

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

5C. *THE BURIAL*: Text

As another incomplete¹ painting not shown in Manet's lifetime, *The Burial* (Fig.C1) also needs to be considered with caution in regard to presumptions of his intent, the degree to which he may have considered the work complete, and problems of dating the work from depicted motifs. But, in its present state, with the concealment of his strategies probably far less than would have been the case if exhibited in his lifetime, the painting provides an opportunity to more directly examine and better understand his artistic process. Interestingly, some correspondences between *The Burial* and *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle* also add to that understanding, with the most obvious being the uncertain and ambiguous interplay between their foregrounds and backgrounds in terms of surface composition, illusionistic space, and content. Notwithstanding the notional connection between the sightseers and the Exposition as their object of interest in *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle*, the foregrounds and backgrounds in both paintings seem to make ambiguous connections.

Such uncertainty is highlighted by the outcomes of the analysis for *The Burial* which point to a possible separation in terms of time and locale between the funeral in the foreground and the backdrop of the Parisian skyline. Although the painting has been generally considered a unified, but manipulated image, the proposal here has assessed the background in the upper half of the painting [henceforth referred to as the *upper part*] in terms of collaged views from a series of different viewpoints, and the foreground in the lower half [henceforth referred to as the *lower part*] as a single view and in a locale completely unrelated to that used for the upper part.

Background

Little is known about the production of the painting or what it represents. Although titled in the inventory of Manet's works after his death as "Enterrement à la Glacière",² and notwithstanding Henri Loyrette's emphatic claim that "La Glacière is

certainly where we are",³ it seems that its locale has never been thought by others to be as straightforward. Nevertheless there has been general scholarly accord with the dating of the work, in the identification of what is depicted, and, in more recent times, what the burial represents.

The earlier commentaries on the painting were varied but relatively straightforward. In 1902, Théodore Duret dated the painting at 1869-70, noted "un grenadier de la garde impériale" at the rear of the funeral cortège, and "à l'horizon, une partie de Paris que domine le Panthéon".⁴ In 1931, Adolphe Tabarant dated it at 1870, placed it at "rue de l'Estrapade, au pied de la butte Mouffetard",⁵ noted "les dômes de l'Observatoire, du Val-de-Grâce, du Panthéon, et le clocher de Saint-Etienne-du-Mont"⁶ and suggested that "La présence d'un grenadier de la garde impériale atteste que ce tableau fut peint avant la chute du Second-Empire, mais nous ne croyons pas qu'il soit antérieur à 1870".⁷ Tabarant qualified his dating in 1947 to be possibly "De janvier ou février 1870".⁸

Later responses and assessments also became interested in the symbolism of the work and its representation, but were no less varied and certainly no less speculative. Georges Bataille in 1955 dated the work "from early 1870" and observed that it "betrays the attraction exerted on him [Manet] by the idea of death"⁹ but, in contrast, John Richardson's concern in 1958 was that the work "surely belongs with two snow-scenes done during the siege in the following winter".¹⁰ For somewhat different reasons, Charles Sterling and Margareta Salinger conjectured in 1967 that Manet had "probably painted the picture in 1870 on the eve of the Franco-Prussian War, as it bears a strong resemblance in style to a landscape made in February of 1871 at Oloron-Sainte-Marie",¹¹ and also speculated that the view had "been from the foot of the Montagne Saint-Geneviève in the neighborhood of the Rue Monge, perhaps from the little rise where, in 1869, they had begun to excavate the ruins of the old Roman amphitheatre, called the Arena of Lutetia".¹² In 1971, Linda Nochlin had concurred with the position and dating of Sterling and Salinger, but addressed the painting's subject matter in a wider discourse on realism and attitudes to death, and suspected that

the composition of *Phocion* [Nicolas Poussin, 1648] was in his [Manet's] mind when he began painting his unfinished *Funeral*, substituting observed, contemporary Paris for imaginatively reconstructed Athens and a shabby, shambling nineteenth-century procession for that of the stoical hero of antiquity.¹³

A more recent, and seemingly relevant, source for the painting's subject was raised by George Mauner in 1975 when making a connection between *The Burial* and the funeral in 1867 of Manet's friend, Charles Baudelaire. In many ways Mauner's proposal changed the scholarly approach to the work as the implications from such a proposal set it within the rich and complex context of the relationship between Manet and Baudelaire and of Baudelaire's seminal writings on modernity and contemporaneity. The dating of the work has been repositioned, and the known facts of Baudelaire's funeral and place of burial have also forced the painting's locale and vista of the Parisian skyline to be to be reconsidered. But even though Mauner's proposal is a thoroughly enticing notion, it is one that has yet to develop beyond speculation. The service for Baudelaire's funeral on 2 September, 1867, had been held at the church of Saint-Honoré d'Eylau with the cortège moving to Montparnasse cemetery. An evocative description of the occasion, written soon after by Charles Asselineau in a letter to Auguste Poulet-Malassis, noted that "Il y avait environ cent personnes à l'église et moins au cimetière. La chaleur a empêché beaucoup de gens de suivre jusqu'au bout. Un coup de tonnerre, qui a éclaté comme on entrerait au cimetière, a failli faire sauver le reste." The letter had been first published in 1906¹⁴ and its description of the weather and the gathering of friends seems to have been used as a source, with the use of some melodramatic licence, by Adolphe Tabarant in his 1942 *La vie artistique au temps de Baudelaire*.¹⁵ And Asselineau's description obviously provided the link for Mauner when he wrote that

On 2 September, Manet attended the poet's funeral, and the descriptions given by witnesses of that occasion, including the threatening summer storm and the small cortège moving toward the cemetery of Montparnasse, suggest Manet's painting *L'Enterrement*. Here there are a few human mourners, but nature grieves in the sketchy patch of trees, probably cypresses, which echo the shape of the carriage and figures directly below it.¹⁶

Theodore Reff,¹⁷ Charles S. Moffett,¹⁸ and Françoise Cachin¹⁹ subsequently concurred, in very similar terms, that the painting most probably depicted the

funeral of Baudelaire, and considered its dating to be 1867. Reff also moved the locale "toward the southwest, in the area of the Cimetière de Montparnasse"²⁰ but, with an obvious awareness of all the contradictions of viewing the skyline buildings from such a position, added that

We must conclude either that Manet, working from memory and perhaps from sketches, though none have survived, represented the five buildings in a manner that is topographically impossible but pictorially varied and interesting or that they have not been identified correctly.²¹

Taking a cue from his own claim, Reff suggested that the identification of the Panthéon, Saint-Étienne-du-Mont, and the Tour de Clovis could not be doubted but that "the small cupola could belong to many buildings, both sacred and secular, besides the Observatoire", and that "the large dome near it could be that of the Sorbonne rather than the Val-de-Grâce" seen from "the area of the Cimetière de Montparnasse".²² Henri Loyrette, in 1994, had seen the redating of the work to 1867 as a confirmation of the stylistic similarities between *The Burial* and other paintings such as *Races at Longchamp in the Bois de Boulogne* and *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle*, but noted that the skyline as painted could not have been as seen from the locale of Baudelaire's funeral and, with some contradiction, reclaimed the locale to be "near the rue de la Glacière".²³ That the locale had been there was supported, claimed Loyrette, by the view from Gentilly in a painting of Jean-Jacques Champin, with Manet's position considered, in comparison, to be "lower down and quite near the rue de la Glacière".²⁴ Certainly Champin's view confirmed the basic orientation of Manet's view, or views, but what Loyrette didn't point out was that the vertical relationship between the domes of Val-de-Grâce and the Panthéon as seen from the heights of Gentilly was very close to that as seen in the painting, whereas the proposed viewpoint lower down and closer to the motif would significantly raise the height of Val-de-Grâce relative to that of the Panthéon. The raised line of sight from Gentilly is of some relevance in terms of the analysis and proposals made below. Loyrette's selective scholarship and his later speculations on the depicted funeral, exemplified in part the unsubstantiated claims and confusion that have

typified responses to *The Burial*, but his droll disclaimer that "perhaps... we have been following for more than a century a sad, anonymous funeral procession"²⁵ placed the work and its scholarship into a context which may be closer to the truth than had been considered by anyone previously.

The two most detailed and comprehensive considerations of the painting have been made by Éric Darragon in a doctoral dissertation in 1987,²⁶ and Nancy Locke in an article, 'Unfinished Homage: Manet's *Burial* and Baudelaire' in 2000.²⁷ Although their approaches are different, both studies have raised some interesting points. In terms of dating and locale, Darragon had seen the painting little differently to many other scholars, but was more specific, added to the identifications, and raised a number of relevant issues. He proposed that the painting "montre Paris d'un point bas",²⁸ and that "Le site évoqué, au pied de la Montagne Sainte-Genève, vers les Gobelins, n'est pas déterminé de façon précise".²⁹ In addition to the standard skyline identifications, the tower of Saint-Jacques-du-Haut-Pas was correctly identified but, oddly, Saint-Médard was seen to be "cachée par les arbres au second plan".³⁰ Stylistic comparisons had suggested to Darragon that *The Burial* "annonce les vues peintes durant le siège de Paris et la tonalité grave, le style nerveux et libre, certaines couleurs également, s'accordent avec l'activité des années 1868-69",³¹ but had also highlighted differences with the *Vue de l'Exposition Universelle de 1867*, from the year of Baudelaire's death. In almost every respect, in the landscape, figures, composition, tone, viewpoint, and the light and sky, Darragon had seen the two paintings to be very different. And while he believed *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle* showed its subject to be borrowed from contemporary engravings, *The Burial* showed "une scène banale de la vie quotidienne, mais traitée pour des raisons complexes comme un événement presque tragique".³² Importantly, as a response to the suggestions that the painting depicted Baudelaire's funeral, Darragon brought some objectivity into that question, noting that it was hazardous to make such a claim and that the inspiration of the work was still unclear.³³ Nevertheless, Darragon saw the broader aspects of the work's subject in terms of Manet's originality to "interroger la dimension nationale et religieuse à partir de ce cortège funèbre"³⁴ and symbolically

interpreted its prescient relationship with "la conduite d'un Parisien parmi d'autres en 1870–71".³⁵

Although only made in general terms, Darragon's reference to "les Gobelins" certainly brought into closer focus the area around the Manufacture des Gobelins as the locale or vantage points in the analysis. Whether Darragon had specifically identified the building or had determined that the locale needed to be somewhere in the vicinity of the Gobelins is not known, but to this writer's knowledge it was the first specific reference to that area depicted in the painting.

A slightly different reference to the Manufacture des Gobelins was made by Nancy Locke in her recent examination of *The Burial*. Locke pre-empted some of the research outcomes of this writer, but the areas of consideration, research approach, interpretation of visual data, and proposals for the painting are all very different. The main thesis of her article was that *The Burial* had been painted by Manet as a homage to Baudelaire, and in a wide-ranging discourse that speculated on the possible nature of such a homage, Locke suggested that "The idea of a painting that in some way memorialized Baudelaire would be more meaningful if its referents were both allusive and elusive".³⁶ In those terms, such a painting would not have been "in the manner of Courbet's *The Painter's Studio*",³⁷ and would not have depicted the Cimetière de Montparnasse or any of Baudelaire's dwellings.³⁸ Nor would it have conveyed "such modes as the cult of the dead, the sentimental visit to the grave, the epic funeral",³⁹ or pictured "recognizable literary figures, family and friends".⁴⁰

Although seeing possible influences on Manet from works such as Goya's *The Meadows of San Isidro*⁴¹ or in the socio-political effects of a controversial plan of Haussmann for a necropolis at Méry-sur-Oise and its possible impact on traditional Parisian funeral practices,⁴² Locke's most telling points for her proposal for *The Burial* are seen in her analogies with the works of Baudelaire, and in Manet's exploration of Baudelarian subjects. In discussing the locale for the painting in the thirteenth Arrondissement of Paris, Locke felt that "Baudelaire's bitter and exquisite portraits of the poor and the marginalized provided complex precedents for Manet's gypsies, prostitutes,

and *chiffonniers*"⁴³ and that consequently the "territory of the chiffonniers might be an appropriate spot for a painting in honor of Baudelaire".⁴⁴ For Locke, the

steeple and chimneys and noisy workshops of Baudelaire's cityscapes [in *Les fleurs du mal* and *Le spleen de Paris*] are not specific. His representations of urban squalor in "Le vin des chiffonniers" or of an industrial pastoral in "Paysage" are achieved through the dissonant incorporation of aspects of modernity into a harmonic poetic project.⁴⁵

But "without making it [the painting] into a tableau identifiable with *Les misérables* or yesterday's newspaper", Locke believed that "Manet would have wanted enough site-specificity that his painting carried the pungency of Baudelaire's language".⁴⁶ Such are the preconceptions of Locke about the nature of a painted homage to Baudelaire from Manet, but her reading of the painting as "a small, elegant cortege making its way across a meadow"⁴⁷ displaying the "juxtaposition of a view well known to Parisians and a quality of deliberate unfinish that can be understood within the framework of mourning: refusing the monumental, refusing the elegiac"⁴⁸ hardly seems to make it, in either specific or general terms, a memorial to Manet's late friend.

