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The Revolution of 1789, and the destruction of the Bastille prison in Paris, left a debris field that generated a new touristic market of revolutionary relics in France, Great Britain and the United States in the decades following these events.[[1]](#footnote-1) Myriad pieces of ruins, such as fragments of walls, stones, doors and keys of the fortress, were extracted from the rubble to circulate widely as material testaments to the liberating force of the Revolution. The dissemination of these remains was facilitated by one entrepreneur, Pierre-François Palloy, who arranged the demolition of the building and orchestrated touristic practices on the worksite. Not only did he employ tour guides to direct visitors through muddy dungeons, and help them detach stones from scathed towers, but he also launched a trade in Bastille-themed souvenirs. These ephemera included polished wall stones to adorn jewellery sets, medals, and miniature models of the bastion carved in materials taken from the building itself.[[2]](#footnote-2) These artefacts were meant to further the ‘experiential dimension’ of the Revolution through iconoclastic and reconstructive rituals, which, as the recent studies of Keith Bresnahan and Richard Taws have shown, were part of a patriotic agenda of myth-making.[[3]](#footnote-3) This symbolic performance aimed to elongate a provisional reversal of power, by maintaining the visual memory of a tyrannical site that was bound to disappear, and therefore endanger the remembrance of a revolutionary momentum. Other historians, such as Lynn Hunt, have emphasized the affective power of this commerce of ruins in ‘consolidat[ing] the new Nation that revolutionary rhetoric posited in the first place’.[[4]](#footnote-4)

However, little attention has been given to the role of foreign travellers in the consumption of these revolutionary ruins, and their influence on the re-imagination of French touristic sites during the period. Yet, it seems striking that various bits and pieces of the Bastille now populate British and American museums. Even items of a somewhat insignificant appearance, such as a small cube, cut from a wooden door, now feature in the Smithsonian’s collections in Washington D.C.[[5]](#footnote-5) Whilst the conditions of the transatlantic journey of this little piece remain unknown, it seems clear that material evidence of the Revolution circulated outside France, from the 1790s to the dawn of the nineteenth century.[[6]](#footnote-6) Important figures accessed these goods through donations: the Marquis de la Lafayette, for instance, offered a Bastille key to George Washington, who proudly exhibited it at Mount Vernon.[[7]](#footnote-7) Others, sometimes of a more modest nature, accessed these ruins directly by travelling en masse to the country during the Peace of Amiens, when hostilities temporarily ceased between France and Britain in 1802.[[8]](#footnote-8)

This chapter intends to explore the impact of these migrations on touristic patterns, behaviours and imaginations in post-revolutionary France. As a gap between the Revolutionary and the Napoleonic conflicts, the Peace of Amiens led to a brief yet intense interlude of tourism, which was oriented both towards the resumption of financial connections with France, and the first-hand contemplation of the remains of war and social unrest. British travellers were obsessed with ruins and collecting the remnants of the Revolution. They chronicled, in memoirs, sketchbooks and correspondence, their examination of scathed landscapes and mutilated churches in a direct, affective and sensory manner, which suggests that the peace further developed the ‘experiential’ memory of the Revolution mentioned above. Whilst the studies of Simon Bainbridge, John Richard Watson and Jeffrey Cox have illuminated the shaping force of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars on English Romanticism, this chapter will reverse the perspective by examining how romantic imaginations transferred antiquarian pursuits onto the construction of an ‘immediate history’ of the French Revolution at the eve of the First French Empire.[[9]](#footnote-9)

Considered as a corpus, the narratives and watercolours produced by British travellers, along with French police records and guide books produced to shepherd them through revolutionary sites, offer the possibility to identify not only the reinvention of Grand Tour writing tropes in this episode of post-war tourism, but also the emergence of new spaces of touristic interest in France in 1802.[[10]](#footnote-10) These sources highlight that the quest to contemplate revolutionary ruins had two consequences. Firstly, it refashioned *Ancien Régime* touristic sites in a temporal dichotomy between before and after the revolutionary upheaval. New guide books systematised this tension, and fed imaginations of the recent past and reflexions on the ravages of time. This led to another change: the emergence of new touristic sites within the traditional Grand Tour metropolis of Paris, but also beyond, in the provinces. Attempts to retrace Louis XVI’s escape led, for instance, to the transformation of remote northern places in Lorraine, such as Varennes-sur-Argonne, into touristic hubs where traces of past violence could be gleaned. To explore this twofold dynamic, this chapter will first explore the itineraries and various social outlooks of British travellers to France during the Peace of Amiens, before investigating their collection of revolutionary ephemera and ruins. The last section will reflect on the shift these British migrations produced on the geography and meaning of tourism in post-revolutionary France.

