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Abstract

When the French Revolution erupted in 1789, revolutionaries strove to foster a sense of freedom of expression, guaranteeing a brief freedom of the press. The eleventh article of the 1791 Declaration of the Rights of Man asserts that “The free communication of thoughts and opinions is one of man’s most precious rights; all citizens may therefore speak, write, print freely, except to answer for the abuse of this liberty in cases determined by law.” However, as France became further embroiled in the Revolution, it abandoned its allegiance to the universality of these rights, propagating pro-republican thought, and persecuting anyone who did not share these views. The royalist press was a major concern to the new republican government, because it continued to speak out in support of the king and criticize the Revolution. The existence of royalist journalists and writers thus posed a problem for revolutionaries who wanted to establish a monolithically-minded republic. Therefore, over time, they enacted repressive censorship and punishment to crack down on royalist sympathizers. Although they sent many royalist writers to prison or the guillotine, the revolutionaries ultimately failed to silence their political enemies.

This thesis uses newspapers, images, and other printed media to explore royalist coverage of three events that diminished royal power: Louis XVI’s flight to Varennes in June 1791, his execution in January 1793, and the death of his nine-year-old son and heir, Louis XVII, in June 1795. These were also moments in which royalists had to prove the innocence of the king. To do so, they used tearful, melodramatic language common in contemporary novels and plays. Their goal was to cause their readers to feel pity for the abuses that the Revolution caused for him and his family. This emotional language also applied to both his sacred and worldly “bodies,” especially in recurrent themes such as the king’s affection for his family; allusions to Jesus Christ; and the idea that the revolutionaries barred him from speaking directly to his loving subjects. Royalists also referred to the motif of blood in their writings as a symbol of the king’s sanctity and the carnage caused by the revolutionaries. By creating a body of literature centered around pity to defend the king, royalist writers fostered a community of like-minded individuals who resisted revolutionary repression. By triggering readers’ emotions, royalist writers used a direct method to attempt to save the king, his memory, and hope for the restoration of the monarchy.
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Introduction

“But feeling, sublime and pure, that honors humanity so much, is a fire, it succumbs to the activity of the heart that nourishes it. Reason! Feeling! Is it true that you cannot be found together, and in equal activity, in a head worn out by affronts and withered by pain, and which embraces you in all your immensity!”1

– Nicolas de Maistre, Les derniers régicides ou Mad. Elizabeth de France et Louis XVII

Nicolas de Maistre’s Les derniers régicides ou Mad. Elizabeth de France et Louis XVII was published in 1794, two years after Terror leader Maximilien Robespierre was ousted from power. Although it was published after the most violent period of the Revolution, Les derniers régicides captures the essence of royalist publications that preceded it. The book is a 100-page history of the Revolution that extols Louis XVI’s sister, Élisabeth, who followed him and his wife, Marie-Antoinette, to the guillotine. It identifies her an astute advisor to her brother and a martyr to the royalist cause. To convey its royalist sympathies, Les derniers régicides is infused with melodramatic, tear-filled rhetoric. In one passage, a chambermaid who attended her in her Temple prison cell wiped Élisabeth’s tears whenever she cried: “How penetrating is the delirium of friendship!” Maistre writes, “How sweet is the pity that it inspires! The tears fall and never tire. The unfortunate one! Happy in her delirium, she no longer felt the weight of her captivity, no longer saw the walls of her prison.”2 This emotionally-charged language summons readers’ pity, who can see that Élisabeth’s endless tears, and the “delirium” caused by her captivity, were the results of the Revolution’s unjustified violence towards the royal family.

1 Nicolas de Maistre, Les derniers régicides ou Madame Elizabeth de France et Louis XVII. Causes premières de la révolution, esprit des républiques. (London, 1796), 39–40. « Mais le sentiment, qui sublime et pur, honore tant l’humanité, est un feu, sous l’activité duquel le cœur qui l’alimente succombe. Raison ! Sentiment ! Est-il vrai, que vous ne puissiez vous trouver ensemble, et en égale activité, dans une tête usée par les affronts et flétrie par les douleurs, et qui vous embrasse dans toute votre immensité! » All translations are mine.
2 de Maistre, 40. « Qu’il est pénétrant le délire de l’amitié ! Que la pitié qu’il inspire est douce ! Les larmes coulent et ne fatiguent jamais. L’infortunée ! Heureuse dans son délire ne sentait plus le poids de la captivité, ne voyait plus les murs de sa prison. »
Maistre’s melodramatic style thus serves two purposes: to mourn the royal family as a loving unit, and the king as a sacred ruler who was unjustly wrested from power. Furthermore, it classifies the revolutionaries as treacherous enemies who tricked the king’s adoring subjects into rebelling against him. At another moment in the book, Élisabeth advises her brother: “Thirteen culprits...sent to the scaffold, will bring about rest to France, quickly give them a good example, my brother. The death of these thirteen conspirators will break all the threads of the Revolution that their accomplices will not know how to re-tie.”

Maistre suggests that once Louis eliminates the instigators of the Revolution, and once there are no corruptive forces left to intimidate them, his loyal subjects will eagerly return to his side. The book also expresses hope for an end to the Revolution. “Ah! May the paintings I have presented, that have already exhausted all the colors, never reproduce themselves! May the Revolution, by destroying itself, no longer cause victims! No more victims!”

His plea to end the trauma that the Revolution caused its “victims”: in particular, the royal family and their supporters is thus the reason for which he wrote the book. By exposing the abuses that the royal family suffered, Maistre thus encourages his readers to pity them and condemn the violence of the Revolution.

My study of the royalist press includes journalists, authors, and illustrators, who, like Maistre, criticize the deposition and execution of the king, and hope for a restoration of the monarchy. I focus primarily on newspapers, though during moments of the Terror when royalist sources from within France were limited, I supplemented them with pamphlets, literature, plays, and images. Royalist writings in the 1789 French Revolution are seldom covered by historians.

---

3 de Maistre, 24. « Treize coupables, dont voici les noms, livrés au supplice, rendront le repos à la France, donnez vite mon frère un grand exemple. La mort de ces treize conspirateurs rompra tous les fils de la révolution que leurs complices ne sauront pas renouer. »

4 de Maistre, 88. « Ah! Puissent les tableaux que j’ai présentés, avoir épuisé désormais toutes les couleurs, et ne plus se reproduire ! Puisse la révolution en s’anéantissant, ne plus entrainer de victimes! Plus de victimes ! »
American historian Jeremy Popkin and Australian historian William Murray have documented them within broader studies of the revolutionary press. Popkin’s *The Right-Wing Press in France, 1789-1800*, and Murray’s *The Right-Wing Press in the French Revolution* both give an overview of royalist newspapers. They provide statistics on the circulation of certain issues, identify their editors, and analyze their content. By contrast, French historians’ coverage is sparse. French scholar Jean-Paul Bertaud’s essay “*La presse contre-révolutionnaire (1789-1799)*” gives intelligent insight on the dynamics of the royalist press, and argues that royalist journalists tenaciously resisted revolutionary suppression. The work of Popkin, Murray, and Berthaud help to understand the landscape of the press over the course of the Revolution. The collection of essays in Robert Darnton and Daniel Roche’s *Revolution in Print* analyzes how newspapers, books, pamphlets, and other printed literature defined the media landscape. The recent book by Charles-Eloi Vial, *La famille royale au Temple : le remords de la Révolution*, gives a detailed analysis of the events and public opinion after the deposition and arrest of Louis XVI. Vial studies the change over time of republican opinions on the royal family’s imprisonment, which demonstrates how opinions shifted after Thermidor.

