In Front of Manet's Bar.  

Subverting the "Natural"

JOHN HOUSE

The figure confronts the viewer frontally, directly. Centered in the image, the barmaid's gaze engages our space, grasps our attention. Yet this is not the gaze of the classic portrait image which, Mona-Lisa-like, follows us around the room, confidently positing the sitter as the viewer's equal, or superior. Our engagement with the figure is more oblique, more uncertain, more equivocal.

Hung as the picture now is, we can move up close to it, and momentarily imagine ourselves at the bar, the objects of the barmaid's half-attention. But as soon as we step back to view the image as a whole, we are irrevocably distanced from that gaze, and the complexities and oddities of the representation as a whole come into focus—the illegibility of the space and the incongruities of the famous mirror image.

However, this "we" is problematic, in two ways. If we identify the viewer with the client at the bar, he is immediately gendered, defined in terms of male social spaces and social rituals; the male figure seen in the mirror image endorses this identification. And yet the picture was made to be seen as fine art and in an exhibition context, by a different public, of both women and men, who would approach the image with a quite different agenda.

Moreover, for the picture's first viewers, at the Paris Salon in 1882, its imagery would have been far more complex and problematic than it seems now, raising as it did a set of issues that were central in contemporary debates about the city and its social rituals and morality—about "modernity." Likewise the picture's formal oddities would have seemed far more pointed in 1882. The late twentieth-century viewer can readily accommodate the picture's forms within a "modernist" aesthetic which has come to legitimize far more extreme dislocations of perceived reality. In its original context and for its
In this context, A Bar at the Folies-Bergère attacked the norms in complex and far-reaching ways. Most evidently, it denied a coherent, legible authorial position, by denying empathetic access to the image of the barmaid and yet juxtaposing it with a provocatively engaged image in the reflection, and furthermore, in the most basic terms, by denying the author/viewer any secure foothold within the pictorial space. Beyond this, the stereotype of the barmaid’s sexuality is questioned by the way in which the image is painted. The gaze of the figure, penetrating deep into our space, is counteracted by the barrier of the bar and its contents, whose palpable physicality creates a problematic threshold. The mirror reflection challenges any attempt to read the picture anecdotally or to define the picture as life. The fortun for these challenges was the walls of the Salon. The picture was made to be seen and judged as art; on an immediate level, its transgressions were artistic. By its insistent frontality and its clarity, luminous tonality, it proclaimed its difference from the measured spatial organization and mellow tonality of the pictures around it. But these transgressions also, and more fundamentally, challenged the values that underpinned the normative vision of a legible and coherent universe. As a whole, in its form as well as its subject, A Bar at the Folies-Bergère, in its complexities and calculated inconsistencies, presented a social world—the promiscuous world of boulevard entertainments—which was an epitome of the uncertainties of modernity in the city.

NOTES

I am indebted to Kathleen Adler, Juliet Wilson-Bareau, Kate Flint, and Suzanne T. Lindsay for their searching comments on the first draft of this essay; they are not accountable for the results. Among recent accounts of Manet’s picture, the following have been particularly useful: T. J. Clark, The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and His Followers (New York, 1984); Juliet Wilson-Bareau, “The Hidden Face of Manet,” supplement to Burlington Magazine, April 1986; and Robert L. Herbert, Impressionism: Art, Leisure and Parisian Society (New Haven and London, 1988). These are hereafter abbreviated as Clark 1984, Wilson Bareau 1986, Herbert 1988.
original viewers the picture's distortions had no such sanction: both its imagery and its form challenged contemporary notions of coherence and legibility.

Any historical reading of the picture has to tackle both the imagery and the way in which it was presented in a fine art context, and to bring these two issues together, so as to explore what it meant to treat that subject in painting in that way, at that particular moment.

Contemporary accounts show that the Folies-Bergère was, in the broadest terms, a middle class place of entertainment. The fact that it levied admission charges, rather than simply charge for drinks consumed, set it apart from most of the other cafés-concerts in Paris at the time. The entertainments it offered in a sense aped working class forms, but processed them, re-presented them for middle class viewers, seeking to harness their earthiness and sense of surprise and spectacle to the expectations of a different audience, used to greater professionalism and a more lavish ambiance. Yet, from the viewpoints of urban "high" culture, the Folies-Bergère emphatically represented the "popular." For Huysmans, the place was unique in its cachet boulevardier.

