

2. PICTORIAL PERSPECTIVES: Text

The background to Manet's dynamics in spatial illusion involves both his past and his present. His endeavours and achievements were at one and the same time embedded in the pictorial traditions of the Old Masters and absorbed into the contemporary developments and influences of his own times. They were also set at the vanguard of those crucial changes that led to twentieth-century painting, and were thus a link between his past and future.

Since the fifteenth-century Renaissance, Western art had developed the use of *linear perspective* as the pictorial means to approximate perception with *natural perspective*. All painting is to some degree an artifice, but by the middle of the nineteenth century the potential for perspectival spatial illusion to give a reflection of the *reality* of natural perception was so entrenched into the vision of Western art that the nature of painting's production and reception required, or enabled, the fictive world of history painting, genre painting, sentimental or anecdotal vignettes, the picturesque, and images of reverie and fantasy to imagine the pictorial space, not in terms of the artifice of picture-making, but to be *real*, beyond the *ideal*. The potential for painting to be vitally creative in its own right had thus been diminished. As Clement Greenberg has claimed, "realistic, illusionist art had dissembled the medium, using art to conceal art".¹

The history of Western pictorial space and its structure provides an interesting comparative background to considerations of Manet's application of a perspectival spatial geometry and his fragmentation of space.² Greco-Roman space was an aggregation of different views without a coherent geometry and with each depicted object set in its own separate space.³ Medieval painting used both a stage space with a limited spatial recession to a vertical background and a stratified space with horizontal bands, often not chronologically connected, set above each other and the spatial recession implied with increased elevation.⁴ The Proto-Renaissance contributions of

artists such as Cimabue (c.1240–1302?), Duccio di Buoninsegna (c.1255–1318?), and Giotto di Bondone (1266?–1337) provided tentative but substantial progression towards a unifying spatial system based on empirical observation. Cimabue used a consistent relationship between light and shade,⁵ Duccio displayed a surprising grasp of convergence in his building forms,⁶ and Giotto, in his attempts at a coherent spatial system, used a unified viewpoint, angled planes to the left and the right to convey three-dimensional rectilinear form, overlapping planes to indicate recession, and figures formed with a real sense of volume.⁷ The bringing together of all these elements within the coherent, consistent geometry of linear perspective emerged in the environment of the early fifteenth-century Renaissance in Florence.⁸ Its invention by Filippo Brunelleschi (1377–1446) in c.1413,⁹ its initial applications by Masaccio (1401–28) in his frescoes of the 1420s,¹⁰ and its codification based upon Euclidean postulates by Leon Battista Alberti in his treatise *Della Pittura* of 1436,¹¹ established the basis for spatial illusion in Western art. A relatively coherent perspectival geometry of spatial recession, and a related illusion of volume and shadow projection were evident in Masaccio's frescoes, and these devices of geometries and form were integrated with other illusionistic devices such as atmospheric perspective and colour recession to form an overall system of spatial illusion.

In contrast to the tentatively angled forms of the fourteenth-century artists, the characteristics of Alberti's 'perspective box' included its centred viewpoint and its primary space set parallel to the picture plane. This system provided the basis for pictorial space in painting throughout the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, even if used with less accuracy in northern Europe, and its principles and procedures were theoretically developed and applied within the work of many artists such as Paolo Uccello (1396/7–1475),¹² Piero della Francesca (1410/20–92),¹³ Leonardo da Vinci (1452–1519),¹⁴ and Albrecht Durer (1471–1528).¹⁵

There were, however, limitations with Alberti's system involving the spatial distortion and apparent change in view which were created with the lateral offset of the viewpoint beyond the limits of a practical cone of vision. But there are many examples of

offsets or displacements of the principal vanishing point in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and these have been seen by James Elkins as a "play" with the potential of perspective.¹⁶ Such a displacement is highlighted with two predella panels depicting the *Miracle of the Host* (Fig.81) painted by Paolo Uccello for an altarpiece in c.1468. Whereas the left hand panel, *The Selling of the Host*, displays a typical Albertian perspective with a central centre of vision and vanishing point, in contrast, the right hand panel, *The Jew's Attempt to Destroy the Host*, has its centre of vision and vanishing point offset far to the right with the extent of view, as part of a widened cone of vision, extended to the left. This creates not only a distortion of the space to the left of the scene, but also the sense that one is viewing the interior room of the scene at an angle, as if part of a two-point perspective, and not perpendicular to the picture plane.¹⁷ The angles of the orthogonals in perspective to the left also accentuate the sense of spatial recession. Although this use of the offset viewpoint remained as one of the standard techniques of perspective practice through to the nineteenth century, it is less than clear whether the artists who used its geometry did so as a conscious decision to make use of its accentuated diagonals or its inherent ambiguity as an apparent angled view.¹⁸ And whether the potential for that ambiguity was also identified by Manet in any earlier works is unknown, even though it can be shown in this dissertation that it was used by him for that very purpose. During his trips to Italy he would certainly have seen many clear examples in the works of artists, such as in Titian's *Madonna of the Pesaro Family* (1519–26, Fig.82).¹⁹ The possibility of such an influence is later considered in Chapter 4, with the spatial comparison of some important Manet works and their acknowledged sources.

Perspective's geometry was also an obvious influence on pictorial space. Alberti's system set pictorial space parallel to the picture plane, initially with the primary 'action' depicted in the foreground. During the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries there were many variations on the extent of evident spatial recession within such a spatial configuration, including: a limited 'stage' space,²⁰ a spatial recession, often sequential, to a middle distance;²¹ and spaces which receded completely into a background landscape,

with either a clear separation between the foreground 'action' and the background,²² or intermediate planes set in the middle-distance.²³ Alternatives to such overt structuring of the pictorial space were also developed, even though perspective remained the underlying geometry. Michelangelo Buonarroti (1475–1564),²⁴ for example, created an integration between figures and space itself, with its articulations leading to the dynamic use of pictorial space by the Mannerists. And artists of the Renaissance in Venice, with the Byzantine influence and the early contact with the oil paintings of artists such as Jan van Eyck from Northern Europe, used tonal modulation for spatial illusion rather than an overt spatial structure. As noted by David Rosand, Titian, for example, understood the "constitutive elements of spatial representation: architectural perspective and luminous landscape, color and tone", but was reluctant "to build compositionally upon a consistent and fully realized architectural base."²⁵

At the same time, developments in theory and practice enabled perspective to relate more accurately to natural perspective with the double-angled depiction of three-dimensional form, as had been attempted in the fourteenth century. This involved the introduction of the technique of *tiers points* by Jean Pélerin (called Viator) in his De Artificiali perspective of 1505,²⁶ and its perfection by Jean Cousin in his Livre de Perspective of 1560.²⁷ With the important determination of the vanishing point by Guidobaldo del Monte in 1600, and its development and confirmation by Pierre Desargues in the 1630s, perspective's basic principles had been established and clarified and, notwithstanding the many subsequent developments in procedure and application, did not change during the following centuries to Manet's time.²⁸

The pictorial potential provided by these conventions of perspective was another matter. The use by the sixteenth-century Mannerists of a shallow but dynamically figured space set parallel to the picture plane, and often with dramatic perspectives using low viewpoints,²⁹ was an influence on painting through the Baroque and Rococo periods of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-centuries.³⁰ Dramatic spatial perspectives were achieved by Michelangelo Caravaggio (1575–1610) by different means, with a juxtaposition of the limited spatial recession created by his backgrounds of darkness and the accentuated

spatial illusion achieved with the extreme foreshortening of his figures and the pictorial space seemingly projected in front of the painting's surface.³¹ Nevertheless, the more visually stable structure of the 'perspective box' of Alberti, characterised by its centred viewpoint and planes set parallel to the picture plane, was continued with many variations as a more formal and classical use of spatial illusion, with its ideal form exemplified in the work of Nicolas Poussin (1594–1665).³² These contrasting strands of a classicised, idealised space and the more naturalistic but at times dramatic space, carried through to the nineteenth century in many guises and with many borrowings and overlaps.³³ From the middle of the eighteenth century, for example, the classicised space which had been retained as a counter to the freedom of Baroque space underwent what James Elkins has described as a "single decisive change during the period 1750–1840" with it being "very gently rotated so the picture became a 'two-point'... construction".³⁴ Variants of this rotation, Elkins has pointed out, included symmetrical "two-point constructions", and a Neoclassical adjustment involving the centred corner moved slightly to one side.³⁵ These spatial manipulations using the geometry of perspective to construct an image can be seen against those naturalistic responses to the visible world which had developed in painting from the seventeenth-century, and in which the use of linear perspective was inherent in the translation of natural perspective to its illusion in the two-dimensional surface.

Within perspective's structure during these centuries, spatial ambiguities were intentionally achieved either as the result of pictorial devices such as anamorphosis and perspectival incongruity, or as a contradiction between the geometry of the pictorial spaces and the means of depiction. The anamorphosis in *The Ambassadors* of 1533 by Hans Holbein (1497/8–1543) is an example of such a device but, typically, appears as an appendage and is not directly involved in the artifice of the work.³⁶ And in those works which present incongruous spaces within frameworks of perspectival geometry, such as the unsettling *Carceri d'Invenzione* series of 1745–61 by Giovanni Battista Piranesi (1720–78), the means to achieve the spatial ambiguity are pictorially obvious.

