

3. "Notorious history of modernism's concern for 'flatness'": Text

The proposition made by Clement Greenberg in his essay 'Modernist Painting' 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"¹ was set within the context of a discourse on Modernism's concern for "the ineluctable flatness" of a painting's support.² It not only inflected upon Manet's artifice and surface but also raised the notion that with Manet there had been a decisive change in painting. The re-appraisal of Manet's art in the ensuing debate initiated by the essay accepted its position of primacy but saw the nature of that change in terms that were different to those of Greenberg's Modernist formalism. T.J. Clark, for example, saw it as a change in the nature of representation, and Michael Fried saw it in terms of the relationship between a painting and its beholder. A discourse of the approaches taken by Greenberg, Clark, and Fried is set here against some of the underlying issues of this dissertation involving ambiguity, spatial illusion, and surface.

The notion of a change around Manet was confirmed and made explicit by Clark in the Introduction to The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and his Followers,³ where he stated that "Something decisive happened in the history of art around Manet which set painting and the other arts upon a new course".⁴ Such an assertion was set by Clark within a discourse on "a hierarchy of representations"⁵ involving 'class', 'ideology', and 'spectacle', and used as the prologue to a discussion on 'modernism'. The change in art at that time, reflecting a "scepticism... as to the nature of representation"⁶ involved the process of "constructing a likeness"⁷ and led, according to Clark, "on the one hand, to... putting a stress on the material means by which illusions and likenesses were made..., [and] on the other, to a new set of proposals as to the form representation should take".⁸ In these terms the contemporaneous perception of Mallarmé, "that painting shall be steeped again in its cause",⁹ was likened to assertions of Greenberg that "each art in the new age is thought obliged to determine through the

operations peculiar to itself, the effects peculiar and exclusive to itself".¹⁰ And one of those effects involved the "notorious history of modernism's concern for 'flatness' ".¹¹ Such a history has not only raised issues to do with surface and illusion within the formalist precepts of modernism, but it also has looked forward to the opposing critical position of the more recent contextualised negotiations such as class and gender, or theoretical concepts of the gaze and the observer, and backward to those pictorial transactions at play around Manet.

Clark suggested that a term of modernism such as 'flatness' should "not... be conceived as separate from the particular projects... in which [it is] restated"¹² in that the attraction for the "literal presence of surface"¹³ "must have been because it was made to stand for something: some particular and substantial set of qualities which took their place in a picture of the world",¹⁴ and that these "complex and compatible values"¹⁵ were provided by the "set of contexts for [avant-garde] art in the years between, say, 1860 and 1918".¹⁶ Within such contexts it was perceived that flatness was an "analogue of the 'Popular'"¹⁷ or a means to "signify modernity",¹⁸ that "painting would replace or displace the Real..., for reasons having to do with the nature of subjectivity, or city life, or the truths revealed by higher mathematics",¹⁹ or that the "unbrokenness of surface could be seen... as standing for the evenness of seeing itself, the actual form of our knowledge of things".²⁰ For Clark, "flatness... was these various meanings and valuations; they were its substance"²¹ and "was therefore in play – as an irreducible, technical fact of painting – with... all of these attempts to make it a metaphor".²² Although acknowledging that "it [flatness] resisted the metaphors"²³ and also became "an awkward, empirical quiddity",²⁴ Clark believed that "there was no fact without the metaphor".²⁵ Modernism, he claimed, denied the existence of its own circumstances, and that those "circumstances... were not modern, and only became so by being given the forms called 'spectacle' ".²⁶ Clark's use of the notion for flatness that "there was no fact without the metaphor" was exemplified by his reading of the reflection in the 'flatness' of the mirror in Manet's *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* as a metaphor for the detached "actual social circumstances" of the "plain as well as paradoxical" world of the 'modern'.²⁷ But Clark provided no explanation for

the *fact* of either the flatness or the mirror reflection. An opposite approach, that there is no metaphor without the *fact*, is taken in this dissertation. With Manet, it is proposed, his use of the interplay between spatial illusion and surface was a *fact* of the ambiguity that he created.

Greenberg's position on flatness as presented in 'Modernist Painting' was less concerned with contexts and metaphors and more with concepts of the materiality of art practice, but he had been the first to claim a decisive change around Manet with that 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".²⁸ Such an assertion came within Greenberg's articulation of Modernism, of how its "essence... lies in the use of the characteristic methods of a discipline to criticize the discipline itself"²⁹ and how "the stressing of the ineluctable flatness of the support... remained most fundamental in the processes by which pictorial art criticized and defined itself under Modernism".³⁰ He felt that "realistic, illusionist art had dissembled the medium, using art to conceal art"³¹ and had "sensed that it was necessary to preserve what is called the integrity of the picture plane: that is, to signify the enduring presence of flatness under the most vivid illusion of three-dimensional space".³² Greenberg suggested that this "apparent contradiction"³³ in the relationship between flatness and illusion, a relationship implicit in pictorial art, was simply reversed by Modernism, with "one [being] made aware of the flatness of their pictures before, instead of after, being made aware of what the flatness contains".³⁴ This reduction of the historical identifications of flatness and spatial illusion to a 'before or after' situation is a simplification that does not incorporate the sense that a surface has implicit within it the co-existence of the spatial illusion. Nevertheless, from a perspective almost supportive of Greenberg, and when commenting on Manet's *The Bar at the Folies-Bergère*, Clark was also able to state that "painting is a surface and should admit the fact".³⁵

Greenberg's use of the term 'flatness' was quite specifically related to a two-dimensionality, and although his interposed use of the term 'surface' did confuse his argument it introduced a far more relevant and telling description of the self-criticism of

Modernism and its relationship with the illusion of three-dimensional space. Greenberg felt that whilst "the Old Masters created an illusion of space into which one could imagine oneself walking, the illusion created by a Modernist is one into which one can only look, can travel only with the eye",³⁶ and that "it is a strictly pictorial, strictly optical third dimension".³⁷ Manet's manipulation of spatial illusion and surface has a resonance with such a proposition and reflects Greenberg's belief "that Modernism has never meant... a break with the past".³⁸

Michael Fried, who has seen the terrain of Manet's modernism as a "network of artistic issues"³⁹ which art history has failed to address, quoted both Greenberg and Clark in a discourse on the notion of Manet as the first modernist painter. In the 'Introduction' to his Manet's Modernism; or, The Face of Painting in the 1860s,⁴⁰ Fried suggested that Greenberg's account of modernism, involving the process at some point in the nineteenth century of the endangered arts "demonstrating that the kind of experience they provided was valuable in its own right",⁴¹ was not only open to serious objection, but that the process of the subsequent 'self-definition' meant "not only a relative indifference to considerations of subject matter"⁴² but also that "once under way..., although triggered by social developments..., [it] is conducted in a void".⁴³

Fried contrasted this with the way in which "the social historians of art understand the emergence of modernist painting in Paris in the 1860s and 1870s as responding to a distinctive experience of modernity".⁴⁴ That experience had been seen either as an "emphasis... on the increasingly dehumanized and dehumanizing aspects of life under commodity capitalism... [or] the rise of a 'society of spectacle' with its newly developed modes of entertainment, leisure activity, fashion, and display",⁴⁵ and for both of which "an experiencing subject is imagined as standing at a certain virtual distance from his surroundings, and in a sense from himself".⁴⁶ In Clark's definition of modernism, Fried read the uncertainty about representation to equate with that virtual distance, but he also recognised that Clark had seen in early modernism the stress on the materiality in the way in which "illusion and likenesses were made"⁴⁷ and the way in which "the norm of flatness [played] a crucial role not only in Manet's art but in subsequent modernist

painting".⁴⁸ Nonetheless, the insistence that it could not be understood apart from a context of meaning separates Clark, as well as Fried, from Greenberg.

