

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

5A. INCIDENT IN A BULLFIGHT: Text

Background

The history of Manet's painting *Incident in a Bullfight* is an uncertain one. Exhibited in the 1864 Paris Salon,¹ together with *The Dead Christ with Angels*, the canvas was cut by Manet at an unknown time between the completion of the Salon and 1867, with two separate fragments forming the basis for the reworked and extant paintings, *The Dead Toreador* (Fig.23) and *The Bullfight* (Fig.24). Of those two works, it is known that *The Dead Toreador* was shown at Manet's own *exposition particulière* of 1867 at the Avenue de l'Alma,² and was thought to have been shown earlier at the Martinet Gallery in 1865.³ Their conjoined history, however, has been limited. Although the two paintings had been explicitly noted as the fragments of *Incident in a Bullfight* by Théodore Duret in 1902,⁴ it was not until 1982 when Theodore Reff demonstrated that the two paintings in fact had a common border, with the matching of parts of the X-radiograph images from both paintings – the figures of two small *toreros* and a much larger bull – that they were confirmed to be from the larger 1864 canvas.⁵

Since then, further technical examinations of the two works have been undertaken by the Painting Conservation Department at the National Gallery of Art, Washington DC, particularly and more recently under the supervision of Ann Hoenigswald, Conservator of Paintings, and this program of examination culminated in an exhibition at The Frick Collection, New York, in 1999. That exhibition, *Manet's The Dead Toreador and The Bullfight: Fragments of a Lost Salon Painting Reunited*,⁶ brought these two canvases together for the first time in public since they had been separated and was used to present the current state of the scientific examination of the works, the nature of the re-workings which had been made to both canvases, as well as various proposals for the composition of the unseen 1864 Salon painting. A proposal for the composition by this writer was presented as part of a joint essay with Juliet Wilson-Bareau in the catalogue for the exhibition, and it raised possibilities for the initial composition of the canvas and

presented a specific reconstruction proposal for the Salon painting as a statement of research in progress and as an alternative to some conclusions determined by the conservation team.⁷ One of the many outcomes from a colloquium⁸ which had been held at The Frick Collection at the time of the exhibition was that the ongoing technical examinations suggested that many more stages of reworkings and alterations by Manet existed than had been envisaged to date, and that much more information had yet to be established before the composition of the Salon painting and its various 'before' and 'after' stages could be fully understood and resolved.

Nevertheless, the proposal made by Wilson-Bareau and this writer was the first to have analysed the forms which were visible in the upper left corner of *The Dead Toreador* X-radiograph and place them into a reconstruction proposal for the overall composition of the Salon painting. In the context of the subject of this thesis, this analysis concentrates on the proposal for the Salon painting, presenting the details of the spatial analysis undertaken and the subsequent proposals. Most of these details were unable to be included in the exhibition catalogue, and only some were presented at the colloquium. The earlier stages of the canvas including a composition with a broader sweep of a bullring and smaller figures, and the reworking of the surfaces of *The Dead Toreador* and *The Bullfight* are of interest in the overall chronological understanding of the works, but are not considered in detail here. Part of those considerations involves a proposal that the fallen figure of the toreador had not been part of the composition with the smaller figures.⁹

At the showing of *Incident in a Bullfight* in the 1864 Salon, the incongruities in scale and proportion, which were obviously very evident, brought derision from the public and the caricaturists. The contemporary parodies of Bertall (Fig.A4),¹⁰ Cham (Fig.A3),¹¹ and Oulevay (Fig.A5)¹² provide somewhat different perceptions of the painting, and in terms of understanding its composition, present confusing pictorial evidence. They each seem to have incongruous relative scales between their figures, and oddly related planes of recession for the dead toreador, the bull moving from left to right in a direction parallel with the picture plane, and the standing *toreros* in front of the *barrera*. There are, however, three *toreros* in the Bertall and Oulevay caricatures, all rigidly upright, while

there are two in the Cham with stances of semi-action. And a defined crowd only exists in the Bertall caricature.

Responses from the critics highlighted their perceptions about Manet's grasp of pictorial space, perspective and scale. An early critique in May from Louis Leroy involved a satirical conversation between two fictional viewers of the work in which it was suggested that "Le taureau ressemble à une silhouette noire découpée sans le moindre soin" and that "les bonshommes du fond ont beau se rapetisser, ils n'en fuient pas davantage pour cela".¹³ Hector de Callias wrote in L'Artiste at the beginning of June of

une *Course de Taureaux* divisée en trois plans, – un discours en trois points. – Le premier plan, c'est un toréador, une *espada* peut-être, qui n'a pas su géométriquement enfoncer sa petite épée dans la nuque du taureau, et que le taureau aura éventré avec les deux épées qui lui servent de cornes.