Las Meninas (1656, Fig.86) by Diego Velásquez (1599–1660), is of particular interest here as it has been seen by many scholars as an influence on Manet's articulation of space in *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère*.³⁷ Its complex spatial uncertainty, seen beneath a straightforward spatial appearance, involves: the uncertain interplay between Velásquez as the artist of the actual painting; the self-portrait of Velásquez as the artist within the painting; the unseen surface of the canvas within the painting; the unseen subject of the gaze of Velásquez and the group of the Infanta Marguerita and the court members; the reflection in the mirror on the background wall; and the placement, highlighting, and gaze of the figure seen on the stairs in the background. Although the pictorial spaces seem to have been structured on perspective, the uncertainty in how the painting works raises a doubt about the application of its geometry. Joel Snyder and Ted Cohen have claimed and demonstrated that "At the level of its geometry, *Las Meninas*... is thoroughly and ingeniously orthodox".³⁸ Although not dissimilar to Manet's spatial ambiguity, that in *Las Meninas* exists within a traditional perspectival unity, not within an apparent rejection of it as seen in *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère*.

The forms of illusionistic space from the fifteenth century through to the nineteenth were thus generally based on perspective's geometry, as views either constructed with a knowledge of its procedure or translated with an understanding of its principles. And the many published perspective manuals, particularly from the eighteenth-century, certainly provided the means for artists to construct or translate views in any situation.³⁹ This knowledge was consolidated by the scientific development of optics, with the *camera obscura* and the later *camera lucida* not only providing tacit confirmation of perspective's principles but, in their ability to make available on a surface an image of a selected view, also being used to an ever-increasing extent as aids for painting from the seventeenth-century.⁴⁰

Although seen as a logical progression from these optical devices, photography, with its fixing of the refracted image, not only enhanced this perspectival and spatial confirmation but also provided the means for an artist to record a pose or scene for use as source, *aide-mémoire*, or instrument of transfer. By Manet's time perspective was the

established means of depicting spatial illusion, but photography, with rapid developments made in its technology from the 1840s, brought a new understanding of imagery and its potential within a two-dimensional surface, and liberated painting from many pictorial preconceptions.⁴¹ The composition of images with 'accidental' framing or cropping, the selection of new viewpoints and directions of view, the emphasis on planes in focus, the blurring of images with movement, the overlaying and combining of images, and increased tonal contrast with the reduction of half-tones, were all direct pictorial influences from photography on painting.⁴²

Even though many of these pictorial aspects were absorbed and used by Manet,⁴³ the most important connection with photography existed with those two strategies he employed for his spatial ambiguity, the offset viewpoint and the composite image. The interplay discussed above between the offset centre of vision in a one-point perspective and the simultaneous creation of an apparent angled view was an every-day occurrence in the world of the professional photographer in Manet's time. The standard camera used by these photographers, the *chambre photographique*,⁴⁴ could create its image in exactly that way. The camera could be positioned with its centre of vision set to replicate a one-point perspective and, by means of parallel sliding frames, a part of a wide-angle cone of vision could be selected so that even though its spatial shaping suggested an angled view, the horizontal lines parallel to the photographic plate in the camera would still be seen as horizontal lines of a one-point perspective. Apart from the practical benefit of easier handling of the camera, the frames provided the means to 'correct' perspective.⁴⁵ Obviously there was no novelty in the use of such cameras by the 1860s and any artist would have been aware of, and comprehended, their function.

The potential for the same spatial ambiguity also existed, in a converse way, within the fixed image of a relatively wide-angle photograph, taken, for example, as a centre-point perspective. Rather than create the spatially ambiguous photograph which is possible with the *chambre photographique* camera, those parts of a photographic image furthest from the centre of vision can be seen to be spatially ambiguous when isolated from their original context. Although the horizontal lines parallel to the photographic

plate in such a circumstance remain horizontal and confirm the underlying one-point perspective, the offset space can also make the direction of view appear to be angled.⁴⁶ Whether this potential for spatial ambiguity was seen by Manet either in an understanding of the *chambre photographique* camera or in the isolation of part of a photographic image is not known, but it is shown in Chapter 5 that Manet directly applied this underlying geometry in creating a number of his problematic works. It can even be proposed that the often-noted tendency of Manet to 'flatten' his perspective derives from this same geometry. It suited him artistically to have these elements more horizontal, and with the geometry he had the means to pictorially create them without a need for artificial 'flattening'.

Permanent photographic images also provided a repertoire of images which could be re-used in part within new composite contexts. Such composites, created by combining and overlaying numerous negatives to form one image or by a 'cut-and-paste' technique with paper prints, had developed in England in the 1850s.⁴⁷ Although officially rejected in France as a valid photographic technique,⁴⁸ the potential for photographs to provide new approaches to imagery was not lost on artists. Again, there is no evidence that Manet utilised photographic images in this way, but this research indicates, as shown in Chapter 5, that discrete parts of what could only have been photographic images were overlaid or interlocked in the creation of some of his most ambiguous works. The evidence also indicates that some of these source photographs could only have been taken from an elevated position, such as from an aerial balloon. The early history of aerial photography in Paris, involving Manet's friend Nadar, and others, is a contradictory one (see Appendix 3), but the possibility that Manet used such photographs is seen as a logical occurrence when set into the circumstances of his own artistic agenda and within the milieu of the Paris in which he lived. Such a possibility may also require re-assessments of the nature and dating of some of his works.

A less direct, but nonetheless important, aspect of photography's influence involved the way in which the fixing of an image onto the surface of a negative re-famed the way in which reality and real space could be depicted on a painting's surface. What

was changing for art with the development of Realism in the 1850s was the move away from the imagined to the real, and in this respect photography, with its recording of an 'actuality', provided an insight into the nature of the surface of paintings.⁴⁹ The image in photography, created by means of light refraction and light-sensitive chemicals, exists within its terrain as a record of an 'actuality', no matter how unreal or artificial that 'actuality' is made to appear. And although the artifice of photography is latent and not as overt as that of painting, hidden as it were behind its verisimilitude, it is suggested that artists such as Manet understood that the representation in a painting of that actuality could never be achieved by an attempt at direct 'realism'. Photography confirmed that the concept of 'realism' was an artificial one, and that any sense of truthfulness in a painting's representation could only be achieved by engaging the artifice in its surface and not in the belief of creating a 'real' image of anything, particularly of space.

Photography thus provided the potential for the two-dimensional surface of a work to be a field of new visual and spatial dynamics, and the extent to which Manet realised that potential is one of the many aspects of Manet's art yet to be resolved. His use of photography as a direct image source, and the probability of its use by him as a pictorial influence and a tool for the transfer of images has been raised previously by many scholars,⁵⁰ but the limited available evidence is not seen as a negation of the research results of this dissertation. Some of the works considered in the overview in Chapter 4 certainly suggest an underlying perspectival geometry taken from photographs and show evidence of composite construction. And of the works examined in Chapter 5, *Incident in a Bullfight*, *View of the 1867 Exposition Universelle*, *The Burial*, *The Railway*, and *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* provide evidence of separate views or fragments of views brought together as overlays or collages to form a single, composite image. Such a practice provides the circumstance, but not the direct evidence, in which it can be deemed probable that Manet used photographs in a 'cut-and-paste' procedure, either for transferred images or as actual fragments of photographs, at the preliminary or intermediate stages in the development of his overall images. A lack of evidence may not be so surprising. If such proposed stratagems were in fact used to create the ambiguities

in his works, Manet would certainly not have wished any evidence of a photographic aid to be seen. It may be possible, then, that the extent to which Manet used photography and photographs and the degree of their importance to him in his picture-making process may have been much greater than the lack of evidence has implied.

Pictorial language was certainly extended by photography, but another important aspect of that language involved concepts intrinsic to French art within which Manet's art had been critiqued, particularly during the 1860s, and which also inflected upon his use of spatial disjunctions and fragmentation. These were the complex pictorial notions of *tableau* and *morceau*. In both the theatrical and painting contexts in the 1750s there had been a requirement for works to have a compositional unity as *tableaux*. Michael Fried, who has extensively examined these two issues in his writings, has stated that writers such as Denis Diderot and Friedrich Grimm demanded that in paintings a "pictorial unity be instantaneously apprehensible".⁵¹ This requirement, Fried noted, was an "emphasis on the *tableau*", as "the portable and self-sufficient picture that could be taken in at a glance, as opposed to the "environmental", architecture-dependent, often episodic or allegorical project that could not",⁵² and which "denoted the achievement of a sufficiently high degree of compositional and coloristic unity... to produce a powerful and instantaneous effect of formal and expressive *closure*".⁵³ Such a concept of pictorial unity continued through to the 1850s when, in critiques of the paintings of Gustave Courbet, the contrasting term of *morceau* was used to indicate that his canvases had failed "to conform to traditional notions of compositional unity... [and] were mere *morceaux*, pieces or fragments, regardless of their actual size".⁵⁴ One of the differences between the two terms can be seen in their use in 1860 by Zacharie Astruc when contrasting the art of Courbet with that of Delacroix. "À l'inverse de Delacroix," stated Astruc, "qui ne voit plus qu'un ensemble où résonne l'idée, lui se plaît au morceau spécial qui l'éloigne. Du morceau on monte à l'ensemble, au tableau".⁵⁵ And in a posthumously published essay, Delacroix had written that "Le réaliste le plus obstiné... ne peut prendre un morceau isolé ou même une collection de morceaux pour en faire un tableau".⁵⁶ In both of these descriptions a *tableau* was seen not as a summation of *morceaux* but rather as an

overarching concept, and that the *morceaux* were incorporated within the unifying *tableau*.

