9 Manet’s syphilis
Masculinity, debility, and adaptation in the 1880s*

Allison Leigh

In late August or early September of 1882, the French painter Édouard Manet wrote a letter to the fashionable demimondaine Méry Laurent which is revealing in terms of the artist’s health and general outlook:

What a dreadful month. Rain or wind every day; it doesn’t make the countryside any more pleasant, especially for an invalid [un malade]. [...] I shall have to be very patient, seeing that I may extend my stay until the end of October. I’d like to try to come back somewhat recovered, and these last two months have really done me some good...1

Manet wrote this missive from Rueil-Malmaison, where he was spending the summer much like he had the three previous, recuperating from a decline in his health that most scholars believe began in the mid to late 1870s.2 Although there has long been speculation that the illness to which Manet refers in calling himself “an invalid” resulted from the syphilis he had contracted some fifteen or twenty years earlier, the exact nature of the artist’s increasing debility and its effect on his painting practice have never been clearly established. By using analytical methods to assess the artist’s oeuvre as a whole, this chapter takes a data-driven approach to the problem of evaluating what several art historians have referred to as Manet’s “decline.”3 In so doing, it establishes firmly the types of formal changes which took place in the painter’s work in the last years of his life and challenges long-prevalent assumptions about how disability affects artmaking. For scrutinizing Manet’s practice across the decades reveals that he not only resisted the debilitating effects of syphilis, but he also adapted his painting practice
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to accommodate the changes that occurred in his body as a result of the disease over time.

First, it is important to note that the illness to which Manet refers in his letter to Laurent has been variously discussed, alluded to, or sometimes utterly glossed over in scholarship of the last hundred years. Most recent historians have been forthcoming in their assessment regarding the artist’s syphilitic condition. For example, the art historian Albert Boime states that while Manet was working on *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* in 1882, he was “quite ill from the effects of syphilis.” He further describes how an onslaught of progressive paralysis, which had begun in the fall of 1878, made walking increasingly difficult. According to Boime, by 1882 the artist was “almost glued to his chair.” Similarly, the editors of the exhibition catalog which accompanied the “Manet and Modern Beauty” show held at the J. Paul Getty Museum and the Art Institute of Chicago in 2019 state clearly that the painter “was suffering from tabes dorsalis (known in Manet’s time as locomotor ataxia).” This was, as the authors point out, a degenerative disorder of the nervous system which was frequently associated with tertiary syphilis.

Many writers have been less forthcoming in their assessments, though they still manage to convey the basic facts. The art critics Robert Gordon and Andrew Forge describe the period the artist spent recuperating in places like Rueil-Malmaison as time in which “it seems likely that he was suffering from the last stages of syphilis” (emphasis added). Manet’s friend, Philippe Burty, made a similar allusion soon after the artist’s death in 1883, writing that he died “of the same malady as his father.” The art historian Nancy Locke has written productively on what was likely also the syphilitic condition of Manet’s father, Auguste, who was struck with a paralysis in 1857. Following this event, a renowned surgeon of the time and an authority on venereal diseases described Auguste’s condition as a “cerebral congestion”—then a common euphemism for tertiary syphilis and, interestingly, the same phrase the poet Charles Baudelaire used to describe what he knew was his own syphilitic infection.

Manet himself alluded to his condition in various ways in letters to friends. While undergoing a thermal cure at Bellevue, not far outside Paris, he described emotional “ups and downs” in a letter to the painter Eugène Maus written in August of 1880. Dr. François Siredey, the chief physician at Lariboisière hospital, had advised the artist to seek out hydrotherapy treatments, which involved therapeutic showers and some four to five hours of massage per day. Writing to the poet Stéphane Mallarmé that same summer, Manet stated unequivocally: “I’m prepared to undergo any discomfort in order to regain my health.” The treatments proved punishing. The painter described the shower baths as “a horrible torture” in a letter to Laurent, and he even wrote to the Impressionist painter Berthe Morisot that “the year is not ending well for me concerning my health.” Often, however, Manet brushed off the seriousness of his condition, frequently claiming he
was feeling “much better” and, at one point, even arguing that extending his stay in Bellevue did not mean that he was feeling worse, stating that “on the contrary I am doing better and better.”12 Along similar lines, when a report describing him as “gravely ill” appeared in the French periodical L’Evénement in July of 1882, Manet immediately issued a correction: “Your morning columns contain a bulletin concerning my health which, however sympathetic, is inaccurate. I am not ill. I simply sprained my foot before leaving Paris.”13 It was printed only two days after the original notice appeared, showing the eagerness with which Manet sought to correct public perception.

