

## The choreography of Caillebotte's *Dans un café*<sup>1</sup>

© Malcolm Park 2012

[PO Box 45, The Junction, NSW, 2291, AUSTRALIA; E-mail: mpark24@bigpond.com]

---

One of eleven works shown by Gustave Caillebotte at the fifth Impressionist exhibition in 1880, *Dans un café* (d.1880; Berhaut 142<sup>2</sup>; Fig.1)<sup>3</sup> was a painting that presented, with its mirrored reflections of reflections within a café interior, something of a spatial conundrum. Caillebotte had joined the Impressionists after rejection for the 1875 Paris Salon and showed in their exhibitions of 1876, 1877, 1879, 1880, and 1882. He played a crucial role in the organisation of the 1877 show, conciliated in the disputes that arose among the participating artists over the period, and assisted many in financial difficulties. Although he continued to paint after that involvement, his work became less known with time and only re-emerged from relative obscurity in the late 1940s and, more particularly, the subsequent three decades by way of Marie Berhaut's scholarship and catalogue raisonné<sup>4</sup> and a major retrospective exhibition curated by Kirk Varnedoe and Thomas Lee. Varnedoe's perceptive insights and authoritative commentary in the exhibition catalogue, a subsequent related publication, and earlier articles<sup>5</sup> were a substantial influence on later assessments and studies. One aspect of Varnedoe's considerations, co-authored in part with Peter Galassi, involved the compositional and perspectival analyses of a number of Caillebotte's major works, including *Le pont de l'Europe* (1876; Berhaut 49), *Rue de Paris; temps de pluie* (1877; Berhaut 57) and *Dans un café*.<sup>6</sup> However, many questions can be raised with those analyses and the complexities involved in the pictorial space of *Dans un café* are addressed here.

The painting is also of particular interest in the context of both the function of cafés in the Paris of Caillebotte's time and their depiction by his contemporaries. They proliferated with Baron Haussmann's transformation of the urban fabric of Paris in the 1860s and became the typical venues where artists met for discussion and debate. However, although the response by the Impressionists to their contemporary Parisian world produced numerous interior views, few were of café interiors. Nevertheless, works such as Edgar Degas's *Absinthe* (1876; Musée d'Orsay, Paris) and Pierre-Auguste Renoir's *Au café* (1877; Kröller-Müller Museum, Otterlo), as well as one from colleague Edouard Manet, *La prune* (c.1878; National Gallery, Washington), have become iconic café images of the time. Caillebotte's *Dans un café* is another such iconic work, even if its painterly qualities are less lively

than the others. Its implicit social issues revolving around the standing *habitué* figure as a 'type'<sup>7</sup> and the café as an 'all-male' establishment<sup>8</sup> have been addressed by scholars, but the work is important in Caillebotte's oeuvre for reasons involving its pictorial space.

His concern with pictorial space is particularly evident during the period from 1875 to 1880 and perspective and photography<sup>9</sup> were clearly two important means by which he manipulated space to create emphases beyond mere observation. Those manipulations took many forms. One involved the offset positioning of centres of vision towards one side of a field of view in both one-point perspective views, as in *Les raboteurs de parquet*, and two-point perspective views made to appear as if one-point, as in *Le pont de l'Europe* and *Les peintres en bâtiment* (1877; Berhaut 53). The spatial implications of that technique were used to full effect in *Dans un café* and, as described below, were most probably influenced by photography. Another important spatial characteristic involved deeply recessed spaces reinforced by elongated forms in perspective, as in *Le pont de l'Europe* and *Les peintres en bâtiment*, and the receding planes set at one side of those views to seemingly accelerate the illusion of spatial recession also exist in other works such as *Rue de Paris; temps de pluie* and *Un balcon, boulevard Haussmann*. Spatial recession was handled, however, in ways other than dynamically plunging vistas, as articulated, for example, with the informal intervals through the foreground seated figures and background tree trunks in *Portraits à la campagne* (1876; Berhaut 40). And spatial interaction was also created with subtle reverberations between interior and exterior spaces as in *Jeune homme à sa fenêtre* (1875; Berhaut 32) and *Intérieur, femme à la fenêtre* (1880; Berhaut 140), or the filtering of space through foreground meshes as with the bridge structure in *Le pont de l'Europe, variant* (1877; Berhaut 51) and the balcony balustrade in *Vue prise à travers un balcon* (1880; Berhaut 147). Virtual reflected spaces prior to *Dans un café* were not numerous, but one is mirror-reflected in a work earlier than 1875, *Femme à sa toilette* (c.1873; Berhaut 9), and much less explicit examples with glazed doors exist in works such as *Jeune homme à sa fenêtre*.<sup>10</sup> Wide-angle views from viewpoints close to subjects, as in *Jeune homme au piano* (1876; Berhaut 36) and *Le déjeuner*, and spatial disjunctions resulting from unusual juxtapositions of scale and depth relationships with figures, as in *Intérieur, femme lisant* (1880; Berhaut 139), also indicate Caillebotte's use of photography as a visual resource. Notwithstanding this concerted program of spatial experimentation up to 1880, it is apparent that after that date he was less concerned with space as an integral component of his creative 'palette'. Space had been his métier and the élan of those earlier examples was matched by few subsequent works.<sup>11</sup> In

