



INDIANA UNIVERSITY PRESS

Monuments and Memory in French Nationalism

Author(s): Avner Ben-Amos

Source: *History and Memory*, Fall - Winter, 1993, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Fall - Winter, 1993), pp. 50-81

Published by: Indiana University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25618652>

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

[https://www.jstor.org/stable/25618652?seq=1&cid=pdf-](https://www.jstor.org/stable/25618652?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents)

[reference#references_tab_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/25618652?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents)

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Indiana University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *History and Memory*

JSTOR

Avner Ben-Amos

Monuments and Memory in French Nationalism*

Writing about four Parisian monuments – the Panthéon, the Invalides, the Arc de Triomphe and Notre-Dame Cathedral – Charles Péguy described them as “the four cardinal points of the glory of Paris” which exemplified “French monumental memory.” They were “monarchical monuments and at the same time profoundly popular monuments; old monuments and perpetually new; monarchical monuments and perpetually democratic, and today properly republican and tomorrow anything that one would like, because ... they will never die ... they are eternally monumental, always imbued with an interior sense of eternity, eternally manifested by the value of the stone.”¹

Péguy – a poet, publicist and publisher – wrote *Our Fatherland*, in which these lines appeared, in 1905, as a response to the menacing declarations made in Tangier by the German Emperor Wilhelm II. The publication of this short novel-cum-essay marked the beginning of his transformation from a socialist and a militant Dreyfusard into a fervent Catholic and no less militant nationalist. He himself was, then, a sort of French monument, embodying different political and cultural traditions and, as an astute observer of the contemporary scene, well placed to note the complex play of meaning that characterized the four major monuments of the French capital. Yet, beyond their different meanings, Péguy believed that they all shared a more profound quality – their Frenchness. They were the “four cardinal points of all the glory of France,”² in other words, national monuments that represented the eternal fatherland.

It is the aim of this article to trace the route by which these four monuments that were built in different periods, under different circumstances and for different purposes, came to be by Péguy’s time such prominent markers of the national identity. This identity was far from simple; it was composed of various political and

cultural currents which at times competed with and at other times complemented each other. The monuments corresponded to these various currents and together constituted a complex system, whose components were interrelated. However, this system and the meaning of each monument separately were never stable.

A monument, usually made of durable materials such as stone and iron, gives an impression of permanence and can serve, therefore, as an ideal "site of memory."³ This would seem especially true when a monument is legible, i.e. its form clearly denotes a particular meaning, as in the case of the value system of medieval catholicism which was "inscribed" in the Gothic cathedrals. Yet, as I intend to show, the form of a monument is only one of the factors determining its meaning. Another and no less important factor is the symbolic usage of the monument, especially during a ceremony. The ceremony has its own meaning, which is conveyed through speech, music, movement, decoration and the manipulation of objects, and it can be distinct from that of the monument. Moreover, the duration of the ceremony constitutes a special, high-intensity time, different from the regular existence of the monument in everyday life.⁴ The ceremony, therefore, at least while it lasts, has the power to charge the monument with a special meaning. Certainly, this is not an unlimited power, and the form of the monument sets boundaries to the meaning of the ceremony. Nevertheless, within these limits, the monument can acquire many different connotations, some of which were never imagined by its builder. The overall meaning that emerges during the ceremony is, then, the result of a negotiation between the time (of the ceremony) and the space (of the monument) in which the former usually carries more weight because of the intensity of the performance.

While the four national monuments stood isolated in different parts of the city,⁵ they were at times connected by solemn processions. These processions were made up of different segments such as army units, state officials, church dignitaries, popular societies and carriers of patriotic signs, all of whom together created a complex text to be read by the crowd of spectators.⁶ However, in the context of the present study, the movement of the procession from one monument to another is more important than its various segments. By symbolically linking

several monuments, this movement helped to create a monumental system. At times such a system could also be created by decorating the monuments to highlight the connection between them and distinguish them from other, non-decorated monuments. In this system each monument retained its own particular meaning, while their interrelationship added an overriding national significance. This latter aspect emerged only in Péguy's time.

52

The route our four Parisian monuments have taken toward their prominent national status will, therefore, be traced by studying the way they were given different meanings through their ceremonial usage. In addition, I will pay attention to the formal modifications the monuments underwent, usually after a change of political regime. Nevertheless, this is not an attempt to write an architectural history; rather I would like to construct a "ceremonial" history of these monuments. I will limit myself, for lack of space, to the study of the official usage of these monuments from the rise of nationalism during the French Revolution to the period of the Third Republic, when the monuments Péguy wrote about formed a coherent system (1789–1940). The picture that will eventually emerge will be, of course, one-sided, since the meaning of a ceremony may itself be a subject of contention between the government and the opposition. In addition, by concentrating on these monuments, I neglect the extreme, exclusive nationalism that emerged in the late nineteenth century and created its own monumental system.⁷ However, this nationalism, despite its importance, remained a minority phenomenon, whereas the nationalism expressed by the four monuments was by then dominant.

Although the focus of this study will be the four monuments mentioned by Péguy, other monuments, such as the July Column, will have to be considered too, as they also "competed" for the status of national monument. Yet Péguy's choice was not arbitrary. The city of Paris had always played a central role in French nationalism. Not only did France grow gradually, by successive acquisitions, out of the royal domains on the Ile de France, but the unified country was always governed from this center. In addition, Paris has been, since the early modern period, the social and cultural capital of the kingdom, the place where local

traditions gave way to a national outlook, making it the only site in France that could truly claim to be national.

Among the important Parisian monuments, only the above four achieved the highest status as representatives of the national identity for a long enough period. How can this be explained? An obvious answer would be that they were the only monuments that uninterruptedly served as settings for major national ceremonies, that is remained “active” throughout the period under study. But this is still to beg the question, since what has to be explained is the reason for their choice by successive regimes. Part of the answer seems to lie in their complex architectural form, which rendered them open to different interpretations and made them adaptable to various usages. However, other complex monuments such as the Church of the Madeleine never achieved such a prominent status. An additional factor, then, is the fit, at a certain historical moment, between a monument and the political and cultural suppositions of a regime, which makes the former a preferable vehicle for expressing the ideology of the latter. The Madeleine, for example, which could have fulfilled the role of the revolutionary Panthéon in 1790, had not been completed by then, and the Church of Sainte-Geneviève was chosen instead. However, although the four monuments constituted a system, they maintained among them an inner hierarchy, which made only one of them the main national symbol at a certain period, in accordance with the regime’s view of the nation.

Finally, the relationship between these monuments and French nationalism should be regarded as exceeding mere reflection. As Colette Beaune observed in her book about the birth of French nationalism, “[the] representations of power are themselves powerful.”⁸ Since “the nation” is a cultural and political construct, its symbolic representation in ceremonies, monuments and images makes it a palpable object, comprehensible to a population that has to imagine itself as a unified community.⁹ Symbolic representations of the nation, such as monuments, have, therefore, a creative power as well: they give substance to abstract concepts and enable the spectators to identify themselves with this large and remote entity. Moreover, each particular representation is also a statement about the nature of the nation. Hence quarrels about symbolic representations are actually quarrels about the “correct”

identity of the nation, and the winner is in a position to impose his views concerning this identity.

*

54

My point of departure for the “ceremonial” history of these national monuments is the French Revolution, yet it would be a mistake to claim that nationalist sentiments did not exist in France prior to the Revolution. Such sentiments were, indeed, an integral part of the Old Regime, but they were less central and had different connotations than in the revolutionary and post-revolutionary period.