Journeys and Travellers

On 25 March 1802, the signing of the Peace of Amiens brought not only respite but elation to a British population drained by war.[[11]](#footnote-11) As Jenny Uglow and Jeffrey Cox have recently shown, festivities were organised throughout Britain to celebrate the truce: London was illuminated, shops and pubs advertised the imminent deflation of food prices, whilst mail coaches bore chalk inscriptions heralding ‘Peace with France’ across the country.[[12]](#footnote-12) Yet, Britons also set sail to France with an unprecedented impetus. Within ten days following the treaty, 798 British passengers landed at Calais, and overall, 5000 of these travellers were recorded as residing in the French capital during the truce.[[13]](#footnote-13) In April, George Jackson, the sibling of the British envoy at the negotiations of Amiens, wrote to their mother that in Paris: ‘all the hotels are overflowing with English; for we have an inundation of our shores since the signature of the Treaty, and the flood increases daily, and will no doubt go increasing’. The environmental metaphor used by Jackson reveals that these peace migrations were perceived as a ‘touristic expeditionary force’.[[14]](#footnote-14)

This expedition was the product of war itself. The recent work of Renaud Morieux has shown how war did not suspend cross-Channel migrations during the eighteenth century.[[15]](#footnote-15) Rather, his study of the Channel has suggested the need to rethink patterns of transnational movements as being prompted and recorded by war. Inspired by Daniel Roche, his work has revealed the complexities of ‘peaceful invasions’ which ‘make foreigners, who are usually invisible, suddenly visible’.[[16]](#footnote-16) What made the ‘overflow’ of British visitors so visible in France in 1802 was the British and French systems of border control, which had been tested during the revolutionary wars and which came to be perfected during the peace with a new Alien Act, introducing the use of new certificates and lists of migrants. This meant that visitors had to queue to show passports in coastal towns, and then seek formal permissions from embassies in Paris, where the delivery of passports to leave the country was centralised during the peace.[[17]](#footnote-17) These two procedures framed this heightened moment of mobility, by making it more visible in the eyes of French observers who noted the English ‘delirious envy to visit Paris … and see the First Consul’.[[18]](#footnote-18)

Border surveillance documents reveal a twofold phenomenon. First, migrations operated both ways as evidenced by Madame Tussaud’s ability to exhibit her waxworks in London in 1802. The ‘Register of Passes’ from the British Foreign Office suggests that 2598 passports were given to English migrants wishing to visit France, and 3055 for French travellers traversing the Channel. These trans-Channel migrations also involved other nationalities. Renaud Morieux has showed how the Channel constituted a global crossing between France and Britain, which was traversed by Italian, Swiss, German, Baltic and American visitors.[[19]](#footnote-19) Secondly, the Peace of Amiens democratised temporary migrations, owing to less onerous modes of transport.[[20]](#footnote-20) This democratisation of cross-Channel tourism coincided with new attempts to ameliorate journeys across the Channel, exemplified by Albert Mathieu-Favier’s project of an undersea tunnel. [[21]](#footnote-21)

Much is known about the peripatetic elites who visited France for political and cultural affairs in 1802. These included myriad statesmen: not only Charles James Fox and the ambassador Lord Whitworth but two thirds of the British Parliament, with 82 past, current and future members of the House of Commons and 31 peers.[[22]](#footnote-22) Radicals, such as Thomas Paine and Helen Maria William, had already settled in France in the 1790s, and were visited by these new travellers. Reformers, lawyers and engineers were also prominently represented: Samuel Romilly, Thomas Malthus, Jeremy Bentham, and James Watt were amongst them. Many Romantic authors and artists, such as Samuel Rogers, Maria Edgeworth, Thomas Daniell and William Turner, also hoped to explore Parisian museums and sketch the new acquisitions of the Louvre before the general public was admitted.[[23]](#footnote-23) These select visitors produced vast quantity of writings, principally in the mode of private correspondence and memoirs, which explains the great attention their experience has drawn amongst historians.[[24]](#footnote-24)

Conversely, little attention has been given to more modest visitors, who crossed the Channel in the hope of finding employment or trade on the Continent. The lists of travellers compiled by the diplomat Merry reveal that members of the gentry constituted only 39.6% of these travellers in 1802.[[25]](#footnote-25) His records also suggest that 34.4% were servants, 10.5% soldiers, and 6.8% merchants. Yet, his compilation focused on travellers already in Paris in 1802, and requesting passports from him to return to Britain. Therefore, they do not account for the vast number of textile workers and dealers, who contemplated a longer journey in France to develop their trade. Recent research has shown that the peace enabled the resumption of silk and muslin contraband between the two countries. These goods were extremely sought after, which explains why the French State was eager to encourage the arrival of British textile workers during the Peace of Amiens.[[26]](#footnote-26) Procedures to obtain French citizenship were simplified for these migrants, who could freely circulate in the country and its new territorial extensions in Belgium, Rhineland and Piedmont. As a result, on 14 September 1802, an English textile technician named William Aitken was offered at Calais a passport ‘to travel everywhere in the Republic’.[[27]](#footnote-27) In May 1803, 132 British ‘*mécaniciens’* (an elusive term for skilled workers including master spinners, potters, candle makers, metal manufacturers) were counted in Paris, along with 59 textile dealers and merchant passengers.[[28]](#footnote-28) Another group of travellers, more difficult to trace in the archives, is often left aside: the eloped and poor itinerants, sometimes in quest of employment, who journeyed without legal documents. Their journeys can be retrieved in other sources, such as judiciary reports and local newspapers, as is the case for Betty Amplett, an illegitimate girl from Worcestershire, who, aged thirteen, was placed under the care of ‘some poor relations, and during the short interval of peace in 1802, went to France with an uncle, a shoemaker, who intended to settle there’.[[29]](#footnote-29)

