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INTRODUCTION

The true power of art lies in its paradoxical and transient nature. The true value of a sculpture, poem or symphony cannot be measured in terms of aesthetics or subject matter alone. Instead, art’s impassioned and subjective qualities are those which make the history of human expression worth examining. Artworks are, in essence, dependent upon the priorities of their producing culture and the way they are perceived by successive generations. In this regard, the arts are also inescapably dynamic as they accrue new forms, subtext and social significance with the passage of time. A painting is far more than a simple arrangement of pigment, geometry and light. It seems unlikely, for instance, that a thirteenth century sculptor commissioned to fashion marble finials for St. Peter’s Abbey in London would have imagined that his works would be subject to perpetual reinterpretation by the tourists visiting Westminster Abbey.¹ His sculptures no longer impart the same message they expressed one thousand years ago. The social, religious, economic and political fluctuations of the centuries skew how people regard their fellows’ creations. Indeed, the presence of cultural subjectivity in the arts is of such significance that it must not be neglected by scholars.

Of all the artistic media, perhaps monumental architecture and sculpture are the most open to popular reassessment and scrutiny. By definition, monuments are artworks which have a unique public function and are designed to communicate particular ideas,

¹ Darnton, The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History, 3–6.
whether emotional, political or social.\textsuperscript{2} The war memorials of Washington D.C. and medieval cemeteries, for instance, both reflect the cultural priorities of the society for which they were commissioned. For historians of Western Europe, the monuments of the nineteenth century are of particular interest, as the range of style and subject matter of these works reflected contemporaries’ interpretation of their quickly evolving world. In fact, many scholars of early nineteenth century France, such as Bertrand Lemoine, have suggested that the ideas expressed in monumental art helped to construct the modern concept of a unified cultural identity.\textsuperscript{3}

Monuments’ relationship with social memory and public space is precisely what makes studies of these artworks vital to a holistic understanding of a given era. By considering the development and construction of monumental art during the nineteenth century, additional insight on the political and cultural upheavals of the period may be obtained. That is precisely what this study aims to achieve. Through a comparative analysis of Paris’ monuments, I will demonstrate how three culturally influential groups used public art to broadcast messages about their new social status in post-Revolution France.\textsuperscript{4} These socio-political entities, the military elites, the Grands Hommes and the French Bourgeoisie, were aware of and relied upon the cultural narratives and collective memory of Parisians to communicate their ideas about a new social order through popular art.\textsuperscript{5} These groups commissioned propagandistic artworks throughout Paris in the hope that their appropriation of a conventional medium and aesthetic would lend

\textsuperscript{2} Kselman, \textit{Death and the Afterlife in Modern France}, 168; West, \textit{From Pigalle to Préault}, 3; Lemoine and Bonfante-Warren, \textit{Architecture in France, 1800-1900}, 108.

\textsuperscript{3} Lemoine and Bonfante-Warren, \textit{Architecture in France, 1800-1900}, 108.


\textsuperscript{5} Eisenman et al., \textit{Nineteenth Century Art}, 13; Magraw, \textit{France, 1800-1914}, 35.
credence to their radical views regarding the proper state of French society in the aftermath of the 1789 Revolution.

Yet before beginning a thorough analysis of Paris’ monumental artworks, it is important to consider what a monument is. By my own definition, ‘monument,’ a word coming from the Latin ‘monere’ which means to warn or to remember, is any man-made and physical object whose function is to memorialize a particular event, person, social norm, or virtue of cultural significance. The element of awe is a significant aspect of monumental art and a trait which affects how well the piece communicates with its audience. Scholars must also note the distinction between monumental art and the more general category of landmarks. Landmarks are simply recognizable features of a landscape which may or may not impact the local population’s sense of group identity because their function is not exclusively commemorative. In this regard, a structure like the Washington monument has more in common with a fellow monument like Stonehenge than any other building on the National Mall.

What monuments and landmarks do share, however, is a privileged position within the public sphere. Although this space may vary in terms of both form and location (for instance, both open piazzas and parish cemeteries contain monuments), it is essential that a diverse audience has easy access to these areas so that the functionality of these monuments may be preserved. The significance of a public artwork is derived from the piece’s immediate physical surroundings and the populace’s recognition or adoption of the ideology espoused by its artist or patron. The inherent power of monumental art is such that these structures are able to touch on an assortment of culturally-constructed

---

belief systems, including the notions of death, memory, politics or religion. Indeed, monuments have been shaping the societies of Western Europe for centuries. Ancient Egyptian stelae, Pictish stones and Roman arches all are early examples of monuments which influenced the social dynamic of their respective cultures. The context of monumental art may be adapted to any social theme and can range in subject from religious, to military or domestic scenes. A general, unifying characteristic of monuments, however, is that they are often commissioned by an elite social body. The current administration, prominent families and the Church, for instance, are the most frequent patrons of monumental art in Western art history.

This patronage scheme did not dissipate entirely in the nineteenth century, although the distresses and upheavals of the French Revolution impacted on Parisian art alongside the city’s political organization. Some historians have described the art of the modern era as having been ‘democratized’ by the events of the late eighteenth century. This supposition suggests that more French citizens had access to the means of artistic production immediately before and long after the Revolution. As a result, monumental art took on a new diversity of tone and theme. Such conclusions only reinforce for scholars the importance of commemorative spaces in the history of public opinion in the West. As Michael Garval noted his study on the history of French monumental art, “Whether constructed, imagined, excavated, restored, preserved, consecrated, desecrated, or destroyed, monuments mattered in nineteenth-century France.”

---

9 Ibid., 84.
Indeed, public art has the potential to sway popular views about individual and group identity. In many ways, monuments prompt comparisons between the present and subjective memories of the past, acting as a barometer for cultural dynamism. In the nineteenth century, when Western social organizations and power structures were subject to radical shifts, public art was frequently modified to keep up with the philosophical demands of the chameleon public. This was especially true in France, where Parisian craftsmen possessed more artistic liberties than their international peers. Such freedoms may be attributed to the extreme political and cultural volatility of Parisian life in the aftermath of the French Revolution.\(^\text{10}\) The art of nineteenth century France is a subject which has a particularly rich historiography characterized by a variety of scholarly approaches. The most effective of these analyses work directly from the material culture of the period, upholding the visual arts as keys to the era.

*Extant Scholarship on French Monuments*

Among the most notable historians in this field are Remi Clignet, Michel Vovelle, Dominique Poulot, Alexandra Bonfonte-Warren and Bertrand Lemoine. Contemporary art history theory demands that analyses of nineteenth century monumental art take into account the influence of French cultural identity constructs. In “Political Versus Aesthetic Revolution,” Remi Clignet argues that the nineteenth century’s clear break with the aesthetic conventions of the past was, in part, prompted by the radicalism of the 1789 Revolution. However, Clignet also posits that such “revolutions are partial.” He states that while the political consequences of the uprising led to a cultural shift in France, the

\(^{10}\) Boime, *Art in an Age of Counterrevolution, 1815-1848*, 6.
resulting aesthetic was less innovative than a “the partial or total restoration of ideas, feelings or values that were deemed obsolescent in the preceding period.”11 Expanding upon Clignet’s thesis, Michel Vovelle has argued that because the monumental art of this transitional period was so hybridized, art historians should be cautious when interpreting these artworks, which are not accurate reflections of public opinion. Vovelle warns that although nineteenth century art appears documentary on the surface, the paintings, engravings and sculpture of this period “do not lend themselves to the sequences of cinéma vérité.”12

Three other scholars, Alexandra Bonfonte-Warren, Bertrand Lemoine and Dominique Poulot have prompted academic discussions on the importance of public spaces and art after the French Revolution. In his articles on the tradition of Pantheon-building in the West, Poulot has argued that one of the formative characteristics of nineteenth century society was the strengthening of public opinion as a cultural and political force.13 By extension, suggest Lemoine and Bonfonte-Warren, the development of social autonomy in the modern era informed the function of monumental art. With the ‘democratization’ of the arts, commemorative works were now open to a new range of subjects, and soon, the monument genre was given a new, didactic purpose.

Lemoine and Bonfonte-Warren forward that monuments “manifested a desire to bring together a social body in France that was still deeply divided.”14 Thereby, artists were at liberty to communicate contemporary ideals or concerns in monumental art. In

---

11 Clignet, “Political Versus Aesthetic Revolutions: The 1780-1800 Period as a Case Study,” 98.
general, this social commentary was done through evocations to the neoclassic or neogothic styles, both of which were associated with the idealized antiquity of post-Revolutionary Europe. By extension, evocations to the grandeur of the past were meant to instruct the larger populace on the appropriate behavior for the current period of troubles.\(^1\) This notion of the educational value of public art was not restrained to the monuments of Paris’ public squares, however, as funerary art also played a role in this socio-artistic conversation.

\textit{A Historiography of Funerary Art in the West}

In order to initiate a more holistic discussion of nineteenth century art, this study will consider both the large monumental artworks found on the streets of Paris and the tomb art of the city’s more affluent cemeteries. The advantage of this approach to material analysis is that such comparisons will clarify the motivations of various groups’ in commemorating individuals or institutions who, before and after death, played an important role in French society. Moreover, as both of these venues for artistic expression were defined by their proximity to public areas, each had the capacity to address cultural ideologies. The inherent similarity between cemeteries and the public squares of Paris forces art historians to regard these spaces as discrete but interrelated locales. Yet in spite of the comparable social function of cemetery and other memorial artworks, academic publications which endorse side-by-side visual analysis of these commemorative forms are few to none. Historiographies to date rarely consider the cultural and historical common ground between these memorial types. Another prohibition to the publication of

\(^1\) Leith, \textit{Space and Revolution}, 22.
such combined historiographies is that there are numerous theoretical flaws within the extant literature on modern monuments and French material history.

This investigation will avoid one of the more problematic flaws of this kind—past historians’ attempts to construct broad-reaching examination of all Western funerary art. Philippe Aries, although a pioneer in the study of Western memorial art, was also the first to compromise his analyses by overextending his scope in this regard. Since his works were published in the last decades of the twentieth century, many scholars have identified the failings of his methodology and have limited their own areas of research accordingly.16 However, one aspect of Aries’ research process which will be incorporated into this thesis is the historian’s acknowledgement of the influence the ancient Greeks and Romans had on modern funerary art. Indeed, these societies had a singular impact on the funerary practices of Western Europe, and as such, their cultural norms cannot be willfully neglected by modern historians.

The Development of Western Funerary Art

Any elementary examination of European funerary art must acknowledge, however briefly, the aesthetic precedent of ancient tombs and monuments. The corresponding relationship between the memorials of the past and the present is evident in studies of nineteenth century European monumental art, as the artists of this period demonstrated a clear preference for the neoclassical style. Perhaps not surprisingly, there is evidence that Western burial practices themselves are also derived from the funereal

traditions of the ancients. Historical accounts to date suggest that the funereal customs of the past were rooted in oral memorial services and did not overemphasize the placement of the corpse at the time of burial. A dialogue between the historian Herodotus and Croesus, the sixth century King of Lydia as recorded in *The Histories* underscores the importance of public funeral orations in the Greek tradition. When prompted by Croesus to name the most blessed of all men, Herodotus replies that the soldier Tellus of Athens is most deserving of the title, for he “died splendidly and the Athenians gave him a public funeral where he fell and so honored him greatly.” Thus, although both clan-based ancestor veneration and hero cults relied upon tomb place markers to direct worship, oral memorial ceremonies remained an important part of Greek burial rites.

From the sixth century BC onwards, when the Roman Empire became a true source of power in the west and sought to emulate the Greeks as a means of validating their own rise, the burial practices of the Greeks spread across Europe. Although Roman citizens were generally cremated in the early centuries BC, it is important to note that this means of disposing human remains did not seek to eliminate the deceased’s identity. Rather, the presence of portrait medallions on cinerary urns from this period indicates that the Romans, much like their Greek counterparts, were concerned with preserving identity in the afterlife (Figure 1). As the centuries passed and Europe entered the Middle Ages, preoccupation with representation of the self in funerary art decreased, and eventually, the use of inscriptions and effigies on tombs also faded from popular use. It was only in the eleventh century that such funerary motifs resurfaced in the Western

---

18 Herodotus and Grene, *The History*, 45.
burial tradition.\textsuperscript{20} This aesthetic convention thus came to influence the practices of nineteenth century France.\textsuperscript{21}

Art historians posit that the emphasis on anonymity in western grave art throughout the Middle Ages was likely due to the newfound influence of the Catholic Church in the Mediterranean. In the post-Roman era, the Church was a major cultural and political force whose spiritual ideology determined the formation of early nations. As Catholic leaders accrued social and cultural capital after the fall of the Empire, Western burial practices began to reflect Church doctrine. The result was that the appearance of piety, faith and devotion in funeral services was now valued above opulence and the material appearance of one’s grave. In most European communities, funeral monuments or cinerary urns were replaced with group or communal tombs in their parish graveyards. Eventually, the bodies placed in these large pit tombs would be exhumed to make room for new generations of the deceased and the remnant bones were moved to ossuaries.\textsuperscript{22} In lieu of individual epitaphs, the walls which enclosed church graveyards were often decorated with ‘memento mori,’ ‘danse macabre,’ or ‘ars moriendi’ motifs, all of which denounced human attachment to worldly pleasures (Figures 2-4).\textsuperscript{23}

The few medieval Christians who did commission exceptional tombs or crypts came from only the highest echelons of society. As such, these tombs prove the exception rather than the rule in studies of medieval funerary practices, as the iconography of these graves generally referenced the deceased’s social position or occupation. The sepulchers

\textsuperscript{20} Ariès, \textit{Images of Man and Death}, 31–40.
\textsuperscript{22} Ariès and Weaver, \textit{The Hour of Our Death}, 31, 207.
of the elites were highly stylized in terms of content and form, relying on traditional poses and symbols of Christian piety while neglecting to note any particulars of the deceased’s physiognomy.\textsuperscript{24} Rather than displaying the precise identity of the deceased, the function of medieval tombs was to demonstrate that individual’s position within the earthly and cosmic hierarchies. However, by the second half of the sixteenth century, most churches which had been modified in accordance with the burial wishes of the social elites could no longer acquiesce to the demands the local nobility.

Although in the past, the wealthiest Europeans ensured social differentiation in the afterlife by purchasing plots near the altar or by reliquaries, the centuries-old churches of modern France could not contain the human remains of the ancient nobility indefinitely. Social elites who were now more restricted in terms of their ability to purchase privileged burial plots turned to other means of maintaining a post-mortem social hierarchy even as the rise of a proto-bourgeoisie at the beginning of the eighteenth century increased demand for even more distinctive tomb art.\textsuperscript{25} As Vanessa Harding notes in her study on the funeral practices of early modern London and Paris, burial processions became more elaborate from the late 1600s onward.\textsuperscript{26} This conflagration of the democratization of the arts and increased prosperity in the nineteenth century enabled social elites to draw upon the antique funerary aesthetic while also constructing elaborate tombs in order to reinforce their prominence within society.

\textsuperscript{24} Ariès, \textit{Images of Man and Death}, 48, 79.
\textsuperscript{25} Kselman, \textit{Death and the Afterlife in Modern France}, 9.
\textsuperscript{26} Harding, \textit{The Dead and the Living in Paris and London, 1500-1670}, 78.
The Western Monumental Art Tradition

Yet perhaps a brief overview of the history of the Western monumental tradition would also clarify some of the reasons why, until the present, monumental and public tomb art historiographies have been written in isolation. However, it is difficult to generalize about or even qualify Western monument traditions as there is such a wide range in what art historians generally classify as a monument. No doubt it is for this reason that there are so few holistic analyses on the subject. For instance, it is difficult to discuss the moai of Easter Island and the Vietnam War Memorial of Washington D.C. in the same study, although each is considered a monument. An additional complication is that, in Europe, many public artworks from the Middle Ages to the eighteenth century were commissioned by the Catholic Church and the highest echelons of society, limiting historians’ ability to discern much information from them regarding the larger populace.

However, one of the few scholars whose studies of modern art inadvertently address the history of Western monuments is Albert Boime. Boime suggests that the sculptural and decorative arts were restrained by the artistic and political conventions of guilds and related organizations until the nineteenth century when the majority of sculptors no longer hailed from a purely artisanal background. Unlike painters, who generally came from affluent, middle class families, sculptors before the modern era were more often aligned with the “practical trades” of carpentry and smithing. Boime contends that the true history of Western monumental art began in the nineteenth century, when artists were given additional license and agency by their patrons.

28 Ibid., 5.
Modern Cultural Influences on Monumental Art

As has already been mentioned, there are three primary social institutions whose aspirations for post-Revolutionary France shaped Parisian commemorative art. These groups include the French military, whose prominence in the political arena only grew after 1789, the Grands Hommes, whose role as the intellectual elites of France enabled the dissemination of Enlightenment ideas, and the bourgeoisie, whose economic capital determined French behaviors and cultural norms. Yet these social groups did not arbitrarily commission public memorials—the style and content of the works they sponsored was determined by two larger intellectual movements which developed at the conclusion of the eighteenth century. These movements concerned period beliefs about human mortality and the Enlightenment ideal of an educated, socially-conscious populace. As is often the case in history, these seemingly distinct intellectual concepts upheld by French academics influenced one another within the context of modern Paris, especially with regard to urban development and funerary practices. The confluence of these social constructs allowed the three aforementioned socio-economic institutions to modify the aesthetic conventions of Paris’ public memorials. Yet before beginning an analysis of particular artworks which reflect the involvement of these groups in the development of monumental art, it is important to understand the intellectual movements which inspired them.

The Question of Human Mortality

The first of these late eighteenth century academic developments to be discussed here is the method and processes with which contemporary societies addressed human
mortality. The rapid pace of urban development in France throughout the nineteenth century forced local administrations to reconsider their official practices regarding the appropriate disposal and treatment of the dead. As the population of Paris grew, so did the need for urgent reforms of civic burial traditions.\(^{29}\) This subject has only recently been included in the larger academic dialogue regarding social perceptions of death. The conversation itself was initiated by Philippe Aries and his colleagues in the mid to late twentieth century, at the height of the social history movement. Before, art historians simply recorded information about the imagery and style of Western sepulchers, and it was not until Aries’ *Images of Man and Death* that academics began to consider the relationship between funeral art and society.\(^{30}\)

In contrast, there is an extensive historiography of the social history of dying itself. In the 1980s, historians like Joachim Whaley studied human perspectives of morality as expressed through scientific advancements, social rituals at the deathbed and theological writings.\(^{31}\) This interest in social history, sprung from the mid-twentieth century revolution in academia, brought forth the influential writings of historians like Allan Kellehear, whose works concentrate on the variety of Western funeral practices and John McManners, whose book *Death and the Enlightenment* examines both economic and political catalysts for the evolution of Western memorials.\(^{32}\) Indeed, the bulk of significant work on Western tomb art and funerary practices has been completed in the last three decades. As such, this nascent discipline is subject to and shaped by


\(^{30}\) Ariès, *Images of Man and Death*, 237.


contemporary research practices, beginning with the interdisciplinary nature of modern scholarship.

Historians like Thomas Albert Kselman and Albert Mytum, for instance, have expanded upon simplistic analyses of Western mortuary procedures by considering how popular revolts, mass publications and the living conditions of the lower classes influenced urban organization and funerary conventions. Other scholars have discussed how nineteenth century philosophies were manifest in the arts. In *The Space of Death*, Michel Ragon focuses on how the evolution of French social principles during this period affected the development of European cemeteries, giving especial consideration to the growing trend of religious diversity in the West. In large part, French historians have remained the innovative scholars of this field, as the works of Philippe Aries were quickly joined by those of Michel Dansel in the late 1990s and early 2000s. Dansel’s primary contribution to the historiography of the social history of death is his emphasis upon cemeteries as meeting places which encouraged communal memory building.

