

1. REALITY, ARTIFICE AND AMBIGUITY: Text

In an art-historical context the meaning of the term 'reality' is a problematic one, influenced as much by its point of reference as by its more general descriptive implications. Nonetheless, it can be said that much of Manet's oeuvre gives compelling evidence of being an art of response to the reality of his life and times. His proclamation when a youth that "il faut être de son temps"¹ became a clear precept for his subsequent work and also provides some understanding of the nature of its content. Although his later statements or writings on art are limited in number, they confirm, even if in a somewhat superficial way, his belief in learning from nature rather than from other sources,² in the importance of reality rather than the invented,³ and in responding to contemporary modernity rather than an imagined past.⁴ Together with the need to be of one's time Manet had also stated "faire ce que l'on voit".⁵ Not only is the painterly translation of what one sees contingent on many aspects of the process of vision and production, including that of painting directly from a motif, but additionally the term may not be an indicator of a perceived reality. For Manet, reality was not necessarily the equivalence of direct naturalism, but rather a translation of it.⁶ There is in his oeuvre an interesting and complex relationship between what was seen and what was painted, particularly in terms of the selective use of parts of a motif and the way in which those parts were manipulated and conjoined within a work.

The subject matter of the new realism had developed in painting after earlier influences from Gustave Courbet (1819–1877) and, among others, its theoretician, the writer Champfleury (Jules Fleury-Husson).⁷ It was centred upon the urbanised contemporary milieu of Paris with its own particular dynamics of modernity, spectacle and social change.⁸ The manner of Manet's representation of this new subject matter during the 1860s and 1870s established him as the artist whom the public, the critics, and

fellow artists alike saw as the leader of this "new painting".⁹ It was certainly seen by the establishment as a revolt against the conventions of academic painting, but by the avant-garde more as a rejection of the irrelevant banality of Salon history painting in preference for one based upon the contemporary and the everyday.

This new sense of realism was not a straightforward one. As was the standard practice of artists in his time, much of what Manet painted was developed and finished in the studio, notwithstanding his work *en plein air* in the early 1870s with his Impressionist friends. His was thus a qualified reality, created, as it were, with the repeated use of models and stock pieces of costume and studio items, and applied as directly seen motifs in works of varying types, including allusions to earlier artistic sources as evident in *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe* (1863, Fig.18), created contemporary history settings as for *The Execution of Maximilian* (1867–69?, Fig.36),¹⁰ costume pieces as seen with the figure of Victorine Meurent in *Mlle V...in the Costume of an Espada* (1862, Fig.12), a *mise en scène* as in *The Balcony* (1868–69, Fig.45), or the recreation of settings previously recorded in sketch form as in *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* (1881–82). However, many of Manet's paintings were created directly before an original motif, be they people as seen in his many portraits, including *Portrait of Eva Gonzalès* (1870, Fig.47), interior locales as depicted in the Oil Sketch for *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* (1881, Fig.F3), or locales *en plein air* as in *The Swallows* (1873, Fig.55). The verisimilitude with which these motifs were depicted, either as directly seen or as developed in the studio, becomes an important aspect in understanding Manet's process of picture-making, and an important consideration for the research involved in this dissertation. And Manet's direct or indirect use of available images, for a part or the whole of a work, raises another aspect of the reality of his depiction. His use of images from earlier artists is well known,¹¹ but the extent to which he may have used photographs or contemporary illustrations to compose his reality is less than fully understood. Although the evident disjunctions and ambiguities may seem to suggest that Manet had formed parts of his works as imagined inventions, the evidence from this research indicates that he borrowed readily and directly from photographic images and

used his imagination in their transposition into the new context of his painting. He had painted *from* what was seen. The wider implications of this relationship between reality and depiction in Manet's time have been raised by John House when he suggested that:

Realist enterprises justify themselves by claims to depict just what the the artist sees. But it is never adequate to discuss these enterprises in terms of their degrees of realism, as if they approximated more or less closely to some objective truthfulness. Any painting involves an act of transformation in order to recreate visual experience in terms of line, form and colour on a two-dimensional surface, and to make this translation the painter has to find a framework, a set of codes, within the artificial limitations of the surface and the media used... Moreover, the decision of what to select and how to present it necessarily involves priorities and values. The different ways in which the painters encoded reality in their paintings in the nineteenth century were the physical expression of a wide range of social and ideological viewpoints.¹²

Although reality and its translation became the most important aspect for Manet in the artifice of his work, reality was used in the service of his art and not the converse, and the way in which it was absorbed and manipulated to produce his unique representation of it was a very complex one which changed with his artistic development. And even though reality seems to imbue his art, its translation often seems uncertain and obscure at the pictorial and representational levels, with many of his works certainly ambiguous, contradictory, and problematic. This dichotomy involving reality and ambiguity, with the certainty of the quotidian seemingly used in the service of less certain artistic objectives, layered his works. There is also a contrast between that which can be shown to be strategies of complex manipulation and concealment and his stated need for simplicity. Antonin Proust remembered Manet claiming that "La cuisine de la peinture nous a pervertis", and asking "Comment s'en débarrasser? qui nous rendra le simple et le clair?".¹³ But the evidence suggests that, in addition to confusing critics and his viewing public, he may have also misled his closest friends. These uncertainties in the apparent reality of Manet's works have also had a profound effect on both the popular and critical responses to them, with the same aspect often receiving both condemnation and praise,¹⁴ protestations in his own time about the lack of clear narrative,¹⁵ and speculative explanations in more recent times presented as fact.¹⁶

An important influence on Manet's translation of this new realism had been his friend and mentor from 1858 to the mid 1860s, Charles Baudelaire. In his reviews of the

Paris Salons and other writings, Baudelaire had called for a more direct response to the contemporary world but couched the calls in terms of poetic imagination. His review of the Salon of 1845 lamented the lack "d'invention, d'idées, de tempérament... [even though] l'héroïsme *de la vie moderne* nous entoure et nous presse... [and] Ce ne sont ni les sujets ni les couleurs qui manquent aux épopées".¹⁷ He wished that "Celui-là sera le *peintre*, le vrai peintre, qui saura... nous faire voir et comprendre, avec de la couleur ou du dessin, combien nous sommes grands et poétiques dans nos cravates et nos bottines vernies."¹⁸ This reality was not a straightforward one without negotiation. Baudelaire's concern about the influence of photography, for example, was later expressed in his review of the 1859 Salon with the belief that "De jour en jour l'art diminue le respect de lui-même, se prosterne devant la réalité extérieure, et le peintre devient de plus en plus enclin à peindre, non pas ce qu'il rêve, mais ce qu'il voit".¹⁹

The idea of heroism in modern life was developed further by Baudelaire in his Salon review of 1846, in which he suggested that "Toutes les beautés contiennent... quelque chose d'éternel et quelque chose de transitoire, – d'absolu et de particulier".²⁰ This was restated in a different context, in his essay 'Le Peintre de la vie moderne' of 1863, when he related that the artist described (Constantin Guys), "cherche ce quelque chose qu'on nous permettra d'appeler la *modernité*",²¹ with the aim "de dégager de la mode ce qu'elle peut contenir de poétique dans l'historique, de tirer l'éternel du transitoire".²² For Baudelaire 'la *modernité*' was "le transitoire, le fugitif, le contingent... la moitié de l'art, dont l'autre moitié est l'éternel et l'immuable".²³ Although there is no evidence of a direct response from Manet to such a paradigm, a perceived duality of the notions of the contemporaneous and the universal can be perceived in his work with the interplay between his translation of the reality around him and the ambiguous nature of his work. And such an interplay can be seen to have had a resonance with other dualities in the creative milieu of his time.