In addition to Baudelaire's funeral influencing her dating of *The Burial*, Locke also saw the painting to stylistically "combine the loose notation of cityscape visible in the *Universal Exposition* with the handling of space typical of the *Execution* [*The Execution of Maximilian*], which would suggest that the painting is from the same period – late 1867 or early 1868".⁴⁹ But no aspects of the painting's content or revealed information seem to have been taken into account. The considerations of Locke's article of most interest here are those of the painting's locale, and the topography and identification of what is depicted, based on her premise that the painting is a view from a single viewpoint in the area of the Butte-aux-Cailles. An evocative description by Émile de Labédollière in 1860⁵⁰ of a view from this area, that took in the skyline monuments of Paris, was seen by Locke as one "that almost perfectly describes Manet's view".⁵¹ But in addition to noting the buildings seen on the skyline, Labédollière had also referred to the "lignes imposantes de la manufacture des Gobelins" and the "vallée arrosée par la Bièvre".⁵²

This reference to the Bièvre river and the Manufacture des Gobelins introduced Locke's consideration of the same area as that noted by Darragon, and which is also examined in the analysis and proposals below. As a geographical identity, where shown on the location plan (Fig.C32), and the site plan (Fig.C36), the area [henceforth referred to as the 'Bièvre domain'] which was a composite of properties with different private ownerships and functions, had no specific name in the 1860s and today includes the areas of the Square René Le Gall⁵³ and the Mobilier National building.⁵⁴ It was located to the south-west, and directly to the rear, of the Manufacture des Gobelins, enclosed on the eastern and western sides by the two arms of the Bièvre river, and included the tanneries area of the Île des Singes to the north (Fig.C18), the Jardin des Gobelins in the centre (Fig.C17-dwg.4),⁵⁵ and a rustic, overgrown area with makeshift dwellings to the south (Fig.C21). At that time the street which cut across the two arms of the river at this southern end was named Rue du champ de l'Alouette (now named Rue Corvisart), and was an extension of the street which retains that original name today.⁵⁶ The whole area seems to have been surrounded to varying densities by tanneries, which effectively turned the two arms of the river into waste canals. The eastern arm of the Bièvre ran directly beside Rue Croulebarbe and behind the Manufacture des Gobelins (Figs.C17-dwg.1, C19) and the adjacent building of the historic Hôtel de la Reine Blanche (Figs.C17-dwg.1, C18, C19), and was enclosed on its west side adjacent to these buildings and Rue Croulebarbe with a continuous wall. Also behind the Manufacture on the line of this wall was the eighteenth-century hunting lodge of a Comte Jean de Julienne (Figs.C17-dwg.1, C19). All of these elements of buildings and walls are important in the analysis of the imagery in the painting. A continuous wall also existed at the east side of the western arm of the river, but the most obvious element at that side of the Bièvre domain was the line of poplar trees which grew on the west side of the western arm. These trees can also be shown to be important components in the collaging of the pictorial space of *The Burial*, and are discussed in detail in the analysis.

Labédollière's description of the view was compared by Locke to the view depicted in Jean-Baptiste Langlacé's *Paris vu des hauteurs de Gentilly* (1815, Fig.C4).⁵⁷

With the *Butte-aux-Cailles* noted at the right of the painting, Locke suggested that although the vantage point was "considerably more to the south and slightly to the west of Manet's, it is possible to see certain similarities in the relationships between the *Val-de-Grâce*, the *Panthéon*, *St-Étienne-du-Mont*, and the *Tour de Clovis* in the two paintings".⁵⁸ Although the details of those relationships were not considered by Locke, Langlacé's painting presents for this writer points of interest in an examination of *The Burial*, and these are also discussed in the analysis.

The reference to the *Manufacture des Gobelins* was illustrated by Locke with a wood engraving,⁵⁹ *Les Gobelins – La bièvre* which showed a number of aspects that can be identified in the painting and were discussed above, including the low walls at the side of the *Bièvre* river along *Rue Croulebarbe* and behind the *Manufacture des Gobelins*, and a large chimney. This illustration, however, was a typically inaccurate one with not only its perspective being wholly incorrect but with visible elements, including the rear of the *Manufacture des Gobelins* and the position of the semi-circular wall to its chapel, the form of the *Hôtel de la Reine Blanche*, and the position of *Val-de-Grâce*, all moved, deleted, or adjusted, at will. Nevertheless, Locke correctly proposed "the band of yellow drawn across the right center of the picture"⁶⁰ to be the walls at the side of the *Bièvre*.

Other identifications by Locke are, however, problematic. Her suggestion that the single chimney shown in the same illustration had been "that of the tannery... in the old *Hôtel de la Reine Blanche*"⁶¹ might be thrown into question by later photographs in the immediate area of the *Hôtel* which only show numerous smaller chimneys (Fig.C18). Nevertheless, a more accurate illustration titled "*La Bièvre, rue des Gobelins*", seen as the second of four illustrations in Fig.C17, confirms that one large chimney was seen to the left of these buildings from such a vantage point, but suggests it to be further behind the *Hôtel*. This problem of the one large chimney depicted in the painting has been examined here also in the context of another large chimney existing in the area of *Boulevard Arago* and *Rue de la Glacière*, and the proposal includes the possibility that both chimneys were included as overlaid images from different views. A question can

also be raised about Locke's claim that the "long, reddish rooftop in front of the cypress trees"⁶² represented the Gobelins tapestry works, with the analysis below showing that the roof is that of the Hôtel de la Reine Blanche and the rear of the Manufacture des Gobelins building set further to the right. And rather than the trees above these roofs being cypresses, it can be shown that the painting included a part view of the poplar trees at the western side of the Bièvre domain collaged into that part of the canvas.

Literary descriptions of the area around the Bièvre and Butte-aux-Cailles and the views from various vantage points seem to have been numerous, and that of Labédollière, with which Locke's proposal was connected, had not been an isolated one. Honoré de Balzac's text in his novel *La femme de trente ans*⁶³ of some twenty years earlier, and Alfred Delvau's piece set in a historical context in *Histoire anécdotique des barrières de Paris*⁶⁴ five years later, provided similar responses to the vista. As Locke had noted, Labédollière's text seemed to echo Balzac's writing which, importantly, in its description of a similar view of the same area raises a number of topographical points of interest:

Entre la barrière d'Italie et celle de la Santé, sur le boulevard intérieur qui mène au Jardin des plantes, il existe une perspective digne de ravir l'artiste ou le voyageur le plus blasé sur les jouissances de la vue. Si vous atteignez une légère éminence à partir de laquelle le boulevard, ombragé par de grands arbres touffus, tourne avec la grâce d'une allée forestière verte et silencieuse, vous voyez devant vous, à vos pieds, une vallée profonde, peuplée de fabriques à demi villageoises, clairsemée de verdure, arrosée par les eaux brunes de la Bièvre ou des Gobelins. Sur le versant opposé, quelques milliers de toits, pressés comme les têtes d'une foule, recèlent les misères du faubourg Saint-Marceau. La magnifique coupole du Panthéon, le dôme terne et mélancolique du Val-de-Grâce dominant orgueilleusement toute une ville en amphithéâtre dont les gradins sont bizarrement dessinés par des rues tortueuses. De là, les proportions des deux monuments semblent gigantesques; elles écrasent et les demeures frêles et les plus haut peupliers du vallon. À gauche, l'Observatoire, à travers les fenêtres et les galeries duquel le jour passe en produisant d'inexplicables fantaisies, apparaît comme un spectre noir et décharné. Puis, dans le lointain, l'élégante lanterne des Invalides flamboie entre les masses bleuâtres du Luxembourg et les tours grises de Saint-Sulpice.⁶⁵

The locale for Balzac's description of "sur le boulevard intérieur qui mène au Jardin des plantes" can be shown to be at the intersection of the inner Boulevard des Gobelins and Rue du champ de l'Alouette slightly to the west of Labédollière's locale which must have been very close to the intersection of the Boulevard and Rue du Petit Gentilly. Balzac's

description of the view is, however, more panoramic, from the Observatoire at the left to, noted later in the writing, the "canal Saint-Martin" and "les vaporeuses collines de Belleville" at the right.⁶⁶ Such a description, even though in one important detail an incorrect one,⁶⁷ clarifies in principle that in a view from a single viewpoint at such a locale a number of major buildings are seen between the Observatoire and Val-de-Grâce and that a viewed coincidence of the Observatoire and Val-de-Grâce would not have been possible. And the description of "les plus haut peupliers du vallon" is a specific reference to the poplars discussed above, and which are discussed in detail in the analysis below. From a vantage point "au point d'intersection du Boulevard de l'Hôpital et du Boulevard des Gobelins, derrière le grand café qui se trouve élevé juste sur l'ancienne Butte aux Cailles",⁶⁸ Delvau's writing from the locale to be later named Place d'Italie not only noted the buildings on the skyline, but also evoked the stepping-down of the roofs beneath the skyline to the level of the Bièvre river, as is also conveyed in Manet's painting with the lighter-toned areas of paint broadly applied, without detail, between the skyline and the tree-tops:

puis, au-dessous, descendant comme les gradins d'un amphithéâtre vers le fond du vallon où serpente la Bièvre, d'innombrables rangées de toitures pittoresques, de séchoirs de mégissiers, de greniers de tanneurs, et, plus bas encore, des étendages de blanchisseuses, qui sont du meilleur effet – à cette distance.⁶⁹

Other writers, including Victor Hugo and J.-K. Huysmans, wrote of the locale around the Bièvre river itself and the vistas seen from this lower vantage point. Locke noted that the area known as *Champ de l'Alouette* had been described by Hugo in *Les misérables*,⁷⁰ but she did not quote the specific references made to the view of the skyline, which included important identifications for *The Burial*. Hugo's description, with others, is discussed in the analysis.

One specific identification made by Locke is not only of interest in the analysis of *The Burial* but also adds to the possible importance of aerial balloons and the area around the Butte-aux-Cailles in Manet's imagery. Locke proposed that Manet had depicted the first balloon flight which landed on the butte in 1783 as a print image tacked to the curtain within his print for a proposed album frontispiece of 1862 (Fig.16).⁷¹ In the

context of the considerations of aerial ballooning and photography in this dissertation, such a proposal, with which this writer concurs, becomes part of an intriguing pattern of visual references, both direct and indirect and particularly from 1862, that were made by Manet about aerial ballooning. Whether Manet became familiar with the Bièvre domain and the Butte-aux-Cailles areas when a student at the nearby Collège Rollin⁷² is unknown, but it is suggested that the subject of Manet's connection with aerial ballooning and the possible connections between Manet, the Butte-aux-Cailles area and aerial photography in general warrants further research.

