.29, were taken from

photographs rather than from sketches made at the upper levels in each building, or painted directly onto the canvas at those locales. The viewpoint on the grassed bank for the foreground composition of the group of sightseers is also set in close proximity to these painting viewpoints but, in contrast, is set lower at ground level. Such a viewpoint would have been less advantageous for a professional photographer, and although Manet may have commissioned a photograph from there for enlargement of the foreground site, this would have been the most likely viewpoint that Manet actually used for his own visual recording.

The possibility that a number of viewpoints were from aerial balloons carries with it the implication that the views had been recorded with aerial photography. As discussed in Appendix 3, a number of anomalies exist within the known history of aerial photography, and although it seems inconceivable that Nadar did not attempt further experiments between his first limited success in taking aerial photographs in 1858 and his successful exposure of photographic plates in 1868 from the *ballon captif* above the Hippodrome,⁷⁸ no photographs exist to contradict this hiatus of almost a decade. Nevertheless, the analysis has identified four parts of *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle* which relate to views seen from three viewpoints which are set at heights above ground that could only have been possible either as seen from aerial balloons or as perspective constructions. Whereas the landmarks in three of these views are not related to the Exposition, one view shows the Restaurant Français and thus could only have existed as an actual scene during the construction, exhibition, or demolition stages of the Exposition. Although it is possible that Manet conceived and constructed separate perspective views from elevated viewpoints and then used selected sections of each view, it is not seen by this writer to be have been very likely. Manet translated what he saw, even reproduced images, and even though he understood the perspectival geometries underlying any imagery, the research suggests that he would not have even contemplated using such a procedure.

If the proposed views are valid and are as seen from a balloon, they could have been recorded as sketches, but as the detail in these views makes it difficult to imagine a

sketch in a moving balloon being able to capture the specific relationship of the elements depicted, it becomes more likely that photographs were involved. As discussed in Appendix 3, the lack of any direct evidence of aerial photographs in Paris between 1858 and 1868 suggests that aerial photographs were only possible after 1868 and that three of those separate areas of the painting were made as additions or alterations some length of time after its commencement, even into the 1870s. Nadar's record of experimentation and innovation with aerial photography also makes it possible that, prior to the images of 1868, photographs were actually successfully exposed but that the images had not been able to be permanently fixed. As also noted in Appendix 3, such a possibility does not immediately place unknown images before the eyes of Manet for inclusion in this painting, but the fact that the views involved are grouped, adjacent to each other at the left side of the canvas, increases the possibility that they were added at the same time, whenever that may have been. The proposals involving such aerial photographs have assumed the same use of a *carte-de-visite* camera as that by Nadar in 1868, with its four short focal length lenses and the relatively short exposure time that was possible, as discussed in Appendix 3.

Unfortunately any notions of underpainting, alterations, or scraping with earlier work on the canvas cannot be clarified by technical information as, to date, no X-radiographs or infra-red examinations of the painting have been undertaken.⁷⁹ And circumstances of past conservation on the canvas have also made it impossible to assess if the canvas had been cut down by Manet at an interim stage.⁸⁰ This would have been of interest as the analysis has suggested that Manet first painted the extent of the horizon with the Val-de-Grâce set at the right-hand edge of the painting and the hills at Ménilmontant and Montreuil seen at the left. Such a view showed a reduced extent of the Palais de l'Exposition at the right and had the potential, if the canvas had been a little wider, for the position of Manet's exhibition pavilion to be included, or at least inferred, at the left.

There are also some sections of the canvas which remain unidentified. The unpainted area of canvas at the left edge of canvas was assessed in the process of

analysis, but without any resolution, as a possible component in a number of views, including as the pair of piers, with their equestrian statues set on top, at the western end of the Pont d'Iéna. And in the adjacent, jumbled area of pigment which has been described by Clark as "a crush of people crossing a bridge and a steamboat beside them disgorging still more",⁸¹ a steamboat funnel with its cloud of smoke and steam can certainly be seen, but the spatial implications of Clark's proposal have not been able to be confirmed or resolved.