What separates Fried from Clark is Clark's application of the modernist notion of 'flatness' and what Fried has seen as the lack in Clark's "social-historical accounts of Manet's achievement... [of] a sense of engagement with a constantly evolving network of artistic issues in relation to which or in interaction with which the social and/or political meaning of particular paintings is ultimately to be understood".⁴⁹ Both of these aspects are of interest here as both are involved with art practice and the issues to do with surface and implicit space.

For Fried, the pioneering of the "assertion of flatness is largely an artifact of Impressionism"⁵⁰ and "the notion that pictorial unity was essentially a surface affair did not emerge or did not fully emerge as the defining characteristic of modernist pictorial practice before the articulation of a distinctively Impressionist point of view in the early and mid-1870s".⁵¹ He conceded that

critics of the 1860s castigated Manet's pictures for their occasional failures of perspective, for the harshness with which figures and figure-groups were felt to stamp themselves out against their backgrounds, and... for their seeming incompleteness, their inexplicable lack of finish⁵²

but saw those features to "have been associated after the fact with the literal flatness of the support".⁵³ Zola's concession of a "resemblance between Manet's paintings and the popular engravings known as *gravures d'Epinal* as well as Japanese color woodblocks"⁵⁴ was countered by Fried with the fact that "he [Zola] insisted that seen from the proper distance Manet's paintings offered a coherent spatial illusion in which each object occupied its appropriate plane".⁵⁵

The domain, however, is a nuanced and imbricated one and the difficulties involved in Fried's uncertain positions were evident in an earlier article of 1964, 'Modernist Painting and Formal Criticism',⁵⁶ in which he stated

that the history of painting from Manet... may be characterized in terms of the gradual withdrawal of painting from the task of representing reality... in favor of an increasing preoccupation with problems intrinsic to painting itself.⁵⁷

This dissertation proposes that Manet sought to use, in reflexive speculation, those 'problems intrinsic to painting itself' as a more cogent means of 'representing reality'. There was, it is proposed, no withdrawal from one position in favour of the other. Interestingly, Greenberg's equating of the visuality or opticality in Manet and the Impressionists was elsewhere selectively and tenuously used by Fried to not only separate Manet's paintings of the 1860s from the later period,⁵⁸ but also to suggest that "the logic of Impressionism's indebtedness to Manet's pictures of the 1860s"⁵⁹ attributed Impressionism's simplification of the art of painting to those works. "Manet's quick acceptance of certain 'impressionist' means and ambitions"⁶⁰ obviously clouded, then and since, the issue.

What Fried proposed for these "tendencies in his [Manet's] work that lent themselves retroactively to being perceived in those terms"⁶¹ of 'flatness', was a different interpretation involving issues to do with the relationship between a painting and the beholder. Fried suggested that "Manet sought to acknowledge... the presence of the beholder"⁶² and that such an "acknowledgment holds the key to Manet's pictures' notorious 'flatness' "⁶³ in that it is the "product of an attempt to make the painting in its entirety... as a tableau – face the beholder as never before".⁶⁴ Such a concept is involved in Fried's wider considerations of *theatricality* and *absorption* and of Manet's references to past art, but it also gives evidence of his hypothesis about Manet's engagement with the "evolving network of artistic issues".⁶⁵ Certainly Fried's notions of theatricality and absorption are of interest in this dissertation, not only in terms of Manet's limitation of spatial recession and the consequent compression of space, but also in their relationship to Fried's considerations of *tableau* and *morceau*.⁶⁶ In terms of Fried's narrow sense of theatricality, however, the observer is seen to engage with a painting, and those depicted within it, *across* its surface, from the space of the stage to that of the audience. But Manet's engagement of space within the surface of his paintings, it is suggested, was intended to do the very opposite to that claimed by Fried, that is, to avoid any sense of borrowed theatrical artifice. An observer engages with the pictorial space of a Manet painting *within* its surface. The difference is an important one.

Notwithstanding their different approaches, the discourses of Greenberg, Clark and Fried are evidence of a retrospective view that Manet was at the vanguard of a fundamental change in the nature of painting. The notorious 'flatness' of his paintings, indicative of the surface upon which they had been painted, and variously seen by them in terms of its materiality, its function as metaphor, and its potential to engage the viewer, was at its centre. But the terrain of Manet's picture-making between materiality, metaphor, and viewer engagement, that is the artifice, has not been specified. And yet the crafting of that artifice is just as important for any consideration of Manet's influence on the change in painting's direction. Artifice is where medium and meaning intersect and it resides where the observer is engaged, *within* the painting's surface rather than on its "ineluctable flatness". It is proposed that Manet's desire for artistic truthfulness could only be achieved by a paradoxical 'truthfulness of artifice', and he achieved it with a characteristic ambiguity. An amalgam of circumstances and influences provided a background to his reconstitution of the surface of painting, and a major element of this reconstitution involved the engagement of spatial illusion *within* that surface.

These different approaches of Greenberg, Clark, and Fried, are also similar in that their readings of individual paintings used them only as points of reference for, or explanation of, a broader concept. The search for, or examination of, a crafted artifice within the surface of individual works was not their concern. Similarly, it has not been of particular concern in the wider field of Manet literature and scholarship. In a manner which reflects the nature of the art works themselves, that field has been a complex and problematic one, changing with both the passage of time and the currency of art historical orthodoxies and presenting a diverse and often contradictory range of responses and proposals. These diverse circumstances and approaches were well described by John House's opening comments in his essay, 'Manet's Naïveté', written as both background and introduction to the catalogue for the exhibition *The Hidden Face of Manet* in 1986.⁶⁷ House noted that

Critics and historians have rarely agreed on how to deal with Manet's art. In his own lifetime, hostile critics saw his paintings as the denial of true painting and its rules, whereas for his supporters they were a stream of life and light,

flooding across the artifices of studio and Salon art. The preoccupations of recent art historians have been very different; they have tended to focus on two aspects: on his so-called visual 'sources', and on attempts to decode the meaning of his paintings. The search for specific sources from past art for individual elements in Manet's paintings has at times become a sort of competition between historians, as ever more works of art have been brought into play as possible fuel for Manet's picture-making; but this focus on particular elements and particular comparisons has tended to obstruct discussions on the whole paintings whose parts are said to have been 'influenced'. In the search for meanings, the paintings have been presented as ever more complex programmes – either as philosophical allegories, or as documentaries whose 'real' meaning only the most dogged social historian can unravel.

The art-historical industry has certainly increased our information about aspects of Manet's art, but it has produced little agreement on how to approach the paintings themselves. Moreover it has diverted attention from a sustained study of their original contexts: the process of their physical making, their presentation alongside other pictures in the exhibitions where they were first shown, and the critical debates which grew up around them.⁶⁸

There may be, as House suggests, "little agreement on how to approach the paintings themselves", and the diversity of opinion may suggest that little consensus can exist. But there is a contradiction. It is surprising that many long-established propositions or beliefs about Manet's works, particularly those seen to be problematic and ambiguous, have continued to be accepted, unquestioned, and untested by scholars. With apparent agreement, the spatial ambiguities, for instance, have been considered structurally inexplicable and addressed with speculative fiction rather than fact or with the licence made available by uncertainty rather than the rigour required to probe for explanations in the work's original contexts. More recent art historical approaches which have contextualised a work from a position of the writer's own making have reinforced this practice. Irrevocably, the work has been subsumed by the author. This visibility of Manet's painting in the midst of the scholarship is an important issue for this dissertation, and is one which highlights the difference between those approaches which have examined the work as object and those which have seen the work as metaphor or as a vehicle to display the interpreter's own inclinations.

