1. At the Backstage of the Retrospective: The Question at Issue

At the time when Édouard Manet's retrospective was held at the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris in 1884, one year after his death, the painter was still a highly controversial figure. Edmond About, who was to become a member of the Académie française that year, could not accept the fact that the Manet retrospective would be held at the École: "Why didn't Manet come to the Art School while he was still alive; then he could possibly have been made a painter". For About, all the work left by Manet was nothing but an "énorme fumier." And how was it possible to show this "enormous dunghill" to the public at the École? To show Manet's work at the prestigious state-run institution might result in a self-contradiction, About claimed, for the State had to allow protesting, in the name of the State, against the artistic education the State itself has promoted. (2)

Previously, similar reserve had already been manifested by nobody else than Albert Kaempfan, the ‘Directeur des Beaux-Arts,’ who declared that to request the use of the halls of the Beaux-Arts for a Manet retrospective was like asking the doors of Notre Dame Cathedral to be opened for the glorification of Voltaire. (3) Far from being a matter of "bon sense" or a purely artistic matter, the use of the Halls of the École des Beaux-Arts for Manet's retrospective was a highly political issue, and the decision largely depended on secret negotiation between the influential Ganbettist liberal republican Antonin Proust, previous "Ministre des Arts" (newly invented post so as to dismantle the conservative “Beaux-Arts” system), and the opportunist republican, Jules Ferry, who was then assuming the post of "Ministre de l'enseignement public et des Beaux-Arts.” But such political controversies and struggles (in and out of the republican camp) have already been forgotten today and we have been accustomed to imagine the Manet retrospective in 1884 as if it had been held as a matter of course...

More reasonable than About, at least in appearance, was Albert Wolff, whose account of the exhibition was published in Le Figaro, on May 1 1883, as an obituary for Manet: "Manet did not have the satisfaction of finding one of his paintings on the walls of the Luxembourg Museum. The future will do him full justice by placing the Bon Bock and L'enfant à l'épée in the Louvre. It is an enough glory for an artist to die at the age of 50 and leave behind two leaves worth being collected among the demonstrations of French Painting." (4) For Wolff, it was a worthy glory for an artist to see his two main works integrated into the collection of the Louvre. Such seemingly well-balanced praise by A. Wolff, however, was hardly acceptable to the defenders and champions of Manet. Regarding Manet's Flemish Bon Bock and Velazquez-like Enfant à l'épée as his representative works, was precisely the conservative value judgment the organizers of the auction sale had to counter-attack.
2. Manet's Modernism to be Reconsidered

In this paper I will focus my attention on the auction of Manet's studio which followed the École des Beaux-Arts retrospective. In my opinion, a hidden revolution in artistic value judgments took place in the two days of bidding on Feb. 4 and 5, 1884. The importance of the putative "success" of this auction was overlooked by contemporaries and has not been fully scrutinized by recent art historians and students of aesthetics. The fact that the auction was accepted as a "success," however, did contribute to Manet's posthumous reputation as the "father of Impressionism." The purpose of my paper here is to analyze the strategy adopted by Manet's friends at the auction. It tries to demonstrate the extent to which this strategy contributed to the construction of future "modernist" and "formalist" art discourses.

The famous scandals concerning Déjeuner sur l'herbe in the Salon des refusés of 1863 or that of Olympia at the Salon of 1865 are not so much historical facts as mythological anecdotes required by the "modernist" paradigm of historiography, which was still under construction --if no longer entirely absent-- in 1883 and consolidated posthumously only after Manet's death. In this sense, the present study differs significantly from the approach of Michael Fried in his recent monumental work, Manet's Modernism (5). In his last chapter: "Coda, Manet's Modernism", Fried proposes to read Théodore Duret's preface to the auction catalogue as a manifesto of formalistic aesthetics (6). In my opinion Fried tried to rehabilitate this preface retrospectively from his own present stand point. Duret's own intention, however, resided in founding the very absences...
According to Paul Mantz, the “open air” aesthetics began in Manet’s painting only around 1867 with some seascapes like *Steamboat or Combat of the Kearsage and the Alabama*, marked by the “bleu aux profondeurs énergiques” [blue of energetic profundity]. It was out of question for Paul Mantz to regard Manet’s early works like *Déjeuner or Olympia* as the product of “l’air extérieur.” The opposition between Duret and Mantz is all the more crucial as both *Déjeuner* and *Olympia* were presented at the Retrospective Exhibition. While Duret urged Zola to recognize the “voir clair” bright palette in these works prior to the trip to Spain --even by misstating the date: it took place in 1865-- Paul Mantz could not see this bright palette of open air aesthetics in the same representative two works of the master.

