

Erwin und Gerda Panofsky

The „Tomb in Arcady“ at the „Fin-de-Siècle“

In 1936, the Wallraf-Richartz Museum in Cologne acquired from Dr. Andreas Becker a small oil painting on mahogany wood, measuring only 25,5 cm by 41 cm and officially listed as „Idylle“ (Fig. 1)[1]. Signed with the ligatured initials „A. S.“ and dated „75“, this picture can safely be ascribed to the then fashionable painter Alfred Stevens (1823–1906). Though of Belgian extraction, he spent his whole adult life in Paris and here developed into what has been called a „großer Kleinmeister“, known to everybody (Dumas fils and Delacroix were witnesses at his wedding) and specializing in genre pictures as well as in perceptive, slightly satirical portrayals of the Parisian *femme du monde* and the Parisian *femme du demi-monde*.



Fig. 1: Alfred Stevens, *Idylle*, 1875, Köln, Wallraf-Richartz-Museum (Source: Katalog der Gemälde des 19. Jahrhunderts im Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, bearbeitet von Rolf Andree, Köln 1964, S. 293)

Stevens' „Idylle“ shows an open-air scene possibly influenced by Manet's *Déjeuner sur l'Herbe*. Suffused with a blond light that filters through the tall trees of a park-like landscape, the composition is dominated by the Tomb of Philippe Pot (Grand Seneschal of Burgundy, d. 1493), now in the Louvre. Seated on the grass in

front of this Tomb are a couple of modern lovers who have chosen the site for their siesta. Dressed with incongruous elegance, they sit back-to-back while needing as a further support one of the eight pleurants that carry the recumbent effigy. The lady is ineffectually protecting herself from the sun with an umbrella and smoking a cigarette while the moustachioed, tousle-haired gentleman, his straw hat and newspaper resting on the grass at his left, has gone to sleep. In the right-hand foreground are seen two bottles of earthenware, and in the right-hand middle distance a mule or donkey, turning its back upon the beholder, feeds from a haycock. In the right-hand background we observe, in addition to two high-roofed dwelling houses, the remnants of a „mediaeval“ structure consisting of a ruined semi-circular arch and the plate tracery of an erstwhile „Gothic“ façade. And the subtle ironies of the scene are highlighted by the fact that the lady has thrust her hat on the head of the big dog who supports the feet of the effigy and is supposed to signify marital faith or feudal loyalty.

In view of the impression of freedom and spontaneity conveyed by the Cologne „Idylle“ it is surprising that it exists in another version different from the first only by the fact that it is painted on canvas; by its tighter, more careful execution, particularly noticeable in the distant structures; by its darker palette (the lady's umbrella, e. g., is black); and by its considerably larger size which is no less than ca. 60 cm by ca. 96 cm, more than five times the area of Alfred Stevens' painting. In every other respect this second version, preserved in the Depot of the Metropolitan Museum in New York and likewise dated „1875“, is identical with the Cologne „Idylle“. Originally called „*Au Soleil*“, and now

entitled „*At the Tomb of Philippe Pot*“, it came to the Metropolitan Museum as a gift from the estate of Marie L. Russell in 1946, and it is a signed work of Charles Edouard de Beaumont (1821–1888), a Parisian painter kindred in taste, spirit and style to the slightly younger Alfred Stevens.

The perfect compositional identity which exists between the Cologne „*Idylle*“ and the Metropolitan Museum’s „*At the Tomb of Philippe Pot*“ excludes a purely accidental resemblance or two simultaneous portrayals *d’après nature*; in which case it would have been necessary for the eyes of the two painters to be located in precisely the same spot in space. This poses the question whether the priority belongs to Stevens or de Beaumont.

If the two pictures were by one and the same hand one would be inclined to consider them to be *bozzetto* (or *modello*) and „finished product“; in other words, to assume that the smaller, sketchier and very dashing painted picture by Stevens precedes the larger and more pedestrian picture by de Beaumont. But since we are confronted with the work of two different artists, we may be led to the opposite view. De Beaumont, a man of great intellectual sophistication and keen antiquarian interests (he acquired fame as a connoisseur and collector of ancient arms, on which he published a well-illustrated book, *La Fleur des belles épées*, Paris, 1886, and several articles)[2], would seem to be the likelier candidate for the invention of a composition combining so much mockery with so accurate an observation of late-mediaeval style, arms, costume, and heraldry; and we must ask ourselves how it would have been possible for an artist other than the inventor, and basing himself exclusively on the Cologne „*Idylle*“, to derive from the latter all those sharp, clearly delineated details (e. g., the tracery of the ruined buildings in the background and, above all, the inscription on the tomb itself which can be clearly read in the New York, but not in the Cologne, version. In short, the two pictures should be judged not as *bozzetto* and „finished product“ but as „original“

and „reduced copy“, however much this „reduced copy“ may captivate us by its free and impromptu manner.