In Manet's own lifetime personal attacks were as widespread as those on his art, but the paintings themselves were nevertheless at the centre of such concerns, criticised as they were for their subject matter, lack of cohesive composition, limited tonal modelling, poor drawing, range and intensity of colours, lack of finish, incongruous mix

of scales, incorrect perspective, and improbable poses. Rather than seeing Manet's works as ambiguous, the critics were generally bemused by their lack of intelligibility and narrative. In amongst the critical outbursts made for over twenty years, there were some serious attempts to address their more complex implications with a degree of objectivity and a sensitive response. And there were those more outspoken writers, such as friends Émile Zola⁶⁹ and Stéphane Mallarmé,⁷⁰ who recognised the originality of Manet's paintings and wrote specific articles in support of his cause. Although aspects such as spatial illusion, surface or ambiguity were rarely considered in any of the critiques, reference was made to the related concerns of pictorial coherence and finish, flattened forms, scale, fragmentation, and perspective.

In reviews of *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe* at the 1863 Salon des Refusés, Ernest Chesneau had written that "M. Manet aura du talent le jour où il saura le dessin et la perspective",⁷¹ Le Capitaine Pompilius wrote that "vous n'y verriez,... qu'une surprenante, qu'une admirable ébauche",⁷² whereas Théodore Pelloquet wrote that "On ne saurait désigner le travail de M. Manet sous le nom d'esquisse ou d'ébauche... L'incohérence, l'inégalité d'exécution de M. Maner [sic] ne s'expliquent et ne se justifient en rien".⁷³ The criticism of *Incident in a Bullfight*, exhibited in the Salon of 1864, concentrated on problems of scale, perspective, and form. Théophile Gautier suggested that "M. Manet n'a pas bien calculé la diminution de la perspective. Ses hommes sont beaucoup trop grands par rapport à son taureau",⁷⁴ and advised that "M. Manet a eu tort de ne pas consulter pour l'assiette de son tableau ce modeste et utile conseiller dont les plus fiers artistes écoutent les avis, – nous voulons dire *le perspecteur*".⁷⁵ Théophile Gautier *finds* the painting

complètement inintelligible. Un taureau microscopique se tient debout, étonné, au milieu d'une arène de sable jaune. Au premier plan, un toréador est étendu dans une pose oblique, au troisième plan, d'autres toréadors détachent leurs corps, beaucoup trop grands, contre la barrière qui clôt l'enceinte.⁷⁶

Hector de Callias also remarked upon the discrepancies in scale, noting "Vient ensuite un taureau microscopique. – C'est la perspective, direz-vous. – Mais non; car au troisième plan, contre les gradins du cirque, les *toreros* représentent une taille raisonnable et

semblent rire de ce petit taureau".⁷⁷ Gonzague Privat's review of the Salon of 1865 was an enlightened exception to the outcry over *Olympia*, but apart from his references to *tableau* and *morceau*, as noted in Chapter 2, his comments were generally to do with "rares qualités de peinture"⁷⁸ and "l'originalité, la finesse dans la couleur et l'harmonie".⁷⁹ After the rejection of Manet's two submissions to the 1866 Salon, Théophile Thoré viewed the paintings in Manet's studio and indicated a preference for them to others which had in fact been selected, but noted when commenting on *Young Woman of 1866* (1866), that "Manet se débat encore... de finir certaines parties d'un tableau pour donner à l'ensemble sa valeur effective".⁸⁰ In 1868 Thoré was again complimentary, suggesting that "le mérite principal" of *Portrait of Émile Zola* (Fig.42) was "la lumière qui circule dans cet intérieur et qui distribue partout le modelé et le relief".⁸¹ Appraising in 1869 that *The Luncheon* was somewhat incomprehensible, Jules Castagnary wrote that "De même que M. Manet assemble... des natures mortes qui devraient s'exclure... il distribue ses personnages au hasard, sans que rien de nécessaire et de forcé ne commande leur composition".⁸² And in a general comment made in the same year, Gautier felt that "la persistance du ton local" gave Manet's figures "une unité puissante, en dépit des fautes de dessin et de perspective".⁸³ Those perceptions in the 1860s of Manet's faulty perspective seem to have prescribed it as a fact for all subsequent scholars.

During the 1870s more critics, such as Philippe Burty, Edmond Duranty, Jules Claretie, and Armand Silvestre, were positive in their reviews and defended Manet's art from the continuing criticism. But the main points of discussion were his touch, use of colour, the light in his works, and a continued concern about their degree of finish. Castagnary, for example, described *The Railway* in the Salon of 1874 as "si puissant de lumière, si distingué de ton, et où un profil perdu gracieusement indiqué, une robe de toile bleue modelée avec ampleur, me font passer sur l'inachevé des figures et des mains".⁸⁴ And an aspect of flattened space was unintentionally raised by art critic Jean Rousseau in his description of Manet's only submission to the Salon of 1875, *L'Argenteuil* (Fig.57), by suggesting that "Les têtes et les costumes ont de l'aspect et du mordant, c'est tout. Derrière les personnages, un fleuve d'indigo, massif comme un

lingot, droit comme une muraille".⁸⁵ Uncertainties were also still seen as problems of intelligibility, rather than in terms of ambiguity. Of *The Railway* Ernest Duvergier de Hauranne had asked "Est-ce un portrait à deux personnages ou un tableau de style que le *Chemin de fer* de M. Manet...? Les informations nous manquent pour résoudre ce problème".⁸⁶ A lack of literal information was seen by many as a failing.

Manet's most outspoken supporter during the 1870s was his friend Stéphane Mallarmé, who seemed to be one of the first to understand the allusions and illusions embodied in Manet's work, its means of representation as separate from depiction, and the different ways the technique nuanced its levels of content and meaning. In the richly descriptive account of *Masked Ball at the Opera* in his critical article 'Le Jury de peinture pour 1874 et M. Manet', Mallarmé described it as "la noble tentative d'y faire tenir, par de purs moyens demandés à cet art, tout une vision du monde contemporain".⁸⁷ Not only was the painting seen as something in addition to what was depicted, but an allusion to the intrinsic nature of the process involved was also made. And while recognising that the nature of Manet's spatial illusion was of a different order, Mallarmé saw that difference as the result of using a perspective that did not involve the conventions of linear perspective, stating in his 1876 article, 'The Impressionists and Edouard Manet', that

If we turn to natural perspective (not that utterly and artificially classic science which makes our eyes the dupes of a civilized education, but rather that artistic perspective which we learn from the extreme East-Japan for example) – and look at these sea-pieces of Manet... we feel a new delight at the recovery of a long obliterated truth.⁸⁸

Another dimension was added to the limited discourse on space, surface, and ambiguity in Manet's work with the exhibition of *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* at the Paris Salon of 1882. It was a work which involved all of the spatial strategies that Manet had been developing for two decades and overlaid its ambiguity with overt contradiction. The reception of the painting by public and critics alike was in fact more positive than most of the works exhibited by Manet in previous years, and although some of the criticism was strident, much of it was tinged with a begrudging admiration. But the lack of correspondence in the mirror's reflection and Manet's apparent disregard of perspective

met with criticism and incomprehension and created a problem for all, as typified by Jules Comte's Salon review, which noted:

Une jeune femme debout au comptoir d'un *bar*; devant elle les divers flacons et bouteilles qui attendent le consommateur; derrière, une glace dans laquelle se reflète la salle, et au premier plan, la figure d'un habitué qu'on aperçoit causant avec la même femme vue de dos, voilà le sujet, que nous prenons tel qu'il nous est donné, sans le discuter. Mais ce qui nous frappe tout d'abord, c'est que cette fameuse glace, indispensable à l'intelligence de tous ces reflets et de toutes ces perspectives n'existe pas: M. Manet n'a-t-il pas su la faire, ou bien a-t-il trouvé que *l'impression* était suffisante? Nous n'aurons garde de répondre à cette question; nous notons seulement ce fait, que tout le tableau se passe dans une glace, et qu'il n'y a pas de glace. Quant aux incorrections de dessin, quant à l'insuffisance absolue de la figure de la femme qui est, en somme, le seul personnage, quant au manque de correspondance entre les objets reflétés et leur image, nous n'insisterons pas; ce sont lacunes familières à MM. les impressionnistes, qui ont d'excellentes raisons pour traiter de haut le dessin, le modelé et la perspective.⁸⁹

In many ways critical responses to this one painting, with its spatial anomalies compressed into the reflective plane of the mirror, have become symbolic of the way in which Manet scholarship and perceptions about his art have developed since its showing in 1882. In the midst of its brilliance as a painting it has provided, without the requirement for analysis, a supposedly demonstrable example of the disjunctions in Manet's works. Irrespective of the prevailing orthodoxies in the past, perceptions of Manet's space, surface, flatness and ambiguity have remained unchanged, and seen primarily in terms of how they have been assumed to exist in *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère*.

Compared to the critiques in Manet's own time, and in spite of this fixed perception, scholarship since then has been much more considered, more reflective on his whole oeuvre, and more perceptive about the qualities of the individual major works. Its focus of interest has varied from naturalistic or impressionistic conceptions of the work, the influence of Manet's personality or 'genius', his use of historical sources, the work as a reflection of contemporary life, the primacy of the forms and colours of his paintings as an expression of technique and style, and, in more recent decades, socio-political contextualisations. Research has been undertaken as either historical or technical analyses, and its programs have included chronological, iconographic, or art practice overviews, examinations of groups of works related to one theme or subject, or

the detailed examination of one particular work involving its pictorial aspects and background contexts and influences. Technical examinations of the works have also provided valuable information about Manet's palette, the canvas supports he employed, the cutting of particular canvases, his brushwork and techniques of scraping and layering of pigment, the earlier states underlying the visible surfaces, and the adjustments made in the development of the final image. Programs of research into the crafted artifice of Manet's paintings by means of site analysis and identification have been few, and instances when such research has been integrated with interpretative or historical assessments have been rare.

The potential for the examination of a work of art as object to provide information which is indispensable in understanding its wider implications was, nevertheless, demonstrated admirably by Juliet Wilson-Bareau⁹⁰ with *The Hidden Face of Manet* exhibition of 1986,⁹¹ and for which the collaborative program of research with conservators provided the most comprehensive array of technical information about Manet's work to date.⁹² In her Introduction to the catalogue, Wilson-Bareau explained that the

study began as an attempt to solve particular problems relating to Manet's paintings, prints and drawings. It has ended by demonstrating that Manet's artistic enterprise was a formidably intelligent one, with a quite remarkable unity and coherence. Any disjointedness, any apparently ragged edges, are due largely to our lack of understanding of the ways in which he developed his paintings. If one looks for them, the cut and ragged edges of his canvas will tell us, quite literally, about the reshaping of pictures or their joining with other canvases, while X-rays and the analysis of pigments can reveal painting that lies beneath the surface.⁹³

From the physical information of the canvases, importantly not seen in isolation but set within art-historical contexts, Wilson-Bareau made proposals for Manet's process of production in a number of important paintings that allowed them to be seen very differently to how they had previously been imagined.⁹⁴

That such an approach can provide insights not available to a process of speculation has also been confirmed by many other scholars who have used either scientifically established or well-researched factual information to make important discoveries or proposals about Manet's works. Physical information established by X-

radiographs and related scientific procedures has been used in wider research programs undertaken by Juan Corradini from 1959 to 1983,⁹⁵ Theodor Siegl in 1966,⁹⁶ Beatrice Farwell in 1975,⁹⁷ Theodore Reff in 1982,⁹⁸ David Bomford and Ashok Roy,⁹⁹ Anne Coffin Hanson,¹⁰⁰ and Michael Wilson¹⁰¹ in 1983, E. Melanie Gifford in 1984,¹⁰² and David Bomford and colleagues in 1990.¹⁰³ And well-researched, but less scientific, approaches were used by Reff in 1970 to identify a source for Manet's borrowing of images,¹⁰⁴ and by Douglas Druick and Peter Zegers in 1983 to make specific site and event identifications in one of Manet's prints.¹⁰⁵ In clarifying a part of the process of production or the identification of an image, such endeavours have usually involved a reassessment of the nature of a work, and have thus also provided the potential for details of its artifice to also be re-examined.

This abstracted disassembling of a work by means of a physical or historical analysis and its virtual reconstruction in terms of subsequent hypotheses or proposals seems to present a not inappropriate correspondence to Manet's own process of reconstituting imagery within a work's surface in terms of spatial ambiguity. But most scholarly considerations of the relationship between space and surface in Manet's works have been much more limited, restricted by the preconceptions established by *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* and a standard use of subjective visual judgements or speculations irrespective of the approach taken or the premise upon which it was based.

Prior to Clement Greenberg's exposition in 1961, many aspects of modernist formalism had prevailed in pictorial overviews of Manet's art, involving subjective visual assessments in which the flattening of forms and limitations of spatial recession were seen as compositional manipulations at the work's surface. Greenberg's proposals both confirmed and extended such considerations. But these manipulations were critically seen by others rather as flawed technique. John Richardson, for example, had claimed in 1958¹⁰⁶ that Manet's "sense of design was faulty",¹⁰⁷ citing numerous examples from Manet's paintings of the 1860s. "*Le Vieux Musicien* is not altogether successful," Richardson believed, "for it is evidently pieced together out of separate studies... [and] there seems to be no spatial, temporal or compositional, let alone thematic, relationship

between the figures".¹⁰⁸ By "dispensing with all but the most summary indications of perspective and by trying to reproduce on his canvas the informal... groupings of everyday life... a number of his [Manet's] figure-compositions... disintegrate" Richardson claimed.¹⁰⁹ What made it worse for Richardson was that Manet's spatial illusion was flawed "at times irreparably, by... a fallible sense of scale" as he believed could be seen with "the disproportionate woman in the background of *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe*, the miniscule boy in the foreground of *L'Exposition Universelle* and the gigantic man with the sunshade in *La Plage de Boulogne*",¹¹⁰ and "even when he [Manet] took the precaution of making preliminary sketches, he was still apt to end up with a design that is out-of-scale or incoherent, especially if the composition involves a degree of recession or includes two or more isolated figures or groups".¹¹¹ Manet's resort to improvisation when "he would reduce the pictorial recession to a minimum" was usually unsuccessful, Richardson believed.¹¹²

Other writers weren't so critical. Alan Bowness did not see what Richardson had criticised as failings, believing "that most of what Mr. Richardson and Manet's critics see as faults are deliberate experiments – sometimes clumsy perhaps, but bold and adventurous" and added that "one cannot seriously be expected to believe that anyone with as thorough a training as Manet had could not have got his proportions and perspective constructions right had he wished to".¹¹³ As part of that experimentation, Bowness claimed that Manet restricted space to relate it to the picture plane:

He is not concerned with an illusionistic space, and will sacrifice to make the space as shallow and restricted as possible. Everything is subordinated to this overriding demand – and Manet's innovations are as revolutionary as those of anyone. He sees that the lighting, often very harsh, always comes from the front, and thus it eliminates the halftones, reduces modelling to a minimum, and simplifies and flattens the forms. He makes figures and objects in different planes in space touch on the picture plane, and often relates them to the edges of a picture.¹¹⁴

And Beatrice Farwell also saw the spatial play in a more positive light, with the assembled composite images seen rather as a synthesis, and suggesting that