This idiosyncratic use by Manet of reality for art's sake had found earlier expression in Paris with the literary works of writers such as Gustave Flaubert (1821–1880), whose novel *Madame Bovary*, published in 1857, broke from preconceived

conventions of narrative. In a letter written to J.-K. Huysmans in 1879, Flaubert asserted that "Art is not reality. Whatever else you do, you must choose from the elements which the latter furnishes".²⁴ The issue of reality and art had been much discussed in Paris from the 1840s and 1850s and continued to be so during Manet's life. Flaubert's call to selectively use reality could equally be seen in the world of painting as a credo that Manet might have used to explain his own nuanced art. And in the context of the specific proposals made in this dissertation, the wider artistic aims of Flaubert, including the notion that the work itself, and not its creator, subject, or purpose, is of the greatest artistic importance, also provide an intriguing corollary with Manet's strategies of subterfuge and detachment. "What strikes me as beautiful", Flaubert wrote in correspondence in 1852, "is a book about nothing... without external attachments, which would hold together by itself through the internal forces of its style".²⁵ Flaubert's beliefs that "one ought not let his personality intrude",²⁶ "passion does not make poetry",²⁷ "one subject is as good as another. It is up to the artist to raise everything",²⁸ and "Irony, seems... to dominate life",²⁹ confirmed a detached objectivity as a prerequisite for both the artist and the art.

Flaubert's "ideological viewpoint", to use John House's phrase, developed an 'art for art's sake' approach in contradiction to those two other positions in the literary field of the 1840s and 1850s, 'social art' and 'bourgeois art'. In Pierre Bourdieu's 1988 essay, 'Flaubert's Point of View', the approach of Flaubert and his colleagues was likened to many aspects of Manet's later achievements.³⁰ For Bourdieu, "realism... was a partial, and failed revolution... [which] did not really question the tendency to mix aesthetic value and moral (or social) value" and the novel had "seemed predestined for a simple, naive search for the illusion of reality".³¹ Bourdieu believed that "Realism...[had] questioned the existence of an objective hierarchy of subjects... [but] was only to reverse that hierarchy".³² With the employment of "double refusals" as part of his contradictory position³³ and the invention of pure aesthetics, Flaubert, Bourdieu suggested, had "broken this privileged tie with a specific category of objects... [and] generalized and radicalized the partial revolution of realism", and that "like Manet confronted with a

similar dilemma, he painted both bohemia and high society".³⁴ In doing so Bourdieu believed that Flaubert and Manet had revolutionised their respective art forms. The distancing "from all social positions favored by formal elaboration" and the "elimination of received ideas, of all clichés"³⁵ are some of the characteristics of this point of view and part of the reasons for Bourdieu's belief that writers such as Flaubert had invented "the modern artist... [as one] recognizing no jurisdiction other than the specific norm of art".³⁶ But for Bourdieu the most revelatory characteristic was that of the work's composition, claiming that

Like Manet somewhat later, Flaubert abandoned the unifying perspective, taken from a fixed, central point of view, which he replaced with what could be called, following Erwin Panofsky, an "aggregated space", if we take this to mean a space made of juxtaposed pieces without a preferred point of view.³⁷

In taking up Flaubert's explanation of the lack of "the falseness of a perspective" in Sentimental Education,³⁸ by means of the analogy used by Flaubert that it doesn't go to a point as a pyramid, Bourdieu stated that

In itself the refusal of the pyramid construction, that is, an ascending convergence toward an idea, a conviction, a conclusion, contains a message, and no doubt the most important one: a vision, not to say a philosophy, of history in the double sense of the word... As a bourgeois who was vehemently antibourgeois and completely devoid of any illusions about the "people"... Flaubert preserves in his absolute disenchantment an absolute conviction, which concerns the work of the writer... [of] an absolute refusal to give the reader the deceptive satisfactions offered by the false philistine humanism of the sellers of illusion.³⁹