such circumstances and because of its spatial complexity and sophistication *Dans un café* can be thought the culmination of his spatial program.

That is exemplified with its audacious use of double reflections with large mirrors. As décor elements utilised extensively in dining and entertainment establishments, large mirrors became a device by which artists modulated pictorial space and Caillebotte may have been influenced by specific works or particular artists. Manet, for example, had experimented with mirrors in settings of cafés and café-concerts, as seen in his contemporaneous *Café-concert* (1878–79; Walters Art Museum, Baltimore) – a painting exhibited in Paris at *La Vie Moderne* in March, 1880, and in which the top-hatted customer looks in the direction of where the singer seen reflected in the wall mirror behind him may actually be performing. The reflections in all such works were, however, literal, even if that in *Café-concert* created uncertainty. Caillebotte's use of double reflections in *Dans un café* was of a very different order. Although seemingly comprehensible, the spatial play is ambiguous as the eye is led from the actual foreground space into the reflected spaces with their uncertain juxtaposition of walls, mirrors, figures and objects.

In the painting's café setting, the specific locale of which is unknown, the standing *habitué* seems to lean back against a table, which is set in front of an upholstered bench seat, and looks in a detached manner at something set slightly to his left. In the mirror is seen his reflection almost directly behind him as well as the reflections of two men seated at a table in front of a second mirror, with the man seated on an upholstered bench leaning forward and to one side. To the face of the second mirror is fixed a hat rack and reflections in that mirror include those of hats and, beyond, a light-filled window and a striped awning. A coat is hanging on a wall which is adjacent the mirror and seemingly in the same plane. Of two groups of wall-bracket lights – that at the left seen in the first reflected space and that at the right reflected in the second reflected space – their different sizes confirm that the reflected distance from the viewer to the second group is greater than to the first. The main direction of light on the scene is from the *habitué*'s right (viewer's left) side. The artist is not seen in any of the reflections.<sup>12</sup>

A perspectival analysis (Fig.2) confirms an underlying perspective geometry to the painting's pictorial space and provides an understanding of the relationship between the wall planes and the centre of vision from a viewpoint.<sup>13</sup> The slight upward angle of the long edges of the bench seat and table tops directly behind the *habitué* indicates the centre of vision is at an angle to the foreground

wall, even if almost perpendicular, and the view is basically a two-point perspective, not a one-point perspective. When those parallel, horizontal edges are extended they converge towards a vanishing point *VP1* which is outside the picture field far to the right and positions the eye level *EL*. The lack of the artist's reflection in the mirror on the wall behind the *habitué* indicates the vanishing point for all parallel, horizontal lines perpendicular to the mirror must be positioned to the left of the mirror's left edge and that is confirmed by the vanishing point *VP2*, also set at the eye level, established from the *habitué's* hat and its reflection. In contradiction, however, the ends of the table tops (presumed to be rectilinear in shape) directly behind the *habitué* converge towards a very different vanishing point *VP3* on the eye level. That circumstance may have been influenced by Caillebotte's preparatory drawing, *Au café* (c.1880, Berhaut 142A (*Homme devant un miroir*), Fig.3), which has all the characteristics of a drawing from 'life' and in which the final assessed angle of the table top end relates directly to that in the painting. The two reflected spaces, the first in the foreground mirror and the second in the mirror behind the two seated men, also provide perspectival information. In the first reflected space the edges of the bench seat behind the two seated men and the hat rack fixed to the mirror above them would be parallel and horizontal in reality and they converge towards a vanishing point *VP4* that is also at the eye level and positioned far to the left of *VP2* and *VP3*, confirming that in the reflected space they are set at an angle to the foreground mirror's surface. In contrast, as the two groups of wall-bracket lights are approximately horizontal, the walls to which they are fixed must be either perpendicular to the centre of vision or nearly parallel with the foreground wall and mirror.