The artist’s desire to hide the seriousness of his condition is paralleled by the commentary of later art historians such as George Heard Hamilton, who never mention syphilis as the disease Manet was suffering from, instead only ambiguously suggesting it:

An inflammation of the legs which had developed during the winter of 1880 was rapidly becoming more acute. From a letter to Mme. Emile Zola […] it is apparent that as early as April 1880 he had been forbidden to climb stairs. […] He was more and more frequently obliged to rest in order to prevent the recurrence of severe pains in his legs.14

Thus, Hamilton describes symptoms typically associated with syphilis, but avoids naming them as such. Even the art historian Carol Armstrong, in her lengthy book on Manet published in 2002, never mentions syphilis, though she does occasionally reference an unnamed affliction. During a discussion of Manet’s Self-Portrait with Palette (1878), she describes how it “was painted toward the end of his career, when he was already ill and his face was the gaunt ghost of its former attractive self.”15 The self-portrait indeed shows the artist having lost weight, though he remains the well-dressed Parisian gentleman he was in numerous other photographic, painterly, and lithographic reproductions.

Earlier in the book, Armstrong alludes to the artist’s ailment during her analysis of Manet’s late flower paintings:

In 1882, after the completion and exhibition of the A Bar of the Folies-Bergère, an ill, house-bound Manet painted more than a dozen marble-topped flower pieces […] Executed under conditions of confinement, visitation, and gift-receiving, this series completes […] Manet’s still-life production…16

Most often, the late flower paintings Armstrong is describing show a small cluster of blooms arranged in a somewhat indeterminate space, often on a ledge or marble counter (Figure 9.1). Much like those flowers the artist produced in 1864, these canvases from his final years demonstrate Manet’s bravura handling of oils—the creamy whites and blush pinks of variously
shaped and weighted petals intersect with verdant greens often tinged with gray or lavender. Throughout his career, Manet showed a preference for certain plant species—roses, peonies, and lilacs being the most frequently depicted. Yet for Armstrong, Manet’s late flower paintings, despite their overall similarity to those produced earlier, were deeply connected to the illness and debility which characterized his final years.

She is not alone. Many scholars claim that the flower depictions represent a “period of decline.” In one monograph, the British art historian Douglas Cooper wrote that “the pictures of these last years […] became increasingly weak and flashy,” and Armstrong referred to them as “small-scale dalliance in a minor key.” Even in his own time, the Salon paintings of the 1880s were criticized as a new nadir for the artist. The critic René Ménard wrote in 1881 that Manet’s submissions “certainly did not rise this year to the level of his previous exhibits” and Roger-Ballu, an inspector of the fine arts department, wrote in the Nouvelle revue: “Let us pass by quickly with regret for the real pictorial ability of a painter which will be extinguished without having produced anything, which will have been invisible since it has remained sterile.” This last reference to Manet’s sterility may have been a
veiled allusion to his illness and was paralleled by the novelist Joris-Karl Huysmans’ scathing review:

This year is decidedly bad, for now Manet in his turn is going to pieces. Like a new wine, a bit sharp but clean and of an unusual taste, this artist’s painting was strong and heady. Now it is adulterated, laden with dregs, devoid of all bite and fragrance.

Huysmans’ critique, and his description of Manet and his work as “adulterated” and “going to pieces,” seems to nebulously indicate the breakdown then occurring in the artist’s body.

While more recent historians have expressed similar concerns about the quality of Manet’s works after 1879, it is significantly more common for scholars to correlate the artist’s illness with the diminishing size of his compositions. Hamilton states firmly that Manet was “obliged by the circumstances of his ill health to abandon large figural compositions,” while other commentators have claimed that “his illness accounts for their size” and “his awkwardness and difficulty with handling the brushes forced him to paint small formats.” Even the most cursory reading of the literature on Manet’s final years reveals a bevy of such suppositions regarding the late compositions, all of which fail to rigorously assess the place of these paintings in Manet’s larger oeuvre.

Is it true that the painter’s works diminished in scale as his illness progressed? The answer is not so simple. If one undertakes a large data assessment—one that evaluates Manet’s paintings across his entire lifetime—it becomes clear that the average size of his works between 1879 and 1883 was actually not much smaller than in several earlier periods in his life (Figure 9.2). In fact, Manet was painting on almost exactly the same average scale in his last years as he had been at the outset of his career. The average size of his canvases from 1856 to 1860—when he was in his mid-twenties—was 58.6 square centimeters, while it was only just slightly smaller (58.4 square centimeters) when he was increasingly debilitated between 1879 and 1883.