From the *Absinthe Drinker* to the *Bar at the Folies-Bergère* Manet synthesized pictorial space by means of disparate represented objects forced into relationship with one another by the craft of painting and not by the optical laws observed by academicians, the camera, and the Impressionists.¹¹⁵

Whereas all of these assessments were made somewhat in isolation from other considerations of the works involved, Nils Sandblad, in his Manet: Three Studies in Artistic Conception of 1954, had set Manet scholarship in a new direction with a synthesis of biographical, historical, iconographic, thematic and pictorial evidence around single works.¹¹⁶ Anne Coffin Hanson later brought something of Sandblad's synthesis to a more general overview of Manet's oeuvre, his life and times, and his artistic influences and development, but Hanson's pictorial approach was obviously derived from Greenberg's position.¹¹⁷ She believed that Manet "was not alone among the more inventive artists in the nineteenth century in clinging to the illusion of the real world as a basis for his art, and at the same time, through the craft itself, of changing the character of the canvas away from its function as a window",¹¹⁸ and in her 1983 essay, 'Manet's Pictorial Language', Hanson suggested that Manet

held in active tension the flatness of the picture surface and the sensation of the volume of the objects depicted on it, and... that he achieved his goals through a slow and deliberate process of perceiving and reacting, drawing and redrawing, until he reached an effective pictorial expression.¹¹⁹

Although this suggests a process of response rather than a strategy of forethought as proposed in this dissertation, the notions of deliberation are certainly similar.

Notions of Manet's surface and space were also raised in a context of artistic speculation with the rich and almost arcane writing of Jean Clay in his 1983 article, 'Ointments, Makeup, Pollen'.¹²⁰ Beatrice Farwell, in an editor's statement to an issue of Art Journal in which Clay's article was later published,¹²¹ invoked T.J. Clark, and along the way Clement Greenberg, to better describe Clay's discourse. Clay "takes analysis to extremes of detail and refinement" Farwell suggested, and that "this dissection of paintings layer by layer and of drawings stroke by stroke... attempts to isolate the factors that make this art modern, and that connect with the Greenbergian conception of modernism in which painting seeks to define itself".¹²² Farwell suggested that Clark and Clay "offer current extremes of the formalist and contextualist positions, yet they share their quest for answers to the puzzle of Manet's modernism, differently as that term may be defined from their disparate viewpoints."¹²³ Clark's approach reconstructed "the shifts

and dislocations... of social layers", Farwell noted, whereas Clay reconstructed those of "paint layers".¹²⁴ For this writer, Clay achieved much more than that.

Clay's article was a rich *mélange* of thoughts, references and propositions swirling around Manet's works, teasing from them some perceptions that notionally correspond with or loosely describe what the spatial analyses for this dissertation have found and what has been earlier proposed here as his artistic speculation. Clay suggested that Manet's borrowings from anywhere and everywhere, from countless Old Masters, from Japanese art, and from photography, were a subversion of "linear continuity, progress and source".¹²⁵ And in addition to identifying "appropriation, inversion and condensation" to be "'devices' that turn Manet's efforts into work *about* painting", Clay saw "a tendency temporally, sequentially, to decline (in the grammatical sense) a given visual idea".¹²⁶ For Clay, Manet's oeuvre "does not develop, it simply operates by displacement"¹²⁷ and suggested that "There is repeated cleavage and conflict among the components of the painting. It is no longer a matter of painting masterpieces, or entities, but of introducing elements of torsion and contradiction. Of inventing painting while destroying it".¹²⁸ Clay hypothesised that "Discrepancy at work in painting... may have been his [Manet's]... program", and presented, as an example, that "the most glaring discrepancy is between the play of illusionistic depth and the demands of the surface".¹²⁹ What Clay proposed was an intentional program of reaction, of "a borderline art, always reactive, with no other aim than to place all tradition, even its own, in an untenable position".¹³⁰ Formulaic devices of centred compositions, vertical or horizontal struts, frieze constructions, cropping, and Oriental perspective, were described by Clay as some of Manet's means, together with surface scrapings, and the overcoming of the traditional "distinction between form and background" with a new surface "produced... by weaving, overflowing, and overlapping".¹³¹ And he suggested that composites of merged forms and unexpected configurations were "also produced by the surface".¹³² Mindful of Manet's historical influence on 'flattening', Clay proposed that Manet "constantly takes into consideration the empirical reality of the support" with "spaces left blank, equal thickness of line, hatchings, rubbing (*frottage*)",¹³³ and that he used walls in the interplay

between space and surface, as screens, or as seen in the *Execution of Maximilian* paintings, where the wall not only "cuts the spatial continuity like a cleaver" but is also a "representation of the support".¹³⁴ If Manet was "inventing painting while destroying it", then Clay disassembled Manet's art in terms of critical analysis, rather than the physical or historical, and reconstituted it with a maelstrom of language and ideas which, as if taken from the works themselves, gave insight into the artifice of Manet's space and the materiality of his surfaces.

Others also have seen Manet's space in terms other than formalist ones, in either conceptual or, more recently, theoretical terms. In a discussion on the *Masked Ball at the Opera*, Eric Darragon observed, for example, that "L'espace possède chez Manet une force étrange qui retient l'intérêt. Il s'agit d'une donnée esthétique profondément inscrite dans le temps, depuis le *Déjeuner sur l'herbe* au Salon des Refusés jusqu'au *Bar aux Folies-Bergère* du Salon de 1882".¹³⁵ From a different position, James H. Rubin believed that "Manet's handling of spatiality, or disregard for it, is linked to his preoccupation with... a 'centred' foreground" and that "what once was an illusionistic space is now the space of imagination or creative thinking".¹³⁶ With his concepts oscillating between the physical and the metaphysical, Rubin considered that

Manet had not so much reduced a previously spatial conception of art (though that is the historical effect), as he has produced an art where contact between the creative self and the realm of its creativity – a virtually physical contact – is maintained by treating the canvas as the supporting slab for materials represented by the paint. the signs of Manet's presence remain virtually in his possession by never leaving the physical present for the illusory and timeless realm of art.¹³⁷

And with terminology similar to that used for the proposals made in this dissertation, but in the process denying any possibility of an ambiguous duality between spatial illusion and surface, Rubin also suggested that Manet's "representation is merged with physicality by locating its site within the painting rather than outside or over and above it – at the surface rather than beyond its frame."¹³⁸

Writing from a viewpoint which sees "the space (social, literal, metaphorical) of modernism as representation",¹³⁹ Johanna Drucker has proposed that *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe* and *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* "offer a radical contrast of representational

strategies... with respect to the structure of space".¹⁴⁰ *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe* was seen to be "a studio space, dimensionless, illusionistic, mannered and self-conscious, calling for clear attention to its conceits, but still maintaining the structure and relations of monocular perspective, with all its objectifying and distancing activities".¹⁴¹ But she also noted that the way in which that painting "collages the space of an Arcadian landscape into the space of the social domain"¹⁴² involved a "play with the traditional codes of painted space" that "calls attention to the artifice of painting's representational strategies".¹⁴³ In contrast, *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* was considered by Drucker to have "abandoned the structuring conventions of painting for those of photography – internal montage, density, mirroring".¹⁴⁴ And the contrast between the two paintings was also seen by Drucker in the relative position of a viewer to those spaces, "outside... the theatrically formed proscenium space" in *Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe*, and "completely inside the represented space"¹⁴⁵ of *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère*, with its image "collapsing our [the viewer's] space with its own".¹⁴⁶