The greatest challenge I have encountered was the scarcity of secondary sources that dealt with royalist writings during the Terror. This paucity can be explained by the extremely tight press restrictions the government imposed in mid-1793, which made it difficult to find any sources that were forthright in their support for the monarchy. I had originally intended to explore press coverage of Marie-Antoinette’s execution, but it was impossible to find any non-neutral press coverage: restrictions were so oppressive at that point that royalist journalists refrained from commenting on her death in the same vivid ways they had on her husband. However, I found many sources on the king’s execution. Jeremy Popkin offers a rich analysis of
Terror press sources in his article “The Royalist Press in the Reign of Terror,” which gives a unique look at the ways the royalist press operated, and fostered a community of mutual support for the king, under the oppressive measures of the Terror. My work takes into account the media and public opinion landscape that these analyses provide, while also analyzing how royalist language took on the emotional, tearful qualities of contemporary plays studied by Sarah Maza in “The 'Bourgeois' Family Revisited,” and books studied by Lynn Hunt in *Inventing Human Rights*, and Robert Darnton in *The Great Cat Massacre*. By combining contemporary press habits and literary styles, I aim to provide a multi-dimensional understanding of why royalists defended the king with histrionic language.

The thesis focuses around three turning points of the Revolution that undermined royal power: the king’s flight to Varennes in 1791, his execution in 1793, and the death of his young son, Louis XVII, in 1795. These events are important because they provoked a surge of royalist publications to cover the events and defend the monarchy. Furthermore, these events help to organize this information to present royalist concerns about the Revolution. We see these strategies in the previously cited passages from *Derniers régicides*. These tactics focus on three themes: the king’s sacrality, the revolutionary effort to corrupt affection for the king, and the importance of family values to the royal plight. These themes were expressed in emotionally-charged language to garner pity for the king’s situation. Furthermore, the concept of blood was often interwoven into the discourse. For the royalists, blood had several meanings, including its indication of dynasty, sacred healing powers, family relations, and villainization of the revolutionaries. Regardless of the adversities they faced—whether it was censorship, imprisonment, or death—royalist writers forged a community of print to end the Revolution and restore the monarchical institution they so passionately supported.
Although the revolutionaries initially intended to allow freedom of expression, royalist writers tested their tolerance for opinions that diverged from their own. Therefore, the Revolution’s silencing of royalists was a breach of their own values and a regression to the censorship that journalists faced in the Ancien Régime. At the same time, the persecution of royalist writers would change the course of public opinion after the Thermidorian Reaction in 1794. To distance themselves from the violence of the Terror, revolutionaries determined to extend pity to all citizens, not just fellow republicans. They still censored writings with royalist sympathies, but they looked at the king’s family in a new, more sympathetic light while rejecting the violence of the Terror. Nonetheless, royalist writings prospered despite the censorship they faced throughout the Revolution. Despite revolutionary attempts to eradicate royalist sympathies, the perseverance of the royalist community demonstrates their adamant hope for the restoration of the monarchy. Their tenacity and success thus help explain its restoration in 1814.
Censorship was not a novelty in Revolutionary France. Laws regulating what could be printed already existed in the Ancien Régime, under which a limited number of newspapers published within France could comment on politics. Even so, censorship laws mandated that every newspaper get approval for everything it printed. Under the Ancien Régime, censorship operated under a game of privilege. Before establishing a newspaper, a publisher had to obtain a license from the government, which became a mutually beneficial relationship: the government knew who was printing information about them, and the publisher was protected against competition. The government also monitored what foreign journals could disseminate within the country, but these faced more lenient restrictions than domestic journals. As a result, the content of foreign newspapers differed drastically from those published within France: for example, they brought to light that the king had ministers that helped him govern, whereas domestic papers implied that the king ruled without assistance. Despite their relative freedom, foreign-published papers still faced oppressive measures: if they did not comply with the government’s expectations, censors would bribe their publishers, harass their correspondents, and keep them from sending their copies through the mail.  

On the other hand, the king encouraged the publication of newspapers that refrained from discussing topics such as politics and religion. In an attempt to preserve his “paternalistic” image, he allowed editors to print journals about topics devoted to non-political or religious topics like fashion, theater, and gossip, or those whose political contexts conformed to the official script. As a result of this encouragement, between 1751 and 1788, over 200 new journals began printing, demonstrating a rising demand for news and information. Of particular interest in

---

these journals were foreign affairs, the king’s routine, and matters of the court.⁶ Political papers fared best: in the 1780s, the *Gazette de France* had 12,260 subscribers, and the *Mercure de France / Journal de Bruxelles* boasted a peak circulation of 20,000 copies.⁷ The expansion of the press in the second half of the eighteenth century reflected rising literacy rates among urban elites and artisans in the kingdom’s cities.

As for books, censorship laws in the late eighteenth century prohibited coverage of God, the king, and morality.⁸ At the same time, they targeted foreign publications in order to protect and promote domestic publishers.⁹ Nonetheless, the crown had expanded its censorship regime since the late seventeenth century and thereby encouraged a black market in publishing. By 1789, there was a thriving economy of clandestine publications where print items that did not pass censorship were printed outside of France and smuggled into the country. If caught, those involved in this intricate network were imprisoned or branded.¹⁰ Furthermore, a system of resistance to strict suppression of publications was already in place in the years leading up to the Revolution. Ancien Régime restrictions on publishing, in combination with the rising number of journalists and writers, led to prerevolutionary calls for freedom of the press expressed in the *cahiers de doléances* in early 1789.¹¹ Immediately after 1789, France enjoyed a brief, “virtually unregulated” freedom of the press, during which an explosion of republican papers occurred: over 500 appeared in the next three years.¹² The increase in royalist papers followed slowly, but

---

⁹ Roche, 7.
by 1790 there were enough to equal those of the republicans. However, “free press” in the eighteenth century differed from how we define it today. Historian Charles Walton explains that despite the abolition of censorship, there were still occurrences of suppression, manipulation of public opinion, and surveillance in the beginning of the Revolution, where censors cracked down on royalist publishers. These crackdowns will be addressed in the next section.

The Revolution also saw significant changes in journalistic content. Under the Ancien Régime, newspapers lacked accuracy and organization. For one, they often contradicted each other—or themselves—in the content on which they reported. There was a noticeable disconnection between editors and their correspondents, evident in the way that editors pieced brief, often opaque, remarks that made it difficult for readers to understand exactly what was at stake. The Revolution improved the quality of journalism. In comparison to the disorganization and contradictions that characterized Ancien Régime newspapers, those published after 1789 described events accurately and in more detail. Additionally, the Revolution introduced daily newspapers, which provided readers with constant updates on what was going on in the country, rather than them only being able to rely on a paper that came out once a week. Though an improvement from those of the Ancien Régime, Revolution-era journals grew more ideologically divisive. Writers and editors injected their own political views into their choice of topics and type of coverage. While this variety allowed readers to choose from a number of opinions across the political spectrum, it often forced readers to learn about events through a significantly

---

13 Murray, 11-12.
15 Censer, 18-21.
16 Censer, 29.
politically-charged lens. These politically-charged journals, whether republican or royalist, aimed to convince readers that they had the correct political view.

Revolutionary journalists came from a variety of backgrounds, although they all had received a secondary education. Many journalists began their careers in law or as gens de lettres. This diversity extended to royalist journalists. Not much is known about their backgrounds, but a study by Jeremy Popkin concludes that while a substantial number were of noble origin, many others were not. Most of them came from “the learned professions,” and even fewer came from artisan or peasant families. Popkin also determines that a significant portion of royalist journalists’ fathers were not writers; therefore they turned to journalism because of their own political opinions, the steady paycheck that daily newspaper sales promised, or both. Nonetheless, churning out frequent issues, particularly with the introduction of daily publications, was a universal struggle for journalists of the French Revolution. This challenge was exacerbated by the fact that they used old wooden printing presses, as opposed to England’s updated iron press. As a result, papers were often either riddled with errors, repetitive, or plagiarized from other newspapers to meet these grueling demands. Given this outdated means of production, newspapers offered limited daily print runs which reduced the number of readers they reached. Nevertheless, they reached a wide number of people throughout France. Royalist newspapers were evidently a part of these sales, indicating that there was a vast number of

---

17 Censer, 30-33.
18 Popkin, Revolutionary News, 42-46.
21 Popkin, Revolutionary News, 67.
22 Popkin, Revolutionary News, 58.
people either opposed to the Revolution or curious for a critical perspective, and willing to consume information that supplemented their resistance.