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, qu'ils pourraient écraser sous les talons de leurs escarpins.¹⁴

Jules Castagnary followed in Le Grand Journal with the observation that "l'homme tombé et présenté en raccourci est un morceau excellent; mais où est la perspective et que devient l'ensemble du tableau?"¹⁵ and Théophile Gautier, *fils*, suggested in Le Monde Illustré that the painting was "complètement inintelligible", that the bull was "microscopique" and "Au troisième plan,... toréadors détachent leurs corps, beaucoup trop grands, contre la barrière qui clôt l'enceinte."¹⁶ With his critique in L'Indépendance belge on 15 June, Théophile Thoré suggested a possible source for the prone figure of the toreador or *matador*, and in his description of the scene raised an aspect involving *picadors* that is important in the proposal made here for the painting, stating:

Voici une autre victime de la férocité des mœurs, victime volontaire, étendue roide dans le cirque d'un combat de taureaux, qui continue à l'extrémité de la vaste arène. Ce toréador, éventré pour le plaisir de quelques milliers de spectateurs affolés, est une figure de grandeur naturelle, audacieusement copiée d'après un chef-d'œuvre de la galerie Pourtalès... peint par Velazquez tout simplement. M. Manet ne se gêne pas plus pour "prendre son bien où il le trouve," que pour jeter sur la toile son coloris splendide et bizarre, qui irrite les "bourgeois" jusqu'à l'injure. Sa peinture est une espèce de défi, et il semble vouloir agacer le public comme les picadores de son cirque espagnol, piquant des flèches de rubans multicolores dans la nuque d'un adversaire sauvage. – Il n'a pas encore saisi le taureau par les cornes.¹⁷

And while displaying enthusiasm for the painting but presenting a detailed criticism of its scale and perspective, Théophile Gautier wrote in Le Moniteur universel that

M. Manet n'a pas bien calculé la diminution de la perspective. Ses hommes sont beaucoup trop grands par rapport à son taureau. Il faut une plus longue distance pour réduire à cette taille la bête formidable qu'on appelle un taureau de course. Un *novillo* de deux ans serait plus fort. La courbe décrite par la palissade (*las tablas*) ne s'arrange pas non plus exactement, et le sol, qui devrait être plan, semble en pente comme un plancher de théâtre. 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*.¹⁸

Although these contemporary commentaries, together with the caricatures, provide interesting clues to the Salon painting's form and content, they cannot be read too literally as a description from which reliable information can be taken for use in any reconstruction. Thoré's identification of the Pourtalès Collection painting,¹⁹ then thought to be by Velásquez, as a possible source for the angled figure of the *matador*, highlighted the fact that by 1864 Manet had not seen an actual bullfight. His imagery for the painting was thus essentially second-hand, raising questions about his understanding of the sequence and regalia of a *corrida* and accentuating the problems involved in placing a figure established within one set of spatial parameters into the possibly unrelated pictorial space and eye level of the bullring.

Analysis and Proposal

With this background of contemporary documentation, possible sources for a part of its image, and the X-radiographs and other technical information from the two extant works, an analysis of the possible composition for *Incident in a Bullfight* has involved issues of authentic bullfight procedures and bullring details, the identification of three-dimensional forms and cast shadows from the X-radiographs, and spatial problems of scale and perspective. Its considerations of perspective have been influenced by the fact that there are insufficient indicators of a spatial geometry between viewpoint(s) and the view(s) of the bullring for a virtual site to be constructed and analysed accurately with computer-generated modelling.²⁰ Even the size of the original canvas is uncertain. Although its size is nominally limited here on the available technical information²¹ to the lower and left

edges of *The Dead Toreador* canvas and the upper and right edges of *The Bullfight* canvas, it now seems possible that the original canvas may have at least extended above the upper edge indicated with the potential for a crowd as shown in the Bertall caricature.²² Also taken into account in the analysis is the fact that the form of the two extant paintings can only be used as a guide, with the extent of reworking of each work unable to be determined with any certainty, and the obvious contrast in *brio* between their two surfaces difficult to be reconciled with the knowledge that they are from the same initial canvas and retain forms that also existed in that canvas.²³ The information in the X-radiographs, therefore, presents an important means to look at these aspects but, as has been described in earlier chapters, cannot provide all the answers.

