Views on Eighteenth Century Culture

Views on Eighteenth Century Culture:

Design, Books and Ideas

Edited by
Leonor Ferrão
and Luís Manuel A. V. Bernardo

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Views on Eighteenth Century Culture: Design, Books and Ideas

Edited by Leonor Ferrão and Luís Manuel A. V. Bernardo

This book first published 2015

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-8100-7
ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-8100-5

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

LEONOR FERRÃO
AND LUÍS MANUEL A. V. BERNARDO

This publication includes contributions by academics from many different fields who study the 18th century, brought together by Eugénio dos Santos to celebrate his work.

Eugénio dos Santos de Carvalho (18 March 1711 – 25 August 1760), or simply Eugénio dos Santos, was one of the most important Portuguese architects and urban planners of the 18th century. His work bridged the reigns of King João V (1706-1750) and King José I (1750-1777), both of which were marked by extraordinarily important cultural, economic, social and political events. His best-known and largest scale project was the plan for rebuilding the *Baixa* area of Lisbon after the earthquake of 1st November 1755, and the respective detail plan (1758): the draft projects for residential and commercial buildings and, finally, the *Praça do Comércio* (including the Stock Exchange), the Council Senate, the Royal Arsenal and the two Customs Buildings. His approach was able to interpret and modernise tradition, although it was integrated into Portuguese architecture and urban planning culture (which goes back to building Portuguese cities in the four corners of the world and the 17th century plain style). He was also influenced by the complex circumstances that surrounded the creation of New Lisbon. The result did not have the magnificence of other great European cities that saw large-scale urban intervention but certainly reflected a modern view of the city. It shows a concern for aesthetics and cleanliness that is coherent with the idea of the capital of an empire and the political pragmatism that characterised King José I's governance. The reconstruction continued, however, in terms of public works, until 1807 (when the royal court left for Brazil to escape the first Napoleonic invasion).

Discussing Eugénio dos Santos therefore means discussing the context of the Enlightenment in Portugal, with its specific characteristics and relationships with other European cultures. This book examines Eugénio dos Santos and the culture of his time, with a particular focus on *books*.

This implies that some chapters are strictly concerned with him, but most of the contributions deal with other works and contexts.

In the 18th century, particularly in countries further away from the great publishing centres, the book, whether handwritten or printed, was a very important instrument for acculturation, the circulation of ideas and the updating of knowledge in all areas, and it was the only one for many readers.

Books allow us to *see* very different things, depending on the reader and the purpose of (re)reading. For Portugal, this aspect was particularly relevant because of religious censorship, political censorship and self-censorship, which restricted reading and the selection of books and authors available in the bookselling market. Consequently, this conditioned both authors' and readers' choices. The criteria for importing foreign titles and publishing texts printed in Portugal, whether by Portuguese authors or translated into Portuguese, as well as the preferences concerning format, were also related to such procedures.

The book – from recommended to prohibited reading – was also an essential tool for achieving "natural nobility" (which at the time was more valuable to some than nobility by birth) and feeding new socialisation practices. For others, it was simply a collectable item. This elitist dimension was obviously related to the knowledge of foreign languages. Readers' level of understanding of the languages in which works were published was one aspect that helped establish a structure for accessing knowledge that had many limiting factors.

For instance, as regards art literature, which included disciplinary texts, most titles found in Portugal were in their original language or in French translations, as some catalogues of book collections belonging to Portuguese architects that have now been discovered show. Of course, besides buying books, architects and artists also wrote and published mostly in Portuguese, thus producing a modern ontological and technical terminology. Nonetheless, books were not only a way of disseminating content: publishing techniques underwent deep transformations and a notable increase in quality over the 18th century, both in terms of typesetting and printing.

Essentially, then, this book discusses books, collections (of books), printed documents, handwritten documents, and drawings, but also ideas, architects, philosophers, writers and printing techniques.

The Editors acknowledge the important support from Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.

PART 1:

ON ARCHITECTURE AND CITY PLANNING

CHAPTER ONE

ROYAL SQUARES, PUBLIC SQUARES AT THE TIME OF ENLIGHTENMENT

MICHEL DELON
UNIVERSITÉ PARIS-SORBONNE, FRANCE

The story of royal squares in Europe was for a long time encumbered with nationalist assumptions. Researchers defended and criticised the idea of a French model that would be exported to the other countries of the continent[1]. This model had become more precise through the squares successively dedicated to Louis XIII, Louis XIV and Louis XV in Paris and in other cities of the French provinces. A programme of geometrical urbanism cleared a space in the middle of which the king's equestrian statue was raised. The control of the horse by its horseman became the image of the control of the State by its sovereign. There are similar cases and reminders of this model in Copenhagen, Lisbon, Naples, then under Spanish rule, and in Cassel[2]. But in the debates preceding and accompanying the building of these squares, the debate is sensitive, argued between a model of personal power that glorifies itself and a model that rather highlights religious reference. In Lisbon, the triumphal arch that

[1] Cf. Louis Réau, *L'Europe française au siècle des lumières*, Paris, Albin Michel, 1951, p. 269-272, chart p. 281, and the critique of this point of view. This model had become Pierre-Yves Beaurepaire, *Le Mythe de l'Europe française. Diplomatie, culture et sociabilités au temps des Lumières*, Paris, Autrement, « Mémoires », 2007.

[2] Richard L. Cleary, *The Place Royale and urban design in the Ancien Régime*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 1999; H. Ziegler, « Le modèle de la place royale française à l'épreuve de l'Europe », Ch. Chastel-Rousseau, « La figure du prince au XVIIIe siècle: monument royal et stratégies de représentation du pouvoir monarchique dans l'espace urbain », *De l'esprit des villes. Nancy et l'Europe urbaine au siècle des Lumières, 1720-1770*, Versailles, Artlys, 2005; Ch. Chastel-Rousseau (ed.), *Reading the royal Monument in Eighteenth-Century Europe*, Farnham, Ashgate, 2011.

connects the square to the city can increase or complete the king's equestrian statue. Eugénio dos Santos thought of the continuity of one monument to another: the glorification of commerce under the high patronage of King José I[3]. In Vienna, Maria Theresa chose to erect a church. In Berlin, Frederick II had a square built to avoid having his own equestrian statue erected there. In Saint Petersburg, Catherine II decided to pay tribute to the founding ancestor, Peter the Great, and in turn, her son Paul I made a point of erecting his own monument in front of his palace, paying tribute to Peter the Great with a second equestrian statue in a more classical style than the pathetic drama imagined by Falconet, with a horse rearing up on a bare stone pedestal.