Most scholars recognize the mutual importance of burial practices and tomb sculpture iconography to holistic analyses of modern Europe. The connection between these two entities began in Roman times with a series of legislative policies which regulated disposal of the dead. “The Law of the Twelve Tables,” the foundation of Roman law under the Republic, mandated that no burials or cremations could take place inside a city. Philippe Aries suggests that the reasoning behind this legislation was

Roman culture’s fear that close proximity with the deceased could pollute the surrounding soil and water reserves. By placing human remains outside the city boundaries, the ancient sought to “tame death.”37 However, the absence of proper enforcement for this law meant that outlying Roman territories were at liberty to ignore or uphold the mandate, and they often gave preference to local customs. In Paris, this legislation was only halfheartedly endorsed until the late eighteenth century, with the advent of the Enlightenment.38

In the second half of the eighteenth century, new concern for urban sanitation and public health forced Parisian administrators to once again consider the advantages of the Roman legal precedent. In spite of the centuries of tradition which allowed affluent families to use urban parish graveyards as venues for social expression, the government of post-Revolution France passed several decrees which prevented the further use of these cemeteries in the interest of public health. This marked a period of transition for the burial practices of Western Europe. Urban sprawl in the latter half of the eighteenth century meant that the parish churches which once lay outside the Roman-era city walls had become absorbed into the fabric of Paris. Population growth in centralized regions of the city began to overtax local parishes, which were often the only resource for the disposal of human remains.39 Clergymen constructed tombs in every available space, selling burial plots underneath the flagstones, in the roof, and even between the walls (Figures 5-6). Citizens who did not or simply could not afford such post-mortem luxuries were laid out in common ditches in the churchyard, which could contain up to one

37 Ariès and Weaver, *The Hour of Our Death*, 20.
thousand corpses. The land set aside for these ditches was rotated over a period of years so the corpses in each area of the graveyard had time to decay before the remains were exhumed and placed in the Paris ossuary.\textsuperscript{40}

Over time, however, these communal burial plots began to affect the chemical content of the soil surrounding the graveyard. According to several eighteenth century accounts on the state of Parisian cemeteries, sometimes the soil, pebbles and grass did not even conceal the bones below.\textsuperscript{41} Such conditions were incompatible with the fact that the maintenance of the social status quo became increasingly important to European elites into the early modern era. The baroque fascination with images of the ‘danse macabre’ devolved into depictions of a ‘controlled’ and scientific method of dying. In the eighteenth century’s Enlightenment-based mindset, one’s death could be tamed by ensuring that one’s earthly reputation remained intact and in keeping with the standards of the day.\textsuperscript{42} Yet this intellectual development was irreconcilable with the realities of urban burial practices of the early nineteenth century. Many Parisians still adhered to the tradition of burying the impoverished in communal pits within the city limits. Another barrier to the continued use of cemeteries as a venue for post-mortem social differentiation included the presence of prostitutes, street vendors in churchyards as well as locals’ regular use of the area as refuse pit.\textsuperscript{43} This degradation of the cemetery structure could not match the cultural preference for preserving a social framework after

\textsuperscript{40} Ragon, \textit{The Space of Death}, 51.
\textsuperscript{41} Ariès, \textit{Images of Man and Death}, 48, 79; Society of Arts (Great Britain), \textit{Journal of the Society of Arts}.
\textsuperscript{43} Ariès and Weaver, \textit{The Hour of Our Death}, 69–70.
death. At this juncture, the true battle between memory and mortality had begun, as Enlightenment intellectuals restructured cultural perceptions of death.

An Enlightened Populace

The second intellectual development of the nineteenth century which influenced the aesthetic of monumental art is the Enlightenment ideal of an autonomous and educated French public. Philosophes of this period were concerned with democratizing and disseminating knowledge to the general public, theorizing how increased literacy rates, ease of transportation and access to new material goods might edify the lower classes. Several historians have made studies of the intellectual society of the late eighteenth century France, including scholar Jonathan I. Israel, whose analyses emphasize the “sense of shock and acute danger” the Enlightenment presented Europeans with. Israel argues that regardless of the precise message of Enlightenment philosophers, the intelligentsia’s radical beliefs had a profound influence on the modern West.

Other historians like Peter McPhee have asserted the importance of education on the social developments post-French Revolution. In his work on the social history of Revolutionary France, McPhee discusses how religion, political theory and the Enlightenment philosophy of civil equality all influenced the culture of modern France. The gradual solidification of public identity and autonomy in the late eighteenth century via new methods of communication and the cheap cost of travel encouraged the dissemination of knowledge. An increase in the number of popular journals and

---

45 Israel, Radical Enlightenment, 3.
46 McPhee, Social History of France, 1789-1914, 1–2.
newspapers during this period is a testament to the larger cultural shifts which were taking place in the modern West. Journals, through both text and image, spread ideas about representational government, reports of civil unrest and social policy changes being made by the new administrations which held power in the years after 1789.47

One social issue addressed by the Parisian newspapers at the turn of the century, as has already been alluded to, was the problem of public sanitation and the organization of graveyards. This became an especially tendentious topic as it became clear that the overuse of Paris’ cemeteries was creating other urban structural issues. Parisian officials regarded the construction of the Cimetièrè de l’Est, better known today as the Cemetery of Père Lachaise, in the early nineteenth century as an opportunity to not only solve the problem of graveyard mismanagement, but to construct a new social space which would supplement Enlightenment philosophes’ efforts to educate the people (Figures 7-9). Plans for Père Lachaise were made official in 1804, and soon after, the new cemetery began to attract wealthy and socially prominent clients.48 However, the true cultural significance of Père Lachaise is derived from its monuments’ subliminal, didactic messages about social stratification.

Another source of the cemetery’s popularity following its grand opening in 1817 stemmed from its reputation as one of the more exclusive burial grounds of modern Paris. Yet in spite of its elite clientele, Père Lachaise served a broad swath of Paris’ population

and the funerary artworks on its grounds reflect the diversity of those interred there.\textsuperscript{49} Even in the years directly before it was opened for public use, the layout and structure of Père Lachaise was a subject of considerable interest to early nineteenth century architects and engineers, who regarded the areas as but another medium for popular edification. Beginning in the 1770s and 1780s, famed architects like Etienne-Louis Boullee became interested in epitaphs and sepulchers as design projects.\textsuperscript{50}

Much like the Enlightenment-era social theorists, these French architects saw Père Lachaise as both a solution to the problem of urban sanitation and an opportunity to educate the public on civic virtues. The aesthetic French landscape designers and urban developers turned to for the realization of their intellectual ambitions was the ‘garden cemetery’ or ‘picturesque’ model (Figure 10). The picturesque garden was a landscaping form popularized in Europe by the social elites of the eighteenth century, who imported exotic flora and fauna to their country estates.\textsuperscript{51} Aside from the physical layout of the gardens themselves, landscapers became interested in the archaic symbolism of particular plants. Over time, it also became fashionable to also include memorials to deceased family members or national heroes in these gardens. In theory, the isolated, symbolic and beautiful surroundings for these statues would inspire visitors to reflect on the condition of human mortality.\textsuperscript{52}

Eventually, the picturesque garden tradition made its way into the graveyard landscapes of northern Europe. The picturesque convention gained momentum from the

\textsuperscript{49} Mytum, “Public Health and Private Sentiment,” 294–295.
\textsuperscript{52} Denton, “Death in French Arcady,” 201.
popularity of Nicholas Poussin’s mid-seventeenth century painting *Et in Arcadia Ego*, a reinterpretation of the ‘memento mori’ theme which was so popular in the West during the Middle Ages (Figure 11). Modern historian Enrico De Pascale suggests that the fervor with which Poussin’s revision of the *Et in Arcadia Ego* artistic motif caught on in seventeenth century France is connected to the period’s literary idealizations of death via exposure to the cultural norms of the ancient Greeks. In particular, French artists were interested in the literary theme of Arcadia, a mythological land where humans remained young and lived without the knowledge of mortality. Arcadia appealed to European artists because its sylvan and unpolluted state served as a balm to the gilded trappings of the Baroque aesthetic, which had begun to wane in popularity by the end of the eighteenth century. As Howard Montagu Colvin argues, although the classical trend in Western art was overwhelmed by decorative sensibilities in the Baroque era, in the aftermath of the Revolution, the artificial horrors and melodrama of death seemed trite in comparison to the grim social realities which characterized daily life.

Western Europe’s preoccupation with the Greek tradition was not only historical in scope, however. Many contemporary authors suggested that modern society should borrow from the funeral practices of the Greeks and other ‘oriental’ cultures. In a series of articles written for *Voyage Litteraire*, Madame Chenier, the mother of the poet Andre Chenier, emphasized the virtues of modern Greeks’ funereal traditions. In particular, she remarked upon their habit of visiting cemeteries, laying out flowers and paying homage to the deceased family members. Madame Chenier approved of the family-centric nature of such cultural practices and argued that modern French society certainly could learn

from the Greeks’ model. In this regard, cemeteries were seen as a tool for the cultural edification of the populace. Much like the other public spaces of Paris, such as the open squares of the Place de la Concorde or the Jardin du Luxembourg, the garden Elysium of Père Lachaise provided an emotional outlet for its visitors, but the idyllic setting also provided a space for theatrical expressions of melancholy which as so fashionable among the local elites.

The Formation of Paris’ Public Spaces

Indeed, the picturesque garden precedent was a significant factor in deciding upon the location and appearance of Père Lachaise. The land upon which Père Lachaise was built had its own romantic and inspiring history, something which only increased the area’s popularity in the early decades of the nineteenth century. In the fifteenth century, the grounds of Père Lachaise were part of the country estate of a wealthy Parisian merchant. Later, the land was redistributed to the Jesuits as a “retreat for their aging members.” In 1762, the monks were forced to relinquish their rights to Mont Louis when the Jesuit order was outlawed in France. The following year, the property was offered for public resale, at which point it was purchased by the Parisian government.

In the early 1800s, Alexandre-Theodore Brongniart, the Chief Inspector of the Second Section of Public works for the department of the Seine and the City of Paris, was given control of Père Lachaise and the cemetery was inaugurated in 1804. Brongniart
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had some initial difficulty persuading the wealthy citizens of Paris to bury their dead in this sector of the city as the Eastern quarter was still relatively underdeveloped and not yet ‘fashionable.’ However, from the beginning, Père Lachaise was a burial site favored by the French authorities, and many civil servants were interred on the grounds. This eventually led to Père Lachaise becoming something of a tourist destination.

By 1825, several Parisian guidebooks were published which not only mentioned the cemetery, but provided tour itineraries and maps for the eager visitor. The tombs of Moliere, Heloise and Abelard and Jean de la Fontaine remained some of the more popular attractions.59 Local Parisians also spent weekend afternoons strolling through Père Lachaise. In his book *Death and the Afterlife in Modern France*, historian Thomas Albert Kselman suggests that Parisians’ preoccupation with the leisure activities of the Cemetery of Père Lachaise was merely an evolution of the earlier French tradition of using parish graveyards as marketplaces and social gathering spots.60 Indeed, it is important for historians to remember that the Cemetery of Père Lachaise was but the product of an earlier and well-established French cultural tradition in which all manner of public spaces were used for the edification of the local population. As such, all future analyses of the public art of either Père Lachaise or the monuments of the city of Paris itself must take into account these venues’ relative values of two of many locales which the social elites of the era used for their propagandistic purposes.

60 Kselman, *Death and the Afterlife in Modern France*, 201.
Conclusion

The two aforementioned socio-philosophical concepts about human mortality and an enlightened public characterized how three distinct social groups interacted with the conventions of European monumental art in the early nineteenth century. The events of the French Revolution exposed Parisian society to the influence of the new political, intellectual and economic elites who modified the traditional aesthetic of memorial art in order to solidify their own position in a nation which remained stratified and divided. These elites self-consciously reasserted their cultural prominence on both the public avenues of Paris and in the graveyards on the perimeters of the city. In this thesis, the particular contributions of the military elites, the Grands Hommes and the Parisian bourgeoisie to the themes and subjects of French memorial art will be laid out in individual chapters. Each chapter will not only provide a background on the social institution in question, but will also analyze artworks associated with these groups in each of the public areas discussed above.

The first chapter will address the impact of the institutionalized military on the popular and funerary art of post-French Revolution Paris. Here, I will consider how Napoleonic political policies determined the appearance of notable French landmarks such as the Arc de Triomphe and other, lesser known tombs of military officers in the cemetery of Père Lachaise. The next chapter will focus on the Grands Hommes and how their intellectual and creative legacies influenced popular perceptions of national identity through the sculptural friezes of the Pantheon de Paris and other mausoleums. Finally, I will look at the French bourgeoisie, whose role in the 1789 Revolution afforded Paris’ most notable families in an astonishing amount of cultural capital in the following
century. In particular, the bourgeoisie’s attempts to modify the aesthetic of Western memorial art are best considered in relation to the Place de la Bastille and the family chapels of Père Lachaise.

The aim of the conclusion is to provide the reader with a brief overview of how integral a role the diversification of wealth and education was in allowing the new social bodies the ability to express themselves creatively in the public sphere. Moreover, I will discuss how the French people of this century have chosen to remember their culture’s association with monumental art. It is not the responsibility of the historian to merely note monumental and popular art of the early nineteenth century as marginal points of interest in holistic studies of the era. Instead, it is vital that scholars come to appreciate the value of monumental art in French history and give it an appropriate place in the historiography of the nineteenth century.
CHAPTER ONE
FRENCH ART FROM NAPOLEON TO THE BOURBONS: THE MILITARY’S CULTURAL DIALOGUE

In periods of revolution and social upheaval, very little seems stable and the overarching social structure becomes volatile. However, a study of history demonstrates that there are, in fact, some social patterns which surface time and again in the face of political turmoil. If one looks at the events of the French Revolution, for instance, one such recurrent theme becomes immediately apparent. In the aftermath of 1789, the military elites of France retained their practical function and position in the administrative sphere of Paris. Throughout the nineteenth century, army support and interaction with the extant political body was crucial to the maintenance of a stable French society. Indeed, numerous historians to date have readily acknowledged the influence military men had on the organization of Paris in the aftermath of the French Revolution and well into the modern era.¹

Although the military was far from an autonomous social body in the early nineteenth century, due to France’s “revolutionary tendencies” which prevented cultural cohesion, the general aim of the army elites in this period was to promote popular perception of their group’s legitimacy as a political authority. Their role in the revolt-induced regime changes which occurred following the chaos of 1789 cannot be overestimated, and by extension, the military’s influence within the administrations they

¹ Boime, Art in an Age of Revolution, 1750-1800, 469.
brought to power is also worth noting.\textsuperscript{2} For instance, many army commanders, especially during the Napoleonic era, ended their careers in service by beginning another in the Parisian government.\textsuperscript{3} Their rise as a cultural powerhouse following the Revolution had a long-lasting effect on French culture, which extended far beyond the content or tone of contemporary literary works or executive policies which they were party to. Rather, the military elites are important to contemporary studies of nineteenth century France because of their modifications of public artworks. A primary source of this group’s agency stemmed from their participation in the numerous military coups which took place at the conclusion of the ancien régime, when the strength of local militias often determined which faction ascended to power.\textsuperscript{4} This innate control over the development of French politics afforded the military elites access to an abundance of cultural resources which they then used to drive intellectual production and mold popular opinion. Three social issues which the army addressed in the monumental artworks they commissioned during this era involve the military’s relationship with French history, the rest of Europe and with modern Parisian society.

Yet before beginning a discussion of the military elites’ use of public art, however, it is important to understand the circumstances which contributed to their rise in cultural prominence after the French Revolution. Most historians assert that the military’s slow accumulation of power throughout the modern era began during the reign of King

\textsuperscript{2} Boime, \textit{Hollow Icons}, 1, 36.
\textsuperscript{3} Griffith, \textit{Military Thought in the French Army, 1815-51}, 14.
\textsuperscript{4} Rubin, “The Politics of Quatremere De Quincy’s Romantic Classicism,” 230–32. The personal history of French politician Quatremere de Quincy as described by James Rubin is an excellent example of how influential French military men grew in importance during this period.
Louis XIV. The monarch’s aggressive foreign policy in the first half of the seventeenth century led France to participate in the wars of succession which crippled Europe. Perhaps because that the military was one of the social institutions which made France a political powerhouse in the eighteenth century, it is not surprising that this group should have dominated so many of France’s socio-political activities under this monarch. 

Ironically, the frequent and recurring wars of succession throughout Europe in the eighteenth century were also an indication of the Western monarchies’ slip into a state of decline. Therefore, as the political factions who prompted the rise of the military became increasingly unstable, the future of the French military also became uncertain. The events of 1789, however, solidified the army’s function within French politics as elite soldiers took the place of the deposed aristocracy in local administration. The Enlightenment also had an impact on the military’s rise to power as the philosophy of nationalism permeated European culture. In particular, the socio-political principle of “the Nation in Arms,” wherein every able-bodied man was registered for active service, helped the military elites establish their prominence in post-Revolution France.

Yet the army’s social agency was not derived exclusively from their participation in the armed conflicts of the eighteenth century. Indeed, military elites accrued additional influence during the reign of Napoleon and throughout the early years of the Empire, when the Emperor’s overseas campaigns changed the dynamic of European relations. However, Napoleon’s bellicose nature held greater implications for the French citizenry than any government corollary, as his final defeat in 1814 damaged the country’s
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international reputation and subjected the people to the interests of a nascent bureaucracy.

All the same, this slackening of France’s influence across Europe weakened the growth of the military only temporarily. Although, as historian Patty Griffiths notes, “France was determined to enlist only a relatively small proportion of its manpower” after 1815, a significant part of the federal budget was set aside for army operations.\(^8\) This reduction of France’s military in the aftermath of the Bonapartist regime was little more than show, an attempt by the new government to distance themselves from the politics of the Empire. Over time, the French army only accumulated additional social influence in modern France.\(^9\) Much like the rulers of the ancien regime, the military elites of this period chose to express their new agency through the arts, and in particular, the monumental art of Paris’ public spaces.

Although the role of art in socio-political affairs extends far beyond the scope of the early nineteenth century, the historiography of monumental art is such that Napoleonic-era artworks are often the focus of scholarly analyses. This is perhaps because the Emperor Napoleon was so prolific in his commissions for artworks which were propagandistic in tenor.\(^10\) Indeed, in spite of past regimes’ use of art as a medium of self-aggrandizement, the administrative officials of the early nineteenth century ushered in a new form of dialogue between the arts and the general public. One of the primary differences between the popular monuments of the previous decades and those of the modern era was the extent to which such memorials were regarded as educational tools which could both elevate the moral status of the public and serve the purposes of the
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regime. Historian James Leith has suggested that the subjects of early nineteenth century public monuments were not created merely to perpetuate an earlier artistic tradition which cast European monarchs and religious figures in a positive light. Instead, the intellectuals of the era demanded a change in the monumental aesthetic so that kings would “share public space with great men.”

The French literary and artistic community was well aware of the army’s involvement in the fine arts, however. One contemporary writer who noticed and approved of the military participation in the public arts was the Rene Francois Armand Prudhomme, the editor of the serial publication Revolutions de Paris. In 1793, Prudhomme wrote an article for his journal in which he asserted Paris’ need for popular monuments which rejected the authority of the ancien regime, thereby validating the events of the French Revolution. The author then describes his ideal monument, an enormous colossus which would stand on the Pont Neuf atop of the ruins of a statue to the late sixteenth century French monarch Henri IV. The illustration Prudhomme provides for the figure recalls the classical Colossus of Rhodes, even though the figure is adorned with the garments of French Revolutionaries, including a Phrygian cap (Figure 12).

The two most striking aspects of Prudhomme’s ideal monument, however, are the contents of the colossus’ palm and the author’s suggested title for the piece. Prudhomme proposed that this monument, if it were ever built, should be named the “Mangeur du Roi,” or the Eater of Kings. The inherent violence of the work’s theme is reflected in the
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11 West, From Pigalle to Préault, 8.
12 Leith, Space and Revolution, 8.
13 Prudhomme, Révolutions de Paris, publ. par le sieur [L.M.] Prudhomme, 288–290. For a partial translation of Prudhomme’s article, see Appendix B, Section 1.
giant’s firm grasp on a deposed European monarch in his left hand. The audience is well aware that the crushed king will soon be devoured by this personification of the French people. However, it is important to remember that the hostile imagery of Prudhomme’s engraving was not at odds with contemporary views regarding popular art. The number of comparable proposals for monuments which celebrated the downfall of the ancient regime at the end of the eighteenth century suggests to historians the significance of military and revolutionary-themed monuments in the modern construction of a French public identity.\(^\text{14}\)

\textit{Arc de Triomphe d’Étoile}

As Prudhomme’s “Mangeurs du Roi” sculpture was never realized, art historians must look to extant Parisian monuments for further insights on how the French military influenced monumental art. The Arc de Triomphe de l’Étoile, for instance, is perhaps the most recognizable of the Emperor Napoleon’s public commissions which address his military accomplishments in the early eighteenth century (Figure 13). Construction of the triumphal arch was begun in 1806, following the Napoleonic victory at the Battle of Austerlitz.\(^\text{15}\) The monument, which contains aesthetic quotes from the Arch of Titus in Rome, is a neoclassical masterpiece composed of four main pillars, each of which features a narrative sculptural group (Figure 14). Along the attic of the Arc de Triomphe are thirty shields emblazoned with the names of Napoleonic and Revolutionary victories and six reliefs on the uppermost façade which represent important events of the early nineteenth century. Some of the more subtle attributes of this monument include the

\(^{14}\text{Ibid.}\)

\(^{15}\text{West, From Pigalle to Préault, 105.}\)
trumpeting allegories from Roman mythology which fit into the corners of the arcade and decorative entablature.