In contrast to these aspects of the upper part of *The Burial*, the identification of the funeral group and its locale and the spatial manipulations of the painting have received limited scholarly consideration. In many ways the spatial implications of the funeral are as important in understanding Manet's spatial strategies as they are in any search for the work's meaning. Notwithstanding the more recent consensus that the painting is a memorial or homage to Baudelaire, most scholars have also noted, or have tried to avoid noting, that the specific details of the funeral as depicted cannot be made to match the specific details of Baudelaire's funeral and his burial site at Cimetière du Montparnasse. The points of conjecture with the funeral in the painting include whether an actual funeral was seen and depicted by Manet, even if used anonymously and symbolically in the painting, and, if so, the identities of the deceased and the participants, the locale of the funeral, and whether the funeral cortège is moving from the left to the right or has indeed arrived at the burial site. The identification of the locale would clarify the nature and extent to which the painting had been collaged, and the details of the funeral group could clarify any ambiguous spatial shaping that Manet may have employed. Prior to the Baudelaire connection, Sterling and Salinger had conjectured that "The white pall over the coffin and the white horse... are customary for a child or young girl",⁷³ but the regulations of the time, as discussed below, seem to contradict this, with a white cloth over the coffin of a child or young girl not a regulatory requirement, and the choice of a white horse an option at extra cost. Locke proposed that "Manet might have intended a subtle effect of theatricalizing the movement and location of the cortege" with the

presence of this man as "an observer who watches the funeral procession",⁷⁴ but there is no certainty that the cortege is in fact moving and an official observer at a burial required by the regulations in certain circumstances would more readily explain his presence. In terms of locale, both Darragon and Locke made indirect connections with the area behind the Manufacture des Gobelins. Darragon had stated that the location of the scene "vers les Gobelins, n'est pas déterminé de façon précise",⁷⁵ had noted that "la valeur spéciale de la composition repose sur l'espace ouvert et verdoyant, au premier plan"⁷⁶ and the "terrains vers les Gobelins et la Bièvre étaient encore largement ouverts",⁷⁷ but also that "Aucun cimetière n'existait à cet endroit".⁷⁸ Locke's reference to this locale for the burial was even less clear, with the cortege seen to be moving "from the dense elevation of the grove at left to the green of the meadow at right" and entering "an area almost enclosed by the curving yellow band of the Bièvre; the meadow itself becomes an oval, almost like an arena or amphitheater."⁷⁹ In an earlier reference to the Bièvre with what was described as a topographical shift in the painting, Locke had noted that the "band of yellow... in all likelihood represents the low retaining walls built along the Bièvre River".⁸⁰ Although such a pictorial shift suggested that Locke had not seen the meadow to be actually related to the wall at the rear of the Gobelins, no alternative site was named. In contrast, the analysis and proposals below present a case, based upon circumstantial evidence, that the depicted funeral is at a specific locale in the Cimetière du Père-Lachaise in the Twentieth arrondissement of Paris.

Scholarly considerations of space as a creative component in the painting have also been limited. Linda Nochlin raised aspects in terms of pictorial structure, contrasting the "willed meaning" underlying that of Poussin's *Phocion* and the "casual non-significance" underlying Manet's *Funeral [The Burial]*.⁸¹ And the composition of *The Burial* was seen by her in terms of "lightly brushed, discrete entities – formless figures, shapeless clouds, scrubby trees – scattered across the surface of the canvas",⁸² and its coherence seen to arise "from the conjunction of immediate perception and swift notation: at no point in the canvas does one element give pictorial or conceptual reinforcement to another".⁸³ The painting's space, for Nochlin, was

neither finite and measured nor infinite and boundless: it is a contingent space, both extensive and flat at the same time, a result of certain structural conjunctions on the picture surface. It is above all a shallow space, if not a flat one: one cannot progress through it or measure it off, or see it as an ample, coherent stage for the presentation of significant action and meaning, as one could in Poussin's painting.⁸⁴

At the descriptive level, these notions of the painting being the "result of certain structural conjunctions on the picture surface" have resonances with the general proposals of this dissertation and the specific proposals made below. Nochlin certainly had seen Manet's successful destruction of traditional order to imply "a consistent if not a totally conscious viewpoint on the part of the artist",⁸⁵ but the viewpoint was seen, at one level, as a greater interest "in the appearance of the landscape panorama as a whole than in the funeral"⁸⁶ and, at another and more obscure level, "as an expression of a more universal contemporary attitude towards death and the relation of man and nature".⁸⁷ The form of any structural conjunctions on the surface of the painting, however, was neither assessed in the context of Manet's picture-making practice nor in terms of its implication for spatial disjunctions or ambiguity.

The only other response to the painting's space that has not been couched in generalities has been the inference by Locke of a pictorial fracturing with specific topography seen to be set within a framework of pictorial shifts. She observed that "Even if Manet characteristically pulls background elements forward and makes the perspective more abrupt than did... Langlacé, the topography represented in *The Burial* nevertheless remains... specific".⁸⁸ The grove of trees in the left foreground was seen by Locke to register as an elevation, rendered by Manet with a lightening of the grove's right edge "in order to set it off from the meadow at right as well as from the dark foliage that encloses the procession".⁸⁹ And a topographical shift was also seen at the "band of yellow drawn across the right center of the picture, beyond the foreground meadow".⁹⁰ But the implications of these perceived shifts in terms of a possible different viewpoint or the overall form of the painting as a composite were not developed.

Analysis

The procedures and techniques employed in this analysis and the computer modelling of the topography, buildings, monuments and landmarks, are as described for *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle* in 5(B) above and in Appendix 4, with the modelling used to confirm or make new identifications of the painting's buildings and landmarks and, in particular, to assess their depicted relationships in terms of viewpoints, and views or composite views. Two aerial overviews of the site for the upper part of *The Burial* provide a sense of the topography and these relationships. The painting of Victor Navlet, *Le XIIIe vu d'une Montgolfière* (1855, detail, Fig.C4), is replete with contradictions in the context of this analysis. With a view as if seen from an aerial balloon, and including a balloon in its complete image, its detail is such that it can only have been a perspective construction even if Navlet had actually experienced the view from a balloon. But although the depicted view presents a picturesque sense that is worth noting, those same details are, nevertheless, very standardised and at times very inaccurate,⁹¹ limiting the value of the painting for any reliable historical detail. With a similar direction of view to the Navlet, a computer-generated perspective (Fig.C34) shows, when read in conjunction with the location plan (Fig.C32), the positions of the various landmarks and buildings of interest, with: La Glacière, the Butte-aux-Cailles, the Bièvre domain, Manufacture des Gobelins, and Hôtel de la Reine Blanche seen in the foreground; Saint-Pierre du Petit-Montrouge, the Observatoire, Val-de-Grâce, the elm tree Orme de Sully, Saint-Jacques-du-Haut-Pas, the Panthéon, Saint-Étienne-du-Mont and Tour de Clovis in the middle-distance; and Saint-Germain-des-Prés, Église de la Sorbonne, Sainte-Chapelle, the Tour Saint-Jacques, Saint-Séverin, and Notre-Dame, among others, in the distance; and Saint-Pierre-du-Montmartre on the very distant Butte Montmartre. The Cimetière du Père-Lachaise, as the proposed site for the lower part of *The Burial*, is seen in the location plan, Fig.C63.

Unfortunately the only examination by this writer of the X-radiograph made of the painting has been by means of a photographic print (Fig.C2),⁹² without the benefit of

technical information from conservators. Any interpretations presented here are thus limited in their accuracy by these circumstances, but it is believed that a number of aspects which can be raised are revealing. On the skyline Manet seems to have experimented, as part of a collage in flux, with the positions of the domes, spires and towers, and with some parts of the covered or scraped forms still evident. Even the skyline itself seems to have been first painted at a higher position with ghosted forms of the Val-de-Grâce dome, and the dome and lower roof of the Panthéon visible. Some specific aspects of the overpainting can be identified. At the left edge of the painting a vertical, rectilinear shape has obviously been overpainted with the tree on the skyline and the analysis has suggested that shape to be the tower of Saint-Jacques-du-Haut-Pas as seen in one particular view. And the lower roof and triangulated profile of the facade of Val-de-Grâce have been overpainted with the form of the problematic 'dome' adjacent to it. The proposal is made below that the image of this dome had first been a famous elm tree seen above the roof and that the complete image including the roof was then changed to be the single form of the Observatoire dome as seen from a different viewpoint. The X-radiograph also suggests in the central grouping of buildings around what has been identified as the Hôtel de la Reine Blanche, that not only does a lower viewpoint seem to have been used at an earlier stage but what has been determined to be the row of dark poplars above these roofs gives a strong indication that some of the trees had in fact originally been painted as some of the many smaller chimney stacks in that area. And in the lower left of the canvas, some dense areas of pigment present a much more specific depiction of what could be read as tombs than is visible in the surface of the painting.

It became quickly evident in the analysis that no one viewpoint could provide a view that would incorporate the lateral relationships for the grouping of the skyline buildings seen in the painting. And although the Butte-aux-Cailles area had the potential for an elevated vantage point to provide a sweeping view in the general direction required, it could not provide the vertical relationships required. Earlier paintings, such as those used by Loyrette and Locke for comparison with *The Burial*, not only provided

topographical information but also highlighted the problems involved in a single-viewpoint concept. Langlacé's painting from Gentilly, for instance, shows the line of the barrières de la Santé, de la Glacière and d'Italie, marked by the row of trees in the middle distance. In front of, and therefore to the south of, those trees is seen the two arms of the Bièvre river and at the left in the foreground, the *étangs* which when frozen in winter were used for ice skating and after which the area known as La Glacière, shown by the buildings in front of the trees at the left, was named. In the far distance, between Val-de-Grâce and the Panthéon can be seen the Butte Montmartre. Although Langlacé's painting is not an altogether accurate view, the lateral relationships of the skyline buildings demonstrate that the scene depicted in *The Burial* could not be possible from any one vantage point as used by Langlacé. In addition, the position and relative height of the squared twin towers of Notre-Dame at the right-hand end of the roof to Saint-Étienne-du-Mont also indicate that the height of any viewpoint that could maintain a similar elevation of the towers in relation to the Tour de Clovis and Saint-Étienne-du-Mont would need to be at an elevation similar to, or higher than, the heights of Gentilly. Another painting which also depicts topography of interest, but more as a vignette of that part of the city, as a *veduta* set in pastoral surrounds, is Sigismond Himely's *Vue prise de la Glacière* (Fig.C4).⁹³ Its view, however, not only shows at the right the Butte-aux-Cailles, but also correctly shows at the left the Observatoire in its position to the south-west of Val-de-Grâce. Even though the vantage point of the Himely is, as is that of the Langlacé, not directly relevant for the views of *The Burial*, it makes clear that from the general direction of Gentilly and the Butte-aux-Cailles, no view could place the domes of the Observatoire and Val-de-Grâce adjacent to each other. Although not photographically accurate, these paintings nevertheless provided qualified information for analysis and what they demonstrate about the impossibility of a single viewpoint was confirmed by the computer modelling.

For the upper part of the painting, the series of different views have been determined to be from eleven viewpoints, set at heights above the varying ground levels from twenty-two to one hundred and thirty-two metres. They are stretched in a relatively

straight line in plan, with one above the area to the south of Saint-Pierre du Petit-Montrouge and the remaining ten set at relatively regular intervals in a continuous curve down from above the area known in Manet's time as La Glacière and along the line of Boulevard d'Italie towards the Place at the intersection of Boulevard d'Italie and Rue Mouffetard. The viewpoints, as if points on a flight path of an aerial balloon, had not been predetermined or arrived at fortuitously but, rather, are the result of an examination of all possible circumstances. To establish inter-related points in space which provide a series of views relevant to relationships of elements in *The Burial* cannot simply be coincidental.⁹⁴ Even so, although such a pattern is almost unarguable, it is also almost inexplicable.

The positions of such points, however, are not absolute without some flexibility. Viewpoints for those views that only involve the relationship between two elements in space which are at similar heights and close together are able to be moved along a line of limited distance and still produce the proposed view. And those that involve three or more elements in space to be co-ordinated have very little range of movement before the precise relationships are no longer held. Venues other than aerial balloons for the determined viewpoints of the proposal are nevertheless limited. Because of the inclined centre of vision used, the viewpoint from which the Observatoire is seen adjacent to Val-de-Grâce can be moved closer to the subject, to a position which is aligned with and at a similar height to the top of the tower of Saint-Pierre du Petit-Montrouge, without the required view being lost. But if the viewpoint were moved laterally to the church's tower then the very specific detail of the view is not maintained. Generally, however, no other structures, such as chimney stacks, of the required height were available as vantage points in the proximity of the eleven positions, and even if some of the viewpoints with only two elements were projected backwards to any high buildings on the top of Butte-aux-Cailles, for example, others would not be able to be moved, and the details of the images would be no longer relevant. If the proposed viewpoints are valid, then it could only mean that Manet either used photographs taken from an aerial balloon or had indeed sketched the views himself from a balloon.