These issues came sharply into focus in 1881. In May, Ikon Sari, proprietor of the Folies-Bergère since 1871, reopened the place as the Concert de Paris, presenting ambitious programs of Classical music, with a distinguished comme d'honneur. However, the experiment was an immediate failure, and Sari quickly decided to return to his previous successful formula; a satirical playlet presented this decision as the victory of popular phénomènes over high "Art." This victory would have been fresh in the viewers' minds in 1882, when Manet presented his image of the place at the Salon, bastion of high art.

Three key issues were at stake in the image of the café and the café-concert in the 1870s and 1880s: politics, alcohol, and sexuality. However, these issues have a complex and in some ways oblique relevance to Manet's painting; both the status of the Folies-Bergère itself, and the political circumstances at the moment when Manet exhibited the picture, mean that it cannot be discussed in the same terms as the images of lower-class places of entertainment painted by members of the Impressionist group and their associates in the later 1870s.

The most immediate causes for official concern about cafés were political. Throughout the century, the authorities regarded cafés as the primary forums of political opposition, particularly in phases when the tightest controls were imposed on political debates and public meetings. In the severe repression of President MacNahon's "moral order" régime of the mid-1870s, cafés were a particular object of surveillance and controls, notably in a draconian round of closures of cafés which were suspected of being centers of republican opinion in summer 1877, after the government upheavals of the seize rti. However, the climate changed with the establishment of a firmly based republican government in the elections of 1877-79, and the law of 17 July 1880 transformed the position of the café, allowing free political activity and retaining only controls in the interests of law and order. The result was a vast increase in the number of cafés.

The significance of the changes in political and social climate introduced by the "opportunist" Republican administration under the presidency of Jules Grévy from 1879 onwards cannot be overemphasized. The rigorous controls and governmental paranoia of the 1870s gave way to an extended period of open economic expansion and social debate, encouraged most notably by the amnesty offered to the former communards in 1880 and the press laws of 29 July 1881, which finally gave France an effectively free political press.

These changes gave rise to a wholesale shift in contemporary perceptions of the city. Under the "moral order" régime of the 1870s, the city, as potential hotbed of political radicalism, had to be strictly policed; by contrast, the Grévy government gave considerable latitude to urban culture, building on notions of industrial and commer～tal progress, and instituting the 14 July celebrations as talisman of "freedom." This effective endorsement of the modern city precipitated a flood of critiques from the erstwhile protagonists of "moral order," attributing the evils of modern society to the city and its influence. These attacks focused in particular on notions of moral and physical disease—a Pandorâs box of infections, notably sexuallicense, alcoholism, and social anarchy, which threatened the very structure of society. The roots of these attacks can be traced back to the Second Empire and beyond; but the liberalization of the early 1880s forced conservative moralists into vociferous opposition.

The new official view of modern Paris emerges vividly in Alfred Roll’s 14 July 1880 (fig. 31), a vast tableau of the first official 14 July celebrations of the Third Republic, purchased by the State at the 1882 Salon—the year that Manet exhibited A Bar at the Folies-Bergère. The picture includes many of the emblems of the city that had seemed so
threatening under the previous régime—the public sale of alcohol, drunken revelers, tile comprehensive mixing of classes, and, just to the right of tile bandstand, the figure of a single woman in a public space; in the foreground, even the gamin de Paris, traditional emblem of anti-authoritarian revolt, is co-opted to sell Republican buttonholes. All this can be accommodated, controlled, by tile dual forces of Republic and army, of peace and war, which enclose and contain the revelers: the moment shown is when the crowd stops to salute the parading of a newly presented regimental flag, framed by the monument to tile Republic and the banner on the flagpole declaring PAX. This presentation of flags symbolized the regeneration of the French army after the disasters of the Franco-Prussian Wars.

The restrictions on cafés of the mid- to later 1870s give an immediate context to the sequence of paintings of café subjects by the artists of the Impressionist group, painted, as Robert Herbert has noted, as a response to the sequence of paintings of café subjects by the artists of the French army after the disasters of the Franco-Prussian Wars declaring PAX. This presentation of flags symbolized the regeneration of the French army after the disasters of the Franco-Prussian Wars.