The nationalist explosion during the French Revolution was the outcome of the confluence of two concepts that each acquired a subversive connotation during the eighteenth century: the fatherland (*la patrie*) and the nation (*la nation*). However, their meaning was not univocal and they could have Christian and monarchist colorings as well.

La patrie – the land of the fathers – originally denoted the place of birth, to which one was attached in a sentimental manner. The Christian connotation of the fatherland, which conferred upon this piece of land a measure of sacredness and stipulated that anyone who died defending it would go directly to heaven, first appeared during the Crusades, when it was applied to the Holy Land. It was then transferred to the French territory, where it was associated with the sacred, mystical body of the Church and afterwards became also identified with the religious personality of the king. Patriotic, Christian and monarchist sentiments went, therefore, hand in hand, since France was also distinguished from other countries by being “very Christian.” During the Enlightenment, however, the *philosophes* accentuated the emotional aspects of the fatherland, where one could live happily and freely among one’s fellow citizens, contrasting it with the formal, distant and despotic kingdom (*royaume*) where the monarch reigned.¹⁰

Likewise, the concept of the nation – derived from the Latin verb to be born – had Christian associations, since it was God who was believed to have created different groups of people (nations), all existing within the same religious framework. In the eighteenth century this concept acquired a more precise legal and political

meaning, relating it to the question of sovereignty. Whereas the absolutist kings claimed that the nation resided entirely in their persons, giving them absolute power, the aristocratic *parlements* regarded themselves as representing the nation against monarchical arbitrariness. On the eve of the Revolution “the nation” enlarged its contours in a radical way. Sieyès defined it succinctly in his celebrated pamphlet *What Is the Third Estate?*, in which he wrote that the nation was the origin of all laws, adding that “what is not part of the Third Estate is not part of the nation,” thus excluding from sovereignty the king, the higher clergy and the aristocracy.¹¹

Nationalist sentiments were known, then, in prerevolutionary France, but they were shared mainly by limited circles within the elite and were subordinated to the higher value system of the Church and the monarchy. It was the Revolution that transformed them into a powerful, popular force which cut itself loose from the tenets of the Old Regime and based itself upon a new set of principles. The political and legal “nation” came into being when the Estates General was replaced by the National Assembly; the egalitarian, emotive fatherland became a cause to fight for when the Prussians and the Austrians invaded France in 1792 and the volunteers marched to the frontier singing of “amour sacré de la patrie.”¹² The nation and the fatherland thus merged to produce the Republic, which was the felicitous combination of a political regime and the people’s pride in their country. Being *patriote* was the same as being *républicain*, and defending *la patrie* meant defending the achievements of the Revolution against its enemies from within and without.

The prerevolutionary verbal attacks against the sacred personality of the king and the Christian principles from which he derived his legitimacy were followed in the Revolution by more extreme acts. Among these one can count the decapitation of Louis XVI in January 1793 and the de-Christianization wave of the years 1793–1794, which included the closure of churches and various acts of iconoclasm. Yet this was not mere destructiveness. The king was executed not because of any particular crime he had committed, but for usurping the power of the nation, and an integral part of the de-Christianization wave were the new cults of Reason and of the Martyrs of Liberty.¹³ The desacralization of the Old Regime did

not leave behind a void; instead there was a transfer of the sacred to new revolutionary values.¹⁴

56

If we assume that the sacred, as a cultural category, exceeds the religious, it would be easier to understand the transformation that occurred during the Revolution. As Moore and Myerhoff claim in a neo-Durkheimian spirit, “an essential quality of the sacred is its unquestionability.”¹⁵ Thus, the sacred tenets of the Old Regime were replaced during the Revolution by the no less sacred ones of the Republic, which included the combined values of the nation and the fatherland. Since both ceremonies and monuments have an aura of eternity and authority – and hence seem unquestionable – it is often by means of them that a sense of the sacred is communicated. However, as Lynn Hunt reminds us, one should not regard the sacred as a stable, homogenizing category that automatically creates a consensus.¹⁶ During the Revolution the new definition of the sacred was itself an arena of fierce contention, not only between the revolutionaries and the supporters of the Old Regime, but also among various groups of revolutionaries. What Hunt fails to mention is that the old sacred and the new were not necessarily mutually exclusive. Even during the Revolution, when the conflict between them was at its height, one could discern elements of continuity which were even more apparent during later, more harmonious periods.

*

Of the four Parisian monuments that were to play such an important role in French nationalism, three had already existed prior to the Revolution: the Panthéon (known then as the new Church of Sainte-Geneviève), the Royal House of Invalides and Notre-Dame Cathedral. These monuments were, then, “implicated,” each in its own way, in the value system of the Old Regime. Nevertheless, they had also acquired nationalist and patriotic connotations that made them excellent candidates for eventual inclusion in the new republican sacred.

The central revolutionary monument, the Panthéon, began its life in a patriotic context in 1744, during the War of the Austrian Succession, in the course of which Louis XV became seriously ill. The king prayed to St. Geneviève for recovery and after regaining

his health promised the canons of the Abbey of Sainte-Geneviève to rebuild their old and ruined church that stood on a hill on the left bank of Paris. St. Geneviève was an apt patroness for the king's prayers as she was an early version of Jeanne d'Arc: a simple shepherdess who lived in the mid-fifth century and averted by her prayers the imminent attack of Attila the Hun on Paris. She became the patron saint of Paris, representing the devotion of the common people to the fatherland and to the Church.

The grandiose ceremony of laying the cornerstone of the new church, in which the king played a dominant role, took place in 1764. The choice of the date was not accidental: a year after the French defeat in the Seven Years' War, the king attempted to ameliorate his image which was tarnished by military failure and the constant criticism of his reign. He had already embarked on an ambitious building program in Paris and the provinces, and the new and imposing edifice was to be its summit. It was designed by Jacques-Germain Soufflot, one of the advanced architects of the period, who planned a gigantic basilica in the shape of a Greek cross, an immense dome in the manner of Saint Peter's Cathedral in Rome, and a vast crypt for the burial of the canons. However, faithful to the neoclassical style of the eighteenth century, it would also have Corinthian columns supporting a large portico with a triangular fronton – all of which made it resemble a Greek temple. It was to become a monument proclaiming the perpetuity of the Christian religion while simultaneously celebrating the French monarchy, the protector of the fatherland. Because of its impressive size, its shape and its location, it was referred to as a Temple of the Nation already before the Revolution.¹⁷

The Royal House of Invalides, built by Louis XIV between 1671 and 1676, was also conceived as a patriotic monument. The decision to build an army hospital and a place of retirement for old soldiers was made in 1668, between the two Dutch campaigns, and its location was related to the king's ambitious urbanization plans that aimed to develop the west side of Paris on the left bank of the Seine. However, being a hospital, the institution was also under the auspices of the Church. Moreover, the Church of Saint-Louis, known also as the soldiers' church, which was built as an integral part of the Invalides and to which was added later a magnificent Royal Chapel, accentuated its religious character.