Behind this strange opposition between Théodore Duret and Paul Mantz was hidden another controversy about the "bariolage". As early as 1863, Paul Mantz had criticized Manet's *Laura de Valence* exhibited at the Gallerie Martinet at the Bd. des Italiens. Mantz saw in this painting only the "bariolage rouge, bleu, jaune, noir" which were "la caricature de la couleur, et non la couleur elle-même". If Guitarero in 1861 was "une ébauche violente," Manet, with *Laura de Valance*, finally entered --as Paul Mantz diagnosed--- “into a domain of impossible thanks to his brave instinct,” and the hostile critic declared his "stern refusal to tread in that impossible domain with Manet.” (11) In his biography of Manet, published in 1902, Théodore Duret will quote from this passage from Mantz to characterize the incomprehension of that earlier epoch toward Manet's bright and vivid colors, “juxtaposed side by side without the gradation or chiaroscuro,” in frontal opposition to the academic training.

According to Duret, the bright and vivid color sensation thus realized by Manet's *Déjeuner sur l’herbe* was "so intense that it created on the eyes of the public of the epoch an effect of the open air lighting cast on the eyes of an owl." (12) And Duret tried to convince his readers that this "outrageous" light effect ["quelque chose d’outrè"] was one of the reasons for the public's disapproval of the painting in question. Let us here remember that contrary to Mantz, Albert Wolff had recognized, in the above mentioned obituary, that Manet's first steps into impressionism ["avènement de l'Impressionnisme"] were marked in 1863 with *Déjeuner sur l'herbe*. Although Wolff agreed with Duret on this point, their value judgment was completely opposed. In fact, Wolff intentionally called the painting *Partie carrée*, to insinuate a certain immorality. (13) Needless to say, the march to Impressionism was simply a disaster in Manet’s artistic career, from the point of view of a Wolff. To such a “revolutionary painting” Wolff much preferred the ‘Spanish tast’ of *L’Enfant à l’épée* and the Flandre style *Le Bon Bock*.

In spite of slight differences in their opinion, Mantz and Wolff agreed on the aesthetic judgment. Both of them more or less highly esteemed Manet's early works, which were still free from contamination by impressionistic color treatment. And such dislike of Impressionism was also a widely shared opinion at the time, as one can judge from the exhaustive inspection of the obituaries of Manet published in 1883 (14).

Why then did Théodore Duret try so hard to oppose these shared, broadly established dominant public opinion? Here we come to the question of Duret's position as the responsible person at the auction sale of the contents of Manet’s studio.

4. ‘Procès-verbaux’ of Manet’s Auction Sale

In 1966 Melete Bodelsen published an important article on "The Early Impressionist Sales in the Light of Some Unpublished Procès-Verbaux" (15), conserved at the Archives de Seine, which included the Manet auction of Feb. 4-5 1884. This paper revealed many inconsistencies left unnoticed between the already known witnesses and the statements found in the procès-verbaux. Unfortunately her article hastened to rectify the factual "errors" and thus failed to investigate the reasons for these discrepancies. Further inquiries into this aspect would have revealed unexpected and hidden facts. Let us summarize the relevant observations in three points.

First, it should be noted that the entry order of bidding generally does not follow the numbers given in the catalog. In
the case of the Manet auction, the order of bidding must have been meticulously calculated by the appraiser, Paul Durand-Ruel, as the expert, and the sellers, Manet's family and Duret, executor of the painter’s will. In other words, those who were concerned had previously arranged and determined the order of bidding, knowing as they were, that the order would affect the total transactions. By carefully examining the list of the auction restored by Melete Bodersen, one can find out several discrepancies between the name of the bidders, which had been heretofore publicly recognized, and the names indicated in the original transcription on the procès-verbaux. The most striking cases in terms of the price are that of Chez le Père Lathuille (fr. 5.000) and Le linge (fr. 8.000).

Chez le Père Lathuille was commonly believed to have been bought by "M. Lehnhoff" then known as Manet's nephew, and Le Linge was publicly thought to have been bought by Eugène Manet, the painter's younger brother. However the procès-verbaux revealed that in reality those two paintings were bought by Théodore Duret himself, for 13.000 frs.. Curiously enough the painting which appeared following Chez le Père Lathuille and Le Linge were none other than Olympia, which had to play a symbolical role in the "success" of the whole auction. Olympia was sold to Lehnhoff for 10.000 frs., the highest price in the second day. The total profit for the second day brought 43.745 frs. for 94 pieces; that is to say, the three main paintings, Chez le Père Lathuille, Le Linge and Olympia, cover more than one half of the yield of the second day.