In his book *The Right-Wing Press in the French Revolution*, William Murray analyzes the circulation of royalist newspapers. He concludes that both republicans and royalists faced difficulties in publishing journals—whether through persecution or staffing issues—but both sides of the political spectrum nonetheless were successful in business.24 The monarchist paper *L’Ami du roi*, for example, had 5,700 subscribers by May of 1791, and the “violently counterrevolutionary” *Journal de la cour et de la ville* had as many as 10,000 in total.25 Murray does not indicate the specific locations of these papers’ circulation, but they were most likely sold to French and émigré readers.26 Jeremy Popkin has found that many subscribers to journals like the abbé de Royou’s *Ami du roi* and Pierre-Barnabé Farmian De Rozoi’s *Gazette de Paris* had origins in the nobility and clergy. However, the numbers presented by both Murray and Popkin do not account for newspapers sold on the street, nor the fact that many newspapers were read out loud to other people or in political clubs, increasing the potential audience.27 Another factor for which these numbers do not account is the popularity of cafés as reading spots in the eighteenth century: Thierry Rigogne demonstrates that reading was an important feature of café culture decades before the Revolution: patrons associated reading newspapers closely with these venues, more so than the novel drinks they served.28 Nonetheless, it is safe to say that these newspapers, leading up to 1792, when the press faced anti-royalist censorship laws, enjoyed a respectable amount of success and spread, although figures varied by journal.

---

25 Murray, 302; 83–86.
26 Murray, 86.
Poverty and illiteracy also limited access to newspapers. They were relatively expensive: subscriptions cost thirty to thirty-six livres, which was an unattainable figure for most working people, whose salaries averaged three livres a day. Additionally, although the literacy rate was on the rise, though it varied by region, about one third of the French population could not read. Literacy in cities and towns—even those with more than 2,000 people—was greater than in rural areas. Though women evidently were less literate than men, they began to catch up over the course in the eighteenth century, having a higher growth rate than that of men. Nonetheless, people in Paris, including women, had a higher literate population than the other regions of France.

Royalist papers varied in their political stances. The two most common were the “throne and altar” political stance, as it was dubbed by Murray, which defended the sacrality and absolutism of the throne. “Throne and altar” papers included the *Ami du Roi* and the *Journal de Louis XVI*. There was also an “anglophile” side of the royalist press, which supported the English structure of constitutional monarchy structure, in which the king was a part—and not the whole—of governmental decision-making. “Anglophile” papers included the *Mercure de France* and the *Actes des apôtres*, though it sometimes swung to the absolutist side. As the Revolution progressed, though, republican tolerance for royalist publications decreased drastically. While recognized left-wing newspapers, such as *Révolutions de Paris* and the *Père Duchesne*, continued their publications during the Terror, no royalist paper survived past August 10, 1792.

---

34 Murray, 302.
when the monarchy was unofficially overthrown. In the aftermath of this event, most royalist presses were ransacked and destroyed by angry mobs, and many of their journalists were thrown in jail and executed.35

The Revolution not only accelerated the explosion of the political press, it also gave birth to new journalistic language and strategies for targeting and persuading readers. In such a turning point as the Revolution, where journalists were no longer constrained by the censors of the Ancien Régime, and thus vividly colored their newspapers with political opinions, they also grappled with methods to best convince their readers to believe that theirs was the correct one to believe. Similar to today, most readers bought papers that conformed to their political views. In the early years of the Revolution, the competition for readers and revenues was fierce.36 Therefore, it was essential to be convincing. The eighteenth century was already an era of change, including in the ways that people wrote stories and philosophized about the human mind. To persuade readers, the royalist press borrowed developments in literature including conceptions of pity and empathy to convince their readers that the king was being mistreated by revolutionaries.

Notions of pity and sentimentalism pervaded the art and literature of the Enlightenment. Pity already had a central role in French culture, according to historian Gonzalo Sánchez, through the Catholic Church. Sánchez reminds us that the French word for pity, pitié, differs from that in other languages. For example, whereas in English, “pity” connotes the sentimental phenomenon of what Lynn Hunt defines as having the potential to “imply condescension,” pitié

derives its meaning from the combination of two words—“learned” piety and “widespread, demotic” piety. Therefore, the French term encompassed both human compassion and religious devotion. A 1787 dictionary definition of “pity” defines it as just that: “Compassion, feeling of sorrow aroused in us by the pain and misery of others.” Sánchez also indicates that a similar definition persisted in a nineteenth-century dictionary, which he says was drawn from the seventeenth-century: “a sentiment that takes hold at the sight of sufferings and which moves us to ease them.”

Writers and dramatists in the seventeenth century introduced a strong connotation between weeping and pity. This association suggested intellectual superiority: those who wept tears of pity had to be intelligent and virtuous to do so. Moreover, weeping from pity was considered a pleasurable act, since it reflected one’s intellectual and moral privilege. The virtuous quality of pity carried over into eighteenth century, where it converged with Enlightenment philosophy to become both a social virtue for Montesquieu in his Lettres persanes, and an equalizing phenomenon for Diderot in his Encyclopédie. Diderot argued that pity was a natural phenomenon that all people, not solely the virtuous or intelligent, shared. Enlightenment thinker Jean-Jacques Rousseau identified pity as fundamental to the human condition and the basis of social life. He emphasized that the influence of pity on the heart was one of man’s fundamental qualities “prior to reason,” which consisted of a “natural repugnance to seeing any sentient being, especially our fellow man, perish or suffer.” So natural is this
sentiment, according to Rousseau, that even animals demonstrate it by reacting negatively to other dead animals of their own species, or refusing to hurt members of other species. Finally, he indicates that pity is, in fact, a pillar of human existence and cohabitation in the unadulterated state of nature, where it “takes the place of the laws, mores and virtue,” as an incentive to ensure against unwarranted harm to others. As such, Rousseau and his followers regarded pity as essential to understand other humans, feel compassion for them, and avoid making them suffer. This idea was also promulgated by revolutionaries such as Louis Antoine de Saint-Just, who, clearly inspired by Rousseau, later declared that the naturalness of pity was corrupted by the artificiality of society.

Rousseau himself was well-versed in conveying emotions through the written word. His best-selling novel *Julie, ou la nouvelle Héloïse* triggered extreme emotional reactions in readers, who, treating the characters as if they were real, “wept,” “suffocated,” and “raved,” in response to their tragic endings. They also took the characters’ lessons to heart, an interaction between reader and writer that Robert Darnton calls a “new rhetorical situation.” Rousseau intended for readers to directly apply the contents of the novel to their own lives. In the process, they would identify with his characters, regardless of differences in class, age, or sex. By using situations and emotions that could be easily understood by all his readers, Rousseau introduced a form of empathy that transformed expectations about readers and reading. Of course, sentimentality was already prevalent in eighteenth-century writing, but it was particularly the emotional accessibility

---

42 Rousseau, 36.
43 Rousseau, 38.
and empathetic application of his story that caused these outbursts from his readers.\textsuperscript{48} Other contemporary works, such as \textit{Pamela} and \textit{Clarissa}, both by English novelist Samuel Richardson, garnered similar reactions because they also stressed that emotions, not social status, defined the human condition.\textsuperscript{49} Readers were able to transcend rigid eighteenth-century social boundaries, exercising in their natural ability to “sympathize”—the contemporary term for “fellow feeling,” which historian Lynn Hunt likens to what we would call empathy today. Therefore, these novels emphasized and employed the human ability to step into others’ shoes and understand their emotions. The sharing of sentiments thus fundamentally defined people as not only human, but social beings.\textsuperscript{50} The way in which eighteenth-century novels employed this phenomenon to encourage its readers to disregard class boundaries in favor of universal “sympathy” was thus a novel use of an existing sentiment that could elevate the individual and society.\textsuperscript{51}