The only previous proposal for the painting's setting, and one that has been accepted by all scholars, was made by Kirk Varnedoe in 1976 in the form of a diagrammatic plan (Fig.4).<sup>14</sup> It involved mirrors set on two opposing parallel walls and a window set in the wall behind the *habitué*. No perspective view of the proposal was offered but a computer-generated view presented here of the café interior as seen from the viewpoint (Fig.5) produces an image that has no potential to correspond with the painting, either in its perspective or relationship of its parts.<sup>15</sup> There are, for example, only two walls involved, one seen both in actual space and as a second reflection, and the other as a single reflection, with the vanishing point for both walls converging to a single vanishing point towards the right. There is no evidence of a wall or mirror that could produce the required alignment in perspective of the seated men's table, wall-bracket lights, hat rack and awning; the seated man on the bench is to the (viewer's) left of his companion, not to the right as in the painting; and, the hat reflections are to

the (viewer's) left of the actual hats, also not to the right as required. Importantly, the pictorial space is obvious and comprehensible, without ambiguity.<sup>16</sup> Although Varndoe suggested that, as part of the "confounding game of optics", Caillebotte had ensured there would be no reflection of the seated men in the second mirror,<sup>17</sup> a reflection of the man nearest the mirror is actually seen. And even though it could be eliminated by moving the men and table, but not the mirror, along the wall to be closer to the viewpoint, the men would then be overlapped by the *habitué's* figure and the view's basic disparity with the painting would not be altered.

The alternative proposal made here has a very different plan arrangement, as shown in Fig.6.<sup>18</sup> It shows walls *wall.1* and *wall.2* to be parallel, mirror *mr.1* fixed to *wall.1*, and an angled *wall.3* to which mirror *mr.2* is fixed.<sup>19</sup> With the first reflected and second reflected virtual spaces set out behind mirror *mr.1* and reflected mirror *mr.2* respectively, the plan also demonstrates how those reflected spaces are seen from the viewpoint *PI*. All item notations in the first reflected virtual space are given a single quotation mark (e.g. *m.3'*) and those in the second reflected virtual space given a double quotation mark (e.g. *m.3''*). At the viewpoint, the artist, whether sketching or using a camera, is positioned outside the reflected lines of sight, ensuring that his reflected figure is not seen in either mirror. The centre of vision *CV* from the viewpoint is almost perpendicular to *wall.1* and, importantly, is offset at the left side of the depicted extent of view (*ev*). And the *habitué* (*m.1*), with a turn of his head to his left, is looking towards the seated men *m.2* and *m.3*. A computer-generated view as seen from the viewpoint (Fig.7) presents a relatively accurate correspondence with the painting's image, in both the perspective geometry and the relationship of its parts, as seen with the overlaid line drawing made after the painting.<sup>20</sup> In the first reflected space behind mirror *mr.1* the *habitué's* reflection is correctly set behind his actual figure; the reflected figures of the seated men are to the (viewer's) right of him; the man *m.3'* is to the (viewer's) right of his companion; and, the group of lights *g.1'* is on *wall.2'*. In the second-reflected space behind mirror *mr.2'*, the group of lights *g.2''* is on *wall.3''* which is approximately perpendicular to the centre of vision;<sup>21</sup> the window and its awning are to the (viewer's) right of the lights; and, the reflections of the hats are correctly to the (viewer's) right of the actual hats. That the painting's image is an offset section, both horizontally and vertically, of a complete view around the centre of vision shows that Caillebotte either intentionally constructed the perspective in that way or, as is more likely, used a *chambre photographique*<sup>22</sup> camera which could record such a partial view with that spatial shaping. The image's ambiguity is heightened by this unseen, but sensed,

difference between the view's actual direction of its centre of vision and its apparent direction set diagonally through the reflected spaces to the window in the upper right corner.