The vast edifice, capable of lodging several thousand soldiers, was built in a baroque style with large inner courtyards and a tall and ornamented chapel dome that dominated its neighborhood. The Invalides, then, had its own function, but was also an impressive setting for ceremonial occasions. Before the Revolution such occasions were visits of the king and foreign sovereigns, like Peter the Great (1716) and Joseph II (1777), or military funerals. Although important army commanders such as Henri Turenne were buried in the Cathedral of Saint-Denis, the royal necropolis, lesser figures were buried in the crypt under the soldiers' church. However, these were rare occasions, and during the eighteenth century the Invalides did not receive much attention from the monarchy. After the death of Louis XIV it received only two royal visits – by Louis XV in 1718 and Louis XVI in 1788 – and the growing presence of Freemasonic ideas among its residents was detrimental to the influence of the Church.¹⁸ Yet during this period the Invalides continued to receive new veterans, thus keeping its patriotic dimension even though its royal and Christian image was fading.

Notre-Dame Cathedral, the oldest of the four monuments, was also the most important from a religious point of view. Built between 1163 and 1345, during the golden age of the great French Gothic cathedrals, it became the main Christian edifice of Paris and the seat of the city's archbishop. Although the French kings were traditionally crowned in the Cathedral of Reims, Notre-Dame played a major role in religious ceremonies related to the monarchy, notably the royal funerals.¹⁹ Royal funerary processions usually stopped there on their way to Saint-Denis in order to perform the central part of the ceremony, and the cathedral would keep and subsequently display the rich ornaments and objects which were specially created for the ceremony. The cathedral also played a central role in the ceremony of the royal entry, by which the city officially received the new king, showing him deference in exchange for his benevolence.²⁰ Notre-Dame, then, was not only a religious but also a royal monument that displayed the might of the Church and the monarchy, each enhancing the power of the other.

It seems more than coincidence that these monuments share an association with the dead. Bishops and archbishops were buried in

the crypt of Notre-Dame, and funerary monuments of church dignitaries were placed in the deambulatory area; the crypt of the Invalides' Church of Saint-Louis contained the governors' graves, and the crypt of the new Church of Sainte-Geneviève was destined to receive the bodies of its deceased canons. All this was in accordance with old Church custom. Bodies of Christian saints and martyrs, which were regarded as intermediaries between heaven and earth, had been precious cult objects since the early days of the Church.²¹ These bodies rendered the churches in which they were buried especially valuable and turned them into preferred places of burial for believers. As the custom spread, even churches that had no relics became burial grounds for the powerful and the rich, and the communities' cemeteries were built adjacent to them.

However, during the eighteenth century, the connection between churches and cemeteries was severed. In France, among the elite, the process of de-Christianization brought about a change of attitude toward death and the dead body: the emphasis on the physical body and the afterlife was replaced by a growing attention to the survival of the memory of the dead person among the living community.²² In addition, new hygienic notions made the bodies of the dead appear as dangerous to public health, hence as objects that should be removed from residential areas. The consequences of these developments were the closing down of old churchyard cemeteries, a diminution in the number of burials in churches, and a general "exile" of the dead to new cemeteries built outside the city limits. In Paris, for example, four cemeteries were closed in 1780–1782, to be replaced by the cemeteries of Montmartre, Montparnasse and Père-Lachaise, which at this period were situated outside the city.²³

Yet the four Parisian monuments under study moved in the opposite direction. After the French Revolution they became burial places of national heroes, and Notre-Dame – the only monument that did not receive the body of a national hero – was the setting for several magnificent state funerals. Indeed, what turned them into national monuments was, among other factors, the bodies of heroes that were buried in them. They thus combined the Christian practice of burying the body of the saint inside a sacred monument with the new Enlightenment sensibility that underlined the need to preserve the individual's memory among the living.

However, the figure of the saint was replaced by a new kind of hero: the Great Man.

This emblematic figure was promoted by the *philosophes* as a counter-model to the king and the nobility. Unlike the latter pillars of the Old Regime, great men did not inherit their titles, nor were they given them by God; they merited them on the basis of their talents, which were employed in the service of humanity. Great men were, usually, “intellectuals” – scientists, philosophers and writers – although legislators or orators could also join their ranks, providing that their acts contributed to the progress of mankind.²⁴ Upon his death, the great man crossed the threshold to immortality – not that of Christian afterlife, but the memory of future generations. This notion of a non-transcendental eternity was developed by Diderot, who postulated a sacred posterity that would replace “the other world of religious men” and whose task would be to judge the merit of the citizen and to decide whether – and how – to commemorate him.²⁵ During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the characteristics of the great man were modified so that military men and politicians were also admitted to that illustrious company, while posterity became better defined. It was represented by the Nation, which regarded itself as eternal and hence capable of keeping the memory of the great man.²⁶

Like a ceremony, a body itself of a great man was capable of transforming the meaning of the monument. The relationship between these two factors should be considered as complementary: a ceremony was a unique, intense event, limited in time, but capable, through the participation of a large crowd and the accounts of the various media, of making a forceful impact upon the popular imagination; the burial of a hero's body on the premises of a monument created, on the other hand, a more subdued yet continuous presence that had a long-term effect. At times a grave became a place of pilgrimage, like that of the Unknown Soldier under the Arc de Triomphe, but even if it did not attract many visitors, its powerful presence put its stamp on the public image of the monument. For example, the presence of Emile Zola's body in the Panthéon marked it as a “leftist” monument, belonging to the winning side in the Dreyfus affair. However, the transfer of his body to the monument in 1908 had

its own significance, for it was done in an impressive state ceremony that served as a victory celebration for the Dreyfusards.

How do we explain the importance of the presence of the remains of a hero within the monument and its impact upon the cult of the nation? The national hero was, first, a pedagogical figure by means of which nationalistic values could be inculcated in the population. His heroic acts and way of life became exempla which everyone was supposed to follow. However, the emphasis on the physical presence of the dead body and on the monument that “wrapped” it indicated that the function of the hero’s corpse was more than pedagogical. Since the Nation was an abstract notion, the dead hero could serve as its embodiment together with the monument with which he was identified. French nationalism did not in this case develop an elaborate ideology, like that of the king’s two bodies – the one real, flesh and blood, the other mystical, standing for the sacred monarchy.²⁷ However, the manner in which the hero’s body was presented in the ceremony and the attitude of the crowd both during and after the event indicated that the body stood not only for the historical person but also for the entire nation, whose being transcended that of a short-lived individual. Thus the body, the monument and the nation merged and became one and indivisible, as was the French monarchy and the French republic that replaced it.

*

The monumental system typical of the Third Republic, to which Péguy referred, was created gradually by the various successive regimes following the French Revolution. It did not come into being in a linear, cumulative process: not all the regimes accorded the same importance to the same monuments and only some of them attempted to link several monuments and to create a coherent system. However, a political regime cannot always be considered an adequate unit of analysis. At times, the significance of certain monuments changed during the span of one regime because that regime underwent inner changes, and the analysis will have to take cognizance of these transformations as well.

The first major change in the meaning of the monuments occurred during the French Revolution, with the collapse of the

value system of the Old Regime. Of the three existing monuments, the Church of Sainte-Geneviève was the first to be “adopted” by the Revolution, since its neoclassical form and previous national image accorded with the revolutionary spirit.²⁸ After the death of Mirabeau, the famous revolutionary tribune, in April 1791, the church became the Temple of the Great Men – a pedagogical monument and a burial place for the great men of the nation, known afterwards as the Panthéon. The fronton of the monument was covered with an allegorical relief showing the Fatherland surrounded by Virtue, Liberty and Genius, above an inscription “To the Great Men the Fatherland is Grateful.” Christian imagery disappeared from the interior, which became more somber and serene after the abolition of the large lower windows with their colorful stained glass. But more important for the new identity of the monument were the funerary ceremonies held in it, during which bodies of “great men” were transferred to its crypt.