The most complex network of debates around the place and around Matter's picture of it concern sexuality. The Folies-Bergère itself had a complex sexual geography. The orchestra stalls were characterized as the territory of those ordinary bourgeois nègres who wanted to see the show, while the boxes and the promenoir which surrounded them, together with the lavish winter garden, were tile unequivocal province of the flâneur and the prostitute; it was this, wrote Elie Frédault in 1878, that made the Folies-Bergère into "le nératible turff [sic] de la galerantrianparisienne." The site of Manet's picture was the gallery with its promenoir though less often described, this seems to have been a continuation of the promenoir below.

Throughout the Folies-Bergère there were bars with mirrors behind them—in the entrance corridor, in tile promenoirs upstairs and downstairs, and in the winter garden. For Maupassant, tile barmaids there were "merchants of drinks and love." A cartoon of 1878 (fig. 24) shows that their potential sexual availability was a humorist's cliché; and Stop's caricature of Manet's painting (fig. 23) calls the barmaid a "merchant of consolation." Yet their status was crucially different from that of the women who [led their trade in the promenoirs, for, unlike them, the bartuaids were able to choose their sexual partners. Certainly, as the 1878 cartoon shows, their clients might dream of becoming their lovers, but the seeming modesty and hesitation of the client here only makes sense if they were not perceived as automatically available. In contemporary writing on clandestine prostitution, much is made of the distinction between those who could choose and those who could not. Moreover, Carel's pamphlet on the peril facing the waitresses in brasseries d'femmes—a central issue in the literature of moral Égarat—saw no Problem in women serving from behind a bar, with "their virtue protected by a broad and impassable counter." The uncertainty of the barmaid's position vis-à-vis her client is crucial to Manet's picture.

This uncertainty is only one of utility ways in which the picture undermined conventional notions of pictorial legibility. To see how central this challenge to legibility was to Mallet's project, we must return to the canvas itself, and to the way in which he worked up the final image.

In his sketch for A Bar at the Folies-Bergère (fig. 1), the space is relatively coherent, with bar, barmaid, and mirror seen from an angle; the viewer is invited to imagine himself in the place of the man with a cane raised to his chin seen in the reflection at the far right, rather below the barmaid. In the final version the barmaid is pre-
scnted frontally; bar and mirror, too, seem more or less frontal. Yet the reflection of barmaid and customer is displaced to the extreme right, and the customer seen in the reflection stands face to face with the barmaid and a little taller than her, whereas we—the viewers of the picture—seem to be at a greater distance from the image that looks out of the picture. Moreover, the bottles in the reflection do not correspond to those on the bar—they are placed on the "wrong" edge of the bar; and, in the reflection, a wide space opens out between bottles and barmaid, while the reflection of the little glass of flowers is displaced to the right margin.

An x-ray photograph (fig. 15) shows that the final picture, as initially laid in, corresponded closely with the sketch. The figure of the barmaid seems to have faced the viewer from the outset, but otherwise the forms were in the sketch: the barmaid's hands folded, and the reflection of her head in front of the pillar just right of center, with the man in a round-topped hat with cane to his chin clearly seen at the right. The barmaid's reflection was then shifted not once but twice: first to a position to the right of the pillar, directly above the bowl of mandarin oranges (in this position it would already have partly obscured the original male figure), and then to its present location; the reflection of the top-hatted man was inserted at a very late stage.

The incongruities between image and reflection are not the only problem that the final picture raises. The reflection on the left presents a further puzzle: all that we can see beyond the reflected bar is the opposite balcony, with the columns supporting it; even at first glance, to the left of the end of the mirror, we see only the column opposite and a dark space around it. There is no indication in the part of the balcony on which the customer, and implicitly the ourselves, are placed. We have still less foothold than the green Shoed acrobat who swings above the audience at the top left.

It was not only in its spatial incongruities that the picture transgressed contemporary conventions of representation. Anomalies arise, too, in the ways in which the brushwork and facture direct the viewer's attention. As we should expect, the principal image is more sharply focused than the reflection, and the figure of the barmaid lands out boldly from the flurry of seemingly improvised marks that evoke the audience on the opposite balcony. Yet this principal figure is not the most sharply focused element in the picture: the bottles and fruit bowl are treated with great richness and finesse, while the barmaid is more broadly and simply treated.