With Bourdieu's correlation of Flaubert and Manet, it follows that Manet is seen to reject the idea of perspective's ideal single view(point) of the world, and replace it with a pictorial space of 'juxtaposed pieces'. Many of Manet's works, with their apparent disavowal of perspective's geometry and their disjunction of spaces, do in fact reflect such a proposition. Are such works, then, evidence of Manet's own intention to provide an alternative to the 'sellers of illusion' rather than of his supposed lack of skill with perspective? Even though Bourdieu's proposition had a philosophical underpinning, there was no suggestion to how this alternative of either Manet or Flaubert had been achieved, that is, how it had been crafted as a work of art, and there is no statement of intent from Manet to provide such an alternative. Although evidence of an intention may

be revealed if his spaces of 'juxtaposed pieces' were themselves examined, the critical concerns for such an approach of analysis and identification, as broached in the Introduction, remain. Flaubert himself reflected upon this problem in correspondence about critics and their lack of concern about the crafting of an art work, when he asked

Where do you know a good critic who worries about the work *in itself*? There are all kind of analyses of the milieu where the work was produced and the causes that brought it about; but *unknowing* poetics...? where does it come from? its composition, its style? the author's point of view? Never!⁴⁰

For Manet, it can be shown that although his works offered new, or alternative, modes of pictorial cohesion, in their crafting he had not abandoned perspective at all. In fact his artifice relied upon it. But rather than being employed for a reliance on verisimilitude, the unifying geometry of perspective was variously used for parts of a fragmented space with a preferred point of view, parts of an aggregated space without a preferred point of view, parts of an overlaid space with multiple points of view, as well as for the conventional, unified single image. Its use was much more complex than Bourdieu implies with its supposed abandonment, but it was concealed as Manet's own 'double refusal', absorbed into the artifice of the painting's surface, both unifying and fragmenting at one and the same time. Art was certainly Manet's primary purpose and it is suggested here that his art, to again reflect Flaubert's view, was not only *not* reality, but was also never meant to appear as such in any straightforward way. But paradoxically, to further paraphrase Flaubert, Manet's art was indeed furnished by elements from the objectivity of reality as recreated by means of the illusion of linear perspective. The refusal of the illusion was crafted with the illusion of perspective. Flaubert would have understood and enjoyed Manet's subterfuge. Bourdieu, on the other hand, although recognising the apparent rejection of a unifying perspective had, at the same time, missed the point (of view).

In Manet's art, the spatial ambiguity is a very potent one, involving not only the very processes of its artifice, including offset viewpoints, spatial disjunctions or slippages, spatial overlays, and interplays between pictorial space and surface, but also his wish to keep the devices used to create that artifice less than obvious. Ideologically,

the ambiguity was also part of Manet's private speculation, which was, on the one hand, directed at the works themselves as processes of pure art, engaged at their surface and metaphorically layering them even further, but providing no additional meanings for viewers, and on the other hand distanced from, and taking no heed of, the expectations of others, received ideas, or pre-determined positions. An articulation of such a distancing by Manet, as recorded by his friend and confidant of the 1870s, Stéphane Mallarmé, described an abstracted involvement of the mind, eye, and hand as part of this speculation:

Each work should be a new creation of the mind. The hand, it is true, will conserve some of its acquired secrets of manipulation, but the eye should forget all else it has seen, and learn anew from the lessons before it. It should abstract itself from memory, seeing only that which it looks upon, and that as for the first time; and the hand should become an impersonal abstraction guided only by the will, oblivious to all previous cunning.⁴¹

This is not a credo about looking at things with a fresh and innocent eye. It is an artist asserting that with serious art one should speculate anew with each and every work. Rather than using an unfettered eye, it can be shown that Manet's speculations in creating his spatial ambiguity were introspectively purposeful, structured and considered.

Such purposeful spatial ambiguity was, however, not created within Manet's artifice in isolation, and those other dimensions to the ambiguity in his works, such as unclear narratives or uncertain representations, are interwoven in its matrix and cannot be disregarded. Thus, for example, the spatial disjunctions in *The Old Musician* (1862, Fig.7) are reinforced by the incongruous mix of character types; in *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe*, the sequence of spaces which, at one and the same time, seems both clear and uncertain, appears connected with the odd casual seriousness of the group of figures seated in the foreground and the woman bathing behind them; the uncertainty of a narrative in *The Luncheon* (1868–9, Fig.44) also clearly has a spatial function; the puzzling representation of *Portrait of M. Pertuiset the Lion Hunter* (1880–81, Fig.77) is reinforced by the strangeness of the depicted space; and, the contradictory perspective of

A Bar at the Folies-Bergère, in itself, raises uncertainty about the painting's narrative and representations.