Although Napoleon initiated construction on the Arc de Triomph in 1806, it was only inaugurated during the July Monarchy in 1836. This delay on the arc’s completion was due to Napoleon’s downfall and the reluctance of subsequent governments to endorse a work which lauded the accomplishments of the deposed Emperor.16 When control of the project was handed to French politician Adolphe Thiers in 1833, there was a general understanding between all involved that the monument would no longer applaud the legacy of Napoleon alone. Instead, the work’s link to the Grande Armée of the Empire was modified to represent “the glory of all the French armies since 1792.”17 In this regard, the general body of the French military elite benefitted from the monarchy’s revision of the monument, as their multi-generational successes after the revolution were celebrated in public art. The sheer number of names and notable events represented in this work were meant to remind Parisian civilians of the socio-political significance of the military in an era when the upper classes advocated the “drastic recoding [of monuments] to conform to the ideology and historical memory of the new regime.”18

It must be noted that in addition to the artworks which adorn the Arc de Triomphe themselves, one aspect of the monument which affected the work’s symbolic potency within French culture is the work’s position in the city itself. Much like the Pont Neuf, the Arc de Triomphe is situated at the center of a large, open space which serves as a

16 Boime, Art in an Age of Counterrevolution, 1815-1848, 311.
17 Ibid., 311–312.
18 Ibid., 16.
nucleus of activity for the surrounding neighborhoods (Figure 15). The twelve radiating avenues which stretch out from the traffic circle lead to various industrial, mercantile and cultural quarters of the city. Indeed, like many of Napoleon’s monumental works, the placement of the Arc de Triomphe was deliberate. The Emperor’s selection of the end of the Champs-Élysées promenade as the location for his monument was intentional as it allowed visitors to view the Tuilleries Gardens and the Louvre from the same vista. This figural alignment of the arc with the important landmarks of Paris was Napoleon’s attempt to validate his work in the eyes of the French people.\textsuperscript{19} The Arc de Triomphe’s physical location and prominence in the urban skyline ensured that the monument remained the effective center of daily life and activities in Paris.

Nonetheless, the Arc de Triomphe’s formal qualities in addition to its considerable status, are of primary interest to art historians. In particular, the friezes and other sculptural embellishments of the work influenced contemporaries’ understanding of the monument, and as such, are important to scholars interested in Napoleonic propaganda. One of the central motifs of the Arc de Triomphe which resurfaces in comparable Empire-period works is what art historian Albert Boime has described as the “Napoleonic hero,” a military man who “is not of royal or noble descent, but is elevated to the status of monarch through insertion into the conventional sign system. Thus the preservation of the semiotics of kingly representation preserved the visual configuration of the social hierarchy.”\textsuperscript{20} In evoking antiquated styles which alluded to the grandeur of the Romans, and more subtly, the French monarchy, Napoleon and the military elites of

\textsuperscript{20} Boime, \textit{Art in an Age of Bonapartism, 1800-1815}, xxv.
the period were drawing parallels between the France of the nineteenth century and that of the past.

One contemporary author whose work reflects this period’s nostalgia for and power brokering with history is the French architect Francois Blondel. Blondel’s primary interest in this regard was the monumental aesthetic conventions of the latter half of the seventeenth century, and triumphal arches in particular. In an article he wrote for *Le Magasin Pittoresque* on art from the time of King Louis XIV, Blondel asserted that the function of neoclassical art was “to surpas[s] the grandeur and magnificence of what antiquity has left us,” thus maintaining a constant and self-conscious dialogue with the past.  

This conversation between late eighteenth century artists and European cultural history is also evident in the prolific number of history paintings produced in France during this period. Now, artists who were previously tied to the priorities of their patrons were able to engage their art in the philosophical debates of the day, further complicating our modern interpretation of socially-charged works like the Arc de Triomphe. It is this ability of the arts to both reflect and influence the larger culture which military elites sought to capture in their public monument commissions in the early nineteenth century.

Historians have speculated that Thiers’ choice of the three artists who completed the friezes of the Arc de Triomphe was intentional and in line with the aesthetic dialogue referenced above. The sculptors Thiers hand-picked for the work were Francois Rude, Antoine Etex and Jean-Pierre Cortot, all of whom came from Republican political backgrounds. As such, they were workers who would have been sympathetic to the
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administrative aims of the military elites. Of the Arc de Triomphe friezes, the most famous today is Francois Rude’s *La Marseillaise*, although the accompanying friezes *Le Triomphe de 1810* by Cortot and Etex’s *Le Paix de 1813* and *La Resistance de 1814* also speak to the relevance of the French military during this period (Figures 16-19). Each sculpture group represents events in the history of Revolutionary and Imperial France, but they are further unified through the artists’ unanimous employment of neoclassical motifs.

Rude’s *La Marseillaise* is perhaps the best place to begin to tease apart the neoclassical elements of the Arc de Triomphe, as this artist elevated the use of antique ornament above all else. Spatial relations and aesthetic beauty, for instance, were two elements of the academic canon which Rude seems not to have been concerned with. Moreover, Rude’s figures are not portraits, nor are they realistic with regard to his historical subject. Indeed, it is difficult to believe that the citizen-soldiers of the French Revolution would have chosen to adorn themselves so sparsely and wear only light armor in the street riots of 1789. The only truly realist element of the composition is Rude’s inundation of the youthful, athletic and classical citizens of a fictive Paris with a naturalistic sense of trepidation which could be expected of untrained armed forces about to enter battle.

Nonetheless, it is Rude’s figure of Liberty floating above the heads of Paris’ brave citizens which is one of the most recognizable aspects of the composition. The underlying comic element of the work is derived from Rude’s choice not to depict Liberty as a
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beautiful or static personification like those found in classical art (Figure 20). Instead, Rude used the figure’s attributes to accentuate the composition’s movement, as her drapery ripples in a sourceless, divine wind and her diagonal configuration contrasts with the jumbled mass of bodies below. The disjunction between the two halves of Rude’s composition may reflect the artist’s own interpretation of the violence and turbulence of 1789. The humor of this piece is such that it represents both the heroism and the folly of the French Revolution, as the aspirations of the revolutionaries were but ideals which ignored the realities of leadership. The work of Rude, and by extension, Paris’ military elites, reflects this social group’s attempts to clarify their opinions regarding the state of France following the conflicts of the late nineteenth century and their role in the new social order.

Other aspects of the Arc de Triomphe which speak to the social role of the French army after 1789 are the friezes which line the arcade (Figures 21-26). Indeed, these six reliefs represent important battles or other relevant scenes from the Revolutionary and Napoleonic periods. In particular, these friezes highlight the military elites’ relationship with the rest of Europe. Each contains the underlying theme of nationalism, a narrative structure accentuated by the fact that these scenes are all representations of France’s foreign imperialism. Of the five battle scenes on the arc de Triomphe, two allude to the Napoleonic campaigns in Egypt, and one of each in Russia, Belgium and Italy. As images of decisive moments in Napoleonic history, these reliefs and the Battles of Alexandria and Aboukir in particular, aid historical analyses of the army’s self-
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representations during this period, as they allude to contemporary views of French imperialism. Unlike the friezes in which the Napoleonic army is shown in opposition with other European nations, those which depict conflict between the French and the Egyptians represent the African troops as awkward and submissive. Imperialist tendencies aside, however, it is significant that the artworks of the Arc de Triomphe depict French military victories against a variety of foreign nations, as this implies that all countries, whether from the West or not, are subject to the interests of the French military. By extension, then, these cultures were also dependent upon French culture and political activities, as the army controlled these elements of Parisian life as well. Moreover, the fact that these representations of French military victories were placed in a central location within France’s capital itself is indicative of the military’s self-conscious ability to modify the public spaces of Paris. Ostensibly, their aim in doing so was to enter into a social conversation regarding their complex association with other nations.

Finally, the military elites used the Arc de Triomphe to express their views regarding their relationship with modern French society. In fact, the interdependence of the army and the French people is clearly expressed in the symbolism of the Arc de Triomphe’s friezes by Antoine Etex. Indeed, a comparison of the artist’s two dynamic sculptural groups La Resistance de 1814 and Le Paix de 1815 demonstrates contemporary views of how the French military remained an important part of Parisian society during times of both war and peace. To begin, Etex’s La Resistance de 1814 is a depiction of the civil struggles which took place during the invasion of Paris by foreign forces in 1814. In this work, a classically-proportioned and stoic citizen-soldier fills the center of the composition. He draws the viewer’s attention to his attempts to shield his elderly father
and wife from a mounted enemy, who is in turn struck down by a winged personification of French Resistance. Resistance’s presence acts as the static and stabilizing component of the composition, contrasting with the sharp diagonals made by the fallen enemy soldier and the splayed legs of the defensive Frenchman in the center. Although the military is not explicitly referenced in this work, the actions of the citizens who are featured in Etex’s frieze allude to the often-entangled role of the institutionalized army and the larger populace during this period.

By extension, Etex’s Le Paix de 1815 is another work which is not strictly representational of the French military and its role in post-Revolutionary society, yet alludes to their influence. Like La Resistance de 1814, this sculptural group is organized around two central figures- a classically-formed soldier and a personification of a civic virtue. In this instance, the personification is Minerva, the Roman goddess of both wisdom and war. The dual function of Minerva is yet another indication that the army’s role in Parisian society does not and cannot diminish even in times of peace. Instead, the message of Etex’s related works is that civic peace in France can, ironically, only be brought about and sustained through military activity. In this composition, the symbols of war which were featured in La Resistance de 1814 have been transformed into icons of peace-time economy. The war horse of the enemy invader has been replaced by an ox which is framed by grains and other images of agricultural prosperity. To the bottom left, a woman holding a child is juxtaposed with a young boy reading, alluding to the familial, intellectual and religious potential of the post-war era. The subversive message in the
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work, however, is the military nature of the central figure, who, although sheathing his sword, is also physically prepared for foreign attacks. Such messages would have been understood by the larger French public and were a part of the military’s propaganda campaign to demonstrate their cultural potency.

*The Military Elites in Père Lachaise*

However, the French military did not restrict discussions of their newfound sociopolitical significance in France to the realm of Paris’ public spaces alone. An autonomous if not entirely united social body like the military elites understood the cultural history and continued relevance of grave art in France, and thus, they implemented the public areas of Paris’ cemeteries for their propagandistic purposes as well.\(^{30}\) The artistic diversity and freedom found in popular spaces like Père Lachaise allowed the group to be explicit about their ideology regarding the relationship between the army and French history, the rest of Europe and modern Parisian society. Indeed, as Père Lachaise began to emerge as an important cultural center in France during the early decades of the nineteenth century, the number of affluent patrons of the cemetery increased, allowing for greater diversity and individualization of the tombs. Thus, it is not surprising that groups of especial significance, like the military, should have selected Père Lachaise as a burial ground for their members.\(^{31}\) Military elites interested in imparting a particular message to the French public were cognizant of Père Lachaise’s function as a social gathering place and were not above using grave art as a means of addressing their social function in the West.

\(^{30}\) Kselman, *Death and the Afterlife in Modern France*, 165.

Perhaps because of the secular and museum-like quality of Père Lachaise, very few of the tomb monuments in the cemetery are exclusively religious in character. Rather, several allude to or celebrate a particular accomplishment of the deceased. One such artwork which focuses on the secular and mortal achievements of the patron is the monument of the Napoleonic general Maximilien Sebastien Foy (Figure 27). Foy, who also served in Paris’ Chamber of Deputies, was a popular political figure in the nineteenth century, and so at the time of his death in 1825, an elaborate memorial and funeral service were sponsored by Foy’s contemporaries. In fact, the monument which currently contains the remains of Foy was sculpted over a period of years following the general’s death, from 1826 to 1831. One consequence of this delay in artistic production is that the work incorporated allusions to the events which occurred following his funeral.

Foy’s marble tomb was an artistic collaboration between the famous French sculptor David d’Angers and the young architect Leon Vaudoyer, although d’Angers is generally renowned for the design and execution of the work. Indeed, it was not uncommon for prestigious French artists such as d’Angers to accept or compete for private funerary commissions in the nineteenth century. In fact, Père Lachaise is full of remarkable works by notable sculptors such as Francois Rude, Antoine Etex and Antoine-Augustin Preault. The tomb of General Foy, however, remains an exceptional case of tomb art is it is both architectural and sculptural in form. D’Angers’ involvement in this commission is evidenced by the sculpture of General Foy in the guise of a Roman orator in the center of the portico and the friezes which embellish the sides of the tomb.
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The overtly neoclassical tone of the tomb is accentuated by the work’s architectural details and organization. The piece rises up from a square base which is surmounted by another level of marble which contains three sculptural reliefs depicting scenes from the career and funeral procession of General Foy (Figures 28-30). Adjacent is a plaque bearing the tombstone inscription which contains personifications of the Genius of War. These sculptural elements help identify Foy with his career in the military.\(^\text{34}\) At the summit of the tomb rests an open-air tempietto containing an erect statue of the general himself. D’Angers’ sculpture of Foy is evocative of Roman oratory statues, as will be discussed later (Figure 31).

Foy’s notoriety among the French people waxed after stories regarding his heroics in the Battles of Austerlitz and Constantinople reached Paris. It was only following his military service in Spain, however, that Foy was made a full general by the Emperor. His exemplary behavior at the Battle of Orthez in 1814 earned Foy the additional titles “Commander of the Legion d’Honneur” and Count of the Empire.\(^\text{35}\) Despite his Bonapartist leanings during the Hundred Days of 1815, Foy was appointed to the Chamber of Deputies, the lower chamber of the French parliament, when he retired from the army during the Bourbon Restoration. Foy’s participation in Napoleon’s Spanish campaigns influenced the development of his political career, especially as the issue of France’s involvement in Spain was a controversial issue across Europe in the early nineteenth century.\(^\text{36}\) From the time of his election to the Chamber of Deputies to his death in 1825, Foy remained the leader of the liberal opposition in Paris, making him

\(^{34}\) Ibid., 25.
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popular among both the people of France and his military colleagues. In fact, the presence of a soldier in the far right corner of d’Angers’ frieze depicting Foy’s funeral procession is but one marker of the military’s long-time support for their champion.

In terms of the tomb itself, d’Angers’ sculpture of General Foy at the center of this composition is of especial interest. To art historians, the oratory stance of the general is reminiscent of the sculptures dedicated to Roman orators such as that of the Augustus of Prima Porta. As historian Andrew William Lintott has noted, it was not at all uncommon in the Roman Republican period for government elites to serve a dual role in society as a military and political leader. The clear career parallel between General Foy and some of the more famous Western historical figures like Caesar Augustus is mirrored in this artwork and illuminates d’Angers’ reasoning in modelling this statue of Foy in the way he did.37 In this instance, it is easy to see how the military elites of modern Europe were using all kinds of monumental public art, in both the open cityscape or in urban graveyards, to identify themselves with the legacy of the Roman Empire. This attempt to figuratively align Foy and his comrades in the Chamber of Deputies to this historic tradition is echoed in one of the panels of the second tier of the monument, where Foy is shown speaking to the legislative body.

Yet this monument also alludes to the French military elites’ associations with the rest of Europe, in addition to their relationship with the past. D’Angers’ representation of General Foy’s campaign in Spain in a side frieze is reminiscent of the panels found on the Arc de Triomphe in that this piece celebrates the military’s international influences. This work, which depicts an orderly regiment of French soldiers on the left and a series of

37 Lintott, *Violence in Republican Rome*, 102.
frightened, disheveled Spanish resistance fighters on the right, hardly seems like an accurate representation of the Napoleonic wars. Nonetheless, the prominence of a confident Foy at the center of the composition reminds the viewer of the virtue of the deceased’s behavior as a representation of the nation’s military interests, regardless of how modern diplomats viewed the conflict. The imperialist tone of this frieze echoes that of the Arc de Triomphe, demonstrating the extent to which nationalism remained a potent theme in the iconography of the military elite during the early nineteenth century. Around the time Foy died, in the 1820s, the Bourbon monarchy was anxious to eradicate all reminders of Napoleon’s victories during his foreign campaigns for fear that public support of Imperial conquests could destabilize the legitimacy of the new regime. As such, the presence of a frieze on this tomb which celebrates a chapter of history which many Frenchmen would have gladly forgotten is indicative of the military’s influence in Parisian society and their determination to remind society of their historic significance.38

In spite of the fact that there were several demographic entities in modern Paris who did want to remember the successes of the Napoleonic wars, this tomb was also used by the military elite as a medium for discussing their new role in French culture. In particular, the frieze depicting the funeral of the war hero, is a narrative work which alludes to the social group’s cultural prevalence. Although General Foy’s career in politics only lasted seven years, in that time, he accrued significant public support due to his endorsement of liberal ideals and advocacy for Napoleonic war veterans. In light of his popularity, it is not surprising that Foy’s funeral procession from Paris to the then remote cemetery of Père Lachaise in 1825 accrued such a large following. Contemporary

reports suggest that upwards of 100,000 mourners followed Foy’s casket to his burial place in the cemetery, taking the hours-long walk from the center of the city to the graveyard. Many of the participants were student demonstrators who hailed Foy as a national hero. In Paris itself, biographies of Foy’s life and portraits representative of his funeral were sold in mass. D’Angers’ relief depicting the general’s funeral, then, was a realistic portrayal of the events of 1825 and reflects the public’s emotional response to the passing of a military elite (Figure 33). 39 Such publicity for the funeral of a man of Foy’s rank within society only underlined the perception that the military officials who rose to power in the aftermath of the French Revolution would only continue to accumulate influence in all areas of Parisian life.

Conclusions

Once again, even the most cursory examination of Paris’ culturally relevant public monuments like the Arc de Triomphe or the tomb of general Foy indicates the military’s social relevance in the early nineteenth century. Both of these artworks possess aesthetic and structural characteristics which reflect the army’s willingness to use monumental art to broadcast their position in their relationship with the past, the world and the society of modern France. 40 The emergence of the military as a cultural and political force in the early nineteenth century allowed these social elites to manipulate the traditions of Western art to forward this particular agenda and solidify their power base in a still-turbulent Europe. Yet as will be discussed in the subsequent chapters, the military was far

39 Ibid., 24.
from the only social group whose prominent figures used their cultural capital to influence public opinion.
CHAPTER TWO
THE GRANDS HOMMES AND THEIR INTELLECTUAL DESCENDANTS:
ACADEMIA’S ARISTIC INFLUENCE

Once the ideas of the Enlightenment began to permeate Western culture in the early nineteenth century, social constructions such as nationalism and social differentiation grew cultural relevance. Although French society recognized several cultural figureheads even during the Middle Ages, it was not until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that the French began to erect public works to commemorate their national heroes. This change in the function of public art was due, in part, to the development of cultural autonomy and unification in the face of the 1789 Revolution. All the same, the dynamism of French urban society during this period mandated the formulation of a new genre of monumental art whose form and symbolism was exclusive to modern anxieties, interests and priorities. One social group whose members were regularly represented in such public works in the nineteenth century is the French intellectual elites, or the Grands Hommes.

As has been noted in the Introduction, the Enlightenment led to a variety of cultural, economic and political changes in Western Europe. One of the changes this academic movement initiated in the final years of the ancien regime was the social practice of using public art as an educational medium. Unlike the civic masterpieces of earlier centuries which also focused references contemporary events or social structures, such as Ambrogio Lorenzetti’s Allegory of Good and Bad Government fresco in the
Palazzo Publico of Siena, the monuments of eighteenth century Paris were larger in number and more specific in terms of historical context (Figure 34).¹ Yet a key difference between the work of Lorenzetti and the artists of modern France was the visibility of these masterpieces. Whereas viewing of the *Allegory of Good and Bad Government* was limited to the political leaders of the city, the public monuments of France in the years following the French Revolution were designed to address a larger swath of the local population. As such, these works were more socially charged, containing particular messages from their patrons.

One of the most stringent advocates of a didactic use for public art in modern France, the politician Armand Guy Kersaint, discussed his theoretical basis for the social appropriation of popular monuments in an address he made to the Conseil du Département de Paris in 1791.² This discourse speaks to contemporary intellectuals’ belief that public art, when appropriately constructed, would inspire patriotic and moral sympathies among citizens. In a particularly stirring point of his dialogue, Kersaint addressed his audience directly, asking them:

> What can match the eloquence of this solitary stone which marks the resting place of a great man? Do you not see the good father, the sensitive mother, leading their son, as if by chance, to this venerable place, eagerly awaiting the natural question to arise: Why is this stone here? For you, my son, so you will also feel happiness at rendering service to your country.³

---

¹ Hargrove, “From L’An II to the Centenary: Rousseau to Marat in Bronze,” 143–44.
² Kersaint, *Discours sur les monuments publics*.
For a partial translation of Kersaint’s Address, see Appendix B, Section 3.
Kersaint’s emphasis on art’s ability to stimulate a conflagration of historical, familial and patriotic sympathies in this hypothetical narrative is reflective of a larger social belief about urban monuments in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

This shift in popular attitudes towards public art during the post-Revolutionary period is further evidenced by changes made to the subjects of such works. In particular, it is during these decades that monuments dedicated to figures from the ancien regime began to be replaced with those of secular individuals of national merit. Historians have suggested that revolutionary Parisians’ interpretation of the government’s reluctance to destroy centuries-old royal monuments as an indication of the administration’s sympathy for an antiquated and repressive political regime. This shift in how the larger populace interpreted public art is what catalyzed a change in what subjects were deemed acceptable for public artworks.⁴

Among the new social institutions which were well-represented in public art during this period was the Grands Hommes, the intellectual elites of France whose academic and social contributions were considered notable.⁵ This “democratization of fame,” as historian Michel Garval has termed it, allowed prominent professionals from a variety of backgrounds, including politics, literature, science and the arts, to acquire the title of Grands Homme.⁶ Voltaire has remained one of the best known French Grands Hommes well into the twenty-first century and was also one of the earliest scholars to define this new social group. In a letter Voltaire wrote in 1735, he stated that “great men [are] all those who have excelled in the useful or in the pleasing. Pillagers of provinces

⁵ Hargrove, “From L’An II to the Centenary: Rousseau to Marat in Bronze,” 143.
are only heroes.”⁷ Over time, the title and social distinction of ‘Grands Homme’ has been awarded to as diverse personae as Marat, Victor Hugo, Louis Braille and Nicolas-Joseph Beaurepaire.