Overall, British travellers came to France to fulfil a variety of social interests. This led to a reinvention of pre-revolutionary patterns of movement, by remodelling older Grand Tour practices on interconnected business and cultural interests. In this respect, the example of William Humphrys, a Birmingham merchant, is particularly apt. The Humphrys led a foreign trading house affiliated to the Levant Company, with close commercial ties with Europe, which the Revolutionary Wars had seriously damaged. The peace thus offered the family a perfect opportunity to canvass potential new trade partners and recover huge debts. Humphrys’ project in November 1802 was colossal: assisted by his son, he aimed to find one 120 French and Italian traders in Paris, and to write off an overall debt of £40,000. Claims required delicate arrangements, and necessitated copying a large amount of correspondence for the use of banking agents, which the father and son planned on accomplishing over six months.[[30]](#footnote-30) Yet, during that time, not only did the Humphrys spend their journey chasing debtors, but they also combined business with pleasure. Upon their landing at Calais, they chose to lodge at Monsieur Dessein’s inn, which had inspired Laurence Sterne’s famous novel *A Sentimental Journey through France and Italy* (1768).[[31]](#footnote-31) Thence, they followed the coast to Montreuil-sur-Mer – also celebrated by Sterne – then Nouvion, Abbeville and Amiens to see where the recent peace had been signed and which constituted another landmark in their attempt to follow Sterne’s ‘sentimental journey’. They stopped for several days at Amiens to observe the Gothic architecture of the cathedral which, in the words of William Humphrys, was ‘rendered interesting to the travellers by its being the *chef d’œuvre* of our countrymen during the Regency of the Duke of Bedford’. A common Franco-British history was sought in the contemplation of the landscape and famous châteaux, as they passed through Clermont and Chantilly. Their entrance into Paris epitomized this outlook, as the Humphrys chose to follow particular streets to obtain specific views of the capital. They made the decision to enter Paris in a two-stage itinerary, first by entering the metropolis from the North and passing by monarchical sites such as the Basilica of Saint-Denis and the former ‘*Poste Royale*’. Their progression to the centre of the city was equally codified: ‘the course and point of entry into Paris being altered by desire of the travellers to the exterior Boulevards and *Barrière de l’Etoile* in order to view the capital from its finest approach through the *Champs Elysées*’. Their Parisian entry formed a loop, as they then travelled back into Saint-Denis, to settle in the *Hotel de Bruxelles*. Their journey was clearly embedded in post-revolutionary tourism, or at least, a highly symbolic itinerary to enliven business purposes.[[32]](#footnote-32)

(Re)-collecting the Ephemeral

Movement itself, in time and space, was the prime interest of British visitors. This movement was embodied in one specific kind of ephemera: the ruin, understood broadly as it was in the Romantic age, as an environmental and social phenomenon. Ruins acquired a different cultural value during the period. Previously conceived as artificial ornaments to fictionalise the gardens of aristocratic Europeans and elicit nostalgic sentiments about the power of nature over human endeavours, ruins came to be associated with specific historical events to be commemorated. As Peter Fritzsche has convincingly argued:

the ruins of the past were taken to be the foundations for an alternative present. The result, then, was that nineteenth-century contemporaries took ruins to be the debris of quite specific historical disasters … and they anxiously attended to the preservation of these dated and provenienced ruins.[[33]](#footnote-33)

Focused on French and Prussian responses to the Napoleonic Wars, Fritzsche’s study has offered a compelling framework to consider changing perceptions of time and space during the period, which could be expanded to study British travelling behaviours in France during the Peace of Amiens. France was heavily scarred by the wilful demolition of churches, convents, castles and other sites of religious and feudal power that republicans aimed to obliterate. British visitors constantly commented on these ephemeral remains. Not only did they aim to collect evidence of these vestiges, but they also hoped to recollect the destructive force of the recent past. This was achieved by reading and discussing with the local population, but also by preserving, in their own writing, the transient historical message of these sites.