Throughout his career, critics had accused Mallet of failing to differentiate the salient points of his compositions, of showing "a sort of pantheism that places no higher value oí a head than a slipper, which sometimes gives more importance to a bunch of flowers than a woman's face ... which paints everything almost uniformly." Yet, in A Bar at the Folies-Bergère, the execution seems more positively to invert expected values. The focus on the barmaid's merchandise upgrades still life elements—traditionally treated as accessories—as if to emphasize that they are the primary reason for her presence behind the bar. And at the same time one expected focus is unobtrusively denied. As the 1878 cartoon of barmaid and client shows (fig. 24), a stereotype of such imagery was the client's fixation on the barmaid's bosom. In Manet's canvas the décolletage initially attracts the viewer's eye; but the little bouquet of flowers, summarily sketched directly onto the canvas priming, is by far the least highly worked part of the figure, and there is not a hint of modeling in the flesh painting around it. The viewer's attempt to become a voyeur is balked.

The viewer's relationship to the image is complicated, too, by the gaze of the barmaid. The presence of a figure looking straight out from a picture invites a direct response from the viewer, particularly if that figure is central. Yet the seeming distance and abstractedness of the barmaid's expression thwarts any attempt at empathetic engagement. Ernest Duez's canvas (fig. 32) illustrates the type of direct appeal that Manet's picture so carefully avoids, with the added aid to the viewer of the attentive male figures seen at the table at back right.

Manet's concern to distance himself from the conventional rhetoric of sexual appeal is also revealed by the very different ways in which the female figure is treated in the sketch and the final picture. The piled-high blonde hair and pert expression of the figure in the sketch give way to the far less elaborated hairstyle and less flirtatious demeanor of the final figure, for which he used a different model.

The distancing in A Bar at the Folies-Bergère is further complicated by the apparently closer and more engaged interchange seen in the mirror reflection, between the woman and the man whom we seek to read as our alter ego. Stop's caricature (fig. 8) resolved this discrepancy between image and reflection with wit and concision, simply by slipping the back view of a top-hatted man into the image, between the viewer and the bar. But the picture itself makes no such concessions to spatial and psychological legibility.
The x-ray evidence shows how deliberately Manet introduced the discrepancies between image and reflection in the picture. The rupture of a literal spatial coherence emerged, step by step, as he worked on the final canvas—how should these dislocations be viewed? From the start of his career, Manet’s critics accused him of willful subversion of academic values; yet his apologists, from Zola onwards, emphasized the aesthetic dimensions of his enterprise, his concern for the effect of the Cache of color. In 1882, Georges Jeanniot visited Manet’s studio while he was at work on A Bar at the Folies-Bergère, with the model posed behind a marble slab laden with bottles and foodstuffs: “Although he worked from the model, he did not copy nature at all closely; I noted his masterly simplifications…. Everything was abbreviated; the tones were made lighter, the colors brighter; the values were more closely related to each other, the tones more contrasting.” Manet insisted that “concision is everything.” Yet such formalist accounts seem quite inadequate to account for the positive dislocations of the picture.

The initial responses to A Bar at the Folies-Bergère upon its appearance at the 1882 Salon give some insight into the ways in which it invited and yet thwarted conventional modes of reading images, and how the issues it raised related to wider contemporary social and moral debates. T. J. Clark has explored a number of the key themes in the criticism of the picture, and in particular the discussions of the barmaid—her beauty or ugliness, her modernity, and her presumed moral status—and the widespread concern with the truthfulness of the mirror reflection; Old the accuracy of the lighting. Most immediately, there was no agreement about how to read the barmaid’s expression. She could be characterized as beautiful and lively—the archetypal modern fille; but she could also be seen as bored and paralyzed. One critic, Louis de Fourcaud, could elaborate on her pouting and disgusted turn of the lip as her response to the attentions of her “gross, blase, idle” client.