All the same, few Grands Hommes have accrued such historical notoriety as the philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau, whose radical ideas about political organization and the innate morality of humanity were the recognized and frequent subjects of public debate. By the time of his death in 1778, Rousseau was already considered a Grands Homme, and as such, was given a scenic burial plot on an island in Ermonville, Oise, where he spent the last weeks of his life (Figure 35). This picturesque garden of marble sculptures and poplar trees was designed “to stimulate meditations up on the greatness of the man buried on this island.”⁸ In fact, tourist visits to the tomb of Rousseau became so frequent in the eighteenth century that local artisans began to manufacture inexpensive prints of his burial site as souvenirs. Indeed, as the writings of Grands Hommes like Voltaire were well-known by the public, assorted monuments which either lauded or decried their life works would have had been of equal significance to the patriotic French public.

In recent years, historians such as Michel Dansel have examined the French public’s developing awareness of the Grands Hommes as a cultural force during the Enlightenment. In his text Les Lieux de Culte from the late 1990s, Dansel describes this phenomenon as a ‘Cult of the Celebrity.’ As has been discussed in the Introduction, Dansel’s use of the term ‘cult’ refers to the nineteenth century’s cultural preoccupation

⁸ Rosenblum, Transformations in Late Eighteenth Century Art, 117.
with the ideas or accomplishments of their fellow countrymen.\textsuperscript{9} Other scholars like Thomas Albert Kselman corroborate Dansel’s thesis, arguing that the French ‘Cult of Celebrity’ developed out of the turbulent events of the French Revolution. Kselman suggests that this social construction evolved under the influence of the revolutionaries within the French government, many of whom wished to lessen society’s dependence upon religious institutions. Instead, their hope was that religion would be replaced with nationalist sympathies with the help of well-placed artworks which lauded academic patriots.\textsuperscript{10} Thus, although the Grands Hommes social tradition had cultural roots which predated the Revolution, it was only after 1789 that this concept of national heroes became a trademark of French culture.

\textit{The Men behind the Grands Hommes}

Nonetheless, scholars cannot discuss the Grands Hommes’ influence on the public monumental and cemetery art of nineteenth century Paris as if they were a social group with qualities comparable to those of the French military elites or the bourgeoisie. The essential difference between the Grands Hommes and the other independent classes of nineteenth century Europe is that the intellectual elites were hardly autonomous in terms of their social philosophies or political beliefs. Rather, the establishment of an individual’s status as a Grands Homme was often a cultural honor bestowed upon the prominent academic by their peers, sometimes many years after their death. In this regard, it would be a fallacy to assert that the Grands Hommes were a unified group which had a singular message to relate to the public through monumental art.

\textsuperscript{10} Kselman, \textit{Death and the Afterlife in Modern France}, 168.
Instead, the men who benefitted the most from a Grands Homme’s nominal attachment to a particular project were the first generation of nineteenth century intellectuals. These academics drew upon the status of their Grands Hommes predecessors to influence popular perceptions of their own work. One asset to association with revered Grands Hommes was the validation and public endorsement of one’s own ideas. Thus, it was this second set of enlightened men who looked to the public art of modern Paris as a venue to steer social and intellectual discussion. In the process, however, they divulged their own priorities regarding the new Grands Hommes’ relationship with the past, other European nations and contemporary society.

*The Grands Hommes in Paris’ Public Squares: The Panthéon de Paris*

The construction of the first monumental work which reflected the Grands Hommes’ cultural agency in France was begun in the late 1750s. In 1758, the French government began a project to transform Paris’ crumbling church of St. Geneviève into a mausoleum for the nation’s renowned civic and intellectual elites. The Panthéon de Paris was but one of several projects proposed in the revolutionary era which was designed to inspire the larger populace to emulate the careers of notable Frenchmen (Figure 36). As modern historian Dominique Poulot asserts, the eighteenth century brought about the start of a new artistic trend which sought to functionalize death and public memory for the benefit of the country’s intellectual legacy. Poulot suggests that because the period’s preference for didactic artworks increased the variety of civic monuments in Europe, one of the best ways for art historians to understand these works is to acknowledge their

---

aesthetic and cultural precepts. One such architectural precursor for the Panthéon de Paris was the Comte d’Angvillier’s 1776 project with the Grand Gallery of the Louvre.

Although portions of the Palais du Louvre were set up as a museum and with public access as early as 1750, it was only in the last quarter of the eighteenth century that King Louis XVI authorized renovations of the gallery so that the people of Paris would have access to the portrait statues of notable Grands Hommes. Beginning in 1776, the French monarchy gave the Comte d’Angvillier the annual responsibility of choosing four statues of Grands Hommes which would be displayed at the Paris salon for public critique. The works would then be exhibited permanently in the Grand Gallery. This decision to involve the public in the selection of masterpieces which represented the best of French society was an administrative novelty which contributed to the weight of popular opinion in all subsequent monumental projects like the Panthéon de Paris. In fact, the citizens of Paris were so engaged in the construction of the Grand Gallery that throughout the second half of the eighteenth century, numerous miniature replicas and engravings of the sculptures were sold commercially.

The writings of the late eighteenth century French sculptor Charles-Louis Corbet reflect this wave of popular support with which D’Angvillier’s project and associated works like the Panthéon were met with in the years following the Revolution. In a 1796 letter he wrote to his friend Lagarde, Corbet discussed the innate benefits of government-sponsored public arts in periods of social upheaval. He stated that it was the responsibility of the French ministries and the intellectual elites to support the arts “since it serves, in addition to talent, the public and private virtues, for in the arts these virtues

---

12 Rosenblum and Janson, *19th Century Art*, 103.
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are commonly found to the people”⁴ Indeed, Corbet’s sentiments can help historians understand the sporadic and fraught construction of the Panthéon de Paris.

As agreed upon by the committee in charge of renovating St. Geneviève, the plans for the new structure were based upon the Roman Pantheon. Indeed, the Roman Pantheon functioned as both an architectural and philosophical prototype. Work on the Panthéon de Paris was begun in 1775 under the direction of King Louis XV, who felt obligated to restore the Abbey of St. Geneviève following his recovery from a serious illness. King Louis XV commissioned Jacques Gabriel Soufflot to act as the head architect for this project. Among the defining characteristics of Soufflot’s plans for the remodeling of the Panthéon de Paris is the architect’s reliance on the Greek cross plan and neoclassical motifs for the structure.⁵ Some of the neoclassical elements Soufflot added to this monument are the large frontal portico supported by Corinthian columns, a sculptural pediment and the Panthéon de Paris’ iconic triple dome.

Although the king began the Panthéon project with the intent of simply restoring the abbey, once the Revolution hit France in 1789, the religious motives of the monarchy gave way to the interests of the anti-religious political bodies that now held power. In 1791, the newly established Constituent Assembly hired architectural theorist and arts administrator Quatremere de Quincy to oversee the development of the Panthéon’s interior decorations with the understanding that St. Geneviève would be transformed into a mausoleum for the nation’s intellectual elites. In a report he wrote to the Assembly, De Quincy declared his intention to remake the church into a shrine for a “religion which is

⁵ Leith, *Space and Revolution*, 112.
genuinely universal, to which all people should rally. That religion is morality.”

Quatremere de Quincy began his mission by reorganizing the building itself, designating three of the transepts to different academic fields associated with the Grands Hommes. He assigned the northern nave to the sciences, the eastern to patriotic virtues, and the south to the arts (Figure 39).

Among the first Grands Hommes interred in the Panthéon were the French politicians Mirabeau and Marat, who were soon followed by other intellectuals who had accrued significant academic followings. However, it would be erroneous for historians to assume that the selection of Grands Hommes buried in the Panthéon de Paris during this period was unanimously applauded by French society. In fact, the subsequent removal of Mirabeau and Marat’s remains from the Panthéon by conservative social leaders and their administrative counterparts in 1794 and 1795, respectively, indicates that the Grands Hommes status could be a revocable honor. Keeping such notions about the controversial role of the Grands Hommes in mind, it is easy for scholars to see how the heirs of these intellectual elites relied on monumental public art to discuss their relationship with the academic legacy of France.

Although it was Louis XV elected to use neoclassical motifs on the Panthéon de Paris in the mid-eighteenth century because of the contemporary penchant for the antique style, Quatremere de Quincy added Greek and Roman ornaments to the façade in the 1790s (Figure 40). This aesthetic evocation to the classical era, a period regarded by

---
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nineteenth century intellectuals as the birthplace of modern academia, was deliberate.¹⁹ In doing so, Quatremère de Quincy struck a symbolic comparison between the culture of the ancients and that of Revolutionary France, thus lending legitimacy and grandeur to nascent social institutions. Thus, the eighteenth and nineteenth century renovation of the Panthéon de Paris was far more than a quotidian remodeling project for a crumbling urban façade. It was an attempt by this second generation of Grands Hommes to forge a cultural link between the academics of ancient times and those of modern France.

The innate patriotism of post-Revolutionary reconstructions of the Panthéon is further reflected in Quatremère de Quincy’s careful selection of a new design for the exterior pediment. The original frieze for the church of St. Geneviève, *The Triumph of Faith* by the sculptor Coustou, was replaced by another work by Jean Guillaume Moitte in the late eighteenth century under the direction of Quatremère de Quincy. Ironically, Moitte’s work, titled *The Fatherland Crowning the Civic Virtues*, was replaced during the Bourbon Restoration by a similar piece sculpted by the famous artist David d’Angers.²⁰ Scholars of the Panthéon de Paris have posited that one of the reasons the heirs to the Grands Hommes tradition elected to replace Moitte’s work in the 1830s was to edit and ‘update’ the façade to include new members of the intellectual elite.²¹ Indeed, according to historian Albert Boime, d’Angers’ *Aux Grands Hommes La Patrie Reconnaissante*, was a self-conscious attempt to align “the new regime with the historicist ideology of the Restoration.”²²

---

Moreover, visual analysis of the Panthéon frieze is essential to current studies of the Grands Hommes because the artist designed the work around a specific iconography relating to nineteenth century ideals of patriotism and civic duty. As has already been mentioned, the aesthetic precedent for the Panthéon de Paris is the Roman Pantheon, and as such, it is not surprising that d’Angers’ pediment design also contains visual quotes from the classical structure. Although the sculptures which once adorned the Pantheon in Rome are no longer extant, historians estimate that the decorative motif contained allusions to Roman administrative ideals. The Panthéon façade featured political themes as well, as d’Angers selected the allegory of La Patrie (The Fatherland) as the central figure of the work. Much like Moitte’s three-figure composition which bookended the masculine La Patrie with the subservient goddesses of Virtue and Genius, d’Angers chose to emphasize the patriotic element of French society in his frieze. He did so by placing a feminine and static La Patrie in the center of the composition, indicating her essential function in modern Paris.

However, there are other elements of d’Angers’ work which distinguish it from its aesthetic precedents. Here, d’Angers has chosen to include portraits of contemporary, recognizable military men and Grands Hommes. The men, divided by rank and social reputation are being offered crowns of laurel by La Patrie and her assistant goddesses. Liberty stands below and to the left of La Patrie, handing the central allegory additional wreaths, while History records the Grands Hommes’ deeds on a tablet at her feet. The artist’s choice to place such striking imagery on the front of the Panthéon de Paris was intentional, as the frieze is unabashedly propagandistic and as was intended to influence the opinions of the citizens who passed the structure on a daily basis.
Although d’Angers’ participation in this project was due to the political and social elites of modern France, the degree of liberty afforded to French artists during the early nineteenth century meant that d’Angers’ own opinions were readily interpreted in his art. For instance, although d’Angers’ liberal politics made the artist a favorable candidate for the commission under the Orleanist monarchy, after the 1830s, his social philosophies only spurred on his critics. Art historians like Stephen Eisenman have suggested that d’Angers, a Grands Homme in his own right, incorporated a disproportionate number of liberal versus conservative social figures in this frieze in a deliberate effort to reshape the message of his sculptural group. If Eisenman’s thesis is true, d’Angers’ artistic agency demonstrates the extent to which the Grands Hommes themselves could influence how they were represented in public art.\(^{23}\)

As for the frieze itself, it seems likely that d’Angers spent the bulk of his time carving the Grands Hommes figures which frame either side of the allegories. To the right of La Patrie are representations of military men associated with the development of France following the 1789 revolution. Although this half of the composition recalls the procession-like forms characteristic of ancient architectural decorations, there are many features of this work that place it firmly within a modern aesthetic context.\(^{24}\) The period clothing of the officers and their individuality is one such marker of the work’s modernity. Another contemporary element of the right half of the composition is the artist’s endowment of the frieze with a sense of humor. Of the numerous military figures, only one of them, the Emperor Napoleon, seems overeager to grasp his laurel wreath.

\(^{23}\) Eisenman et al., *Nineteenth Century Art*, 240.

\(^{24}\) Ibid.
from La Patrie. This narrative aspect of the work is no doubt the artist’s commentary on contemporary politics.

In contrast, the Grands Hommes represented on the left side of d’Angers’ frieze appear to have been pulled from a range of modern social groups, representing the gamut of the ideological right and left. To the far left, the artist included Voltaire and Rousseau reclining on a bench. Other Grands Hommes, including Mirabeau, the artist David holding his palette, Manuel, the Marquis de Lafayette and the Archbishop Fenelon are all proceeding towards La Patrie and her divine helpers. Unlike the military men of d’Angers’ frieze, the Grands Hommes are distinct from one another, as each possesses a recognizable attribute. This design choice was made, ostensibly, so that the original audience would have understood the identities of the figures represented.

Moreover, the diversity of occupations associated with the Grands Hommes shown on the left side of the Panthéon frieze reflects the new generation of intellectual elites’ attempts to redefine their relationship with modern Europe. By demonstrating both the variety of the Grands Hommes’ scholarship as well as the potency of their philosophies, the academic leaders of revolutionary France were reasserting the nation’s dominance in the nineteenth century. By extension, then, the message of this frieze is that France’s Grands Hommes were not only the rightful heirs to antiquity’s greatest minds, but they were also superior to their foreign peers. This ideology is further expressed in the layout of the Panthéon de Paris itself, which recognized the contributions of Grands Hommes of scientific, political and artistic backgrounds.

---

However, the decorations of the Panthéon de Paris were also reflective of the Grands Hommes’ position in modern France. As has been mentioned before, there was some initial debate from within the modern intellectual elite as to which Grands Hommes should have been commemorated on the Panthéon. D’Angers’ work, although initially well-received by the liberal factions of Parisian society, began to make waves among the academic elites after about 1830, when popular opinion shifted and the conservative elements of France saw the frieze as “tendentious, incendiary or simply incoherent.” In fact, the work was so provocative to certain administrative parties that d’Angers’ final design for the Panthéon was only officially recognized in 1837. Many felt that the artist’s sculptures, while well-executed, were deliberately effrontery and contrary to the goals of the new government. While King Louis-Philippe resented the work’s glorification of revolutionary behavior in an era which remained politically unstable, the conservative Catholics of Paris dislike d’Angers’ portraits of atheists like Rousseau and Voltaire on the façade of a structure which was initially a house of God. Some elements of the political right even critiqued d’Angers’ work as a scathing commentary on Orleanist authoritarianism and bourgeois corruption.27

Select art historians like Steven F. Eisenman have even suggested that although the figures represented in this frieze held a particular place in Parisian culture, the extent to which the Grands Hommes depicted were esteemed by the general public in the 1830s was not proportional to the grandeur of d’Angers’ work. Instead, the sculpture group was “the construction of an Enlightenment canon, the celebration of the principles of 1789

26 Eisenman et al., Nineteenth Century Art, 240.
27 Boime, Art in an Age of Counterrevolution, 1815-1848, 93; Eisenman et al., Nineteenth Century Art, 241.
and the embrace of alternative or popular art traditions, […] acts that engaged a progressive bourgeois public sphere that for the most part no longer existed.”

Analyses of the Panthéon and related artworks which decorate the streets of Paris demonstrate that the symbols and ideas expressed in these pieces, although designed to address the general public, better reflected the ideals of the nineteenth century intellectual elite. The Panthéon’s aesthetic and subject matter reflected the goals of the heirs to the Enlightenment-era Grands Hommes, who saw public monumental art as a venue for discussing their relationship with the past, the rest of Europe and modern France. In this regard, d’Angers’ sculptural frieze was a kind of bourgeois martyrology which supported the aims of the revolutionary intelligentsia.

The Intelligentsia in Père Lachaise

Yet the second generation of Grands Hommes possessed enough cultural and economic capital in the early nineteenth century to spread their social ideology through multiple public venues and artistic media. The Grands Hommes tombs found in the cemetery of Père Lachaise, for instance, are comparable to the sculptures of the Panthéon in terms of symbolic content. Indeed, these sepulchers highlight the patrons’ interest in aligning themselves with the academic elites and intellectual tradition of France. Although the Parisian Grands Hommes who were buried in Père Lachaise during the early decades of the nineteenth century were far from the first cultural heroes of the West

---
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to be communally remembered, never before had mausoleums to the intellectual elites been endowed with such complex metaphor.\textsuperscript{30}

Picturesque tombs like that of Rousseau were the thematic and cultural pretext for the memorials to Grands Hommes found in Père Lachaise, but the tradition of commemorating national heroes certainly predates the modern era. For instance, the elaborate sculptures, portrait busts and mausoleums found in Florence’s Santa Croce and in St. Peter’s Basilica in Rome are comparable in terms of both subject and aesthetic to those found in Père Lachaise. However, one difference between the tombs of the sixteenth century and those of the modern age is the range of the patrons’ social backgrounds. Indeed, as any Parisian with sufficient funds could purchase a modest plot in the fashionable cemetery of Père Lachaise, the artworks situated on the grounds are as diverse as the Frenchmen who commissioned them.\textsuperscript{31} It is this diversity of the kinds of Grands Hommes buried in Père Lachaise that helps modern art historians understand the idea their followers sought to relate through these monuments. By visually incorporating several types of academics into the historic fabric of the cemetery, the new Grands Hommes were entering into an international dialogue regarding their relationship with the broader European elite. Père Lachaise contained monuments to scientists, visual artists, politicians, thespians, philosophers and social scientists. As a collective whole, these sepulchers represented France’s importance within the community as a variegated source of knowledge with ties to the past, the rest of Europe and modern France.

Yet, for those with enough cultural and economic capital to relate their social agenda of power to the general public, there were other open spaces in Paris available for

\textsuperscript{30} Garval, “A Dream of Stone,” 84–85.
\textsuperscript{31} Pantano, “Liberal Politics and the Parisian Cemetery,” 23.
new forms of monumental expression. The Grands Hommes tombs found in Père Lachaise cemetery demonstrate equal concern on the part of the patrons for aligning themselves with the academic elites and tradition of France. Although the Parisian Grands Hommes who were buried on the grounds of Père Lachaise in the early nineteenth century were far from the first esteemed cultural heroes of the West to be remembered by their communities following their death, never before had Grands Hommes mausoleums been filled with so many layers of subtext and social significance. Picturesque tombs like that of Rousseau were the immediate artistic pretext for the memorials to Grands Hommes in Père Lachaise, but the tradition of commemorating community heroes certainly predates the late eighteenth century. For instance, the elaborate sculptures, portrait busts and mausoleums found in Florence’s Santa Croce and in St. Peter’s Basilica in Rome are comparable in terms of subject and aesthetic to those found in Père Lachaise.