These same notions were similarly applied to Manet and his work. Throughout his career, Manet was criticised for his paintings being insufficiently unified as *tableaux*, and within the concept of the term used in the 1850s, their various parts, seen as separate entities, were described as *morceaux*. In a review of the 1863 Salon des Refusés, in which Manet exhibited *Mlle V...in the Costume of an Espada*, *Young Man in the Costume of a Majo* (1863, Fig.15), and *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe*, Théodore Pelloquet, for example, complained that "M. Manet ne sait pas composer un tableau, ou plutôt, il ne se rend pas compte de ce qu'on entend par un tableau",⁵⁷ and that "Je vois bien ça et là des morceaux qui approchent de la nature... mais... le reste est d'une incohérence tout à fait inexplicable".⁵⁸ Jules Castagnary, in a review of the 1864 Salon, wrote of the fallen matador in *Incident in a Bullfight* as "un morceau excellent; mais... que devient l'ensemble du tableau?",⁵⁹ and by 1870 he was still suggesting that Manet "possède une partie des qualités nécessaires pour faire des tableaux. Ces qualités je ne les nie pas; mais j'attends les tableaux".⁶⁰

The nature of Manet's pictorial fragmentation was, however, very different to the perceived lack of compositional unity in Courbet's work, and other critics saw Manet's works more holistically, both in that term's general sense as a summation of the parts, and in its philosophical sense in which the whole is more than a sum of its parts. In his review of the 1863 Salon des Refusés, Astruc spoke of "des oeuvres... si harmonieuses, exécutées avec tant de verve et de force qu'elles semblent jaillies de la nature par un seul élan".⁶¹ Of Manet's art Astruc believed that "lui n'impose et ne montre pour ainsi dire son accent vital",⁶² and that "L'individualité est si forte qu'elle échappe au mécanisme de construction. Le rôle de la peinture s'efface pour laisser à la création toute sa valeur métaphysique et corporelle. Longtemps après, seulement, le regard découvre les formes de l'exécution."⁶³ Any sense of ambiguity, incomprehensibility, or pictorial disjunction in *Mlle V...in the Costume of an Espada*, a work referred to by Astruc as a "bizarre tableau qui nous montre une femme victorieuse, dans une cirque",⁶⁴ provided no impediment to

him specifically praising the three exhibited paintings, stating that "Rien de plus séduisant de ton que la jeune femme tenant son épée nue à la main; de plus franc, de plus robuste que le portrait; de plus savoureux que le grand paysage d'un caractère si jeune, si vivant, et que Giorgione semble avoir inspiré",⁶⁵ or to presciently suggest that Manet's "grande intelligence... demande à fonctionner librement dans une sphère nouvelle qu'il vivifiera".⁶⁶ Fried has suggested that

Astruc saw Manet's paintings as exactly opposite to Courbet's: that is, he claimed that *how* Manet's pictures were painted was far less important *in one's experience of them* than their sheer individuality, their vitality, their immediate, instantaneous power to attract or repel... [and] *all* that was experienced... was the total result, the painting as a whole, in its essential unity.⁶⁷

Such a description makes it clear that Fried has translated Astruc's comments to refer to Manet's works as *tableaux* and made a connection between such an understanding and the writing of Gonzague Privat, who used the terms *morceau* and *tableau* in a later perceptive and supportive review of Manet's two paintings in the Salon of 1865, *Jesus Mocked by the Soldiers* (1864–65, Fig.27) and *Olympia* (1863, Fig.19). In contrast to Astruc, Privat believed that "M. Manet a cherché le *tableau* sans se préoccuper assez de la forme et des détails",⁶⁸ but when imagining how Velásquez may have advised Manet, he suggested "acharnez-vous à rendre la nature dans toute sa vérité; peignez beaucoup le *morceau*, mais gardez bien précieusement votre tempérament artistique".⁶⁹ For Fried, Privat's interplay between *morceau* and a wider artistic context had suggested in Manet's work a "too glaring disjunction between the realist *morceau* and the artistic *tableau*",⁷⁰ confirming for Fried that "during the first half of the 1860s Manet was in search of a new *paradigm* of what a painting was".⁷¹ Fried has seen that search as one for a *tableau* and has set it within contexts of his own making, 'absorption' and 'theatricality'.

To present an alternative paradigm for which Manet was 'searching', Astruc's responses can be seen in terms other than those determined by Fried. Without reference to *morceau* or *tableau*, Astruc seems to have principally recognised, with some enthusiasm, that Manet's works were artistically cohesive, irrespective of the means by which they had been constructed. Such a view acknowledged that the pictorial fragments of Manet's paintings, rather than being disparate parts in search of the organic, unifying shroud of a *tableau*, existed as separate, and often strangely different, but integral parts of a cohesive whole of his own making. Within this cohesive whole these parts were variously connected or disconnected, unified or in opposition, or ambiguously somewhere in between. And such a cohesive whole ignored conventions, was very unlike a *tableau*, and in painting terms, was very new. A requirement for a *tableau* precluded a painting surface in which spatial ambiguities and disjunctions could be intentionally sustained, or in which parts of the surface were treated with different, and often contrasting, degrees of emphasis or finish. The apparent contradiction that Manet's cohesive whole was often created with fragments, and without an adherence to preconceived ideas about a unified surface, reflects his 'art for art's sake' approach, and the double contradiction that such a fragmented whole was achieved with unseen threads of linear perspective invokes a Flaubertian 'double refusal'.

The milieu of contemporary Paris in which these critiques of pictorial concepts such as *tableau* and *morceau* were raised also provided the rich tapestry of influences and possibilities from which Manet's pictorial space developed. The artistic sense of the new, the modern, and the avant-garde had received its impetus during the 1850s, and the conjunction of influences and circumstances which transformed Paris provided the background in which Manet brought his program of practice to fruition during the 1860s and 1870s. This layered background of spectacle, *modernité*, and strata of class and gender, also included a new and dynamic physical environment of new boulevards, vistas and viewpoints, and public and private spaces.⁷² The problem for an artist such as Manet who wished "être de son temps", to paint "des oeuvres sincères" and "être vrai"⁷³

in the visual expression of such a world involved the engagement between the actuality of this reality and the artifice.

Contemporaneity for the avant-garde artists was considered essential, but although subject matter had changed accordingly,⁷⁴ spatial illusion was handled little differently to that of the Academicians, with the traditional use of perspective. The evocation of *la vie moderne* was achieved at a superficial level with narrative genre works⁷⁵ and popular illustrations,⁷⁶ but the artistic negotiation of the actuality of this world of artifice with its contradictions, ambiguities, uncertainties and disjunctions required a new means of pictorial translation somewhat different to the narrative artifice of Academic imagery. Manet was the artist who best negotiated this new terrain. Although modernity for him was real, its reality could not be literally or overtly depicted, but rather needed the layers within its fabric to be translated into the surface of his paintings with an imagination beyond the directly visible. The pictorial spaces within which this translation evolved had neither the 'artificial' literalness of the spatial depiction of the Academicians nor the equivalence to nature claimed by the later Impressionists, who presented their pictorial artifice, with its rendering 'en plein air' of 'light' on 'landscape' as an 'impression' of what the 'eye' sees at a 'moment' in time, as fact. The concept of time generally evident in Manet's work is neither the narrative climax of a history painting nor the fleeting Impressionistic moment, but was part of a typically contemporary, everyday event of life embodying the past and future in its present.

Manet's pictorial spaces had the same resonance, being neither separate nor unified, open-ended or closed, but responsive to the artistic requirement at hand. *Music in the Tuileries* of 1862 (Fig.9), for example, has often been seen as Manet's first painting which addressed the implications of modernity and the issues of his time. It is certainly not the compositional unity required of a *tableau*, but in spite of its uneven spatial texture, made up of the informal gathering of motley groupings of people, chairs, and trees, it is an artistically cohesive whole and can be contrasted with another work of that period, *La pêche* of c.1861–63 (Fig.8), in which many different and disparate spaces seem to have been interlocked into place, but for which no cohesive whole seems to

exist. What Manet had achieved in *Music in the Tuileries*, with a cohesive whole incorporating uncertain or dislocated pictorial spaces, was continued to be used by him throughout his career. By its very nature, however, his new and unique concept of pictorial space was always unsettling to a certain degree, even when used in scenes of domestic or familial quietude. Particularly in his interior views, Manet's pictorial space was rarely one of a relaxed ease and openness, of a pictorial informality as can be seen, in contrast, in the matter-of-fact space of Frédéric Bazille's *The Studio in the rue de la Condamine* (1869–70, Fig.98) – a space into which one could imagine entering. Manet's space was rarely confrontational, but in both manner and means it was forever acting a dual role, creating its illusion and, at the same time, contradicting itself with its engagement at the surface.