Proposal

Although the analysis has found *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle* to be a composite of a series of relatively accurate views, the possible circumstances of those separate views add important dimensions and complexities to the understanding of both the painting's production and Manet's artistic practice. In contrast to earlier proposals, the time at which the painting was commenced and the period during which Manet worked on the canvas are presented here to be more, rather than less, uncertain. This is not seen as a loss of clarity but rather as a valid response to the assessed information. Set around the chronological framework of the Exposition Universelle being held between 1 April and 30 October, 1867, and in light of the research and the computer modelling outcomes, it is suggested that: the painting may have been commenced, with its main composition laid-in, at any time between February and 26 September of that year; the view of the newly-formed Place du Roi-de-Rome, on which are set the foreground figures, could not have been seen before mid-March; the aerial balloon was painted after 26 September onto an already established composition; and, the views encompassing the Restaurant Français, the Panorama National and Pont de l'Alma, and the Palais des Tuileries, Palais du Louvre and the Tour Saint-Jacques most probably had been painted as part of the painting's initial composition but were possibly painted after July, 1868 and even during the 1870s.⁸²

It is proposed that the painting is a composite of various views from viewpoints and directions of view as shown on the location plan (Fig.B15), the site plan (Fig.B19), a

perspective overview of the site (Fig.B20), and detail plan (Fig.B28), and that most of these views were available to Manet in the form of photographs which he then used both as source images and as components of a cut-and-paste collage. The main composition of the painting was based upon three parts of two panoramic views of the Exposition and the skyline of Paris (taken from viewpoints, or station points, SP1 and SP2), and the groupings of sightseers in the painting's foreground were as viewed from a grassed bank overlooking the Place du Roi-de-Rome, in a position (viewpoint SP3) which was forward of viewpoints SP1 and SP2, and set between their lines of sight. As noted above, Robert L. Herbert had explained the pictorial elimination of the Seine river in terms of a possible use of binoculars by Manet, and for the enlargement of the foreground grouping, an optical device such as binoculars or a camera, used to take a photograph for that purpose or for use as an *aide memoire*, may have been employed. It is also proposed that the four views at the left side of the canvas around the Restaurant Français, the Panorama National and Pont de l'Alma, and the Palais du Louvre, were based on three separate aerial photographs taken from aerial balloons at viewpoints SP4 above the Seine river near the Exposition, SP5 above an area between the river and colline de Chaillot, and SP6 above the Esplanade des Invalides.

Those sections of the canvas which are considered to have been painted by Manet without reference to photographs, although possibly to his on-site sketches, are the figure groupings in the foreground and the balloon in the upper right corner. Manet's somewhat ironic depiction of the figures in the foreground seems to have come from direct observation rather than being fleshed-out from figures in a photograph. And, as noted above, the position of the *ballon captif*, painted above the Palais de l'Exposition with an angled restraining cable, was one that did not relate to the procedures of the ascensions. Although painted as a record of the actual balloon, its position gives support to a chronology for the painting that indicates the basic composition, without Avenue de Suffren in view, to have been in place before 26 September, and that Manet's wish to include the *ballon captif* at some time after that date thus required it to be painted with the angled cable.

Each proposed perspective view is overlaid with a painting format set, in both size and position, relative to those parts identified as existing in the painting, and the form and relative position in the painting of those selected parts are confirmed with the overlay line drawing (Fig.B38) made from the painting. The different views are shown to have been overlaid and interlocked as a composite image by Manet, with disparate elements existing at one and the same time as perspectively correct parts of visibly indeterminate smaller views and as part of the cohesive image at the surface of the painting itself. In such a process the spaces of the parts have been engaged at the work's surface. Details of the proposed views are as follows:

- i) The main composition of the painting was based on views from a viewpoint (station point) SP1 in a building at No.29 Rue Franklin overlooking the Place du Roi-de-Rome,⁸³ set at approximately 23 metres above the road level.⁸⁴ The view from this vantage point (Fig.B23) was first painted by Manet as a broad sweep of the Parisian skyline with the hills of Ménilmontant, Montreuil and Vincennes at the left, and the dome of Val-de-Grâce at the right (format A in Fig.B23). The Exposition was painted at the right side of the canvas with a section of the Palais de l'Exposition correctly positioned at the right edge. Pictorially, a disposition of the view in this way, with the central area of the canvas mainly comprised of elements in the middle-distance and distance, would have had limited potential for any manipulation of space.