This permit us to assume that the price Duret had given to Chez le Père Lathuille (5000 frs.) and Le Linge (8000 frs.) was a preventive measure to avoid the sharp drop in price of the Olympia. How the bidding up by Duret of these two pieces was intentional is evident when compared to the results of the first day. Among the main works of the first day Nana made only 3.000 frs., and Le Bar aux Folies-Bergères no more than 5.850 frs. Argenteuil, which appeared before these two, reached 12.500 frs, but in reality it was bought back by the family by Léon Koëlla Lehnhoff, the illegitimated son of the painter. Obviously the bidding up of Nana and Le Bar aux Folies-Bergères on the first day was a failure. And this is confirmed by a letter of Duret to Zola sent the very evening of the first day (16). Duret confessed to Zola that their camp had already used up all available resources, and so he was worried about the bidding of the following day. And we shall see that it was none other than Duret himself who spent his money during the battle of the second day.

Secondly, we should note that practically all of the important works were bought back or sustained by the family members and friends of Manet, although they obviously took pains not to give such an impression to the public. Koëlla Lehnhoff and appraiser Jacob respectively took Argenteuil and Olympia with the highest prices, but both of the two persons in reality represented Manet's widow, and according to an eyewitness, both of these paintings were withdrawn without any real bidding taking place (17). The affair was settled almost as if it were a premeditated insiders’ business.

Thirdly, it must be already clear that the prices presented and sustained by the Manet family and their supporters implied a certain intention of their own. All the works so far discussed were more or less controversial pieces because of their impressionistic overtones. Argenteuil had been criticized for its too much vivid blue ("indigomanie"). Although Chez le Père Lathuille and Le linge were highly appreciated exceptionally by Stephan Mallarmé, they were severely criticized by Mantz. As an outspoken challenge to Duret, Paul Mantz declared that "the so-called open-air ("plein-air") cannot be observed in these paintings" (ibid.). Even a friendly critic, Joris-Karl Huysmans noted in his catalogue of the Retrospective: "Les derniers Manet deumeurent médiocres..." (18).

The estimated prices given to these later works undoubtedly indicates that the intentions of Manet's family and their supporters consisted in creating a new market which would support the impressionistic experimental works. In fact these late works still remained unsold in Manet's studio. Obviously, without this "social construction of new value," no brilliant future could not be expected for such Impressionists as Monet, Pissarro, Sisley, Renoir, etc, then known by the disdainful name of the "Batignolles School", of which Manet was once regarded as the leader. It was by no means by chance that the person in charge of the sale, Théodore Duret, was to become the champion and chief defender of Impressionism and the appraiser-commissioner,
Paul Durand-Ruel was to be remembered in history as the merchant-dealer of the Impressionism. The sale of the contents of Manet's studio was directed (in a theatrical sense of the word) by those script-writers and stage directors speculating on the future rise in price as well as value of the Impressionist paintings.

5. “Touching Stone” for the Posthumous Glory

Since 1884, the two days of bidding have been perceived as a "success" (or "demi-succès" for Jacques Lethève, unsatisfied with the unjustifiably modest result) and have been taken as a matter of course by Manet specialists. It must be noted, however, that without the "success" of the auction in 1884 the status that Manet was going to enjoy as "the father of modern art" would not have been legitimated. Duret himself was well aware of the fact that "the touching stone and the decisive test" for the posthumous glory of Manet fully depended on the success of the retrospective and the auction (19). And Duret was, among others, one of the key persons who "represented" the auction as a "success" and contributed to the diffusion of this image of an "unexpected success". In his biography of Manet, published in 1902, Duret gave the following description: “The sale, which had begun under such precarious conditions, immediately gave the impression of an unexpectedly success.”(20)

After prosaically giving the detail of the amount for each of the main paintings, Duret concludes: “The news rapidly spread all over Paris. The amount of the sale during two days of bidding on Feb. 4 and 5, 1884 reached 116,637 francs.” The total of the sale profit was proudly declared a token of the great victory achieved. Yet we have already seen the hidden side of the event. Despite the impression of the huge amount that Duret's seemingly objective description did not fail to create, the fact was that Olympia was withdrawn by the family at half the price (frs. 10,000) of the estimate (frs. 20,000) and Argenteuil (estimated 15,000 frs.) were also taken by Lehnhoff at 12,500 frs, without any other bidding. Le Bar aux Folies-Bergères was taken by Emmanuel Chabri, composer and close friend of Manet, at only 5,850 frs., while its estime was 10,000 frs. Paul Eudel from Le Figaro, who assisted at the auction, wondered if it was a success or a failure. (21)