The most obvious discrepancy between the proposal's image and that of the painting involves the reflected angled *wall.3'*, with its attached mirror and bench seat, and the table at which the two men are seated. Not only are those elements seen in the view with a slightly more angled perspective than in the painting, they are also set at a slightly lower level, as if the viewpoint was higher when a detailed assessment was made of their reflected images. No explanation can be given for the discrepancy and adjustments to the wall's angle, the viewing height, or the distance from mirror *mr.1* make little difference – an adjustment made to improve one aspect increases the discrepancy of another. Interestingly, the inclination of the reflected angled wall in Caillebotte's preparatory drawing is much greater – suggesting that he used some flexibility in coordinating and finalising the angled wall and the double-reflections.<sup>23</sup> The inconsistencies revealed by the perspectival analysis and this example not only confirm that the painting's image is not a photographic exactitude but also make clear that no reconstruction of the café's presumed space can produce a view to match the painting. They are not a contradiction of the painting's overall perspective geometry – rather, they are seen as either Caillebotte's unintended inaccuracies made during its creation or intentional adjustments made to suit his agenda of ambiguity.

An intentionally ambiguous device which can be explained is the absence of a second reflection in mirror *mr.2* of the seated man *m.3* supporting his head on one hand. By leaning the man both forward and to one side Caillebotte ensured that his reflection would not be seen in the mirror – part of his torso is within the line of sight but it is lower than the back of the bench seat and therefore not seen in the mirror. To have seen the reflection of his head would have limited the painting's potential for ambiguity – so, to avoid it, Caillebotte 'stage-managed' the setting. One element of the staging also enhanced the ambiguity by means of the unifying spatial and pictorial device of transposition. The scene's main lighting through a window (*wi*) outside the painting's field to the left (the *habitué's* right) is actually seen emanating from the painting's surface through the double reflected window in the upper right corner. A wry touch indeed. One can imagine the artist, with prankish humour, setting up a camera and 'choreographing' everyone, including himself to be not seen, in order to achieve the desired result.<sup>24</sup> Importantly, the crafted ambiguity inflects upon one's response to the painting.

Nothing is quite what it seems – the lassitude of the scene is given an 'edge', the apparent confidence of its main 'player' is diminished and his detached demeanour is infused with introspection.<sup>25</sup>

That layering of *Dans un café* with spatial ambiguity raises an intriguing and tantalising possible connection with Edouard Manet's later masterpiece, *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* (1881–82; Courtauld Institute Galleries, London), in which things that apparently should have a reflection don't seem to and things that are seen in reflection aren't there.<sup>26</sup> As the younger Caillebotte knew Manet and clearly had much more contact with him than known records attest,<sup>27</sup> it can only be assumed that Manet saw *Dans un café* in the Impressionist exhibition of 1880 and was influenced by its play of mirrors when he commenced the *Bar* the following year.<sup>28</sup> Both paintings use a single, apparently frontal, foreground figure set within the spatial shaping of an offset view.<sup>29</sup> Whereas Manet used, as he had with various works throughout his career, the offset strategy in a one-point perspective to suggest a concurrent angled view,<sup>30</sup> Caillebotte used the technique in a two-point perspective to change the apparent direction of view. As noted above, the two-point perspective views of *Le pont de l'Europe* and *Les peintres en bâtiment* appear as if one-point, but in *Dans un café* a frontal two-point perspective view appears as if a more angled two-point view to the right through the reflected spaces. That connection between the similar underlying strategies of the two artists and Caillebotte's possible awareness of the mirror reflection in Manet's *Café-concert* give rise to a speculation that the original influence on Caillebotte's spatial manipulation in fact came from Manet.

Notwithstanding that possibility, the nuanced spatial concept and layered artifice of *Dans un café*'s singular image make it both unique in Caillebotte's oeuvre and a significant work from that epoch.

---

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Assistance with the computer modelling and illustrations, initially from Mark Jacques and subsequently from Darren McKimm, is gratefully acknowledged.