This story may be renewed in the perspective of the present symposium, taking into account the exchanges between paper, wood and stone architecture. The city is sketched, engraved, and told, before being built in monuments, either ephemeral or durable. Reproduced on paper, it circulates from one country to another; even among those who cannot travel, it becomes the subject of debate beyond the circles of power. The reality of cities built and rebuilt by the will of the most powerful and the richest was imposed on a population reduced to silence. To debate possible cities, to make proposals public and question oneself on the issues of urban choices, transforms individuals from mere witnesses into actors of the city and into citizens of the community. In Paris, the regular organisation of a public exhibition of recent works by the Academy of painting in one of the king's palaces, the Louvre, gives rise to a critical literature which sets the example of a free debate regarding painting and sculpture[4], as the century's musical quarrels started issues that go beyond the aesthetic sphere. The media articles, the brochures and the books multiply and respond; the role of works of art, made for the king, the Church or the State, or for private individuals, leads to questions of private or public patronage. Should art be given to the simple market and to commercial competition or should it depend on a State policy? Is it for

[3] Miguel Figueira de Faria, « 6 June, The king's birthday present: an insight into the history of royal monuments in Portugal at the end of the *Ancient Régime* », in Ch. Chastel-Rousseau (ed.), *Reading the Royal Monument in Eighteenth-Century Europe*, op. cit., p. 79; Leonor Ferrão, « Eugénio dos Santos e a Estátua Equestre : relendo Machado de Castro », in Miguel Figueira de Faria (coord.), *Machado de Castro, da utlilidade da escultura*. Lisbon, Caleidoscópio, 2014, p. 66.

[4] Cf. Richard Wrigley, *The Origins of French Art Criticism, from the Ancien Régime to the Restoration*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1993; René Démoris et Florence Ferran, La Peinture en procès. *L'Invention de la critique d'art au siècle des Lumières*, Paris, presses de la Sorbonne nouvelle, 2001.

private consumption or a vector of public discourse on the origins and values of the community? One of the brochures, for example, has the title, *Observations sur les arts, et sur quelques morceaux de peinture et de sculpture, exposés au Louvre en 1748, où il est parlé de l'utilité des embellissements dans les villes*. The principle of the *Salon* is to be open to the public, therefore to be subject to its judgement. The brochure goes from painting to sculpture and from there, as the title indicates, to sculpture and the Parisian public monuments, and to that which is not yet called urbanism. It discusses in particular the appropriateness of a new theatre. "Isn't it deplorable that in the largest city in Europe, we have a theatre like our *Opéra*, whereas in Parma there is one which, due to its large dimension, amazes whoever sees it? Would it not be possible to have the same thing here?"[5] To embellish a city is to establish a plan, to think about its alignment and plan public monuments which are not only the palaces and the churches, but also the fountains and the theatres.

It is through this space of confrontation and debate that the royal square tends to become a public space. Certain years give examples of this. In 1763, an equestrian statue of the king was erected in a new square in Paris, at the city limits between the Tuileries and the Champs-Elysées, in what is today's Place de la Concorde. The statue was started by Edme Bouchardon and finished by Jean-Baptiste Pigalle[6]. In 1765 in Reims, the city of the crowning of French kings, a new royal square, built after bitter controversies, was finished with the inauguration of a statue of Louis XV, sculpted by Pigalle. In that year's *Salon*, an engraving shows the royal monument. In the same year, a *Description de la place de Louis XV que l'on construit à Reims* by Legendre, the engineer responsible for the construction, was published; as was a treaty by abbé Laugier, *Observations sur l'architecture*, which had a chapter, « Des monuments à la gloire des grands hommes », and a summary of the royal squares and monuments which aimed to produce a theory; and the *Monuments érigés*

[5] [Saint-Yves], *Observations sur les arts, et sur quelques morceaux de peinture et de sculpture, exposés au Louvre en 1748, où il est parlé de l'utilité des embellissements dans les villes*, Leyde, Chez Elias Luzac Junior, 1748, p. 170.

[6] Cf. M. Marin on Parisian royal squares, *Les Monuments équestres de Louis XIV*, Paris, 1986 ; S. Granet, « La Place Louis XV : recueil des différents projets et plans proposés pour la construction d'une place publique destinée à la statue équestre du roi », *La Vie urbaine*, 1962, n° 3; D. Rabreau, « La statue équestre de Louis XV d'Edme Bouchardon », *L'Information d'histoire de l'art*, 1974, n° 2 ; A. Rostaing, « La place Louis XV » et Mark K. Deming, « Les places Louis XVI », *L'Urbanisme parisien au siècle des Lumières*, Action artistique de la ville de Paris, 1997.

en France à la gloire de Louis XV by Pierre Patte, which opens with an introductory reflection, « Des honneurs et des monuments de gloire accordés aux princes et aux grands hommes, tant chez les anciens que chez les modernes. » The three books don't have the same status: Legendre's is a large folio, 48cm x 66cm, accompanied by two full-page engravings and six double-page ones; Patte's is a 28cm x 42cm folio illustrated with 57 drawings, and the several copies in the Parisian libraries in Morocco leather bear the different coats of arms of the royal family. Laugier's book is an octavo, unnecessarily analysing luxurious engravings. If we take into account the simple brochures produced by the *Salon* which were rarely bound, we have knowledge of the extent of the printed production, from the more modest publications to the most prestigious and luxurious objects. There are also the manuscripts: projects which had only one copy stacked in the archives, and periodicals recopied into a few copies, such as Grimm and Meister's literary correspondence, which is distributed according to fifteen princely recipients throughout Europe and in which Diderot confides his judgement to the *Salon* of Pigalle's work in Reims and Bouchardon's in Paris.