However, one difference between the monuments of the sixteenth and seventeenth century and those of the modern age is the range of occupations and social classes represented in these works. Indeed, as anyone with sufficient funds could purchase a modest plot in Père Lachaise, it only follows that the artworks situated on the grounds should be as diverse as the patrons who commissioned and were buried beneath them. It is this diversity in the types of Grands Hommes buried on the grounds of Père Lachaise that helps modern art historians understand the ideas the intellectual elites of Paris sought to relate through these monuments. By visually incorporating a variety of academics into the historic fabric of the cemetery, the new Grands Hommes were entering into an international dialogue regarding this social their relationship with the broader European elite.
Père Lachaise contained monuments to scientists, visual artists, politicians, thespians, philosophers and social scientists. As a collective whole, these sepulchers represented France’s importance within the community as a variegated source of knowledge with ties to the past, Europe and modern France. Indeed, the fact that so many nineteenth century Frenchmen openly advocated Père Lachaise as a burial plot for the great men of the nation indicates how well-regarded this graveyard was among contemporaries.\textsuperscript{32} One needs only to look at the pomp and circumstance of Honore de Balzac’s public burial in Père Lachaise in 1850 to observe the connection between the Grands Hommes elites and this burial ground (Figure 42). The presence of notable Frenchmen at this funeral, including the eulogist Victor Hugo, indicates that the Grands Hommes of the post-revolutionary age used this cemetery as a venue for initiating social discussions about their group’s relevance in a turbulent, modern society.\textsuperscript{33}

\textit{The Tomb of Paul Baudry}

In terms of other Grands Hommes who were laid to rest in Père Lachaise, one of the more distinctive examples of tomb art and a piece which reflects the ideology of the nineteenth century intellectual elite, is the grave of Paul Baudry (Figures 33-34). Baudry, a painter of national repute in the nineteenth century, was well regarded by his contemporaries for his fresco work in the newly completed Palais Garnier. The artist studied under Michel Martin Drolling, a painter who learned his own craft from one of the most famous Grands Hommes of the modern age, Jacques-Louis David.\textsuperscript{34} Baudry was

\textsuperscript{32} Brown, \textit{Père Lachaise}, 30.  
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\textsuperscript{34} Harding, \textit{Artistes Pompiers: French Academic Art in the 19th Century}, 103–104.
an artist of his own merit, however, and it was his success at the French Academy which earned him the Prix de Rome in 1850. His subsequent travels in Italy allowed Baudry to study the masterpieces of the Mediterranean masters firsthand. Some art historians have even suggested that Baudry’s interest in mythological scenes and motifs was the direct result of his foreign travels and preoccupation with the Italian school. Baudry’s preference for these themes may explain the iconography his brother, the architect, selected for the artist’s tomb.

Ambrose Baudry designed his brother’s tomb so that a central portrait bust of the Grands Homme is flanked by a winged allegory (likely meant to represent France) on the right and a prostrate personification of the Arts to the left. Winged France suspends a crown of laurel leaves above Baudry’s head, alluding to the artist’s privileged status as a renowned figure in the canon of French art. The allegory’s pose, disposition and behavior, similar to those found on other public monuments to France from this period, suggest her identity as La Patrie. To the other side of the sculpture group rests a weeping personification of the Arts. Near her rests an artist’s palette and a palm branch, material symbols of Baudry’s choice of occupation and fame.

However, it must be noted that Baudry’s tomb was far from the only Grands Homme grave in Père Lachaise which made use of allegories and other antique motifs. Rather, a number of sepulchers to French scholars and academics relied on neoclassical motifs. Some, like that of Chopin, feature allegories like the muse Euterpe, while others, like that of Ingres, incorporated neoclassical architectural forms (Figures 45-46). Some

were even more exotic in aesthetic. For instance, the reclining form of the French painter Theodore Gericault is reminiscent of Etruscan funerary art whereas Champollion’s tomb is formed like an Egyptian obelisk (Figures 46-49). Modern art historians have attributed the nineteenth century’s preference for an antiquated aesthetic to the period interest in archaeological research. Public exposure to the academic trend of referencing history in monumental art determined the conventions of the tombs found in Père Lachaise, but it would be erroneous to attribute the nineteenth century aesthetic to the whims of popular culture alone. Instead, the Grands Hommes’ attempts to parallel their deceased peers with the traditions of the ancient world are reflective of this group’s association with European history. By aligning themselves both aesthetically and intellectually with the academics of the past, this new generation of Grands Hommes was validating their new cultural agency.

However, memorials like that of Paul Baudry in Père Lachaise cemetery were not concerned only with the Grands Hommes’ relationship with the rest of the world or even with the past, as such works also reflected modern society’s perception of these prominent citizens. The repetition of certain themes in nineteenth century funerary art elevated Parisians’ recognition of Grands Hommes’ social contributions. The tradition of erecting public memorials to France’s elites from previous centuries had, by the mid-nineteenth century, been modified so that a wider range of social classes were both represented in and exposed to these memorials. The iconic status of many of these works took on in the modern era is a testament to local recognition and appropriation of the tombs into the fabric of Parisian life. The grandeur of these monuments was such that
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they became important landmarks, thus ensuring the continued remembrance of the
Grands Hommes represented by all future generations. In this sense, the Grands Hommes
modified Père Lachaise so that it became a miniature version of the institutionalized
Panthéon de Paris itself.

Conclusion

Analyses of nineteenth century monuments to the Grands Hommes of France in
both Paris’ public squares and the cemetery of Père Lachaise remain useful to modern
scholars interested how the events of the French Revolution prompted the development of
new cultural forces in the West. The Panthéon de Paris and the tomb of Paul Baudry, for
instance, are especially relevant to such studies. Indeed, each of these monumental,
popular artworks contains clues for historians regarding the nature of French Grands
Hommes’ position in modern society as their intellectual heirs began to rethink their
association with history, the rest of the world and with revolutionary Paris. The
Enlightenment culture of the previous century led to an increase in the Grands Hommes’
cultural potency, visibility and relevance, a social change which affected the development
of Parisian monumental art. The ideals of nationalism and the didactic function of art
facilitated the Grands Hommes’ rise to social prominence as the group attempted to
redefine their cultural function in the nineteenth century. In the following chapter, I will
expand upon the dynamic role of monumental art in Revolutionary Europe, discussing
how the French bourgeoisie also used this medium for their own propagandistic and self-
aggrandizing purposes.
CHAPTER THREE
THE CULTURAL AGENCY OF THE BOURGEOISIE: HOW THE MIDDLE CLASS SHAPED PARIS’ MONUMENTS

Every historical era has several distinctive social, economic, civic and political characteristics which help scholars define the tenor and events of the period. For the early decades of the nineteenth century, the emergence of the bourgeois class in Western Europe was one such period-based characteristic which affected the development of modern society. In particular, studies of the bourgeoisie are relevant to scholarship which considers how this social group affected the visual arts and the aesthetic of modern Paris. Indeed, from fashion to wallpaper and public monuments, the middle class dominated the cultural production of France.¹

The bourgeoisie’s social agency in Paris in the nineteenth century stemmed from their singular role in the events of the French Revolution. The social and economic vacuums which appeared in the aftermath of 1789 allowed the more forceful and affluent members of the French middle class to influence the new administration.² Indeed, the bourgeoisie remained an important part of French society throughout the late eighteenth century so that even into the 1830s, they were still regarded as the unofficial ‘heroes’ of the French Revolution. This categorization of the middle class as instigators of revolutionary change fuelled France’s dependence upon the bourgeoisie during this

period, opening up the nation to the class' pro-capitalist and anti-absolutist ideology. Indeed, the growth of a cohesive French popular culture in the early nineteenth century due to rising literacy rates and new means of transport allowed the middle class to influence Parisian culture. The socially-conscious nature of the French public after the revolution enabled bourgeois self-expression through monumental and popular art.

Contemporary historians like Harold Mytum and Roger Magraw have asserted that although the cultural influence of the French middle class peaked during Napoleon’s reign, the bourgeoisie’s social prominence throughout the nineteenth century allowed the group to determine the aesthetic and subject matter of Parisian monuments long after the Empire’s collapse. Today, scholars tend to focus on the bourgeoisie’s impact on French cultural norms, including popular practices regarding family structure, education, literacy, consumerism and individualism. The last of these points, the middle class’ link with the concept of individualism, is perhaps the most important, as this ideological principle was closely associated with Liberalism in the modern era. The bourgeoisie, who accrued cultural capital from their participation in the French Revolution, employed their economic strength in the pursuit of a more individualistic and Libertarian society in the nineteenth century. According to Mytum, one by-product of the middle class’ intercession in post-Revolution politics was the protection of private property and individual collateral at the expense of authoritarianism. In this regard, the bourgeoisie were not above manipulating political circumstance and forwarding a self-serving social agenda.

---

Another defining characteristic of the bourgeoisie during this period was the group’s attempt to distinguish itself from the lower classes of French society, with whom they shared legal status as part of the Third Estate before 1789. This anxiety to achieve social differentiation was but another manifestation of the bourgeoisie’s interest in individualism. Indeed, the emerging middle class only felt additional pressure to isolate themselves socially from the working masses in the early decades of the nineteenth century when urban industrialization facilitated an influx of immigrants into Paris. The bourgeoisie also sought distinction by adopting a unique manner of dress, social practices, work ethic and iconography for memorialization. Their commemorative conventions are the most informative to this thesis, as the new middle class of France used popular art not only to recognize an individual’s unique contributions to society, but to highlight the group’s relationship with history, European culture, and modern Paris. Much like the political and intellectual elites of the era, the bourgeoisie sought to maintain their social prominence by aligning themselves with the aristocracy of past generations. This assimilation was accomplished by integrating their own interests into the visual arts using modified versions of popular symbolism.

The Place de la Bastille

One product of the bourgeoisie’s possession of a sizable amount of cultural capital in the nineteenth century was that they were able to influence the spatial and artistic organization of Paris itself. Although discussions of Paris’ reorganization in the
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nineteenth century are generally restricted to an analysis of Baron Haussmann’s reforms, the bourgeoisie’s artistic agency within the city during this period cannot be overstated. As scholar James Leith has stated, “public squares in French and other European cities are now so much a part of the urban landscape that we are apt to forget that their advent was an important stage in the history of urbanism.”\(^8\) Indeed, during the restructuring of Paris in the aftermath of the French Revolution, when the medieval boroughs were considered a safety and security hazard, there was a general public outcry at deplorable state of the city. The physical condition of Paris did not match the idealistic utopia the revolutionaries wanted to forge for future generations. In this regard, perhaps no public square garnered more attention than the Place de la Bastille, the site of one of the key events of the Revolution (Figure 50).

The Place de la Bastille became an important cultural landmark throughout France following the 1789 Revolution for reasons which are self-evident. The Bastille, which had long represented the authoritarian policies of the ancien regime, gained iconic status as the nexus of the late eighteenth century uprisings on July 14, 1789, when Parisians stormed the fortress in an act of political defiance. In following years, images of the Bastille and its destruction permeated Western society, were printed in Parisian newspapers and became the featured subject of popular engravings (Figure 51).\(^9\) Indeed, perhaps because the Bastille accrued such cultural significance in the nineteenth century, many Parisians, especially those from the middle classes whose prosperity was due to the fall of the ancien regime, wanted to erect a memorial upon its ruins. For the bourgeoisie, it was not enough to remember the fall of the Bastille in name only. Instead, “a new

symbol was required to take the place of the old […] revolutionaries were virtually obsessed with the magical idea of symbolically turning the location of the Bastille from a place of oppression and horror into a place of public joy and freedom.”

Throughout this period, the Bastille only increased in importance within French popular memory, as the political atmosphere of the nation remained turbulent. As a result, numerous architects and artists submitted plans for the decoration of the Place de la Bastille within years of its destruction. In keeping with the neoclassical aesthetic of the age, several artists suggested building victory columns, obelisks and statues of personified civic virtues at the center of the Place de la Bastille (Figure 52). For a time, a sculpture to the Egyptian mother goddess Isis, called La Fontaine de la Regeneration sat at the center of the square (Figure 53). Members of the bourgeoisie who were engaged in this artistic dialogue through their connections in the government suggested that the monument which would be placed in the Place de la Bastille should showcase the sacrifices of all French revolutionaries, regardless of their class.

As for the design of the monument itself, the primary concern of contemporary artists and their middle class collaborators was that the memorial should suggest France’s cultural and political heritage. In particular, there was an underlying desire to connect modern Paris to the social traditions of the Roman Empire. Thus, it is not surprising that the majority of the architectural proposals for the project were based on the Roman aesthetic. The victory column plans still retained some of the Baroque extravagance so popular in the previous century, but all in all, their artists remained preoccupied with the

10 Ibid., 69.
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austere style of the Romans. Such proposals were also favored by the administrative committee in charge of the project in the 1790s. Yet in spite of Parisians’ call for the construction of a memorial on the site of the Bastille in the weeks after the Revolution, the tumultuous political environment of the era prevented any real progress from being made on the project.

**The Elephant of the Bastille**

Moreover, during Napoleon’s reign in France, the Emperor all but discarded the plans for a memorial to the bourgeois martyrs of the Revolution in favor of other monumental works which celebrated the accomplishments of his own regime. Moreover, Napoleon’s architects did not simply change the theme of the Place de la Bastille memorials. The artists also modified the form this artwork would take so that rather than traditional Roman columns or victory arches, Napoleon’s monument would be a large fountain in the shape of an elephant. The Elephant of the Bastille, as the structure became known, was likely the Emperor’s method of paralleling his own military conquests with those of the Carthaginian general Hannibal, whose North African troops headed for Rome on the backs of elephants in the third century BC (Figure 54). In addition, the fortress-like viewing platform on the back of the Elephant may have been a further reference to the previous function of the Bastille itself.

Aside from the design of the monument, the materials which were set aside for the completion of the Elephant of the Bastille also held symbolic value. Napoleon requested that the fountain should be made of cast bronze taken from the canons his
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troops captured from enemy armies during his foreign campaigns in the early nineteenth century. Jean-Antoine Alvoine, the artist who was commissioned for the project, was not able to execute the piece beyond its initial stucco casting, as Napoleon was removed from power upon his army’s defeat at the Battle of Waterloo only two years after the construction began. Although this monument was never completed, the temporary presence of the work in Paris from 1813 to 1846 left a considerable impression on locals and their sense of communal identity. Indeed, long after progress on the Elephant was halted, the scaffolding remained in place, serving as a permanent, negative reminder of the fall of the Empire. Victor Hugo even wrote about the Elephant of the Bastille in his masterpiece Les Miserables, where the hollow plaster cast of the fountain served as a home for Parisian street urchins (Figure 55).¹⁵ Hugo’s innate criticism of the decaying structure, a symbol of government corruption and neglect, reflects contemporaries’ awareness and disapproval of the piece. As public critique of this work mounted in the first decades of the nineteenth century, all subsequent governments were left with the task of finding an acceptable replacement for the structure.

The Monarchy’s Reinterpretation of the Place de la Bastille

Following the 1830 July Revolution, another branch of the Bourbon family, the House of Orleans, held the seat of power in Paris. The new King Louis-Philippe quickly saw the advantages of using the Place de la Bastille as a site to commemorate his ascension and to recognize the hundreds of bourgeois civilians who died in the uprising.¹⁶
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Indeed, the middle class’ participation in the 1830 transfer of power only increased the king’s incentive to erect a monument in this public square.\(^{17}\) As in the French Revolution, it was the Parisian bourgeoisie, whether businessmen or journalists, who provided the impetus for the era’s social and political change. Much of the conflict stemmed from Charles X’s efforts to bar middle class citizens from serving in the Chamber of Deputies, a right guaranteed by legislation drafted in the years immediately following the Revolution of 1789.\(^{18}\) Thus, in an effort to placate the bourgeoisie, Louis-Philippe spent only one year in power before initiating construction on a new monument for the Place de la Bastille which recognized the social group’s role in the Revolution (Figure 56). The king and his artists proposed building a Roman victory column called the *Colonne de Juillet* which acknowledged by name the individuals, not the political elites, who died during the royal coup.\(^{19}\) The monument, topped by a sculpture of the Genie de la Liberte and other symbols of the French nation was inscribed with the names of the 615 citizen-martyrs who participated in the 1830 uprising (Figure 57).

In this regard, the bourgeoisie’s influence on the aesthetic of modern monumental art is quite evident. Their ability to pressure the French government into funding a monument which commemorated the middle class’ contributions to society in an open square which was already associated with their participation in the overthrow of the monarchy speaks to the bourgeoisie’s cultural significance in the nineteenth century.\(^{20}\)

\(^{19}\) Lüsebrink and Reichardt, *The Bastille*, 222.
Indeed, the construction of the Colonne de Juillet underlines this group’s ongoing aesthetic dialogue with European history. The choice of a Roman column as the precept for the work was deliberate and intended to invoke in viewers the same sentiments that other neoclassical monuments like the Arc de Triomphe did. By hearkening back to the antique, the bourgeoisie were attempting to validate their social authority while reminding Parisians of their more recent and notable contributions to public welfare. The middle class’ literal replacement of the Bastille, a conventional symbol of autocracy, with an artwork dedicated to those who fought for increased popular representation was a truly powerful cultural statement.

Yet the culturally-influential bourgeoisie did not limit their use of monumental art to works which discussed their constructed relationship with the past. The economic elites also initiated an international conversation with the rest of Europe regarding their right to drive France’s commercial and political successes in the absence of authoritarianism through artistic commissions. This particular dialogue is also reflected in the design of the Colonne de Juillet, as the monument contains a variety of nationalist symbols and marker of middle class cultural prominence. The column, cast from twenty-one bronze drums reached 154 feet tall and contained a spiral staircase which extended from the white marble base to the gilt statue at the pinnacle. Some of the symbols found on the sixteen foot wide Corinthian capital-shaped base include ornamental bas-relief decorations. These appliqued sculptures by the artist Antoine-Louis Barye are a bronze lion and four cockerels, which represent the French nation and the events of the July Revolution (Figures 58-59). The bronze cockerels are easy enough to read as national
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symbols, whereas the lion’s iconography is slightly more complex. The lion, often associated with the zodiac sign Leo, here serves as an allusion to the month of July, when the Bourbon monarchy was overthrown.\(^{23}\) All of the noted icons of nationalism help historians see how the bourgeoisie were careful to align themselves with an exclusively French national character in the early nineteenth century, even as their prominence across Western Europe grew.

Equally important to art historians is the general public’s reception of the work upon its inauguration in 1840. Based upon primary accounts of the piece’s unveiling, it seems as though the majority of Parisians were pleased with the appearance and character of the Colonne de Juillet, particularly as it was so flattering towards those who had made personal sacrifices in a time of national crisis. Among the Frenchmen who openly praised this monument was the author and Grands Homme Theophile Gautier, who eulogized the heroes of the Revolution in a poem he composed upon the work’s completion. In “Le 28 Juillet, 1840,” Gautier addresses these citizen-martyrs, stating: “At the place where the Bastille was, / Sacred soil so gentle to your bones, / You will sleep among family, / Noble children of the old heroes!”\(^{24}\) Gautier’s work along suggests the importance of such artworks in Parisian culture. The bourgeoisie’s attempts to underscore their particular relevance in a post-Revolutionary society are reflective of their interest in establishing a new balance of power within Paris. The manner in which larger society and the French government recognized their cultural relevance in public art is indicative of the numerous changes taking place in France during this period. Certainly, one of these changes

\(^{23}\) Lüsebrink and Reichardt, *The Bastille*, 222.


For a partial translation of Gautier’s Poem, see Appendix B, Section 5.
involved the function of monumental art. In selecting a neoclassical motif for the column
and then endowing that work with multiple layers of social commentary, the government
of France was recognizing the bourgeoisie’s continuing impact on the social and political
state of modern Paris.