In addition to the sentimental novel, philosophes like Diderot also promoted the \textit{bourgeois drama} on the stage.\textsuperscript{52} These plays emphasized aspects of the human condition such as emotions and family. Central to their plots is what Sarah Maza calls “hyperbolic sentimentalism,” in which characters would engage in extreme displays of “weeping, collapsing, exclaiming, and pontificating.”\textsuperscript{53} Similar to the way that readers of Rousseau and Richardson identified with their characters regardless of class distinction, the exaggerated displays of emotion featured in these \textit{drames} highlighted the fact that emotion and sensibility transcended social status. Therefore, writers of the \textit{drame} tapped into contemporary thought about humanity

\textsuperscript{48} Darnton, \textit{The Great Cat Massacre}, 245–47.
\textsuperscript{49} Hunt, \textit{Inventing Human Rights}, 39.
\textsuperscript{50} Hunt, \textit{Inventing Human Rights}, 65.
\textsuperscript{51} Hunt, \textit{Inventing Human Rights}, 57–58.
\textsuperscript{53} Maza, 227.
and emotions, distancing themselves from class distinctions and instead moving towards a universal human experience. The salient role of family to their plots also defined these plays. A common trope in these plays was a character’s discovery that he or she was related by blood to another character, which resolved any class differences between them. This story arc further makes evident that familial love (also expressed histrionically and passionately here), like human sentiment, also breaks down class barriers. These plays thus considered the Enlightenment idea that society should be founded on shared values or *mœurs*, defined by an ability to feel the same compassion towards any other person.54 In this way, the *drames* of the late eighteenth-century established new expectations in audiences about the importance of emotions and family intimacy.

Eighteenth-century thought about emotion, pity, and the human condition developed in tandem with the increased use of sentimental language—in combination with theatricality—in contemporary writings, from *mémoires* to court documents. These were characterized by a “use and abuse of hyperbole, exclamation, faltering speech, and the awkward emphasis and identity and state of mind.”55 These traits persisted and arguably exploded during the Revolution. The writings of Rousseau influenced revolutionary writers like Jean-Paul Marat, who injected their political discourse with stirring language meant to call his supporters to action.56 Royalist writers also adopted this sentimental language to plead their case for the preserving the monarchy. Writers defending the king employed contemporary emotional rhetoric to inspire pity for his unfortunate situation, and encourage readers to exercise their newfound ability to “sympathize” across boundaries. Therefore, they employed both aspects of pity identified by Sánchez—

54 Maza, 222-227.
56 Reddy, 189.
Catholic religious piety, and Enlightenment human pity—to evoke emotion in all readers, regardless of political standing.

Newspapers, books, and pamphlets defending Louis XVI used religious motifs and symbolism as well as histrionic language that stirs the emotions of even modern-day readers. Because eighteenth-century novels like Rousseau’s *Julie* taught readers to privilege feeling over rank, readers who had previously read about the king’s daily activities were able to empathize with his misfortune during the Revolution. The king was human just like readers: he had a family and emotions. Louis XVI himself promoted this family-oriented image, complemented by the fact that he had no mistresses, unlike his predecessors. Royalist writers made strategic use of these pre-revolutionary literary trends that had transformed how people read and identified with characters. Because the king and his subjects shared aspects like emotions and familial affection, it was easier for royalist readers to understand his situation. In this case, Louis and his family were the characters with which royalists hoped readers would make such a connection. Therefore, the rhetoric these writings used, which his readers recognized from other contemporary works, thus “moved” them “to ease” his suffering.

---

II. The King’s Misguided Subjects: The Royal Family and the Flight to Varennes

The Flight to Varennes on the eve of June 20, 1791 was “arguably one of the most dramatic and poignant moments in the French Revolution,” and for good reason. By 1791, Louis XVI found himself in an increasingly hostile situation, where his powers and personal safety were quickly diminishing. The National Assembly had stripped him of his control of the army, his right to issue pardons, and his power to reject laws, among others. Additionally, on Easter that year, he and his family were blocked by an indignant crowd as they left the Tuileries palace to attend church services in Saint-Cloud. Feeling unsafe and secretly opposing the Revolution, the king, with the help of his advisor, Louis-Auguste de Breteuil, decided to escape with his family. He would head for the town of Montmédy on the Eastern borders to join loyal troops led by the royalist general Bouillé. There, they would initiate a counter-revolution, of which Breteuil commented that he hoped military action would not be necessary: instead, the threat of force, and the love the people harbored for their king, would cause the revolutionaries to surrender. Confident that this plan would work, Louis XVI left behind a written declaration explaining his reasons for this departure and his rejection of the revolutionary decrees that he had previously approved. The plan, though elaborately crafted, fell through: despite that they were in disguise, the king and his family were recognized in the town of Varennes. They were arrested and brought back to Paris. Though there was initially a positive reaction to his return, a surge of popular anger erupted when the documents denouncing the Revolution were discovered. Upon
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their return, the king and his family were surrounded by shocked Parisians, who remained silent and refused to remove their hats—a gesture of respect—to welcome him back. The flight to Varennes undermined the faith of the French people in the king, especially since they found irrefutable proof of his hostility to—and thus, incompatibility with—the Revolution.

In the aftermath of Varennes, royalist writers found themselves in both ideological and physical danger. Some presses were physically attacked, like that of the “throne and altar” paper L’Ami du roi (Friend of the King), whose title displayed on the first page began to inexplicably change. It was originally L’Ami du Roi, des Français, de l’ordre, et sur-tout de la vérité. On June 22 it was changed to read L’Ami des Français, de l’ordre, et sur-tout de la vérité. Finally, on June 27, it read L’Ami __________ des Français, de l’ordre, et sur-tout de la vérité. Evidently, its publishers were removing the reference to the king in response to Varennes. A similar occurrence affected the Journal de Louis XVI. In an issue after the king’s flight, they wrote that there was a “disturbance in our print shop,” which delayed publication. These material references demonstrate growing hostility and violence towards the royalist press. In the face of this hostility, royalist journalists drew from contemporary ideas of pity and sentimentalism as well as perceptions of the king’s bond with his people—such as his humanity and his kingly and familial paternalism—to reconcile Louis XVI with his decision to flee Paris.

This section will explore how royalist writers represented the king’s humanity and the familial qualities of the royal couple to insist on his innocence. The king’s loving, paternal relationship with his people was also a feature of royalist coverage of Varennes. Therefore, they

64 Journal de Louis XVI et de son peuple ou le défenseur de l’autel, du trône et de la patrie (No. 89), 132. « Le peu de respect du nouveau régime pour la liberté & les propriétés des citoyens domiciliés, ayant occasionné un dérangement dans notre imprimerie, c’est à notre grand regret que ce no. paraît un ordinaire plus tard. »
argued that the king had the right to leave Paris, since he was acting in his duties an absolute ruler, and metaphorical father, to punish his disobedient “children.” Royalists further blamed the revolutionaries for subverting the natural order of things and putting the king “in chains.” They also blamed the revolutionaries for corrupting the king’s relationship with his people and misleading them to turn against him. Furthermore, whenever members of the royal family attempted to speak to the public, the revolutionaries prevented them from doing so. Finally, royalists borrowed the melodramatic style of the “bourgeois drama” to highlight the royal couple’s love for their children, and to convince readers that their mistreatment in the aftermath of Varennes deserved both pity and outrage. By asserting that the king still held absolute power over the revolutionaries, and by demonstrating how the royal family was suffering, royalists hoped to convince readers that Louis XVI, though mistreated, would soon quell the revolutionaries who caused his suffering and restore his right to rule.