On the evening of the second day, Duret had confessed more modestly and frankly the fact hidden behind this "allure de succès inespéré". He was writing to his friend Zola: "My worry [about the sudden slide down] fortunately did not take place on the second day, and the études most difficult to sell also found buyers. (...) The public takes the result as an enormous victory. And I myself think I have enough reason to be satisfied.” (22)

We already know that more 30 percent of the total amount of the second day was sustained by nobody else than Duret himself, to prevent the slide down of the prices and to secure the reputation of Olympia. And Duret also kept silent about his personal intervention in financially supporting the Manet family in taking back Chez le Père Lathuille and Le linge. These maneuvers of insider trading were also covered up and erased by the very person in charge of the auction. It can be said without exaggeration that it was mainly by his personal intervention and sacrifices that Duret succeeded in creating the (false) impression of the “success” in this auction. Here is certainly the reason why Duret was so “satisfied with the results.”

The splendid victory was nearly a fictional image which was publicly diffused by concealing the risky shortage of necessary promotion fund. But this critical situation, frankly revealed in Duret's personal letter to Zola, has been entirely effaced in the objective description of the event, published eighteen years later, in 1902. The later public version leaves no hint at a possible disaster. But Duret cannot be blamed for this tactful manipulation of concealment. As a matter of fact, the publication of Manet's biography in 1902 had previously excluded any such probability of disaster in the 1884 auction. On the contrary, it was nothing but the "success" of the auction in 1884 itself that requested Duret to publish Manet's biography in 1902. Duret’s personal financial initiative in 1884 had evolved into a public recognition of Manet’s triumph by 1902. It was destined to gain impersonal and social dimension from the beginning of the Twentieth Century.

6. “Apothéose imprévisible”
What were the results of the "success" of the auction? Albert Wolff's remark is worth citation: "The Batignolles School descended to the Hotel Drouot with Manet's work. This auction was one of the most fascinating mad events ("charmants folies") of our time. (...) I was there contemplating for one hour, not without inquietude, the way his friends, the passionate, and the speculators were snatching not only the works where Manet's talent is shining triumphantly but also the most insignificant things in terms of monetary or artistic value. Even the portraits, half effaced because of moisture in the studio, could obtain rather insane prices ("des prix relativement insensées")." (23)

This passage is remarkable in three aspects. Firstly, Wolff saw at the auction a total reversal of previously held value judgment. Indeed, what Wolff called "les choses les plus insignifiantes" were precisely what Théodore Duret was worrying about by calling them as "the études most difficult to be accepted" ["les études les plus difficiles à faire accepter"]. The pastels were sold without any particular difficulty at the beginning of the second day. Once again it was none other than Duret himself who bought the first piece Chanteuse for 300 frs., to set an example for subsequent bidding.

The reason why Duret had asked Zola to modify "some etchings" into "etchings" now becomes clear. This minor "correction of physical order" was also connected to the general shift in aesthetic value judgment. For Duret, etchings, no less than lithographs, pastels and drawings, could not be regarded as secondary works or études, but, on the contrary, constituted the essence of Manet's art, in its fragmental nature, spontaneity and expressivity. These are, by the way, the very characteristics Baudelaire tried to defend by the key word of "modernité" which he defined as “le transitoire, le fugitive, le contingent,” constituting the half of the art while the other half was “l’éternel et l’immuable.” (1863) Far from being "insignificant", these fragments "most difficult to be accepted" had to be accepted de facto at the auction, for it was the place where the "most insignificant things" should be transfigured and constructed into commodity goods to be circulated with profit in the art market.

Secondly, Wolff did remark on the decisive importance of this overturn in marketing strategy for the future of the Batignolles School, i.e. the Impressionists. So long as a distinction was categorically maintained between the finished academic work and the non-finished rough sketch, there was no margin or basis to recognize value in the works of the Impressionists. But once the "insignificant" and half effaced pastels by Manet were accepted, Impressionist painters would also be able to obtain their ‘civil right’ i.e. proper position in the art market.