Other visual influences which were absorbed to varying degrees by Manet and his avant-garde colleagues included the direct graphical qualities of popular imagery,⁷⁷ the potential of lithography as a potent artistic process,⁷⁸ and the simplicity of Japanese coloured woodblock prints, with their characteristic compositional freshness, angled spatial geometries, and interplay between spatial illusion and surface.⁷⁹ The exact circumstances by which the artists in Paris became aware of the woodblock prints are not certain, with conflicting claims for dates and personalities involved. And their influence on French art in Manet's time was looked upon with mixed reactions. One of the most influential in recognising the importance of the *ukiyo-e* prints and who popularised the movement he called 'Japonisme' was Philippe Burty, a close friend of Manet.⁸⁰ Together with others such as Félix Bracquemond, another of Manet's friends, Burty typified those who felt that Japanese art provided, among many other things, a fresh, alternative view to prevailing traditions. Edmond Duranty, a supporter of *la nouvelle peinture*, was not so enthusiastic, feeling that it had the potential to reduce French painting to the decorative and the ornamental.⁸¹ Although the extent of direct sources used by Manet is not certain, there are many evident correspondences, all of which involve some degree of interplay between pictorial space and surface. In spatial illusion terms, these include: surface patterning of elements in space,⁸² forms depicted with large areas of relatively

unmodulated colour;⁸³ vertical railings as space modulators;⁸⁴ direct application of oblique parallel geometries, with either one plane parallel (or almost parallel) to the picture plane,⁸⁵ or with no planes parallel to the picture plane;⁸⁶ accentuated perspectival recession;⁸⁷ and single, staged figures with various rotations of the head, hand gestures or actions.⁸⁸ Other paintings show no direct connection in terms of their spatial organisation, but rather are expressions of Japoniste fashion and accoutrements.⁸⁹ In all, no pattern of influence is evident from those works which involve a correspondence and it seems that Manet absorbed what he needed within the overriding requirements of his own work.

Although it reflected these contemporary pictorial influences and was a response to the milieu of his time, Manet's work was nonetheless seen, even in the climate of artistic change, to have been radically new and different. But, notwithstanding such an assessment, it did not ignore the past. Despite its appearance, Manet's unconventional imagery can be seen to have been structured for the most part on the traditional conventions of perspective and to thus provide the principal evidence of a point of conflation in Western painting, set between its past and future.⁹⁰ Rather than using it to see through the illusionistic 'transparency' of a painting's surface, which had falsely been seen by the Academicians as a time-honoured tradition, Manet idiosyncratically used perspective to position and enmesh his ambiguous and fragmented spatial illusion firmly within its surface and, in doing so, reclaimed the terrain of the painting's surface in its much more traditional role as a field of artistic negotiation.

The concept of the surface as a place of Manet's creative negotiation is in itself, however, not new.⁹¹ When writing in both historical as well as artistic terms on the nature of the surface in Manet's works, James H. Rubin, for example, stated in his Manet's Silence and the Poetics of Bouquets of 1994, that

Manet had not so much reduced a previously spatial conception of art (though that is the historical effect), as he had produced an art where contact between the creative self and the realm of its creativity... is maintained by treating the canvas as the supporting slab for materials represented by the paint.⁹²

For Rubin, "the defining element of Manet's painting... is no longer the frame but the surface", and "the canvas has become the stage for representation".⁹³ Believing that "no longer can one so confidently refer to the painting's field as a *space* – realm or site might be more appropriate",⁹⁴ Rubin suggests instead that the "space of uncertainty between the viewer and the picture is... the field within which Manet's painting silently operates".⁹⁵ The context, specificities and nuances of Rubin's notions of Manet's space and surface are, however, very different to this dissertation's proposals which see the illusion of space to be the very means by which the surface was reconstituted.

The way in which other avant-garde artists of Manet's time handled pictorial space in the midst of these new influences is of comparative interest. Even though pictorial dynamics were often exploited by other artists with uncustomary views influenced by photography, perspective remained the standard form of spatial geometry. And although the influence of lithography, popular imagery, and Japanese woodblock prints can be seen in compositional effects involving space in their paintings,⁹⁶ their main impact was rather in their prints, drawings and illustrations. It is of interest to note, however, that the ambiguity involved in the interplay between offset centres of vision and apparent angled views discussed above was not only of interest to Manet. But whereas such an interplay was covertly used by Manet for its ambiguity, its overt use by others often created a strangely distorted space for a painting's content.⁹⁷

Works of three very different artists who were all contemporaries of Manet, Edgar Degas (1834–1917), Paul Cézanne (1839–1906), and Gustave Caillebotte (1848–93), provide comparisons of particular interest with his spatial concepts.⁹⁸ The art of Degas, who was as mindful of the traditions of the Old Masters as Manet and as determined to revitalise painting, indicates a similar path, although one with some important pictorial differences.⁹⁹ Even though evidence of photography's influence can be seen in works such as *At the Races in the Countryside* (1869, Fig.100), the spatial constructs of his work during the 1860s remained somewhat conventional. During the 1870s, however, Degas was much more dynamic in his experimentations with perspective and space than Manet, even if more literal. His use of raised and lowered viewpoints to create views

with spaces set obliquely to the picture plane, placed an emphasis on the subject and introduced new issues for composition, as evident in *Mlle La La at the Cirque Fernando* (1879, Fig.101) and *Diego Martelli* (1879, Fig.102). The matched dynamics of composition and pictorial space as seen in Japanese woodblock prints seem much more evident in Degas' work than in Manet's and, with the pattern of its spatial indicators seen also as important compositional elements, create a very different kind of interplay between spatial illusion and surface.

Cézanne seems to have experimented with spatial geometries as much as anyone. In two frontal portraits, *Portrait de Louis-Auguste Cézanne* (1866, Fig.94), and *Portrait d'Achille Empereire* (c.1868, Fig.95), for example, a very clear influence of angled, parallel geometries from Japanese prints is evident, and a work not exhibited in Cézanne's lifetime, *Paul Alexis lisant à Émile Zola* (c.1869–70, Fig.96), not only gives surprising and further evidence of an angled geometry with the reclining figure of Zola, but shows as drastic a disjunction of pictorial space as anything by Manet to that time. In Origins of Impressionism, Henri Loyrette limited his assessment of this particular work to suggesting that "had it been exhibited, it would have promptly invited comparison with Manet because of its colors, the blacks and greens it owed to *Le Balcon*".¹⁰⁰ But the placement in that same text of its image adjacent to that of Manet's *Baudelaire's Mistress Reclining* (c.1862, Fig.13)¹⁰¹ (which, likewise, was not exhibited in Manet's lifetime), highlighted their similarly angled and fractured spaces, their brutally 'modern' and unsettling spatial ambiguity, and the extent to which Cézanne had at that time rejected conventions of perspectival space. In the 1870s, Cézanne, influenced at first by the Impressionistic techniques of Camille Pissarro (1831-1903), continued to fracture space but that unsettling, ambiguous quality so evident in *Paul Alexis lisant à Émile Zola* gave way to a more structured approach involving, in part, visual surface texture.

Compared with Degas and Cézanne, Caillebotte's use of an interplay between space and surface is limited, but his work is of general interest here with its often accentuated use of perspective, and of particular interest with the relationship between two of his paintings, *Dans un café* (1880, Fig.H1) and *Le Pont de l'Europe* (1876) and

two Manet paintings, *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* and *The Railway*, respectively. In contrast to Manet, Caillebotte accentuated spatial recession with perspective, particularly with his depiction of the plunging vistas of the new boulevards of Paris,¹⁰² and often negated any real interplay between space and surface by the somewhat obvious use of impasto pigment disengaged from the depicted space. There are, however, important points of connection between their works.

With its use of a mirrored double-reflection to choreograph an uncertain scene, Caillebotte's *Dans un café* has often been seen as a possible influence on Manet's later *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* of 1881–82.¹⁰³ Certainly *Dans un café* creates an ambiguous spatial interplay that has some similarities to Manet's work, and the analyses of both paintings here only enhance that possible influence (see Appendix 2(a) for the analysis of *Dans un café*, and Chapter 5(F) for the analysis of *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère*). In a reversed process of influence, Caillebotte's *Le Pont de l'Europe* suggests that it not only may have been influenced by Manet's *The Railway* of 1873, but that such an influence also raises the possibility that Manet and Caillebotte discussed their artistic processes in some detail. Such a possibility is discussed in Appendix 2(b).

With painting immediately after Manet taken in different directions by the later work of Degas, Cézanne, and Claude Monet (1840–1926), and by the developments of Vincent Van Gogh (1853–90), Paul Gauguin (1848–1903), and Georges Seurat (1859–91), the extent of Manet's impact or influence on his contemporaries and on those later developments and changes in painting into the twentieth century is very difficult to accurately evaluate. Even though he was seen as the leader of the 'new painting', and at least at the end of his life supported by many, there was no accord about the nature or worth of his art. At Manet's funeral, Degas was overheard to say that "Il était plus grand que nous le croyions!".¹⁰⁴ His innovations, recognised by some but usually seen as faults, were not able to be codified or carried on and developed by any would-be 'follower'. His friend Berthe Morisot (1841–95) and his only pupil, Eva Gonzalès (1849–83), were obviously directly influenced by the 'style' of his brushwork and the 'lightness' of his

palette but, for the most part, their works seem devoid of the *gravitas* underlying Manet's works or the *frisson* at their surfaces.