The depiction of a more concentrated section of the view from the same viewpoint, set slightly to the right of the first view, centred on the dome of the Invalides, and with a broader expanse of the Palais de l'Exposition and the more dynamic positioning of the Exposition elements in front of it, overcame such a shortcoming (format B in Fig.B23), and formed the basic structure for the right hand background of the painting. This second part of the same view was overlaid the first part, with the Val-de-Grâce positioned where the Panthéon had been initially placed, and the Observatoire at the right edge of the canvas where the dome of Val-de-Grâce had been painted. Although the extent of retention of the

skyline forms of other domes, towers, and spires from the first view is uncertain, the overlaid view was certainly conjoined with elements of the first view rather than being used as a complete overpainting with complete erasure. The hills on the left skyline, with the spire of Notre-Dame-de-la-Croix de Ménilmontant accurately positioned, the part of the Palais de l'Exposition at the right, and the dome of Val-de-Grâce, for example, were retained, and other elements, such as the Tour Saint-Jacques, are proposed to be also visible in amongst the detail of the second layer. In the second part of the view, the skyline relationships between, from the left, the Phare des Roches-Douvres, Saint-Sulpice, the Invalides, the Panthéon, Saint-Jacques-du-Haut-Pas, the elm tree the Orme de Sully,⁸⁵ Val-de-Grâce, the Phare Anglais, Notre-Dame-des-Champs and the Observatoire, together with the Exposition buildings and the Pont d'Iéna, can be seen to be depicted with reasonable accuracy in the painting. Those identified sections of the two views which are part of the existing painting, are shown as part-images 1 and 2 in their relative positions and confirmed in detail with overlay line drawings in Figs.B24 and B25, respectively. Such a process described with these two parts of the same view is illustrative of the collaging technique that Manet applied to the whole work and in other works.

Although possibly being little more than coincidence, it is interesting to note that one of the aerial balloons set in position above the Esplanade des Invalides can be seen from viewpoint SP1 at the very position at which the dome of the Panorama National was set in the painting. With flights made by balloons from the Esplanade from June to August during the time of the Exposition, the appearance of a balloon in such a position, as seen by Manet or in a photograph, may have been an influence in positioning the dome of the Panorama National at that position with a semi-circular shape.

- ii) Although the tower of Saint-Germain-des-Prés is visible to the left of the Phare des Roches-Douvres in the perspective view from SP1, it is not visible in the painting. This was achieved by the use of a view from a lower viewpoint, SP2, in a

building at No.25 Rue Franklin, at an approximate height of 10 metres above the road level. From such a position the view, as seen in Fig.B26, shows that the tower of Saint-Germain-des-Prés is unseen, hidden behind the Phare des Roches-Douvers on the site of the Exposition. The view also displays the relationship between Sainte-Clotilde, Sainte-Chapelle, Notre-Dame, and the Phare des Roches-Douvers as accurately depicted in the painting. This is shown as part-image 3 in its relative position and confirmed in detail with the overlay line drawing in Fig.B27.

- iii) With the foreground of the painting, Manet's concept was obviously to both create spatial ambiguity as well as limit the 'speed' of spatial recession by incorporating this setting right across the canvas at a much larger scale than the remainder of the painting. Such a device has made the relationship between the foreground setting and the background of the Exposition and the cityscape both feasible and disjointed at one and the same time. And when viewed, any involuntary attempt to reconcile these contrasting spaces into one construct, makes the foreground composition seem less than spatially feasible or cohesive. But, and notwithstanding Manet's typical subtle adjustments of scale and painterly technique with each object at the surface of the canvas, the foreground can be shown to be an accurate perspectival view of part of the newly-formed Place du Roi-de-Rome, with the figures depicted at their appropriately relative sizes⁸⁶ in actual positions which have been able to be determined on the grassed and road surfaces.

The viewpoint at SP3 is as from a seated figure on the grassed bank which had been formed as a transitional plane between the eastern edge of Rue Franklin and the conical form of the Place du Roi-de-Rome, as visible in photographs, Figs.B10 and B12, and the perspective view Fig.B20. This viewpoint is set below, in front of, and between, the centre of visions from SP1 and SP2, and it becomes clear that Manet had wished to maintain, as much as possible, a similar spatial shaping for both the foreground and the background. The viewpoint provided two prospects, a wide view similar to those from SP1 and SP2, and a closer view of a selected part

of the open area of the Place du Roi-de-Rome as the setting for the foreground groups of figures. From this lower, and closer vantage point, particular elements of the wider view (format A, in Fig.B29), are seen to be slightly larger and set relatively higher than as seen from SP1 or SP2. The higher positions of Sainte-Clotilde, Sainte-Chapelle, Notre-Dame, the Phare Anglais are as depicted in the painting, and shown as part-image 4 in Fig.B30. Also included in the painting from this view are a part of the excavated cliff face created by the earthworks in forming the Place du Roi-de-Rome, and possibly a more accurate lateral position for the Observatoire.