An aspect of identification brings into consideration the regalia and procedures of the *corrida*. In its present form, *The Bullfight* has been confirmed to correctly depict the form and colour of the various outfits worn by the *tóro*s.²⁴ The extent to which Manet made any changes to such details and whether such changes were carried out before or after his trip to Spain in 1865 remain uncertain. And Thoré's reference, as noted above, to "les picadores de son cirque espagnol, piquant des flèches de rubans multicolores dans le nuque d'un adversaire sauvage" can only be a specific reference to the scene as shown in Manet's painting and not as a metaphor for the fact that "il semble vouloir agacer le public". Such a reference suggests the existence in the painting's image of a *picador* and "flèches de rubans multicolores", or at least that the existence of the latter implies the involvement (possibly unseen) of the former. Either situation is a confusing one in that a *picador*, on horseback, would use a wooden-shafted, unadorned, steel-spiked *pica* into the neck muscles, not at the head, of the bull during the first act of a bullfight, and a *banderillo*, from a standing position, would place the *banderillas*, a pair of rounded dowels with coloured ribbons or papers and with barbed steel points, into the withers of the bull during the second act of the bullfight.²⁵ A *matador* is not present with the *muleta* and sword during either of these sequences in the *corrida*, in contrast to the evidence of the contemporary cartoons and commentaries that the fallen figure in the original painting was such a *matador*, and the X-radiograph evidence that the painting of the figure of the

toreador, or *matador*, has remained, apart from the adjustment of the feet, basically intact.²⁶ This possible confusion by Manet with the specific ritual of the *corrida* gives support to the argument that, rather than cutting the original canvas before his trip to Spain as a response to the criticism, Manet did so after realising the errors on actually seeing bullfights during the trip. And in the context of the painting of 1864, there is thus the possibility that a pair of coloured *banderillas* may have existed, although still in an incorrect position at the bull's head, where the shaft, or possible *pica*, is now seen in the lower right corner of *The Bullfight*.

With such possibilities and uncertainties existing, the examination of the co-ordinated X-radiographs of the existing separate paintings was undertaken in an attempt to identify a spatial structure upon which known information of the 1864 painting could be set. Such a structure, although not based upon an underlying perspectival geometry, was provided by the extension of the enclosing barrier seen in *The Bullfight* into the upper left corner of the *Dead Toreador* canvas. This extension was established with a proposal for the large, apparently interlocking forms seen in the upper left corner of *The Dead Toreador* X-radiograph, identifying the barrier and a corner gate post, two gates with one fully open and the other almost closed, and the shadows of the barrier, post and one gate cast on the ground of the bullring. The details of the resultant proposal, as shown in Fig.A7, are seen to be partly made up of identified elements visible in the co-ordinated images of the existing paintings, as shown in Fig.A8, from the co-ordinated X-radiographs of the existing paintings, as shown in Fig.A9, and from those elements assessed by this writer to have been part of the original painting.

The proposal, with the formats of the two existing paintings shown as (A) and (B), provides a setting for the combined actions of the larger figures of the existing prone *matador* (c), and three *toreros* (d, e, and f), and the proposed amended form of the bull (g) with the angled *pica* (h) set against its head, as discussed above. The forms of the barrier (j) and the stand (k), as visible in *The Bullfight*, are unchanged. There are, however, spatial disjunctions in perspective and scale with the relationships of all of these elements. No apparent coincidence of eye levels seems to exist, with that for the barrier nominally set

between the curvatures of its top and base at EL1. The eye level for the group of toreros was assessed to be slightly higher, that for the matador to be much higher, and that for the bull to be lower.²⁷ Combined with these disjunctions of multiple eye levels are also those of scale. If the scale of the barrier were to be used as the spatial determinant, for example, then certainly the bull is too small and the *matador* is too large. But such assessments only confirm the disjunctions and mean little in terms of Manet's picture-making process.