The subject of all these texts is the *square* as a space with a meaning, a radiant place which would grant each element of the city its location and its function; a clear space that allowed the sovereign people to gather in a *forum* in the old city, or that stages the ruler and the void to better illustrate the pre-eminence of the king. The equestrian statue shows the king's elevation in relation to the all of his subjects. The social hierarchy is shown, in the passage of time, through the difference between pedestrians and horsemen. The same gap is established between real life horsemen and the bronze horseman. Abbé Laugier ponders the « Monuments à la gloire des grands hommes »[7] (Monuments to the glory of great men). The latter must be commemorated by history and by buildings. First come the princes, who might be celebrated with a "statue in the middle of a large square". Laugier mentions the following squares: Place des Vosges and des Victories and Vendôme – that is, the Parisian squares dedicated to Louis XIII and Louis XIV – not to mention the dauphin square, where the statue of Henry IV is off-centre. He had mentioned the monument very favourably ten years earlier in his *Essai sur l'architecture*: "And what! Does a statue have to essentially have a square? That of Henri IV on the Pont Neuf, is it not in a hundred times more favourable [a] position than all the others?"[8] Worried about a French-style conjuration, he refrains

[7] *Observations sur l'architecture*, La Haye et Paris, Desaint, 1765, p. 226-250.
[8] *Essai sur l'architecture*, Paris, Duchesne, 1755, p. 168.

from mentioning the illustrious Italian models, the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius in the Capitol, those of Gattamelata by Donatello in Padua, that of Bartolomeo Colleoni by Verrocchio in Venice, that of Cosimo I by Jean Bologne in Signoria square in Florence, and those of other countries which are mentioned by Pierre Patte in his own essay. He then proceeds to mention royal squares which had been built in the whole kingdom, in Lyon, Dijon, Bordeaux, Nancy, Rennes and Reims. But he thinks that the limited space in cities will not allow this policy to go on for a long time. It would be necessary, according to him, to replace entire squares, by demolishing them, with more limited monuments which would be less space consuming: triumphal arches, gates, fountains or even columns following the model of the Antonine and Trajan columns. In the *Essai sur l'architecture*, he proposed the transformation of the Pont Neuf into an alley with royal statues. It would only be necessary to install the successors of Henri IV on each side of him. As for illustrious men other than the sovereigns, tribute can be paid to them in galleries or on the peristyles of buildings corresponding to their speciality: the important magistrates in Law Courts, generals in military academies, and scholars, artists and writers in their respective academies. Religious personalities and politicians should have their own memorial places. While waiting for this national recognition, illustrious men would be commemorated at mausoleums installed in the churches' external galleries. The Saint-Denis Abbey should be reorganised so that a bit of chronology and pedagogy can become part of the royal graves. Historical rationalisation imposes itself on the religious and dynastic ritual. All of the final part of the *Observation* has to do with funeral sculptures.

For Laugier, cities cannot have royal squares. The safeguard of the city network excludes an urbanism that is too monumental. As for the idea of establishing those majestic squares outside the city limits, where space is available and land is cheaper, it does not appeal much to the abbé: "The idea, so they say, is to build a square on that large plot of land situated between the Pont Tournant and the Champs-Élysées. I have no doubt that after a lot of expenses, a beautiful thing will be built; but in earnest truth it is a square in the middle of fields, and this reflection is enough to make this project ridiculous."[9] This critique could also apply to the Peyrou square in Montpellier, which will be laid out as a promenade-alley at the entrance of the city. As much as he, on the one hand, praises commemorative statues, he shows reticence with regard to squares which

[9] *Ibid*., p. 167-168. The Pont Tournant then led to the access of the Jardin des Tuileries.

need too much space. He asks about the alignment of streets, but refuses "dull exactitude and a cold uniformity which makes one regret disorder"[10]. A city cannot be a mere "parallelogram crossed in every detail by straight right-angled lines". The Utopian geometry should not destroy the urban clutter and its past experienced memory. Regularity has its limits; historical cities cannot resemble cities built *ex nihilo* or ones rebuilt after a catastrophe, such as the Pombal area in Lisbon[11].

Pierre Patte can be included in the long historical timeline, into the past as well as the future. He remembers the Egyptian and Roman monuments, reduced to ruins, and mentions Paris' future transformations. His book is, in itself, a monument to the king's glory. It is a large book and its illustrations are impressive. But he does not settle on only listing what was built, he supplies the records of the different projects proposed at the same time that d'Ange-Jacques Gabriel's was taken on. He deploys, behind the real capital, a multitude of possible cities. The chosen monument and plan is a palimpsest of all the other imagined proposals. Reality deepens with a virtual world which puts it into perspective. Patte offers the urban issue to public administration; he also subjects it to an opinion, which judges the power's decisions. The projects which were not taken on become objects of reflection, paper architecture, hypotheses which remove absolute character from royal verdicts, utopias that confront reality with other possibilities. Future becomes a page, if not blank, at least one on which to rewrite endlessly. "There is nothing wiser than to sketch on a general plan the wished embellishments, and in the likely places, even if they cannot be carried out but in the long run; what we have started, our nephews will finish. If we had followed this practice in the large cities, we would not see so many public and private works forming a chaotic structure, and whose different parts are not in harmony, do not form a unity or correspond."[12] Regularity here takes its revenge.

Urbanism becomes a choice between several different models, between competing plans. Intellectual work, technical competence, and public

[10] *Ibid*., p. 223.

[11] Cf. *La Ville régulière. Modèles et tracés*, under the direction of X. Malverti and Pierre Pinon, Paris, Picard, 1997.

[12] Patte, *Monuments érigés en France à la gloire de Louis XV, précédés d'un Tableau du progrès des arts et des sciences sous ce règne, ainsi que d'une description des honneurs et des monuments de gloire accordés aux grands gommes, tant chez les Anciens que chez les Modernes, et suivis d'un choix des principaux projets qui ont été proposés, pour placer la statue du roi dans les différents quartiers de Paris*, Paris, Chez l'auteur, Desaint, Saillant, 1765, p. 179.

opinion enter the scene. The projects which plan a Louis XV square on the île de la Cité – connected for the occasion to the île Saint-Louis, in front of the Louvre colonnade, in the middle of the Halles or Saint-Jacques street right in the heart of the Quartier Latin etc. – could have remained on paper in the archives, as the proposals to create a square between the Tuileries and l'Etoile were long forgotten in the « Recueil Marigny », a manuscript that ended up in an aristocratic library of Saint-Petersburg before returning to the west and being bought by the city of Paris in 1995[13]. In publishing them to the great glory of His Majesty, Pierre Patte turns a reserved domain into an object of public debate. In no way should his attitude be compared to that of Necker, the *Compte rendu au roi*, some twenty years later, thus taking the country's finances public for the first time, but in both cases it has to do with publishing; that is, the space of a new *square* for public opinion, no pun intended. Each publication puts a public space to the test, in the sense that Christian Jouhad and Alain Viala tried to renovate Jürgen Habermas' reflection[14]. The royal square is the subject of debate; it virtually becomes a *forum* before being invaded by people as a political force. Richard Wittman showed how, little by little, debate on the city has become more open, in line with the more general debate on art and the monarch's cultural policy. Newspapers included articles on embellishment and projects; the minutes of the Louvre salons integrate the judgments on Parisian urbanism[15].