Besides Mirabeau’s funeral, which was a traditional, modest religious ceremony, all the other pantheonizations of the revolutionary decade (1789–1799) were grandiose civic celebrations of the great man and, through him, of the revolutionary values and the sovereign people to which he belonged. Not all the ceremonies had the same atmosphere. While those celebrating the *philosophes* Voltaire (July 1791) and Rousseau (October 1794) were calm and sober, those of the “Martyrs of Liberty” Michel Lepelletier (January 1793) and Jean-Paul Marat (July 1793) were excited and provocative.²⁹ Yet, beyond the differences, these ceremonies identified the Panthéon with the political “nation” in the sense of Sieyès’ pamphlet. Nevertheless, its success was rather limited, since the decision to immortalize contemporary revolutionary leaders in addition to the venerated *philosophes* backfired: the bodies of Mirabeau and Marat were removed from the Panthéon after the period of the Terror, and the pedagogical value of the monument was considerably depreciated. However, it remained an important revolutionary symbol, as proven by its tumultuous history during the nineteenth century.

Notre-Dame also played a role – albeit a brief one – in the new revolutionary cult.³⁰ During the period of the constitutional monarchy it was used as a cathedral for marking major national

events, such as the celebration of 13 July 1792, the day preceding the anniversary of Bastille Day, by a solemn *Te Deum*. However, the traditional association with the monarchy and Christianity left the cathedral on the margins of the revolutionary imagery. This changed with the extreme anti-clerical and anti-monarchist wave of 1793–1794, during which many churches, including Notre-Dame, became the targets of iconoclasts. The cathedral was then closed to Catholic practice and rededicated to the new cult of Reason, which marked its debut with a sumptuous Festival of Reason and Liberty (November 1793) that featured a live allegory of the Goddess of Reason and a huge choir singing the “Hymn to Reason” with the members of the Convention. Other revolutionary events, such as the abolition of slavery, were celebrated in the new Temple of Reason (18 February 1794), until the cult of Reason was officially replaced by the cult of the Supreme Being (May 1794), to which the old cathedral was yet again rededicated. But not for long: after the fall of Robespierre, the Directory returned Notre-Dame to the constitutional clergy (August 1795). Henceforth the ceremonies celebrated there would have a national and religious character. The Parisian cathedral remained a Christian building and none of the succeeding regimes attempted to change its identity again.

Although the Invalides played a minor role in the revolutionary cults, it did not escape the fate of other monuments associated with the Old Regime. Its name was changed in July 1792 from the Royal House of Invalides to the National House of Invalides, while the Royal Chapel became the Temple of Victory and later the Temple of Mars. Yet no major revolutionary ceremony took place in the monument, which continued to function as a military hospital and a home for retired soldiers.

During the revolutionary period, then, two of the three monuments – the Panthéon and Notre-Dame – were identified with the political-national aspect of the Revolution, while the third – the Invalides – became a patriotic monument associated with the war against the foreign enemy. Although these two aspects were both part of the revolutionary discourse, the monuments were not linked in any symbolic way. The frequent political and military upheavals of this chaotic decade prevented the establishment of

the kind of long-standing coordination that was needed for the creation of a monumental system.

64

The coming to power of Napoleon Bonaparte did not significantly modify the meaning of the monuments, but their relative importance was changed. As a result of the conciliatory policy toward the Church, the Panthéon was returned to the clergy in February 1806, and its “republican” fronton was covered, but it continued to serve as a burial place for those whom the Emperor held in high esteem.³¹ However, these were no longer the “great men” of the Enlightenment, but state dignitaries and useful servants of the Empire such as senators, ministers and cardinals. The “inflation” of interments – 49 during the First Empire – and the choice of the Cathedral of Saint-Denis, the old royal necropolis, as the future burial place for Napoleon and his family, reduced the Panthéon to secondary status. Moreover, it no longer represented the national principle, and only the civil servants of the regime were buried there in compensation for their loyalty to the Emperor.

Notre-Dame Cathedral was a better place to mark the new alliance between the regime and the Church. Indeed, the promulgation of the Concordat that was signed with Pope Pius VII was celebrated there in April 1802 in a grand religious ceremony with the participation of Napoleon and the highest officials of the regime. Notre-Dame was also the site of the Emperor’s magnificent coronation ceremony in December 1804, a site which he preferred to the customary Cathedral of Reims. Thus Napoleon could, at the same time, underline the continuity of his regime with the religious tradition of the French monarchy and mark a new beginning by choosing Paris, the symbol of the people whom he had claimed to represent.

Yet, the aspect of the regime that was most accentuated through the symbolic use of monuments was neither the civil nor the religious, but the military. The importance of the Invalides grew steadily: this was where the ceremonies celebrating the victory in the Battle of Marengo (July 1800) and awarding the medals of the newly created Order of the Legion of Honor were held, both in the presence of Napoleon. In addition, the Invalides became a necropolis for the military heroes of France: the body of Henri Turenne, the famous seventeenth-century commander, was

solemnly transferred there (September 1800), as well as the heart of Vauban, the military engineer of Louis XIV (1808), and the bodies of military commanders who fell in Napoleon's European campaigns.

Napoleon also desired a new military monument to celebrate his own unprecedented achievements on the battlefield. Three months after his great victory at Austerlitz he ordered the construction of an arch of triumph that would commemorate the glory of the French army (February 1806). At first, he envisaged building the arch in the empty Place de la Bastille, a revolutionary site and also the route traditionally taken by the armies returning from the east. However, he finally opted for the hill of the Etoile in the western outskirts of the city, away from the densely populated quarters of eastern Paris, which offered a large empty space for impressive army parades.³² The monument's neoclassical form was in tune with the aesthetics of the Revolution, but Napoleon, no doubt, wanted to resuscitate the tradition of the Roman Empire and not the Roman Republic. The huge Arc de Triomphe, which was to include allegorical reliefs depicting the heroism of the French army and inscriptions commemorating victorious battles and commanders, was not completed during the First Empire. Nevertheless, it was used in April 1810 for the entry of the new Empress Marie-Louise, whose procession passed through a provisional structure built upon the foundations of the arch.

65

The other military monument built by Napoleon also commemorated the victory at Austerlitz: the Austerlitz Column (known today as the Vendôme Column) was built in 1810 on Place Vendôme in the western part of Paris, replacing the equestrian statue of Louis XIV that had been destroyed during the Revolution. A statue of the Emperor was placed on top of the tall column, which was covered with battle scenes engraved in bronze taken from the cannons captured at Austerlitz. The choice of Place Vendôme testified to Napoleon's tendency to use the western, upper-class part of the city around his Tuileries Palace for erecting ostentatious symbols of his power, instead of the popular eastern part. Since his legitimacy largely rested on his military success, the monuments that he either upgraded or created were related to the patriotic side of French identity. His monumental system would

have included the Invalides, the Arc de Triomphe, the Austerlitz Column and Notre-Dame. However, his fall in 1814 prevented this system from coming into being.

66

The Bourbon Restoration of Louis XVIII and Charles X, the most reactionary regime of the post-revolutionary period, adopted a monumental policy that countered that of both the Revolution and the First Empire. The Panthéon was totally restituted to the Church, and on 21 January 1822 – the anniversary of the execution of Louis XVI – it was given to the Order of the French Missionaries. The revolutionary relief and the inscription on the fronton were removed, and the custom of burying a “great man” or a dignitary in the crypt was abandoned. Notre-Dame, in contrast, became the most important monument of the restored monarchy, which derived its legitimacy from its alliance with the Church. All the major ceremonies of the regime – except for the coronation of Charles X in Reims – took place in the Parisian cathedral. They included, for example, the expiation ceremony for Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette (May 1814), the marriage of the Duc de Berry (June 1816), the baptism of the Duc de Bordeaux (May 1821) and the funerals of the Prince de Condé (May 1818) and Louis XVIII (October 1824). Most of these ceremonies were also religious rites so that the Christian and the royal aspects of the regime reinforced each other.