The discussions of the picture are inseparable from wider contemporary debates. Running through the commentaries is an underlying concern that seems fundamental to Manet’s project in the context of its initial reception in 1882: this is the relationship between “nature” and “artifice” within contemporary culture. The picture raised this issue in two distinct ways, both in terms of the question of verisimilitude in painting, and in relation to notions of modernity in the city.
additives (none of the ironic paradoxes here of Baudelaire's celebrated "Bloge du maquillage" in Le Peintre de la vie moderne, in which face-painting allows woman to transcend the imperfections of nature). However, tracts of social morality took a different position; Maxime du Camp, writing in the 1870s, adopted an overtly moralistic tone in attacking make-up, while Paul Lacroix in 1858 developed this argument into a starkly misogynistic image of make-up being used to conceal underlying physical decay which will finally burst through in all its ruin—another sudden leap from the sphere of "culture" to the sphere of "nature." Lacroix's account was given wide circulation in Larousse's Dictionnaire in 1869.27

At first sight, the critics' invocations of make-up in their discussions of Mallet's picture relate simply to the way in which the barmaid is described; but notions of cosmetic concealment and deceit seem to act also as metaphors for deeper anxieties. For Paul Alexis, make-up was just one ingredient in his wholly unproblematic celebration of the "modernity" of the image, published before the exhibition opened. I-ioussaye's account, by contrast, moved from "the flat, plastered face of the girl" to the mirror, whose presence is conveyed by "a little white dust spread on the back of the young woman."28 Thus the flaws in the mirror image, its imperfect, blurred, frosted image of the place, are evoked by the metaphor of face powder, as if cosmetics were the root of Houssaye's evident anxiety at the culture that the place represented.

Many of these issues came together in a review of A Bar at the Folies-Bergère, published under-the-name Jules Fleurichamp.29 After evoking the "seething, powdery" background, and insisting that it does, despite the uncertainties, represent a mirror, the author invokes the obligatory mention of Impressionist sketch-like technique; the core of the account, though, insists on a necessary connection between subject and treatment, switching rapidly between evocation of the scene and characterization of the facture, in a sequence of staccato (and untranslatable) paragraphs which itemize in turn the barmaid's face, clothing, and jewelry, the items on the bar and in the background, insisting at one moment that there is "not a trace of beauty" here, but rather "naturalness, gaiety, light and skill," and at the same time reiterating all the elements of studied artifice which formed the overall tableau, from the barmaid's makeup to the lighting and the trapeze artist's legs.

Two other pictures at the 1882 Salon vividly posed the problem of the nature of the "natural" in modern society; Roll's 14 July 1880 (fig. 31) and Leon Lhermitte Me Wages of the Harvesters (fig. 33). In a sense the two presented decisively different versions—Lhermitte's in terms of due rewards for honest toil in the countryside, Roll's in terms of the peaceful coexistence of classes in urban, republican festivities. The bases of order in Lhermitte's are ostensibly natural; despite the presence of the paymaster, all the figures know their rightful, "natural" place. In Roll's, the order is unequivocally social and cultural. Yet, in the context of the politics of 1882, both could be assimilated into an overriding discourse of the "natural": the city as an organism could accommodate class diversity to the mutual benefit of all, while rural labor offered its due rewards. Indeed, Louis de Fourcaud insisted that both pictures should be seen in the same terms, as being "so logically and so freely composed that it they seem to have come into being all on their own"; standing in front of Htennittie's picture, "it seems as if one has reality itself before one, the composition is so natural and the painter has taken such care to conceal himself."30

Of course both of these visions of order were fictions. The proclaimed order of Paris obscured the ever-present threats of unemployment, poverty, and homelessness, and the propagandist image of rural stability was an increasingly ineffective attempt to counteract the effects of migration to the towns and cities in the face of the developing "great agricultural depression," a result of agricultural diseases at home and increased competition from overseas. Nor was there any security in the world of high capitalism on which Srdvy's Republican government had pinned its faith: in February 1882 one of France's leading banks, the Union Generale, had crashed, involving other banks and ruining many businesses and investors.