There is, in addition, the uncertainty of Manet's intent, which, if one is to accept his own statements or to believe the recollections of his friends, was at times as ambiguous as his works. Notwithstanding the unequivocal exposition in this dissertation that Manet's spatial ambiguity was considered and intentional, there is no evidence in his few known direct statements to confirm such a proposition. And any thought that he had intended to make his works provocatively ambiguous, can be contrasted with the sentiments expressed in the non-confrontational essay within the catalogue to his private exhibition of 1867: "L'artiste ne dit pas aujourd'hui: Venez voir des œuvres sans défauts; mais: Venez des œuvres sincères".⁴² But the fact remains that, from the time that they were first viewed in public, many of his works have conveyed an unsettling, ambiguous quality.

It has been suggested that in some works the ambiguity had been consciously created by Manet as an artful manipulation of the inconsistencies inherent in the paintings themselves. But such suggestions are usually qualified. T.J. Clark's reading, for example, of Manet's *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* in his The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and his Followers,⁴³ presented the usual and valid responses about the apparent impossibility of the mirror's reflection, and noted that "there seems little doubt that the structure which gives rise to these uncertainties was devised by the artist with conscious care".⁴⁴ But this structure to which Clark refers is not one underlying its spatial construction but, rather, is one which made the impossible reflection be seen as a contrivance that "must have been felt to be somehow appropriate to the social forms the painter had chosen to show". For Clark it was used with intent by Manet as a pictorial metaphor, as an artifice of a single order, without any suggestion that a contradictory structure could exist to show that the reflection was in fact possible and that the artifice was of a double order, crafted with intent.⁴⁵

Such a contradictory structure, nevertheless, does exist in the painting and, in the midst of all the concealment and ambiguity, Manet provides subtle but definite evidence

of it, and in doing so confirms the painting's crafted structure, his strategy of subterfuge, and, above all, his complete understanding of the geometry of perspective. With a touch of self-directed and light-hearted subversion of his very own stratagem, at the right-hand edge of *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* Manet painted one half, and only one half, of a reflected rose, and in doing so provided the confirmation, or at least the means to confirm, that the painting was in fact based on correct perspectival geometry. Of course such an implication is not obvious with just the identification of the flower, and indeed only has relevance if the strategies of concealment used by Manet are also identified. Nonetheless, the potential for such identification is there. And such a disclosure also makes clear that Manet's few statements on his art can be now seen either as attempts to confuse or, more probably, as benign pronouncements of a kind required to keep the recipient content. It becomes clear that he was more than happy for his work to be seen by everyone, including his closest friends, in any way they wished, as long as it was other than the one used in its creation. The research for this dissertation has been, in part, a program to identify those very strategies employed by Manet to craft the ambiguous reality in the artifice of his works, and about which he was obviously so secretive.

1. REALITY, ARTIFICE AND AMBIGUITY: Notes

DISSERTATION: Volume 2, pp.2,3

NOTES

[\[p.2 of dissertation here\]](#)