But the Bourbons knew that they could not simply turn back the clock to the prerevolutionary period and reestablish the Old Regime. If there was no question of evoking the sovereignty of the nation, they could make an appeal to the patriotic sentiments of the people on condition that these sentiments would be associated with the monarchy. Hence the increasing role of the army, which took part in all the official ceremonies alongside the clergy. In addition, the bodies of army commanders continued to be buried in the Invalides and construction of the Arc de Triomphe was resumed in 1823 after the victories of the French army in Spain. The new decoration envisaged for the monument was to highlight the Spanish campaign and its commander, the Duc d'Angoulême, but the July Revolution of 1830 interrupted the hesitant progress of the work. The other Bonapartist monument, the Austerlitz Column, also became a Bourbon monument by the substitution of

an enormous fleur-de-lys, the royal symbol, for the figure of Napoleon.

Nonetheless, the regime's military-patriotic aspect as manifested in the monuments remained a minor one. The return to religion and to the glorious royal past marked the Bourbon Restoration to such a degree that of the four monuments only Notre-Dame continued to play a central role in its symbolic representation.

The July Revolution brought to the throne a citizen-king, Louis-Philippe of Orleans, who owed as much to the French Revolution and its national/patriotic discourse as to the Old Regime. In certain respects, therefore, the monumental system that he attempted to create prefigured that of the Third Republic, which also combined the two aspects of the Revolution. An anti-clerical attitude predominated in the first years of the regime, which could be explained partly by the revival of the revolutionary viewpoint and partly by the reaction to the clericalism of the hated Bourbons. No wonder that one of the new king's first steps was to take the Panthéon out of the hands of the Church and convert it, once more, into a Temple of the Great Men (26 August 1830). The original, revolutionary inscription was restored, and the sculptor David d'Angers was commissioned to prepare a new allegorical relief for the fronton, depicting the Fatherland, History, Liberty and the figures of great men such as Rousseau, Voltaire and Mirabeau.

Another means of affirming the new regime's attachment to the values of the French Revolution was the erection of the July Column in the Place de la Bastille, the symbol of triumph over the monarchy. The bodies of the victims of the July Revolution were buried at its base, while its top was surmounted by a statue representing the spirit of Liberty.³³ The two monuments that represented the nation as a popular force – the July Column and the Panthéon – were linked on the first anniversary of the July Revolution. The ceremony, led by Louis-Philippe, began with laying the foundation of the column, continued with a procession that paused at Notre-Dame on its way to the Panthéon, and ended there with an impressive spectacle, during which a large choir sang the *Marseillaise*, and a poem by Victor Hugo, in honor of the victims of the July Revolution, was recited.

The two monuments continued to be associated each year, on the anniversary of the July Revolution, by an official procession, but their importance rapidly declined. After the crystallization of a republican opposition, first manifested in Paris in the riots that took place during the funeral of General Lamarque (June 1832), the regime became gradually more authoritarian, distancing itself from the popular symbols of the French Revolution. While the republicans made several failed attempts to transfer their dead leaders to the Panthéon, the government closed the crypt to the public and, despite its initial decision, did not bury any “great man” there. David d’Anger’s relief, which included also the republican leaders La Fayette and Manuel, was discreetly unveiled in September 1837, and other ambitious decorative plans were dropped. The July Column was finally inaugurated on the anniversary of July 1840, with the reluctant participation of Louis-Philippe, who was afraid to set foot in the popular quarter of eastern Paris which was the bastion of the opposition.³⁴

Notre-Dame Cathedral, which at first played a minor role in the Orleanist monumental system, gained in importance as the regime moved away from its anti-clerical, revolutionary stance. After Fieschi’s failed assassination attempt (28 July 1835), the king participated in a *Te Deum* of gratitude in Notre-Dame, and he also chose it for the baptism of his grandson (1841) and the funeral of his son (1842). However, the Enlightenment tradition, to which the regime belonged, did not enable the cathedral to regain the central place it had occupied during the Restoration.

After the initial, popular phase of the regime, the emphasis shifted from the eastern to the western part of the city and the Bonapartist monuments that stood for the military-patriotic tradition of the nation. At the top of the Austerlitz Column, the figure of Napoleon again replaced the Bourbon fleur-de-lys, and the construction of the Arc de Triomphe continued according to the original decorative plan, which glorified the armies of the Revolution and the Empire. The arch was solemnly inaugurated in July 1836 for the anniversary of the July Revolution, and it was used afterwards for the entry of the king’s daughter-in-law to Paris (1837) and for the passage of his son’s funerary procession (1842).

Yet, of the three Bonapartist monuments, it was the Invalides that became the most important for the regime. Not only did it

continue to receive the bodies of military commanders, but it also became the burial site of the victims of Fieschi's assassination attempt and the body of Napoleon. The latter's funeral ceremony in December 1840 became a spectacular event that greatly enhanced the cult of the Emperor, who had died in 1821 in his place of exile in Sainte-Hélène.³⁵ But, although the funeral contributed to the career of Louis-Napoleon Bonaparte, the future Emperor Napoleon III, it was meant at the time to help the July Monarchy recruit for its own benefit the military glory of the late Emperor. After a long maritime voyage, led by the king's son, the Prince de Joinville, the body arrived at Courbevoie, to the west of Paris. On its way to the Invalides, where the king awaited it, the imposing funeral procession passed through the Arc de Triomphe and the decorated Champs Elysées, before a huge crowd estimated at a million people. The ceremony could have been longer and more elaborate, but the regime was apprehensive of the subversive potential of the expected crowd and shortened the route and the duration of the procession. With the coffin of Napoleon in its midst, the Invalides soon eclipsed the Austerlitz Column as the center of the Bonapartist cult and reinforced its position as a monument identified with the French military-patriotic tradition.

During the July Monarchy, then, two monumental systems, representing the two aspects of French nationalism, emerged one after the other: first that of eastern Paris (Panthéon–July Column) and then that of western Paris (Austerlitz Column–Arc de Triomphe–Invalides), with Notre-Dame taking part occasionally in each. The two systems remained separated, and the fact that the regime could maintain only one of them at a time demonstrated its inner contradictions: although it had been established as a result of a popular revolution, it still remained a monarchy, albeit underplaying its religious foundations. Its main recourse for obtaining legitimacy was, therefore, the patriotic tradition, but even that was perceived as a potential threat to its stability, as shown in the case of the return of Napoleon's remains.