Similar results hold true for the five-year period between 1871 and 1875: his canvases were on average only slightly smaller (by 5.6 square centimeters) than those from his last years. So, it is not entirely true to say that Manet was “forced to paint small formats” because of his growing infirmity.

Further, an analytical evaluation of all the paintings Manet made across his lifetime can be used to debunk other somewhat misleading assertions. For instance, a handful of historians have averred that Manet’s late Salon paintings were smaller than those from his earlier years. An example of this can be seen in a recent essay, where Armstrong asserts that A Bar at the Folies-Bergère is “diminished in size compared to the painter’s notorious Salon paintings of the 1860s.” While this statement is technically true in that the Salon works from the last four years of Manet’s life were on average smaller than those specifically from the 1860s,
Figure 9.2: Average size of Manet’s paintings across time.
may be somewhat misleading in a larger sense.\textsuperscript{25} For if one assesses the
Salon paintings from other years, one finds that Manet’s final accepted
Salon works were not always smaller than what he produced in the years
when he was healthy (see Figure 9.2). In fact, his final Salon paintings
were \textit{larger} in average size than those from 1873 to 1874.\textsuperscript{26} Additionally,
his final submissions were really only slightly smaller in average size—just
under six centimeters—than those which were exhibited between 1860 and
1863 (Figure 9.3).\textsuperscript{27}

Even if one separates the late flower paintings—the size of which are so
often referred to as “symptomatic of his declining health”—out from the
rest of his production, what one discovers is not as simple as scholars have
previously asserted.\textsuperscript{28} These works prove on average not to be smaller than
the flower paintings the artist made in 1864 (Figure 9.4). In that year, Manet
produced six renderings of peonies which collectively averaged fifty-three
square centimeters. When Manet returned to flower depiction between 1877
and 1883, the canvases averaged 53.4 square centimeters—almost exactly
the same overall scale.\textsuperscript{29} Similarly, the “smaller” late flower paintings, taken
as evidence of his weakening by so many scholars, prove not to be greatly
different in scale from the larger body of still-life paintings to which they
belong. Over his entire lifespan, Manet painted some forty-five traditional
still-lifes depicting food, objects, and animals. Taken altogether, these can-
vases average 48.62 square centimeters. The group of twenty-five flower

\textbf{Figure 9.3} Édouard Manet (in black and white on the left) scaled to the size of his
Salon canvases. Top row shows all Salon works painted between 1860
and 1869 which were exhibited in the Salons of 1861, 1864, 1865, 1868,
and 1869. Middle row shows all Salon works painted between 1873 and
1874 and exhibited in the Salons of 1873, 1874, 1875, and 1879. Bottom
row shows all Salon works painted between 1879 and 1882 and exhibited
in the Salons of 1879, 1880, 1881, and 1882 (all works are shown to scale).
Figure 9.4 Average size of Manet’s still-life and flower paintings over time.
paintings he made between 1864 and 1883 are actually slightly larger than his accumulated still-lifes—by 4.71 square centimeters. 30

Analysis of the data reveals that, in terms of their scale, the flower paintings should simply be considered on par with Manet’s larger still life practice. They are not qualitatively different from the larger body of paintings that depicted flora and fauna and spanned the entirety of the artist’s productive years. In fact, even those flower paintings Manet made in the final year of his life, when he was the most debilitated, are on average larger than the still-lifes he made in not just 1861, 1869, and 1872, but also 1876, 1877, 1880, and 1882. And out of all the flower paintings he made in the 1880s, it is likely that Manet actually produced the largest in the final year of his life, in 1882 or early 1883 (Figure 9.5). At fifty-one square centimeters, it shows a spray of white lilacs in a clear glass; stems of the cut branches and tiny bits of flower petals float in the water, while viridian leaves soar above the heavy blooms. A murky umber background, mixed with only the slightest hint of ochre, was painted in after the floral arrangement. The dark background bounds and shapes the blossoms and surrounding foliage, sometimes overlapping
them slightly and carving out the various material substances to shape the pictorial space. The symphony of ivory and cream tones which comprise the flowers are a tour de force of painterly skill. The brushwork, as in so many of Manet’s paintings, makes the canvas look as though it was painted quickly, even instinctively, but we know this was an effect the artist cultivated. Both the colors chosen and the marks made were highly calculated and the comprehensive data reveals that the flowers he portrayed between 1881 and 1883—when he was the most incapacitated—actually grew larger in average overall scale every single year. All this disproves the notion that illness and scale (or, on a larger level, disability and capability), should be so directly correlated.