To enable a three-dimensional confirmation of overlap and size diminution in the perspective view of the foreground groups of figures, rectilinear prisms were used as simplified indicators for each individual figure. A plan of the layout, with the positions of the viewpoint and the various figures and groups of figures used in the perspective view, is seen in Fig.B28. The perspective of the figure groupings (format B, in Fig.B29) confirms that the painting's foreground depicts a perspectively accurate and cohesive, but relatively distant, view of which a part (part-image 5) had been enlarged and spread across the full width of the canvas, as confirmed with the overlay line drawing in Fig.B31.

As discussed above, of all the viewpoints for the painting's views, SP3 is seen as the one from which Manet responded directly to the motif, by means of his sketchbook, or possibly as oil sketches created directly onto smaller canvases. Obviously Léon Leenhoff, with his dog, would have been requested to pose for Manet on the circular road, but the other figures and groups of figures need only have been, and also give evidence in the painting to have been, vignettes observed and recorded at different times.

- iv) The building of the Restaurant Français was used by Manet as a transitional element between the more general view of the Exposition developed from viewpoints SP1 and SP2 and the view of the Panorama National and Pont de l'Alma at the left edge of the painting. A view of the Restaurant as seen in the

painting is shown from viewpoint SP4 at a height of seventy metres above ground in Fig.B32, and confirmed as part-image 6 of the painting with the overlay line drawing in Fig.B33. Such a viewpoint would only have been possible from an aerial balloon.

All the views proposed to be from aerial balloons have been presented in the vertical 'eight by five' format with a horizontal angle of view of twenty degrees to relate to the imagery which would have been obtained from the use of a *carte-de-visite* camera.

- v) From viewpoints SP1 or SP2 in Rue Franklin, the dome of the Panorama National could not have been seen to the extent shown in the painting above the trees and rooftops, and the form of the arches to the Pont de l'Alma as it then existed would have been much flatter, as seen at the left edge of Fig.B23, than as depicted.⁸⁷ The lateral relationship between the dome and the bridge would also not have been as seen in the painting.

A viewpoint SP5, at a height of eighty-five metres above ground, provides a perspective view as seen in Fig.B34 for the particular views of the Panorama National (format A) and the Pont de l'Alma (format B) as seen in the painting, and shows that the view of the Panorama and the buildings and trees seen directly beneath it had been reduced in size relative to that of the bridge. The curvature of the Panorama's dome in the painting is greater than it actually was,⁸⁸ and still is, but the height of the viewpoint, which in such a position would only have been possible from an aerial balloon, allows the dome to be seen, sets the dome laterally in a position above the Pont de l'Alma as required, shows the river bank at the left angled above the bridge and, with the overlap in perspective of the arch profiles at each side of the bridge, produces a shape in silhouette very similar to that as seen in the painting. Relative to the view of the Restaurant Français this combined view has been set into the painting at a lower position than that required by the perspective of the Restaurant, providing further evidence of a cut-and-paste technique. The accuracy of the view of the dome of the Panorama National and the

trees along the angled bank of the Seine set beneath it, as part-image 7, and that of the Pont de l'Alma with the angled river bank set above it and the trees to the right river bank beneath it, as part-image 8, are confirmed with the overlay line drawings in Figs.B35 and B36, respectively.

- vi) Adjacent to the trees between the Panorama National and the Pont de l'Alma, and in the area of the painting extending across to the spires of Sainte-Clotilde, a series of roof forms can be seen as part of the cityscape. These are proposed to be part of a view, seen or recorded, from another elevated viewpoint SP6, set at eighty-seven metres above the Esplanade des Invalides, and in a position that can only have been from an aerial balloon. As discussed above, it is proposed that the balloon had been either *Le Géant*, which had made flights from the Esplanade, or *L'Impériale* when it was used as a *ballon captif* at that locale.

A perspective view from SP6, as seen in Fig.B37, clearly shows the raised roof form of the Pavillon de Flore of the Palais des Tuileries, the overlapping raised roofs of the Palais du Louvre behind it, the tower on the Place du Louvre, and the isolated profile of the Tour Saint-Jacques. Further to the right are the combined roofs, towers, and domes of the Hôtel de Ville, Saint-Gervais, and Saint-Paul-Saint-Louis. Those elements from this view which have been identified in the painting are shown as part-image 9 and confirmed with the overlay line drawing in Fig.B38.

Such a view provides clear evidence of the spatial disjunctions which exist within the overall image of the painting. As can be seen by the painting format size shown in Fig.B37 and its translation to the form of the painting in Fig.B38, the relative scale of the elements in part-image 9 is much smaller in the painting to, say, that of the Pont de l'Alma as part-image 8 in Fig.B36. And not only are the perspectives in these two separate part-images very different but there is also no correlation between the eye levels for each view, with that for part-image 8 set much higher than the one for part-image 9.