The Bourgeoisie in Père Lachaise

However, France’s middle classes were not entirely dependent upon government
leaders to produce artworks which reasserted their social influence. Another venue the
middle classes used for social expression and a place which was valued by the French
military and Grands Hommes as well was the Cemetery of Père Lachaise. Here, the
wealthy bourgeoisie commissioned family chapels and crypts which featured imagery
that spoke to their new cultural agency (Figures 60-62). The elaborate carvings, stained
glass and sculptural reliefs which decorated the upper middle class tombs of Père
Lachaise alluded to these families’ wealth and prominent position in Parisian society.
Indeed, although many important civic figures and Grands Hommes received their own
tombs in Père Lachaise, most bourgeois citizens of nineteenth century France were buried
alongside their family members.25

In fact, there is some indication that the bourgeoisie’s preference for group burials
derived from the middle class’ recognition of the funerary customs of the past. Some of
the best examples of ancient pretexts for modern family tombs come from Republican
Rome, where epitaphs delineated the graves of the more affluent families. Over time,
however, the static image of the Roman nuclear family on tombs transformed into that of

a grieving household. As has been noted in the introduction, social mourning became an important part of the Parisian bourgeoisie’s life cycle by the nineteenth century and was often the subject of contemporary art.\textsuperscript{26} Widows, bereaved children and pensive couples are featured in a variety of artistic media from this period, including engravings, jewelry, paintings and even sculpture (Figures 63-64). However, for as different as the tombs of the ancients and the modern era seem upon first glance, their unique functions were reconciled by comparable styles. In general, early nineteenth century family crypts were gothic or neoclassical in form, but after about 1820, they became far more elaborate and individualized.\textsuperscript{27}

This evolution of bourgeois family tombs in Père Lachaise is reflective of the social group’s cultural and aesthetic priorities in this period. By elaborating upon the artistic and funereal conventions of the past, the new middle class was demonstrating their awareness of the European artistic canon, much like the military and intellectual elites of the same period did when they selected the neoclassical style for their public monuments.\textsuperscript{28} The bourgeoisie’s attempt to define themselves as an educated social elite by aligning themselves with the aesthetic of past European cultures was part of a larger artistic campaign to redefine their position in a post-Revolution France. However, the middle class’ approach to the manufacture and display of funereal monuments influenced the burial norms of other socio-economic groups as well. During this period, even the

\textsuperscript{26} Ragon, \textit{The Space of Death}, 87.
\textsuperscript{27} Colvin, \textit{Architecture and the After-Life}, 369.
\textsuperscript{28} Licht, \textit{Sculpture, 19th & 20th Centuries}, 18.
poorest Parisians buried in Père Lachaise managed to purchase a modest grave marker or small epitaph.²⁹

As has already been mentioned, one barometer for the popularity of family tombs in Père Lachaise during the early nineteenth century is the number of engravings and prints which featured this type of tomb structure. One such engraving which is of especial interest for art historians examining the relationship between the bourgeoisie and the new monument traditions of modern France depicts the Perregaux family crypt (Figure 65). The patriarch of the Perregaux family, Jean-Frederic, was an influential banker who relocated to Paris in order to grow his business in the late eighteenth century.³⁰ After marrying into a well-to-do family, Perregaux was able to climb his way up the social ladder and eventually became the financial consultant of select European nobility. Yet aside from financial affairs, the Perregaux were involved in the artistic community of modern France. As such, it is perhaps not surprising that their tomb is relatively artistic in terms of form and content. These types of decorations reflected their international and cosmopolitan background.³¹

The multicultural interests of Parisian families like the Perregaux were characteristic of the French upper middle class during the nineteenth century. For art historians, the bourgeoisie’s cultural agency both at home and abroad affected the messages this group conveyed through their funerary art. The sheer number of families who were buried in Père Lachaise Cemetery who had foreign relations or ties abroad is indicative of the bourgeoisie’s far-reaching influence in the modern era. Not only did the

³⁰ Hedley, “Vigée Le Brun’s Newly Conserved Portrait of Mme Perregaux in the Wallace Collection,” 224.
³¹ Ibid., 226.
middle class have some bearing on the events which took place in Paris itself, but the international community was impacted by their distinctive social norms, financial attitudes and political beliefs. In terms of the monuments of Père Lachaise, the juxtaposition of family tombs with the aforementioned culturally-relevant sculptures clarifies the nature of the bourgeoisie’s relationship with modern French society. The close proximity of this group’s tombs with those of other social elites may be interpreted as the modern middle class’ way of showcasing their new relevance in the aftermath of the French Revolution.

Conclusion

Upon closer examination of bourgeois-commissioned monumental artworks from the modern era, it is clear that this social group’s efforts to reassert their cultural relevance affected the course of Parisian life in the nineteenth century. In both the open public squares of Paris and the city’s cemeteries, the bourgeoisie left their mark on French society while influencing popular views of death and remembrance. From the politically-motivated monuments of the Place de la Bastille in the center of Paris to the family tombs of Père Lachaise, the artworks which memorialize the upper middle class speak to the social dynamism of this period. Indeed, much like the military elites and the Grands Hommes of modern France, the new bourgeoisie used the monumental artistic medium and its conventions in order to address their own position with regard to French history, the rest of Europe and contemporary society.
CONCLUSION

One of the most challenging aspects of academic research is the scholarly recognition that even the most detailed analyses are little more than minute contributions to a much larger historical narrative. Indeed, it is impossible for historians to compile holistic studies of the past, but one method whereby historians might compensate for the inherent flaws of their field is to write syntheses rather than treatises on microcosmic societies. As this thesis has shown, interdisciplinary studies of a single point in history can often shed more light on the cultural norms of the era at hand than an inquiry driven by a single methodology.¹ By applying the extant historiography of socio-political developments in the nineteenth century to visual analyses of Paris’ monumental art, it is possible to understand the function and significance of these works within the context of modern society. In particular, examinations of the artworks commissioned by the French military elites, the European Grands Hommes and the bourgeoisie provide insight on the relationship these social groups had with the past, the rest of Europe and within their own society.

As has already been mentioned, the military, intellectual and socio-economic elites of Paris developed autonomy in the early nineteenth century which enabled them to manipulate the conventions of monumental art for self-serving purposes. These new public monuments were designed to convey particular ideas about the social groups’ cultural relevance in a public venue. However, both in France and throughout Europe in

general, there exists a long tradition of social elites adjusting the appearance and content of public art to sway popular opinion. However, the monuments of modern France have garnered a great deal of attention from the academic community in recent decades because of the works’ prominence and variety.

Moreover, the existence of primary sources and other accounts like the poems of Theophile Gautier and Prudhomme’s publication *Revolutions de Paris* reflect contemporaries’ enthusiasm for the nineteenth century’s ‘statuomanie.’ Such works also indicate the depth of the military, cultural and socio-economic elites had on the broader French culture. Art historians concur that the rapid creation, overturn and destruction of public monuments during this period is related to the revolutionary tendencies which characterized Paris in the decades following the fall of the monarchy. In this environment, artistic license increased and public statuary became tendentious, developing multiple layers of meaning. Those who possessed sufficient funds and public support asserted dominance over French society and took the place of the deposed monarchy. The same social groups, the military, the Grands Hommes and the bourgeoisie, later used Paris’ public spaces as a venue for propaganda.

However, it must be noted that scholars of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries were not the first to note the importance of popular art in this period of Parisian history. Beginning at the end of the eighteenth century, nascent efforts were made among the academic and artistic elite of the city to preserve artworks, churches and architectural forms which were associated with the ancien regime. When the French Revolution began
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in 1789, the ensuing street riots endangered many of Paris’ public statues and the edifices of local churches. In 1793, the National Convention even sanctioned the destruction of select royal tombs in the Cathedral of Saint Denis in an anti-authoritarian demonstration (Figures 66-69). In this same year, revolutionary deputy Bertrand Barere de Vicuzac stood before the Assembly to contest the preservation of the tombs. He suggested that the inherent regality and authority of the monuments were dangerous and a bane to a government in the midst of a post-Revolutionary crisis. Such arguments appealed to the skittish and unstable revolutionaries, and as such, it was only a matter of time before the government authorized the destruction of the royal tombs. In this regard, it was not only the creation but the destruction of monumental art in modern France which contributed to the stability of new social powers in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Yet it must be noted that in addition to destroying the art of the ancien regime, the French Revolution also founded a committee whose task it was to remove and conserve culturally relevant artworks from Paris’ public spaces as early as 1791. Thus, even in the years immediately following the deposition of the French monarchy, the intellectual and cultural elites of France recognized the social significance of Paris’ monumental art. The collection of artifacts which were salvaged from the streets of the city was housed at the Musée National des Monuments Français, an institution which opened in 1795 under the supervision of Alexandre Lenoir (Figures 68-69). Lenoir, a French archaeologist and activist for the preservation of Paris’ commemorative art, remained the director of this museum through the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Although in the coming
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decades, many of the museum’s objects were returned to their former places within Paris, the simple fact that the revolutionaries considered these works of such national importance that they felt they needed to be preserved for future generations is extraordinary. Such precautions are indicative of contemporaries’ belief that monumental art was an important part of French cultural heritage. National attempts to conserve artworks from all of France were initiated alongside the efforts of Lenoir and the Musée National des Monuments Français. These efforts were perhaps born from the fear that additional sources of cultural heritage would be destroyed in the aftermath of the Revolution. Nonetheless, the fact that Lenoir’s museum remains a popular tourist stop and source of Parisian pride speaks to the significance of public monuments in French culture.

Even in the eighteenth century, several scholars developed an interest in Paris’ monuments and the public’s relationship with them. In the late 1860s, art historians like Jules Guiffrey had begun to analyze texts, engravings, and other official records which alluded to late eighteenth century perspectives on the vandalism of the monuments of Paris. Even in the eighteenth century, several scholars developed an interest in Paris’ monuments and the public’s relationship with them. In the late 1860s, art historians like Jules Guiffrey had begun to analyze texts, engravings, and other official records which alluded to late eighteenth century perspectives on the vandalism of the monuments of Paris. Almost one hundred years after the French Revolution, historians, academics and politicians were grappling with the problem of how to represent the events of 1789 to future generations. Although the Revolution itself had occurred some decades before, the brief period of conservatism which characterized mid-nineteenth century France made it difficult for scholars to reconcile the destructive and progressive aspects of late eighteenth century politics. This general inability to celebrate or decry the revolutionaries
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for desecrating Paris’ cultural inheritance made the mere subject of eighteenth century ‘statuomanie’ somewhat incendiary within modern European academic circles.\textsuperscript{9}

Today, scholars and activists alike have continued this trend of preserving culturally relevant artifacts. This no doubt stems from the simple fact that many art historians have begun to analyze the social and historical significance of these public artworks. Perhaps such endeavors indicate that monuments and other sculptures outside of museum collections are finally gaining the recognition they deserve within academia. The preservation efforts of non-profit humanities organizations across the globe have not only brought the public’s attention to the significance of monumental artworks, they have also embraced the educational potential of these sculptures. In a sense, this development in the treatment of monumental art is merely an evolution of the works’ popular function.

Once again, such works are far more than stone or plaster forms. They are also part of a living European history which spans centuries.

The versatility of monuments and the way in which society continues to reinterpret masterpieces is one of art’s more unique and fascinating qualities. The dynamism of human expression is such that artworks, whether they are sculptures, monuments or paintings, are not only subject to the passage of time, but the priorities of the contemporary cultural elites. In nineteenth century France, the ideals of the military, intellectual and socio-economic leaders were exhibited in period monumental and funerary art. Indeed, while an artwork may at the time of its conception seem little more than an organization of pigment, marble or plaster, over time, it accrues a transient and expressive power. Indeed, even stones possess eloquence.

\textsuperscript{9} Ibid., 31.
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SELECTED IMAGES

Figure 1
Example of a Roman Tomb Portrait Medallion
*Tombstone of L. Vibius and Family.* Vatican Museum, Rome.
(From Panofsky, Figure 92).

Figure 2
Memento Mori-themed Artwork
Hans Memling, *Triptych of Earthly Vanity and Salvation*, c. 1485, oil on oak panel, 22 ×
15 cm. Musee des Beaux Arts, Strasbourg.
(From Wikimedia Commons).
Figure 3
Danse Macabre-themed Artwork
(From ArtStor).

Figure 4
Ars Moriendi-themed Artwork
E.S. Master, *Temptation of Pride*, 1450, 87 x 65 mm.
(From ArtStor).
Figure 5
View of the Cemetery of Saints Innocents
Charles-Louis Bernier, *Vue générale prise du point A du plan et embrassant toute la partie du Cimetière qui donne sur la rue aux Fers [actuelle rue Berger] dessinés le 21 fevrier 1786*, 1786, drawing, 22.8 x 43.5 cm. From the Collection of Hippolyte Destailleur.
(From Bibliothèque nationale de France online, Gallica.bnf.fr).

Figure 6
Israel Silvestre, *View of the Church and Cemetery of Saints Innocents in Paris*, 17th c., 14.2 x 25 cm.
(From Bibliothèque nationale de France online, Gallica.bnf.fr).
Figure 7
Entrance to Père Lachaise.

Figure 8
Old Map of Père Lachaise
Figure 9
*View of the Cemetery of Père Lachaise*

Figure 10
*An Example of the Picturesque Motif*
Salomon Gessner, *Tomb in the Landscape*, from *Oeuvres*, 1797.
(From Etlin, Figure 149).
Figure 11
Nicolas Poussin, *Et in Arcadia Ego*, 1650, oil on canvas, 85 x 121 cm. Musee du Louvre (From ArtStor).

Figure 12
Prudhomme’s hypothetical colossus
(From Bibliothèque nationale de France online, Gallica.bnf.fr).
Figure 13
Arc de Triomphe de l'Étoile, 1845, drawing.
(From Bibliothèque nationale de France online, Gallica.bnf.fr).

Figure 14
A travers l'arche de l'Arc de Titus: l'observatoire construit sur la Tour du Capitole en 1853. L'allée qui relie le Capitole à l'Arc de Titus n'est pas encore bordé par les arbres replantés en 1855, photograph, 17.2 x 24.4 cm.
(From Bibliothèque nationale de France online, Gallica.bnf.fr).
Figure 15
(From Bibliothèque nationale de France online, Gallica.bnf.fr).

Figure 16
Rude, Francois, *Departure of the Volunteers of 1792* ("La Marseillaise"), 1833-1836, limestone, h. 42’. From the Arc de Triomphe de l’Étoile.
(From Artstor).
Figure 17

Figure 18
Antoine Etex, *La Resistance de 1814*. From the Arc de Triomphe de l’Étoile. (From Wikimedia Commons).
Figure 19
Antoine Etex, *Le Paix de 1815*. From the Arc de Triomphe de l’Étoile. (From Wikimedia Commons).

Figure 20
Francois Rude, *La Marseillaise*. From the Arc de Triomphe de l’Étoile. (From Wikimedia Commons).
Figure 21
J.E. Chaponniere. *The Fall of Alexandria*. From the Arc de Triomphe de l'Étoile. (From Wikimedia Commons).

Figure 22
Bernard Seure. *The Battle of Aboukir*, From the Arc de Triomphe de l'Étoile. (From Wikimedia Commons).
Figure 23
Carlo Marocchetti, *The Battle of Jammapes*, From the Arc de Triomphe de l’Étoile. (From Wikimedia Commons).

Figure 24
Figure 25

Figure 26
Figure 27
Frederick Nash, *Monument Erected to Général Foy*, 19\textsuperscript{th} c., drawing. (From Bibliothèque nationale de France online, Gallica.bnf.fr).

Figure 28
David d’Angers, *Foy in Spain*, 1826-1831, plaster. Galerie David d’Angers. (From Pantano, Figure 3).
Figure 29
(From Pantano, Figure 4).

Figure 30
(From Pantano, Figure 5).
Figure 31
(From ArtStor).
Figure 32
(From Bibliothèque nationale de France online, Gallica.bnf.fr).
Figure 33
*Funeral Oration at Père Lachaise.*
(From Dansel, *Au Père-Lachaise*, Page 75).
Figure 34

Figure 35
Figure 36
(From Bibliothèque nationale de France online, Gallica.bnf.fr).

Figure 37
Hubert Robert, *Grande Galerie of the Louvre after 1801, 1801-1805, oil on canvas, 37 x 46 cm.*
(From ArtStor).
Figure 38
Pantheon of Rome, 125 - 128 CE. Rome, Italy.
(From ArtStor).

Figure 39
Cross Plan of the Panthéon de Paris
Plan du local de la nouvelle Église Ste Geneviève, 18th century, drawing.
(From Bibliothèque nationale de France online, Gallica.bnf.fr).
Figure 40
Pierre-Antoine de Machy, *View of the Pantheon with a Projected Statue of Fame*, mid-1790s.
(From Bibliothèque nationale de France online, Gallica.bnf.fr).

Figure 41
David d'Angers, *Panthéon Frieze*, limestone.
(From ArtStor).
Figure 42
Agence Meurisse, Cimetière du Père Lachaise : La Tombe de Balzac, 1926, photograph.
(From Bibliothèque nationale de France online, Gallica.bnf.fr).
Figure 43
*Tomb: Bust of Paul Baudry*, Père Lachaise Cemetery, sculpture.
(From ArtStor).
Figure 44
(From Wikimedia Commons).
Figure 45
Demézy, *La tombe de Frédéric Chopin au Père-Lachaise*, 1919, photograph, 22 x 16.5 cm.
(From Bibliothèque nationale de France online, Gallica.bnf.fr).

Figure 46
Tomb of Ingres in the Cemetery of Père Lachaise in Paris.
(From Wikimedia Commons).
Figure 47
(From ArtStor).

Figure 48
Example of an Etruscan Tomb
*Tomb of the Volumnii*, late 2\textsuperscript{nd} century, travertine covered with painted stucco, 163 cm.
Perugia, Italy.
(From ArtStor).
Figure 49
(From Wikimedia Commons).
Figure 50
Benoist and A Bayot, *Place de la Bastille*, lithograph, 24.8 x 35.7 cm.
(From Bibliothèque nationale de France online, Gallica.bnf.fr).

Figure 51
*Démolition du Château de la Bastille*, 1789, 28.5 x 45 cm.
(From Bibliothèque nationale de France online, Gallica.bnf.fr).
Figure 52
Jean-Louis Prieur, *Temple dédié à la liberté : projeté sur les ruines de la Bastille, proposé par souscription, l'auteur renonçant à toute espèce d'honoraires et contribuant pour sa part de la somme de 300 £*, late 18th century, engraving.
(From Bibliothèque nationale de France online, Gallica.bnf.fr).

Figure 53
Isidore-Stanislas Helman, *La Fontaine de la régénération, sur les débris de la Bastille, le 10 août 1793*, late 18th century, engraving.
(From Bibliothèque nationale de France online, Gallica.bnf.fr).
Figure 54
Dominique Vivant Denon, Projet de Fontaine pour la Place de la Bastille, engraving. (From Bibliothèque nationale de France online, Gallica.bnf.fr).

Figure 55
L'éléphant de la Bastille, mangé par les rats, change de place, 1844. From L'Illustration, n° 66, 1er juin 1844, p. 224. (From Wikimedia Commons).
Figure 56
A. Provost, *Char funéraire des victimes de Juillet*, lithograph, 21.2 x 27 cm. (From Bibliothèque nationale de France online, Gallica.bnf.fr).

Figure 57
Figure 58
(From Bibliothèque nationale de France online, Gallica.bnf.fr).

Figure 59
Antoine-Louis Barye, *Lion of the July Column*, 1836, copper alloy with green and black over red-brown patina, 20.6 x 42.2 x 7 cm.
(From Wikimedia Commons).
Figure 60
Neogothic decorative elements on a family tomb in Père Lachaise
(From Wikimedia Commons).

Figure 61
Example of a Nineteenth Century reinterpretation of Classical architecture in Père
Lachaise
(From Wikimedia Commons).
Figure 62
(From Wikimedia Commons).
Figure 63
A Grieving Middle Class Family
*Le Cimetiere du Père Lachaise*, 1822

Figure 64
(From Aries, *Images of Man and Death*, Page 94).
Figure 65
Monument de la Famille Perrigaux, Père Lachaise.
Figure 66
Tomb Effigies of the Kings of France in Saint-Denis.
(From ArtStor).
Figure 67
Pierre Joseph Lafontaine, *Alexandre Lenoir Opposing the Destruction of the Tomb of Louis XII at the Church of Saint-Denis*, after 1799, graphite, brown wash, and black-and-white gouache highlights, 28x 23 cm. Paris, Musee Carnavalet. (From Naginski, Figure 8).

Figure 68
*Napoleon and Josephine Visiting the Musée des Monuments Français with Alexandre Lenoir*, 18th century, brown ink, pen and ink, brown wash, black chalk, white highlights. (From ArtStor).
Figure 69
APPENDIX B
TRANSLATIONS OF SELECT PRIMARY SOURCES

1. EXCERPT FROM PRUDHOMME’S REVOLUTIONS DE PARIS


The Original French:

Les rois ne pouvant usurper entièrement dans les temples la place de la divinité, s'etoient emparés de leurs portiques; ils y avoient placé leurs orgueilleuses effigies, dans doute afin que les adorations de peuples arrêtassent à eux avant d'arriver jusqu'au sanctuaire. C'est ainsi qu'accoutumés à tout envahir, ils osoient disputer à Dieu même les vœux et l'encens.

[…]

Citoyens, perpétuons ce triomphe de la raison sur les préjuges; qu'un monument élevé dans l'enceinte de la commune de Paris, non loin de cette même église dont ils avoient fait leur panthéon, transmette a nos neveux le premier trophée élevé par le peuple souverain de son immortelle victoire sur les tyrans; que les débris tronques de leurs statues, confutément entasses, forment un monument durable de la gloire du peuple, et de leur avilissement. Que le voyageur qui parcourra cette terre nouvelle, reportant dans sa patrie de leçons utiles un peuple, dite: J'avois vu dans Paris des rois, objets d'une avilissante idolâtrie; j'ai repaisse, ils n'y étoient plus.

Je propose de placer ce monument, compose des débris amoncelés de ces statues, sur la place du Pont Neuf, et d'asseoir au-dessus l'image du peuple géant, du peuple français. Que cette image importante par son caractère de force et de simplicité, porte écrit en gros caractères sur son front lumière; sur sa poitrine, nature, vérité; sur les bras, force; sur les mains, travail. Que, sur l'une de les mains, les figures de la Liberté et de l'Egalite, ferrées d'une contre l'autre, et prêtes à parcourir le monde, montrent a tous qu'elles ne reposent que sur le génie

et le vertu du peuple. Que cette image du peuple debout tienne dans son autre main cette massue terrible et réelle, dont celle de l'Hercule ancien ne fut que le symbole. De pareils monumens, font [sont] dignes de nous; tous le peuples qui ont adore la liberté, en ont élevé de pareils; ils gitent encore non loin du champ de bataille de Granion [?] les ossemens des esclaves et des tyrans qui voulurent étouffer la liberté helvétique; ils sont là
élevés en pyramide, et menacent les rois temeraires qui oseroient violer le territoire des hommes libres.