The elements identified in the upper left corner of *The Dead Toreador* X-radiograph include the extended barrier (*j1*), the corner gate post (*m*), and the gates to the bullring, with one open (*n*) and the other almost closed (*p*). Part of the process in analysing these shapes in the X-radiograph involved what has been proposed as two shadows (*q* and *r*) cast on the sand surface of the bullring, one cast by the post (*m*) and the barrier, and the other by the left-hand gate (*p*). The shape of the serrated form of the shadow is a reasonably accurate depiction of the shadow cast by the top edge of a panelled barrier with posts at intervals and with sunlight in the direction shown. The extensions of the post (*m*) and the barrier top set beyond the edge of the proposed canvas provided the form from which the direction of sunlight (*s1*) could be established, and the vertical angled edge of the post is seen to form the straight edge of the shadow on the ground. This same direction of sunlight (*s2*) has been used to establish, from the horizontal distance of its cast shadow on the ground surface (*r*), the height of the gate (*p*), with the shadow of the gate's vertical edge seen parallel in space with the shadow of the post and the shadow of the gate's top incorrectly curved. For simplification, and with the sunlight direction almost parallel in plan with the picture plane, the sunlight was shown in the exhibition catalogue proposal with parallel lines. More accurately, the sunlight is shown here as parallel rays in space with a vanishing point below and out of frame. The foot-rail (*t*) evident in *The Bullfight*, is extended to the left, as partly seen in the X-radiograph, to the corner post (*t1*) and across the faces of the two gates (*t2* and *t3*).

The profile of the proposed bull (*g*) is a composite of information from the X-radiographs and the form of the bull in *The Bullfight*. Its form within the canvas of *The*

Dead Toreador is used to its full extent, but with what until now have been considered to be two horns are proposed here as the bull's right horn and the extension of the shaft visible in the lower right corner of the X-radiograph of *The Bullfight* (not its visible form in the painting), to form the *pica* (*h*). The form of the bull within the confines of the canvas of *The Bullfight* uses the intermittently seen outline of its back in the X-radiograph as well as a form assessed by this writer from the outline of the bull's back visible in the painting, and the end of the bull's tail as seen in the painting. The gap (*u*) between the canvases of the two existing paintings combines the lower and upper forms of the bull's body and the proposed position of the bull's left horn.²⁸

The positions of the three toreros (*d*, *e*, and *f*) are taken from *The Bullfight*, but, with only two depicted in the Cham caricature, the inclusion of the torero (*e*) is uncertain. The extent of the crowd (*v*) has been limited to that shown in *The Bullfight* but, as indicated above, the original canvas may have at least been above the upper edge of *The Bullfight* canvas. The form and position of the fallen *matador* relates to that of the existing painting and as evident in the X-radiograph, with the different position of his feet seen in the X-radiograph maintained as the possible form in the Salon painting.

Apart from the sunlight rays depicted more accurately in perspective as mentioned above, there are two differences in form between the proposal shown here in Fig.A7 and the proposal published in the exhibition catalogue. The first involves the detailed profile of the top of the barrier as required to form the serrated form of the cast shadow and which was not included in the catalogue diagram for reasons of clarity, and the second involves the top edge of the front wall of the stand (*k*), which has been drawn to more accurately show its form in *The Bullfight*, and which, in fact, demonstrates Manet's understanding of the overlapping curved lines in perspective of the barrier top and the shape of the stand.

As discussed above, there are unresolved problems with any proposal for the Salon painting, and those which still exist in this proposal involve questions of the existence of a *pica* or *banderillas*, the incorrect position of the *pica* against the head of the bull, and the fact that the open gates suggest the bull's recent arrival which, in turn, does not account for the already dead *matador*. Some of these aspects provide confirmation of Manet's then

limited knowledge of the bullring and the *corrida*. There are also a number of other problems. First, the direction of sunlight which forms the cast shadows on the ground of the barrier top, the post and the gate, and which is connected to the shadow edge visible in the painting (*b*), cannot form the curved edge (*w*) of the shaded area of the barrier, which is formed by the curved barrier top of the barrier itself. Although the lack of a cohesive space does not allow a correct shape to be determined, it would in reality be more vertical than depicted. And second, the form proposed for the foot-rail (*t2*) to gate (*n*) also presents a functional problem, in that it is seemingly too long and would not allow the gate to fully close. Interestingly the shadow formed by the rail on the face of the gate at (*x*) is, however, reasonably accurate and confirms that the position of the rail to be intentional. This is a possible anomaly which may be easily explained with more knowledge of the means used at the time of closing the gates.

These problems are not seen as impediments for the overall proposal, and only highlight the contradictions which make themselves apparent with so many of the spatial aspects in Manet's art, be they shadows, perspective, scale, or disjunctions. Even though his cast shadows, for example, can be seen at times to be variously inconsistent, incorrect, and indeed perversely indifferent to conventions of spatial geometry, there is sufficient evidence, as here, to make it clear that those discrepancies are intentional and that in all of these contentious areas of pictorial inconsistencies, including shadow projection, Manet knew exactly what he was doing.