That viewpoint SP6 is in a position that can be directly connected to the very locale from which aerial balloon flights were known to have been made during the period of the Exposition seems a circumstance other than coincidence. Although a photograph could have been taken from above the Esplanade des Invalides at any time after the Exposition, the concentration of flights, as described in Appendix 4, from that very site during the Exposition adds further evidence to the suggestion that aerial photographs had been successfully taken, although possibly not 'fixed' as a permanent image, from the skies above Paris before Nadar's photographs in July of 1868.

The overall proposal sees the image of *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle* to have been created with this series of relatively accurate views, of different scales, taken from a number of different positions, and collaged on the canvas at pictorially unrelated levels. As confirmation of the accuracy of the proposal, the composite image of the interlocked and overlaid computer-generated sections of views is seen in Fig.B39 and with the line drawing overlay made from the painting in Fig.B40.

By its very nature, the collaged image can be seen, at one and the same time, to be both spatially cohesive and disjointed. Such spatial ambiguity is heightened, within the interlocking and overlaying of the views, by the spatial filtering through the figures in the foreground into the differently scaled space beyond, by the recession of space to the left and not to the right, and by the repetition of some motifs, and the erasure of others. No work that Manet exhibited showed such complex collaging, and in his oeuvre it is only matched by *The Burial*, another work not exhibited in his lifetime. This would suggest that *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle* was seen by Manet as an important experiment in assessing the implications of the technique and seeing how far the spatial ambiguity could be stretched before the painting simply became a collection of disparate views. With the painting in a state which seems transitional rather than complete, it seems impossible to presume the final form intended by Manet, but, in terms of spatial

ambiguity and fracture, one senses that the work is finely balanced, and exactly as he wished it to be at that stage.

Furthermore, *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle* is a work which confirms, and in many ways better than any other, Clement Greenberg's proposition that "Manet's paintings became the first Modernist ones by virtue of the frankness with which they declared the surfaces on which they were painted". As argued in Chapter 3, the reason for them being the first was more to do with Manet's spatial ambiguity rather than with the different ways in which Greenberg, Clark, and Fried have seen Manet's use of flatness of his paintings. It is also one of the few paintings of the nineteenth century which, in representing a sanctioned and popular contemporary public event, employed illusionistic imagery which was also complexly experimental.

5B. VIEW OF THE 1867 EXPOSITION UNIVERSELLE: Notes

DISSERTATION: Volume 2, pp.18–21

NOTES

[\[p.18 of dissertation here\]](#)

1. T.J. Clark, The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and his Followers, Thames and Hudson, London, 1985, p.62.
2. "Signé... de la main de Mme veuve Edouard Manet." (Adolphe Tabarant, Manet: Histoire catalographique, Montaigne, Paris, 1931, p.171).
3. Robert L. Herbert, Impressionism: Art, Leisure & Parisian Society, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1988, p.4.
4. For a discussion of these issues as a background to the painting, see: Clark 1985 (as in n.1), pp.60–66.
5. The Salon was held from 15 April to 5 June.
6. The Exposition opened on 1 April and closed on 30 October.
7. The Ingres exhibition was held from 8 April to 15 June.
8. The specific reasons for Manet holding his own exhibition remain uncertain. As Patricia Mainardi has explained: "Because of the complicated procedure, there has been some confusion in the historical accounts which variously state that Manet had not been invited to exhibit, that he did not apply because he was afraid of being rejected, or that he was in fact rejected." (Patricia Mainardi, 'Edouard Manet's *View of the Universal Exposition of 1867*', Arts Magazine, v.54, no.5, January, 1980, p.113-n.6). In a letter to Zola dated 2 January, 1867, Manet indicated that "on m'a jugé indigne de profiter comme tant d'autres des avantages de l'envoi sur liste." (Françoise Cachin, et al., Manet 1832–1883, exh. cat., The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, and Harry N. Abrams, New York, 1983, p.520).
9. Letter from Émile Zola to Antony Valabrègue, 4 April, 1867. Quoted from: John Rewald, The History of Impressionism, The Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1973, p.168.
10. Precedents of independent exhibitions included those of Jacques-Louis David in 1799, Horace Vernet in 1822, and Gustave Courbet in 1855.
11. In the letter to Zola dated 2 January, 1867, Manet wrote that "Je vais risquer le paquet et, secondé par des hommes comme vous, je compte bien réussir." Quoted from: 'Appendix 1, Letters from Manet to Zola', ed. [Colette Becker](#), Cachin, et al. 1983 (as in n.8), p.520.
12. "à l'angle des avenues de l'Alma et Montaigne", Tabarant 1931 (as in n.2), p.167.
13. Éd. Manet – Étude biographique et critique, brochure, E. Dentu, Paris, 1867.
14. Antonin Proust, Édouard Manet souvenirs (with 1897 text), L'Échoppe, Paris, 1996, pp. 34–35.
15. Mainardi 1980 (as in n.8), p.109.
16. e.g. Honoré Daumier's lithograph showing a father and son overlooking the site of the Exposition, with the caption:
 "–O mon fils! quel admirable tableau! Vois-tu d'ici le Palais de l'Exposition, ce temple de la Paix!...
 – Oui papa, et l'École militaire aussi!"
 (Le Charivari, 16 January, 1867, p.7).