[...]

Homère défignoit les rois de son tems sous le titre de mangeurs de peuples. On écriroit sur le font de cette figure du sans-culotte français, ces mots : Le Peuple Mangeur de Rois.

*My Translation:*

As kings were not able to completely usurp the place of the divine, they took possession of their space; there, they placed their proud effigies [near entrances and along the church aisles] so the people would stop there to worship before entering the sanctuary. Thus accustomed to invading everything, they even dare to compete with God’s wishes and rituals.

[...]

Citizens, celebrate this triumph of reason over prejudice; Let a monument be raised within the municipality of Paris, not far from this same church which was made a pantheon by the old aristocracy, to give to our descendants the first trophy raised by the sovereign people to commemorate the immortal victory over the tyrants. Let the debris of their broken statues, now in piles, form a lasting monument to the glory of the people, and their centuries of degradation. Let the man that will travel around this new land [learn of our accomplishments] and report our valuable lessons back to his nation say: ‘In Paris I saw kings, who had become objects of a degrading idolatry; I went back, and they were no more.’

I propose to place this monument, built from the debris of these broken statues, on the Place du Pont Neuf, and set above it *the image of great people, the French people*. Let this image which is important because it personifies strength and simplicity, have written, in large letters, on its forehead, light; and on his chest, nature, truth; on his arms, strength; on his hands, work. Let the figures of Liberty and Equality hold one another in one of his hands, and be ready to travel across the globe, to show to everyone that they can only exist alongside the genius and virtue of the people. Let this standing image of the People hold in its other hand a fearsome and real-looking club, which was no more than a symbol for the ancient Hercules. Such monuments are worthy of us; all the people who have loved liberty, who raised similar monuments to virtue. The bones of slaves and tyrants who wanted to stifle freedom, they remain next to the battlefield of Granion, they make the steps of the pyramid, and threaten the kings who would dare to violate the territory of men.

[...]
Homer recognized the kings of his time under the title ‘Eaters of People.’ Let it be written on the front of this personification of the sans-culottes French the words: ‘The People Eat Kings.’
2. EXCERPT FROM FRANCOIS BLONDEL’S LA MAGASIN PITTORESQUE


The Original French:

L'éclat du règne de Louis XIV, les faits qui l'illustrèrent, ne pouvaient manquer de fournir à l'architecture de nombreuses occasions de s'exercer dans des genres nouveaux et variés. Il appartenait à celle glorieuse période de remettre en honneur certains monuments inusités au moyen âge, et qu'on avait à peine essayé d'inaugurer sous les règnes antérieurs à celui du grand roi ; nous voulons parler des arcs de triomphe. L'art fut alors appelé à consacrer par des témoignages impériissables les victoires, les hauts faits du règne, et l'admiration de la France. La ville de Paris voulut marcher l'égale de Rome, et dresser sur les pas du roi vainqueur des arcs triomphaux à l'instar de ceux que les Romains avaient coutume d'élever à la gloire des conquérants et des empereurs.

De tous les monuments élevés en l'honneur de Louis XIV, celui qui offre le plus d'analogie avec les modèles antiques est l'arc de triomphe dit du Trône. Tous les architectes furent chargés de présenter un dessin qui surpassât en grandeur et en magnificence ce que l'antiquité nous a laissé de plus complet dans ce genre.

My Translation:

The brilliance of the reign of Louis XIV [lies in that] his manner could not fail to give architecture a new way to express itself […] we want to talk about triumphal arches. Art was then, by imperishable testimonies, called upon to consecrate victories, the achievements of his reign, and the veneration of France. The city of Paris wanted to be considered the equivalent of Rome, and to raise triumphal arches for victorious kings as the Romans used to do to glorify their emperors.

Of all the monuments erected in honor of Louis XIV, one which offers the closest analogy with the classical models is the Triumphal Arch, called ‘du Trône.’ All the architects were commissioned to present a design that surpassed the grandeur and magnificence of what antiquity has left us.
3. EXCERPT FROM ARMAND-GUY KERSAINT’S DISCOURS SUR LES MONUMENTS PUBLICS, PRONONCE AU CONSEIL DU DEPARTMENT DE PARIS, LE 15 DECEMBRE 1791


The Original French:

Qui peut égaler l'éloquence de cette pierre solitaire attendant un grand homme? Ne voyez-vous pas le bon père, la mère sensible, conduisant leur fils, comme par hasard, dans ce lieu vénère, attendre impatiemment cette question si naturelle: Pourquoi cette pierre? Pour vous, mon fils, si vous avez le bonheur de rendre un grand service à votre patrie.

My Translation:

What can match the eloquence of this solitary stone which marks the resting place of a great man? Do you not see the good father, the sensitive mother, leading their son, as if by chance, to this venerable place, eagerly awaiting the natural question to arise: Why is this stone here? For you, my son, so you will also feel happiness at rendering service to your country.
4. **EXCERPT FROM CHARLES-LOUIS CORBET’S LETTERS TO CITIZEN LAGARDE**


*The Original French:*

Chez un grand peuple, où les arts sont nécessaires, le gouvernement leur doit dans tous le temps son appui, et dans les temps de révolution, il doit avec son appui des secours à ceux qui les cultivent; c'est ainsi qu'il s'honore, puisqu'en cela il sert et honore ouvertement à-la-fois, outre les talens, les vertus publiques et privées, car c'est véritablement parmi les artistes qu'elles se trouvent plus communément. S'il y a quelques foibles ressources encore pour les peintres, à Paris seulement, les ateliers de sculpteur sont vides, le ciseau ne s'y fait point entendre, ils sont déserts!

*My Translation:*

In a great nation, where the arts are necessary, the government owes them constant support, and in times of revolution, [the government] must support those who foster the arts; in this way the government honors itself, since it serves, in addition to talent, the public and private virtues, for in the arts these virtues are commonly found to the people. If there are only a few resources for painters in Paris and the sculpture studios are empty, the chisel does not sound, these studios are deserts!
5. EXCERPTS FROM THEOPHILE GAUTIER’S “LE 28 JUILLET, 1840”

From: Gautier, Théophile. Poésies complètes ... G. Charpentier, 1877.

The Original French:

‘Le soleil de Juillet, le soleil tricolore,
‘Dans le ciel triomphal va rayonner encore :
‘Réunissez nos os pour ce jour solennel !
‘Qu’on nous donne un tombeau digne
de Babylone,
‘Tout bronze et tout granit, quelque haute colonne,
‘Avec nos noms gravés, et le chiffre immortel !

‘Car il ne fut jamais de plus noble victoire,
‘Et toute gloire est terne auprès de notre gloire !
‘Phalange au cœur stoïque et désintéressé ;
‘Contre le fait brutal, contre la force injuste,
‘Nous soutenions les droits de la pensée auguste,
‘Soldats de l’avenir combattant le passé !

[...]
La France est grande et magnanime ;
Elle a sur ses autels pieux,
Impartialité sublime,
Une place pour tous ses dieux
Et, sans avoir peur d’aucune ombre,
D’aucun nom rayonnant ou sombre,
Elle accorde à tous un linceul.
Pour vous un sépulcre se fonde,
Et l’on va prendre au bout du monde
L’empereur, lassé d’être seul !

A l’endroit où fut la Bastille,
Sol sacré bien doux pour vos os,
Vous irez dormir en famille,
Nobles enfants des vieux héros !
Aux yeux de la foule en extase,
Qui pleure et qui prie à la base,

My Translation:

'The July sun, the tricolor sun,
'Will shine again in the triumphal sky:
'Reunite our bones for this solemn day!
'Give us a tomb worthy of Babylon
'All granite and bronze, a high column
'With our engraved names, and immortal numbers!

'Because there was never a more noble victory
'And all other glories are dull compared to ours!
'Ranks of stoic and selfless hearts;
'Against brutal acts, against the unjust force,
'We support the rights of the august thought,
'Soldiers of the future fighting against the past!

[...]
France is great and magnanimous;
She has on pious altars,
Sublime impartiality,
A seat for all her gods
And, without fear of any shadows,
Of any names radiant or dark
She grants all a shroud.
For you a sepulcher is made,
And it will bring from the end of the world
The emperor, weary of being alone!

At the place where the Bastille was,
Sacred soil so gentle to your bones,
You will sleep among family,
Noble children of the old heroes!
In the eyes of the ecstatic crowd
Which cries and prays at the base,
Rises your Pantheon!
S’élève votre Panthéon !
Une colonne fière et haute,
Airain digne d’avoir pour hôte
Trajan ou bien Napoléon.

[...]
Dans des fêtes patriotiques,
A vos carrefours glorieux
L’on ira chercher vos reliques,
Qu’attend le caveau radieux,
Dans leurs chants sacrés, les poètes,
Par qui toutes gloires sont faites,
Rendront votre nom éternel !
Pour qui meurt en donnant l’exemple,
Le sépulcre devient un temple,
Et le cercueil est un autel !

A column proud and high,
Brass worthy to host
Trajan or Napoleon.

[...]
In patriotic celebrations
To your glorious crossroads
There one will find your relics
Which are expected in the radiant vault
In their sacred songs, poets,
By whom all glories are made,
Will have your name made eternal!
For those who die as martyrs,
The tomb becomes a temple,
And the coffin is an altar!
**Primary Sources**


*Le Magasin Pittoresque* was one of France’s first popular magazines, a serial which began printing under Édouard Charton in 1833. This publication is notable for its prolific use of illustrations and political cartoons which offered scathing criticism of the July Monarchy and its attempted social reforms.


In a series of letters the late eighteenth century Parisian sculptor Charles-Louis Corbet wrote to his friend in the French government who Courbet addresses as ‘Citoyen Lagarde,’ the artist expresses his concerns about contemporary developments in the modern European aesthetic. Courbet was critical of the Revolutionary government’s involvement in the arts, and in particular, the way in which the regime used monumental sculpture and public art as a medium of political propaganda.


The writings of celebrated nineteenth century author Theophile Gautier have made a considerable impression upon the Western literary tradition. Among his greatest works is a poem which addresses Post-French Revolution beliefs and concerns about the July Monarchy. In particular, “Le 28 Juillet 1840” concerns the legacy of the Parisian citizens who were martyred while bringing the regime to power. Indeed, Gautier’s poem proclaims these fallen French heroes worthy of eulogy, and is in of itself notable for its allusions to the Colonne Juillet, a monument in the Place Bastille.


For historians researching the traditions and beliefs of Late Attic Greece, Herodotus’ *The Histories* is an essential primary source which addresses the particulars of Athenian culture and tradition. For my purposes, Herodotus’ text is important because of its references to the role of death and public funerals in Greek society.


Victor Hugo’s literary masterpiece, *Les Misérables*, has been lauded by readers, critics and historians since its initial publication in 1862. While the novel is best known for its characters, stirring plot and social critique, *Les Misérables* is noted in this analysis.
because of Hugo’s commentary on nineteenth century Parisian culture and the social stratification.


Armand de Kersaint, a prominent public figure in post-Revolutionary France served in several different political offices. While his tenure as a naval officer, an administrator of the department of the Seine and a ‘depute suppleant’ in the Legislative Assembly all had long-ranging effects on French public policy, perhaps Kersaint’s most significant civic contribution was his 1791 report to the Conseil du Departement de Paris on the city’s public monuments. In this address, Kersaint concluded that the construction of outdoor monuments to the Grands Hommes of France in Paris would be advantageous to the government and provide a framework to maintain the moral stability of the nation.

**Rene Francois Armand Prudhomme, Révolutions de Paris, publ. par le sieur [L.M.] Prudhomme, 1793.**

*Revolution de Paris* is a journal series which chronicles the political developments of the French Revolution. Its publication run lasted from July 1789 to February 1794 under the renowned Parisian editor Sully Prudhomme. Many scholars have acknowledged the documentary importance of *Revolution de Paris*, especially as the journal’s views reflected with those of the Parisian general public in the late eighteenth century. For this particular historical inquiry, *Revolution de Paris* is a critical primary source because of Prudhomme’s radical views of on the role of monumental architecture in Revolutionary France.

**Society of Arts (Great Britain). Journal of the Society of Arts.** Great Britain: The Society, 1870.

The *Journal of the Society of Arts* is a public record of the meeting notes of the late nineteenth century British association of the same name. It remains an important source of information about contemporary academic views of Paris’ renowned Pere Lachaise cemetery. In the journal, there is a small article which addresses the French government’s attempts to restrict and manage cemetery overcrowding in modern Paris. Such commentaries demonstrate to modern scholars the extent to which cemetery organization and appearance were of concern to many Europeans.

**Secondary Sources**


In this overview of late eighteenth and early nineteenth century French monuments, historian Robert L. Alexander considers the evolution of this artistic form, noting how
contemporary popular opinion shaped artists’ approach to public art. Alexander pays particular attention to Paris’ political memorials and their architects’ self-conscious evocations of Roman victory arches and columns. After establishing a correlation between the styles of modern and ancient memorials, Alexander demonstrates how the themes of nineteenth century monuments are broader in scope than those of previous centuries.


While Philippe Aries’, *The Hour of Our Death*, is perhaps the better known of the scholar’s publications, his *Images of Man and Death* is of particular significance to this study of Parisian funeral monuments as it addresses the aesthetic developments of commemorative art. Yet there are many historians, like Thomas Albert Kselman, who find issue with Aires’ analyses, especially the historian’s tendency to overstate the importance of certain cultural developments, and in doing so, generalize his findings. In this regard, Aries’ works are an excellent place to begin an examination of funerary sculpture, although his work cannot be considered authoritative or reflective of contemporary thought.


Philippe Aries’ work *The Hour of Our Death* is a critical text to the historiography of Western monumental art and cemetery sculpture. Aries, one of the foremost scholars on the evolution of European views of mortality, was one of the first academics to consider the aesthetic changes within the commemorative art canon from the Roman era to the present. Since Aries’ publications in the 1970s and 1980s, however, several scholars have revised the historians’ theses with respect to new methodologies which downplay his tendency to make generalizations.


Although Brooks Beaulieu’s article on the French artist Antoine-Augustin Préault is primarily focused upon the artist’s prominent career, it also addresses the general state of the arts in France following the Revolution. Beaulieu’s enumeration of the obstacles Préault encountered as a politically conscious artist seeking commissions in the 1830s demonstrates the volatility of the public service sector during this era. Moreover, this analysis speaks to the fact that many nineteenth century artists were influenced by the social hardships they witnessed both on the streets of Paris and abroad. Theses such as Beaulieu’s validate my own work which is reliant upon scholarly agreement that there was a clear relationship between art and popular culture in modern France.

In the second of Albert Boime’s scholarly writings on the history of modern art, the scholar engages in an academic discussion of the social and political history of the early nineteenth century. In particular, Boime concentrates on the cultural influence of charismatic leaders like Napoleon Bonaparte as well as the dissemination of Enlightenment ideals and nationalist sympathies throughout Europe. The central argument of this work is that the themes of popular art from this period were determined largely by the governing political forces and other influential, interested parties.


In an effort to push historians beyond the broad-brush term Romanticism, Albert Boime addresses a broad variety of subjects, mediums, and themes which surfaced in European art in the early nineteenth century. In particular, Boime concentrates on the way in which popular culture and political turbulence affected artists and the conventions of this era. Like many other works in this bibliography, *Art in an Age of Counterrevolution* contends that art from this era was often constructed to serve the interests of the emerging bourgeoisie.


In this first publication of a series in which historian Albert Boime discusses the development of Western art in the modern era, the author considers the crucial issues that French and English artists faced in a revolutionary age. Far more than an elementary examination of notable artists and their work, this book suggests that contemporary social and political events in the West had a significant influence upon the aesthetic of the late eighteenth century.


The bulk of Boime’s thesis in *The Politics of Sculpture in Nineteenth-Century France* rests upon what the historian considers the paradoxes of nineteenth century sculpture. For instance, Boime argues that although the majority of French sculptors from this period came from an artisanal and lower-middle class background (a demographic reality which may explain why many works address contemporary social issues) the high concentration and organization of sculptors in large cities kept the thematic content of these artworks rather conservative. Another important theme in Boime’s work is the influence of popular political movements on Parisian monumental art. He discusses how the post-Revolution French government mandated the destruction of statues which spoke to the grandeur of the ancien regime as a means of bolstering public sympathy for the current administration. This historical analysis supports my own argument that art and political
ideals were important in the wake of the French Revolution and that the systematic revision of the Parisian urban landscape was a means of arousing popular support.


In outlining the history of the cemetery of Pere-Lachaise in Paris, Frederick Brown provides the reader with a deeper understanding of how the social and intellectual movements of modern Europe determined public policy. Beginning in the late 1700s, Brown discusses how the French bureaucrats’ Enlightenment-based ideals regarding urban planning led to the development of new venues for social differentiation. Far from merely outlining the legislative processes involved with the construction of Pere-Lachaise, Brown recognizes the cultural movements which influenced cemetery design in the early nineteenth century.


In *Blood in the City*, historian Richard D. E. Burton considers how the series of violent and politically-motivated revolts and popular uprisings which dominated post-Revolution France affected Parisian culture. In particular, Burton focuses on the religious implications of the Revolution, namely, the ‘dechristianization’ of French society, the role of women in the nineteenth century, and the development of Parisian social identity. Burton argues that a study of the era’s revolutions and counter-revolutions is a necessary supplement to any analysis of French history, as these bloody uprisings determined many aspects of modern society.


Like his colleague Michel Vovelle, Remi Clignet discusses how the inherent cultural subjectivity of art influences academic discussions of post-revolutionary French visual culture. For instance, Clignet posits that it is because of the ‘relative autonomy of the differing communities that make up societies’ that the art of the nineteenth century is so dynamic and inconsistent in terms of iconography. This idea that dueling social and intellectual prerogatives determined the artistic output of any culture is a useful one and contributes to this thesis in that it supposes the existence of an intrinsic relationship between people and culture.


In this article, William B. Cohen considers the social history of Paris with respect to its urban population and economic stratification in the nineteenth century. Cohen argues that numerous aspects of modern city life, including disease, crowding and revolt, were
driven by the physical organization and demographics of Paris. In relation to my own work, Cohen’s analysis corroborates my supposition that the cemetery of Pere Lachaise was built in reaction to contemporary protests about urban social conditions.


*The Transformation of Modern France* is a compilation of historical essays which emphasize the dynamic and often conflicting nature of French society in the post-Revolutionary era. A recurrent theme in these articles is the idea that although a significant portion of the French populace pushed for radical reforms in the early decades of the nineteenth century, very few of these ideals were realized; instead, French society was slow to change on a cultural level and retained many of the social norms and practices which had characterized this nation in previous centuries.


In *Architecture and the After-Life*, scholar Howard Montagu Colvin constructs an analysis of nineteenth-century popular attitudes towards death as part of a larger examination of European funeral monuments. Colvin argues that the changing aesthetic of memorials in the early decades of the modern era marks the development of a social consciousness born from the dissemination of Enlightenment ideals and scientific discoveries in Europe. Colvin discusses the stylistic evolution of these monuments and contrasts their motifs with those of contemporary paintings and lithographs, demonstrating that modern painting was far from the only socially-conscious medium of the period.


Although Matthew Craske’s concentration in *Silent Rhetoric of the Body* does not correspond with either the location or time period of my own research, his work is useful in that it provides historians with a model for analyses of Western funereal monuments. In his introduction, Craske states that his intention is to illuminate the relationship between secular and private memorials in England during the eighteenth century because the “complex relationship between public and private culture that is also applicable to the analysis of painted portraits, household busts or landscapes.” Such attempts to generalize artistic analyses in the modern area open up additional possibilities for my own work.


As James Stevens Curl notes in this article on the European artist John Claudius Loudon, the garden-cemetery vogue of the nineteenth century had different manifestations in each Western European nation. However, Curl also remarks that urban planning officials often
looked abroad for ideas about how to best organize and beautify their city, especially as intellectuals’ underlying push for the picturesque French model drove public policy. This desire for a new memorial aesthetic may be observed in the designs of John Claudius Loudon, whose work in England during the early years of the century was heavily influenced by the Parisians’ successes in Pere-Lachaise.


*Au Pere-Lachaise*, one of French historian Michel Dansel’s earlier analyses of the social role of the famous Parisian cemetery, addresses both the history and the organization of the city’s early nineteenth century funerary spaces. A work influenced by Dansel’s personal interest in the aesthetic of Pere Lachaise’s monuments, this book examines how the artworks of the cemetery correspond to its physical layout, providing the reader with a comprehensive understanding of why Pere Lachaise became such a popular venue for the high society of modern France.