Systematic assessments of this variety can be used to productively formulate other breakthroughs regarding the years when Manet was increasingly impaired. Evaluating the format the artist chose for his paintings over time demonstrates that a dramatic shift began in the second half of the 1870s (Figure 9.6). Between 1863 and 1874, Manet painted most of his canvases in a horizontal format (61%). But then between 1877 and 1883, in the wake of the 1875 onset of pain in his legs reported by his close friend, the journalist Antonin Proust, that percentage decreases sharply (falling to only 24%). The decline in the number of horizontal canvases in fact falls most precipitously between 1876 and 1877. Whereas 60% of Manet’s works were painted horizontally in 1876, that number drops to only 8% the following year—one of the sharpest declines in his entire career. What might explain this stark change in format? It is now time to return to the documentary sources and

Figure 9.6  Format of Manet’s paintings over time (vertical vs. horizontal).
analyze further the ways in which Manet’s increasing debility after 1875 affected his painting practice.

Descriptions left by his contemporaries make it clear that Manet was forced to paint from a seated position increasingly in his last years. The painter Georges Jeannoit reported an episode in which he visited the master while he was working:

When I returned to Paris in January of 1882, my first visit was to Manet. […] He recognized me at once, held out his hand, and said: “I’m so sorry, please forgive me, I must remain seated, I’m having difficulties with my foot. Do sit down over here …” It was then that I saw how sorely his sickness was trying him, he walked with a cane and seemed to tremble; yet he remained in good humor and spoke of his imminent recovery…

Proust described similar struggles: “He was walking with difficulty and came to see me only with huge efforts and accompanied.” The artist Gaston Latouche, who posed for the Folies-Bergère painting, also recalled that Manet was “exhausted by his disease” and frequently “rested on a couch” as “the disease grew more malevolent.” Such accounts make it clear why Manet was forced to turn increasingly to the vertical format. Painting from a seated position would have made it easier for him to adjust the canvas perpendicularly on his easel, as opposed to standing and moving his chair each time he needed to paint a different section of a large horizontal work.

Working from a seated position and not being able to freely walk the city streets as he had for so many years must have been a painful adjustment. Several scholars describe the importance of Manet’s activity as a “flâneur” and “boulevardier” to his overall identity. These terms were used to describe men who strolled the streets of Paris and observed modern urban life, and Manet has been frequently discussed for the way his gait “gave him a special elegance.” His contemporaries continually highlighted this distinctive element of his comportment. Proust wrote that Manet “had an alluring cadence which his hip-swinging gait imprinted with a particularly elegant character,” while the writer George Moore noted the way his shoulders “swaggered as he went across a room.” Not being able to walk as he once had and the new forced reliance on a cane must have been a painful sign of his infirmity and one that made it difficult to hide his declining condition.

An episode reported by Proust provides strong evidence that Manet was self-conscious about the visibility of his malady. According to the writer, during this period Manet visited a hat shop, where the famous milliner Mme. Virot offered him a chair when she saw that he was leaning on his cane. To this, the artist responded gruffly: “I have no need of a chair, I am not impotent [je ne suis pas impotent].” Proust describes how Manet’s “pride” would not allow him to “confess his suffering.” Apparently, even after returning to his studio, Manet did not let the incident go, saying to Proust: “imagine wanting to pass me off as a legless cripple [un cul-de-jatte] in front of all
the women who were there!” The critic Adolphe Tabarant also described how Manet, despite his pain by late 1881, tried to keep acting the part of the flâneur by visiting the Folies-Bergère nightclub and “sketching the decor while moving agonizingly around the promenades.” Such anecdotes make it clear how much Manet struggled to remain the fashionable man-about-town he had been in Parisian society.

All this paints a picture of a man desperately trying to keep up appearances and resist the outward signs of his deterioration. For Manet, being seen as a man with a cane who struggled to walk meant that he would be viewed as, in his own words, “a legless cripple.” Such judgment was unacceptable to him, no matter the reality of his growing bodily weakness. When Manet sharply countered the offer of a chair with the declaration that he was “not impotent,” he made clear that his disability had come to threaten his masculine identity and his gendered sense of himself in the world. This danger to his male ego could certainly be countered with sharp words and by appearing in his usual haunts as Tabarant describes. But there was perhaps no greater arena in which the artist could reclaim his presence as a man than through his painting practice. For while he may have been forced by his growing physical limitations to paint more canvases in a vertical format, the data on Manet’s oeuvre also reveals a tremendous surge in productivity at the end of his life (Figure 9.7). Just when one might expect his illness to have forced him to reduce the amount he worked, Manet pushed against such circumstances and ramped up his production.