From the case of Reims, Legendre and Diderot also conceive a royal square as the starting point of an urban reorganisation. Diderot explains: "The square was designed for the city, and the monument for the square"[16] Legendre extends his *Description de la place de Louis XV que l'on construit à Reims par des ouvrages à continuer aux environs de cette place, et de ceux à faire dans la suite pour l'utilité et l'embellissement de cette ville*[17]. The two men have family ties. The king's engineer, Jean-

[13] Cf. Jörg Garms, *Recueil Marigny. Projets pour la place de la Concorde, 1753*, Paris Musées, 2002. Le débat reprend après la mort de Louis XV pour construire une place à son successeur : voir Mark K. Deming, « Louis XVI en l'île. Contribution à l'étude des places royales parisiennes à la fin de l'Ancien Régime », *Revue de l'art*, 83, 1989.

[14] Christian Jouhaud et Alain Viala (éd.), *De la publication entre Renaissance et Lumières*, Paris, Fayard, 2002.

[15] Richard Wittman, *Architecture, Print Culture, and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century France*, New York-Londres, Routledge, 2007.

[16] Diderot, « Le monument de Reims », *Œuvres complètes*, DPV, t. XIII, p. 168.

[17] Legendre, *Description de la place de Louis XV que l'on construit à Reims*, Paris, De l'imprimerie de Prault, 1765.

Gabriel Legendre, general inspector of France's department of civil engineering, as mentioned in the title page of his *Description*, is Sophie Volland, the philosopher's mistress's brother-in-law. Diderot became interested in the Reims project at the very beginning. He informs the subscribers of the *Correspondance littéraire* of his interest in July 1760. A debate starts regarding the site for the statue: should it be placed in a colonnade on one of the sides of the square or at the centre? Diderot is in favour of the centre and approves of Pigalle's invention. The equestrian statue is replaced by a pedestrian statue; the peaceful king replaces the warring king. "The monarch has his left hand on his scimitar, and his right hand is extended. It is not a hand which commands, it is a hand which protects. Thus the arm is limp; the fingers in his hands are apart and dropping slightly. The figure is not proud, and it should not be; but it is noble and sweet."[18]

The monument in Reims is in the line of a wish expressed by Voltaire: "It is an old custom of sculptors to include slaves at the foot of statues of Kings; it would be better to portray free and happy citizens." In Nancy, the inauguration ceremony of the royal square in 1755 reflected this old symbology being set aside: "These commemorations were always upset by the sound of chains and the moaning of the captives; they often dismayed nature and humanity; we often saw the scholar shudder and refusing to look at them."[19] In Reims, the royal figure is accompanied by two figures, neither slaves nor vanquished and chained enemies, but actors in the country's life: on one side "a naked artisan sitting on bales, his head resting on one of his fists which is clenched, and resting from his tiredness", on the other "a dressed woman leading a lion by a tuft of its mane" which represents administration. In reality, Diderot reproaches, we cannot place the two figures in the same plan: the artisan is a social type, whereas the woman with the lion is allegoric. This "mixture of the truth and fiction" cannot but displease. According to a habit he develops and systematises in the *Salons*, Diderot redoes the work according to his own taste. "I would rather have in place of the woman with the lion, a peasant with the tools of his work, and separate these two men with a woman who would have had several small children, one of which attached to her nipple."[20] Diderot thus replaces the two figures with a different iconological status with three figures of the same level: Commerce, Agriculture and Population.

[18] Diderot, « Le monument de Reims », p. 166.
[19] Patte, *Monuments érigés en France à la gloire de Louis XV*, p. 165.
[20] Diderot, « Le monument de Reims », p. 167.

In 1765, he is at his fourth *Salon* composed for the princely subscribers of a manuscript, *Correspondance littéraire*. Two exhibitors are the pretext for speaking about the Reims monument once again: Falconet, Pigalle's rival, and Moitte, who drew and engraved the sculpted group. The comparison between the 1760 article and the 1765 comment shows what draws the philosopher's attention. When Pigalle's monument was presented in Paris, "Falconet, who does not like Pigalle", Diderot explains, admitted to his colleague: "I saw your Citizen; it can be made as beautiful, because you have done so; but I do not think that art can go one step further than this"[21]. The king and the administration allegory are set aside; the artisan remains, now turned into a citizen and the object of emulation between the two best sculptures of the time. *Citizen* is the word Voltaire uses and it is the one Legendre uses in his description: "The happiness of peoples derives from a happy citizen, enjoying a perfect rest, among the cornucopia overflowing with fruits and flowers; the olive tree grows between the feet of the citizen sitting [on] stacks of merchandise; his open purse shows his security; and a lamb that is sleeping between the paws of a wolf is the symbol of peace and tranquillity."[22]

As for Moitte's engraving, it was quickly dealt with by Diderot. According to him, it was "a complete failure", with, in particular, a "stiff figure of the king walking on his heels"[23]. Grimm also adds his opinion as the director of the *Correspondance littéraire*, whose subscribers are directly concerned with the issue of the royal sculptures. He takes advantage of the engraving to criticise the monument extensively: "The pedestrian figure of the king is a complete failure. The king resembles a carter; he is ignoble and bulky, and it requires a particular talent to fail a figure and give the king this ignoble air." And the naked figure sitting on a bale, why do we call him citizen? "He looks like a rascal. Why is he naked? Do we see in our cold countries citizens resting completely naked, in the evening, in our warm weather?"[24] Grimm goes back to Diderot's proposal, which was that of replacing the two characters with three figures representing the population, agriculture and commerce. Diderot denounced the confusion between the real and the allegoric[25]; Grimm extends the

[21] *Salon de 1765*, Ed. Hermann, p. 291.
[22] Legendre, *Description de la place de Louis XV que l'on construit à Reims*, p. 7.
[23] *Ibid*., p. 323.
[24] The Lewinter edition at the Club français du livre reproduces the text of the *Correspondance littéraire*, it therefore makes Grimm's note available: *Œuvres complètes*, CFL, t. VI, p. 246-247.
[25] Cf. Georges May, « Diderot et l'allégorie », *SVEC*, LXXXIX, Oxford, The Voltaire Foundation, 1972 et M. Delon, « La mutation de l'allégorie au XVIIIe

critique in refusing the citizen's nudity. Should the king be on horseback or on foot, in Roman armour or in modern costume? Should the figures accompanying him be in an ideal state of nudity or in modern costume? The renouncement of the heroic idealisation condemns the characters as resembling carters and rascals.