Michel Dansel, one of the premiere scholars on the history of Pere Lachaise, began his research for *Les Lieux de Culte* in the middle of the twentieth century, when few other scholars were interested in the sculptural assets and cultural significance of the cemetery. In this work, one of his later publications, Dansel moves beyond a simple analysis of Pere Lachaise’s organization, and argues that the cemetery has historically been a locus for the development of the Parisian ‘cult of celebrity.’ Dansel traces the evolution of the term ‘cult’ as its related connotations shift from the religious to the popular and how the ‘cult of personality’ came to be associated with Pere Lachaise.


Robert Darnton, one of the most influential scholars of the twentieth century, set out his historical methodology in *The Great Cat Massacre*, which is perhaps his best known work. Here, Darnton states that historians must recognize the subjectivity of our own cultural sensibilities, “for nothing is easier than to slip into the comfortable assumption that Europeans thought and felt two centuries ago just as we do today.” In my own analysis of the art of nineteenth century France, this notion of evolving cultural ideologies is important, as it allows me to suppose that society and artistic symbols are intertwined facets of a larger dynamic.


Margaret Fields Denton, in her article on Nicolas Poussin’s *The Arcadian Shepherds* (1638-40), extends existing analyses of this painting to a broader discussion of early nineteenth century views of death and dying in the West. The focus of Denton’s work is
the emergence of the picturesque landscape garden and its development in France following the French Revolution. For the purposes of this thesis, the work of Nicolas Poussin is relevant insofar that it is a visual marker of the modern era’s intellectual dynamism and the manner in which Enlightenment ideas shaped cultural views of the cycle of life.


In this compilation of assorted artistic motifs and themes, author Enrico De Pascale sets forward a concise examination of how death has been portrayed in the visual arts throughout history. Although this work reads more like a dictionary of the various elements of a composition than a intense analysis of specific artworks, the precision with which these aspects are laid out is useful for any scholar interested in ‘reading’ complex monuments like tomb sculpture.


*Nineteenth Century Art* is a comprehensive analysis of a variety of artists, themes, motifs and mediums which form the body what is currently regarded the canon of modern art. In this work, attention is paid to how artists of the early nineteenth century sought to move beyond the accepted conventions of art upheld by tradition and the French Salon.


In many ways, *The Architecture of Death* is author Richard A. Etlin’s attempt to place the developments of cemetery art from eighteenth century Paris into a broader historical context. By referencing examples of tomb sculpture from previous centuries and Indo-European cultures, such as the tomb of Mausolus at Halicarnassus in Asia Minor or Pisa’s Campo Santo, Etlin highlights the self-conscious return to classic motifs found in modern art. Etlin also discusses the influence Enlightenment-based scientific and social processes had on French sanitary and urban planning policies of the late eighteenth century.


Many historians have acknowledged the influence of turbulent social environments on the populations of Western European nations in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. A variety of historical analyses have been devoted to particular aspects of European culture from this era, ranging in theme from music to clothing, gender roles, and in the case of David Garrioch, the evolution of the Parisian bourgeoisie. Garrioch’s book *The Formation of the Parisian Bourgeoisie*, considers how the new French middle
class used their economic power after the French Revolution era to influence the norms of the larger society.


In an analysis of society’s changing attitudes towards public monuments in the years between the French Revolution and the First World War, Michael Garval asserts that a key element of this development involves the emergence of the bourgeoisie and the social ideal of public fame. Garval asserts that “the emergence of a large bourgeois audience of readers, viewers, spectators, and fans, [...] permitted an unprecedented dissemination of words and images, names and faces.” Such statements, which refer to the influence of the middle and lower classes in French culture during the nineteenth century, bolster my own thesis, which draws parallels between public monuments within modern Paris to those found in other venues, like the cemetery of Pere-Lachaise.


Far more than a simple account of the history of the French military in the early half of the nineteenth century, Paddy Griffith's *Military Thought in the French Army, 1815-51* is a thoughtful analysis of the philosophies and training methods which defined the nation's armed forces in the modern era. Griffith's self-proclaimed intent is to move beyond studies which consider the propagandistic aims of the French military in an era in which France's army was the most formidable in the West; instead, Griffith considers how the military defined itself and how these self-perceptions influenced French history.


Although *Beyond the Body* is essentially a historical analysis of modern art and Western civilizations’ representations of death in the visual arts, this work is also an attempt to generalize the psychological principles of a larger cultural body. Indeed, in this study of popular Western ideas about human mortality, the authors claim that historians must look beyond material culture and examine “the cultural assumptions which underpin visuality” as a means of gaining insight into the past.


The social and artistic prominence of French academic art is the subject of historian James Harding’s book *Artistes Pompiers*. Here, Harding outlines the importance of Salon patronage and public opinion to the positive development of an artist’s career in the early decades of the nineteenth century. This work will be of particular importance to my own work as it provides the reader with a concise biography of Paul-Jacques-Aime Baudry, a
well-renowned artist in his own time, whose tomb in Pere Lachaise is representative of a larger group of Grands Hommes Memorials in Paris.


Unlike other social histories concerning human perceptions of mortality which generalize Western psychological perspectives on death, Vanessa Harding’s *The Dead and the Living in Paris and London* the author is concerned with the specifics of how European cities’ social dynamic was affected by Western acknowledgement of mortality. Harding argues that “the practices surrounding death and burial can make an important contribution to understanding urban culture and experience,” and therefore by extension, the arts.


In her article on nineteenth century sculptural representations of Paris’ most influential citizens, June Hargrove extends the existing academic discussion of post-Revolutionary public monuments into a detailed analysis of artworks which commemorate Rousseau and Marat. Hargrove suggests that the primary distinction between commemorative art from previous centuries and those of the modern era include the physical location, subject and popular function of these works. Her focus on both individual sculptures and the personal testaments of various literary contemporaries is of significance to this thesis, which likewise depends upon primary sources to establish social context.


In this article on the work of the French artist Vigee Le Brun, art historian Jo Hedley discusses the techniques and reasoning employed with the conservation of Le Brun’s portrait of Madame Perregaux, completed in 1789. In addition, Hedley considers how the social position of both the artist and the sitter influenced the composition, showcasing the author’s knowledge of the Perregaux family and their bourgeois background.


In *From the Classicists to the Impressionists*, historian Elizabeth Basye Gilmore Holt contends that the radical aesthetic break nineteenth century artists made with the aesthetic canon of Europe led to the development and escalation of tensions between artists and the established institutions which had controlled cultural production in previous centuries. Holt attributes this dynamism to the emergence of Romanticism as an intellectual movement, and contends that, therefore, art in this era is best defined by its sentimental
rather than its aesthetic qualities, although all modern art is noticeably distinct from that of previous periods.


Although in modern society, the process of dying is often regarded as a highly personal or familial concern, there is historical evidence that this cultural understanding of mortality has only recently become mainstream. Indeed, as Allan Kellehear argues in *A Social History of Dying*, even into the early decades of the modern era of Western civilization, death was understood within the context of “specific social contracts with particular interests within rather than across the broader community.” Kellehear’s research into the alternative concerns of death which have been touted by European cultures in the past illuminates various aspects of these same cultures’ popular discourses about the “proper” manner of dying.


Following in the scholarly tradition of historians like Philippe Aries, Kselman’s *Death and the Afterlife in Modern France* is an effort to relate political, economic and social events to Europeans’ ever-changing perception of death. Kselman states that the modern era was, at its essence, a time of conflict, and the contradictions of the period influenced how the public expressed itself. With regards to nineteenth century tomb sculpture, Kselman suggests the aesthetic of this art form was the product of two dueling ambitions of affluent Europeans: to find a medium whereby postmortem individualism may be showcased, but also, a venue where one’s social significance may be preserved.


In the last decade of the twentieth century, art historian James A. Leith identified a noticeable gap in the historiography of late 18th century art, namely, an absence of literature which considered how monuments and public space were used as tools of propaganda by French politicians. In his subsequent publication, *Space and Revolution*, Leith provides an overview of the role symbols, rituals, and rhetoric played in the post-Revolutionary French monument aesthetic. Beginning with a concise definition of propaganda and later expanding upon his definition with examples of the evolution of public art, Leith considers how monuments and architecture developed over the course of the nineteenth century.


In recent decades, as academia has begun to delve into the particulars of cultural and social history, there has been a push to reexamine the connection between the visual arts
and the cultures which produced them. Historian James Leith takes this scholastic
tradition a step further, arguing in his article “On the Religiosity of the French
Revolution” that the artworks, music and architecture of post-Revolutionary France
present strong allusions to the Christian artistic tradition. This attempt to reconcile the
various aspects of French culture during this period is essential to my own thesis, which
is dependent upon the notion of an interlaced social network.


In this overview of French architecture from the nineteenth century, the director of
research at France’s National Council for Social Research, Bertrand Lemoine, considers
how social concerns shape popular aesthetics. From monuments to metro stops, Lemoine
covers the various manifestations of Parisian art in the modern era, clarifying modern
scholarship’s understanding of what many nineteenth century Europeans regarded as
‘art.’

United States of America: Dept. of Art History, University of Maryland at College Park,
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This compilation of essays on the history of post-Revolutionary France focuses on the
various social institutions and ideals which shaped Western culture in the nineteenth
century. By focusing on diverse topics such as renowned individuals, the anti-clerical
movement of the late 1700s and the iconography of the Revolution, *Culture and
Revolution* provides academia with further insight as to how the political activity of this
turbulent era affected the cultural practices of France.


Fred Licht’s work on modern sculpture is a well-constructed and thorough compilation of
images of nineteenth and twentieth century art. In an overview of the artistic
developments in this period, Licht addresses the emergence of Romanticism and
Classicism as artistic movements following the French Revolution, a topic of vital
importance in my own research.


In his discussion of the administrative and social developments which occurred in the
Republican era of Roman history, scholar Andrew William Lintott addresses several key
issues regarding the organization of Western military and political institutions. For the
purposes of this thesis, Lintott’s work is a source which provides information about the
role of the army in ancient cultures.

Among the central themes in Nigel Llewellyn’s *The Art of Death* is the idea that popular opinion and contemporary social concerns predicate the themes present in the art of the period. Llewellyn states that although modern society often downplays the social importance of grief, Western cultures’ understanding of death has been in flux for centuries and is a significant part of cultural development. Using the presence of Christian ideology as a unifying thread, Llewellyn suggests that as religious ideals evolved, so too did European beliefs about mortality and behavior at the death-bed.


In an analysis which compares the city to a series of architectural and artistic layers, François Loyer’s *Paris Nineteenth Century* considers the medieval structural origins of Paris and how the social dynamic of early modern France determined its contemporary organization. Taking into account such diverse factors as population growth, railway lines and Enlightenment ideals regarding urban sanitation, Loyer crafts for the reader a concise history of how Paris’ facade was constructed by deep historical forces.


In an analysis of the political and social symbolism of the Bastille in France from the late eighteenth to the mid eighteenth century, scholars Hans-Jürgen Lusebring and Rolf Reichardt consider how popular opinion shaped domestic policy in Paris in the modern era. Lusebring and Reichardt uphold the evolution of the Bastille as a potent symbol of the revolutionary ideals which remain a prominent aspect of French cultural memory. This work begins with a discussion of the Bastille’s representations in art in the wake of its destruction, and concludes with its role in modern society.


After discussing the numerous and often problematic approaches to social history as a discipline, Roger Magraw sets up an outline for how the Enlightenment and the Revolutionary ideals of the late 1800s shaped French society in the following century. This work considers the central themes of modern French history and includes contemporary research done of the nation’s religious views, educational reforms, gender and class warfare. Magraw argues that the complexity of the historiography of this era is due in equal parts to the paradoxical nature of modern French society and the contradictory theses of past scholarly studies; he sets up this work as a remedy to this “problematic enterprise.”

In an exhaustive study of the demographic, spiritual, social, and scientific changes which took place in eighteenth century France, John McManners has constructed an analysis of Western attitudes towards death in the modern era by building on the work of other prominent twentieth century historians such as Philippe Aries. The underlying premise of this book is that scholars can better understand this period with a comprehensive historiography on the French people’s beliefs and practices regarding human mortality.


In an effort to build upon the social histories of post-Revolutionary France to date, author Peter McPhee begins his analysis with a revised definition of the term “social history” and a brief overview of past scholarship in this area. McPhee argues that the fundamental flaws of previous social histories lie in the historians’ overemphasis of economic and political structures; McPhee contends that, moving forward, scholars must consider “the ways in which people in the past expressed themselves and gave meaning to the confusion and unpredictability of the world in which they lived.” With such a sentiment as the academic focal point of the work, *Social History of France* uses primary sources to illuminate how the average Frenchman reacted to legislative and political dynamism in the long nineteenth century.


In this article, Allan Mitchell argues that although the origins of social history as a discipline lie in France, it was only until recently that much of the scholarship on European attitudes towards death have focused on the early modern period. These studies have excluded the conflicting perceptions of human mortality which surfaced in France after 1789. Mitchell suggests that because there is such a dearth of flushed-out historical theses on this topic, many historians have relied too heavily upon the analyses of Philippe Ariès, whose methodological flaws compromise the scholarship of this field.


As Harold Mytum argues in “Public Health and Private Sentiment,” historical analyses of cemetery constructions and popular attitudes towards death can tell academia something significant about the cultural developments of previous eras. Mytum’s work focuses upon the archaeology of eighteenth century gravesites, and in particular, how the organization
of these sites reflected contemporary social norms with regards to mortality, social stratification, and the dissemination of Enlightenment ideals in Western Europe.


In this analysis of the relevance of sculpture within the public spheres of Europe, author Erika Naginski relies on primary accounts and visual sources to support her thesis regarding popular art in Enlightenment-era France. For the purposes of this thesis, Naginski’s work is extremely useful as it helps scholars better understand the motivations and anxieties social elites had for artworks which celebrated the accomplishments of the ancien regime.


In this comprehensive examination of Western sepulchral art from the early centuries AD to the present, historian Edwin Panofsky provides a brief overview of the most common motifs and subjects associated with this kind of sculpture. A central theme of Panofsky’s work is the concept of aesthetic change over time, and his analysis underlines how social class, location, and contemporary political activity affected public interpretations of the messages conveyed by such memorials.


In this article on the cultural importance of sculptural art in the cemetery of Pere Lachaise, Nadine A. Pantano discusses the dynamic between public and private sentiments as expressed in nineteenth century memorial sculpture. Pantano suggests that the location and popular appeal of Pere Lachaise cemetery culminated in an “ideal opportunity for [patrons to obtain] a certain freedom of expression and the propagation of ideas that might otherwise be subject to censorship.” The author extends her analysis into an examination of the iconography of the tomb of General Foy, a work which is critical to this thesis.


In the first chapter of *The Transformation of Modern France*, scholar Janet Polasky outlines how the events of the French Revolution determined the course of the nation’s history in the two subsequent centuries. In particular, Polasky focuses on the idea of a “Revolutionary Heritage,” or the cultural tradition of civil unrest, which has had a significant impact on modern French society and art.

In a concise history of the political and social developments which took place in France over the last two centuries, Jeremy D. Popkin directs the reader’s attention to larger historical themes associated with post-Revolutionary France. Among these themes is the emergence of the bourgeoisie and the assorted issues which arose out of their public and cultural dominance. Popkin’s consideration of the bourgeoisie’s influence over France’s educational and economic reforms informs my own research by providing social context.


In this detailed history of the printed literature and newspapers of Revolutionary France, author Jeremy D. Popkin discusses the role periodicals and journals played in the spread of radical political ideals. Popkin argues that Revolutionary-era authors used a particular kind of diction and tone in order to interest the larger population of France in current political events. This historical analysis considers how popular press coverage affected events following the Revolution and how publishers used their civic influence to promote liberalism in government.


In this analysis of the early nineteenth century Parisian preoccupation with commemorations to the ‘Grands Hommes’ of France, author Dominique Poulot discusses French methods of popular remembrance. He argues that Paris’ modern pantheons have much in common with their ancient prototypes, even if they purport to uphold reformed, Enlightenment ideals of a new age.


Written in the tradition of Philip Aries’ analyses of Western burial customs, Michel Ragon’s comprehensive study of funerary decoration touches on several key points about public memorials and other architectural forms in modern Europe. Aside from his discussion of different tomb motifs and designs, Ragon recognizes the importance of these works relative to those found elsewhere in Europe. Particularly relevant to my own thesis is Ragon’s assertion that “sometimes mausoleums have been put to some other purpose than their original functions,” as this sentiment implies that there is a dynamic element to European funerary monuments, and furthermore, that this dynamism is swayed by a variety of social forces.

In this analysis of Western European art from the turn of the nineteenth century, art historian Robert Rosenblum discusses the thematic and stylistic differences between the two principal aesthetic movements of the time, Romanticism and Classicism. Rosenblum argues that as of yet there have been no authoritative texts which distinguish these two movements, perhaps because the two aesthetic ideologies often overlap in the arts. Instead, Rosenblum shows how the bulk of art from this period contained elements of each movement and argues that this heterogeneity of styles must be recognized in future analyses of modern art.


An exhaustive analysis of European art from the nineteenth century, Rosenblum has laid out both biographies of individual artists and the cultural motivations behind the emergence of diverse artistic philosophies during this era in *19th Century Art*. Perhaps most relevant to any work on post-Revolutionary French art are Rosenblum’s broad analyses of this period’s sculptural and architectural developments.


A recurring theme in many historical analyses of the years following the French Revolution is the idea of political and social diversity and conflict. In his article on the art theorist, architect and politician Quatremere de Quincy, James H. Rubin considers the various sources of artistic philosophy and inspiration which drove French creative minds in the early nineteenth century. In particular, Rubin focuses on the role of German Romanticism in Quatremere de Quincy’s artistic methodology and how the politics of this century alternately embraced and shunned alternatives to Enlightenment ideals.

Sandars, Mary F. *Honore De Balzac, His Life and Writings*. Echo Library, 2006.

In her analysis of the life and creative works of the French author Honore de Balzac, historian Mary F. Sandars considers the impact this Grands Homme had on the development of modern French society. Moreover, her work considers how de Balzac maintained a presence in Parisian culture even in the years after his death. This additional insight provided by the author makes this source of especial interest to a thesis such as my own, which is concerned with the impact of the Grands Hommes within nineteenth century France.

This historical analysis by Ellie Nower Schamber focuses on nineteenth century French Romantic artists and how their socio-economic class “influenced the form and content of their art, and how it influenced their political stance as well.” Schamber’s work moves beyond the generally accepted supposition by historians that artists are influenced by contemporary events, and demonstrates how visual artists’ reactions to the French political sphere affected the longevity and caliber of their career.


J. M. C. Toynbee’s analysis of Roman burial practices has remained the definitive study on this subject since its initial publication in 1971. Toynbee addresses Roman cultural beliefs about death and the wide range of practices associated with such beliefs across the empire. Burial practices themselves are also an important part of this analysis, as Toynbee reconstructs for the reader what the funerary artworks and processions of ancient Rome might have looked like. For the purposes of this study, Toynbee’s work is invaluable as it takes into account the differences in Roman funerary rituals across space, time, class and gender boundaries.


In his brief analysis of the sketches, engravings, and other popular representations of the French Revolution from the early nineteenth century, Michel Vovelle hits on several key points regarding the character of French art as it related to post-revolutionary politics. Perhaps the most relevant of these points to my own analysis is the idea that the symbolic content of these works was flexible; he argues that the significance of the allegories and motifs so often used in public monuments, paintings and newspaper caricatures from the years following the Revolution were subject to not only the views of the artist, but the current political regime and dominant social ideology.


Alison West’s *From Pigalle to Préault* is a detailed analysis of the assorted artistic motifs, genres, and styles associated with French sculpture from the end of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Of great assistance to my own thesis is West’s concentration on both public monumental sculpture and private commissions, because in so doing, she provides a cohesive overview of the sculptural aesthetic of this era.

A work inspired by the social history movement of mid twentieth century, Joachim Whaley’s *Mirrors of Mortality* is an insightful analysis of modern Europeans’ changing attitudes towards death and the afterlife. The central tenet of this work is that although social rituals and cultural beliefs are inevitably intertwined, funerary practices are less likely to evolve than the underlying ideals which prompted their development. Whaley also acknowledges the importance of burial rites as a cultural activity, stating that they “helped to reinforce social or political ideals, while tombs and monuments strengthened concepts of continuity, legitimacy and status.”


Gordon Wright’s newest edition of *France in Modern Times* takes into account the various scholarly movements of the twentieth century and the effect such writings have had on contemporary understanding of France’s political and social development since the Revolution of 1789. A comprehensive work which recognizes the most influential writings on the history of France, this book is an asset to any researcher looking for an overview of modern academic thought.


In *Pantheons*, editors Matthew Craske and Richard Wrigley introduce a discussion of how pantheonic architectural structures have evolved from their original form in antiquity to their modern function in Western urban spaces. This collection of scholarly essays considers both the meaning and architectural developments of the pantheon as it gradually gained a role in the process of constructing social identity on the national and local stages.