There was no doubt in contemporary minds that the king’s flight was deceitful. Even some royalist papers initially expressed their shock and disappointment (the author of the *Journal de Louis XVI* commented that “the king has not shown in his voyage, nor in the moment of his arrest, nor in his return to Paris, the dignity and firmness that are suited to the royal character that he has assumed”65), but they quickly recovered their footing and insisted on the king’s innocence, employing elements of pity and sentimentalism to garner sympathy for him. The process of “desacralization,” which had begun in the 1750s under Louis XV, was the first implication that the king’s “two bodies”—originally thought one and inseparable—were, in fact, an illusion.66 As the association between the king’s godly form and his human self came apart,
Louis XVI’s flight humanized him, showing his mortal capacity for cowardice and poor decisions. Mona Ozouf confirms that this event was an abandonment of the “roi-principe” for the “roi-personne,” which made him, as a fellow human being, more susceptible to criticism.67 While to revolutionaries, he may have no longer been a godly figure, royalist writers affirmed both his kingly status as well as his humanly characteristics to assert that he deserved to rule the country.

Prior to the Revolution, Louis XVI was characterized as “good”: having a “large heart,” and putting the needs of his people before his own.68 During the Revolution, royalist writers insisted on his benevolence, highlighting it as both a redeeming personal and professional trait that outshone the need to criticize—or mistreat—him. Therefore, in their writings on Varennes, royalist writers continued to emphasize that Louis was a good king and father. In fact, newspaper articles after June 20 often referred to him as the best of kings. An article in Ami du roi entitled “Invitation à mon sexe,” in which the author Adèle de Bellevale calls upon fellow women to stand in solidarity with the royal couple, writes, “It is time to embrace the most just and best of kings.”69 The moderately royalist satirical paper Les Actes des apôtres published a song in the issue following the flight to Varennes:

You who cherish your oppressive subjects,  
King, whose goodness was the crime,  
Deigns to welcome the respect of our hearts,  
Offered to your sublime virtue.

And a few lines later:

To [save France], to give her peace,  
You wanted to vanquish her without war,
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Of her own benefits, she punishes
The best of the kings of the earth.70

By referring to the goodness of the king, Bellevale and the authors of the Actes des apôtres
express their faith in his good character. Coupled with this, as the song hints, is a defense of the
flight to Varennes as an extension of his astute judgment as king. It paints his flight as his way of
protecting the nation and doing what he thought was best for it. For the Actes des apôtres, the
flight was not proof of cowardice, nor an act of abandonment. It was, rather, a sacrifice to save
France from the Revolution and restore peace in the realm. This argument is echoed in the
Journal de la cour et de la ville (the Petit Gautier), which affirmed that the king aimed to
reclaim the throne that the revolutionaries had wrested from him:

I salute you, monarch of the French. It is not I who would criminalize your attempt to
retake the scepter that your noble ancestors had left you. The attempt that you have just
made to break your chains, lifts you up to the eyes of all the French; it explains the
mystery of your past conduct, it shows them that you are worthy of being their king, &
that the pure blood of the Bourbons runs through your veins.71

Here, the author villainizes the revolutionaries, demonstrating that the arrest and criminalization
of the king for having fled was a contemptible action. Additionally, he writes that the flight was
a reasonable response to the revolutionaries’ encroachment on his royal power, and that the king,
as a good, and qualified ruler—the latest in a long line of generations of rulers in the Bourbon
line—deserved to be understood, and respected, for his actions. Also important is the writer’s
interest in Louis’ Bourbon blood, which set him above the people and made him fit to rule.

70 Les Actes des apôtres (no. 271), 13, https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k1054080t. « Toi qui chéris les sujets oppresseurs, / Roi, dont la bonté fut le crime, / Daigne accueillir l’hommage de nos cœurs, / Offert à ta vertu sublime. » / Pour [sauver la France], pour lui donner la paix, / Tu voulais la vaincre sans guerre ; / Elle punit de ses propres bienfaits / Le meilleur des rois de la terre.
71 Gautier de Syonnet, Journal de la cour et de la ville, June 27, 1791, 462, https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/011570349. « Je te salue, monarque des Français. Ce n’est pas moi qui te ferai un crime d’avoir cherché à ressaisir le sceptre que t’avaient laissé tes nobles aïeux. La tentative que tu viens de faire pour briser tes fers, te relève aux yeux de tous les Français ; elle leur explique le mystère de ta conduite passée, elle leur apprend que tu es digne d’être leur roi, & que le pur sang des Bourbons coule dans tes veines. »
Nonetheless, the benevolent king, who could do no wrong, was punished for his attempts to save his country from chaos. Royalists’ insistence on Louis’ benevolence thus identified him as a victim of injustice to rally their readers.

Royalist writers also situated the flight to Varennes within a familial framework to inspire pity from readers. They described Louis XVI not only as a king in chains, but also as a disrespected father. Lynn Hunt traces changing views of fathers in eighteenth-century novels. The plotlines of many mid-eighteenth century novels centered on a “generous and sometimes tortured father who is made to suffer by his guilty children.” Thus, royalist journalists drew from this style to emphasize the king’s suffering. Adèle de Bellevale’s appeal to female royalist support not only describes Louis XVI as “the most just and best of kings,” but also as “a tender and generous father.” She redeemed him as a benevolent father, who would not dare to take advantage of or hurt his children—his own people—in any way. These republicans are, in the allusion to the tortured father, his rebellious, “guilty” children, whose misbehavior and disrespect cause him to suffer. Lynn Hunt argues that family novels could also feature a father who was absent, or worse, showed “despotic parental authority.” Louis XVI’s enemies would adopt this strategy to portray him as a duplicitous or negligent ruler. But despite this, royalist journalists, in their minds, had nothing to fear. To them, as previously stated, the king’s flight was the discipline that his rebellious children deserved. Louis was thus a strong, gentle father who deserved pity because his children were rebelling against the natural order of things. Louis was not the despot; rather it was his misguided subjects who had forced him to flee.
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Royalists insisted that monarchy granted security to French society. By destroying it, the revolutionaries hurt the country and threatened the natural order of things. Two centuries earlier, political theorist Jean Bodin emphasized the importance of the monarchy as an institution and the infallibility of the king. Bodin asserted that the sovereign was essential to a commonwealth—such as that of France—to lead and guide its inhabitants. Therefore, “it is neither the town nor its inhabitants that makes a city state, but their union under a sovereign ruler.”

If a commonwealth had no sovereign, the people would lack both a strong force to unite them and a superior father figure to guide and discipline them. Additionally, Bodin argues that the sovereign’s elevated status—subject to the laws of nature and God, but wielding power over his people—makes him conscious of his actions and their outcome. Thus, he knows what is best for his children and cannot be punished for any actions taken against them. Bodin cites an extreme example to prove his point: if a father (or sovereign) kills his child (or subject), it is never “without cause,” and it is because the child/subject “has merited such a fate.”

Therefore, Bodin concludes that “parents are not suspected of being liable to abuse their authority,” and that even if there were circumstances in which a father/sovereign did so, it was an anomaly that should not affect a change to the system, because “[anyone] who wished to abolish all those laws which were liable to give rise to difficulties would abolish all laws whatsoever,” and chaos would ensue. Bodin’s argument thus asserts that royal authority, by its very function, was capable of maintaining order. Any threat or resistance to his power should thus instantly be quelled. Bodin’s logic, merged with the contemporary image of the king as a “good father,” insisted that Louis was the rightful
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sovereign despite revolutionary insubordination. He was thus was both in his paternal right—and acting in the people’s best interest—to retaliate against the Revolution.