Diderot implicitly answers in the *Essais sur la peinture* which follow the *Salon de 1765*: "Naked figures, in the middle of a scene, where people are used to [being] dressed, does not offend us at all. It is because flesh is more beautiful than drapery […] In portraying them nude it makes the scene distant, it reminds us of a more innocent and simpler age, wilder manners, more similar to imitation manners. We are unhappy about the present times, and this going […] back to older times does not displease us." [26] Some years later, Voltaire represented as a naked old man would be a scandal. But Diderot's remark could be applied to the Reims monument; the naked citizen indicates an ideal that remains distant. It is a wish that is far from being granted. The king's apology would become satire; the kingdom's praise would become critical. The *Essais sur la peinture* resume the mixture of allegoric and real beings and also do not praise the monument. "What does that woman leading a lion by its mane next to a carter lying on bales mean? The woman and the animal are walking [in] the direction of the sleeping porter, and I know that a child would cry out: mummy, that woman is going to feed that poor man to her beast. I do not know if it is its intent, but it will happen if that man does not wake up, and that woman moves one step closer. Pigalle, my friend, grab your hammer, and tear apart this association of bizarre beings."[27] And Diderot resumes his national triad proposal: agriculture, commerce and the population. He defends the principle of nudity[28], but he maybe responds to the pejorative word *carter* used by Grimm by using the word *porter*. The idea of royal sweetness and protection does not prevent the return of aggressiveness and violence in the figure of the lion.

The representation of the king in Reims hesitates between the classical representation of a hero, and the incarnation of being made of flesh and with feelings. At his feet, the character on bales concentrates the doubt. Who is he really? In turn an artisan, a citizen, a carter and a porter, he climbs the ladder of the Third State, of politics and of the social. He

---

siècle. L'exemple de Diderot », *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France*, avril 2012.

[26] *Essais sur la peinture. Salons de 1759, 1761, 1763*, Ed. Hermann, p. 63-64.

[27] *Ibid*., p. 58.

[28] Regarding the inhabitant of the countryside: "Is it not a beautiful thing a naked peasant resting?" (p. 59).

emphasises the ambivalence of the latter order in the France of the *Ancien Régime*, between the people's ancient ideal and the reality of the rabble[29]. Reasonable people, restless rabble. His attitude may be understood from a realistic or allegorical point of view: weariness of the man who has dutifully accomplished his work, or the trust of the man protected by the social order, if it is not the melancholy man who, not at all asleep, wonders about his homeland, grabbing his chin. The call for a critical awareness, for some lucidity, for a consciousness of citizenship would then take on a new meaning. Yet, some years later, the theme of the citizen appears as the sculptor's self-portrait. We could state "that the representatives of the city of Reims wanted this resemblance themselves"[30]. The anecdote agrees with Falconet's words as quoted by Diderot. Either by its traits or by its artistic accomplishment, the character subsequently represents the artist's power. The monument to the king's glory is explicit, visible at the top, suggesting another power, implicitly, at the bottom. As the king humanizes himself, sets aside his dynastic grandeur, the artist idealises himself, strips himself from his special condition to become the conscience of time, and in fact, the spokesman of a community. Diderot dreamt of a Parisian square where the forest could have remained: "If I would have to set the Louis XV square where it is, I would have avoided cutting down the forest. I would have liked the obscure depth among the colonnade of a large peristyle to be seen."[31] As nudity or as bare stone, the forest would represent the instance of nature, the people's deep truth, as opposed to monarchical arbitrariness; an ideal counter-power that the philosopher lets speak for itself. The architectural and administrative regularity will constantly be confronted with the metaphor of an ideal democracy of origins[32]. This development appears at the end of the chapter

[29] Cf. Jean Fabre's enlightening article on the rewriting by abbé Coyer and by the chevalier Jaucourt, « L'article 'Peuple' de l'*Encyclopédie* et le couple Coyer-Jaucourt », *Images du Peuple au XVIIIe siècle*, Paris, Colin, 1973.

[30] Jean-Robert Gaborit, *Jean-Baptiste Pigalle. 1714-1785. Sculptures du musée du Louvre*, Paris, RMN, 1985, p. 67. More recently Guilhem Scherf, « Diderot et la sculpture », dans *Le Goût de Diderot*, Paris, Hazan, 2013, p. 161-163.

[31] *Essais sur la peinture*, p. 52-53. Laugier amazingly compared the city of Paris to a forest: "It is an immense forest, varying from plain to mountains, cut right in the middle by a large river." He entrusts the building to "[a] crafty artist": "Let us suppose he is allowed to chop and sculpt as he pleases; what advantage might he take from these diversities?" (*Essai sur l'architecture*, p. 224-225). Ten years later he is more cautious.