This process amalgamated previous travelling itineraries with a keen exploration of recent revolutionary debris. Indeed, the Peace of Amiens added a revolutionary detour to the Grand Tour. Travelling to France was not a novelty of the period; Paris and French academies had long been important educational points on the itineraries of Grand Tourists and their families towards Italy.[[34]](#footnote-34) Yet, the cessation of war with revolutionary France enabled British travellers to resume this educational tradition with a twist. As Richard Ansell argues in his examination of ‘Foubert’s Academy’, looking beyond the Grand Tour ‘is to examine the context of domestic preparations and alternatives within which foreign voyages took place’.[[35]](#footnote-35) Looking at the preparation of English travelers, such as James Forbes, to revisit Grand Tour plans in 1802 is certainly fruitful. As his private correspondence suggests, the continental journey that Forbes elaborated for his family was not only meant to provide the ‘last polish’ to his daughter’s education by exploring ‘interesting scenes’ in the Alps and Italy, but it also offered him and his wife the opportunity to visit formerly prohibited places in the North. Before setting sail in Harwich, he wrote to a friend:

as I was prevented on my former tour from visiting Holland, Flanders, and France, by the war which then desolated so large a part of Europe, I shall avail myself of the present period of general tranquillity to pass through these countries … It is our first object, therefore, to see the principal towns of Holland, and from thence shape our course through Flanders to Paris.[[36]](#footnote-36)

They landed in Hellevoetsluis as it was ‘a place of considerable importance to the Batavian republic’; in Rotterdam, they visited the ‘French and Dutch theatre’ and Forbes observed the agricultural efforts of the locals particularly the ‘dykes, on which the very existence of the Republic may be said to depend’.[[37]](#footnote-37) Although the family reproduced patterns of Grand Tour sociability, by exploring Gothic cathedrals, statues of Erasmus and meeting with exiled English and Scottish clubs, Forbes clearly stated in his letters to his sister that he was not in search of the ‘picturesque’ there.[[38]](#footnote-38) The exploration of this ‘flat’ country responded to a different kind of aesthetics and touristic pursuit than his domestic touring of Wales or his appreciation of Italian sites. Rather, Forbes was interested in the infrastructures of ‘revolutionised Holland’, and he bought a ‘statistical account published in Paris’ to investigate ‘the extent, population, agriculture, and commerce, of the Batavian republic’, which he quoted in great length to his sister.[[39]](#footnote-39)

Paris was equally visited for the revolutionary and military curiosities it hosted under the First Consul. The work of Holger Hoock has emphasized the importance of ‘spoils of war’ in shaping exoticism in the late eighteenth century.[[40]](#footnote-40) This phenomenon was epitomised by the Peace of Amiens, which heightened the ‘Egyptomania’ and ‘collecting furor’ of British visitors eager to see Bonaparte’s art loot, which filled the Louvres after his Egyptian and Italian campaigns.[[41]](#footnote-41) Outside art galleries, British visitors had also an interest in contemplating the militarisation of French society through its landscape, particularly the war monuments populating the city. Many visitors commented on French war tablets, listing the fallen of the revolutionary conflicts. The painter Joseph Farington visited the Invalides for this purpose, and noted the democratic nature of these memorials where ‘rank made no difference in the claim of distinction’.[[42]](#footnote-42) This republican memory was associated with Ancient Roman practices. Indeed, not only did Bonaparte’s art booty embody a ‘*translatio imperii*’ from Rome to Paris, but these war monuments were also perceived as ‘a French variation on the Roman serial campaign relief carving’.[[43]](#footnote-43)

This antiquarian perspective partly explains the obsession British visitors demonstrated for observing, drawing and touching ruins of the Revolution throughout the country. On his arrival to the North of France, the lawyer John Carr noted:

We traced the desolating hand of the revolution as soon as we ascended the first hill. Our road lay through a charming country. Upon the sides of its acclivities, surrounded by the most romantic scenery of woods and corn fields, we saw ruined convents, and roofless village churches, through the shattered casements of which the wind had free admission.[[44]](#footnote-44)

This romantic view of desolation encapsulates the tourism of absence that emerged amongst British visitors around three types of revolutionary ruins: places of former monarchical glory, mutilated domestic settings, and derelict confessional sites. Visiting the *Petit Trianon* in 1802 – a princely residence outside Versailles – John Carr dedicated some time to the contemplation of the ruins of its farmhouse and mill, which he depicted in a watercolour. For Carr, the observation of the landscape functioned in a reimagining of what had been lost. ‘A rivulet’, he wrote, ‘still runs on one side of it, which formerly used to turn a little wheel … The apartments, which must have been once enchanting, now present nothing but gaping beams, broken ceilings, and shattered casements.’[[45]](#footnote-45) The furniture bore the marks of other visitors’ passages: ‘the wainscots of its little cabinets, exhibits only a tablet, upon which are rudely penciled, the motley initials, love verses, and memorandums of its various visitors.’[[46]](#footnote-46)

The contemplation of defaced convents and churches nourished melancholic musings amongst British visitors, whose perceptions were deeply influenced by reading and listening to music in their journeys. Visiting the chapel and gardens of a convent – which had been closed and turned into a musketry repository during the Revolution – John Carr noted:

the painful uncertainty of many years had occasioned the neglect and ruin in which I saw them. Some of the nuns were reading upon shattered seats, under the overgrown bowers, and others were walking in the melancholy shade of neglected avenues. The effect of the whole was gloomy and sorrowful, and fully confirmed the melancholy recital which I received from Mrs S.[[47]](#footnote-47)