The Second Republic, born of the February 1848 Revolution, did not survive long enough to create a coherent policy concerning the use of the main national monuments. However, as in the period immediately following the July 1830 Revolution, it placed emphasis on the two popular monuments of eastern Paris.³⁶ The

Panthéon was to remain a republican monument, but it acquired a broader, supra-national significance: it was renamed the Temple of Humanity, and the painter Paul Chevanard was commissioned to prepare a series of murals that would depict the history of the human race from Biblical times to Napoleon, including episodes from the history of the major religions (a plan that was never executed).³⁷

70

The July Column, located in the heart of the popular quarters of Paris and linking the revolutions of 1789 and 1830, played a more active role both in the revolutionary events themselves and in the official ceremonies of the new regime. It was the meeting place for anti-government demonstrators at the end of February, and the destination of their march from the Panthéon on 23 June 1848 during the insurrection against the bourgeois regime of the Second Republic. It was also the terminus of solemn processions, such as the one celebrating the provisional government (27 February) and those of the funerals of republican leader Armand Carrel (2 March) and the victims of the February fighting (4 March). However, the Column was not utilized after this initial radical phase of the Revolution. The turning point came on 6 July, when the funeral procession of the June Days' victims, which had been intended to terminate at the Column, stopped at the Church of the Madeleine in the western part of Paris because the organizers did not dare venture into the eastern part of the city.

The revolutionaries, in contrast to their predecessors of 1789 and 1830, were not hostile to religion and did not attempt to change the identity of Notre-Dame or the Invalides. Nonetheless, they refrained from using these monuments in any of the regime's major ceremonies. The Arc de Triomphe retained its patriotic identity and was the setting for the official Festival of Fraternity on 20 April 1848 that celebrated the alliance between the army and the young Republic. However, it was not the only site in western Paris to be used by the Republic. The Place de la Concorde, with its Egyptian obelisk, was the point of departure for the funerals of 4 March and 6 July and also the setting for the official proclamation of the new regime on 23 April. The Festival of Harmony took place on 21 May on the Champ de Mars, the empty space often used for celebrations during the French Revolution and where the Eiffel Tower was later erected.

The Second Republic thus accentuated the division between the monuments in the eastern and western parts of Paris and only rarely linked them, as in the case of the 4 March funeral which began in the Place de la Concorde and ended at the July Column. The Republic was thus either popular and insurrectional or serene, bourgeois and patriotic. However, as in the French Revolution, the rapid political changes that took place between 1848 and 1851 prevented the establishment of a stable monumental policy even within these categories.

Louis-Napoleon Bonaparte, the first president of the Republic, was also its liquidator. The regime that he founded resembled, at least in the way it presented itself to the public, that of his glorious uncle. It had the same authoritarian, clerical and patriotic characteristics of the First Empire, and the four main national monuments were all enlisted in its service.

The Panthéon, which until then had been associated with the popular-national tradition, underwent the most radical transformation. Four days after the coup d'état of 2 December 1851, which practically abolished the Republic, it was given back to the Church, and the cult of Sainte-Geneviève replaced that of the great men. During the consecration ceremony of the repossessed church on 3 January 1853 the reliquary of the patroness of Paris was deposited there, and in 1857 a sculpture representing her overcoming Attila and saving the city by her prayers was placed in the entry to the nave. Thus, as in the times of Louis XV, the Church of Sainte-Geneviève again marked the alliance between patriotism and Catholicism. Yet this act did not signal a mere return to the Old Regime; the cult of the saint was now more accentuated, for since then patriotism had become a popular force, capable of mobilizing the masses.

The other religious monument, Notre-Dame, was of even greater significance for the Second Empire as it linked the regime both with the French monarchical tradition and with Napoleon I who had been crowned there. The disintegrating cathedral was finally restored by the architect Viollet-le-Duc³⁸ and was associated with the regime by a series of ceremonies: the celebration of the plebiscite of 21 November 1851 which ratified the constitution of the Second Empire (1 January 1853); the marriage of Napoleon III (30 January 1853); the celebration of the victory of Sebastopol

(17 September 1855); and the baptism of the imperial prince (14 June 1856). All these ceremonies were attended by representatives of the clergy and the army, as well as state officials, thus uniting the forces that constituted the foundation of the regime.

72

However, the regime's symbolic center of gravity lay in western Paris, especially in the two monuments that were by then closely associated with Napoleon I: the Arc de Triomphe and the Invalides. For the declaration of the Second Empire on 2 December 1852, Napoleon III made his solemn entry into Paris through the arch, which was afterwards used as the gate of entry for visits by foreign sovereigns. The fact that Napoleon's body was buried in the Invalides made it the regime's most important monument, especially after a special open crypt was built to contain an impressive porphyry sarcophagus in which the body was placed (inaugurated in April 1861 in the presence of Napoleon III). The Invalides also became the burial place for other members of the Bonaparte family, as well as for high-ranking army officers who served the regime, with each of the funerals celebrated as a military-religious ceremony. The monument thus combined the functions of Saint-Denis and the Panthéon: it became a familial and military necropolis that was to begin a new tradition and legitimize the regime.

Each of the four national monuments represented, to various degrees, the patriotic-religious nature of the Second Empire. However, they remained isolated, and connections were not formed between them during processions or decorations. It was perhaps their very similarity that made such linking unnecessary, for any one of them sufficed to express the basic values of the regime.

The Third Republic, which replaced the Second Empire after the defeat in the battle against Germany at Sedan on 2 September 1870, was more heterogeneous in its outlook. It was the only regime since the French Revolution that succeeded in combining both aspects of French identity: the popular-national emphasis on the sovereignty of the people, and the military-patriotic eagerness to defend the fatherland. The regime accordingly developed a complex monumental system, which endured, with modifications (notably after World War I), until its fall in 1940.

The national monuments' change of identity from Bonapartist to republican did not, however, occur immediately. The republican regime established itself securely only in 1879, and even though it claimed to be the heir to the ideals of the French Revolution, it did not advocate social revolution and was apprehensive of any rapid change. Moreover, despite its anti-clericalism, it was at times ready to accommodate the Church and did not wish to upset Catholic public opinion by provocative symbolic action. Lastly, although the regime was driven by the patriotic desire to recover Alsace and Lorraine, the territories that had been lost to Germany in the 1870/71 war, it refrained from any steps that could have been interpreted as bellicose. In sum, although it reversed in many respects the tendencies of the Second Empire, it was a moderate regime that did not repudiate entire parts of the French past, as the French Revolution had done with the Old Regime, and the Bourbon Restoration with the revolutionary period. Like the July Monarchy, it regarded as its own both the pre- and post-revolutionary periods, emphasizing the features that fitted its own view of French identity. But whereas the Orleanists had turned consecutively to different periods of the French past, the republicans managed to evoke all of them simultaneously.

It was the death in 1885 of Victor Hugo, the epitome of the republican "great man," that gave the republicans the opportunity to begin transforming the identity of the monuments.³⁹ His "natural" burial place was the Panthéon, the revolutionary Temple of Great Men, but since he had demanded in his will a secular funeral, the monument had to be desacralized. Hugo was also associated with the cult of Napoleon I, whom he had admired, and with the Arc de Triomphe, about which he had written in his poetry. Hugo's body lay in state under the magnificently decorated arch, from where the funeral procession departed to the Panthéon whose Christian emblems had been hastily removed. The Bonapartist arch was then "rehabilitated" as a republican monument, while the Panthéon was again taken out of the hands of the Church, despite the latter's protests, and returned to the Republic. The ceremony, attended by an enormous crowd of over a million people, symbolically linked the two aspects of French identity embodied in the Republic. This was the first step in the construction of the monumental system.

The other two monuments, previously identified with non-republican traditions, were eventually also “appropriated” by the Republic. Unlike the Church of Sainte-Geneviève, Notre-Dame could not be desacralized; not only would such an act have outraged Catholic public opinion, but the republicans regarded themselves as heirs to the French monarchy as well, particularly to its patriotic dimension. They preferred, therefore, to perform in Notre-Dame the religious part of some of their important state funerals, such as those of the scientist Louis Pasteur (October 1895) and the President of the Republic Felix Faure (February 1899). At President Carnot’s state funeral in July 1894 the funeral procession that departed from the Elysée Palace to the burial in the Panthéon paused for a religious service in the cathedral, which was decorated with black crepe and tricolor flags. The clergy did not accompany the President’s body to the Panthéon, but the funeral nonetheless linked France’s most highly regarded religious and secular monuments, thereby demonstrating the Republic’s integrative capability.