Because the roles were reversed between the king and his subjects, royalist writers insisted on the king’s “misery” after his arrest at Varennes. On June 24, the Petit Gautier published an article summarizing the flight: “While we liked to picture the touching moment where the king would hold his loyal subjects in his arms, against his heart…in this same moment, this monarch returned to the chains that he tried in vain to break.”79 Another article in the June 27 issue of the Petit Gautier criticizes revolutionaries for incriminating the king “for having tried to break his chains.”80 Allusions to the king’s unnatural prisoner status was another tactic to inspire pity. Not only did his well-meaning personality make his arrest groundless, but his “chains” were also an antithetical image: like Bodin’s assertion that a sovereign could not be overthrown by his own subjects, Louis’ arrest was not only an insult to his kingly status, but to the natural order of the realm. Therefore, the dissemination of the image of the king “in chains” illuminated the unjust situation in which Louis was trapped, and the tyrannical conduct of the Revolutionaries. Furthermore, based on the rightful order of things as indicated by Bodin, the king, as father of his people, had the exclusive right to punish. The fact that these unruly children were punishing their father was incompatible with his authority, and thus intolerable.

The tactic of manipulating events to serve the royalist agenda was also replicated in the Journal de la noblesse, de la magistrature, du sacerdoce et du militaire. This staunchly monarchist paper changed the narrative of the king’s arrival in Paris, particularly the scene of Parisians refusing to remove their hats: “Some aides-de-camp that were coming and going

79 de Syonnet, 27 juin 1791, 434. « Pendant que nous aimions à nous représenter le moment touchant où le roi presserait dans ses bras, contre son cœur, des sujets fidèles… dans ce moment même, ce monarque rentrait dans les fers qu’il a vainement essayé de briser. »
80 de Syonnet, 27 juin 1791, 461. « d’avoir cherché à briser les fers. »
ordered the people to stay covered; those who had their hat in their hand put it on their head.”81 This description implied that the people still loved their king—many of them still wanted to greet the king with respect—but the revolutionaries intervened to prevent them from expressing their affection. By insisting that the narrative differed from what was generally reported, royalist writers, like the publisher of Journal de la noblesse, reassured their readers that love for the king prevailed.

Royalist journalists also borrowed tropes from the contemporary “bourgeois drama,” particularly the tearful histrionics and the power of family, to defend the royal family. By arousing emotions through their descriptions of the royal family as a happy, affectionate unit, royalist journals elaborated on how the family was affected by the failed flight. Marie-Antoinette, for example, was painted as a faithful, supportive wife and a nurturing mother. The Journal de Louis XVI, for example, observes that “the queen found herself ill when they separated her from the Dauphin; but the people and the guard, the barbarians, laughed at the humiliations & the tears of the father, the mother, & the children.”82 A similar account appeared in the Mercure de France, which reports that on the hot summer day of their return: “An eyewitness assured us that when approaching Paris, the queen lifted the carriage blinds & said to the people while showing her children: Gentlemen, see, we are suffocating, look at the poor state my children are in: some ferocious voices were heard: we will suffocate you even more.”83 In both cases, the queen displayed maternal concern through her natural reaction of crying when

81 Journal de la noblesse, de la magistrature, du sacerdoce et du militaire (No. XXVII), 224. « Des aides-de-camp qui allaient et venaient, ont donné ordre au peuple de rester couvert ; ceux qui avaient leur chapeau à la main l’ont mis sur leur tête. »
82 Journal de Louis XVI (no. 93), 180. « La reine se trouva mal quand on la sépara du dauphin; mais le peuple & la garde, barbares, riaient des humiliations & des pleurs du père, de la mère & des enfants. »
83 Jean-François Marmontel, Mercure de France, 167. « Un témoin oculaire nous a assuré qu’aux approches de Paris, la Reine leva le store de la voiture & dit au peuple en montrant ses enfants ; Messieurs, voyez, nous étouffons, regardez donc mes pauvres enfants dans quel état les voilà : quelques voix féroces se firent entendre : nous t’étoufferons bien autrement. »
separated from her son (the king also cried to signal his paternal affection), and her devotion to the well-being of her children. Additionally, the article casts the revolutionaries in a malicious light—laughing at and torturing the queen. The theme of the “misguided people” resurfaces here: by showing her children to the crowd, she hoped to awaken their natural affection for the king and reveal the cruelty of the Revolution.

These maternal portrayals of Marie-Antoinette contrasted starkly to republican caricatures. The queen had been the target of pornographic libels since the late 1780s, which portrayed her as a sexual deviant. In these libels, she was sexually frustrated by her lazy, alcoholic, and impotent husband, and instead sought pleasure from a host of other characters, including her friends the Princesse de Lamballe and Madame de Polignac, the Marquis de Lafayette, and even Louis XV. This vilification campaign reflected the “desacralization” of the monarchy that had emerged in the 1750s in that it undermined the structure of the royal couple, and gave the public a look into the queen’s private life, which was supposed to be off-limits. These pamphlets accused the queen of having children out of wedlock—a popular guess for their “real” father, for example, was Louis XVI’s own brother, the Comte d’Artois—to which the king was portrayed as oblivious: “Louis was blind, & the court on Toinette / From the first moment that Charlot [the Comte d’Artois] climbed her / had cast their eyes.” Again we see a concern with blood as a dynastic marker. The prospect that the royal children were not the king’s caused anxieties about the legitimacy of the succession to the throne and the royal line. These allegations of the queen’s perversity followed her up to her death, when in her 1793 trial she was accused of having
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sexually corrupted her nine-year-old son, ultimately “forgetting her duty as mother.” Royalist writers thus countered the defamatory claims made against the monarchy: whereas republicans described her as a lascivious, manipulative woman—incapable of, if not contemptuous of, her duties as wife and mother—royalists described her as naturally loving and tender towards her husband and children.

The employment of pity and sentimentalist language was a strategy for royalist writers to maintain support for Louis XVI. Although the flight to Varennes dramatically undermined his influence and credibility, royalist writers insisted on his innocence and absolute power. They depicted him as the unjust victim of the violent Revolution. Further, they insisted that the revolutionaries were responsible for this mistreatment by preventing the king and queen from speaking directly to the people. Though it is undeniable that his flight caused chaos, royalist papers used sentimental rhetoric to portray the evasion as a positive display of the king’s humanity and paternal instincts. They insisted that his attempt at retaliation was part of his rightful duty to quell any insubordination to his benevolent rule. Even the royalist journalists who disagreed with the king’s decision, such as the *Mercure de France*, demonstrated their overall support for the king by alluding to the adverse conditions to which the royal family was subjected after their capture. By triggering readers’ emotions with their sentimentally-charged words, royalists inspired them to resist the Revolution for the sake of their king’s royal status, his personal well-being, and the future of France.
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**III. The Passion of Louis XVI: The King’s Martyrdom**

On August 10, 1792, following a proclamation that anyone who sought to harm the royal family would be punished, angry insurrectionists stormed the Tuileries palace in Paris, where the king had been forced to reside. While the king and his family took shelter at the Legislative Assembly, hundreds of agitators and palace guards were killed. Among the dead was François-Louis Suleau, contributor to the royalist newspaper *Les Actes des apôtres*, who was recognized by the mob and murdered. The Legislative Assembly suspended Louis XVI’s power until the monarchy was formally abolished the following month, on September 21. Consequently, the revolutionary government launched an attack on the royalist press, arresting and executing many journalists, including Pierre-Barnabé Farmian De Rozoi, founder of the royalist *Bulletin de minuit*, who was the first journalist to be guillotined. Jean-Paul Bertaud argues that the events of August 10 seemed to “sound the death knell” for the royalist press. That December, the National Convention passed a law that anyone who attempted to reestablish the monarchy would be sentenced to death. At this point, support for the monarchy and the royal family qualified as a capital offense. It was suddenly much more dangerous to voice royalist sentiments either in person or in print.