We have been unable to ascertain whether Alfred Stevens and Charles Edouard de Beaumont were personally acquainted, much less when and where they may have had occasion to inspect the Tomb of Philippe Pot in the flesh. We know of this monument that it was not acquired by the Louvre until 1889, that is to say, a full fourteen years after the date of our two paintings. And to establish its location in the antecedent decades and lustra of the nineteenth century is not quite easy.



Fig. 2: Antoine le Moiturier?, *Tomb of Philippe Pot, Seigneur de la Roche*, Paris, Musée du Louvre (Source: Wikipedia)

Philippe Pot, Seigneur de la Roche, was born in 1428 at the Château de la Rochepot near Beaune and died in 1493. He was a Knight of the Golden Fleece (which honor was bestowed upon him by his godfather, Philip the Good of Burgundy), Grand Chambellan of Louis XI of France, and, after the death of Charles the Bold, Governor of Burgundy. His Tomb, probably executed by Antoine le Moiturier, was completed before Philippe Pot’s death: its inscription seems to have been formulated before the demise of Louis XI in 1483 and refers to Philippe’s own resting place in the future tense (*cy demorra*)[3]. In conformity with his wishes, his remains were put to rest in the Chapelle de St.-Jean-Baptiste in the Abbey Church of Cîteaux where they stayed undisturbed for about three-hundred

years. In 1791 or 1793, a few years after all ecclesiastical property had been transferred to the French State, the Tomb of Philippe Pot was to be removed to Dijon and to be deposited in the Cathedral of St.-Bénigne; but whether and when this was done remains in doubt[4]. About 1808, however, the monument was bought, for fifty-three *livres*, by one of the most prominent citizens of Dijon, the President Count Richard de Vesvrotte. Having thus saved it from „une destruction certaine et imminente“[5], he placed it in the garden of his townhouse, the Hôtel de Ruffey, 33 rue Berbisey[6]. In an engraving by J.-J. Beugean (or Baugean, d. 1819) after J. M. S. Bence, datable between 1817 and 1819 (*Nouveau voyage pittoresque de la France*, F. d’Ostervald, ed., Paris, 1817–1824, II, Vue 171; we see the Tomb (Fig. 2), surrounded by trees, before a high, blank wall while in Bence’s closely related engraving after Alphonse-Louis Duc in J. A. Hugo’s *France pittoresque*, Paris, 1835[7] this wall is hardly visible. Before 1836, the same wall seems to have been decorated by affixing to it, apparently rather at random, a small collection of Roman and Gallo-Roman reliefs. A final engraving by Bence – after M. Marie Alexandre Duparc and Mlle. Pillement – shows this improved arrangement described and illustrated in the second volume of A. de Laborde’s *Les Monuments de la France* of 1836[8]. „Ce monument“, says de Laborde, „est maintenant dans les jardins de l’hôtel de M. le Président Richard de Vesvrotte ...; aujourd’hui couronné par des arbres touffus, et environné de monuments antiques, il présente un aspect tout-à-la-fois agréable, solitaire et pittoresque.“[9]

In 1850, however, Pierre de Vesvrotte, apparently the son and heir of Count Richard, decided to sell the Hôtel de Ruffey and to move his residence to the Hôtel d’Agrain, 18 rue Chabot-Charny, which he had inherited ten years before; it was in the „cour“ (not „jardin“!) of this Hôtel d’Agrain that the Tomb of Philippe Pot was „installé définitivement“[10]. Pierre de Vesvrotte constructed a new library adjacent to the Hôtel and, beneath it, a „crypte ou caveau“ – to-

day a coal cellar dimly lighted by a low window set into a segmental arch – „pour recevoir“ the Tomb. The wall above this window – the north-east wall of the new library – was articulated by a system of blind tracery displaying another collection of Roman and Gallo-Roman reliefs which, as we learn from Professor Thuillier, came from the *Castrum* at Dijon and none of which is identical with any of the pieces shown in de Laborde’s *Monuments de la France*. „Il [Pierre de Vesvrotte] aménagea pour lui [the Tomb] une sorte de châtelet; crypte voûtée, surmontée d’une bibliothèque dont les murs extérieurs furent incrustés de bas-reliefs antiques.“[1] This construction was accomplished „dans le cours de l’année 1855“[12], which date completely agrees with the style of the library building as it now stands. And it was during this year, and probably only during this year, while the building operations at the Hôtel d’Agrain were under way, that the Tomb was sent out to the family’s country seat, the Château de Vesvrotte, located (according to information kindly supplied by M. Garreta) in Beire-le-Châtel, a few kilometers to the north-northeast of Dijon[13].