Thirdly, Wolff coolly and cynically grasped that this revolution in artistic value judgment had been accomplished through “craziness” ("folie") on the part of people possessed by a sort of “hallucination.” The auction was a kind of public stage magic show of alchemy, where "les choses les plus insignifiantes" underwent a sort of “transubstantiation” and became objects of speculation. Incidentally, Wolff had seen with amazement this process of the posthumous promotion of Manet as an “apothéose imprévisible” ["an unexpected apotheosis"]. (24) Wolff continued:

In this assembly of friends and the hallucinated, the connoisseur M. Durand-Ruel is especially worth mentioning. All the painting of Millet, Rousseau, Corot, Delacroix had been passed through his hands at the time when they were not yet so expensive. Now this benefactor would continue the same procedure with the Batignolles School, once the chef of which was Manet. To him was attracted the most wild impressionists, Caillebotte and others. M. Durand-Ruel foresees the most brilliant future for these so-called Masters. At the bottom of his wide soul, the connoisseur probably judges Manet a little bit parrot in the canvases where he almost successfully grasped the genuine art ("art veritable"). For I am sure Durand-Ruel was smiling with visible satisfaction as the objects which he has put up for bidding were of the most confused genre ["d'un genre plus désordonné"] (25).

7. Dillectics in Aesthetic Judgment

Probably nobody else saw more cynically but insightfully the truth of this stage of overturning as it was disguised in the Manet auction in 1884. It must be pointed out that (i) Wolff was almost the only exceptional art critique who did perceive that a true scandal was happening at the auction hall without being perceived as such by most of the audience; (ii) that this experiment (sort of alchemy in its true sense of the word) cannot be successful without modifying in the process the very
definition of Fine Arts in European art history and that (iii) Durand-Ruel --and Théodore Duret in his shadow-- were actively involved in the invention of this new value judgment (which implied toppling-down of the academic hierarchy).

To be more precise, firstly, the artistic scandal could not be fully accomplished solely by the spectacular public outrage which were putatively provoked by *Déjeuner sur l’herbe* or *Olympia* (in fact, *Déjeuner sur l’herbe* was not really a scandal but was relatively well appreciated in the Salon des refusés of 1863). The invention of a new value structure is not completed unless (and not until) these unacceptable works (or things not recognizable as art) are recognized *de facto* as profitable commodities for commercial sale in the art market. And this invention of a new market was accomplished in the auction hall as an invisible scandal.

Secondly, in this creation of a new market, Duret and Durand-Ruel carried out a tautological operation: while transforming insignificant objects into masterpieces, they set up a new definition of masterpiece in accordance with the "insignificant objects" in question. Here is the very definition of alchemy as a social magic, and Duret, as a “critique d’art,” attempted to impose this new way of appreciating art in his preface to the auction catalog. He declared: while writers (“écritains et hommes de lettres”) would generally see uniquely the subject-matter of the paintings and would not pay due attention to the “intrinsic value of the painting itself” [“valeur intrinsèque de la peinture en soi"], the only thing the real connoisseur should ask of the painting is whether or not "it is painted, with all the meaning the word implies." (26)

Thirdly, the auction was a stage for prophecy where the organizer was requested to create such audiences and buyers who would believe in his prophecy. By making this declaration, Duret asked the audience to become the true "connoisseurs" capable of appreciating the "valeur intrinsèque de la peinture en soi" in the work of Manet. "Put a Manet in the midst of the works of Delacroix, Corot, or Courbet, and you shall see it standing among paintings belonging to the same species, as if it were its natural place" (27). Here was Duret's self-fulfilling prophecy, to which Wolff seems to have ironically protested, in the above quoted passage. Whether one finds Manet's work taking a "natural" position in the midst of the masterpieces or not depends not so much on the "naturalness" in question as on the “success” of “education of the eye” for the purpose of "naturalizing" Manet. And Duret was trying to impose this artistic education to posterity. The preface we have just read was one of the first steps for the education, and it will be followed in 1902 by the publication of his biography of Manet….

8. Paradox of an Accomplished “Symbolic Revolution”

It is of course not our business to be surprised at the miracle that the auction did accomplish: "Manet se vent" [Manet sells] (28). Rather the success of the whole manipulation depended on whether this impression of miracle could conceal what was really transgressed by this accomplishment. This secret brainwashing had had to be done without being recognized as such. And the success of the plot finds its confirmation in the fact that posterity was satisfied with laughing at the “incomprehension” of a critic like Wolff, "L'effroncé Tartuffe," “l'incompréhensif,” “l'hypocrète,” “le détracteur,” full of “imbécilité” to use some of the defamations pronounced by such champions of Manet like A. Tabarant and Jacques Lethèue (29). And yet we must recall Wolff's prediction at the auction hall: "what a dream of gold, which will change into a terrible nightmare", "Manet's friends are terrible" ["Les amis de Manet sont terribles"] (30). As Pierre Bourdieu has put it, what has been definitively launched by Manet and his friends was "a sort of the bankruptcy of the Central Bank of the symbolic capital in art". Ironically enough, it was not these defenders of Manet like Tabarant or Jacques Lethève but the very Wolff, "l'incompréhensif” himself, who was horrified by the "institutionalisation of the anomie" (Bourdieu), plotted and successfully staged at the 1884 Manet auction (31).