The Invalides continued to be dedicated to the cult of the army and to be the site of state funerals of important commanders such as Marshals MacMahon, the ex-President of the Republic (October 1893), and Canrobert (February 1895). Its Bonapartist dimension was subsumed under a more general military identity and it was also associated with the achievements of the French Revolution. One of the historical processions that crossed the city from west to east on the centenary of the First Republic (September 1892) departed from the Invalides toward Austerlitz Bridge, while the heart of the revolutionary commander La Tour d’Auvergne was deposited in the monument in 1904. On the first Bastille Day of World War I (14 July 1915), the body of Captain Rouget de Lisle, the author of the revolutionary hymn *La Marseillaise*, was reburied there in a ceremony intended to uplift the country’s morale. The funeral procession, led by President Raymond Poincaré, began at the Arc de Triomphe, thus linking the two monuments of French military glory.

The most prominent of the four Parisian monuments constituting the system was the Panthéon, for it represented the popular-national aspect of the Republic which, after the defeat by Germany, could take more pride in its great men than in its

soldiers. It accordingly played the central role in the centenary of the French Revolution⁴⁰ and also served as the burial ground for several eminent personalities: President Sadi Carnot (1894), the scientist Mercein Berthelot (1907) and the writer Emile Zola (1908), who was reburied there after the acquittal of Captain Alfred Dreyfus.

The French victory in World War I, won at the cost of a high toll in human life, changed the inner hierarchy among the monuments. Pride in the recovery of Alsace and Lorraine was mingled with mourning for the fallen soldiers,⁴¹ and both led to the predominance of the military-patriotic aspect of the Republic in the interwar years. Moreover, France was ruled during most of this period by center-Right governments that were less concerned with the popular-national aspect than the prewar governments. Consequently, the monuments that were associated with the army became more prominent, notably the Arc de Triomphe.

The first sign of this change was the impressive victory parade of 14 July 1919 that departed from the arch. But the event that determined the new status of the monument was the burial there of the body of the Unknown Soldier. The question whether to bury this symbol of French heroism in the Panthéon or under the Arc de Triomphe was hotly debated in the Chamber of Deputies, and the latter was chosen both because of its military-patriotic associations and because the former, with the Dreyfusard Zola in its crypt, was perceived as a leftist and hence a divisive monument.⁴² In a single moving ceremony on 11 November 1920 the body of the Unknown Soldier was transferred to the arch, and the heart of the founding father of the regime, Léon Gambetta, to the Panthéon, for the same event marked both Armistice Day and the 50th anniversary of the Third Republic.

Thus, as in the case of Hugo's funeral, the Arc de Triomphe and the Panthéon were associated in the same ceremony. However, in the ensuing period the former became the main symbol of the proud but grief-stricken country that emerged out of World War I. It became a popular as well as an official place of pilgrimage and the site of the annual ceremony marking Armistice Day, in which the highest dignitaries of the state participated. Moreover, in March 1929 the body of Marshal Foch, one of the heroes of World War I, lay there in state, a rare tribute that demonstrated

the importance of the arch. The status of the Invalides, which received his body, was also enhanced, since many of the funerals of war commanders took place in its church, notably that of Marshal Joffre in January 1931.

76

In this monumental system of the interwar years Notre-Dame became a kind of middle point that lay, both geographically and symbolically, between the military monuments of the west and the Panthéon in the east of Paris. It was used both in military state funerals, such as those of Foch and Joffre, as a stopping place between the Arc de Triomphe and the Invalides, and in civilian state funerals, such as that of ex-President Poincaré, which began at the Panthéon (October 1934). Meanwhile, the popular-nationalist image of the Temple of the Great Men was enhanced when in November 1924 a short-lived left-wing coalition government transferred to it the body of Jean Jaurès, the socialist leader assassinated on the eve of World War I. Despite the changes in the interwar period, the stability of the monumental system of the Third Republic testified to its success in maintaining a long-term equilibrium between the two dimensions of French identity. This success was one of the factors that contributed to the regime's outstanding longevity compared with the other regimes since the French Revolution.

*

The "ceremonial history" of these four Parisian monuments, from their birth to the point in time when they constituted a coherent system, demonstrates that in order to continue to be relevant to French society they had to be transformed, time and again, by their ritualistic usage.⁴³ Their original meaning, inscribed in stone, was not effaced, but it became part of a wider meaning that resulted from the encounter between the ceremonial action and the space of the monument. Monuments that ceased to be the setting for public ceremonies, such as the Vendôme Column, continued to be part of the Parisian landscape, but became mere tourist attractions. They no longer participated in the changing history of France and were contemplated, both by Frenchmen and foreigners, on an individual basis. Thus, only a ceremony, as a collective act, conferred upon a monument a meaning that could

be relevant to a new generation. Hence also the importance of the encounter between the ceremony and the monument for constructing a collective memory.⁴⁴ Even though the participants in the ceremony were not always familiar with the monument's role in the nation's history, in their memory they integrated the ceremonial action and the monumental space. The monument thus became a site of memory, not only of French history, but also of the stately ceremony that had taken place.

Notes

78

- * I would like to thank the German-Israeli Foundation for Scientific Research and Development for its financial help that enabled me to carry out the research on which this article is based.
- 1 Charles Péguy, *Oeuvres en prose, 1898–1908* (Paris, 1959), 1:813.
 - 2 Ibid.
 - 3 See Pierre Nora, “Entre Mémoire et Histoire: La problématique des lieux,” in idem, ed., *Les lieux de mémoire*, vol. 1, *La République* (Paris, 1984), xvi–xlii. For the relationship between space and collective memory, see Maurice Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory* (New York, 1980), 128–57.
 - 4 See Sally Moore and Barbara Myerhoff, “Secular Ritual: Forms and Meanings,” in idem, eds., *Secular Ritual* (Assen, 1977), 3–24.
 - 5 For the significance of the location of the four monuments, see Avner Ben-Amos, “The Sacred Center of Power: Paris and the State Funerals of the French Third Republic,” *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 22, no. 1 (Summer 1991): 27–48.
 - 6 For the notion of the procession as a text, see Mary Ryan, “The American Parade: Representations of the Nineteenth-Century Social Order,” in Lynn Hunt, ed., *The New Cultural History* (Berkeley, 1989), 131–53.
 - 7 For a recent discussion of the distinction between this kind of nationalism and the older, “open” nationalism, see Zeev Sternhell, “The Political Culture of Nationalism,” in Robert Tombs, ed., *Nationhood and Nationalism in France from Boulangism to the Great War, 1889–1918* (London, 1991), 22–38.
 - 8 Colette Beaune, *Naissance de la nation France* (Paris, 1985), 344. For the relationship between symbols and political power, see also Clifford Geertz, “Centers, Kings and Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power,” in idem, *Local Knowledge* (New York, 1983), 121–46.
 - 9 See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London, 1991), 1–36.
 - 10 For the concept of the fatherland in French nationalism, see Beaune, *Naissance de la nation France*, Alphonse Dupront, “Du Sentiment National,” in Michel François, ed., *La France et les français* (Paris, 1972),