Between 1879 and 1883, Manet made 139 paintings—more than at any other time in his life. In fact, the next nearest five-year period (between 1869 and 1873) is dramatically far from the rate at which he began canvases in his last years. Further, averaging all the years of his work before his illness reveals that Manet produced about eleven paintings a year, thus making his last full year of painting in 1882 an increase of 230% compared to his normal average rate. Review of the data demonstrates that painting served a similar purpose to his declaration that he was “not impotent.” By painting more than he ever had before, Manet could keep up appearances and bolster the version of his masculinity that he had projected in the years before the complications from syphilis arose. For Manet, making thirty-seven paintings in 1879, thirty-six in 1880, twenty-four in 1881, and surging to thirty-seven in 1882 was a means of shoring up his manhood against the repressive reality of his own body’s breakdown. The same was true of the Salon pictures. More of his canvases were exhibited in the Salons between 1879 and 1883 than in any other five-year period in his life.

These painterly efforts prove similar to the letters he wrote professing that he was getting “better and better,” the newspaper correction in which he proclaimed “I am not ill,” and his walking “agonizingly” about the Folies-Bergère as he sketched. And he made all these paintings—more, in fact, in the last full year of his life than in any other—while undergoing painful treatments in the summers, while working mostly from a seated
Figure 9.7 Number of paintings produced by Manet over time (and percentage of signed works by year).
position, and while barely being able to walk unassisted. Without question, such astonishing productivity recalibrates our sense of what an artist who is suffering from a painful debility can achieve. Too often art historians have assumed in the case of Manet, but also other disabled artists, that the work produced under conditions of impairment must necessarily be lesser. Among Manet scholars this meant positing theories that his paintings became smaller, that his subject matter was lesser, and that his production declined. But the reality is that Manet fought the effects of his disability, projecting instead a sense of masculine assuredness and capability. And he did this while adapting in subtle ways to his condition, making adjustments by working more often in a vertical format such that he might prolong his ability to work.

At the same time, the data on Manet’s overall artistic production reveals one more truth. For as much as he worked in his final years, he also seems to have completed fewer than he ever had before (Figure 9.7). If one takes a signature affixed to a canvas as confirmation that the painting was finished, then analyzing the percentage of autographed works by Manet over his lifetime exposes that he signed his name to fewer and fewer canvases beginning in 1875—the same year that Proust tells us the artist began to have pain in his legs. So as much as the painter was producing works at an unprecedented rate, he was either not satisfied with what he was making enough to sign it, or he was unable to bring his paintings to the state of resolution he had in earlier years. Thus, the reality of Manet’s condition did have effects which forced him to adapt his practice, but not in ways that have been properly accounted for by scholars.

Even with all his efforts to maintain appearances, the artist’s illness overwhelmed him in the spring of 1883. By early April of that year, his left foot had become black and swollen, and his doctors decided an amputation was necessary. An account of the operation appeared in *Le Figaro* two days later:

On Wednesday one of Manet’s friends came to see him and reported that a man he knew, in a similar situation, had permitted such an amputation, and that subsequently he was well on the way to recovery. “Well then,” Manet said, “if there is nothing else to do, take off the leg and let’s be done with it!” [...] The limb to be amputated was in a deplorable state; gangrene had set in and reduced the flesh to such a degree that the toenails came away upon contact.

To the end, Manet seemed hopeful for a recovery, telling the doctors to perform the operation so that he might “be done with it!” and, we might presume, get back to his paintings. Despite everything—the treatments he had been subjected to at Bellevue, the amputation, and his own persistence in working—Manet died on April 30, ten days after the operation.
He had subtly adapted his artistic practice to his increasing debility, but the intensity of his work ethic and the scale of his artistic ambition remained undiminished. By not presuming, as so many critics have, that Manet’s disability caused his works to become “sterile” and “adulterated,” or that his final years represent a “period of decline,” this chapter forces a reconsideration of the art and life of one of history’s greatest modernists. The holistic data analysis performed here might help scholars uncover further truths about Manet’s paintings, but it should also serve as a lesson in the dangers of so easily conflating disability with inability. For Manet proves that despite extraordinary impediments, artists have a remarkable capacity to adapt and accomplish—even in the face of terrible pain.
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