The representation referred to by Drucker and her perception of the collapsing of space from within or without the surface of *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* were nevertheless partly concerned with the pictorial and confirmed the notion that this particular work typifies those problematic spatial aspects in Manet's art. But the increased use since the 1970s of socio-cultural contextualisations or author-driven theoretical frameworks has seen the ambiguous space and surface of *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* become representation and the paradigm for the assessment of Manet's work in general, apparently encapsulating its essential characteristics. Richard R. Brettell has noted that "during the last generation, the painting has gone from being an examination of flatness and complex pictorial illusionism and become a representational examination of many... class and gender issues".¹⁴⁷ Additionally, it has become the vehicle for discourse on these very approaches, as noted by Carol Armstrong, "a sort of epicenter for variations on the practice of the social history of art".¹⁴⁸

And, of course, the epicentre for all of these approaches to *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère*, and by association to his oeuvre, has been the apparent disjunction between

what is depicted in front of the mirror and in its reflection, and the declared presumption by all that it is spatially impossible. As Brettell has observed, "the reflection... has caused more speculation than any depicted mirror in the history of Western art".¹⁴⁹ In addition, it has always been believed that an interaction of some kind, be it by gaze or conversation, existed between the reflected images of the barmaid and the male customer. As noted above, these aspects were evident when it was shown in 1882, and although the visual reading of the work has changed little since then, with the problem of the mirror repeated time and again, it has only become an interpretative issue in more recent years, building to a crescendo in the 1990s.

In 1919, Théodore Duret wrote that "Une glace par derrière la représentait en conversation avec un monsieur, qui n'apparaissait, lui, que reflété. C'est cette particularité de la glace, renvoyant l'image des personnages et des objets dans la salle, qui faisait déclarer l'arrangement incompréhensible."¹⁵⁰ But most writers in the early twentieth century were as concerned with the barmaid's expression as they were with the mirror's disjunction, and many others, such as Jacques-Emile Blanche in 1924¹⁵¹ and Robert Rey in 1938,¹⁵² made no mention of either. Adolphe Tabarant in 1931 wrote that "A droite, en fausse équerre, la blonde serveuse du bar est reflétée de dos, écoutant les propos d'un monsieur dont le jeu d'optique de la glace ne révèle que la tête coiffée d'un chapeau de haute forme".¹⁵³ Maurice Bex suggested in 1948 that "the very presence of this figure, more static even than the rich still-life of bottles, glasses and fruit heaped before her on the counter, imparts an amazing balance to the composition, which is otherwise incoherent to the point of recklessness".¹⁵⁴ And Anne Coffin Hanson, in 1966, proposed that "Manet's space is not explainable or enterable, but remains poised at that curious point of tension between plane and illusion – the very tension which was to lead artists to new solutions in the twentieth century".¹⁵⁵

In 1975, with the suggestion that "the mirror does not really reflect the phenomenal world as it should but, in effect, contains another and different one... [and]... represents another dimension, the other half, the complement to the other reality", George Mauner had confirmed that issues other than visual phenomena were

being considered.¹⁵⁶ But the most influential and, in some ways therefore, the most important contextualised reading of *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* has been that by T.J. Clark in his two writings on the work in 1977 and 1984,¹⁵⁷ with its implications raised in the discourse involving the views of Clark, Greenberg, and Fried set out above. Although all commentaries continued to discuss the impossibility of the mirror's reflection,¹⁵⁸ Clark's approach of seeing the work in terms of class and spectacle seemed to make valid any viewing position outside its domain, both literally and metaphorically. James H. Rubin, for example, suggested that

Its effect is... tied to the ambiguous identity of self and other: standing directly before the painting, the viewer appears to observe himself (the figure opposite the barmaid in the mirror) from a position other than the one he physically occupies. He takes both positions, the one external, the other within. In viewing itself as other, the self can experience itself as body and object rather than as consciousness and subject.¹⁵⁹

And in an essay which brought representation, space and ambiguity in Manet's art together, Jack Flam noted that "The *Bar* offers the most striking instance in Manet's art of the primacy of mental vision over actual sight. The spatial ambiguity in the construction of the painting is more extreme than anything in Manet's earlier painting".¹⁶⁰

It was proposed by Flam that

If part of the modernity of Manet's earlier paintings was expressed in their discordant spatial shifts, sense of alienation, and paralyzed narratives, in the *Bar* he explores the possibilities of multiple narratives and multiple levels of consciousness, and connects the manipulation of space to that of time.¹⁶¹

This exposition by Flam was included in the 1996 anthology of essays on *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère*, 12 Views of Manet's *Bar*.¹⁶² Notwithstanding the calibre of its contributors, the anthology highlighted a marked separation between the work of art and the scholarship. As editor Bradford R. Collins explained, the anthology represented "merely the latest chapters in a long and ongoing process of investigation in both Manet studies and art history", and that "the painting is merely the vehicle for a controlled experiment in current methodology, or methods".¹⁶³ This sense of limitation or control was evident when Richard Shiff stated in the Introduction that T.J. Clark's "influential view of Manet's *Bar* constitutes much of the common ground for the twelve essayists".¹⁶⁴ At a superficial level, extreme diversity seemed evident in the essays, which revolved

around issues such as gendered separations, Manet's fantasy life, the neurosis of ideology, psychological awareness, iconography of the Immaculate Conception, modern masculinity, and sexuality and spectatorship.¹⁶⁵ But with the common denominators of Clark's view and a methodology of speculation, together with the continued espousal of the unquestioned dogma about the painting's reflection, they contributed little to our understanding of the painting. In fact, the painting, together with any remnants of its surface, was nowhere to be seen.

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

3. "Notorious history of modernism's concern for 'flatness' ": Notes

DISSERTATION: Volume 2, pp.10–14

NOTES

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

1. Clement Greenberg, 'Modernist Painting', in Art in Theory: 1900–1990, eds. Charles Harrison and Paul Wood, Blackwell, Oxford and Cambridge, Mass., 1993, p.756. Original publication of radio lecture, Arts Yearbook, 4, 1961, pp.101–8.
2. id.
3. T.J. Clark, The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and His Followers, Thames and Hudson, London, 1985.
4. *ibid.*, p.10.
5. *ibid.*, p.6.
6. *ibid.*, p.10.
7. id.
8. id.
9. From Stéphane Mallarmé, 'The Impressionists and Edouard Manet', The Art Monthly Review and Photographic Portfolio, London, trans. George T. Robinson, v.1, no.9, 30 September, 1876, p.222. Quoted in: Clark 1985 (as in n.3), p.10.
10. Greenberg 1993 (as in n.1), p.755.
11. Clark 1985, p.12.
12. id.
13. id.
14. *ibid.*, p.13.
15. id.
16. id.
17. id.
18. id.
19. id.
20. id.
21. id.
22. id.
23. id.
24. *ibid.*, p.14.
25. *ibid.*, pp.13-14.
26. *ibid.*, p.15.
27. *ibid.*, p.254.
28. Greenberg 1993, p.756.
29. *ibid.*, p.755.
30. *ibid.*, p.756.
31. *ibid.*, p.755.
32. *ibid.*, p.756.
33. id.
34. id.
35. Clark 1985, p.248.
36. Greenberg 1993, p.758.
37. id.
38. *ibid.*, p.759.