17. News of Maximilian's execution on 19 June at Querétaro was published in L'Indépendance belge in Paris on 1 July, and was formally announced on 6 July (Juliet Wilson-Bareau, Manet: The Execution of Maximilian: Painting, Politics & Censorship, exh. cat., National Gallery Publications, London, 1992, pp.36–37). Also see that publication for a comprehensive discussion on the circumstances of Maximilian's execution and Manet's series of paintings on that subject.
18. *ibid.*, p.50–51.
19. Françoise Cachin, Manet, trans. Emily Read, Grange Books, London, 1991, p.69.
20. In his memoirs, Antonin Proust had noted that "Au mois d'août, je passai quelques jours avec Manet à Trouville. Quand le courrier arrivait, lui apportant des nouvelles de son exposition, il disait: "Voici le flot boueux qui vient. La marée monte." (Proust 1996 (as in n.14), p.35).
21. e.g. Adolphe Tabarant, Manet et ses œuvres, Gallimard, Paris, 1947, p.140; and, Henri Loyrette who agreed with Tabarant, writing that "There is no reason to doubt the biographer's [Tabarant's] statement... Not until June could he have found a period of calm in which to paint" (in, Gary Tinterow, and Henri Loyrette, Origins of Impressionism, exh. cat., The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1994, p.413).
22. Theodore Reff, Manet and Modern Paris, National Gallery of Art, Washington, 1982, p.36.
23. Mainardi 1980, p.110.
24. *ibid.*, p.112.
25. For a description of the undertaking, see: Clark 1986, pp.60–61.
26. Mainardi 1980, p.110, p.115-n.33.
27. Sigurd Willoch, "Edouard Manets Fra Verdensutstillingen i Paris 1867", Konsthistorisk Tidsskrift, 45, 1976, P.108 ('Résumé' in French language).

[\[p.19 of dissertation here\]](#)

28. Patricia Mainardi 1980, p.110.
29. John Richardson, Edouard Manet: Paintings and Drawings, Phaidon Press, London, 1958, p.122.
30. Reff 1982 (as in Note 22), pp.36–37.
31. Nigel Blake and Francis Frascina, 'Modern Practices of Art and Modernity', in Francis Frascina, et al., Modernity and Modernism : French Painting in the Nineteenth Century, part of The Open University Course – A316: 'Modern Art: Practices and Debates', Yale University Press, New Haven and London, in assoc. with The Open University, 1993, p.106. The summit would have been then, as now, in the Cimetière Passy.
32. Herbert 1988 (as in n.3), p.5.
33. The annotations of Léon Leenhoff appear in a posthumous Register of Manet works made in 1883 and hand-written on a series of card-mounted photographs of Manet's works taken by Fernand Lochard. For a full description and reference information of the collections of the Leenhoff documents, including the Register of works of 1883 and the Lochard photographs, see: Juliet Wilson-Bareau, 'The Hidden Face of Manet: An investigation of the artist's working processes', exh. cat., The Burlington Magazine, v.128, no.997, April, 1986, 'Documents', p.97.
34. Mikael Wivel, with Juliet Wilson-Bareau, and Hanne Finsen, Manet, exh. cat., Ordrupgaardsamlingen, Ordrupgaard, Copenhagen, 1989, pp. 94–5.
35. Mainardi 1980, p.110.
36. *id.*
37. *ibid.*, p.111.
38. *ibid.*, pp.110–11.
39. *ibid.*, p.111.
40. Reff 1982, p.87.
41. Herbert 1988, p.5.