1. Antonin Proust, Edouard Manet: Souvenirs, L'Échoppe, Paris, 1996, p.10.
2. e.g. "ne faites de la peinture que d'après Nature. Cette dernière est encore plus forte que MM. et X.Z.", as recorded by Gaston La Touche ('Édouard Manet. Souvenirs intimes', Le Journal des arts, 15 January, 1884, p.2).
3. e.g. "je ne puis rien faire sans la nature. Je ne sais pas inventer.", as recorded by Émile Zola ('Mon Salon II – Édouard Manet', L'Événement illustré, 10 May, 1868, p.3). Such sentiments can, of course, be contradicted with Manet's almost flippant suggestion, as recorded by Berthe Morisot, that "You can do *plein air* painting indoors, by painting white in the morning, lilac during the day and orange-toned in the evening". Quoted from: Juliet Wilson-Bareau, ed., Manet by himself, Little, Brown and Company, London, 1995, p.303.
4. Nevertheless, his comment, as remembered by Antonin Proust, that "nous n'avons pas d'autre devoir que d'extraire de notre époque ce qu'elle nous offre; sans pour cela cesser de trouver bien ce que les époques précédentes ont fait" (Proust 1996 (as in n.1), p.38), indicates that he believed the past could offer important lessons.
5. Proust 1996, p.10.
6. In his 1867 article of support, 'Une nouvelle manière en peinture – Edouard Manet', Zola wrote that Manet "aura compris... qu'il lui restait à essayer de voir la nature telle qu'elle est... la traduisant à sa manière." (L'Artiste: Revue du XIXe Siècle, ed. Arsène Houssaye, 1 January, 1867, pp.43–64. Quoted from: Émile Zola: Œuvres complètes, ed. Henri Mitterand, Cercle du livre précieux, Paris, 1969, v.12, p.828)
7. For the socio-political background to Courbet's art, see: T.J. Clark, Image of the People: Gustave Courbet and the 1848 Revolution, Thames and Hudson, London, 1973.
8. For the best description of the social and physical milieu of Paris at this time see: Robert L. Herbert, Impressionism: Art, Leisure and Parisian Society, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1988. Also see discussion and other references in Chapter 2.
9. The sense at the time that painting had taken a new direction, rather than simply a reactionary one, is evident from the titles used by Zola for his 1867 article (see n.6) and by Edmond Duranty for his 1876 article, La Nouvelle Peinture: A Propos du groupe d'artistes qui expose dans les galeries Durand-Ruel (pamphlet, E. Dentu, Paris, 1876), supporting the Impressionists at the time of their second group exhibition.
10. Although the depiction of the locale and circumstances of the execution were not based on factual visual information, the paintings of *The Execution of Maximilian* were also not quite fiction. Information about the incident, including written reports, photographs showing staged scenes purporting to be reconstructions, and composite photographs with images of those executed, when alive, set into locales claimed to be the exact location, had been received in Paris during the months after the event, providing imagery and information in response to which anyone who was interested, such as Manet, could create a second-hand reality.

11. The literature on Manet's visual 'borrowings', both direct and indirect, from earlier artists is extensive, and the examples known or claimed are numerous, including: from Corneille le Jeune, after Giulio Romano in *The Surprised Nymph* (1859–61); from Marcantonio Raimondi, after Raphael in *Déjeuner sur l'herbe* (1863); from Titian in *Olympia* (1863); from El Greco in *Masked Ball at the Opera* (1873–74); from Peter Paul Rubens in *La pêche* (1861–63); from Diego Velázquez in *The Tragic Actor* (1865–66), and *Philosopher* (1865–67); from Rembrandt in *The Surprised Nymph*; from Bartolomé Murillo in *Boy with Dog* (1860–61); and, from Francisco de Goya in *Young Woman Reclining, in Spanish Costume* (1862), *Mlle V...in the Costume of an Espada* (1862), *Lola de Valence* (1862), *The Execution of Maximilian* (1867–69?), *Portrait of Théodore Duret* (1868), and *The Balcony* (1868–69).
12. John House, 'Manet's Naïveté', introductory essay, in Juliet Wilson-Bareau, 'The Hidden Face of Manet; An investigation of the artist's working processes', exh. cat. *The Burlington Magazine*, v.128, no.997, April, 1986, p.1.
13. Recorded by Antonin Proust, *Édouard Manet. Souvenirs publiés par A. Barthélemy*, H. Laurens, Paris, 1913, p.16.

