

sculpture, he was able to turn a collection consisting largely of funerary monuments and architectural fragments into an extraordinarily popular and influential museum. The story of Lenoir's museum illustrates even more clearly than the Louvre the contradictory forces of the revolutionary period and the way these were resolved by the museum. It also reveals the strange way in which the Revolution revived an interest in the past which it had vowed to abolish.

Nearly all the items in Lenoir's collection had religious, royal, or aristocratic roots, and none was an acknowledged masterpiece. Despite the fact that they were all French, there was little reason to expect the Revolution to preserve them, much less exhibit them. However, Lenoir's masterful arrangement of the pieces according to century in a series of galleries decorated to evoke the spirit of the period was intended to tell the story of the evolution of French art, as he claimed, from its barbaric roots to classical excellence. Here a royal tomb lost its regal and religious significance and became a bit of evidence of the progress of French art and culture. Ironically the romantically decorated galleries and the "elysian garden" containing the actual remains of a number of famous Frenchmen also revived an interest in the past, especially the medieval past. The museum was ahead of its time in that classical era, and by the blossoming of the historically oriented Romantic movement, it had been disbanded and its contents returned to their former owners.

Throughout his book McClellan has attempted, usually successfully, to set the museological and aesthetic story into its political and social context, a difficult job considering the confusion and turbulence of the period. This is a very successful book, which should appeal as much to students of French history or the history of ideas as to those concerned with the history of arts and museums. There are 84 well-chosen black-and-white illustrations.

Christopher Greene
Trent University

David Van Zahnten — *Building Paris: Architectural Institutions and the Transformation of the French Capital, 1830–1870*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994. Pp xix, 360.

One of a series by David Van Zahnten on the architecture of nineteenth-century Paris, this book deals with the transformation of the capital during the July Monarchy, the short-lived Second Republic, and the Second Empire. This was a period of explosive growth when central Paris took on many of the features of the present-day city — the expansion of the Hôtel de Ville, additions to the Palais de Justice, the new opera by Garnier, extension of the École des Beaux-Arts, the completion of the Louvre, erection of new libraries such as the Bibliothèque Nationale, the piercing of the great boulevards under the direction of Haussmann, and the opening of public spaces such as that in front of the Comédie française. It was also the period of the erection of grand hotels, huge department stores, imposing banks, and impressive railway stations.

Much of this development is familiar to historians, but more than previous scholars Van Zahnten analyzes in detail the administrative framework within which architects worked. He underlines the fact that architectural practice in France, and especially its capital, was very different from that in the United States and Britain. Architects in Paris worked under strict government discipline, whereas Anglo-American architects worked largely as free agents. Even private builders had to conform to regulations about alignment, continuity between cornices along blocks of buildings, and allowable heights. Private buildings thus had to be planned to serve as background for major public monuments.

An unusually broad span of public buildings fell under state control besides major state buildings — theatres because of censorship, churches because since the Revolution they were owned by the state, and even thermal baths. Most architects were prepared for their public role by training at the *École des Beaux-Arts*. Despite these forces for uniformity in style, Van Zahnten shows there were tensions and rivalries among various government services — the *Bâtiments Civils*, the *Travaux de Paris*, the *Palais Royaux* (or *Impériaux*), the *Édifices Diocésains*, the *Monuments Historiques*, the corps of *Commissaires-voyers*, who supervised local construction, and the Bureau of the *Plan de Paris*.

Van Zahnten argues convincingly, however, that despite overall control and the fact that most architects worked on retainer in offices provided by the state, the rivalries among state agencies and sheer force of personality allowed leading architects considerable room to express their personal visions. One of the author's best chapters deals with individual architects. He provides a valuable table showing which architects worked for various agencies and which ones taught at the *École des Beaux-Arts*. Synthesizing these lists, he concludes that four personalities were of central importance in mid-nineteenth-century Paris: Pierre Fontaine, Félix Duban, Victor Baltrard, and, *ça va sans dire*, Eugène Viollet-le-Duc. In addition he lists 12 others of secondary importance: Auguste Caristie, father and son Charles and Hubert Rohault de Fleury, Jean Huguot, Louis Visconti, Hector Lefuel, Joseph Duc, Henri Labrousse, Émile Gilbert, Gabriel Davioud, Théodore Ballu, and Charles Garnier. Van Zahnten's sketches of the careers and ideas of these architects make an invaluable contribution to the field.

Van Zahnten sees a major development linking all the series of architects and buildings: the transition from a dominant *goût de roi* (or emperor) toward a more varied and more modern architecture. Royal architecture had been designed to "represent" the authority and glory of the ruler. According to the author, the last great example of such representational architecture was the additions to the Louvre completed in 1857, just over a dozen years before the overthrow of the emperor whose power it was intended to express. The new architecture expressed itself in modern building types and novel materials such as iron and glass sheds. The new types included such buildings as the *Bibliothèque Nationale*, the market known as *Les Halles*, the huge modern hotels, the new department stores, and the imposing railway stations. Although Van Zahnten does not say so, these too were often representational, not of the regime, but of the financial power of industrialized France.

Despite its impeccable scholarship, new insights, and wealth of illustrations, this book is still primarily about architectural history in the traditional sense. There is only passing mention of the actual social changes which lay behind the new developments or of their impact on social life. How was life different because of the apartment blocks or department stores? How did the railway stations change people's habits? What happened to the people who were ousted from their traditional dwellings as Haussman cut his broad boulevards through the old city? How was everyday life influenced by new sidewalks, sewers, and the coming of fresh water, the *conquête de l'eau* as one historian calls it? Thus social historians will be largely disappointed by this otherwise impressive book.

James A. Leith
Queen's University

Ginette Kurgan-van Hentenryk et Serge Jaumain, dir. — *Aux frontières des classes moyennes. La petite bourgeoisie belge avant 1914*, Bruxelles, Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1992, 147 p.

Once upon a time, it was thought the *petite bourgeoisie* was slated for extinction, caught in a suffocating squeeze between capital and labour. The departure of shopkeepers and artisans from the historical stage might be accompanied by explosions of resentment and political extremism, but such rear-guard actions could only prolong an inevitable decline. There were currents in Marxism and in political economy, more so in the late nineteenth century than in our own times, which believed in this scenario. The present volume of essays, ably edited by Ginette Kurgan and Serge Jaumain, lays the thesis of inevitable decline to rest, replacing it with a picture of *petit-bourgeois* life at once more nuanced and open-ended. *Fin-de-siècle* Belgium is the chosen terrain of discussion, and it yields interesting results in three respects.

There is first the question of *petit-bourgeois* identity. Workers may identify themselves as workers, bourgeois as bourgeois, but what about the various strata in between? Pharmacists, as Diana Vazquez Martinez's article in this volume demonstrates, liked to think of themselves as members of the liberal professions. They held university degrees, wore white coats at work, and sometimes had quasi-laboratories on their shop premises. The *cabaretiers* studied by Rudy Ankaert, on the other hand, were more inclined to align themselves with the labouring classes, among whom they often lived and worked.

Yet however fluid class frontiers might have been, there were markers distinguishing *petits bourgeois* from their social neighbours. They were possessors of a small capital, whether material or intellectual in nature; they had the resources to start an enterprise; and they had a smattering of education. Politics helped to bring class boundaries into yet sharper focus. The socialist *Parti ouvrier belge* (POB) was founded in 1885. Alongside the POB and with its encouragement burgeoned a powerful co-operative movement which threatened the livelihoods of many shop-