Scholars have also been uncertain about Manet's influence. The paintings of Cézanne and then of the Cubists have often been retrospectively seen as developments from Manet, but there seems little consensus in these assessments. In an article arguing against the multiple viewpoint theory for Cézanne and the Cubists, with its suggestion of the fragmenting and reforming of solids, John Adkins Richardson¹⁰⁵ has claimed that Braque and Picasso, as the two most important cubists, created "pictures from discontinuous fragments and elements of marks",¹⁰⁶ and that "from its very first appearance in the nineteenth century, modernism in painting has been to a greater or lesser extent concerned with the fragmentation of visible wholes."¹⁰⁷ To counter a connection with what he saw as the predictable raising of the multiple viewpoint theory to explain Manet's *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère*, Richardson offered the even more predictable explanation for its disjunction of the mirror reflection that the man with whom the barmaid is engaged in conversation should "block our view of her – unless we are meant to identify with him as spectator".¹⁰⁸ For Richardson "modernity is full of shatterings of visual reality".¹⁰⁹ In a response to Richardson's proposition, Nan Stalnaker¹¹⁰ agreed that Cézanne "did not cut up and recombine pieces of traditional space", but that

"he was... working with an idea of pictorial space, which originated with Manet, that rejects single viewpoint perspective as the basis for painting composition. In this new understanding of space, multiple viewpoints were tolerated in a way they were not in traditional pictorial representation."¹¹¹

But in describing this new space in terms posited by Stéphane Mallarmé in 1876,¹¹² Stalnaker claimed that Manet gave priority to the interaction of tones rather than to that of perspective.¹¹³

Such a discourse illustrates the problems in the perceptions of Manet's historical position. Both Richardson's rejection of Manet's possible use of multiple viewpoints and Stalnaker's perception of it in tonal rather than perspectival terms are conceptual speculations, without a confirmation or otherwise of their existence, the means by which

they may have been used, or their artistic purpose. If it had been known in Manet's time, or soon after, that many of his images used multiple viewpoints with perspectival interaction for purposes of spatial ambiguity, the question can be asked whether it would have changed the nature and extent of his influence? But these processes that Manet used were not identified, discussed, or copied, and the uncertainty and speculation that have dominated the assessments of his art have ensured that it has been in constant reappraisal by scholars and not codified to become an icon of influence. And certainly in the last decades of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth, more profoundly influential agencies other than Manet's work were involved. The development of non-Euclidean space and its relationship with time as the fourth dimension,¹¹⁴ the explorations into the domain of the psyche, and the socio-political events within Europe as it stumbled towards the First World War were major influences on philosophy, art, and popular imagination, and their impact far outweighed any possible direct or latent influence on the directions of painting from Manet.

The most relevant, apposite, and longer-term perception of Manet's influence on the direction of painting was incorporated in the retrospective propositions made by Clement Greenberg in his essay of 1961, 'Modernist Painting'.¹¹⁵ The proposition that "Manet's paintings became the first Modernist ones by virtue of the frankness with which they declared the surfaces on which they were painted"¹¹⁶ set Manet's art at the vanguard of Modernist art and into a position of influence on all avant-garde art into the twentieth century. Notwithstanding the limited viewpoint from which it was written, Greenberg's essay reassessed Manet's art and its influence, both historically and pictorially, in an unprecedented way and in unambiguous terms, and in the process raised questions about illusion and surface. It also initiated a diverse and important discourse about Manet's artifice and the surface of his paintings which has continued to the present.

2. PICTORIAL PERSPECTIVES: Notes

DISSERTATION: Volume 2, pp.3–10

NOTES

[\[p.3 of dissertation here\]](#)

1. Clement Greenberg, 'Modernist Painting', in Art in Theory: 1900–1990, eds. Charles Harrison and Paul Wood, Blackwell, Oxford and Cambridge, Mass., 1993, p.755.

[\[p.4 of dissertation here\]](#)

2. Relevant aspects of the underlying geometry of perspective and its practice are discussed in Appendix 1.
 For study of pictorial space in Western art, including perspective, see:
 William M. Ivins, Jr., Art & Geometry: A Study In Space Intuitions, Dover Publications, New York, 1964 (1946);
 John White, The Birth and Rebirth of Pictorial Space, Faber and Faber, London, 1957 (1967; 1972; Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1987);
 Sidney J. Blatt, in collab. with Ethel S. Blatt, Continuity and Change in Art: The Development of Modes of Representation, Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, N.J., 1984;
 and, William V. Dunning, Changing Images of Pictorial Space: A History of Spatial Illusion in Painting, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, N.Y., 1991.
 For historical and theoretical studies of linear perspective, see:
 Samuel Y. Edgerton, The Renaissance Rediscovery of Linear Perspective, Basic Books, New York, 1975;
 Pierre Descargues, Perspective, trans. I. Mark Paris, Harry N. Abrams, New York, 1977;
 Marco Chiarini, 'Renaissance Space and the Birth of Perspective in Painting', in Space in European Art, E.H. Gombrich et al., exh. cat., The National Museum of Western Art, Tokyo, 1987, pp.127–34; and, Martin Kemp, The Science of Art: Optical themes in Western Art from Brunelleschi to Seurat, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1990.
3. For historical study of Greco-Roman space, see: Ivins 1964 (as in n.2), Ch.2 – Greek Art, pp.10–37, Ch.2 – Greek Geometry, pp. 38–48, Ch.9 – The Greeks Again, and What They Missed, pp.95–104; Blatt, 1984 (as in n.2), pp.124–59; White 1957 (as in n.2), Ch.16 – 'Spatial Design in Antiquity', pp.236–73; and, Dunning 1991 (as in n.2), pp.1–9.
4. For historical study of Medieval space, see: Blatt 1984, pp.159–90; and, Dunning 1991, pp.10–15.
5. For commentary on Cimabue's space, see: White 1957, pp.23–30; and, Dunning 1991, pp.15–19.
6. For commentary on Duccio's space, see: White *ibid.*, pp.78–83.
7. For commentary on Giotto's space, see: White *ibid.*, pp.57–77; and, Dunning 1991, pp.26–34.
8. For historical study of Renaissance space, see: William M. Ivins, Jr., On the Rationalisation of Sight, with an Examination of Three Renaissance Texts of Perspective, Metropolitan Museum of Art Papers No.8, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1938 (De Capo, New York, 1973); Blatt 1984, pp.197–241:

- Marco Chiarini, 'Renaissance Space and the Birth of Perspective in Painting', in Space in European Art, E.H. Gombrich et al., exh. cat., The National Museum of Western Art, Tokyo, 1987, pp.127–34; Decio Gioseffi, 'Italy's Contribution: Perspective and the Renaissance', *ibid*, pp.135–44; and, Dunning 1991, pp.35–88.
9. For historical and theoretical discussions of Brunelleschi and perspective, see: White 1957, pp.113–21; Martin Kemp, 'Science, Non-science and Nonsense: The Interpretation of Brunelleschi's Perspective', Art History, v.1, no.2, June, 1978, pp.134–61; and, Kemp 1990 (as in n.2), pp.11–14, 344–45.
 10. For historical and theoretical discussions of Masaccio's works, see: White 1957, pp.135–41; Kemp 1990, pp.16–21; and, Dunning 1991, pp.57–68.
 11. For historical and theoretical discussions of Alberti's 1435 treatise De Pittura, see: Ivins 1938 (as in n.8, above), pp.14–27; White 1957, pp.121–26; and, Kemp 1990, pp.21–24.
 12. For historical and theoretical discussions of Uccello's works, see: White 1957, pp.202–07.
 13. For historical and theoretical discussions of della Francesca's works, particularly *Flagellation of Christ*, c.1460, and treatise, De Prospectiva pingendi, c.1474, see: Marilyn Aronberg Lavin, Piero della Francesca: The Flagellation, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1972 (1990); James Elkins, "Piero della Francesca and the Renaissance Proof of Linear Perspective", The Art Bulletin, v.69, no.2, 1987, pp.220–30; and, Kemp 1990, pp.26–35, including the analysis of part of *Flagellation of Christ*; and, Laura Geatti and Luciano Fortunati, 'The *Flagellation of Christ* by Piero della Francesca: A Study of its Perspective', Leonardo, v.25, no.3/4, 1992, pp.361–67.
 14. For historical and theoretical discussions of da Vinci's application of perspective, see: White 1957, pp.207–15; Kemp 1990, pp.44–52, including analyses of *Annunciation*, c.1472–3, and *Last Supper*; c.1497; and, Dunning 1991, pp.71–82.
 15. For historical and theoretical discussions of Durer's works and treatise Unterweysung der Messung, 1525, see: Ivins 1938, pp.34–43; and, Kemp 1990, pp.53–61, including an analysis of *St. Jerome in His Study*, 1514, engraving.
 16. Such a description by Elkins is set within his wonderfully erudite chapter, 'Demonstration, Play, Arcanum', which examines "the Renaissance exploration of perspective" in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (James Elkins, The Poetics of Perspective, Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 1996, pp.117–80).
 17. Martin Kemp (Kemp 1990, pp.36–40) has analysed the two predella panels, *The Selling of the Host*, on the left, and *The Jew's Attempt to Destroy the Host*, on the right, in terms of the evident preliminary and final geometries. Kemp notes that in *The Jew's Attempt to Destroy the Host* the vanishing point offset to the right "results in a plunging system of space in which the scene is viewed from a standpoint outside the house" (*ibid.*, p.38), but does not connect that observation to the way in which the geometry ambiguously makes the view of the interior as if an angled one with a sense of its own centre of vision different to the actual centre of vision for the work.

[\[p.5 of dissertation here\]](#)

James Elkins, also without commenting on its spatial ambiguity, has suggested that although Uccello may have "meant his construction to have narrative meaning... it is more likely that he thought of it as a construction, with a more general dramatic meaning." (Elkins 1996 (as in n.16), pp.147–48).