[p.11 of dissertation here]

39. Michael Fried, Manet's Modernism: or, The Face of Painting in the 1860s, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1996, p.288.
40. Fried 1996 (as in n.39).
41. Greenberg 1993, p.755.
42. Fried 1996, p.14.
43. id.
44. *ibid.*, pp.14-15.
45. *ibid.*, p.15.
46. id.
47. Clark 1985, p.10.
48. Fried 1996, pp.15-16.
49. *ibid.*, p.288.
50. *ibid.*, p.17.
51. id.
52. id.
53. id.
54. id.
55. *ibid.*, p.17, p.461-n.47.
56. Michael Fried, 'Modernist Painting and Formal Criticism', American Scholar, v.33, 1964, pp.642–48.
57. *ibid.*, p.642.
58. Fried 1996, pp.18,19.
59. *ibid.*, p.407.
60. id.
61. *ibid.*, p.17.
62. *ibid.*, p.266.
63. id.
64. id.
65. *ibid.*, p.288.
66. As discussed in Chapter 2.
67. John House, 'Manet's Naïveté', 'The Hidden Face of Manet: An investigation of the artist's working processes', exh. cat., The Burlington Magazine, v.128, no.997, April, 1986, pp.1–19.
68. *ibid.*, p.1.
69. For discussion of Zola's role as art critic, and his writings on, and relationship with Manet, see: Ima N. Ebin, 'Manet and Zola', Gazette des Beaux-Arts, s.6, v.27, June, 1945, pp.357–78; F.W.J. Hemmings, 'Zola, Manet and the Impressionists (1875–80)', Modern Language Association Publications, v.73, no.2, 1958, pp.404–17; Gaëton Picon, 'Zola's painters', Yale French Studies, trans. J.L. Logan, no.42, 1969, pp.126–42; Lilian R. Furst, 'Zola's art criticism', in French 19th Century painting and Literature, ed. Ulrich Finke, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1972, pp.164–81; Alan Krell, 'Manet, Zola, and the 'Motifs d'une Exposition Particulière', 1867', Gazette des Beaux-Arts, v.99, March, 1982, pp.109–15; and, Fried, 1996, *passim*.
70. For discussion of Mallarmé's writing on the visual arts and Manet's works, see: Penny Florence, 'A new problematic of the imaginary', Mallarmé, Manet and Redon: Visual and Aural Signs and the Generation of Meaning, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986, pp.26–45; and, Jean C. Harris, 'A Little-known Essay on Manet by Stéphane Mallarmé', The Art Bulletin, v.46, no.4, December, 1964, pp.559–63.
For additional discussion of the relationship between Manet and Mallarmé and their collaborations, see: Alan Bowness, 'Manet and Mallarmé', Philadelphia Museum of Art Bulletin, v.62, no.293, 1967, pp.213–21. Also see references in n.87 and n.88.

71. Ernest Chesneau, 'Salon des Vaincus', Le constitutionnel, 19 May, 1863. Quoted from: Alan Krell, 'Manet's Déjeuner sur l'herbe in the Salon des Refusés: A Re-appraisal', The Art Bulletin, v.65, no.2, June, 1983, p.317.
72. Le Capitaine Pompilius (pseud., Carle Desnoyers), 'Lettres particulières sur le Salon (des Refusés)', Le Petit Journal, no.131, 11 June, 1863. Quoted from: Fried 1996, p.446.
73. Théodore Pelloquet, L'Exposition: Journal du Salon de 1863, no.22, 23 July, 1863, Quoted from: Fried 1996, p.575-n.115.
74. Théophile Gautier, 'Le Salon de 1864', Le Moniteur universel, 25 June, 1864, p.1.
75. id.
76. Théophile Gautier, *filis*, 'Le Salon de 1864', Le Monde Illustré, 18 June, 1864, p.397.
77. Hector de Callias, 'Salon de 1864', L'Artiste, v.1, 1 June, 1864, p.242.
78. Gonzague Privat, Place aux jeunes! Causeries critiques sur le Salon de 1865, Paris, 1865, pp.63–64. Quoted from: Fried 1996, p.559-n.14.
79. *ibid*, p.65. Quoted from: Fried 1996, p.559-n.16.
80. Théophile Thoré, (pseud., W. Bürger), Salons de W. Bürger, 1861 à 1868, préf. T.Thoré, 2 vols., Librairie de Ve Jules Renouard, Paris, 1870, v.2, p.318.
81. Thoré 1870 (as in n.80), v.2, p.532.
82. Jules Castagnary, 'Le Salon de 1869', Le Siècle, 11 June, 1869, p.3.
83. Théophile Gautier, 'Le Salon de 1869, II', L'Illustration, 15 May, 1869, p.311.

[\[p.12 of dissertation here\]](#)

84. Jules Castagnary, 'Le Salon de 1874', Le Siècle, 19 May, 1874, p.1.
85. Jean Rousseau, 'Le Salon de 1875', Le Figaro, 2 May, 1875, p.1.
86. Ernest Duvergier de Hauranne, 'Le Salon de 1874', La Revue des deux mondes, 1 June, 1874. Quoted from: House 1986 (as in n.67), p.18.
87. Stéphane Mallarmé, 'Le Jury de peinture pour 1874 et M. Manet', in La Renaissance littéraire et artistique, 12 April, 1874, pp.156.
88. Stéphane Mallarmé, 'The Impressionists and Edouard Manet', The Art Monthly Review and Photographic Portfolio, London, trans. George T. Robinson, v.1, no.9, 30 September, 1876, pp.117–22. 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.31.
89. Jules Comte, 'Les Salons de 1882. III', L'Illustration, 20 May, 1882, p.335.
90. Wilson-Bareau and this writer are research colleagues involved in a mutual and continuing endeavour to better understand Manet's works. The informal association was initiated after it was realised that both had made the same identifications in *The Railway* and it has continued on a number of projects since, the most recent of which involved a proposal for *Incident in a Bullfight* of 1864 as part of an exhibition at The Frick Collection, New York, in 1999. Details of this proposal are given in Chapter 5(A).
91. 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, pp.21–86.
92. Wilson-Bareau's program of Manet research, spanning the period from 1978 to the present, has resulted in a body of literature which includes exhibition catalogues, catalogue essays and entries, edited collections of correspondence and statements, and articles and reviews.
93. Wilson-Bareau 1986 (as in n.91), p.21.
94. The works considered included: *La Nymphe surprise* (1861) and related works; *Le déjeuner sur l'herbe* (1863) and related works; *Olympia* (1863) and related works; *The Execution of Maximilian* series; *Reichshoffen* (1877–78), *Au café* (1878), *Coin de café-concert* (1878 or 1879), *La serveuse de bocks* (c.1878–80), and *Café-concert* (c.1878–80); *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* (1881–82) and related works.

95. Juan Corradini, Edouard Manet; La Ninfa Sorprendida, exh. cat., Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes de Buenos Aires, Instituto Jung de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, 1983.
96. Theodor Siegl, 'The Treatment of Edouard Manet's *Le Bon Bock*', in Bulletin: Philadelphia Museum of Art, v.62, no.291, Autumn, 1966, p.133–41.
97. Beatrice Farwell, 'Manet's *Nymph Surprise*', The Burlington Magazine, v.117, no.865, April, 1975, pp.224–29.
98. Theodore Reff, '*The Dead Toreador*, 1864', in Manet and Modern Paris, National Gallery of Art, Washington DC, 1982, pp. 214–215.
99. David Bomford, and Ashok Roy, 'Manet's *The Waitress*: An Investigation into its Origin and Development', National Gallery Technical Bulletin, v.7, 1983, pp.3–19.
100. Anne Coffin Hanson, 'Manet's Pictorial Language', in Françoise Cachin, et al., Manet 1832-1883, exh. cat., The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, and Harry N. Abrams, New York, 1983, pp.20–28.
101. Michael Wilson, Manet at Work: An Exhibition to Mark the Centenary of the Death of Edouard Manet 1832–83, exh. cat., National Gallery Publications, London, 1983, passim.
102. E. Melanie Gifford, 'Manet's *At the Cafe*: Development and Structure', Journal of the Walters Art Gallery, v.42–43, 1984–85, pp.98–104.
103. David Bomford, et al., Art in the Making: Impressionism, exh. cat., National Gallery, London, and Yale University Press, London and New Haven, 1990, pp.112–19.
104. Theodore Reff, 'Manet and Blanc's 'Histoire des Peintres' ', The Burlington Magazine, v.112, 4 July, 1970, pp.456–58.
105. Douglas Druick, and Peter Zegers, 'Manet's *Balloon*: French Diversion, The Fête de l'Empereur 1862', The Print Collector's Newsletter, v.14, no.2, May–June, 1983, pp.38–46.
106. John Richardson, Edouard Manet: Paintings and Drawings, Phaidon Press, London, 1958.
107. *ibid.*, p.13.
108. *ibid.*, p.13.
109. *id.*
110. *id.*
111. *ibid.*, pp.13,14.
112. *ibid.*, p.14.
113. Alan Bowness, 'A Note on 'Manet's Compositional Difficulties' ', The Burlington Magazine, v.103, June,1961, pp.277.
114. *id.*
115. Beatrice Farwell, Manet and the Nude: A study in Iconography in the Second Empire, Garland Publishing, New York and London, 1981, p.65.
116. Nils Gösta Sandblad, Manet: Three Studies in Artistic Conception, trans. Walter Nash, C.W.K. Gleerup, Lund, 1954.
117. As published in an exhibition catalogue (Edouard Manet: 1832-1883, exh. cat., Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia, and The Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago, 1966), a monograph