To conclude, let us take a look at one reaction by an Impressionist more or less directly interested in the affair. Camille Pissarro's observations cast an ironical insight into the "symbolic revolution" of the Manet auction, from which Pissarro himself would eventually profit.
Manet was a great painter but he had a fault, he was starving for recognition by the constituted authorities, he believed in the credential, he aspired to the honors. He died without attaining these. Duret, and Antonin Proust are named executor of his will, and to set up his exhibition with solemnity, they found it best to appoint the worst officials, Manet's relentless enemies, to the organizing committee, so as to give an official endorsement. All the bourgeoisie are there, all those who loved and defended the artist. Shocking! Backward! (...) It's miserable, but it's therefore in the order. (32)

Here is a harsh observation by an anarchist concerning the paradox of an alienated bourgeois artist. Manet's artistic achievement had prevented him from obtaining the social distinction to which he aspired. And yet the posthumous reward prepared by Manet's republican friends amounted to a form of spiritual treason. To deceive the Bourgeois, one should disguise oneself as a bourgeois artist; but after the performance in masquerade ceremony (i.e. auction), who can distinguish the disguised from the real bourgeois? Those enemy bourgeois, plotted in the conspiracy of a symbolic revolution which Durand-Ruel (legitimist) and Duret (republican) had prepared, left the auction hall triumphantly, without noticing that they had been deceived. This is what André Chastel ironically called the “Impressionism disguised in bourgeois fashion” ("Impressionnisme embourgeoisée"). (33) In contrast, those artists, like Pissarro, who would profit from this canonization of their precursor felt betrayed and he therefore scornfully disdained the ceremony of Manet’s canonization. Such are the ironies of the double treason implied in the symbolic revolution which fabricated the Manets as negotiable merchandise in art market.

The following year in 1885 Duret and Durand-Ruel crossed the Atlantic to sell Manet and the impressionist painters in New York and Boston. Their success in search of a new American market eventually contributed to the legitimizing of the the Impressionists in France. As Pissarro put it with grimace, "C'est roide, mais c'est bien dans l'ordre." L'enfant à l'épée and Femme au péroquet entered the Metropolitan Museum as early as 1889, and in the same year, Belgian collector Henri van Cutsem (1839-1904) purchased Argenteuil at the Paris World Fair (to be legged to the city of Tournai in 1904 together with Chez le Père Lathuille in the building designed by Victor Holta). In the meanwhile Olympia was purchased from the family in 1890 by a fund-raising campaign. Monet, who had been worried about the possible exodus of Olympia to the United States, took the initiative for this fund-raising. Still it was not until 1907 that Olympia finally entered the Louvre. The event did not fail to provoke many protests. As for Le déjeuner sur l'herbe, it had to wait until 1934, to be welcomed at the Louvre. The centennial of the painter had been celebrated two years earlier to commemorate the definitive "Triomphe de Manet" (Paul Valery) as a representative classic now fully integrated into the authentic Modern tradition of French Art History.

Notes
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The present paper concentrates the focus on the auction sale of 1884 only, and other aspects which should be discussed remain untouched. For the full development of my idea on the issue, please refer to my book in Japanese, *Kaiga no Tasogare*, with the French summary: *Le Crépuscule de la peinture, Latte poshime d'Édouard Manet*, University of Nagoya Press, 1997. The following notes are updated in minimum necessity, as of Sep. 26, 2009.


(2) E. About, "Manet à l'École des Beaux-Arts", *Le Siècle*, 7 jan. 1884:
« Pourquoi ce garçon-là n'est-il pas venu à l'école de son vivant? On en aurait fait peut-être un peintre. Imposer à l'école, durant tout près d'un mois, un garnissaire qui l'a brévée ouvertement [openly defied the Fine Art School] jusqu'au dernier jour de sa vie, n'est-ce point abusif, pour ne pas dire injurieux [abusive, if not insulting]? Il est impossible d'admettre que l'état proteste lui-même contre l'enseignement de l'état dans le palais où nos jeunes peintres sont instruits aux frais de l'état ».