After the death of Count Richard in 1873, the Vesvrottes seem to have begun to think of selling the Tomb. The French government attempted to block this plan on the grounds that the Tomb, when it had been removed from its original location in the Abbey Church of Cîteaux, had passed into public property, thus allegedly having become „inaliénable et imprescriptible.“ This claim, however, was decisively rejected by the Cour d’Appel of Dijon in 1886 so that the family was left in full possession of the property rights. In the following year (1887) the Tomb was deposited, perhaps as a matter of precaution, in the neutral territory of a *hangar* (location unspecified)[14], and in 1889 it finally found its way into the Louvre (Fig. 2). The little street behind the erstwhile library of the Hôtel d’Agrain, however (in Guasco-Jobard’s city plan of 1853 still called „rue de Musette“), now bears the name of „rue de Philippe Pot.“ When asking where in 1875 the Tomb could

have been inspected and portrayed within the *plein-air* setting depicted by Alfred Stevens and Charles Edouard de Beaumont, we are at a loss. The „crypte ou caveau“ beneath the library of the Hôtel d’Agrain, confined and poorly lighted, is excluded by definition.[15] Neither in the garden of the Hôtel de Ruffey on rue Berbisey nor in the environs of the Château de Vesvrotte at Beire-le-Châtel, both entirely changed in the course of more than a century, do we find the model of the park-like landscape envisaged by the two Parisian painters; and a professional architect’s drawing by François Ch. Savinien Petit (1815–1878), „dessinateur attaché à la Commission des Monuments Historiques“, which shows the Tomb in pure longitudinal elevation, is of little help except that it represents the *pleurants* in a sequence different from that shown in the original and in several other renderings but agrees with that encountered in most others: the coats-of-arms of the *pleurants* on the averted side are drawn separately beneath their feet; and it is evident that the bearer of the three *chevrons d’or* (The Seigneur de Nesle) occupies the place at the front right-hand corner of the Tomb. In addition, we know that the Tomb was at the Château de Vesvrotte only in 1855 and on no account could it have been on the territory of the Hôtel d’Agrain before 1840 when this Hôtel came into the possession of Pierre de Vesvrotte.

But is it really necessary to assume that in the earlier of our two paintings – de Beaumont’s, if our initial assumption is correct – the Tomb was portrayed from the monument itself? May it not have been portrayed from a reproduction while the more distant landscape features were filled in *ad libitum*? We are inclined to accept this possibility or at least to submit it for discussion.

In 1857 or 1858 Count Richard de Vesvrotte donated to the *Commission des Antiquités de la Côte d’Or* „deux très-belles épreuves de photographie exécutées par M. son fils, Armand de Vesvrotte, représentant les deux faces de l’intéressant tombeau de Philippe Pot“ – an event considered important enough to be

commemorated in the Commissions’s *Comptes rendus*[16]. In 1922, this Commission was absorbed, as a section, by the *Académie des Sciences, Arts et Belles-Lettres* at Dijon; but young Armand’s beautiful photographs could not be located in the Academy’s archives. One of them, though inconspicuously placed, was discovered in the *Musée des Beaux-Arts* in Dijon, and an inspection confirmed our suspicion that Armand’s photographs had served as a basis for two of the large lithographs found in the volume *Bourgogne* in Charles Nodier’s and Baron I. J. S. Taylor’s *Voyages pittoresques et romantiques dans l’ancienne France*, Paris 1820–1878; III (occasionally designated as IX), 1863, Pls. 72 and 73[17].

That these two lithographs – about the earliest produced by a photographic process – duplicate the two *épreuves photographiques* taken by Armand de Vesvrotte and donated by his father to the *Commission des Antiquités* cannot be questioned. Showing the „two sides of the interesting tomb of Philippe Pot“, they correspond exactly to the description given by de Vesvrotte Senior and may be presumed to have been taken in the garden of the Hôtel de Ruffey shortly before the monument was hidden away in the „crypt or cellar“ beneath the new library of the Hôtel d’Agrain. This assumption is borne out by the luscious appearance of the trees which would be incompatible with the severely limited space available on the grounds of the Hôtel d’Agrain and by the fact that the photograph surviving in the *Musée des Beaux-Arts* is explicitly inscribed: „Vers 1850 dans le jardin de l’Hôtel de Ruffey.“

The photograph now in the *Musée des Beaux-Arts* agrees with Nodier’s and Taylor’s Pl. 72 down to the last blade of grass and the last leaf in the foliage of the trees; and the apparent discrepancy between foreground and backdrop (which latter has been suspected of having been tampered with in the lithograph) can be accounted for by the difficulty of focusing the camera upon a nearby object while at the same time showing the more distant background.