[\[p.13 of dissertation here\]](#)

(Manet and the Modern Tradition, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1977), and a series of articles.

118. Hanson 1977 (as in n.117), pp.200–01.
119. Hanson 1983 (as in n.100), p.20.
120. Jean Clay, 'Ointments, Makeup, Pollen', October, trans. John Shepley, no.27, 1983, pp.3–44.
121. Beatrice Farwell, 'Editor's Statement: "Manet et Manebit" ', Art Journal, v.44, no.1, Spring, 1985, pp.7–8.

122. *ibid.*, p.8.
123. *id.*
124. *id.*
125. Clay 1983 (as in n.120), p.4.
126. *ibid.*, p.7.
127. *ibid.*, p.8.
128. *id.*
129. *ibid.*, p.9.
130. *ibid.*, p.8.
131. *ibid.*, p.13.
132. *ibid.*, p.19.
133. *id.*
134. *id.*
135. Éric Darragon, 'Manet, *Le Bal masqué à l'Opéra*', Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire de l'art français, 1985, p.161.
136. James H. Rubin, Manet's Silence and the Poetics of Bouquets, Reaktion Books, London, 1994, p.184.
137. *id.*
138. *id.*
139. Johanna Drucker, 'The Representation of Modern Life: Space to Spectacle', in Theorizing Modernism, Columbia University Press, New York, 1994, p.1.
140. *ibid.*, p.24.
141. *ibid.*, p.25.
142. *ibid.*, p.24.
143. *ibid.*, p.25.
144. *id.*
145. *id.*
146. *ibid.*, p.26.
 The question can certainly be asked if, in the coalesced dynamics of representation, pictorial space, surface, and viewer, there is a research game of semantics involved here. The idea of a transparency of the surface *through* which one sees the spatial illusion involved with traditional use of perspective can be seen against notions, for example, of Greenberg's seeing of a work *at* the surface; of Fried's engagement between the pictorial space and the the viewer *across* [this writer's terminology for Fried's notion]; of Clay's composites produced *by* the surface; of Bowness's compression of space *to* the surface; by Rubin's representation *within* a painting *at* its surface; by Drucker's placement of a viewer *inside* and *outside* a work; and this writer's proposal for the engagement of space *within* the surface. Notwithstanding these differing descriptions, and even though all the notions imply specific meanings, at times overlapping, the concepts can be said to be attempts to inflect upon the complex nature of Manet's art and to contribute to the ongoing process of its scholarship, rather than to claim definitive explanations based upon the choice of correct terminology.
147. Richard Brettell, Modern Art 1851–1929: Capital and Representation, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1999, p.177.
148. Carol Armstrong, 'Counter, Mirror, Maid: Some Infra-thin Notes on *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère*', in 12 Views of Manet's Bar, ed. Bradford R. Collins, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1996, p.25.
149. Brettell 1999 (as in n.147), p.177.
150. Théodore Duret, Histoire de Edouard Manet et de son œuvre, avec un catalogue des Peintures et des Pastels, Bernheim-Jeune, 1919, pp.195–96.
 In the original edn. Duret had written: "Derrière elle une glace occupait le fond du tableau et la montrait causant avec un monsieur, qui n'apparaissait, lui, que reflété. C'est cette particularité de la glace renvoyant l'image des personnages et des objets, qui faisait déclarer l'arrangement incompréhensible." (H. Floury, Paris, 1902, p.154).

151. Jacques-Emile Blanche, Manet, F.Rieder et Cie., Paris, 1924.
152. Robert Rey, Manet, trans. Eveline Byam Shaw, French and European Publications, New York, and Hyperion Press, Paris, 1938.
153. Adolphe Tabarant, Manet: Histoire catalographique, Montaigne, Paris, 1931, pp.410–11.
154. Maurice Bex, Manet, House of Beric, London; Pierre Tisné, Paris, 1948, pp.16–17.
155. Hanson 1966 (as in n.100), p.187.
156. George Mauner, Manet, Peintre-Philosophe: A Study of the Painter's Themes, The Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park, Penn., and London, 1975, p.161.

[\[p.14 of dissertation here\]](#)

157. T.J. Clark, 'The Bar at the Folies-Bergère', in The Wolf and the Lamb: Popular Culture in France, from the Old Regime to the Twentieth Century, eds. Jacques Beauroy, et al., Anma Libri, Saratoga, Calif., 1977, pp.233–52; and, Clark 1985, pp.205–258.
 158. See, for example:
 - Novelene Ross, Manet's Bar at the Folies-Bergère : And the Myths of Popular Illustration, UMI Research Press, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1982, p.9;
 - Kathleen Adler, Manet, Phaidon Press, Oxford, 1986 (1983), p.227;
 - Cachin, et al. 1983 (as in n.100), p.481;
 - Robert L. Herbert, Impressionism: Art, Leisure & Parisian Society, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1988, p.80;
 - Rubin 1994 (as in n.136), p.87;
 - Collins 1996 (as in n.148): Carol Armstrong, p.33; Albert Boime, p.47; David Carrier, p.73; Kermit S. Champa, p.107; Bradford R. Collins, p.121; Jack Flam, p.165; James D. Herbert, pp.221–22; John House p.239;
 - Fried 1996, pp.345–46; and,
 - Alan Krell, Manet, and the Painters of Contemporary Life, Thames and Hudson, London, 1996, p.199.
 159. Rubin 1994, p.88.
 160. Jack Flam, 'Looking into the Abyss: The Poetics of Manet's *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère*', in Collins 1996, p.168.
 161. *ibid.*, p.172.
 162. Collins 1996.
 163. Bradford R. Collins, 'Preface', *ibid.*, p.xxi.
 164. Richard Shiff, 'Introduction: Ascribing to Manet, Declaring the Author', *intro.*, *ibid.*, p.3.
 165. In a review of the publication, Paul Smith wrote that "The cumulative effect of the methodological pluralism in this book (or its paradoxical consensuality) is that 'Manet' has no agreed use, and so is deconstructed by default." ('Manet Bits', joint book review of: 'Manet and the Painters of Contemporary Life', Alan Krell; 'Manet by Himself', ed. Juliet Wilson-Bareau; 'Manet's Modernism or, The Face of Painting in the 1860s', Michael Fried; and '12 Views of Manet's Bar', ed. Bradford Collins, Art History, v.20, no.3, September, 1997, p.478).
-