Whilst music inclined his vision of ruinous landscapes, previous readings equally influenced the ways in which female travellers interpreted religious iconoclasm. In Calais, Anne Plumptre was struck by how the city contrasted with the travel accounts she had read before her journey, and which had depicted to her a populous place ‘abounded … in monasteries and nunneries’.[[48]](#footnote-48) Now, ‘scenes of ruin’ populated the city, revealing more broadly ‘the sad effects of that phrensy [sic.] of destruction which at one fatal period of the revolution had taken possession of all France, and of which we never ceased to see continual and melancholy traces wherever we travelled in the French territory’.[[49]](#footnote-49)

These ‘traces’ were sought by British visitors, who recollected fragments of violence by interviewing, on a systematic basis, the local inhabitants about their own direct experiences of the events. This was a twofold process: it first involved inquiring about the meanings of surrounding ruins. On arriving at Montreuil, Mary Berry was struck by the desolation of the *Eglise Notre Dame*, and began, almost immediately, ‘questioning the people at the inn at what time their church was *démolie*’.[[50]](#footnote-50) She and her servants asked the various customers, who ‘denied it being demolished’, before obtaining ‘at last’ the expected answer from ‘the maid’. The latter ‘owned that [the church] had been pulled down that a rich individual of the town had bought the church and meant to preserve it, but that the people of the place, *dans le temps de la terreur* (which they now all talk of as if it had taken place in the days of St. Louis), had threatened him with the guillotine if he did not allow it to be destroyed.’[[51]](#footnote-51) Reproducing the locals’ speech flow, in a free indirect speech only interrupted by the historical insight of the visitor, further identified the French locals with the events.[[52]](#footnote-52) Associating people with ruins was, in fact, the second aspect of this recollection. The Reverend Stephen Weston referred to the ‘the long faces of the ruined’ in Paris; Mary Berry assessed a French theatre actress as ‘*une ruine que le temps n’a pas respectée*’; and John Carr reflected on the fact that ‘the barbarous jargon of the revolution is rapidly passing away. It is only here and there, that its slimy track remains’.[[53]](#footnote-53) The ruin was double – both environmental and social – which the prolific writings and drawings of British visitors aimed to witness and translate onto paper.[[54]](#footnote-54)

These accounts were inpinged by a variety of asthetics and memories that coalesced into each other in the observation of revolutionary ruins. The main influence was that of French artists, who had already depicted the ruination of French landscapes during the Revolution. Inspired by Roman antiquities, Hubert Robert – nicknamed ‘*Robert des ruines*’ after the Terror – had surveyed the obliteration of several Parisian landmarks in paintings such as *Les ruines de l’Abbaye de Longchamp en 1797*, and speculated on the destruction of the Louvre in *Vue imaginaire de la Grande Galerie du Louvre en ruine* in 1796.[[55]](#footnote-55) Furthermore, the popularity of ruins, as a picturesque if not sublime sight, explains why travellers such as Mary Berry, who had prior experience of Italy, praised the ‘most picturesque ruined castles’ of Avignon.[[56]](#footnote-56)

However, there were clear tensions between the imaginings provoked by châteaux and churches. Whilst the vision of castles mobilised positive visions of chivalric and rural felicity, mutilated Catholic churches revived Gothic myths about the Henrician Reformation. British travellers constantly associated the revolutionary closures and vandalising of convents with the dissolution of monasteries in England under Henry VIII. This is particularly evident in the trope of the ‘idle monks’ that permeated writings such as those of Ann Plumptre, who saw them as ‘idle, dissolute, and profligate race, and contributed not a little to the corruption of the country’.[[57]](#footnote-57) This was embedded in a recurring comparison with domestic ruins such as Fountains Abbey, a Cistercian monastery in Yorkshire.[[58]](#footnote-58) These parallels were owing to the fact that, because of the series of conflicts that kept the country at odds with the Continent, British Grand Tourists had refocused their activities on domestic sites, exploring English ruins and Welsh vistas.[[59]](#footnote-59) These comparisons were sometimes inflected by orientalism, to emphasize the forsaken nature of a post-revolutionary wasteland. Stephen Weston, for instance, depicted a French Benedictine abbey as consisting of ‘few remaining pillars and arches peeping through the trees like Palmyra in the desert’.[[60]](#footnote-60) Overall, the exploration of revolutionary ruins crystallised a variety of imaginations, which were transferrable to new sites of tourism, beyond the traditional trajectories of the Grand Tour.