All things considered, it would seem very probable that the Tomb of Philippe Pot, as rendered by Charles Edouard de Beaumont and Alfred Stevens, was not portrayed from life but from one of the two photo-lithographs included in Nodier's and Taylor's *Voyages pittoresques et romantiques*, then at the height of its reputation and diffusion. As shown in the two paintings, the appearance of the Tomb literally agrees with Nodier's and Taylor's Pl. 72 not only in proportions and with respect to the other elements permanently and structurally inherent in the monument itself (composition, relation between mass and voids, measurements, costumes, and modeling) but also with respect to such incidental and accidental features – not likely to recur twice by mere coincidence – as the direction of the light (which comes from the right, causing the *pleurants* to cast oblique shadows upon the plinth and permitting the dog as well as the quaintly protruding feet, knees, hands, and profile of the effigy to stand out with great brilliance against the dark background) and, above all, the perspective point of view. In contrast to all other renderings at our disposal, the Tomb is set slantwise into space in such a manner that the *pleurant* on the extreme right is placed in the center of a triangle formed by the corner of the plinth, and the point of vision is exactly on the level of the slab supporting the effigy – in consequence of which the margins of this slab, though meeting at right angles, form an unbroken horizontal line. Whether the open-air landscape in the back of our two pictures was also suggested by a print in one of the illustrated books published in the nineteenth century or originated in the painter's observation and/or imagination, we were unable to determine.

In staging an amorous episode in the vicinity of a tomb, de Beaumont and Stevens followed a tradition which can be traced back to remote antiquity and is rooted in the deepest and darkest recesses of human psychology. Petronius' story of the Matron of Ephesus (rewritten for the stage by Lessing), Queen Anne's surrender at

the bier of her husband in Shakespeare's *Richard III*, the custom – still practiced, we are told, in places such as Istanbul – of making love in a cemetery: all these motifs are variations on the sublime theme ἔρωτος δὲ αἴτια Θάνατος. And in the „Tomb in Arcady“ tradition[18] we can observe the gradual development of the Tomb from a *memento mori* into an invitation, now elegiac, now triumphant, to enjoy the blessings of life and love.



Fig. 3: Guercino, *Et in Arcadia ego*, ca. 1621-1623, Rome, Galleria Nazionale (Source: Wikimedia)

This development begins, for us, with the Tomb of Daphnis described and occasionally illustrated in the Fifth Book of Vergil's *Eclogues*: Jacopo Sannazaro's poem *Arcadia* (1502) contains several other descriptions of „Tombs in Arcady“, that on p. 308 in M. Scherillo's edition of 1888 substituting for the first time a haughtily reluctant shepherdess for a haughtily reluctant shepherd[19]. But the motif came to be proverbial in art and literature only with an early picture (probably between 1621 and 1623) by Guercino in the Galleria Nazionale at Rome (Fig. 3). Here two young shepherds, entering from the left, are arrested in their cheerful progress by the sudden sight of an enormous death's head – much as the young huntsmen are stopped by the sudden appearance of three corpses in such mediaeval renderings of the Legend of the Three Quick and the Three Dead as Traini's well-known fresco in the Camposanto at Pisa. In Guercino's picture the death's head receives the attentions of a fly

and mouse, both traditional symbols of transience and decay, and it rests on a dilapidated piece of masonry inscribed ET IN ARCADIA EGO.

According to the rules of Latin grammar the „ET“ in this epigrammatic and elliptical sentence can refer only to „IN ARCADIA“ so that the sentence must be supposed to be pronounced by Death in person: „Even in Arcady“, says he, „there am I.“ This is how the phrase was originally understood in England (including King George III who translated it without hesitation when he saw it on a tombstone in the double portrait of Mrs Bouverie and Mrs Crewe by Sir Joshua Reynolds). Not so on the Continent where Poussin intervened with two famous pictures. The earlier of these (ca. 1630) is in the collection of the Duke of Devonshire at Chatsworth and is still dependent on Guercino: it continues to be invested with a moralistic message in that its *memento mori* is matched by the *cave avaritiam* proclaimed by its counterpart, the Metropolitan Museum's *Midas Washing His Face in the Source of River Pactolus*; and the shepherds, here in the company of the Arcadian river god Alpheus and followed by a shepherdess, still approach the scene from the left and are arrested by the unexpected sight of a skull which here, however, has become quite small and is placed upon a fine, curvilinear sarcophagus inscribed ET IN ARCADIA EGO. In the later picture in the Louvre (about or shortly after 1640 rather than ca. 1655, the traces of Guercino's influence and the aftereffect of mediaeval moralization have entirely disappeared. The Arcadian shepherds, here three young men and one young woman, are no longer surprised and arrested in their movement but symmetrically posed in calm, reflective attitudes, pointing at or pondering over the enigmatical inscription; and this inscription is now engraved upon what Sannazzaro would have called a *bel sasso quadrangulo*. The death's head, reduced in size and importance but still present in the earlier version, has been omitted entirely.