(4) A. Wolff, *Le Figaro*, 1 mai, 1883:
« Manet n'a pas eu la satisfaction de voir une de ses toiles au Luxemborub; l'avenir le vengera en plaçant le Bon Bock et l'Enfant à l'épée au Louvre. Mourir à cinquante ans et laisser derrière soi deux pages dignes d'être recueillies parmi les manifestations de la peinture française, c'est assez de gloire pour un artiste ».


(8) Lettre à Zola, à la date du 28 déc. 1883, conservée à la Bibliothèque nationale de France à Paris, n.a.fr. 22461 :
« Page 5 vous dites qu'il [Manet] n'a commencé à voir clair qu'à la suite d'un voyage en Espagne. Cela est inexacte, car son voyage d'Espagne date de l'année 1866 [sic.] et vous savez tout ce qu'il avait déjà produit à cette époque. Ne pourriez-vous pas supprimer ou modifier ce passage? Page 13 vous dites: Enfin il a laissé quelques eaux-fortes. Ne pourriez-vous pas oter "quelques" et dire "eaux-fortes" voilà tout ».

« Il semble n'avoir commencé à voir clair qu'après avoir rompu toute discipline... »

(10) Paul Mantz, "L'oeuvre de Manet" *Le Temps*, 16 janvier. 1884:
« Nous avons le regret de ne pouvoir fixer d'une façon tout à fait précise le moment où Manet commença à avoir une notion plus ou moins nette de l'air extérieur. L'Exposition de l'École des beaux-arts semble présenter ici une lacune ».


(12) Théodore Duret, *Histoire d'Édouard Manet et de son oeuvre* (1902), 1906, pp.40-41:
« Il [Le Déjeuner sur l'herbe] produisait, sur les yeux du public de ce temps, l'effet de la pleine lumière sur les yeux du hibou ».


(15) Melete Bodersen, "Early Impressionist Sales 1874-94 in the Light of Some Unpublished 'Procès-verbaux',” Burlington Magazine, June 1968, pp.331-347. It must be noted however that this article tends to put too much emphasis on the new discoveries made by the consultation of the original procès-verbaux. Let us take just one case from the A. Tabarant collection, currently conserved at the Pierpont-Morgan Library in New York. Tabarant documentation includes photographs of Manet’s work with meticulous hand-written notes by A. Tabarant on the margin. The sheet of Chez Le Père Lathuille clearly indicates, by Tabarant’s hand, that “Vendu le 5 février 1884, à l’Hôtel Drouot acheté par Théodore Duret 5000 fr.” (MA 3950, Vol.2, p.21).

And Tabarant’s book, Manet et ses œuvres, Paris : Gallimard, 1947, p.382 gives the same information without ambiguity. However, the significance of this fact escaped A. Tabarant’s himself, and the posterity, including Melete Bodersen, cast little attention as for who paid for the tableau at the auction, and never asked the question as for the purpose of this payment. By the way, one copy of the catalogue des ventes Manet, in the possession of Théodore Duret is known to be transferred to tabarant and is also conserved now at the Pierpont-Morgan Library, New York, but we could not consult it on the spot.

(16) lettre de Duret à Zola, 4 fév. 1883 (manuscrit, Bibliothèque nationale de France à Paris, as note 8 above):
« Nous avons fait 71.000 f. à la vacation d’aujourd’hui. Seul l’Argenteuil est retiré à 12.500. Ce sont, comme je le prévoyais, les grands tableaux que nous n’avons pu faire monter et qui nous ont empêché d’atteindre un total plus élevé. C’est la vacation de demain qui est à craindre, car presque tous les amis et partisans ont donné aujourd’hui et plusieurs ne pourront probablement pas recommencer demain. »


(19) Théodore Duret, op. cit. [as note 3], p.257.