As stated above, the ongoing physical examinations of the extant paintings suggest that much more is yet to be revealed about the interim stages of the original canvas and therefore possibly of its imagery when exhibited in the Salon of 1864. In the context of the spatial considerations of this dissertation, *Incident in a Bullfight* is seen as part of an ongoing development with composite imagery by Manet, but as an outcome with which he was ultimately not satisfied. Its precedents in the early 1860s included *The Old Musician*, *La pêche*, and *Mlle V...in the Costume of an Espada*, and like *The Old Musician* it was a composite of disparately scaled forms rather than spaces and because of that it created neither a spatial unity within its illusion nor a cohesion of spaces at its surface as had been

achieved with *Mlle V...in the Costume of an Espada*. Although there is no evidence of an interplay of frontal and angled views in this proposal for *Incident in a Bullfight* or in the extant paintings, Manet brought that strategy into play when he worked on the etching and aquatint after *The Dead Toreador* in 1868 (Fig.A6). The simple device of the background plane set parallel to the picture plane in interplay with an apparently angled element in the figure of the *matador* is one that, as discussed in Chapter 4, was used time and again by Manet throughout his career.

5A. INCIDENT IN A BULLFIGHT: Notes

DISSERTATION: Volume 2, pp.16–18

NOTES

[\[Page 16 of dissertation here\]](#)

1. Listed in the Salon catalogue as: "No.1282 – *Épisode d'une course de taureaux*."
2. Listed in the exhibition catalogue as "No. 5 – *L'Homme mort*, L.1m.53c., H.0m.75c."
3. "In late 1864 or early 1865 he [Manet] wrote to the dealer Louis Martinet, indicating his intention to send eight pictures to an exhibition at his gallery. Item no.2 in Manet's list is '*L'Espada mort*.'" (Charles S. Moffett, 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.196.
4. In his *Histoire de Edouard Manet et de son œuvre. Avec un catalogue des Peintures et des Pastels* (H. Floury, Paris, 1902), Théodore Duret noted of *L'Homme mort* that "Ce tableau est le fragment principal du tableau exposé au Salon de 1864, sous le titre *Épisode d'un combat de taureaux*, qui a été coupé et divisé en deux." (cat.no.51, p.205), and that a work described as "trois

[\[Page 17 of dissertation here\]](#)

- terreros contre la balustrade de la corrida, avec un taureau noir par devant" was catalogued as "Le second fragment du *Combat de taureaux*" (cat.no.52, p.205).
5. Theodore Reff, *Manet and Modern Paris*, National Gallery of Art, Washington, 1982, pp.214–15. Reff also pointed out that earlier X-radiographs were read as evidence that *The Bullfight* had not been part of the 1864 canvas.
 6. Susan Grace Galassi, the curator of the exhibition, invited Juliet Wilson-Bareau and this writer to develop our ongoing research into *Incident in a Bullfight* in collaboration with Ann Hoenigswald and her colleagues at the Conservation Department, National Gallery of Art, Washington DC. For an excellent overview of the history of the original canvas and its two fragments, see Galassi's essay in the exhibition catalogue of the same title, Susan Grace Galassi, et al., *Manet's The Dead Toreador and The Bullfight: Fragments of a Lost Salon Painting Reunited*, The Frick Collection, New York, 1999, pp.7–18.
 7. Malcolm Park and Juliet Wilson-Bareau, 'Another View of Manet's Bullfight Pictures', *ibid.*, pp.22–24.
 8. Colloquium held at The Frick Collection, New York, on 7 June, 1999.
 9. For this writer, Manet's disjunctions can be seen as integral parts of the *possible* or *not-possible* cohesion of a work's overall space. As has been described in more detail in Chapter 4, an earlier work, *Mlle V...in the Costume of an Espada*, presented extreme disjunctions of scale and space, but with the complex spatial interrelationships between its disparate elements seen cohesively at the surface of the work, the *possibility* exists that the spaces are woven together. The very possibility makes the overall space ambiguous. It is suggested that the relationship between the toreador and the smaller figures, as proposed for an earlier composition involving those elements by Ann Hoenigswald (Galassi, et al 1999 (as in n.6), plate 4), is an obvious contrast between 'large' and 'small' and makes any cohesion of the overall space, even an ambiguous one, *not possible* – and makes their conjunction in the one image one that Manet would not have made.