Although any consideration of a dating for the painting of c.1867–70 would make, as discussed in 5(B) above and in Appendix 3, the aerial photographs only possible after Nadar's photographs of July, 1868, there are a number of aspects that make any sketches from a balloon less likely. The regular intervals between ten of the viewpoints would not only have provided the time to make each of a sequence of eight exposures on one plate in a *carte-de-visite* camera, but the identification of the viewpoints as a series of points in space set at regular intervals suggests, in itself, a repetitive activity such as making exposures in sequence. As is also shown in the proposals, the directions of view for the sequence of viewpoints are generally towards the north and more particularly to the combined motif of Val-de-Grâce and the Panthéon, and such a pattern confirms the restricted views of a camera fixed in one position to the basket of a balloon, rather than the more flexible possibility of someone making quick sketches in any direction desired. And even though contemporary reports of flights noted that the baskets beneath the balloons would, at times, oscillate,⁹⁵ such a rotation can be accommodated within the formats of the views from each viewpoint.

The question of the dating of the painting is also raised in one of the views. The gap which can be seen in the painting between the right-hand side of the Tour de Clovis and the reduced profile of the roof to Saint-Étienne-du-Mont can be replicated in a view from a particular viewpoint in the proposed flight path (Figs.C49 and C51). Such a correlation cannot have been by coincidence and confirms that both Manet's depiction and the computer modelling of the church and tower were reasonably accurate. For such a small, yet precise, detail to have been noted in sketch form from an aerial balloon would simply have been impossible, whereas it could have been recorded in an aerial photograph. An enlarged detail (Fig.C10) of a contemporary photograph (Fig.106) taken from Saint-Gervais illustrates, in reverse, the detailed forms of the roof. Although the precise date is unknown, the construction work on the roof and facade of Saint-Étienne-du-Mont had been completed in 1868, and the question that can then of course be asked is, how could a photograph be taken after July 1868 of a stepped roof form which no longer existed? Or, conversely, how could a photograph be taken from an aerial balloon

of the stepped roof form when the means to take such a photograph supposedly did not exist? As discussed in Appendix 3, the possibility exists that photographs could have actually been taken but were experimental in nature and not permanently 'fixed'. Until further research either establishes the exact completion date of the construction work on the roof of Saint-Étienne-du-Mont or finds that Nadar in fact made other photographs in that hiatus before 1868, no answer can be provided.

Specific identifications of unfamiliar elements of the painting were crucial in terms of a full realisation of the painting's imagery and an understanding of its composite construction. The view which incorporates the lighter- and warmer-toned forms of the Hôtel de la Reine Blanche and the lighter green area behind the Manufacture des Gobelins in the middle distance is, in many ways, the focus which supports the possibility that the composite image is seen as a unified space. And the funeral in the foreground is, tentatively at least, an extension of that space somewhere in, or in the vicinity of, the Bièvre domain. Whereas the description by Labédollière was of a view overlooking this area, a different but as evocative a description made from within the setting, after approaching it from the opposite direction, appeared in Victor Hugo's *Les Misérables* of 1862. When describing the area known as "le champ de l'Alouette", the narrator related that

Quand on a monté la rue Saint-Jacques, laissé de côté la barrière et suivi quelque temps à gauche l'ancien boulevard intérieur, on atteint la rue de la Santé, puis la Glacière, et, un peu avant d'arriver à la petite rivière des Gobelins, on rencontre une espèce de champ, qui est, dans la longue et monotone ceinture des boulevards de Paris, le seul endroit où Ruisdael serait tenté de s'asseoir.

Ce je ne sais quoi d'où la grâce se dégage est là, un pré vert traversé de cordes tendues où des loques sèchent au vent, une vieille ferme à maraîchers bâtie du temps de Louis XIII avec son grand toit bizarrement percé de mansardes, des palissades délabrées, un peu d'eau entre des peupliers, des femmes, des rires, des voix; à l'horizon le Panthéon, l'arbre des Sourds-Muets, le Val-de-Grâce, noir, trapu, fantasque, amusant, magnifique, et au fond le sévère faite carré des tours de Notre-Dame.⁹⁶

Although similar to that of Labédollière's, such a description of the area and the view of the skyline makes two references of particular interest here, to the "peupliers" and "l'arbre des Sourds-Muets".

As mentioned above, a distinctive and historic feature of the Bièvre domain had been the line of poplars which had grown beside the western arm of the Bièvre. But as a result of their cyclical removal every fifty years or so for safety reasons, their irregular appearance in illustrations and photographs had been puzzling.⁹⁷ Even after the river was covered early in the twentieth century, the poplars have remained to mark its course, as can be seen from an aerial photograph of the area in 1996 (Fig.C22). Evidence from illustrations and photographs indicate that the poplars certainly existed during the 1860s, 1870s, and well into the 1880s, with their removal approximately around 1890. The reference to the poplars by Honoré de Balzac cannot be dated with certainty,⁹⁸ but with all the references taken into account it suggests that in c.1840 they were tall, mature trees, and thus making their removal cycle to be c. 1845–50, c.1885–90, c.1945-50, and c.1996. It is proposed that these trees have been painted in three separate positions in *The Burial*, but with only their tops depicted in each view: first, at the centre-left of the canvas below the large tree on the skyline; second, to the left of the Hôtel de la Reine Blanche and the Manufacture des Gobelins in the centre of the canvas; and third, as the row of trees set beneath the Panthéon and above the roofs of the Hôtel de la Reine Blanche and the Manufacture des Gobelins, at the centre-right. In the latter context at least one of these poplars seems to have covered an earlier chimney stack painted behind and above the roof of Hôtel de la Reine Blanche. All previous scholarly references to these trees have seen them as cypresses,⁹⁹ but the trees adjacent to the western arm of the Bièvre river had always been poplars, and the silhouettes of poplar trees which had existed in Manet's time in an area adjacent to the Bièvre river but on the southern side of the Boulevard des Gobelins, as seen in the photograph Fig.C20, directly convey the same character as those depicted in the painting.

Outcomes from the process of examination and analysis to solve the dome-like form adjacent to the drum and dome of Val-de-Grâce have complicated the issue rather than clarified it, with many aspects considered and a resultant proposal that involves two possibilities as part of Manet's deliberations. As discussed above, it has been considered

by most scholars that the rounded form was that of the large dome of the Observatoire, but without a rational explanation of a specific view it has been thought that Manet purposefully transposed the dome to its depicted position adjacent to that of Val-de-Grâce. In the development of composite images, and as has been shown with that of *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle*, such new relationships are part of the end result of such a cut-and-paste process, but rather than being the result of an arbitrary conjunction, the tension between the two forms that would have been observed in an existing image is considered by this writer to have been the reason for its inclusion. This relationship of counterpoint between these two domes is visible from two directions. From the north-east it could have been photographed by a professional photographer from the roof level of the church of Saint-Paul-Saint-Louis and seen at the left of one of the many standard views from elevated positions of the Panthéon and its surrounding landmarks. But in such a view the size of the Observatoire dome is too small in relation to that of Val-de-Grâce. In contrast, a view from the south-west, with the Observatoire closer to the viewpoint, provides the required size relationship, and from an elevated viewpoint the required vertical relationship is able to be replicated with the computer modelling.

Another suitable 'dome', albeit a semi-circular silhouette found on the distant horizons in a number of photographs dating from as early as 1845 (Figs.C11, C13, C14, C15, and C16) was established to be a large elm tree, known as the Orme de Sully, at the southern end of the courtyard to the then Institut des Sourds-muets in Rue Saint-Jacques (Fig.C12).¹⁰⁰ Apparently famous for its size and prominence on the Parisian skyline, the elm had been noted in an article of 1903 which reported the fact that the tree was dying:

Le fameux "orme de Sully", qui faisait l'admiration des visiteurs de l'Institut des sourds-muets, rue Saint-Jacques, vient de mourir. Et comme la direction de l'école craint de le voir s'abattre quelqu'un de ces jours, elle va en faire couper toute la partie supérieure.

Jusqu'à ces dernières années, ce géant des arbres parisiens avait encore des feuilles tardives. Cette année, les vieux gardiens de l'école ont attendu vainement. Les feuilles ne sont pas venues. D'ailleurs, si comme le veut la tradition, il a été planté sur les ordres de Sully, vers l'an 1600, il n'en a pas moins commencé son quatrième siècle, ce qui est d'une longévité assez remarquable.

L'orme de Sully avait une hauteur d'environ 50 mètres. Sa circonférence, mesurée à la base, accuse six mètres.¹⁰¹

The very dome-like shape of the elm as particularly seen in the Marville calotype, its size as seen in the winter-time photograph taken from the Panthéon (Figs.C6, and C8), its correct relative position to the dome of Val-de-Grâce as seen in the reversed image of the Martens daguerrotype, and its close physical proximity to Val-de-Grâce present an intriguing and convincing argument that the Orme de Sully could be the 'dome' in the painting. On the one hand such a proposition can be confirmed with a computer-generated view from one of the developed viewpoints, but on the other it is confronted by two potential problems – the purity of its shape and the possibility that the elm had been painted a second time, as part of a separate view on the skyline, with its image cut at the painting's left edge. In spite of a slight serration at the painted edge of the 'dome', probably the result of the brush dragged across underpainting rather than intentional figuring, its form is regular and untextured. But for a painting which was obviously in flux, its painted shape could simply be seen as a blocking-in of its form. Such a regular shape also seemingly contrasts with the form of the more recognisable tree at the edge of the painting. The analysis has shown that in one particular view the position of the Orme de Sully is in such a lateral position relative to the surrounding buildings, but somewhat lower, and the possibility that the tree at the painting's edge represents the elm is an uncertain one.

Nevertheless the evidence of the information from the views is seen to present a chronology for the image of the 'dome' in which Manet first painted the Val-de-Grâce, with the profile of its angled facade and roof to the left of the church's dome as seen in the X-radiograph, and the Orme de Sully correctly positioned from above and behind the lower roof and facade of the church. With the dome of the Observatoire seen to make a very similar but more ambiguous relationship with Val-de-Grâce, it can be seen that the elm and the roof and facade of the church were then overpainted with the dome of the Observatoire. The evidence in the X-radiograph that the roof and facade of Val-de-Grâce had been initially painted suggests that any depicted dome-like form in the first composition had only been visible behind the roof and that the overpainting suggests that

the second form had been visible in front of the roof – a sequence as proposed for Manet's use of the Orme de Sully and the Observatoire dome. Whereas a depiction of the elm would have identified a viewpoint, that of a non-specific dome kept that particular aspect of the painting an ambiguous one.

Another element which was clearly characteristic of the area around the Bièvre domain was the industrial chimney stack, and as can be seen in a photograph taken from the Panthéon in 1878 (Fig.C6), and in a detail of the same photograph (Fig.C8), countless stacks existed.¹⁰² One very tall stack is depicted in *The Burial* to the left of the central building group of the Hôtel de la Reine Blanche and, as noted above, Nancy Locke had proposed it to be the stack for a tannery in the Hôtel. Most of the stacks in that immediate area seemed shorter and the painted stack is set further to the north. To address this issue of the stack an analysis was carried out to assess the implications of positions and heights of stacks if seen from the series of viewpoints which had been developed for the skyline buildings. Notwithstanding the fact that the date of the photograph from the Panthéon was a decade after the period of 1867 to 1870 on which the research and analysis had concentrated, an examination showed that one stack seemed to be more evident in the area to the north of the Manufacture des Gobelins, but also that the tallest stack in the area existed just to the south-west of the intersection between Boulevard Arago and Rue de la Glacière. The computer modelling not only established that a chimney stack (C6) at that position became an accurate component in the view from viewpoint SP3 in which the Val-de-Grâce and the domed crown of the Orme de Sully were adjacent, but that in the view from viewpoint SP7 which showed the Hôtel de la Reine Blanche and the Manufacture des Gobelins, a chimney stack (C7) in approximately the correct area also became an obvious component in that view, with the image of both stacks superimposed and set in the same position in the painting. Although any stacks could have been painted by Manet during the 1870s, and the proposal includes them as indicative of a spatial possibility, such a proposal needs to be tempered by the fact that the research has not yet established if those specific stacks actually existed in, say, 1867.