(20) Ibid. 1906, pp.243-44:
« Le vente, commencée dans des conditions si précaires, prit tout de suite une allure de succès inespérée. Sur toutes les œuvres on mettait des enchères, et beaucoup parmi les acheteurs étaient des amateurs nouveaux et inattendus, venant grossir le groupe des amis connus. On vendait, entre autres, sept tableaux exposés aux Salons. Le Bar aux Folies-Bergères réalisait 5.800 francs; Chez le Père Lathuille, 5.000 francs; le Portrait de Faure en Hamlet, 3.500 francs; la Leçon de musique, 4.400 francs; le Balcon, 3.000 francs. Puis ensuite le Linge faisait 8.000 franc; Nana 3.000 francs. l’Olympia était retirée à 10.000 francs et l’Argenteuil à 12.000 francs. Ces prix semblaient, alors qu’on les criait, extraordinaires. Ils déconcertaient absolument ces spectateurs, venus pour assister à un insuccès et disposés à rire, mais se tenant maintenant silencieux. Manet se vent! disait la foule étonnée, à la sortie, et la nouvelle courut immédiatement tout Paris. La vente, en deux vacations, les 4 et 5 février 1884, produisait 116.637 francs. »

(21) Paul Eudel, art. cit. [as in note 17].

(22) Lettre de Duret à Zola, le 5 fév. 1884:
« Mes craintes ne se son pas heureusement réalisées et les études les plus difficiles à faire accepter, ont trouvé preneurs. »

(23) Albert Wolff, Le Figaro, 7 fév. 1884:
« L'école des Batignolles a fait une décente à l'Hôtel Drouot avec l'œuvre de Manet. Cette vente a été l'une des plus charmantes folies de ce temps: j'étais là pendant une heure, contemplant, non sans inquiétude, ce flot d'amis, de passionnés et de spéculateurs qui s'arrachaient, non seulement les ouvrages où le talent de Manet éclate triomphant, mais encore les choses les plus insignifiantes comme valeur d'argent, comme valeur d'art. Des portraits au pastel, à moitié effacés à force d'avoir moi dans l'atelier, ont atteint des prix relativement insensés. »


(25) Albert Wolff, *Le Figaro*, 7 fév. 1884:

« Dans cette assemblée d'amis et d'hallucinés, l'expert, M. Durand-Ruel, mérite une mention spéciale. Tous les tableaux de Millet, Rousseau, Corot, Delacroix, ont passé par ses mains à une époque où ils ne valaient pas cher. A présent cet homme de bien voudrait recommencer avec l'école des Batignolles, dont pendant un temps, Manet fut le chef. A lui tous les impressionnistes les plus échevelés, Caillebotte et tutti quanti. M. Durand-Ruel prévoit pour ces maîtres l'avenir le plus brillant. Au fond de sa grande âme, l'expert juge peut-être Manet un peu perruque dans les toiles où il a serré de près un art véritable, car j'ai cru remarquer qu'il souriait avec une satisfaction d'autant plus visible, que l'objet par lui mis aux enchères était d'un genre plus désordonné. »

(26) Théodore Duret, préface du catalogue de vente, Hôtel Drouot, 1884; *Critique d'avant-garde*, 1885, p.126:

« Tout ce qu'ils demandent à un tableau, c'est d'être peint, en prenant le mot dans toute son acception. »

(27) Ibid., p. 127:

« Mettez un Manet au milieu de Delacroix, de Corots, de Courbet et vous l'y laissez, comme à sa place naturelle, entre ses congénères. »


(29) Jacques Lethève, *Impressionnistes et symbolistes devant la presse*, Paris, Armand Colin, 1959. A. Tabarant, *Manet et ses œuvres*, Paris, Gallimard, 1947, pp.487-89. In his final years, Duret gave Tabarant his personal documents and letters relative to Édouard Manet. Tabarant wondered why Duret did not make use of these documents in his own writings and wrongly concluded that Duret did not understand the value of this documentation. Through this judgment Tabarant reveals that he overlooks the plain fact that it was none other than Duret himself who contributed to the very “construction of the symbolic value” of Manet materials, including the documentation which Tabarant mentions.

(30) Wolff, art. cit. [note 25]:

« Que de rêve d'or, qui se changeront en épouvantable cauchemar. (...) Les amis de Manet sont terrible! »


« C'est le 5 janvier l'ouverture de l'exposition Manet. Manet, tout grand peintre qu'il était, avait un traves, il mourait d'envie d'être reconnu par les autorités constituées, il croyait à la patente, il aspirait aux honneurs; il est mort sans y atteindre. Duret, Proust (Antonin), ont été nommés les exécuteurs de ses dernières volontés, et pour donner plus de solennité à son exposition, ils n'ont rien trouvé de mieux que de nommer les pire officiels, ses ennemies acharnés à faire partie du comité d'organisation afin de donner un cachet officiel à la cérémonie. Toute la bourgeoisie est là, tous ceux qui ont aimé, défendu ce grand artiste... shocking! arrière! (...) C'est roide, mais c'est bien dans l'ordre! »