[p.3 of dissertation here]

14. Of the barmaid in *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère*, Henry Houssaye's response was that "Il paraît que ce tableau représente un *bar* des Folies-Bergère; que cette robe bleu criard, surmontée d'une tête de carton comme on en voyait jadis aux vitrines des modistes, représente une femme;" ('Le Salon de 1882', in *La Revue des Deux-Mondes*, 15 June, 1882, p.583), whereas Émile Bergerat effusively noted that "la belle fille en robe noire-bleue qui tient le comptoir est excellemment dessinée, modelée sur un beau ton local, franche de coloris, naturelle de pose et toute pleine de caractère." ('Salon de 1882', *Le Voltaire*, 10 May, 1882, p.2).
15. Jules Castagnary was obviously bemused by the lack of narrative in both *The Luncheon* (1868–69) and *The Balcony* (1868–69). In his Salon review of 1869, Castagnary wrote:

Que fait ce jeune homme du *Déjeuner*, qui est assis au premier plan et qui semble regarder le public? Il est bien peint, c'est vrai, brossé d'une main hardie; mais où est-il? Dans la salle à manger? Alors, ayant le dos à la table, il a le mur entre lui et nous, et sa position ne s'explique plus. Sur ce *balcon* j'aperçois deux femmes, dont une toute jeune. Sont-ce les deux soeurs? Est-ce la mère et la fille? Je ne sais.

('Salon de 1869', *Le Siècle*, 11 June, 1869, p.3).
16. Michael Paul Driskel, for example, in his essay 'On Manet's Binarism: Virgin and/or Whore at the Folies-Bergère', asserts that his strongest claims regarding Manet's share in the production of meaning for his work [*A Bar at the Folies-Bergère*] are that he willfully appropriated the iconography of the Immaculate Conception and placed it in an ambience where he knew prostitution of one type or another was commonplace, and thereby inscribed in his picture a *lorette* or the trope of irony consisting of two opposed, yet interrelated conceptions of women which had broad cultural resonance and rich associations.

(in *12 Views of Manet's Bar*, ed. Bradford R. Collins, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1996, p.158).
17. Claude Pichois, ed., *Charles Baudelaire: Critique d'Art*, 2 vols., Armand Colin, Paris, 1965, v.1, p.77.
18. id.
19. *ibid.*, v.2, p.308.
20. *ibid.*, v.1, p.173.
21. *ibid.*, v.2, p.452.

22. id.
 23. id.
 24. Gustave Flaubert, letter to J.-K. Huysmans, 1879. Quoted from: Documents of Modern Literary Realism, ed. and trans. George J. Becker, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1963, p.96.
 25. Becker 1963 (as in n.24), p.90.
 26. *ibid.*, p.95.
 27. *ibid.*, p.91.
 28. *ibid.*, p.93.
 29. *ibid.*, p.91.
 30. Pierre Bourdieu, 'Flaubert's Point of View', trans. Priscilla Parkhurst Ferguson, Critical Inquiry, v.14, 1988, pp.539–62.
 31. *ibid.*, p.560.
 32. id.
 33. *ibid.*, p.552. Bourdieu sees Flaubert as positioned in the same "geometric locus of contraries" of Baudelaire.
 34. *ibid.*, p.560.
 35. *ibid.*, p.562.
 36. *ibid.*, p.551.
 37. *ibid.*, p.562.
 38. Gustave Flaubert, in letter to J.-K. Huysmans, *ibid.*, p.562.
 39. *ibid.*, p.562.
 40. Gustave Flaubert, quoted in: Bourdieu 1988 (as in n.30), pp.554–55.
 41. Stéphane Mallarmé, 'The Impressionists and Edouard Manet', Art Monthly Review, September, 1876. Quoted from: Charles S. Moffett, et al., The New Painting: Impressionism 1874–1886, exh. cat., The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, San Francisco, 1986, p.29.
 42. 'Motifs d'une Exposition Particulière', in Catalogue des Tableaux de M. Édouard Manet exposés Avenue de l'Alma en 1867, Paris, 1867, p.5.
 43. T.J. Clark, The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and his Followers, Thames and Hudson, London, 1985.
 44. *ibid.*, p.251.
 45. *ibid.*, p.252.
-