Despite these harsh laws, the royalist cause continued to operate. Jeremy Popkin argues that the Terror government never implemented a systematic crackdown on the press. Therefore, though major royalist papers like the *Ami du roi* and the *Petit Gautier* were terminated, they soon
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cropped up under new names. Bertaud refers to the journalists who stayed in France after August 10 as “moles,” due to their tendency to reappear and to make a new press that looked to “gnaw away at the roots of the Revolution.”93 The *Petit Gautier* became the *Journal de la feuille du matin*, and the *Nouvelles politiques* became the *Gazette universelle*, although the newly-established *Quotidienne* also claimed to be its legitimate successor.94 Many journalists also emigrated to London and established royalist papers there, including Jean-Gabriel Peltier and his *Dernier tableau de Paris*. Despite the dangers they faced, royalist journalists found ways to promote their values and sell their papers, while also fostering solidarity among themselves. Therefore, when the editor of the *Journal français*, Gabriel-Henri Nicolle, was arrested in January of 1793, other royalist newspapers, such as the *Révolution de 92* and the *Feuille de matin*, denounced the fact that “man cannot express his thoughts freely, because his thoughts can displease those who have authority,” in an era that was supposed to guarantee freedom of the press.95 Their determination to survive despite the odds shows how their determination to save the monarchy was unperturbed by the violence of the Terror.

Few royalist publications exist from the immediate aftermath of August 10, but those that do demonstrate the same values and resistance to republican beliefs and enforcement. These would be the final issues of those newspapers, as they would be discontinued in the following days. The *Journal de Louis XVI*, though William Murray describes it as “less significant”, managed to publish its final issue on August 11, 1792, in which it described the events of the previous day.96 One sentence stands out: “Starting at seven in the morning, the king, the queen,
Monseigneur le dauphin, & all of the royal family were obligated to seek their safety in the center of the manège [the stables], that is to say, among the cruelest of enemies.”97 Despite the brevity of this summary, the Journal, as one of the last royalist papers standing, takes a subtle stand against the violence of August 10. The author foreshadows the suffering to come of the royal family, as they would have to deal with the “cruelty” of the Legislative Assembly. Not only will they suffer, but they have been brought to “their knees at the feet of the manégiens”.98 It is distressing that a figure as good and powerful as Louis XVI should be brought to his knees before these “cruel” rebels. The Bulletin de minuit is even bolder in its coverage of the event, which it calls “that sacrilegious day, no less atrocious than the night of October 6 [the women’s march on Versailles], and, that, like it, was nearly an eternal night for the greatest of kings!!!!!”99 Here, the Bulletin evokes sympathy for the king’s situation by emphasizing the cruelty that made Louis suffer. The mere fact that the Journal and the Bulletin put out final articles criticizing the events of August 10 in the face of the violence towards royalist journalists was an act of resistance. Additionally, the few words written in the Journal, and the many, emotionally-charged words written in the Bulletin, maintain the quality shown in the examples of Varennes—pity for an unfortunate king who fell victim to the chaos of his rebellious, bloodthirsty subjects.

After the chaos of August 10, Louis and his family were arrested and sent to the Temple prison in Paris. His power as king remained suspended until the revolutionary government deposed him in September. In December, he was put on trial for treason. The month was

97 Murray, The Right-Wing Press in the French Revolution, 192; “Journal de Louis XVI” (11 août 1792), 180. « Le lendemain 10, dans la matinée, l’alarme devint plus sérieuse. Dès sept heures, le Roi, la Reine, Mgr. le Dauphin et toute la famille Royale furent obligés d’aller chercher leur sûreté au milieu du manège, c’est-à-dire parmi les plus cruels ennemis ; la horde inombrable des factieux ayant fait effort pour pénétrer au château. »
98 Journal de Louis XVI, August 11, 1792, 180. « Le feu & le pillage sont dans les appartements de la famille Royale qui est à genoux aux pieds des manégiens »
99 Bulletin de minuit, August 11, 1792, 466. « voilà l’esquisse de cette journée sacrilège, non moins atroce que la nuit du 6 Octobre, et qui, comme elle, fut presque pour le meilleur des Rois une nuit éternelle !!!!! »
punctuated by heated speeches from National Convention members, debating whether the newly-renamed Citizen Louis Capet was innocent, whether or not his kingship tied into his rights as a citizen, and how to deal with him if found guilty. On January 18, 1793, the decision was made: Capet was convicted and sentenced to death by guillotine. His execution would take place several days later, on January 21. As France sank deeper into the Reign of Terror, intolerance grew for any challenges to Jacobin efforts to establish the new republic. In the same extremist spirit with which royalist journalists were killed in August, any expression of sympathy for the king was deemed an attack on the Revolution’s efforts to bring happiness and liberty from tyranny. This attitude was referred to as “pitié hypocrite,” literally “hypocritical pity,” which revolutionaries classified as a crime that merited execution. In his 27 December speech to the National Convention on Louis’ fate during the king’s trial, the Jacobin Louis Antoine de Saint-Just warned his colleagues against this phenomenon in judging their former king’s fate: “All evil men are for the king: so who here will be for him? Hypocritical pity is on the lips of some, anger on the lips of others; everything is used to corrupt or to frighten hearts.” “Hypocritical pity” was a threat because, as historian William Reddy argues, sparing the life of someone who questioned the values of the revolution was unpatriotic. It threatened to undermine the work that the revolutionaries had done to forge the republic. Feeling pity for the king and sparing his life, then, would give him the opportunity to destroy the republic and retake the throne. This is why he was sentenced to death.
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On January 21, 1793, the king was dead, and Paris was quiet. This eerie silence was corroborated by journalists on all sides of the Revolution, but interpreted through the lenses of their biases. Marat, in his *Journal de la république*, classified it as a relieved calm, one long-awaited and colored by a “serene joy.”104 The royalist *Quotidienne*, however, calls this “the silence of stupor.”105 Across the English Channel, the émigré-run *Courier de Londres* went so far as to turn the revolutionaries into blood-thirsty beasts: “The current calm of this capital [Paris] resembles the frightening silence that reigns in the dark forests of Africa. It is only interrupted by the roaring of tigers, who announce the thirst they have for blood.”106 In covering the death of the king, royalists used sentimental language to address both his status as king and as a human being. They employed emotionally-charged, sometimes melodramatic, language to describe the royal family’s grief, as well as their own. These tactics triggered sympathy for their cause and forged a community of mourning among their fellow royalists through print.

This section will explore how royalist writers portrayed the execution and defended Louis XVI after his death. Louis’ sacrality particularly dominated the narrative: royalist writers likened Louis to Christ, a martyr who died for his supporters while defending the institution of monarchy in France. But the themes of popular affection and the royal family’s bond were still apparent. The analysis will begin with a general presentation of royalist writers’ reactions to the execution, including the play *La mort de Louis XVI* and the book *Une fleur sur le tombeau de Louis XVI*, where the themes of the king’s sacrality, popular affection, and the family metaphor are all prominent. Royalist writers and artists’ insistence on Louis’ sacrality will further be analyzed in

---


105 *La Quotidienne, Ou Feuille Du Jour*, January 22 1793, 90.

106 Edward Cox, John Lewis Cox, and Thomas Baylis, eds., *Courier de Londres*, January 22 1793, 57. « Le calme actuel de cette capitale ressemble au silence effrayant qui règne dans les sombres forêts de l’Afrique. Il n’est interrompu que par le rugissement des tigres, qui annonce la soif qu’ils ont du sang. »
the way that certain scenes before his death were commonly replicated and mentioned; creating a
parallel to the Passion of Christ. Therefore, the royalists used the religious and human
derivations of pity to defend the king as a martyr after his death.