In overview, the identifications, and possible identifications, in the upper part resulting from the analysis have included, from the left on the skyline: the initial painting of the tower of Saint-Jacques-du-Haut-Pas beneath the tree painted on the horizon; the tower of Saint-Germain-des-Prés; the tower of Saint-Jacques-du-Haut-Pas; a depiction of the dome of the Observatoire transformed from that of the Orme de Sully as the hemispherical dome-like object seen adjacent to the drum and dome of Val-de-Grâce; a spire representing both that of Sainte-Chapelle and Notre-Dame in different views; Saint-Pierre-du-Montmartre on the Butte Montmartre, and beside it, a second depiction of the spire of Sainte-Chapelle seen above the roof of the Panthéon; the dome, drum and lower roofs of the Panthéon; the peak of Saint-Séverin's tower; the tower and the lower roof over the nave of Saint-Étienne-du-Mont;¹⁰³ the Tour de Clovis; the higher roof over the apse of Saint-Étienne-du-Mont; and at the right-hand edge of the canvas, the towers of Notre-Dame. In the lower section of the upper part of the painting, from the left, the identifications have included: the poplar trees to the eastern side of the west arm of the Bièvre river in the Bièvre domain; the speculative identification that two chimney stacks, one near the intersection of Boulevard Arago and Rue de la Glacière and the other to the north of the Hôtel de la Reine Blanche, are represented by the same chimney stack seen in the painting; the tower and roof of Saint-Médard; the wall set at the western side of the eastern arm of the Bièvre river in the area behind the Hôtel de la Reine Blanche and the Manufacture des Gobelins; the buildings making up the Hôtel de la Reine Blanche; the rear wall of the Manufacture des Gobelins; and, a suggestion of, rather than the depiction of, the hunting lodge of Comte Jean de Julienne.

The analysis of the funeral scene in the lower part of the painting has been influenced by pictorial, topographical, and horticultural considerations, details of funeral practices in Paris in the mid-nineteenth century, as well as the possible explanations of the scene's content. Even though the proposal made here is based solely on circumstantial evidence, the characteristics of the locale and the nature of the funeral are such that, if valid, any evidence can only ever be circumstantial, with a continued search for specific information about the funeral's identity or Manet's connection with it, for

instance, an impossible quest. It is believed, however, that there are sufficient indicators in the totality of the evidence here for the proposal not to be seen as speculative. Interestingly, no item of researched material has yet contradicted the proposal as an explanation for the depicted funeral.

Part of the explanation is grounded in the debates that were prominent in France during the nineteenth century on funeral policy between the law, organised religions, the civil institutions, and the community. And part of the debate involved the right for an individual to have a separate grave rather than be buried in the *fosse commune*, or common grave, and the problems of religious, and other, segregation within cemeteries.¹⁰⁴ The right to have separate graves was given expression with the ability of many, as individuals or families, to obtain *concessions à perpétuité*, as private areas purchased within cemeteries.¹⁰⁵ But as the result of uncertain legislation, the attitude of clerics, and the policies about the circumstance or classification of the deceased, many were denied the right to be buried in anything but unconsecrated ground, including, among others, unbaptised or stillborn children, alcoholics, and those who had not practised their religion, who had been prohibited from receiving a Catholic burial, or who had died by suicide. To ensure that such funerals had been properly carried out and not been moved to a consecrated part of a cemetery, agents of the civil authorities were responsible to take, deliver and bury the corpses.¹⁰⁶ By the very nature of their worldly circumstances, many of those deceased would have been buried in the *fosse commune*.

The regulations in mid-nineteenth century Paris¹⁰⁷ also established minimum funeral requirements for deceased children under the age of seven¹⁰⁸ and for others above that age,¹⁰⁹ and the minimum requirements for a *service ordinaire* and six other classes with varying number of vehicles, number and type of personnel, and level of decoration. Many aspects were optional at extra cost and some decisions were to be made only by the family concerned. The cloth over the coffin, for instance, was not a regulatory requirement, even for the funeral of a child or young girl, and the decision for the cloth to be either black or white was one left to the family. For the hearse to be drawn by white horses was also an option at extra cost. Often, a wider range of classes with more

variations than the minimum stipulated by the regulations, was also provided by commercial undertakers, as seen in the illustration, Fig.C23. These regulations and modes of practice provide information for identifications in *The Burial*. With the presence of the coachman wearing his *chapeau à cornes*, the undertaker wearing a *frac noir* at the rear of the hearse, no evidence of a costumed master of ceremonies or a robed cleric, and the undraped hearse with tassels possibly at its corners, the modest funeral depicted in the painting is consistent with a *service ordinaire* or *neuvième classe* funeral as depicted in that illustration. And the isolated figure at the side of the hearse in the painting, detached from the intimate gathering of the family, but seemingly not directly involved in any of the activities of the undertaker, is seen as the authorised agent observing the proceedings. Apart from the imperial guardsman at the left of the group, the identities of the others in the mourning group have remained obscure, with some seen possibly as veiled women, or nuns in habits.

Details of the proposed setting have also influenced this assessment of the nature of the funeral. The locale for the funeral in the painting shows an open area, without tombs or headstones, in which the cortege is adjacent to an angled row of trees, and gives evidence of a viewpoint from which the complete cortege is viewed from above and behind the hearse. On the left is a group of trees which are either positioned closer to the viewpoint or are larger trees, and with a suggestion of tombstones seen between the trunks. The Cimetière du Père-Lachaise in the Twentieth arrondissement of Paris has an area which existed in c.1867 and which would have met all the topographical details of the funeral scene as well as the funeral circumstances depicted. The perimeter configuration of the 68th Division in the cemetery existed then (Fig.C26)¹¹⁰ as it does today, but whereas it is now covered with tombs (Figs.C27, and C30), its use then was very different. In 1867 it was a relatively open area, still used as a *fosse commune*, and with only a small number of *concessions à perpétuité*. It had earlier been part of a much larger northern section of the cemetery which had been used for that purpose, as seen in an 1855 map (Fig.C25), and which had gradually reduced in area until it was finally closed on 1 January, 1874.¹¹¹

The 68th Division and the adjoining 56th Division are seen as the setting for the funeral scene in the painting, with Manet's viewpoint at the upper level of the 56th Division on the Allée de la Chapelle (now, Avenue de la Chapelle), near the stairs on Chemin Pozzo di Borgo (now, Avenue des Ailantes), and with the cortege in the south-west corner of the 68th Division, as shown in the site plan (Figs.C63 and C64). Both divisions sloped down from the Allée de la Chapelle to Chemin Neigre (now, Avenue des Peupliers), with the known positions of rows of trees to both sides of the latter providing the requisite trees seen behind the cortege in the painting, and the path between the two Divisions, the Chemin Pozzo di Borgo, with the known positions of short rows of trees on both sides at its lower end providing the closer trees in the painting's left foreground.¹¹² Within the 68th Division three isolated trees, with their positions known, are seen to provide the different kinds of foliage seen at the right edge of the canvas, with the uppermost set across the Manufacture des Gobelins building proposed as the foliage of a branch to the tree nearest the viewpoint. More specific identifications of the trees depicted in the painting are, however, not possible. Although it is known that the layout of these Divisions did not exist in 1855 and that the tree positions around the Divisions as shown were as recorded in c.1873, no record of planting has been found. Additionally, no trees which were growing in c.1867 exist in the cemetery today.¹¹³

The view as available from the proposed viewpoint today is as shown in the photograph, Fig.C28, with little more to see than tree foliage, but the painting format overlay provides some idea of the direction of view towards the partly-seen space behind the trees. A photograph taken with a similar direction of sight to that of the proposed viewpoint but from a position much closer to the site of the funeral (Fig.C29) clarifies some aspects of the view, but is still unable to show the proposed site. The actual site is seen in photographs, Figs.C30 and C31, taken recently from Avenue des Peupliers. In Fig.C30, the holly tree seen at the right is in exactly the same position as the tree which

was closest to the hearse in 1867, and in Fig.C31, which is a view across the proposed site back towards Manet's viewpoint, the same holly tree is seen at the left.

Records show that in 1867 only two *concessions à perpétuité* existed in the 68th Division, one taken out in the name of *Famille Collet* in 1864 and the other in the name of *Famille Ailliot* in 1867,¹¹⁴ but a tomb with the name of *Famille Meunier*, facing the then Chemin Pozzo di Borgo, has an engraved date of 1832. Of these three, the Meunier and Ailliot tombs exist in the area and view in question. It is proposed that the Meunier tomb existed in its present form in 1867 and is the object seen between the trees trunks at the left of the painting, and with more clarity and direct relationship to the actual tomb in the X-radiograph (Fig.C2). The Ailliot *concession*, purchased on 17 December, 1867, and positioned directly beyond the mourning group seen in the painting is the site of the depicted burial. The tomb which exists today at the *concession* can be seen in the photographs, Figs.C30 and C31,¹¹⁵ and as the earliest engraved name on the tomb is dated 1885, it is probable that it had not been erected in 1867, and that the site was initially used only as a grave site. Nonetheless, if it had been constructed immediately after the purchase of the *concession* in time for this first burial, the top of the tomb, if depicted in the painting, would have been at the level of the heads of the group of mourners. With no other *concessions* existing at that time in the field of view, the coincidence between their positions as would have been seen from the proposed viewpoint and in the painting provides a point of confirmation for the proposal.¹¹⁶

Such a hypothesis also provides an explanation for the positional details of the cortege. The direction in which the hearse is facing, indicating an arrival from the left, is consistent with the direction from which the cortege would have approached the site from the main entrance to the cemetery in Boulevard de Ménilmontant. The funeral cortege has just arrived at its destination on the only strip of near-level ground in the Division, the hearse has gone past the grave site to be moved backwards to the grave for direct access for the coffin taken from the rear of the hearse,¹¹⁷ and the group of mourners is waiting, not moving in procession, for the coffin to be lifted from the hearse.

Although the image of the funeral may have been borrowed from an illustration, a detached and unobtrusive observation of the funeral would have been possible at the elevated vantage point on the Allée de la Chapelle. A winter date related to the December purchase of the Ailliot *concession* contradicts the foliated scene of the painting which suggests a summer period of June to August, but this could be simply explained with Manet making initial sketches of the burial in December of 1867 and revisiting the site at later times during the development of the painting's composite image, in the summer of 1868, or even into the 1870s. No attempt has been made with this proposal to speculate on why Manet might have been present at the cemetery, and no specific connection has been established between Manet and the names of the deceased in tombs in the 68th Division or in the 56th Division in the vicinity of his proposed vantage point. The existence of a tomb with joint family names of Girod and Fournier near the proposed viewpoint in Allée de la Chapelle is an intriguing circumstance, but Fournier, as the maiden name of Manet's mother,¹¹⁸ was a relatively common French name and the limited research to date has provided no connection of that family with Manet.

The question that arises with the depiction of such a funeral at this locale is to do with the current belief that the painting is in some way a symbolic depiction of Baudelaire's funeral or a homage. A date of December 1867 certainly falls within a likely period that Manet may have contemplated a homage to his friend, but if this proposal for the site at Cimetière du Père-Lachaise is a valid one, it seems that the complete painting is, at most, a very private memorial. With the composite nature of the work and the use of images from two completely unconnected sites, it is more likely to have been one of Manet's works-in-progress, with elements added and deleted in the process of his experimentations over an extended period of time. The funeral of a person unknown to Manet, and indeed to posterity, was simply recorded and set into the foreground of the unrelated composite landscape of the upper part of the painting in a way pictorially not unlike that for the group of sightseers in *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle*. Such a mundane explanation offers information about the painting's subject matter, clarifies the

nature of the depicted scene, and provides insights into Manet's process – but certainly does not detract from the poignancy of the image.