18. James Elkins has suggested that the Mannerists "disassembled, sheared, and disjointed perspective without abandoning the theatrical perspective box they inherited from the earlier Renaissance" (Elkins 1996, p.154), and detailed how artists such as Pontormo and Bronzino used offset viewpoints in the details of paintings to make them "unsettling and hard to read" (*id.*).

19. The painting gives evidence that, in the process of its making, Titian was aware of the potential for an offset viewpoint to provide different spatial readings of the same work. David Rosand, in his essay 'Titian and Pictorial Space', explained such a duality as a site-specific function:

Situated on an altar along the left wall of the church, the *Pesaro Madonna* is visible along the length of the nave; the picture must function both as wall painting and as altarpiece, accessible from a diagonal approach as well as frontally. In accommodating this double routing, Titian designed a radically asymmetrical composition. In its several early versions, revealed in X-ray examination, he conceived an ambitious architectural perspective, with the vanishing point well off to the left of the field; the Madonna and Child were enthroned to the right beneath a vaulted canopy that seemed, when viewed on the diagonal from the left, a transept extension of the nave of the Frari itself.

(David Rosand, 'Titian and Pictorial Space', in *Titian. Prince of Painters*, ed. Susanna Biadene, exh. cat, Prestel-Verlag, Munich, 1990, p.97)

The suggestion that the different spatial reading was for practical site-specific needs does not preclude that Titian was aware of the painting's potential for spatial ambiguity. In more general terms, Rosand also stated that Titian showed a "general reluctance to exploit orthogonal recession; rather, deliberately countering the spatial momentum of perspective construction, ... [to favour] a shallow foreground stage" (ibid., p.95). Such a reluctance is similarly evident in Manet's handling of space.

20. e.g. Andrea del Castagno, *Last Supper*, 1447.
21. e.g. Piero della Francesca, *Flagellation of Christ*, c.1460; and, Melozzo da Forli, *Sixtus IV Appointing Platina*, 1474–77.
22. e.g. Raphael, *School of Athens*, 1510–11.
23. e.g. Perugino, *Giving of the Keys to St. Peter*, 1481; and, Titian, *Presentation of the Virgin*, 1534–38.
24. e.g. *Creation of Sun, Moon, and Plants*, 1511 (ceiling fresco detail, Sistine Chapel, Vatican, Rome).
25. David Rosand 1990 (as in n.19), pp.94–5.
26. For a discussion of Pélerin's book, see: Ivins 1938, 27–34; Kemp 1990, pp.65–6.
27. For a theoretical discussion of Cousin's book, see: Kemp ibid., pp.67–68.
28. For this writer, the earliest cogent exposition of perspective's underlying principle is provided in the drawing by Guidobaldo del Monte in 1600 as part of the original proof and definition of the *punctum concursus* (vanishing point) in his "Problema Proposito", bk.2.54 (see, James Elkins, *The Poetics of Perspective*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 1996, p.113). All methods and procedures of perspective, no matter how complex, have this spatial geometry as their basis. William M. Ivins, however, suggested that del Monte "summed up the perspective knowledge of the sixteenth century and worked out a number of elaborate variations but seemingly added little to the basic theory", and proposed that it was Girard Desargues in the 1630s who "opened the way to both the perspective and descriptive geometries" (Ivins 1938, p.10).
29. e.g. Jacopo Pontormo, *Entombment*, 1525–28.
30. For historical discussion of pictorial space of the Mannerists, the Baroque and Rococo periods, and of pictorial space in general in European art from the sixteenth century to the eighteenth century, see: Blatt 1984, 'Mannerism', 'The Baroque', and 'Parallel Development in Renaissance and Baroque Art and Science', pp.241–89; James Elkins, 'Mannerism: Deformation of the Stage', *Storia dell'arte*, v.67, 1989, pp.257–62; Dunning 1991, Ch.8 – The Baroque Age, pp.89–100, Ch.9 – The Rococo Age, pp.101–114; Paul Philippot, 'Space in the Art of Northern Europe in the 16th Century', in *Space in European Art*, E.H. Gombrich et al., exh.

- cat., The National Museum of Western Art, Tokyo, 1987, pp.169–177; Konrad Renger, 'Space in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Art', *ibid.*, pp.199–208; and, Norman Bryson, 'Transformations in Rococo Space', in Word and Image: French Painting in the Ancien Régime, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1981, pp.89–121.
31. For discussion of space in the work of Caravaggio, see: Frank Stella, 'Caravaggio', in Working Space, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1986, pp.1–22; and, Dunning 1991, pp.96–100.
 32. See: Kemp 1990, pp.126–28, for perspectival analyses of Poussin's works, such as *Holy Family on the Steps* (c.1646), which show that the perspective of their apparent geometrical solidity "has been constructed with decidedly non-Euclidean approximations" (*ibid.*, p.127).
 33. See references in n.30.
 34. James Elkins, 'Clarification, Destruction and Negation of Pictorial Space in the Age of Neo-Classicism, 1750–1840', Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte, v.56, no.4, 1990, p.577.
 35. *ibid.*, p.578.

[\[p.6 of dissertation here\]](#)

36. For discussion of anamorphosis and *The Ambassadors*, see: Kemp 1990, pp.208–11.
 37. George Mauner seems to have been the first to suggest such an influence, writing in 1975 that

In his letter to Fantin-Latour from Madrid, Manet mentions the *Meninas* as a 'tableau extraordinaire,' yet there had been no direct reference to it in his earlier work. But this self-portrait, while clearly linking himself as a personality to Velasquez, does not exhaust his use of *Las Meninas*. In fact the painting in its concept and structure may have been the initial stimulus for... *Un Bar aux Folies-Bergères [sic]*.

 (George Mauner, Manet, Peintre-Philosophe: A Study of the Painter's Themes, The Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park, Penn., and London, 1975, p.151).
 38. Joel Snyder, and Ted Cohen, 'Reflexions on *Las Meniñas*: Paradox Lost', Critical Inquiry, v.7, no.2, Winter, 1980, p.430.
 39. e.g. Louis Bretez, La perspective pratique de l'architecture,...., Paris, 1706; Edme-Sébastien Jaurat, Traité de Perspective à l'usage des artistes,...., Paris, 1750; Pierre-Henri de Valenciennes, Elémens de perspective pratique à l'usage des artistes,...., Paris, 1800; Jean-Thomas Thibault, Application de la perspective linéaire aux arts du dessin, Paris, 1827; Adèle Le Breton, Traité de perspective simplifiée (linéaire), Paris, 1828 (including perspective in mirrors); Charles Pierre Joseph Normand, Parallèle de diverses méthodes du dessin de la perspective,...., Paris, 1833; Joseph-Alphonse Adhèmar, Traité de Perspective à l'usage des artistes, Paris, 1836; and Charles Blanc, Grammaire des arts du dessin, Paris, 1867 (1876).
- James Elkins has suggested in his article, 'Clarification, Destruction and Negation of Pictorial Space in the Age of Neo-Classicism, 1750–1840' (Elkins 1990 (as in n.34), pp.560–82), that from the middle of the eighteenth century perspective manuals developed two opposing tendencies, with a "split between the practical and the mathematical" (*ibid.*, p.561). On the one hand the diagrams and mathematics became so complicated that the manuals were of little practical use, and on the other there was a simplification of space with the "revival of the perspective box – taken more from High Renaissance compositions such as the *School of Athens* than from compositionally similar mid-fifteenth century experiments" (*ibid.*, pp.574–5). Such a split, Elkins stated, "was gradually erased

- by the adoption of a standard method in the second half of the nineteenth century" (ibid., p.580).
40. For an excellent historical and technical coverage of the *camera obscura* and other optical devices, see: Kemp 1990, pp.188–217.
An analytical technique of interest for this dissertation has been used by Philip Steadman in examining the possible use of a *camera obscura* by the Dutch artist Johannes Vermeer (1632-75). In an initial essay ('In the studio of Vermeer', in The Artful Eye, eds. Richard Gregory et al., Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1995, pp.353–372), and a recently published book, Vermeer's Camera. Uncovering the Truth Behind the Masterpieces (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2001), Steadman has analysed in detail the probability that, in translating a scene to canvas, Vermeer had used a *camera obscura* with a lens set at the viewpoints for his paintings, in order to project an image onto a wall in the room where it could be traced. But rather than limiting the analysis to the optical geometry involved, Steadman has used virtual reconstructions and scaled reconstructions for purposes of analysis and confirmation.
 41. For an excellent coverage of photography's relationship to the traditional arts, see: Peter Galassi, 'Before Photography', in Before Photography: Painting and the Invention of Photography, exh. cat., Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1981, pp.11–31; and for further discussion, Helmut Gernsheim, Creative Photography: Aesthetic Trends 1839–1960, Faber and Faber, London, 1962; Aaron Scharf, Art and Photography, Penguin Books, London, 1983; and, W. Rotzler, Photography as Artistic Experiment: from Fox Talbot to Moholy-Nagy, Amphoto, New York, 1976.
 42. Many of these aspects are raised by Aaron Scharf in discussing the influence of photography on Impressionism and Edgar Degas (Scharf 1983 (as in n.41), pp.165–209).
 43. For discussion of Manet's use of photography, see n.50.
 44. Interestingly, the principles underlying the *chambre photographique* are little different to those of the standard camera used by professional photographers today, known variously as the 'view', 'four by five', or 'large format' camera. For a description of the camera, see: Robert G. Mason, and Norman Snyder, eds., The Camera, Time Life Books, New York, 1970, p.67. Such a camera was used to take the photographs (Figs.F48, F49, and F50) included in this dissertation as a demonstration of the bar set-up for *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère*.
 45. Most examples of perspective correction in nineteenth-century French photographs seen by this writer have been for vertical parallel lines, typically of tall structures, rather than for the correction of horizontal parallel lines. Certainly a correction of horizontal lines would not be required as often, as the opportunity to be positioned frontally to a plane at ground level is much easier than to the facade of a tall building. Additionally, unless the distortion is obvious, or lines exist which signal the spatial shaping, the ability to readily identify such a photograph would be less likely than with a photograph correcting vertical lines.
 46. The principle involved is certainly not limited to spatial constructions related to horizontal lines parallel to the photographic plate. The adjustment of angled lines in space in a photographic image taken by a *chambre photographique* has been used to explain an adjustment made by Manet in *The Railway* (see Chapter 5(D)).