- 1423–72; Ernst Kantorowicz, “*Pro Patria Mori* in Mediaeval Political Thought,” *American Historical Review* 56 (1951): 472–92; Philippe Contamine, “Mourir pour la patrie,” in Nora, ed., *Les lieux de mémoire*, vol. 2, *La Nation* (Paris, 1986), 3:11–43; Norman Hampson, “La Patrie,” in *The French Revolution and the Creation of Modern Political Culture*, vol. 1, *The Political Culture of the French Revolution*, ed. Colin Lucas (Oxford, 1988), 125–38.
- 11 Emmanuel Sieyès, *Qu'est-ce que le tiers état?* (Paris, 1988), 41. For the concept of the nation in French nationalism, see Maurice Cranston, “The Sovereignty of the Nation,” in Lucas, ed., *The Political Culture of the French Revolution*, 97–104; Nora, “La Nation,” in François Furet and Mona Ozouf, eds., *A Critical Dictionary of the French Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass., 1989), 742–52; Conor Cruise O’Brien, “Nationalism and the French Revolution,” in Geoffrey Best, ed., *The Permanent Revolution: The French Revolution and Its Legacy* (London, 1988), 17–48; Jacques Godechot, “The New Concept of the Nation and Its Diffusion in Europe,” in Otto Dann and John Dinwiddy, eds., *Nationalism in the Age of the French Revolution* (London, 1988), 13–26.
- 12 “The sacred love of the fatherland” – thus begins the last stanza of the *Marseillaise*.
- 13 The Martyrs of Liberty were three famous murdered revolutionaries: Marat, Chaliier and Lepelletier. See Antoine de Baecque, “Le corps meurtri de la Révolution: Le discours politique et les blessures des martyrs, 1792–1794,” *Annales Historiques de la Révolution Française*, no. 267 (Jan.–Mar. 1987): 17–41.
- 14 For the notion of the revolutionary transfer of the sacred, see Mona Ozouf, *La fête révolutionnaire, 1789–1799* (Paris, 1976), 317–40; Roger Chartier, *Les origines culturelles de la Révolution française* (Paris, 1990), 133–37.
- 15 Moore and Myerhoff, “Secular Ritual,” 3.
- 16 Lynn Hunt, “The Sacred and the French Revolution,” in Jeffrey Alexander, ed., *Durkheimian Sociology: Cultural Studies* (Cambridge, 1990), 25–43.
- 17 This expression is mentioned in a work on Soufflot published in 1785. Quoted in Daniel Rabreau, “La Basilique Sainte-Geneviève de Soufflot,” in *Le Panthéon, Symbole des Révolutions* (Paris, 1989) (hereafter *Le Panthéon*), 48.
- 18 See *Les Invalides: Trois siècles d'histoire* (Paris, 1974), 227–28.
- 19 Ralph Giesey, *The Royal Funeral Ceremony in Renaissance France* (Geneva, 1960), 35–36.
- 20 Lawrence Bryant, *The King and the City in the Parisian Royal Entry Ceremony: Politics, Ritual and Art in the Renaissance* (Geneva, 1986).

- 21 Peter Brown, *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (Chicago, 1981); Philippe Ariès, *L'homme devant la mort* (Paris, 1977), 1:37–96.
- 22 Michel Vovelle, *Piété baroque et déchristianisation en Provence au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1978), and *La Mort et l'Occident de 1300 à nos jours* (Paris, 1983), part 5, 367–506.
- 23 Ariès, *L'homme devant la mort*, 2:204–205.
- 24 For the figure of the Great Man in 18th-century France, see Mona Ozouf, “Le Panthéon,” in Nora, ed., *La République*, 139–66; Jean-Claude Bonnet, “Naissance du Panthéon,” *Poétique* 33 (Feb. 1978): 46–65.
- 25 Quoted in Bonnet, “Les morts illustres, oraison funèbre, éloge académique, nécrologie,” in Nora, ed., *La Nation* 3:220.
- 26 Cf. Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 9–12.
- 27 Ernst Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, 1957).
- 28 For the Panthéon during the French Revolution, see Ozouf, “Le Panthéon”; Mark Deming, “Le Panthéon Révolutionnaire,” in *Le Panthéon*, 97–150.
- 29 See Ben-Amos, “‘Aux Grands Hommes, La Patrie Reconnaissante’: The French Revolution and the Emergence of Republican State Funerals,” *Tel Aviver Jahrbuch für deutsche Geschichte* 18 (1989): 305–34; Jacques Guilhaumou, *La Mort de Marat* (Paris, 1989).
- 30 For the history of Notre-Dame, see Alain Erlande-Brandenburg, “Notre-Dame de Paris,” in Nora, ed., *Les lieux de mémoire*, vol. 3, *Les France* (Paris, 1992), 3: 359–401.
- 31 Barry Bergdoll, “Le Panthéon/Sainte-Geneviève au XIXe siècle: La monumentalité à l'épreuve des révolutions idéologiques,” in *Le Panthéon*, 175–233.
- 32 For the east-west division of Paris, see Maurice Agulhon, “Paris,” in Nora, ed., *Les France* 3:868–909.
- 33 The allegorical statue was masculine, since a female figure could have been mistaken for an allegory of the Republic – an association the July Monarchy preferred not to evoke. The revolutionary attachment had its limits. See Agulhon, *Marianne au Combat: L'Imagerie et la Symbolique Républicaines de 1789 à 1880* (Paris, 1979), 64.
- 34 See Agulhon, “Paris,” 883.
- 35 For the “Return of the Remains” of Napoleon Bonaparte, see Jean Tulard, “Le retour des Cendres,” in Nora, ed., *La Nation* 3:81–110; Jean-Marcel Humbert, ed., *Napoléon aux Invalides: 1840, Le Retour des Cendres* (Paris, 1990).
- 36 For the festivals and ceremonies of the Second Republic, see Agulhon,

- “Fête Spontanée et Fêtes Organisées à Paris en 1848,” in Jean Ehrard and Paul Viallaneix, eds., *Les Fêtes de la Révolution* (Paris, 1977), 243–71.
- 37 See Marie-Antoinette Grunewald, *Paul Chevanard et la décoration du Panthéon de Paris en 1848* (Lyon, 1977).
- 38 See Bruno Foucart, “Viollet-le-Duc et la restauration,” in Nora, ed., *La Nation* 2:613–49.
- 39 For Hugo’s state funeral, see Ben-Amos, “Les funérailles de Victor Hugo,” in Nora, ed., *La République*, 473–522.
- 40 For the centenary of the French Revolution, see Pascal Ory, “Le Centenaire de la Révolution française,” in *ibid.*, 523–60.
- 41 See George L. Mosse, *Fallen Soldiers: Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars* (Oxford, 1990), 70–106.
- 42 For the cult of the Unknown Soldier in France and the role of the Arc de Triomphe in this cult, see Antoine Prost, *Les Anciens Combattants et la Société Française, 1914–1939* (Paris, 1977), 3:35–38; and K. S. Inglis, “Entombing Unknown Soldiers: From London and Paris to Baghdad,” in this issue of *History & Memory*.
- 43 Cf. the concept of “ritual-architectural event” in Lindsay Jones, “The Hermeneutics of Sacred Architecture: A Reassessment of the Similitude Between Tula, Hidalgo and Chichen Itza – Part I,” *History of Religions* 32, no. 3 (Feb. 1993): 207–32.
- 44 For the relationship between ceremonial action and collective memory, see Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge, 1989).