Manet's A Bar at the Folies-Bergère occupies a complex position in relation to these debates. As we have seen, the liberalization of political activity and drinking laws of 1880-81 meant that the subject of urban popular entertainments, as a whole, had lost its radical edge; and the Folies-Bergère itself had no special reputation as a radical forum. The Paris entertainments world was the object of increasingly vocal condemnation by the "moral order" conservatives in the 1880s, and the success of the Folies-Bergère among the middle classes and as a tourist attraction could be seen as evidence of how thoroughly compromised bourgeois culture itself was—as evidenced by Sari's failure to turn the place into a concert hall. But Manet's painting, through its very open-endedness, had nothing in common with the
moral order imagery of decay and degeneration threatening bourgeois ascendancy. In the sense that it could be seen to celebrate the collective social rituals of the city, the picture could even be viewed within the same ideological frame as Roll's 14 July 1880. Yet it evidently could not be co-opted for the government ideology, and Manet's old friend Antonin Proust, so recently Minister of Arts under Gambetta's short-lived ministry, could find absolutely nothing to say about it in his review of the 1882 Salon. It was in its resistance to co-option by either government or conservative opposition, in its rejection of the closures of spatial or psychological narrative, that the picture found its subversive force.

Throughout his career, Manet's art had posed great problems of classification. Often it was unclear to which genre his exhibition pictures belonged; and sometimes a theme was treated in a manner or on a scale that, by traditional standards, was considered inappropriate to the genre to which its subject linked it. Scenes of everyday life were treated on an unduly large scale, or included figures that looked puzzlingly like portraits.

Beyond this, his treatment of his subjects recurrently defied the standard modes of reading and interpretation deployed by contemporaries: figure groups did not cohere, figures looked straight out of the picture, gestures could not be clearly understood, figure types could not readily be classified, and settings were often ambiguous. In the face of these challenges, most critics adjudged his exhibition Pictures try purely artistic criteria. Many condemned him for simple incompetence—“for his failure to draw and model his figures adequately, to make expressions and gestures legible and figure groups coherent. Others, as we have seen, attributed the failure of his pictures to make sense in conventional terms to his preoccupation with the tache of color. Whether in the hands of supporters such as Zola, or of critics who wished to belittle his work, such commentaries played down the significance of his subjects and the way he presented them.

Yet these subjects, throughout his career, engaged with themes that were of central significance in contemporary debates. Only once, with The Execution of the Emperor Maximilian, did he tackle an overtly political subject, and met official censorship for his pains. Otherwise, his subjects mainly dealt with contemporary social life, in Paris and its environs; they consistently explored boundaries and frontiers—between private and public spaces, between city and country, between classes, between respectability and moral uncertainty. And these uncertainties consistently engaged with, and challenged, the conventional, normative distinctions between the "natural" and the "artificial."

There was no consistency about which of his paintings were accepted and which rejected at the Salon. An overt image of prostitution, Nana, was rejected in 1877, but Olympia was accepted in 1865, and subjects as innocuous as The Fifer and Vie Artist were rejected in 1866 and 1876. In the main, the rejections seem to have been the result of the aesthetic or personal prejudices of a particular year's jury. Neither the artistic authorities nor the formal censors found any consistent cause to suppress his work, and hostile critics could defuse its effect by actual or subliterate incomprehension.

Yet it can be argued that, in his consistent subversion of the normative categorization of contemporary life, he was posing a more searching challenge to the dominant social order than any act of direct confrontation and defiance. s’The consistency and complexity of these subversions suggests that this was quite deliberate on Manet’s part. Neither his supporters nor his critics defined his enterprise in any sustained way in these terms; yet his art consistently generated a combination of fascination and anxiety in its viewers, attracting a surprising level of attention even from those who argued that his paintings were fatally flawed. At sonic level, this was a response to the challenge the pictures posed, both in the immediacy and in their disconcerting character to the vision of an ordered world in which everyone could readily be located.

Classification and type-casting are central to any form of social control; the unclassifiable and the illegible pose a fundamental threat to the order that the dominant categories purvey. Such challenges are at their most cogent when they undermine a society's notion of the "natural," since it is on just such definitions of "nature" that justifications for the most basic social inequalities are based. Certainly, as I have argued, there was an important shift in government ideology around 1880, with the emergence of the "opportunist" republic; and this was accompanied by a significant realignment of social values. Yet the new régime, just as touch as the old one, justified its policy by a notion of a rightful, "natural" order, in which everyone occupied a definable place.
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