[32] It is in the forest that Bourbonne's two friends hide. Bourbonne is the hero of Diderot's novel, resisting monarchic and religious order. On the "liberties of the greenwood" and all the Robin Hoods, cf. Simon Schamma, *Le Paysage et la*

of the *Essais*, dedicated to expression in painting. At the beginning of the chapter, Diderot looks over the conditions which determine the human body. The primitive man was thus characterised: "He looks proud and fierce at the same time. His head is held up straight. His look is fixed. He is the master of his forest." [33]

The two approaches of reformism and of radicalism are embodied, according to Diderot, in two types of royal squares: a public square, a forum decorated with the statue of the monarch who would be nothing but the first citizen of the State, or a square where absolute power remains under the threat of an obscurity, that of the wilderness and of the forest. The ideal of a popular monarchy is expressed through the account of a traveller, told to Sophie Volland in July 1762. The man told us incredible things of the love of the sovereigns towards their people. Patriotism took refuge among the Danish. Here is a scene he witnessed, and that you may have wished to have seen. It was on the occasion of the putting up of the king's equestrian statue in one of the public squares of the capital. The people came in a large number.[34] The public shouts long life to the king; the king joins the people and kisses those in his reach. He even throws his hat up in the air. The very antithesis of Versailles' heavy ritual, the scene shows a bourgeois monarch, king of the Danes rather than king of Denmark. The royal square thus becomes a public square, the place of a national unanimity.

In the same year, the question is raised concerning the decoration of Peyrou in Montpellier. That square combines two traditional types of monuments – the king's equestrian statue and the fountain of power that offers the people a drink – at the end of the aqueduct crossing the countryside. It could be surrounded by allegoric groups, as is the Louis XV square in Paris, but in 1771, a report suggests replacing the allegories of the royal virtues with a series of renowned men. "Louis XV's century is an era so glorious for the nation that is difficult to immortalise it. France produced under this reign men who were truly great in all areas. The sovereign, knowing how to recognise them, welcome them, protect them, grant them benefits, employ them according to their talent and merit, has truly contributed to shaping them and making them acquire that fame, [of]

---

mémoire, Paris, Seuil, 1999, p. 157-212. Robert Harrison, dans *Forêts. Essai sur l'imaginaire occidental*, Paris, Flammarion, 1992, takes an interest in "outlaws" (p. 119-128) and in Rousseau (p. 191-200).

[33] *Essais sur la peinture*, p. 41.

[34] Diderot, *Correspondance*, Paris, Minuit, t. IV, 1958, p. 66.

which all the following centuries would approve […].”[35] We can find evidence of Voltaire’s *Siècle de Louis XIV*. The king can no longer be separated from all those who have contributed to making his reign grandiose. Memory insists on the historical truth as opposed to the old heroic abstraction: “All the great men we want to pay tribute to should be dressed in [the] French style and according to the habits of the time in which they lived and that of their rank. Their figure must as much as possible [be] according to portraits one can easily have access to.” [36] We managed to partially recreate the programme of that Pantheon that would have commemorated in pairs, the militaries of Condé and Turenne; Colbert and Duquesne, representing the navy; Fénelon and Bossuet, representing the Church; and Lamoignon and Daguesseau, Justice. If a classical royal square is characterised by a uniform architectural element and by a statue of the monarch, the situation at the end of the *Ancien Régime* denotes a development of urban rationalisation beyond and independent from royal squares, and a “the birth of the Pantheon”[37] even before the Convention had transformed the Saint-Geneviève church on the Quartier Latin mountain into a laic temple of national memory. The square becomes urbanism and, in statuary as well as in eloquence, the king starts giving up his place to citizens. Anacharsis Cloots, the revolutionary activist at the time of the constitutional monarchy, would put the royal statue and that of Voltaire at the same level, the king through blood and the king through his wits: “I have for a long time suggested [placing] Voltaire’s monument in the Champs-Élysées, at the centre of [the] Étoile, in alignment with the statue of Louis XV. Apollo and the Muses and the Graces in white marble would crown the rays of the Étoile.”[38]

In *Tableau de Paris*, at the beginning of the decade of the 1780s, Louis Sébastien Mercier praises the great squares that are spacious and lighten the old capital, but he is severe with all the signs of monarchic absolutism and militarism. In the Victories and Vendôme squares, “those chained up slaves, those proud bronzes, provoked against [the king’s] opponents who would have otherwise been peaceful, without that too insulting bronze.”[39]

---

[35] A note by Faugères, quoted in *Projets et dessins pour la place royale du Peyrou à Montpellier*, Paris, Caisse nationale des monuments historiques et des sites, 1983, p. 63.
[36] *Ibid*., p. 65.
[37] Jean-Claude Bonnet, *Naissance du Panthéon. Essai sur le culte des grands hommes*, Paris, Fayard, 1998.
[38] Anacharsis Cloots, *Écrits révolutionnaires. 1790-1794*, Paris, Editions Champ Libre, 1979, p. 168-169.
[39] Mercier, *Tableau de Paris*, Paris, Mercure de France, 1994, t. I, p. 929.

The inscriptions to Louis XIII's glory in Place des Vosges are equally ridiculous, evoking a campaign in Asia. The Louis XV square is praised for its "superb display", but the pacification of the monarch's statue still does not seem to be enough for Mercier: "Experts pay more attention to the figure of the steed than to that of the king. Bouchardon started this monument; Pigalle finished it. But when will our sculptors learn to do something else than to put a sovereign on horseback, bridle in hand? Is there not another expression to be given to the leader of a people?" The object of popular devotion, only Henri IV's statue on the Pont Neuf is spared any criticism. In a later chapter, the rue Royale is referred to as one of the two most beautiful streets on Paris, thanks to the view from the Louis XV square. "The superb entrance of Paris through the Neuilly bridge, and the Louis XV square, is no doubt worthy of the capital of France. The view from the quays, from Passy up to Arsenal, leads us to imagine the quays of Babylon. The farmsteads that overloaded the bridges no longer exist, and will no longer be an obstacle to having a pleasant view, and to the healthiness of fresh air." [40] The king's glorification is now relegated to being a second plan, as if the essential focus is the organisation of the capital, whose merit is the responsibility of the artists and engineers. The building of the Pont stresses the emergence of the figure of the engineer.

It is true that in *L'An 2440 (*Memoirs of the Year Two Thousand Five Hundred), the remodelled Paris was decorated with new statues. "An imposing figured called my attention. Due to the sweet majesty of its forehead, the dignity of its height, its attributes of harmony and peace, I recognised the virtuous humanity. Other statues were on their knees, and represented women in pain and filled with remorse. Alas, the symbolism was not difficult to perceive: they represented nations asking humanity to forgive them for the calamities inflicted on it for over twenty centuries!" [41] France, for instance, begs forgiveness for the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre and the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Further on, it is no longer an allegory, nor a royal figure. "I noticed on a magnificent pedestal, a negro, bare head, stretched out arm, a proud look, a noble attitude, imposing. Around him were the fragments of twenty sceptres. At his feet we could read the following words: To the avenger of the new world." It is a slave that rebelled and has set free his brothers of America. The royal figure is either replaced by a feminine abstraction, which completes the passage of military power to peaceful power, or through a rebellious and

[40] *Ibid*., t. II, p. 1039-1040.
[41] Mercier, *L'An 2440*, Bordeaux, Ducros, 1971, p. 201.

liberating individual who replaces the monarch at the head of his army, who leads the crowds to conquer a liberty: Spartacus wins, not Augustus. This evocation is all we need to let us imagine popular and insurrectionary demonstrations.