The composite image of *The Burial*, made up of the multiple views of the two separate locales depicted in the upper and lower parts of the canvas, was created by Manet either as a collage of the visible elements in a compositional manipulation at the painting's surface or, alternatively, as a collage of different views as a manipulation of the illusionistic space at the surface. The difference between the two possibilities is an important one, and the analysis showed that selected parts of a series of different views had been interlocked and overlaid, in exactly the same way as in *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle*, to form an image as if of an unsettling, but unified, single view. Although the lack of evidence in the form of photographic images and the apparent anomalies in dating mean that the proposal for such a composite image remains circumstantial, the evidence presented here in the details of the proposal demonstrates that it was developed from thorough analysis of researched information rather than expedient speculation.

Proposal

This proposal sees *The Burial* as a complex composite of relatively accurate perspective views which were interlocked and overlaid as a collage, with no consistent scale, to create an apparently cohesive single image replete with spatial ambiguity. Such a cohesion of fragments and disjunctions is so similar to that for *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle*, another painting of that period which was incomplete and not exhibited in Manet's lifetime, that it becomes clear, as discussed in 5(B) above, that both works were experiments in re-defining the relationship between spatial illusion and a painting's surface. But, also as discussed elsewhere with other works, the resultant spatial disjunctions were not the result of arbitrary scatterings of elements, but rather, were the considered manipulation by Manet of views as directly or indirectly seen.

For the painting's upper part, the views which provide the relevant composite parts are made from eleven elevated viewpoints as part of a flight path, presumably of an

aerial balloon, and in the directions shown as seen in Fig.C36.¹¹⁹ Because many of the views were found to have been generally directed towards the joint motif of the domes of Val-de-Grâce and the Panthéon, and because of the different scales used by Manet, the size of the buildings, domes, and towers as painted cannot match the various sizes evident in all the relevant views. In such circumstances the lateral position of a dome's axis, for example, has been used. The thirteen parts of views as seen from the eleven viewpoints in the flight path and compared with the overlay line drawing made from the painting (Fig.C38), are as follows:

- i) From viewpoint SP1, at a height of 68 metres above ground, the view as seen in Fig.C39 shows the main dome of the Observatoire set pictorially adjacent to the dome and drum of Val-de-Grâce. This viewpoint is set in the line of the other ten viewpoints but is 1.3kms further to the west. As described in the analysis it is proposed that this view was used for the image as seen in the painting after the Orme de Sully had been initially painted in that position, set above and behind the lower roof and facade of Val-de-Grâce as seen from SP4. The image of the two domes as depicted in the painting is confirmed as part-image 1 with the overlay line drawing in Fig.C40.
- ii) From viewpoint SP2 at a height of 131 metres above ground, the view as seen in Fig.C41 shows the most prominent forms on the painting's skyline, the domes of Val-de-Grâce on the left and the Panthéon on the right, in their lateral and vertical relationships, as depicted in the painting and confirmed as part-image 2 with the overlay line drawing in Fig.C42. At such an altitude, the view does not show those two landmarks as silhouettes against the sky, but provides a direct demonstration that the vertical relationship between the two domes as painted was not possible from any vantage point connected to the ground.
- iii) From viewpoint SP3 at a height of 70 metres above ground, the view as seen in Fig.C43 shows the specific lateral relationship between Val-de-Grâce, Sainte-Chapelle, and the Panthéon, and the vertical relationship between Val-de-Grâce

and Sainte-Chapelle, as depicted in the painting and confirmed as part-image 3 with the overlay line drawing in Fig.C44. As can be seen with many of these part views, Manet used the domes of the Panthéon and Val-de-Grâce as axes around which the selected views were connected.

- iv) From viewpoint SP4 at a height of 34 metres above ground, the view as seen in Fig.C45 shows the Orme de Sully (the elm tree), as the first depiction of the problematic dome set adjacent to the dome of Val-de-Grâce, and with the chimney stack speculated to be near the intersection of Boulevard Arago and Rue de la Glacière, all as depicted in the painting and confirmed as part-image 4 with the line overlay drawing in Fig.C46. As noted in the analysis, the X-radiograph suggests that the dome-like shape of the tree has been painted as seen in the view behind the lower roof and the triangulated pediment of the facade to Val-de-Grâce.
- v) From viewpoint SP5 at a height of 25 metres above ground, the view as seen in Fig.C47 and the enlarged detail shows the distant profile of Butte Montmartre with the tower of Saint-Pierre-du-Montmartre together with a second depiction of the spire of Sainte-Chapelle seen above the roof of the Panthéon, all as depicted in the painting and confirmed as part-image 5 with the overlay line drawing in Fig.C48. A photograph (Fig.C9), taken from an elevated position on Notre-Dame, illustrates the profile of the Butte and the position and relative size of Saint-Pierre-du-Montmartre. Although the full profile of the Butte Montmartre in the painting, set at a slope down to the profile of Val-de-Grâce, does not match the view from SP5, the lateral and vertical relationships of the tower, spire and roof of the three buildings are surprisingly accurate for three objects set at such different distances from the viewpoint,¹²⁰ and in doing so provide further evidence that such an alignment would not have been possible except from its record in a photograph.
- vi) From viewpoint SP6 at a height of 24 metres above ground, the view as seen in Fig.C49 has been used for two separate parts of the painting, adjacent to each other but with their scales slightly different and their images set closer together. One part includes the full image of the Panthéon, with its angled view as depicted in the

painting and confirmed as part-image 6 with the overlay line drawing in Fig.C50. The other part includes the very precise lateral and vertical relationships between the tower and the roof, with its stepped profile, of Saint-Étienne-du-Mont, the Tour de Clovis, the Tour Saint-Jacques, and the twin towers of Notre-Dame, as depicted in the painting and confirmed as part-image 7 with the overlay line drawing in Fig.C51. For this writer, if one image provides irrefutable evidence of the claims made here about Manet's use of existing images, it is this one. For such a complex three-dimensional arrangement of building forms, which are all existing at different distances from the viewpoint and at different relative heights,¹²¹ to be depicted in the painting with such coincidence of detail with the perspective view, no explanation other than the use by Manet of a photographic source seems possible.

- vii) From viewpoint SP7 at a height of 25 metres above ground, the view as seen in Fig.C52 shows the row of poplar trees beside the Bièvre river in the Bièvre domain set directly beneath the skyline profile of the Panthéon, as depicted in the painting and confirmed as part-image 8 with the overlay line drawing in Fig.C53. With the height of the poplars and the full extent of the row in the late 1860s unknown, together with the informal nature of the trees themselves, this view and the proposed correlation with the painting cannot be as specific as many of the other views, and, in those terms, must remain a somewhat open claim. Notwithstanding these reservations, the perspective of the row fits perfectly. Although directly connected with the Panthéon in the view, as noted in the analysis the trees have been set above the roofs seen in the view from SP9 and in some instances seem to have been transformations of chimney stacks originally painted behind those roofs to the lower buildings.
- viii) From viewpoint SP8, at a height above ground of 28 metres, the view as seen in Fig.C54 shows the Orme de Sully on the horizon to the left of the tower of Saint-Jacques-du-Haut-Pas with the mansard roofs of the Palais du Luxembourg set at a lower level. Below the horizon is seen the row of poplar trees beside the Bièvre

river in the Bièvre domain. Although the Orme de Sully only relates to the lateral position of the tree seen on the horizon at the left edge of the painting, its position, the height of the tower, and the tops of the poplar trees set in behind and above the trees related to the foreground burial scene are confirmed as part-image 9 with the overlay line drawing made from the painting in Fig.C55.

- ix) From viewpoint SP9 at a height of 24 metres above ground, the view as seen in Fig.C56 has been used for two separate parts in the painting. One part includes the spire of Notre-Dame, the tower and roof of Saint-Médard, the chimney stack positioned to the north of the Hôtel de la Reine Blanche, and the row of poplar trees beside the Bièvre river in the Bièvre domain. With the spire of Notre-Dame set in the same position as the spire of Sainte-Chapelle seen from viewpoint SP3, and the chimney stack set in the same position as the stack seen from viewpoint SP4, the three vertical elements of the spire, the tower of Saint-Médard and the stack are aligned vertically at the right-hand end of the poplar trees, as depicted in the painting and confirmed as part-image 10 with the overlay line drawing in Fig.C57. As noted in the analysis, the positions of these chimney stacks have, as yet, only been based upon details assessed from distant photographs and not on any clear identification of specific stacks at known positions in the period of interest. The other part of the view used in the painting includes the Hôtel de la Reine Blanche, the rear of the Manufacture des Gobelins including the rounded wall to its chapel, the wall set beside the east arm of the Bièvre river, the hunting lodge of Comte Jean de Julienne, the open area of the Jardin des Gobelins in the Bièvre domain, all as seen in the painting and confirmed as part-image 11 with the overlay line drawing in Fig.C58.
- x) From viewpoint SP10 at a height of 27 metres above ground, the view as seen in Fig.C59 shows the towers of Saint-Jacques-du-Haut-Pas and Saint-Germain-des-Prés on the skyline, with the mansard roofs of the Palais du Luxembourg seen at a lower level. As noted in the analysis, the tower of Saint-Jacques-du-Haut-Pas in this position is only visible in the X-radiograph in which it is seen to have been

initially painted where the large tree is painted on the horizon. The positions of the two towers and the lower sloping roofs of the Palais du Luxembourg are confirmed as part-image 12 with the overlay line drawing in Fig.C60.

- xi) From viewpoint SP11 at a height of 22 metres above ground, the view as seen in Fig.C61 and the adjacent enlarged detail, shows one small, but convincing, detail – the uppermost part of Saint-Séverin's tower visible just above the brow of the hill adjacent to the roof at the facade of Saint-Étienne-du-Mont, as depicted in the painting and confirmed as part-image 13 with the overlay line drawing in Fig.C62. Although the viewpoint used provides the correct relationship of the tower to the roof, a viewpoint slightly to the west separates the two elements but brings into view the spire of Sainte-Chapelle just to the left of the Tour de Clovis. Visible in the painting and evident in the X-radiograph, what seems to have been a clearly executed vertical area of painting in that position suggests that a vertical element such as the spire may have been overpainted. It is hoped that any future detailed examination of the painting may clarify such a possibility.
- xii) For the painting's lower part, the view is proposed to be set in the Cimetière du Père-Lachaise from the south-western side of the Allée de la Chapelle, as seen on the site plan, Fig.C64, and as follows:

From a single viewpoint SP12 at ground level, a view of the funeral scene as seen in Fig.C65 nominally shows all the elements as depicted in the painting, and as confirmed as part-image 14 with the overlay line drawing in Fig.C66, including, from the left: the rising (towards the viewer) topography of the 56th Division; the rising pathway of Chemin Pozzo di Borgo with trees to each side; the tomb of the 1832 Meunier *concession* seen between the trees on the northern side of Chemin Pozzo di Borgo; the funeral cortege on the flat, lower section of the 68th Division and behind it the rows of trees lining Chemin Neigre; and, at the right-hand edge of the painting the cut-off profiles of three trees which existed within the 68th Division at that time. The forms and positions of the hearse, the officials and the

mourners, and the trees have been established within the computer modelling with the use of stylised or rectilinear forms. The positions of all trees were as noted in plans of the area from c.1873, but without knowledge of their size or shape. The two closest to the hearse are shown overlapped as seen in the painting and the one closest to the viewpoint is shown outside and to the right of the format but in a position which would enable a branch to be set across the roof and wall of the Manufacture des Gobelins as seen in the painting. Thus, although the forms of the elements used are diagrammatic, their positions and relative sizes, together with the underlying perspective of the view, provide evidence of the relative accuracy of the location details and view.