42. Anne Coffin Hanson, Manet and the Modern Tradition, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1977, p.201.
43. *ibid.*, p.202.
44. Alan Krell, Manet, and the Painters of Contemporary Life, Thames and Hudson, London, 1996, p.156.
45. Mainardi 1980, p.110. Mainardi contrasted the Epinal print to other popular images of the Exposition which avoided the problem of small figures in views with high vantage points by "adopting a distant view and eliminating the foreground". The Epinal print, Mainardi claimed, "breaks all perspective rules" by showing the figures "frontally from eye level and the panorama in bird's-eye perspective" (*id.*). The relative placement of feet in recession of many of the figures in the foreground, as well as the sense of looking down upon most of their heads, seems to contradict this latter claim.
46. Reff 1982, p.36.
47. Théodore Duret, Histoire de Edouard Manet et de son œuvre. Avec un catalogue des Peintures et des Pastels, H. Floury, Paris, 1902, p.216.
48. Étienne Moreau-Nélaton, Manet raconté par lui-même, 2 vols., Henri Laurens, Paris, 1926, v.1, p.92.
49. Tabarant 1931 (as in n.2), p.170.
50. Tabarant 1947 (as in n.21), p.140.
51. Richardson 1958 (as in n.29), p.122.
52. Mainardi 1980, p.112.
53. *id.*
54. Clark 1985, p.66.
55. Herbert 1988, p.5.
56. Wivel and Wilson-Bureau 1989 (as in n.34), p.95.
57. Cachin 1991 (as in n.19), p.69.
58. Krell 1996 (as in n.44), p.155.
59. Frascina et al. 1993 (as in n.31), p.107.
60. Of some interest is the possible recording, in the position indicated on the right-hand side of the photograph Fig.B7, of Manet's exhibition pavilion at the intersection of Avenue de l'Alma and Avenue Montaigne. What appears to be a light-toned structure at that intersection cannot be positively confirmed to be the pavilion.
61. Mainardi 1980, pp.110–11.
62. The shape of the dome for the Panorama National in the painting is more rounded and higher than as it existed in 1867, and still exists. An alternative dome was initially sought, with consideration given to many other domes including, for example, those of the Chapelle de l'Assomption and the Halle-au-Blé, but the relationship of the Panorama's dome to the arched forms of the Pont de l'Alma and the angled bank of the Seine in the view from viewpoint SP5 confirmed the dome to be that of the Panorama.
63. Mainardi 1980, p.111.
64. Similar proposals can be seen in Chapter 5(D), with Manet supposedly deleting a bridge and a road out of his field of view to paint the claimed view of *The Railway*.
65. Willoch 1976 (as in n.27), p.108 ('Résumé' in French language).
66. Clark 1985, p.61.
67. Edmond Renaudin, Paris – Exposition. Guide à Paris, Éd. Ch. Delagrave, Paris, 1867, p.176.

[\[p.20 of dissertation here\]](#)