The revolutionary events would confirm the agitation. The royal statues were toppled. The Louis XV Square became that of the Revolution, before the reconciliation and the Concorde of the two Frances was outlined[42]. Of the monument erected by Bouchardon and Pigalle, there is nothing left but a hand and a foot. The hand was offered to Latude, the most famed prisoner, jailed in the Bastille due to a sealed letter signed by that same hand; the foot was deposited at the new Museum of French monuments. The hand that was sensed to protect did not replace the hand that commands; it is this one that history remembers. Henceforth, the hero is the prisoner moved by an irrepressible desire for liberty, the citizen arbitrarily locked up and relying only on his strengths to regain liberty. Mercier must have certainly known of Füssli's drawing, a self-portrait in Rome next to the foot and hand of a colossal statue of Constantine[43]. On a study trip, the artist is crushed by the antique grandiosity which seems forever lost; the Parisian journalist on foot is rather sensitive to the brutal desecration. Fragmented, the antique hand seems even bigger, leading us to wonder about the lost monument. That of the king is a torn apart, decapitated image: "The day all the statues of kings were removed, I saw the crowd in a singular astonishment: it was evident that those bronzes were not massive, and that the bronze horse's sides were no thicker than a three-pound écu."[44] In opposition to the royal monument as a principle of standardisation and urban extension; there is the scattering of bronze which is not much, and the dismembering of the royal individual, reduced to just a simple fragile body, with no thickness, no national consensus. This is as opposed to the vertical erection, the horizontal circulation. It is a new version of the king's two bodies which was analysed by Ernst Kantorowicz. The monarch's features are slowly erased from coins and banknotes, but he remains fairly recognisable on a certain June 21st 1791

[42] Cf. *De la place Louis XV à la place de la Concorde*, Paris, Musée Carnavalet, 1982. In Lisbon, the royal square is commerce square. In Paris, Louis XV square becomes concord square and the king's statue is replaced by an obelisk. In Bordeaux, Louis XV square, opening onto a water perspective as in Lisbon, became the stock market square and the statue was replaced by a fountain.

[43] Zurich, Kunsthaus. Cf. the exhibition's catalogues, *Johann Heinrich Füssli, 1745-1825*, à la Hamburger Kunsthalle, Munich, Prestel, 1974, n°45, and at the Petit Palais à Paris, 1975, n° 10.

[44] *Le Nouveau Paris*, Paris, Mercure de France, 1994, p. 137.

in Sainte-Menehould, a decisive moment far from the Capital during the Revolution. The postmaster, Jean-Baptiste Drouet would have recognised the royal fugitive from an écu or bank note[45]. It is in the square dedicated to his ancestor that Louis XVI loses his head. In Mercier's analysis, the overthrow is consummated: the artist, the writer opens the space and the time; he is the liaison agent between the singular and the collective, the concrete and the abstract; he redefines a democratic public space, whereas the former embodiment of power is restricted to a few fragments; the king is but a guilty body of flesh, divisible. At Louis XVI coronation in Reims, the formulae of the ancient royal magic were replaced by more reasonable wishes, but it is the whole monarchy that lost its symbolic strength.

In the history of the royal square as it became a public space[46], printed matters and the book constitute a decisive vector, according to two modalities: that of the image, of the technical drawing, and that of critical debate, of free speech. The rationality of the plan and of the measure supplies a new power to engineers and to those who master a technical skill: the argument and debate suggest a right to speak to all those who are capable of reading and thinking. The city invents itself in this way between knowledge and power, between know-how and politics, between sight and vision[47].

[45] Cf. Mona Ozouf, *Varennes. La Mort de la royauté*, Paris, Gallimard, 2005, p. 137.

[46] From Tahrir square in Cairo to Taksim square in Istanbul, current history shows the role of public spaces as a territory of popular movements: cf. the journal *Tous urbains*, PUF, n º3, 2013.

[47] This text benefitted from the remarks and suggestions from participants at the seminar of the Centre Eikones Bildkritik, in Basel, on « *les images du pouvoir et le pouvoir des images* », (the images of power and the power of images), then of those at the *International Conference Books with a View*, in Lisbon (Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, November 23rd-25th, 2011). An outline was proposed in *Die Kunst des Dialogs. L'Art du dialogue. Sprache, Literatur, Kunst im 19. Jahrhundert. Langue, littérature, art au XIXe siècle. Festschrift für Wolfgang Drost. Mélanges offerts à Wolfgang Drost*, Heidelberg, Universitätsverlag Winter, 2010.

CHAPTER TWO

CITY AND ARCHITECTURE IN ROUSSEAU'S THOUGHT

JUAN CALATRAVA
ESCUELA DE ARQUITECTURA, UNIVERSIDAD DE GRANADA, SPAIN

As a starting point, it should be recognized that there is something paradoxical when speaking about 'Rousseau and architecture', given that, in comparison to some of the other great *maîtres à penser* of the XVIII century, in the extensive work of the Genevan, there is barely any interest in architecture. From the point of view of fine arts, numerous examples would actually support an argument for Rousseau's indifference towards architecture. A worthy example, among many others, is found in *Confessions* as an account of his visit to Turin's Royal Palace - although not a single architectural reference is made[1]. Another example, also in *Confessions*, refers to his trip back from Venice, in which he finds no time for the traditional descriptions of the traveller[2]: even when Rousseau is constantly moving around and his biography is full of travels, it is always about trips that have nothing to do with the periplus of a curious man or with the artistic descriptions of the *grand tour* travellers[3]. Indeed, even in

[1] OC I, p. 71. All the quotes by Rousseau that appear in this work are from *Oeuvres complètes* by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Paris, Gallimard, col. "Bibliothèque de la Pléiade", vols. I-V, 1959-1995.