The very pensiveness which here replaces the dramatic encounter with Death, and the

absence of the skull to which in the earlier version the words ET IN ARCADIA EGO could and should be attributed, made it increasingly difficult for the interpreters of Poussin's Louvre picture to maintain the linguistically correct explanation of the ET IN ARCADIA EGO, that is, to ascribe the phrase to Death in person and to supply a verb in the present tense. In 1672 Giovanni Pietro Bellori, a friend of Poussin's, still correctly explained the phrase as meaning: „ET IN ARCADIA EGO, cioè, che il sepolcro *si trova ancora* in Arcadia e la Morte *a luogo* in mezzo le felicità“. In 1685, André Félibien, Poussin's second biographer (and likewise acquainted with him), took the first step towards bad Latinity and good artistic analysis by transposing the phrase into the past and attributing it not to Death but to the occupant of the tomb: „Par cette inscription on a voulu marquer que *celui qui est dans cette sépulture a vécu* en Arcadie et que la Mort se rencontre parmi les plus grandes félicité“ (italics ours). From then on the development proceeded to its logical conclusion. Félibien did not bother about the ET; he simply left it out. And so did Richard Wilson in a picture painted in Rome in 1755: „Ego fui in Arcadia“. Some thirty years after Félibien, in 1719, Abbé du Bos rendered the ET by an adverbial *cependant* („Je vivais cependant en Arcadie“, „And yet I lived in Arcady“). And the final touch was put on by Diderot in 1758 when he, retaining the *vivais*, firmly attached the ET to EGO and expressed it by *aussi*: „Je vivais aussi dans la délicieuse Arcadie.“

It was in this sense – doing violence to Latin grammar but doing justice to the new content of Poussin's Louvre picture – that the phrase became ubiquitously proverbial on the Continent. Wieland, for example, translated it (in *Pervonte*, 1778) as „Auch ich lebt' in Arcadia“ or „Du arme Vastola. Auch du warst in Arcadia“; Goethe used it as a motto for his *Italienische Reise* (1786) in the form of „Auch ich in Arkadien“; Johann Georg Jacobi sentimentalized about a tomb inscribed „Auch ich war in Arkadien“ (*Die Winterreise*, 1769); Schiller paraphrased it into „Auch ich war in Arkadien geboren“ (*Resi-*

gnation, 1786); and Carl Wilhelm Kolbe the Elder (d. 1835) uncannily transformed Arcadia into a fantastic forest or jungle constructed from spectrally magnified herbs or cabbage leaves.

It will be noted that in all these instances the notion of death has entirely evaporated or, rather, has been absorbed into the vision of a paradise lost and remembered with a feeling of soft, elegiac nostalgia: „Auch ich in Arkadien“ came to mean only: „Alas, I, too, once lived in paradise“. Still later authors (e. g., Carl Julius Weber in *Demokritos* or Balzac in *Madame Firmini*, and particularly such well educated English mystery story writers as Dorothy Sayers and Nicholas Blake), inverted the sequence of words in the original Latin text so as to adapt its meaning to the new significance attributed to it by the interpreters of Poussins's Louvre picture: ET IN ARCADIA EGO came to read ET EGO IN ARCADIA or even ET EGO IN ARCADIA VIXI[20].

A climax of this transformation was reached in Adam Friedrich Oeser, the drawing master and lifelong friend of Goethe. In a painting now in the Landesgalerie at Hannover (probably executed between 1767 and 1777) he converted the misinterpreted Latin version into impeccable Greek: Καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ[21].