Changing Geographies of Tourism

British travellers loitered around sites of revolutionary significance, which had not attracted much touristic interest prior to the events. The emergence of these new sites was owing to the heavily mediated nature of the Revolution, whose developments had been conveyed far and wide via letters, memoirs of combatants, and continuous reports and illustrations in newspapers all over Europe.[[61]](#footnote-61) This reshaped Western concepts of historical continuity, and led to what Peter Fritzsche has termed an ‘inverted ventriloquism’, whereby objects of the past contained mysterious historical meanings to be protected, interpreted and verbalised by their visitors.[[62]](#footnote-62)

This disclosure of the past in obscure settings was facilitated by guide books, published in French and English between 1801 and 1803. These publications systematised a binary approach to various sites, comparing the Revolution with the *Ancien Régime*. Upon their return home, English travellers often published their letters or memoirs as guides to future visitors, which followed this dual perspective, as evidenced by a collection entitled *Paris As It Was and As It Is* published in 1803.[[63]](#footnote-63) These guides often followed northern itineraries to Paris, from the Norman coasts to Picardy and Champagne-Ardennes, which highlighted previously neglected villages now bearing the marks of revolutionary ravages. Small towns, such as Clermont-en-Oise, inspired new entries in English guide books for their emptiness. Clermont was worth a detour because ‘[the] chateau is destroyed … woods cut down, and that which was a terrestrial paradise is become a desert’.[[64]](#footnote-64) Spatial emptiness lent itself to the ‘pleasures of the imagination’ of what was no longer there.[[65]](#footnote-65) This was enabled by the description of the architectural structures that used to populate these locales: ‘the chateau’ in question ‘was [the] domain of the duke de Fitzjames, who, during the revolution, [had] been an emigrant … and [was] reduced to a miserable pittance’. Overall, these books emulated the French touristic guides that flourished with the cessation of hostilities, and which were specifically meant to guide foreign visitors through theatres of the Revolution.

These manuals highlighted ‘modern Paris’. Pierre Villiers, a Parisian litterateur and former soldier, was prolific in publishing a whole series of these booklets, which included the multi-edited *Manuel du Voyageur à* *Paris, ou Paris Ancien et Moderne*.[[66]](#footnote-66) These displayed the new geography of Paris divided in twelve *arrondissements*, in the same fashion as the *Guide du voyageur à Paris*. Distributed in London and Paris, this guidebook emphasized new ‘public edifices’ as improving the urban landscape and its cultural value. The *Palais des Tuileries*, for instance, was said to have been embellished by the destructive impetus of the Revolution: ‘the demolition of several buildings on the *place du Carouzel*, is finished; which means that, from whatever entry to the square, the visitor discovers the magnificent façade of the palace’.[[67]](#footnote-67) A new Napoleonic Paris was under construction: the Louvre, renamed ‘Napoleon Museum’, was being expanded, whilst the nationalised *Palais Bourbon* was turned into a legislative assembly adorned by allegorical depictions of history in the making.[[68]](#footnote-68) These guides encouraged visitors to explore places that had hardly been a source of touristic interest before the Revolution, such as the *Musée des Petits-Augustins*, a creation of the Revolution itself. There, mutilated remains of religious sculptures, books, clothes and funerary items had been collated since 1790, and reorganised chronologically to retrace the history of Paris from the Middle Ages to the present.[[69]](#footnote-69) The museum was, in fact, very popular with British visitors, being open on Sundays and Mondays for the locals, and ‘every day for foreigners equipped with passports’.[[70]](#footnote-70) The Bastille was equally popular amongst these visitors, who like James Forbes, ‘frequently visited the Bastille, or rather the ruins of that celebrated fortress, and the buildings erected for various purposes from its dilapidation’.[[71]](#footnote-71) The prison had hardly attracted any attention before 1789, yet its demolition site was now regarded as worth including in touristic guide books.

These new Parisian sights did not outshine previous places of tourism; rather they conflated past and new touristic interests. The Louvre attracted visitors mainly because Bonaparte’s art loot came from Italy, and Ancient Rome remained the key attraction. Secondly, within Paris, new sights linked to the Revolution altered, rather than replaced, more traditional sites such as the *Nôtre Dame* cathedral, or the *Sainte Chapelle*. By putting the emphasis on new political sites, French guide books reframed – rather than erased – the classical hierarchy of destinations in Paris. *Le Guide du Voyageur à Paris* did mention the traditional sites mentioned above, but it relegated religious buildings under the heading ‘Edifices destined for the Catholic cult’, and the former royal palace of the *Conciergerie* was meant to be visited as a ‘prison’.[[72]](#footnote-72) Most entries concerned spaces of recent political significance: new governmental buildings, places of social unrest such as the *Invalides*, revolutionary prisons such as the *Temple*, along with new state properties such as the *Hotel de Soubise*, the new *Banque de France*, national scientific institutes, and places of symbolic display such as the *Champ de Mars* and the newly refurbished *Champs-Élysées*, which gained popularity during the Revolution for elegant promenades. A closer look at these entries shows how baroque architecture was considered as the main appeal of these locations. The *Hotel de Soubise*, for instance, was deemed ‘worth of the curiosity of travellers’ because of its former ‘*éclat*’, particularly the sculptures of Robert Le Lorrain and Guillaume Coustou the Younger which adorned its façade. Yet the ‘*éclat*’ was even more valuable as the edifice had become public property, and was displayed, in these guidebooks, as the wealth of a republican nation.[[73]](#footnote-73)