[2] "Je vis plusieurs choses, entre autres les Iles Borromées qui mériteroient d'être décrites. Mais le tems me gagne, les espions m'obsédent; je suis forcé de faire à la hâte et mal un travail qui demanderoit le loisir et la tranquillité qui me manquent" (OC I, p. 325).

[3] *Vid*. G. Panella, "Viaggio e 'rêverie' nel dispositivo autobiografico di Jean-Jacques Rousseau", in *Scritti in onore di Eugenio Garin*, Pisa, 1987, p. 193-220; Huguette Krief, "Regards sur l'Autre: Jean-Jacques Rousseau et les viyages: du *Discours sur l'origine de l'inégalité* aux *Confessions*", *Bulletin de l'Association Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, 57, 2001, p. 3-16; Frédéric S. Eigeldinger, "Les

the philosopher's correspondence, there is hardly any architectural allusion and, when there is any, it is mostly in relation to his personal circumstances, rather than from an artistic point of view[4].

Certainly, as we shall see, there are examples *a contrario*, from which we can assume a Rousseaunian interest towards architectural details. Yet, the cases where specific attention is paid towards architecture as an aesthetic phenomenon are so few that we could consider these as exceptions to the rule. Rousseau's admiration or critique towards a particular building or towards architecture in general, is mostly the reflection of his moral, economic or political thinking.

As an example, the famous architectural complex in Paris, Les Invalides, is considered a *bel établissement*. By reading the phrase we notice that its beauty is not of an aesthetic kind. Its beauty does not reside in the building itself, but in its guests, those war travelers and authentic modern Lacedaemonians[5].

It is in the celebrated passage of *Confessions*, in September 1738, that Jean-Jacques describes the roman aqueduct of Pont-du-Gard and the equally roman amphitheater of Nîmes. Rousseau praises the architecture of both monuments, clearly echoing the aesthetics of the sublime when he conveys to us the feelings that seize him upon contemplating Pont-du-Gard[6]. However, he stresses that the amphitheatre of Nimes, despite being

---

pèlerinages de Rousseau", *Bulletin de l'Association Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, 57, 2001, p. 33-48.

[4] This is the case, for instance, of the letter 2 July 1771 to his friend from Neuchâtel Du Peyrou, about the Du Peyrou palace: "Êtes-vous en fin dans votre maison? Est-elle entièrement achevée, et y êtes-vous bien arrangé? Si comme je le désire son habitation vous donne autant d'agrèment que son bâtiment vous a causé d'embarras, vous y devez mener une vie bien douce" (Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Correspondance complète*, t. 38, letter no. 6868, p. 234).

[5] "Je ne vois jamais sans attendriseement et vénération ces groupes de bons vieillards qui peuvent dire comme ceux de Lacedemone: Nous avons été jadis / Jeunes, vaillans et hardis" (OC I, p. 1095).

[6] "C'étoit le premier ouvrage des Romains que j'eusse vu. Je m'attendois à voir un monument digne des mains qui l'avoient construit. Pour le coup l'objet passa mon attente, et ce fut la seule fois en ma vie. Il n'appartenoit qu'aux Romains de produire cet effet. L'aspect de ce simple et noble ouvrage me frappa d'autant plus qu'il est au milieu d'un desert où le silence et la solitude rendent l'objet plus frappant et l'admiration plus vive; car ce pretendu pont n'étoit qu'un aqueduc [...] Le retentissement de mes pas sous ces immenses voutes me faisoit croire entendre la forte voix de ceux qui les avoient bâties. Je me perdois come un insecte dans cette immensité. Je sentois tout en me faisant petit, je ne sais quoi qui m'élevoit l'ame, et je me disois en soupirant: que ne suis-je né Romain!" (OC I, p. 256).

a 'much superior work', has impressed him less than Pont-du-Gard, precisely because it is situated in a city with a beggarly urban surrounding. In contrast, while the amphitheatre of Verona is also situated inside the city, its surroundings are better preserved. This 'architectural' appreciation is, nonetheless, a manifestation of philosophical and political 'romanity' and one of the multiple illustrations of the important opposition that Rousseau establishes between urban and rural space, which I shall address later. At the same time, Jean-Jacques critiques the lack of respect by the French towards the city's monuments, which serves also as one of the first formulations, now widely accepted, about the need to protect not only the monuments but also their surroundings[7].

Another important issue should be mentioned in regard to this secondary and 'derived' interest towards architecture and which is on par with great moral and political issues: I am referring to the theatre. One of the great thematic axes on Enlightenment architecture is the conception of a new building model for the theatre in relation to the new moral and aesthetic importance that the *philosophes* grant to theatrical activity. The theatres constructed in Paris, Nantes, Lyon, Bordeaux or Besançon, to name some of the most well-known cases, aimed to epitomize the new idea of the city and its monuments as well as the social role architecture itself was to play. Claude-Nicolas Ledoux, Victor Louis, Jacques-Germain Soufflot, Charles de Wailly or Marie-Joseph Peyre are some of the architectural protagonists in this process, effectively summarized in the Daniel Rabreau's expression 'Apollon in the city'[8]. It is in this 'philodramatic' context that Rousseau shows himself, from a theoretical standpoint, as a crosscurrent, that is, as a firm enemy of the theater in its literary and philosophical aspects as well as in its architectural and urban ones. This is a well-known position of his that could be supported by

[7] "Ce vaste et superbe cirque est entouré de vilaines petites maisons, et d'autres maisons plus petites et plus vilaines encore en remplissent l'arène; de sorte que le tout ne produit qu'un effet disparate et confus, où le regret et l'indignation étouffent le plaisir et la surprise. J'ai vue depuis le cirque de Vérone infiniment plus petit et moins beau que celui de Nimes, mais entretenu et conservé avec toute la décence et la propreté possibles, et que par cela même me fit une impression plus forte et plus agréable. Les François n'ont soin de rien et ne respectent aucun monument. Ils sont tout feu pour entreprendre et ne savent rien finir ni rien conserver" (OC I, p. 256).

[8] Daniel Rabreau, *Apollon dans la ville. Essai sur le théâtre et l'urbanisme è l'époque des Lumières*, Paris, Éditions du Patrimoine, 2008 (with a copious bibliography).