[\[p.7 of dissertation here\]](#)

47. O.G. Rejlander invented the technique of composite photographs in England to create large allegorical images to match the compositions of paintings. His first such photograph, *The Two Ways of Life*, 1857, used thirty seven separate negatives, with the image printed directly onto the sensitive paper. His experiments in the photomontage of images from separate negatives also produced "ghost photographs", as seen in his *Hard Times*, 1860, with a fusion of the

separate images. The composite technique was developed by Henry Peach Robinson but, in contrast to Rejlander, as a photo-montage with separate printed images cut-and-pasted together to fit a predetermined composition with the joins made invisible. His early successful works included *Fading Away*, 1858, made up from five negatives, and *The Lady of Shalott*, 1861, from two negatives. Although criticised and seen by many at the time, and since, as an artificial photographic technique, its potential to liberate the image-making processes for artists was confirmed with parallel developments in painting into the twentieth century. For details and images of the works of Rejlander and Robinson, see: Gernsheim 1962 (as in n.41), pp.77–83; Rotzler 1976 (as in n.41), p.77; and, Scharf 1983, 'Composite Pictures', pp.108–13.

Manet's clear use of composite, cut-and-paste imagery from the early 1860s seems a direct development, no matter how circuitous the influence, from such a technique.

48. Scharf 1983, p.109.

49. For a study of the relationship between photography and Realism, see: Robert A. Sobieszek, 'Photography and the Theory of Realism in the Second Empire: A Reexamination of a Relationship', in One Hundred Years of Photographic History, ed. Van Deren Coke, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, 1975, pp.146–59.

From very different positions, notions of actuality and reality in terms of photography are raised by: Roland Barthes in his 1980 essay, 'Camera Lucida; Reflections on Photography', Camera Lucida; Reflections on Photography, trans. Richard Howard, Hill and Wang, New York, 1981; and, Linda Nochlin, Realism, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1990, p.44.

50. The works of Manet which have been proposed, with some evidence, to have been directly influenced by photographic images include: *Edgar Allan Poe*, 1861–62?, etching; *Portrait of Charles Baudelaire*, 1865, etching; and the portraits of Emperor Maximilian, and Generals Miramon, Mejia, and Diaz, as used in *The Execution of Maximilian*, 1867–69. Many other works by Manet have been speculated by various scholars to have been indirectly influenced by photography, and the nature and variations of these speculations add to the sense that Manet's use of photographic imagery was an extensive one. For these proposals and speculations, see: Beatrice Farwell, Manet and the Nude: A study in Iconography in the Second Empire, Garland Publishing, New York and London, 1981 (Ph.D. Diss., 1973), 'Photography', pp.125–35, in 'Manet and Baudelaire', pp.178–79, in 'Déjeuner sur l'herbe: Evolution and Analysis', p.195, 'Olympia: Evolution and Analysis', p.205; Anne Coffin Hanson, Manet and the Modern Tradition, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1979 (1977), Ch.6 – Photography, pp.193–96; Scharf 1983, pp.62–75; Juliet Wilson-Bareau, et al., Manet: The Execution of Maximilian: Painting, Politics & Censorship, exh. cat., National Gallery Publications, London, 1992, pp.38, 49, 52–3, 58, 59; Michael Fried, Manet's Modernism: or, The Face of Painting in the 1860s, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1996, text: pp.323–26, notes: pp.583–85; Jean Adhémar, 'Le *Portrait de Baudelaire* gravé par Manet', La Revue des Arts, no.4, December, 1952, pp.240–42; Aaron Scharf, and André Jammes, 'Le réalisme de la photographie et la réaction des peintres', L'Art de France, v.4, 1964, pp.174–191; Gerald Needham, 'Manet, Olympia, and Pornographic Photography', in Woman as Sex Object: Studies in Erotic Art, eds. Thomas B. Hess, and Linda Nochlin, Newsweek, New York, 1972 (1973), pp.81–9; Larry L. Ligo, '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, pp.66-74; Larry L. Ligo, 'The *Luncheon in the Studio*: Manet's Reaffirmation of the Influences of Baudelaire and Photography upon his Work', Arts Magazine, v.61, no.5, January, 1987, pp.46–51; Larry L. Ligo, 'Manet's *Le Vieux Musicien*: An Artistic Manifesto Acknowledging the Influences

- of Baudelaire and Photography upon his Work', Gazette des Beaux-Arts, s.6, v.110, December, 1987, pp.232–38; Stephen Bann, 'The Odd Man Out: Historical Narrative and the Cinematic Mode', History and Theory: Studies in the Philosophy of History, no.26 (The Representation of Historical Events), 1987, pp.56–60; Atsushi Miura, 'La vision photographique dans *Combat de taureaux* de Manet', Revue de l'art, no.79, 1988, pp.73–75; and, Larry L. Ligo, 'Baudelaire's Mistress Reclining and *Young Woman Reclining in Spanish Costume*: Manet's Pendant Portraits of his Acknowledged "Mistresses," Baudelairean Aesthetics and Photography', Arts Magazine, January, 1988, pp.76–85.
51. Michael Fried, Absorption and Theatricality: Painting and Beholder in the Age of Diderot, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1988, p.88.
 52. *ibid.*, p.89.
 53. *ibid.*, p.89.
 54. *ibid.*, p.268.
 55. Zacharie Astruc, Le Salon intime: Exposition au boulevard des Italiens, Paris, 1860, p.65. Quoted from: Fried 1996, p.558-n.8.
 56. Eugène Delacroix, 'L'Idéal et le réalisme', L'Artiste, 1 June, 1868, p.339. Quoted from: Fried 1996, p.558-n.11.

[\[p.8 of dissertation here\]](#)

57. Théodore Pelloquet, L'Exposition: Journal du Salon de 1863, no.22, 23 July, 1863. Quoted from: Fried 1996, p.560-n.20.
58. Fried 1996, p.575-n.115.
59. Jules Castagnary, 'Salon de 1864', Le Grand Journal, no.11, 12 June, 1864, p.3.
60. Jules Castagnary, 'Salon de 1870', Salons (1857–1879), G. Charpentier & E. Fasquelles, Paris, 1892, v.1, p.429.
61. Zacharie Astruc, Le Salon de 1863. Quoted from: Fried 1996, p.448.
62. *id.*
63. *id.*
64. *id.*
65. *id.*
66. Fried 1996, p.449.
67. Fried 1996, pp.481,482-n.97.
68. Gonzague Privat, Place aux jeunes! Causeries critiques sur le Salon de 1865, Paris, 1865, p.136. Quoted from: Fried 1996, p.559-n.13.
69. Privat, *ibid.*, pp.65–66. Quoted from: Fried 1996, p.559-n.17.
70. Fried 1996, p.271.
71. *ibid.*, p.482.
72. For discussion of the physical transformation of Paris during the Second Empire under the supervision of Baron Haussmann, and its influence on painting, see: Stephen F. Eisenman, 'Edouard Manet and Haussmannization', in Nineteenth Century Art: A Critical History, Thames and Hudson, London, 1994, pp.238–41. The most relevant description of the physical, social and cultural world of Paris in Manet's time is given in Robert L. Herbert's Impressionism: Art, Leisure & Parisian Society, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1988. Also, see: Theodore Reff, Manet and Modern Paris, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., 1982; T.J. Clark, The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and his Followers, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1986 (1984); Theodore Reff, 'Manet and the Paris of His Time', in Kunst um 1800 und die Folgen. Werner Hofmann zu Euren. Sonderdruck, Prestel-Verlag, Munich, 1988, pp.247–62; Barbara Stern Shapiro, Pleasures of Paris : Daumier to Picasso, exh. cat., Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, in assoc. with David R. Godine, Boston, 1991; and, Otto Friedrich, Olympia: Paris in the Age of Manet, Aurum Press, London, 1992.
73. " 'Être vrai', telle est sa formule", as remembered by Antonin Proust (Antonin Proust, Edouard Manet: Souvenirs, L'Échoppe, Paris, 1996, p.94).