Outside Paris, industrial sites became the source of new peregrinating interests, as entrepreneurs turned revolutionary ruins into textile factories. Exploring a derelict abbey near Rouen, Stephen Weston crossed the path of other British visitors, who came to France to develop their industry and were using the ruins of religious edifices for their trade. The abbey, he noted, ‘is now occupied no more by lazy ecclesiastics, but by industrious mechanics who, under the direction of a company of English manufacturers there, weave velvets similar to those of Spitalfields. We learnt that there were several other establishments of the sort in the province’.[[74]](#footnote-74) These reinvented spaces featured prominently in Northern France, and calico factories embedded in ruins were advertised in various guide books. This underpinned a growing industrial tourism amongst British visitors in France who perceived the social changes experienced by France, through the trope of a manufacturing phoenix, which connected the country to Britain’s industrial ebb and flow. ‘In England’, wrote Ann Plumptre, ‘the town of Manchester has risen to wealth and splendour on the ruin of Spitalfields; and, perhaps, in France, Chantilly, where cotton manufactories are established, may be destined to rise to opulence on the ruins of Lyons’.[[75]](#footnote-75)

New itineraries were also traced by visitors who wished to relive the Revolution, not only in space but in time. ‘Having a wish to see Varennes’, wrote James Forbes to his sister, ‘the spot where the unfortunate Louis was arrested with his family in their flight from the capital, I was determined to spend its anniversary in that town’.[[76]](#footnote-76) The town attracted a growing attention from foreigners, certainly owing to the various illustrations of the arrest that had largely circulated in print in France, Britain and Prussia in the 1790s.[[77]](#footnote-77) There, they could inspect a house, a barn and a bridge, under the guidance of local tour guides.[[78]](#footnote-78) A similar process was taking place across the Rhine, where Prussian farmers guided tourists around Revolutionary battle sites.[[79]](#footnote-79) The British visitors remarked, in unison, upon the poor quality of the sights in Varennes: ‘totally unworthy of notice on any other account’, declared Major Blayney; ‘it is a most insignificant place’, wrote James Forbes, ‘but its connexion with the great events of the revolution makes it interesting’.[[80]](#footnote-80) To overcome this paradox, the latter scrutinised ‘the spot’, by examining ‘the bridge over the Aire where the blockade was formed’ and by ‘reading the account of the arrest in different histories of the revolution’.[[81]](#footnote-81) Their route to Varennes had already followed a specific historical trail in Lorraine, by passing through Valmy, where the Prussian Army had retreated, and following a military axis to Saint-Ménéhould, to see the man who had identified the King on a coin. But it was only with the end of the peace, and the arrest of all British excursionists on French soil in May 1803, that Varennes emerged as a touristic hub for paroled British prisoners of war detained locally at Verdun. Police records and military archives reveal that captives were riveted by the town, and obtained, on a regular basis, temporary permissions to visit ‘the spot’, which further suggests the close intimacy between war and tourism during the period.[[82]](#footnote-82)

Conclusion

Historians have recently reappraised the need to ‘look at the lesser “hot spots”’ of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic period, in order to unravel the more complex contacts created by intermittent periods of truce, such as the Peace of Amiens.[[83]](#footnote-83) This interlude has been reconsidered as a ‘*rattrapage*’, in the words of Renaud Morieux, namely a continuation of previous patterns of migrations suspended by war.[[84]](#footnote-84) This chapter has further nuanced this picture, by revealing how the varied interests of British travellers in revolutionary ruins fed a re-imagination of past travelling experiences. Itineraries of Grand Tourists took a northern turn, whilst French defaced confessional sites were perceived as another kind of historical ruins to be studied and collected. British travellers were active agents of the on-going production and imagination of touristic spaces in France, by prompting the publication of new guidebooks and the emergence of touristic sites not only within Paris but also in Northern provinces so far discarded for their lack of cultural refinement.[[85]](#footnote-85)

This endeavour was facilitated by improving and less onerous modes of transport, which meant that thousands of British travellers of various ages, genders and social backgrounds (therefore not only genteel excursionists but also artisans, manufacturers, and servants) crossed the Channel in the hope to witness the remnants of a historical milestone, and to develop financial connections abroad. Their migrations and interests triggered a long-lasting shift in the geography of tourism in France. Whilst Paris, Montpellier and watering places had previously gathered cosmopolitan travellers in search of intellectual refinements, or simply a milder climate; more remote sites became the object of a novel interest. Travelling itineraries now included minor towns such as Varennes-sur-Argonne, which had recently seen the arrest of Louis XVI. The North-East of France thrived with British peregrinators eager to discover urban landscapes mutilated by the Prussian invasion, and to render their experiences in diaries and sketchbooks.

These travelling behaviours were, in part, extensions of long established practices. They drew mainly on the Catholic practice of reliquary and the cabinet of curiosity culture. Historians have shown that eighteenth century tourists often took relics and fragments wherever they travelled: they chipped pieces of the stones at Stonehenge, picked up pieces of mosaic from tessellated pavements, or pocketed bits of pottery in Pompeii.[[86]](#footnote-86) Similarly, the writings of English travellers in post-revolutionary France echoed pre-existing tropes of travel writing. This is particularly evident in comments on women’s clothing and comparisons made with Ancient Rome.