Jean Honoré Fragonard (1732–1806), on the other hand, retained the idea of death but reversed the original significance of the ET IN ARCADIA EGO in a charming drawing in the Albertina. Here he depicted two Cupids, apparently the spirits of departed lovers, clasped in an everlasting embrace within a broken sarcophagus while other, smaller Cupids flutter about and a friendly genius – a reincarnation of the classical Hymenaeus – illumines the scene with a nuptial torch. To Guercino's „Even in Arcady there is death“ Fragonard's drawing replies: „Even in death there may be Arcady.“

The humanistic tradition that had developed around the Tomb in Arcady found its nadir in the great compatriot and contemporary of Stevens and de Beaumont: Gustave Flaubert. In his beautiful description of the Bois de la Garenne

(„Parc très beau malgré ses beautés factices“) Flaubert mentions „une pierre taillée en forme de tombe“, inscribed IN ARCADIA EGO: „non-sens dont je n'ai pu découvrir l'intention.“[22]

Charles Edouard de Beaumont and Alfred Stevens were certainly aware of the „intention“ of the Tomb in Arcady; but in their pictures this intention is both corroded by the acid of Second-Empire frivolity and diluted by the waters of modern mediaevalism. The incongruity created by the juxtaposition of two late-nineteenth-century excursionists (comparable to the travestied mythological characters in Daumiers's lithographs or Offenbach's operas) with a Gothic tomb, and the ironic contrast between the lady's cigarette-smoking flippancy and the gentleman's obvious lack of interest (not to mention the mischievous placement of the lady's hat upon the head of the symbolical dog) mocks not so much the ideality of the land of pastoral bliss as the reality of love. And the very fact that the scene of this imperfect idyl is laid near a tomb rendered with an archaeological accuracy that makes it possible to assign to it a definite *locus* in space (Burgundy) and time (the end of the fifteenth century), exploits as well as satirizes the preoccupation of the „élite“ with the mediaeval past – a preoccupation which in the seventeenth century had started among a few learned Benedictines but by the middle of the nineteenth, when the book market was swamped with *Voyages pittoresques et romantiques* or *Monuments de la France ancienne*, had grown to the proportions of an international obsession. The two paintings which form the subject of this little study may thus be said to mark the point of intersection between a line of development which reached its apex in Toulouse-Lautrec and another which reached its apex in Viollet-le-Duc.

In a late pen-and-ink drawing by Aubrey Beardsley (1872–1898) the whole process of transformation has run full cycle. Here the Tomb in Arcady is a prismatic pillar surmounted by an urn which to the irreverent mind may suggest a classicizing soup tureen; and it is approached by an elderly dandy who attempts to hide his age

(betrayed by his wrinkled face and almost completely bald head) behind a mask of youthful jauntiness[23]. Modishly and anachronistically attired in a tight-fitting redingote, jabot and spats, and carrying a diminutive cane and a glove in his left hand, he has stopped before the Tomb in a kind of *pirouette* position. Yet he seems to be immersed in melancholy thoughts induced by the ET IN ARCADIA EGO incised on the monument; and it is difficult to say whether these thoughts revolve around the defunct person (presumably dear to him) or around the pleasures of his own bygone youth, or around both. Whichever the case may be, the drawing ridicules the very sentiment of which the phrase ET IN ARCADIA EGO had become the accepted expression in all romantic art and literature. And the very fact that it is impossible to decide whether the aged „Arcadian“ is the perpetrator or the victim of the joke endows Beardsley's composition with the fictitious brilliance of a Wildean paradox.