## NOTES

1. This essay replaces and updates 'Appendix 2: Manet and Caillebotte' in the doctoral dissertation by this author which is also presented in *Unpublished writings*.
2. 'Berhaut' references are for the painting catalogue numbers in M. Berhaut, *Gustave Caillebotte: catalogue raisonné des peintures et pastels*, Wildenstein Institute, Paris 1994 (1st edn. 1978).
3. Catalogue no.6. The works shown included eight paintings and three pastels; see C.S. Moffett, *The New Painting: Impressionism 1874–1886*, exh. cat. (San Francisco, Washington), The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, San Francisco, 1986, p.311.
4. Berhaut's publications include:
  - a) M. Berhaut, 'Trois tableaux de Gustave Caillebotte', *Musées de France*, July, 1948, pp.144–47, in which *Dans un café* (referred to in the article as *Au Café*) is one of the works discussed. An error with the enumeration of the article's end-notes has the text reference to another work.
  - b) M. Berhaut, exh. cat. *Rétrospective Gustave Caillebotte (1848–1894)*, exh. cat. (Galerie Beaux-Arts), Wildenstein, Paris 1951; this catalogue of the 89 works exhibited also includes the first comprehensive 'Catalogue des peintres et pastels' for Caillebotte compiled by Berhaut with 332 works listed.
  - c) M. Berhaut: *Caillebotte l'Impressionniste*, International Art Book – La Bibliothèque des Arts, Lausanne and Paris, 1968.
  - d) Berhaut, *op. cit.* (note 2), 1st edn. 1978.
5. J.K.T. Varnedoe and T.P. Lee, *Gustave Caillebotte. A Retrospective Exhibition*, exh. cat. (Houston, New York), The Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, 1976; and, the later publication based on the exhibition catalogue, K. Varnedoe, *Gustave Caillebotte*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1987. For Varnedoe's discussions on Caillebotte's place within the art of his time in general and the Impressionists in particular see *ibid.*, 'Caillebotte: An Evolving Perspective', pp.12–19, and his earlier article, 'Gustave Caillebotte in context', *Arts Magazine*, 50/8, May, 1976, pp.94–99.
6. Varnedoe 1987, *op. cit.* (note 5). Ch.3: K. Varnedoe with P. Galassi, 'Caillebotte's Space', pp.20–26; Ch.4: P. Galassi, 'Caillebotte's Method', pp.27–40; '39. Dans un café', pp.136–39.
7. Eugène Veron thought it "facile de trouver dans un certain monde ce personnage. C'est un type saisi sur le vif, et qui appartient bien réellement à notre époque."; see E. Veron, 'Cinquième exposition des Indépendants', *L'Art: revue hebdomadaire illustrée*, 21, Paris, 1880, p.93; quoted in Varnedoe 1987, *op. cit.* (note 5), p.195. Joris-Karl Huysmans wondered if "ce pilier d'estaminet, avec son chapeau écrasé sur la nuque, ses mains plantées dans les poches, l'avons-nous assez vu dans toutes les brasseries..."; see J.-K. Huysmans, 'L'Exposition des Indépendants

en 1880', in *L'Art Moderne*, Paris 1883, pp.96–97; quoted in Varnedoe 1987, *op. cit.* (note 5), p.215. And Berhaut thought "Ce personnage... semble sortir directement d'un roman de Zola"; see Berhaut, *op. cit.* (note 4.a), p.146. The *habitué* was modelled by an unidentified friend of Caillebotte and a portrait, *Tête d'homme* (c.1880; Berhaut 141), was probably a preparatory study. He was similarly depicted as a 'type' in *Un balcon, boulevard Haussmann* (1880; Berhaut 146).