Yet, three elements distinguish the experience of revolutionary ruins from the classic Grand Tour. Firstly, revolutionary ruins offered an immediacy of contemplation that did not necessitate prior intellectual engagement with the Classics. In other words, the rawness and recent nature of the damage allowed for a more vivid reimagining than older, milder classical ruins. These revolutionary sites were readily accessible, both geographically and intellectually, to a variety of travellers, since there was little need for interpretation. Reading the post-revolutionary landscape could easily be done through the reading of newspapers and by conversing with the locals, which explains the popularity of these sites.

Secondly, this engendered a variety of emotional languages to narrate personal experiences in locations associated with the French Revolution. Victoria Thompson has recently shown how the Revolution forged new ‘emotional landmarks’ that were eagerly sought by British travellers visiting Paris in 1802, 1814 and in the years following Waterloo.[[87]](#footnote-87) The Revolution, she argued, led to a ‘consistent use of strong and distressing expressions of emotions’ amongst British travellers, who no longer perceived the ravages of time through the pleasurable contemplation of the picturesque, but from a negative emotional lens, a strong fear of revolutionary violence. This caused an unprecedented ‘emotional community’ in response to a ‘cultural trauma’.[[88]](#footnote-88) This chapter does not entirely concur with Thompson’s conclusions, especially on the reinforcement of Franco-British alterity in these travels. Rather, this chapter has highlighted how the existence of endearing melancholy or sentiments of elation in witnessing the end of monarchical absolutism and ‘idle monks’ also permeated the writings of authors such as Marry Berry and John Carr. The assertion, penned by the latter, that ‘every lover of pure liberty must leap with delight upon the disencumbered earth, where once stood that gloomy abode’ to describe the fall of the Bastille to his reader, is a powerful reminder that British and French visions of freedom not only collided but also coincided in personal readings of the landscape.[[89]](#footnote-89) Overall, this chapter has argued that the ‘emotional community’ of British travellers was, far from being homogenously negative, providing a diverse, if not contradictory vision of post-revolutionary France.

Thirdly, these revolutionary ruins differed from classical remains in prompting new perceptions of time. Chloe Chard has shown that eighteenth-century Grand Tourists conflated femininity and antiquity in contemplations of classical ruins in Italy, in order to ‘convert historical time’, the ‘remote, vanished nature of the past … into personal time’.[[90]](#footnote-90) Conversely, revolutionary ruins were seen as crystallising an accelerated time. They embodied the events of ‘yesterday’, a compressed ‘space of time, hav[ing] crouded [sic.] ages into years’, in the words of an English traveller, which did not necessitated this ‘conversion’.[[91]](#footnote-91) Overall, the upheavals of the French Revolution caused a distinctive change, in the sense that pre-existing travel tropes and antiquarian pursuits were geared towards new reflections on social unrest, war and time, on a scale that was unusual and unprecedented in its focus.

In this respect, it seems clear that war and social unrest during the period subtly remodelled touristic practices. French revolutionaries were not the first to wreck castles and churches – the Seven Years’ War had already left many scars in the country – but the fact that foreign visitors travelled en masse to France in 1802 to amble around specific sites of revolutionary ruins indicated a long-lasting change of perception, the fact that, in the words of Peter Fritzsche, ‘recent history had come to be dramatized as a sequence of abrupt endings and new beginnings’.[[92]](#footnote-92) These ‘abrupt endings’ also meant that the touristic attraction of these revolutionary sites faded away within a few years. This is particularly perceptible in the rapid narrowing of anecdotes related to the *Tuileries* palace and garden in British travel accounts. Whilst in 1802 the *Tuileries* featured as the most visited and commented site in narratives penned by British excursionists, the location only led to brief remarks in accounts published in 1814. Previously associated with five remarkable events – the deposition of the French royal family in residence in the palace, the meetings of the Convention and National Assembly, the 11 July 1789 riot of the *Tuileries* gardens, and the defining invasion of the palace on 10 August 1792 – only the 10 August insurrection was mentioned in accounts in 1814.[[93]](#footnote-93) But perhaps most strikingly today, the spot where the Bastille once stood is no longer a prime site of touristic attraction.

Other sites fell into similar oblivion as the Napoleonic Wars led to new imaginings. The touristic surge of 1802 had indeed many successors, particularly following the first abdication of Napoleon. In 1814, British and American visitors flocked again en masse to France to witness what came to be known as the Hundred Days. Their exodus back into Britain in 1815 was only temporary, as visitors of all sorts, included women and children, again crossed the Channel in a post-Waterloo frenzy in 1816.[[94]](#footnote-94) Literary figures such as the Shelleys, but also merchants, artisans and scientists were eager to visit Belgian battlefields to relive the combats of Waterloo.[[95]](#footnote-95) Such developments are a potent reminder of the versatility of interests that underpinned the re-imagination, relocation and democratisation of peripatetic practices, beyond the Grand Tour, in northern France and Europe at the end of the eighteenth century.
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