Endnoten

1. Inv. No. 2579, *Wallraf-Richartz-Museum der Hansestadt Köln, Gemäldegalerie, Wegweiser und Verzeichnis*, Cologne, 1936, p. 99; same publication, 1938, p. 90; *Wallraf-Richartz-Museum der Stadt Köln, Verzeichnis der Gemälde*, Cologne, 1959 and 1965, p. 163. The erroneous identification of the Tomb as that of Bertrand Duguesclin in the 1936 edition is based on a misleading inscription on the back of the picture (repeated in R. Andree's *Katalog* of 1964, p. 118) which reads: „Du Guesclin (Bertrand), 1314–1380 | Monument historique du Château de la Motte-Broön près de Rennes (peint par Alfred Stevens en 1875).“ While Bertrand Duguesclin was born in the Château de la Motte-Broön, he died in Châteauneuf-de-Randon. His Tomb, by Thomas Privé and Robert Loisel, can be admired in St.-Denis and predates the one represented in the Cologne picture by nearly one century. The correct identification of the Tomb as that of Philippe Pot in the Louvre, was made by O. H. Förster in *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch*, X, 1938, p. 267 and further expatiated upon (but without reference to the Louvre's *Description raisonnée des sculptures*) by R. Andree, *Katalog der Gemälde des 19. Jahrhunderts im Wallraf-Richartz Museum*, Cologne, 1964, p. 118.
2. Cf., apart from Thieme-Becker, *Allgemeines Künstlerlexikon*, III, p. 120 and *Dictionnaire de Biographie française*, V, 1949, col. 1139 (with no special reference to the paintings in Cologne and New York), E. Bellier de la Chavignerie, *Dictionnaire général des artistes de l'Ecole Française depuis l'origine ... jusqu'en 1882*; Supplément by L. Auvray, Paris, 1887, p. 49, where the New York picture is listed as „*Au Soleil*“. The Tomb in de Beaumont's „*Au Soleil*“ was identified as that of Philippe Pot by H. Bouchot, „Edouard de Beaumont“, *Chronik für vervielfältigende Kunst*, No. 2, 1888, pp. 16–18. The compositional identity between the New York and the Cologne versions was observed by Mr. Claus Virch of the Metropolitan Museum, brought to the attention of the Wallraf-Richartz-Museum by Mrs. Claire Wever, also of the Metropolitan Museum, and kindly communicated to us by Dr. Evelyn Weiss of the Wallraf-Richartz-Museum. For further information we are greatly indebted to Professor Gert von der Osten, Director General of the Cologne Museums; to Professor Louis Grodecki in Strasbourg; and, quite particularly, to Professor Jacques Thuillier, M. P. Gras, Conservateur en Chef, and M. J.-C. Garreta, Bibliothécaire Adjoint, the three last named in Dijon.
3. See A. Michel, *Histoire de l'art*, III, 1907, p. 407f., Fig. 212; M. Aubert and M. Beaulieu, *Musée National du Louvre, Description raisonnée des sculptures du Moyen-Age, de la Renaissance et des Temps Modernes*, I, Paris, 1950, pp. 241–245, No. 355. Cf. also A. D. Atkinson, „Monument of Philippe Pot“, *The Portfolio*, 1883, pp. 15–20; E. Müntz, „Le Tombeau de Philippe Pot“, *Le Magasin Pittoresque*, 1889, p. 70f. The Tomb is now convincingly attributed to Antoine le Moiturier.
4. *Cour d'Appel de Dijon, Mémoire pour le Comte Armand de Vesvrotte, appellant, contre l'Etat Français, représenté par M. le Préfet de la Côte d'Or, intimé*, p. 6ff. But this *Mémoire*, datable in 1886 and a photocopy of which was kindly placed at our disposal by Messrs. Thuillier and Garreta (see above, Note 2), leaves open the question of the Tomb's movements between 1791/93 and 1808.
5. *Mémoire* cited in the preceding Note, p. 4.
6. *Mémoire* cited in Note 4, p. 3. Cf. H. Chabeuf, *Dijon à travers les âges, histoire et description*, Dijon, 1897, p. 178, from which we learn that before its acquisition by the family de Vesvrotte the Hôtel de Ruffey used to belong to Richard de Ruffey, the friend of Voltaire. The manuscript Dijon, Bibliothèque Publique MS. 989, fol. 46 v., contains a design by L. B. Baudot of 1811 representing the Tomb of Philippe Pot and inscribed „Ce mausolée est actuellement rétabli dans le jardin de M. Richard de Vesvrotte à Dijon“.
7. It should be noted that in these two prints (as also in that by J. M. S. Bence after M. A. Duparc and Mlle. Pillement in de Laborde's *Les monumens de la France*, for which see below, Note 8) the effigy of Philippe Pot has lost its hands and that the *pleurant* bearing a shield with three *chevrons d'or* and placed on the front right-hand corner of the Tomb in most of the other renderings accessible to us, has changed places with a *pleurant* bearing a *fasces d'azur*.
8. Paris, 1836, II, p. 35, Pl. CCXV.
9. *Ibid.*
10. *Mémoire* cited in Note 4, p. 3.
11. Kind communication of Professor Thuillier of May 11, 1967. This information is confirmed by Chabeuf, cited above, p. 174f.: „Vers 1850, M. de Vesvrotte avait fait construire, pour recevoir sa bibliothèque, un bâtiment en arrière, dans lequel il enchâssa des fragments provenant du *Castrum*; la cave au-dessous reçut le tombeau de Philippe Pot, acheté par le Louvre en 1888“.
12. *Mémoire* cited in Note 4, p. 3.
13. This is probably what the Louvre's *Description raisonnée* of 1950 (see Note 3) describes by the clause „Transporté momentanément au Château de Vesvrotte.“
14. This information comes from the Louvre's *Description raisonnée* of 1950.
15. Atkinson, *loc. cit.*: „In the small chamber where the monument is now [that is, in 1883] set up, it is difficult to judge of its full effect; the light enters by a low window at one end, falls dimly on the serene face of the recumbent knight.“
16. *Compte rendu ... de la Commission ... des Antiquités de la Côte d'Or*, V, 1857–58, p. XXVI.
17. For this famous publication see J. Adhémar, *L'Estampe française au XIX. siècle*, II (*La Lithographie du XIX. siècle*, Paris, 1944, p. 11ff.), and H. L. Seaver, „The Golden Book of Landscape Lithography“, *Print Collector's Quarterly*, V, 1915, pp. 445–471. Here particular emphasis is placed on the international character of the contributing artists (among whom we find, in addition to Frenchmen such as J.-B. Isabey, such Englishmen and Belgians as T. S. Boys, R. P. Bonington, and Louis Haghe) and on the fact that the volume „*Bourgogne*“, published in 1863, already contains a few „actual photographs“ reproduced by means of the lithographic process. The *Voyages pittoresques et romantiques dans l'ancienne France*, its plates produced by the „unrivalled“ printing firm of R.-Jules and R.-Joseph Lemercier in Paris, is