When these parts of views are overlaid and interlocked together within the format of *The Burial*, the composite image, as seen in Fig.C67 and compared with the line drawing made from the painting in Fig.C68, shows how the spatial fragments and disjunctions were used by Manet to develop an apparently cohesive space. Even more so than with *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle*, some caution with such a proposal is deemed necessary. On the one hand, the basis upon which these views are proposed remains unproved, while on the other, with none of the circumstances whimsically created – pulled out, as it were, from thin air – much of the imagery in the views cannot be shown to be false or incorrect, particularly with the upper part of the painting. There is also an acute awareness that in the approach which has resulted in these proposals for many specific parts of views, it is clearly possible to see anything one wishes and to make images fit such a complex image in unwarranted ways. It could also be claimed that with a cut-and-paste image it would be possible to match the painting using a range of completely unrelated imagery. That is probably so, but compared to such a random selection of imagery, the viewpoint of each piece of imagery in this instance is known, and it has been established that those viewpoints are part of a specific and identifiable pattern.

Nevertheless, in such circumstances the analysis has been carried out with as much objectivity as possible. This is the very reason why two part views which suggested one of the forms in the painting to be the Église de la Sorbonne have been rejected. And even though the proposals of aerial balloons and photographs for the upper part may all seem improbable, the views provide images which this writer believes cannot be avoided and need to be explained. Additionally, the proposal for the lower part is not based upon views of well-known landmarks of Paris, and by that very fact is more open to question. It relies more on the compilation of circumstantial evidence in its formation rather than a demonstration of its validity, but, as stated previously, no evidence related to the site or the circumstances of the funeral has yet been found to contradict the proposal. Although the site selection was made after detailed analysis, it was certainly expected that such an apparently improbable identification would quickly be shown, particularly with chronological details of events, to be incorrect. In fact the opposite has been the case.

That the collaging technique used to form the composite image of *The Burial* was very similar to that for *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle* suggests that not only were the initial compositions for both paintings developed by Manet at about the same time, but also that the application of the technique in works which are so very different was an experiment to assess its artistic potential. Superficially, such a technique involving the integration of relatively disparate fragments may have seemed more suited to the gregarious image of *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle* rather than the introspection of *The Burial*, but the technique provided the ambiguous undercurrents, not the appearance. It gave an unsettling edge of uncertainty to the festivities on the Champ-de-Mars and rendered a loss of closure to the poignancy in *The Burial*.

5C. *THE BURIAL*: Notes

DISSERTATION: Volume 2, pp.21–25

[2013 Note](#)

The direction of the speculated aerial balloon flight shown on the Plan and Sectional Elevation in Fig.C36 was inexplicably indicated to be from west to east towards the launch site, rather than in the opposite direction. The Figure has been altered.

NOTES

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

1. Although it can be reasonably assumed that any work exhibited by Manet during his lifetime had been taken to his required level of completion, the same surely does not apply to those works which Manet had not exhibited. It has been assumed or determined by some scholars that works such as *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle* and *The Burial* are in the form as finally intended by Manet, with Nancy Locke, for example, referring to the "quality of deliberate unfinish" of *The Burial* (Nancy Locke, 'Unfinished Homage: Manet's *Burial* and Baudelaire', The Art Bulletin, v.82, no.1, March, 2000, p.80). The difficulty in defining 'completion' was also used by Linda Nochlin to set *The Burial* into an external context and claim that "The painting is unfinished, but 'complete', in Baudelairean terms".(Linda Nochlin, Realism, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1990, p.256-n.48).
2. Denis Rouart, and Daniel Wildenstein, Edouard Manet: Catalogue raisonné, 2 vols., La Bibliothèque des Arts, Lausanne and Paris, 1975, v.1, p.44.
3. Henri Loyrette, 'L'Enterrement', in Gary Tinterow, and Henri Loyrette, Origins of Impressionism, exh. cat., The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1994, cat.no.105, p.411.
4. Théodore Duret, Histoire de Edouard Manet et de son œuvre, avec un catalogue des Peintures et des Pastels, H. Floury, Paris, 1902, p.224.
5. Adolphe Tabarant, Manet: Histoire catalographique, Éditions Montaigne, Paris, 1931, p.202.
6. id.
7. ibid., p.203.
8. Adolphe Tabarant, Manet et ses œuvres, Gallimard, Paris, 2nd edn., 1947, p.171.
9. Georges Bataille, Manet: biographical and critical study, trans. Austryn Wainhouse and James Emmons, Skira, Geneva, 1983, p.50.
10. John Richardson, Edouard Manet: Paintings and Drawings, Phaidon Press, London, 1958, p.124.
11. Charles Sterling, and Margaretta Salinger, French Paintings: A Catalogue of the Collection of The Metropolitan Museum of Art, XIX Century, 3 vols., The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1955–1967, v.3, p.44.
12. id.
13. Nochlin 1990 (as in n.1), pp.93–94. Somewhat different comparisons with El Greco's depiction of a city or landscape have been made, with Éric Darragon suggesting that "Manet voit Paris comme Gréco pouvait voir Tolède" (Éric Darragon, Recherches sur la conception du sujet dans l'œuvre d'Édouard Manet (1832–1883), unpublished doctoral dissertation, Université Paris–Sorbonne (Paris

- IV), 5 vols., Paris, 1987, p.506), and Henri Loyrette stating that "Here we are reunited with the tragic panoramas of El Greco" (Loyrette 1994 (as in n.3), p.411).
14. Letter, written 6 or 7 September, 1867, published in Eugène Crépet and Jacques Crépet, Charles Baudelaire: Étude biographique d'Eugène Crépet. Revue et mise à jour par Jacques Crépet, Léon Vanier, Paris, 1906, p.275.
 15. Adolphe Tabarant, La vie artistique au temps de Baudelaire, Mercure de France, Paris, 2nd edn., 1963 (1942), pp.424–25.
 16. George Mauner, Manet, Peintre-Philosophe: A Study of the Painter's Themes, The Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park, Penn., and London, 1975, p.120.
 17. Theodore Reff, Manet and Modern Paris, National Gallery of Art, Washington, 1982, p.41.
 18. Charles S. Moffett, 'The Burial', in Françoise Cachin, et al., Manet 1832–1883, exh. cat., The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, and Harry N. Abrams, New York, 1983, cat.no.98, pp.260–61.
 19. Françoise Cachin, Manet, Chêne, Paris, 1990, p.72.
 20. Reff 1982 (as in n.17), p.40.
 21. Reff 1982, p.40.
 22. id.
 23. Loyrette 1994 (as in n.3), p.411.
 24. id.
 25. id.
 26. Darragon 1987 (as in n.13).
 27. Nancy Locke 2000 (as in n.1), pp.68–82.
 28. Darragon 1987, p.503.
 29. *ibid.*, p.504.

[\[p.22 of dissertation here\]](#)

30. id.
31. *ibid.*, p.503.
32. id.
33. *ibid.*, p.504.
34. *ibid.*, p.507.
35. *ibid.*, p.508.
36. Locke 2000, p.78.
In adopting a *modus operandi* of conjecturing what Manet's painting would *not* have been, Locke articulated an approach with the statement that "Given this tantalizing mix of the particular and the ambiguous, it is necessary to think more broadly, or better yet, speculate" (*ibid.*, p.69), and gave expression to it with the surmise that "Perhaps Baudelaire's thinking, his *fleurs du mal*, his *poèmes en prose* were so embedded in Manet's notion of his own work that Baudelaire's death could only give rise to a painting that had to remain unfinished and unresolved." (*ibid.*, p.79).
37. "a painting done in the manner of Courbet's *The Painter's Studio* would have been anathema to Manet's style and inappropriate as well" (*ibid.*, p.77).
38. *ibid.*, p.78.
39. *ibid.*, p.79.
40. *ibid.*, p.78.
41. With the publication of a monograph on Goya by Charles Yriate in April, 1867, in which a reproduction of the *The Meadows of San Isidro* appeared, Locke believed that "it is not surprising... to find that Manet may have had Goya in mind in the execution of *The Burial*" (*ibid.*, p.74).
42. *ibid.*, p.75.
43. *ibid.*, p.77.
44. *ibid.*, p.78.

45. *ibid.*, pp.79–80.
46. *ibid.*, p.80.
47. *ibid.*, p.78.
48. *ibid.*, p.80.
49. *ibid.*, p.74.
50. Émile de Labédollière, Le Nouveau Paris, histoire de ses 20 arrondissements, Gustave Barba, Paris, 1860 , p.208.
51. Locke 2000, p.69.
52. Labédollière 1860 (as in n.50), p.208.
53. The area was opened to the public in 1938.
54. For a detailed history of the area, see: Gilles-Antoine Langlois, ed., Le XIII^e Arrondissement: Une ville dans Paris, Délégation à l'Action Artistique de la Ville de Paris, Paris, 1993, including the following chapters:
Béatrice de Andia, '2000 ans d'histoire', pp.12–24;
Gilles-Antoine Langlois, 'Le territoire du XIII^e arrondissement', pp.27–33;
Maurice Stockburger, 'La rivière des castors', pp.48–49;
Jean Anckaert, 'La disparition de la Bièvre', pp.50–53;
Michel Le Moël, 'Le mythe de l'hôtel de la Reine Blanche', pp.62–69;
Gilles-Antoine Langlois, 'La grande maison des Gobelins, dite "hôtel Mascarini"', pp.70–79; and 'L'Hôtel royal des Gobelins', pp. 80–89.
55. In earlier plans the gardens of the Manufacture des Gobelins included the complete area in the centre and to the south between the two arms of the river. See illus.69, *Les jardins ouvriers de la Manufacture vers 1835*, in Langlois 1993 (as in n.54), p.88.
56. Prior to the tanneries being built to the west side of the western arm of the Bièvre, the area adjacent to and to the north of Rue du champ de l'Alouette had been named the Champ de l'Alouette. See: *Nouveau Plan Routier de la Ville et Faubourgs: Paris divisé en douze Mairies. Année 1814*, Journeaux l'ainé, Paris, 1814.
57. The image used in Locke's article is a truncated version of the complete painting.
58. Locke 2000, p.69.
59. Referred to by Locke as an etching.
60. Locke 2000, p.70.
61. *ibid.*, p.71.
62. *id.*
63. Honoré de Balzac, 'La femme de trente ans', in La Comédie humaine – Études de Mœurs: Scènes de la vie privée, ed. Pierre-Georges Castex, Gallimard, Paris, 1976, pp.1039–1214 (intro. and préf., pp.1017–38; Histoire du texte, 1584–90; Notes et variantes, pp.1591–1666).
64. Alfred Delvau, Histoire anecdotique des barrières de Paris, E. Dentu, Paris, 1865.
65. Balzac 1976 (as in n.63), v.2, p.1142.
66. *ibid.*, p.1143.
67. Balzac's description of how "l'élégante lanterne des Invalides flamboies" between the Palais du Luxembourg and Saint-Sulpice was in fact a view not possible from any position. The computer-modelling has showed that from the determined vantage point the dome of Val-de-Grâce itself is the one seen exactly in the position described by Balzac and that directly beneath such a grouping the poplars would have been seen. With the earlier reference to the group of buildings set between the

[\[p.23 of dissertation here\]](#)

Observatoire and Val-de-Grâce, the transposed description can only be seen as intentional literary licence.