8. See a discussion on those aspects in G. Groom, '79. In a Café', in A. Distel, et al., *Gustave Caillebotte: Urban Impressionist*, exh. cat. (Paris, Chicago, Los Angeles), La Réunion des Musées Nationaux, Paris, and The Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago, in assoc. with Abbeville Press, New York, 1995, p.209.
9. With his younger brother Martial an enthusiastic photographer, Caillebotte was clearly able to utilise photography as a visual resource. The extent to which he used the process in the development of his imagery is becoming better understood. For discussion on Caillebotte's possible use of photographs as source imagery, see: Varnedoe 1987, *op. cit.* (note 5), pp.20–40; and, M. Park, 'Three street drawings by Gustave Caillebotte', *The Burlington Magazine*, 152/1289, August, 2010, pp.536–39. For a more general consideration of the brothers' involvement with photography, see: S. Lemoine, et al., *Dans l'intimité des frères Caillebotte: Peintre et Photographe*, exh. cat. (Paris, Québec), Musée Jacquemart-André, Paris, and Musée national des beaux-arts du Québec, Québec, 2011.
10. That spatial consideration does not involve the many examples in Caillebotte's oeuvre of reflective surfaces, such as, for example, the floor boards in *Raboteurs de parquet, variant* (1876; Berhaut 35), the dining table in *Le Déjeuner*, the wet cobblestones in *Rue de Paris; temps de pluie*, or the water's surface in his many paintings of the Yerres river. For discussion of such surfaces in terms of 'reflective dazzle', see M. Fried, 'Caillebotte's Impressionism', in N. Broude, ed., *Gustave Caillebotte and the Fashioning of Identity in Impressionist Paris*, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick (NJ) 2002, pp.66–116.
11. In 1884/85 Caillebotte painted a series of spatially interesting works that set single, isolated foreground figures against distant vistas, as seen in *La Père Magloire sur le chemin de Saint-Clair à Étretat* (1884; Berhaut 306). And in the wonderful *Richard Gallo et son chien Dick, au Petit Gennevilliers* (1884; Berhaut 305) Gallo and his dog appear to actually move across the static space established by means of the horizontal river banks and the opposing vertical elements of the two buildings and their reflections.
12. For assessment of Caillebotte's compositional strategies for the painting, see Varnedoe 1987, *op. cit.* (note 5), pp.136, 138, 215 (Plate 39-n.2); also, M-J. de Balanda, *Gustave Caillebotte: La vie, la technique, l'oeuvre peint*, Edita SA, Lausanne 1988, pp.48–51, 98.
13. Many perspectival inconsistencies exist in the works of Caillebotte, but the question of whether they are evidence of artistic licence at the surface of a work, conscious manipulations, or errors is best addressed with analysis of individual works. One is mindful, however, that the vagaries of

artistic vision and practice are often so complex that the potential for perspectival analysis to negotiate the creative process may at times be limited.

14. Varnedoe and Lee 1976–77, *op. cit.* (note 5), Fig. 1, p.145.
15. To produce the computer-generated view it was necessary to adjust the centre of vision – as all angles of incidence and reflection shown at the two mirrors in Varnedoe's diagram are different – and the viewpoint position to ensure the reflections of the seated men were not hidden behind the *habitué's* figure. The seated man on the bench seat is shown leaning forward and to his right side as required to match his reflected figure in the painting leaning to the left. Also, although not shown in Varnedoe's diagram, the wall lights, bench seats, additional table, hat rack and hats, coat and window awning were included to enable their forms within the view to be understood. To enable the top-hat to be the closest reflected hat to the viewer as seen in the painting, the positions of the two hats on the rack are reversed to those in this writer's proposal.
16. It is surprising that scholars have accepted, without question or confirmation, that Varnedoe's proposal produced the painting's depicted scene and inherent ambiguity.
17. Varnedoe and Lee 1976–77, *op. cit.* (note 5), p.145.
18. The initial analysis and proposal were part of a doctoral dissertation completed in 2001. However, many aspects of detail have been developed and refined with subsequent considerations. The proposal was discussed with the late Kirk Varnedoe in 1998 and he graciously acknowledged that the arrangement seemed to correctly explain the painting's configuration and spatial ambiguities. Without being definitive, the size and proportions of the proposed space seem to also present a more likely venue for a café than that seen in Varnedoe's proposal.
19. The forms and locations of the walls not seen in the view are unknown and are shown in notional positions and with notional doorways.
20. The image of *Dans un café* used as the basis for the perspectival analysis (Fig.2) and the views generated in Figures 5 and 7 was that as reproduced in many publications. It was surprising to find with the image supplied by the Musées de la Ville de Rouen, and as reproduced here, that the complete image of the painting's canvas was more extensive at its top, bottom, and right side than the usual reproductions. This is particularly noticed with the group of wall lights at the upper left which are usually cut at the image's top edge but now can be seen as complete spheres. The relevance of the perspectival analysis and the views are not changed, however, with the awareness of the larger image.
21. In the computer modelling the group of lights *g.2* was needed to be set 26 cm. higher than group *g.1* to match the painted image, suggesting a change in floor level may have existed in that area.
22. These were the cameras used by professional photographers at the time and which enabled offset views to be selected. Such cameras relate to the present-day 'view' or 'large-format' cameras.
23. As no X-radiographs have been made of the painting, it is not possible to assess if those elements had been altered from an earlier state.