- justly praised as a „history of lithographic techniques for fifty years“ (p. 458).
18. Cf. E. Panofsky, „*Et in Arcadia Ego: Poussin and the Elegiac Tradition*“, *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, Garden City, New York, 1957, pp. 295–320; Italian translation (with much better illustrations), entitled *Il Significato nelle arti visive*, Turin, 1962, pp. 277–301. In a letter to his friend Emanuel of July 11, 1795, Jean Paul remarks, „Es ist sonderbar, daß der Mensch gerade in der Freude – in der Jugend – in der schönsten Gegend – in der schönsten Jahreszeit mehr zur Schwärmerei der Sehnsucht, zum Blicke jenseits der Welt, zum Gemälde des Todes fähig ist als im entgegengesetzten Fall, in der Noth, im Alter, in Grönland, im Winter“.
 19. For references, cf. E. Panofsky, *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, p. 314; *Il Significato nelle arti visive*, p. 296.
 20. Dorothy Sayers, *The Bone of Contention*; Nicholas Blake, *Thou Shell of Death* (references in E. Panofsky, *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, p. 307 and *Il Significato nelle arti visive*, p. 296). A very inferior poem by George Keate, entitled *The Monument in Arcadia* (1773) and kindly brought to our attention by Professor F. W. Hillis of Yale University, is of interest only in that it corroborates the firmly established association between the ideas of Arcady and tombs.
 21. G. von der Osten, *Katalog der Gemälde alter Meister in der Niedersächsischen Landesgalerie*, Hannover, 1954, p. 114, No. 258.
 22. G. Flaubert, „Par les champs et par les grèves,“ first published (posthumously) Paris, 1886; reprinted in *Œuvres complètes*, Paris, 1910, p. 70. We should like to repeat that this illuminating passage was pointed out to us by the late Georg Swarzenski.
 23. H. C. Marillier, *The Later Works of Aubrey Beardsley*, reprinted New York, 1967, Pl. 141. Cf. K. Foss, *Beardsley; His Best Fifty Drawings*, London, 1955; Pl. XLIX, p. 161; A. E. Gallatin and Alexander D. Wainwright, *The Gallatin Beardsley Collection in the Princeton University Library, A Catalogue*, Princeton, 1952, p. 10 (Gallatin, Nr. 1027). The Princeton drawing, destined for *The Savoy*, 1896, is supposed to allude to the bookstore of the somewhat malodorous Leonard Smithers, located in the Royal Arcade on Bond Street in London.

Abbildungen

Fig. 1: Alfred Stevens, *Idylle*, 1875, Köln, Wallraf-Richartz-Museum (Source: Katalog der Gemälde des 19. Jahrhunderts im Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, bearbeitet von Rolf Andree, Köln 1964, S. 293)

Fig. 2: Antoine le Moiturier?, *Tomb of des Philippe Pot, Seigneur de la Roche*, Paris, Musée du Louvre (Source: Wikipedia)

Fig. 3: Guercino, *Et in Arcadia ego*, ca. 1621-1623, Rome, Galleria Nazionale (Source: Wikimedia)

Für weitere Abbildungen zu diesem Thema wird die Konsultation der Erstpublikation empfohlen.

Titel

Erwin und Gerda Panofsky, *The „Tomb in Arcady“ at the „Fin-de-Siècle“*, in: *Erwin Panofsky – die späten Jahre*, hrg. von Angela Dreßen und Susanne Gramatzki, in: *kunsttexte.de*, Nr. 4, 2011 (9 Seiten),

www.kunsttexte.de.

Postprint aus: *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch* 30 (1968), S. 287-304.