68. J. Wemeare, ed., Les Invalides: trois siècles d'histoire, Musée de l'Armée, Paris, 1974, p.502.

69. The enclosure was described by Wilfred de Fonvielle as "le vaste cirque de toile où ont lieu les ascensions" ('Le grand ballon de l'Exposition Universelle', L'Illustration, 3 October, 1867, p.219).
70. Auguste Luchet, 'Le ballon captif', item in 'Courrier de l'Exposition Universelle', Le Monde Illustré, 26 October, 1867, p.259.
71. See Patricia Mainardi's discussion of this aspect, with reference to Charles Meryon's etching *Le Pont-au-Change* (1854) and Victor Hugo's poem "Plein Ciel" (Mainardi 1980, p.112), and George Mauner's discussion of Hugo's poem and reading of Manet's lithograph, *The Balloon*, as a crucifixion in the context of the "association of a balloon ascent with religious meaning" (George Mauner, Manet, Peintre-Philosophe: A Study of the Painter's Themes, The Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park, Penn., and London, 1975, pp.173–77).
72. See quote from article by Henri de Parville in Appendix 3, n.20. The topicality of the *ballon captif* can also be gauged by the fact that in the short period of just over a month during which it operated, three caricatures by Cham, using the balloon captif as their subject, appeared in Le Charivari. Two of these related directly to the installation: "LE BALLON CAPTIF", 29 October, 1867; and, "LES DERNIERS JOURS DE L'EXPOSITION", 10 November, 1867.
73. Flights made without a restraining connection to the ground, with ascents controlled by the jettisoning of sandbags and descents by the release of gas from a valve at the top of the balloon.
74. Nadar had been forced to sell *Le Géant*, and was only involved in its first flight from the Esplanade des Invalides on 23 June (see Appendix 3).
75. Camille Flammarion, Voyages Aériens, Éd. Ernest Flammarion, Paris, 1881, p.125.
76. The various "clues" that can be found in Manet's paintings are not seen by this writer as enticements for viewers to solve paintings which had been purposefully made complex and "unreadable". Any concern with the viewing public was for his own esteem as a respected artist, and he had little regard for what anyone else thought of his art – a very serious and private process in which no one else was involved. All of his strategies and all of his techniques, including the placement of those elements that give evidence of, or are pointers to, the way in which a work had been devised or constructed, are seen as integral aspects of his speculative artistic process. The inclusion of such indicators was an artistic necessity – about which he may have chuckled – but it was certainly not part of some game of "hide-and-seek" for viewers.
77. With no archival plan information available, the positions of the large detached houses at Nos.14 and 22 on the eastern side of Rue Franklin were established by measurements assessed from contemporary photographs. Viewpoints SP7 and SP8 were found to be within the assessed sizes of these two buildings, most probably at roof level at No.14 for SP7, and from the belvedere at No.22 for SP8. The street numbers noted have been determined from descriptions contained within the *calepins du cadastre* records (D1P⁴/470 – Rue Franklin, Archives Fiscales, calepins du cadastre, Archives de Paris, Paris), and do not relate to present-day numbering. Viewpoint SP9 was positioned at No.35 as part of the row of buildings on the western side of Rue Franklin and on the northern junction with Rue Vineuse, set some eight metres above road level and within the enclosure of the building. There is a slight discrepancy between this height and that assessed from the photograph itself of five metres, suggesting that the levels incorporated into the modelling for the upper part of Rue Franklin were too low.
78. The news of the successful exposure of the plates was announced in July, 1868 (Le Moniteur de la photographie, 18 July, p.1074; and, Le Petit Figaro, 31 July, p.3. See Appendix 3, n.22, n.23). The *ballon captif* at the Hippodrome had been the one used at the Avenue de Suffren facility during the Exposition and had been moved after its closure in early November, 1867.

79. This writer has corresponded with Leif Einar Plahter, former chief restorer, Nasjonalgalleriet, Oslo, on the extent of technical examinations carried out in the past. In correspondence dated 8 May, 2000, Mr. Plahter indicated that the painting had not been x-rayed or examined with infrared vidicon equipment, but he doubted, with the visibility of the ground in many areas and the thinly applied colour in others, that X-radiographs would have been helpful in assessing changes in the composition.
80. Original tacking margins have been cut off the canvas, the edges cannot be examined properly due to the use of putty and retouchings, and the stretcher is not original (communicated by Leif Einar Plahter, correspondence, as in n.79).
81. Clark 1985, p.60.
82. Although the Palais des Tuileries was destroyed by fire in 1871, the ruins remained during the 1870s, and the Pavillon de Flore at the south-west corner was retained and rebuilt.
83. In 1867, the street numbering from No.25 to No.35 in Rue Franklin, and in contrast to that noted in n.77, seems to have been little different to that at the present time (D1P⁴/470 – Rue Franklin, Archives Fiscales, calepins du cadastre, Archives de Paris, Paris). Although No.25 has either been divided into 25a and 25b, or has been changed to 25b, such a change has no effect on the positioning of the viewpoints in particular buildings, with the relative heights of the buildings estimated from the number of floors recorded in the *calepins du cadastre*, and the lateral positions of the different buildings also assessed from contemporary photographs.
84. Although the height of 13 metres above the road level falls within the enclosure of Nos.25 and 29 Rue Franklin, the assessment as noted in n.77 that the upper end of Rue Franklin may have been set in the computer modelling a little lower than it existed in 1867 would mean that the views were no different but that the heights of the viewpoints above road level could have been 10-11 metres.

[\[p.21 of dissertation here\]](#)

85. Details of the then-famous elm tree seen on the horizon are discussed in Chapter 5(C) where it is proposed to have been, at one stage, the elusive dome in *The Burial*.
 86. The following heights were used for the various prisms: the women in the group (1.6m); the couple (man – 1.7m, woman – 1.7m); woman on horseback (head of woman – 1.9m); two men (each – 1.9m); guardsmen (standing – 1.65m); gardener – 1.7m; boy and dog (boy – 1.2m).
 87. Mainardi referred to modern photographs and wrote in the present tense when noting that the pylons of Pont de l'Alma were "much more massive than they actually are" (Mainardi 1980, p.111). The bridge in the painting was opened on 2 April, 1856 (*Engineering*, 12 April, 1867, p.350) and demolished in 1970, with the existing bridge opened in 1972.
 88. The extent of the distortion is unusual for Manet and became the basis of the search noted in n.62.
-