24. Obviously a serious and dedicated artist who was passionate in his commitment to anything with which he was involved, Caillebotte, nevertheless, gives evidence in many of his paintings – with, for example, dogs out for a stroll or the swimmers on the river Yerres – of a droll stroke of the brush and a light, humorous side that responded to human quirks and understood the paradox of things.
25. For this writer, a two-dimensional image contains both the fact of any identifiable aspect and the fiction of its assessed 'representation', not one or the other. Identifications which can explain a work's crafted artifice, such as in this case the spatial geometry which enables the spatial organisation to be identified, are not disconnected from and do not diminish an understanding of the 'art' of such images. Rather, they have the potential to provide insights into their artifice and, in turn, make possible cogent and more relevant readings not previously contemplated.
26. For a review of some of the connections between the two paintings, see R. Brettell, 'Gustave Caillebotte and 'The New Painting'', *Apollo*, 142, December, 1995, p.58. Interestingly, in a discourse on "the double view" evident in *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère*, Marilyn Brown claims that *Dans un café* involves an "ambiguous double reflection that nonetheless projects a unified optical space, something not found in Manet's picture" – even though the assessment of *Dans un café* is based on Varnedoe's incorrect arrangement and she acknowledges that this writer's proposal for the accurate mirror reflection of the *Bar* "appears technically feasible"; see M.R. Brown, 'Yet Another Look at the *Bar*: Manet, Duranty, and the Double View', in T. Dolan, ed., *Perspectives on Manet*, Ashgate Publishing, Farnham (Surrey) and Burlington (VT), 2012, pp.177, 183-n.82, n.83.
27. There is an intriguing dearth of information on the extent of contact, either in person or by correspondence, between Caillebotte and Manet. Just one letter recorded in Berhaut's catalogue raisonné connects their names, that being an undated dinner invitation from Caillebotte to Camille Pissarro in which Manet is noted as one of the intended guests (Berhaut, *op. cit.* (note 2), letter no.5, p.273). Nonetheless and despite their age difference, with their many common friends and artist colleagues, the relatively short distance between their studios, and the fact that within a two year period Caillebotte painted two major works (*Le pont de l'Europe* and *Rue de Paris; temps de pluie*) which depicted locales at short distances on either side of Manet's studio of the time at no.4, Rue de Saint-Pétersbourg, contact between them would have been a natural and certain occurrence.
28. To this writer's knowledge, the possible influence of *Dans un café* on Manet's painting was first raised by Kirk Varnedoe in 1976; see Varnedoe and Lee 1976, *op. cit.* (note 5), pp.145–46. In discussing "l'impression de réalisme" evident in *Dans un café*, Berhaut stated that "C'est à Manet que l'on pense plus particulièrement ici – à Manet qui, ainsi que Degas, a traité plusieurs fois à cette époque le thème du café" but made no specific reference to *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère*; see Berhaut, *op. cit.* (note 4.a), p.146.
29. The offset strategy is explained in M. Park, 'Ambiguity, and the engagement of spatial illusion within the surface of Manet's paintings', Ph.D diss. (University of New South Wales, Sydney,

2001), I, 'Appendix 1: Comparative spatial shaping', pp.246–57; II, pp.32, 255–58. See this writer's spatial explanation of *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* in: *ibid.*, I, pp.208–42; II, pp.29–32, 226–54; as partly illustrated in the published brochure and related website for the *Manet: A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* exhibition held at The J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles, 2007; and, the essay M. Park, 'The spatial ambiguity of Manet's *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère*', in the *Unpublished writings* section of this website.

30. The use of an offset viewpoint in one-point perspective was a technique often used by artists and illustrators alike from the fifteenth century for convenience of construction or suitability of view, but seemingly not for spatial ambiguity. Ongoing research by this writer has, however, identified works, such as Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres' *Madame Moitessier, seated* (1856; The National Gallery, London), which similarly used the technique for ambiguity prior to Manet.
-