68. Delvau 1865 (as in n.64), p.226.
69. *id.*

70. Victor Hugo, Les Misérables, Robert Laffont, Paris, 1985. Originally published in 1862.
71. Locke 2000, p.69, p.81-n.17. Previous suggestions for the landscape depicted in the etching had included: Theodore Reff's "flat low-lying plains of Holland" ('The Symbolism of Manet's Frontispiece Etchings', The Burlington Magazine, v.104, no.710, May, 1962, p.185); Anne Coffin Hanson's "a balloon soaring over some dutch windmills" (Anne Coffin Hanson, Manet and the Modern Tradition, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1979, p.72); and, Larry Ligo's suggestion that the windmills were on "on the highest point in the city of Paris: Montmartre. In the middle of the nineteenth century, Montmartre was almost literally covered with windmills" ('Manet's Frontispiece Etchings: His Symbolic Self-Portrait, Acknowledging the Influences of Baudelaire and Photography upon his Work', Gazette des Beaux-Arts, s.6. v.108, September, 1986, p.68). Jean C. Harris saw it as a reference by Manet to his balloon motif in his lithograph, The Balloon.(Harris, Jean Collins, Edouard Manet: Graphic Works, A Definitive Catalogue Raisonné, Collectors Editions, New York, 1970, p.117), and Juliet Wilson-Bareau also saw it as a possible allusion to the the occasion of The Balloon, as well as being one of "a popular category of the period" (Cachin, et al., 1983 (as in n.18), p.138).
72. The position of the Collège Rollin which Manet actually attended must remain uncertain if previous scholarship is considered. Most references to the collège, including that by Théodore Duret in 1902 (Théodore Duret, Histoire de Edouard Manet et de son œuvre. Avec un catalogue des Peintures et des Pastels, H. Floury, Paris, 1902, p.3) have simply named the institution without locating it. Adolphe Tabarant in 1931 described it as "collège Rollin, l'ancien Rollin de la rue des Postes" (A. Tabarant, Manet: Histoire catalographique, Montaigne, Paris, 1931, p.9) in the *Cinquième* arrondissement (at the area which now exists across Rue Pierre Brossolette between Rue Lhomond and Rue Vauquelin). Others have since used that same location, but without reference to Tabarant or a primary source (e.g. Kathleen Adler, Manet, Phaidon Press, Oxford, 1986, p.9), but Françoise Cachin, after referring to the secondary school by name only in 1990 (Cachin 1990 (as in n.19), p.12), in 1995 stated it to have been "on the Avenue Trudaine" in the Neuvième arrondissement, and at the existing site of the Lycée Jacques Decour (Françoise Cachin, Manet: The Influence of the Modern, trans. Rachel Kaplan, Harry N. Abrams, New York, 1995, p.14). All general maps of Paris until c.1867 showed the Abattoir Montmartre located at that site and it was only with the 1870 Chaix map (Nouveau Plan de Paris Divisé en 20 Arrondissements, A. Chaix & Cie., Paris, 1870), at a time much later than Manet's years of attendance, that a Collège Rollin is indicated there. In these circumstances the site at Rue des Postes is used here.
73. Sterling and Salinger 1955–67 (as in n.11), pp.44–45.
74. Locke 2000, p.80.
75. Darragon 1987, p.504.
76. Darragon 1987, p.505.
77. id.
78. id.
79. Locke 2000, p.80.
80. *ibid.*, p.70.
81. Nochlin 1990, p.95.
82. id.
83. id.
84. id.
85. id.
86. *ibid.*, p.93.
87. *ibid.*, p.95.
88. Locke 2000, p.70.

89. id.
90. id.
91. In spite of the inaccuracies, it is interesting to note that, in the context of their cyclical cutting-down and as would be expected, the poplar trees beside the Bièvre river are not shown in Navlet's painting.
92. A photographic print of the X-radiograph was kindly made available for examination and reproduction by The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
93. Although undated, and irrespective of its rustic style, the extent of visible building development seems not dissimilar to that in the Langlacé, and when Himely's year of birth is taken into account, it must be considered to have been painted some time after 1815.
94. Two views from separate viewpoints which fell within the line of the proposed flight path and which provided identification of the same object have not been included because the apparent form in the painting, although plausible, was not specific enough for the identification to be other than speculation. The possible form of a dome seen against the profile of Butte Montmartre to the left of the Panthéon in the painting could possibly have been the dome of the Église de la Sorbonne in relation to the position of Val-de-Grâce in one view and to that of the Panthéon in a second view.

[\[p.24 of dissertation here\]](#)

- The position of the dome was accurate in each view but the shape in the painting is not unquestionably that of a dome.
95. e.g. Wilfred de Fonvielle wrote "Quand à la rotation du ballon, elle n'est pas constante, j'ai pu compter quelquefois deux ou trois secondes entières sans que le soleil parait changer d'azimut." (J. Glaisher, et al, Voyages Aériens, Hachette, Paris, 1870, Troisième partie, p.370).
 96. Hugo 1985 (as in n.70), Quatrième partie, Livre deuxième – I: 'Le champ de l'Alouette', p.684.
 97. Information on this cycle of growth and controlled removal was provided by grounds staff at Square René Le Gall to *documentaliste* Julia McLaren in July, 2000.
 98. The date when Balzac first wrote the fourth part, *Le doigt de Dieu*, in which the quoted passage is contained is not known but, after many changes, the complete work was published in its final form as part of La Comédie humaine in 1842 (Balzac 1976, v.2, p.1586).
 99. George Mauner wrote that "Here there are a few mourners, but nature grieves in the sketchy patch of trees, probably cypresses, which echo the shape of the carriage and figures directly below it." (Mauner 1975, p.120), and Locke was more definite with the identification as cypresses, writing that "Above and behind the funeral cortege, the dark and ragged cypress trees appear to make a procession of their own against the light, scratchy middle ground." (Locke 2000, p.69).
 100. Now the Institut National des Jeunes Sourds.
 101. As noted in an unreferenced copy of a newspaper item, with hand annotated date of "juin 1903". Estampes, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris.
 102. Writing in 1877, J.-K. Huysmans had evocatively brought the effect of the stacks into a description of the skyline: "tandis qu'à perte de vue dans le ciel s'étagaient les charpentes et les terrasses des mégissiers, au-dessus desquelles se superposaient, séparés par des tuyaux d'usine, les emphatiques et lourds dômes du Panthéon et du Val-de-Grâce." (J.-K. Huysmans, La Bièvre et Saint Séverin, P.-V. Stock, Paris, 1898, Brionne, 1986, p.13).
 103. The painting shows the roof of Saint-Étienne-du-Mont with the section above the nave near the facade set at a lower level than the section over the choir, and a gap formed between the two with the roof over the transepts set at an even lower level. These configurations seem to have been part of restoration and alteration work

which was carried out between 1861 and 1868 and which also included major work on the church's facade (Catherine Marquet, ed., Paris (Guides Bleus), Hachette, Paris, 1999, p.605).

Two paintings of Claude Monet in 1867, *Garden of the Princess* (Allen Memorial Art Museum, Oberlin) and *The Quai du Louvre* (Gemeentemuseum, The Hague), also show the roof to be in the form as depicted by Manet in *The Burial*.

104. For discussion of these aspects see: Thomas A. Kselman, 'The Origins of Commercial Funerals', Death and the Afterlife in Modern France, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993, sub-chapters: 'Class, Identity, and Concessions', pp.182–189, and 'Segregation and Equality in the Cemetery', pp.189–199.
105. For a discussion on the historical background of, and physical problems involving, *concessions à perpétuité*, see: Kselman 1993 (as in n.104), pp.183–88. Without a very detailed program of research, a complete understanding of the chronological sequence of the burial of deceased, particularly in *concessions à perpétuité*, is extremely difficult. The date at which a *concession* had been first purchased may be a guide to a death at that time, but it does not give information about those previously deceased who were re-interred in a family *concession*, or when a tomb had been actually built. The names and dates which are engraved on their stone surfaces are also not comprehensive and do not necessarily provide evidence of the date of the earliest burial actually held at the site. The date of the purchase of the *concession* would seem to be the most reliable guide for that.
106. J. Escargueil (Abbé), Les Enterrements civils considérés au point de vue social, religieux et législatif, René Haton, Paris, 1877, pp.67,68.
107. For regulation details, see: J.-B. Mesnard, Regulateur general des convois, Fontaine, Paris, 1845. For description of contemporary funeral practices, see: Pétrus Borel, 'Le croque-mort', in Les français peints par eux-mêmes, 2 vols. in one book, Éditions Furne et Cie., Paris, 1853, v.1, pp.120–27. For discussion of the development of commercial undertakers in Paris in the nineteenth century see: Kselman 1993, 'The Origins of Commercial Funerals', ch.6, pp.222–56.
108. The regulations for a *service ordinaire* funeral of a child under the age of seven required that the deceased child's coffin, covered by either a black or white cloth, be on a stretcher carried by two porters and preceded by a funeral director. The decision for the cloth to be black or white was made by the families (Mesnard 1845 (as in n.107), p.9).
109. The regulations for a *service ordinaire* funeral for those older than seven required the coffin, covered by either a black or white cloth, carried on a hearse, drawn by two black horses and driven by a coachman, accompanied by four pallbearers and preceded by a funeral director. The families involved decided the colour of the cloth. The *service ordinaire* was the most basic of six classes, with the first class requiring a hearse drawn by four horses, and the provision for up to eighteen draped carriages, two valets on foot, and a master of ceremonies in the cortege. The second and third classes had the master of ceremonies but not the valets. Fourth and fifth class hearses were to be draped in black with silver fringing. The sixth class had a hearse with the silver fringing but was not draped, the provision for one extra draped carriage, and only the funeral director and the coachman in attendance. All coffins for the first to fifth classes were to be made of oak, with those in the sixth made of pine. There were additional charges for optional extras such as white horses,

[\[p.25 of dissertation here\]](#)

decorations to the horses, and tassels to hold the drapes to the hearses (Mesnard 1845, pp.8,12, and 'Tableaux indicatifs de 6 classes de convois et pompes funèbres de la ville de Paris', unpaginated section after p.109).

110. At least until c.1870 other more general maps of Paris displayed an earlier layout of this area of the cemetery which was very different to that which actually existed in 1867 and as exists today.
 111. For details, see: P.-E. Follacci, and A. Hervieu, 'Les agrandissements successifs', in *Le Père Lachaise*, anthology, Éditions Action artistique de la ville de Paris, Paris, 1998, p.72.
 112. The specific tree positions have been established from plans of the 68th Division and the 56th Division held at the Archives de Paris, Paris (*Cimetière de l'Est. 68e Division*, site plan, n.d. (c.1873), *Cimetière de l'Est. 56e Division*, 15 October, 1873, site plan, Archives de Paris, Paris).
As the result of a destructive storm in 1999 which uprooted and damaged many trees in the Cimetière du Père-Lachaise, the trees lining the existing Avenue des Peupliers (then, Chemin Neigre) are no longer seen in the clearly defined rows as would have been visible in 1867 and had been visible for an aerial photograph of 1984 (Fig.C27).
 113. Information provided by: Direction des parcs, jardins et espaces verts, Service des cimetières, Mairie de Paris, Paris.
 114. Details provided by the Administration of the Cimetière du Père-Lachaise.
 115. As discussed in n.105, a complete understanding of the chronological sequence of events involved with a particular *concession à perpétuité* is difficult to establish. Complete details of the burials in the 68th Division of c.1867 are not available from the records held at the Cimetière du Père-Lachaise, but it is known, for example, that the remains of a Paul Texier, a five-year old boy, who had been buried after his death on 9 August, 1867, had been then transferred to the site of a family *concession* bought in 1868. The remains of his father, Pierre, who died at the age of forty-four on 17 January, 1866, are also held in the tomb of the *concession* but had obviously also been moved after the purchase. The Texier tomb is not in the field of view of interest here.
 116. The position of the Ailliot *concession* beyond the group of mourners sheds no light on an identification of the dark shape seen in the painting to the left of the isolated figure of the proposed agent. Its size and form accords with neither an item carried by the agent nor an open grave seen foreshortened in perspective.
 117. As advised by M. Yvan Quercy, of the Musée de L'Attelage et du Corbillard, Cazes-Mondenard, the moving backwards of a horse-drawn hearse of that period would not have been a problem.
 118. The maiden name of Manet's mother had been Eugénie Désirée Fournier (1811–85). Her brother, and Manet's uncle, Edmond Fournier (1800–1865), had been the relative most supportive of Manet's wish, when young, to become an artist.
 119. Flights of aerial balloons of the time were controlled with ascensions made by jettisoning sandbags strung from around the balloon's basket, and descents by opening a valve flap at the top of the balloon to release some of the retained gas. Once the supply of sandbags was exhausted the flight was at an end. The forces of nature were also influential, with the direction of flights only determined by the direction of the prevailing winds, and movements up and down affected by hot-air currents.
 120. From viewpoint SP5, the Panthéon is 1.9 kms, Sainte-Chapelle is 2.95 kms, and Saint-Pierre-du-Montmartre is 6.45 kms.
 121. From viewpoint SP6, the Tour de Clovis is 1.85 kms and its top 27.5m above it, the tower of Saint-Étienne-du-Mont is 1.9 kms and its top 32.5m above it, the towers of Notre-Dame are 2.65 kms and their tops 31.5m above it, and Tour Saint-Jacques is 3.2 kms and its top is 14.5m above it.
-