10. Bertall (pseud. for Charles Albert d'Arnoux), "Joujoux espagnols accommodés à la sauce noire de Ribera,...", caricature, Le Journal amusant, 21 May, 1864.
[2013 Note: The captions to Figures A3 and A4 were incorrectly transposed in the original dissertation. The references in the text and the captions to the reproductions have been corrected; Figure A3 is by Cham and Figure A4 is by Bertall]
11. Cham (pseud. for Amédée de Noé), "Ayant eu à se plaindre de son marchand de couleurs,...", caricature, 'Une Promenade au salon. Croquis par Cham', Le Charivari, 22 May, 1864.
12. H. Oulevay, "Un toréador mis en chambre, par Manet –", caricature, 'Au Salon de 1864', Le Monde illustré, 28 May, 1864.
13. Louis Leroy, 'Salon de 1864, VIII', Charivari, 25 May, 1864, p.79.
14. Hector de Callias, 'Salon de 1864', L'Artiste, 1 June, 1864, p.242.
15. Jules Castagnary, 'Salon de 1864', Le Grand Journal, 12 June, 1864, p.3.
16. Théophile Gautier, fils, 'Le Salon de 1864', Le Monde Illustré, 18 June, 1864, p.397.
17. Théophile Thoré (W. Bürger, pseud.), L'Indépendance belge, 15 June, 1864.
Published in Théophile Thoré (W. Bürger, pseud.), Salons de W. Bürger, 1861 à 1868, préf. T.Thoré, 2 vols., Librairie de Ve Jules Renouard, Paris, 1870, v.2, pp.98–99.
18. Théophile Gautier, 'Le Salon de 1864', Le Moniteur universel, 25 June, 1864, p.1.
19. Other sources for the figure have since been proposed. See: Gerald M. Ackerman's discussion of the possible influence on Manet of Jean-Léon Gérôme's *The Dead Caesar* of 1859 and other Gérôme images in his article 'Gérôme and Manet', Gazette des Beaux-Arts, s.6, v.70, September, 1967, pp.163-76; and Theodore Reff's discussions on Gérôme's work and Léopold Flameng's *Roland Dead (The Dead Soldier)*, 1865, in Reff 1982 (as in n.5), pp.216–19.
Also see a review of the literature in: Charles S. Moffett's catalogue entry, "*The Dead Man (The Dead Toreador)*", Cachin, et al. 1983 (as in n.3), pp.196–98.; and, Susan Grace Galassi, Galassi, et al. 1999 (as in n.6), p.12, p.17-n.23.
20. See Appendix 4 for details of the computer-generated modelling.
21. Ann Hoenigswald, 'Technical Observations', Galassi, et al. 1999, p.19.
22. Discussed at the Colloquium (see n.8).
23. Reference was made to the closeness of brushwork and palette as evident in *The Bullfight* and that of *The Bullfight* of 1865–66 in the Art Institute of Chicago – a work which had been painted after Manet's return from Spain – by Theodore Reff in a lecture presented at The Frick Collection, New York, 20 November, 1982 (cited in: Cachin, et al. 1983, p.196).
24. Confirmed by bullfight expert, Mr. Stanley Conrad, at the Colloquium (see n.8).
25. For a description of the stages of a *corrida*, and an explanation of the words, terms, and phrases used in bullfighting, see Ernest Hemingway, Death in the Afternoon, Jonathan Cape, London, 1955 (1932), and especially 'An Explanatory Glossary', pp.263–340. Stanley Conrad (see n.24) made it clear, however, that the forms of the *corrida* had often changed and had not been static from the nineteenth century.
26. See Ann Hoenigswald's 'Technical observations', Galassi, et al. 1999, pp.19–21.
27. Without a consistent spatial geometry, the assessments have been based upon the form and sensed spatial shaping of each element, and apart from the eye level for the barrier which can use the difference in curvature between the top and bottom of the barrier as a gauge, no accurate placement of the other eye levels can be attempted.
28. At the time of the proposal made for the exhibition catalogue, the gap between the two canvases had been estimated by this writer to have been 5.5 cm, rather than the Ann Hoenigswald's estimation of 4.0 cm (Galassi, et al. 1999, p.21) which had been based upon a more accurate

[Page 18 of dissertation here]

examination of the actual tacking margins. The 5.5cm had been based upon the triangulation of the angled pica seen in the X-radiographs of both paintings, but was assessed by means of the visual examination of small photographic prints. There has not been an opportunity for a more detailed examination to be made, but on further consideration the gap has been reduced in the proposal in Fig.A7 to 4.5 cm.