74. See: Stephen F. Eisenman, 'Manet and the Impressionists', in Eisenman 1994 (as in n.72), pp.238–54.
75. e.g. Jacques Joseph Tissot, *Jeunes Femmes regardant des objets japonais*, 1869 (reproduced in Christopher Wood, *Tissot*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1986, Figure 28, p.39)
76. As seen in journals, e.g. Edmond-Charles-Joseph Yon, *La Grenouillère*, engraving, *L'Illustration*, 16 August, 1873 (reproduced in Francis Frascina, et al., *Modernity and Modernism: French Painting in the Nineteenth Century*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, in assoc. with The Open University, 1993, pl.169, p.178), and posters, e.g. Fig.F12.
77. For an excellent coverage of the role of journalistic illustration in the work of artists in Manet's time, see: Joel Isaacson, 'Impressionism and Journalistic Illustration', *Arts Magazine*, v.56, June, 1982, pp.95–115; and, for discussion of the role of popular imagery in Manet's work, see: Anne Coffin Hanson, 'Popular Imagery and the Work of Edouard Manet', in *French 19th Century painting and literature*, ed. Ulrich Finke, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1972, pp.133–63.
78. For discussion of Manet's role in the development of lithography in the nineteenth century and his use of its artistic potential, see: Frances Carey, and Antony Griffiths, *from Manet to Toulouse-Lautrec, French Lithographs 1860–1900*, exh. cat., British Museum Publications, London, 1978, including introductory essays, pp.11–20, and Manet catalogue entries, pp.32–44; and, for historical and technical details of individual Manet lithographs, see: Juliet Wilson, 'Lithographies', in *Manet: Dessins, aquarelles, eaux-fortes, lithographies, correspondance*, exh. cat., Galerie Huguette Berès, Paris, 1978, unpaginated, cat. nos.73–90.
79. For concise explanations of the circumstances and nature of the influence of Japanese woodblock prints in France from 1854, see: Gabriel P. Weisberg, et al., 'Aspects of Japonisme', in *Japonisme: Japanese Influence on French Art 1854–1910*, exh. cat., The Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland, 1975, pp.120–30; Klaus Berger, *Japonisme in Western Painting from Whistler to Matisse*, trans. David Britt, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and New York, 1992 (1980), pp.1–19; and, Michel Melot, 'The Discovery of Japan', *The Impressionist Print*, trans. Caroline Beamish, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1996, pp.90–94.
- For discussion of the possible influence of Japanese woodblock prints on Manet, see: Colta Feller Ives, 'Edouard Manet' in *The Great Wave: The Influence of Japanese Woodcuts on French Prints*, exh. cat., Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1974, pp.23–33; Klaus Berger, 'Edouard Manet (1832–83)', in Berger *ibid.*, pp.20–33; Siegfried Wichmann, 'Manet', in *Japonisme, the Japanese influence on Western art since 1858*, trans. Mary Whittall, James Ramsay, Helen Watanabe, Cornelius Cardew, and Susan Bruni, Thames and Hudson, London, 1981, pp.22–5; Anne Coffin

[\[p.9 of dissertation here\]](#)

- Hanson, 'Japanese Art', in *Manet and the Modern Tradition*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1977 (second printing, with corrections, 1979), pp.185–92; and, Jacques Dufwa, 'Manet', in *Winds from the East: A Study in the Art of Manet, Degas, Monet, Whistler*, Almquist & Wiksell International, Stockholm, and Humanities Press, Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1981, pp.51–82.
80. For a description of Burty's influence on the exposure of Japanese art and culture to Manet's Paris, see: Gabriel P. Weisberg, 'Philippe Burty and a critical Assessment of Early "Japonisme" ', in *Japonisme in Art: An International Symposium*, ed. Yamada Chisaburo, Committee for the Year 2001, Tokyo, 1980, pp.109–25.
81. Weisberg, 1980 (as in n.80), p.113.

82. e.g. Edouard Manet, *Sea View, Calm Weather*, 1864-65, and, Ando Hiroshige, *Sailing boats at Arai*, late 1840s, coloured woodcut, from series 'Fifty Three Views of the Tokaido' (Fig.87).
83. e.g. Edouard Manet, *The Fifer*, 1866, and, Katsukawa Shunei, *The Wrestler Tanikaze and his Pupil Taki-no-oto*, c.1796, coloured woodcut (Fig.88).
84. e.g. Edouard Manet, *The Railway*, and, Hokusai, *Azuma and Yogoro, two celebrated lovers*, c.1798, coloured woodcut (Fig.89).
85. e.g. Edouard Manet, *Portrait of Clemenceau at the Tribune*, 1879–80 (Fig.76), and, Harunobu (1725–70), *Courtesan with her attendant*, n.d., coloured woodcut (Fig.90).
86. e.g. Edouard Manet, the stool in *Portrait of Théodore Duret*, 1868 (Fig.43), and, Harunobu (1725–70), *Osen of the Kagiya serving tea to a customer*, n.d., coloured woodcut (Fig.91).
87. e.g. Edouard Manet, *Rue Mosnier Decorated with Flags, with a Man on Crutches*, 1878 (Fig.63), and, Ando Hiroshige, *Night Scene at Saruwaka-cho*, 1856–59, coloured woodcut, from series 'Famous Places in Edo: A Hundred Views' (Fig.92).
88. e.g. Edouard Manet, *Mlle V...in the Costume of an Espada*, and, Torii Kiyomasu I, *The Actor Nakamura Senya in the Role of Tokonotsu*, 1716, coloured woodcut (Fig.93).
89. e.g. Edouard Manet, *Lady with Fans*, 1873–4 (Fig.56).
90. The research development for this dissertation necessitated a re-assessment of some notions involving visual perception. Initially it was thought that the implications of visual perception would be influential, or of importance, in developing the outcomes of the research. This has not been the case. The original proposal for the thesis included the suggestion that Manet's use of spatial illusion in part broke a nexus between the perception of actual space with natural perspective and that of spatial illusion in a painting's surface with linear perspective, implying that the perception of spatial illusion involved a conceptual component. Such an implication had been influenced by the theoretical discourse on the perception of paintings and the related psychology of perception which had developed since the 1970s in art-related journals. Much of this discourse, involving writers such as Rudolf Arnheim, David Carrier, Nelson Goodman, E.H. Gombrich, Joel Snyder, David R. Topper, and Marx W. Wartofsky was, in part and at best, speculative and obviously was not keeping abreast of the more scientific research in visual perception. Further research for this thesis raised questions which required some objective evidence rather than the continuance of a speculative claim. Subsequent discussion with Professor Barbara J. Gillam, of the Department of Psychology, University of New South Wales, made it clear that the current understanding is that the processes involved in the perception of the *natural perspective* of actual space and the *linear perspective* of spatial illusion are the very same. As is noted here, the engagement of space within the surface of Manet's paintings still presents itself as a point of conflation between his past and future, but it is presented without the implication of the breaking of a nexus.
91. Other scholarly responses to the relationship of spatial illusion and surface in Manet's paintings are discussed in Chapter 3.
92. James H. Rubin, *Manet's Silence and the Poetics of Bouquets*, Reaktion Books, London, 1994, p.30.
93. id.
94. id.
95. *ibid.*, p.24.
96. As can be seen in Auguste Renoir's *Frédéric Bazille Painting "The Heron"* (1867, Fig.97), for example, with the parallel angling of the canvas on which Bazille is painting.
97. As can be seen in Carolus Duran's *The Merry-makers* (1870, Fig.99), for example, with one pair of table edges set parallel to the picture plane and the vanishing point for the other pair offset to be outside the painting format to the left (Fig.99a).

98. In the context of a discussion on the types of spaces used in the nineteenth century, see: Françoise Cachin's comparison of Manet's spaces with those of Degas and Cézanne in her essay 'The Variety of Space in Nineteenth-Century Art', in E.H. Gombrich et al., 1987, pp.235–41.
99. See: Dunning 1991, pp.124–29.
100. Gary Tinterow, and Henri Loyrette, Origins of Impressionism, exh. cat., The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1994, p.212.
101. *ibid.*, pp.212–13.
102. Noted by scholars, such as J. Kirk T. Varnedoe, in J. Kirk T. Varnedoe, and Thomas P. Lee, Gustave Caillebotte. A Retrospective Exhibition, exh. cat., The Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, 1976, p.67; and, Roseanne H. Lightstone, 'Gustave Caillebotte's oblique perspective: a new source for *Le Pont de l'Europe*', The Burlington Magazine, November, 1994, pp.759–62.
103. Varnedoe and Lee 1976 (as in n.102), p.146.

[\[p.10 of dissertation here\]](#)

104. Jacques-Emile Blanche, Propos de peintre: de David à Degas, Editions Émile-Paul Frères, Paris, 1919, p.144.
 105. John Adkins Richardson, 'On the "Multiple Viewpoint" Theory of Early Modern Art', The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, v.53, no.2, Spring, 1995, pp.129–37.
 106. *ibid.*, p.134.
 107. *ibid.*, p.135.
 108. *id.*
 109. *id.*
 110. Nan Stalnaker, 'Another Look at the "Multiple Viewpoint" Theory : A Reply to Richardson', The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, v.54, no.3, Summer, 1996, pp.287–90.
 111. *ibid.*, p.287.
 112. *ibid.*, p.288.
 113. *ibid.*, p.289.
 114. For discussion of the artistic responses to the theories, see: Linda Dalrymple Henderson, 'The Nineteenth-Century Background', in The Fourth Dimension and Non-Euclidean Geometry in Modern Art, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1983, ch.1, pp.3–43.
For a more specific discussion of the relationship of the theories and the Cubists, see: Giorgio de Marchis, 'The Fourth Dimension', in Space in European Art, E.H. Gombrich et al., exh. cat., The National Museum of Western Art, Tokyo, 1987, pp.257–277.
 115. Greenberg 1993 (as in n.1).
 116. *ibid.*, p.756.
-