The emotionally-charged vocabulary identified in coverage of the Flight to Varennes
resurfaced in royalist accounts of the execution. For example, the *Dernier tableau de Paris,*
published in London by émigré Jean-Gabriel Peltier, describes Louis as an “unfortunate prince”,
and writes that “the blood of the innocent man has been spilled.” The execution was such a
disheartening event that several royalist writers expressed their own sorrow while describing it.
The melodramatic tone of the *Révolution de 92* was unmistakable: “One member [of the
Convention] opposed that he communicate with his family before he dies!!!!” wrote a
contributor on January 20. “Our heart breaks with pain, and we stop ourselves,” wrote another in
the January 21 issue. the *Courier de Londres,* also wrote, on January 25, “We beg our readers
to pardon our oversights, our careless mistakes that may have slipped in the writing of this issue;
wounded with grief, it has been impossible for us to give them our care.” In the anonymous
book *Une fleur sur le tombeau de Louis XVI,* published shortly after the execution, the author
specifies that he aims to clear the king of the wrongdoings for which he was executed, and his
work was motivated by his emotions:

> Sentiment will conduct my quill; it will supplement the insufficiency of my talents; & and if with
this loyal picture of your conduct & the crimes of your enemies, I am able to open the eyes of
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107 Jean-Gabriel Peltier, *Dernier tableau de Paris,* ou, récit historique de la révolution du 10 août, des causes qui
l’ont produit, des événemens qui l’ont précédé, et des crimes qui l’ont suivi., vol. 2 (Londres, 1792), 5–6,
http://hdl.handle.net/2027/nyp.33433069323073. “ce malheureux prince” / “le sang de l’homme innocent a été
versé.”

108 *La Révolution de 92, ou Journal de la Convention nationale,* January 20 1793, 4. “Un membre s’opposait à ce
qu’il communiquât avec sa famille avant de mourir !!!!”

109 *La Révolution de 92, ou Journal de la Convention nationale,* January 21 1793, 1.

110 Cox, Cox, and Baylis, *Courier de Londres* January 25 1793, 69. “Nous suppliant nos Lecteurs de pardonner les
négligences, les inatentions qui auront pu se glisser dans la rédaction de ce Numéro : froissés par la douleur, il
nous a été impossible d’y donner nos soins.”
some of my compatriots, to remind them of the respect owed to the laws, to the love for their sovereign; that would be the sweetest reward & the only glory to which I have aspired.  

These passages demonstrate that dramatic displays of emotion, so prevalent in contemporary literature, were closely tied to the royalist cause. Pity for the king thus intensified their support and engaged readers. These writers thus asserted their political position through their outbursts of emotion, whether it was indignation with the unjust treatment Louis received during his trial, or the torment of losing their king. The news was so overwhelming that these journalists, whose job it was to bear bad news, were unable to convey it without distress. Not only were readers to sympathize with Louis XVI and his family, but also with these grief-stricken writers. Their extreme reactions implied that they were among those whose loyalty to the king was not swayed by the revolutionaries. Therefore, those who felt pity for the king were performing their duties as good subjects. Those who did not were corrupted by the wicked revolutionary forces, like those addressed in Étienne Aignan and Jules-Julien-Gabriel Berthevin’s play.

*La mort de Louis XVI* by Étienne Aignan and Jules-Julien-Gabriel Berthevin rehearses the debate over the king’s fate to prove his innocence. This “tragedy in three acts” was published three weeks after the king’s execution, and constituted an effort to save the his reputation while attacking the regicides who had voted for his execution.  
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111 Une fleur sur le tombeau de Louis XVI. (Berlin, 1793), ii. « Le sentiment conduira ma plume ; il suppléera à l’insuffisance de mes talents ; & si par ce tableau fidèle de ta conduite & des crimes de tes ennemis, je parviens à dessiller les yeux de quelques-uns de mes compatriotes, à les rappeler au respect dû aux lois, à l’amour pour leur souverain ; ce succès sera ma plus douce récompense & la seule gloire que j’aie ambitionnée. »

am seen ascending the throne, / Philip will call you; and over all of France / Will reign with him Marat and Robespierre.”  

Louis’ lawyers, Malesherbes, Desèze, and Tronchet, fail to save the doomed king. Louis struggles to understand why his own people would condemn him, but realizes that it is only a few misguided people among the French that are betraying him (“But no; you were deceived, I do not attribute to you [the people] / The evil that, in your name, some criminals are causing.”). He finds it within himself—as a hero, a king, and a metaphorical father—to forgive his treacherous “children” and accept his fate. In the final scenes, Louis and his family share a final heartbroken goodbye. Gleefully watching the sorrowful scene unfold, Louis’ jailer, Antoine-Joseph Santerre, reinforces the malice of the Revolution: “Let us take advantage of the state into which pain throws them.” This parting quip demonstrates that Louis and his family are helpless victims of the malicious schemes of the National Convention.

Following literary tradition, the play portrays Louis as its tragic hero, and benevolence as his fatal flaw. Robespierre and his scheming counterparts equate the king’s virtue to “weakness,” of which they plan to take advantage: “a kindhearted king, who, incapable of crime / Is of the crimes of others the deplorable plaything.” Here, the “evil” Robespierre reveals his true intention to turn the French people against Louis XVI to satisfy his hunger for power. The trio’s nefarious scheming causes the reader to feel sympathy for the betrayed king, and understand that his goodness, though an admirable quality, can be abused by the wrong people. By polarizing this array of characters—with Robespierre, Marat, and Philippe as the “bad guys,” and Louis and
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113 Étienne Aignan and Jules-Julien-Gabriel Berthevin, La mort de Louis XVI : Tragédie En 3 Actes, 1793, 10. « Philippe: …dès que sur le trône on m’aura vu monter, / Philippe vous appelle ; et sur la France entière / Régneront avec lui Marat et Robespierre »

114 Aignan and Berthevin, 17. « Mais non; tu fus trompé; je ne t'impute pas / Le mal que, sous ton nom, font quelques scélérats. »

115 Aignan and Berthevin, 30. « Profitons de l’état où la douleur les jette »

116 Aignan and Berthevin, 4. « un roi bienfaisant qui, de crime incapable, / Est des crimes d’autrui le jouet déplorable. »
his defense lawyers as the “good guys”—Aignan and Berthevin assembled a simple storyline in
which the reader can easily side with the “good guy” and sympathize with his struggle. The
theme of the misguided people resurfaces: in the scene where he ruminates about his fate, he
understands that those who are sending him to the scaffold do not represent the will of all the
people. Therefore, he is willing to be killed by the amoral revolutionaries since he believes that
those who are loyal to him will avenge his death and restore the throne.

*Une fleur sur le tombeau de Louis XVI* is a nearly 200-page effort to rescue Louis from
his image within the Revolution as a tyrant. For royalists, Louis was a good king, but he was also
a good person. The anonymous author insists on his humanity to counter revolutionary
accusations of tyranny. Throughout the text, the author shares several anecdotes about the king’s
good deeds, because “[to] judge a man well, one must not only look at his public actions, but
also scrutinize his private life.”¹¹⁷ The author’s interest in Louis’ private life parallels
contemporary pamphlets detailing the “private lives” of political opponents, sharing details such
as their delinquency as children or their hypersexuality as adults. In doing so, their authors aimed
to damage the reputation of their target. In the primitive “battle of good and evil” plotlines that
these pamphlets presented, their target was clearly the latter.¹¹⁸ But the author of *Une fleur sur le
tombeau* uses details of Louis’ private life to prove his goodness of character.

The author recounts a time when Louis climbed to the sixth story of a building to help an
old sick man. When his companion complained about the smell, Louis graciously responded,
“You are wrong…the odor of misery is a perfume for he who comes to help.”¹¹⁹ Another time,

¹¹⁷ *Une fleur sur le tombeau de Louis XVI*, 2. « pour bien juger un homme, il faut non seulement rechercher ses
actions publiques, mais scruter encore sa vie privée. »
¹¹⁸ Robert Darnton, *The Devil in the Holy Water or the Art of Slander from Louis XIV to Napoleon*, Material Texts.
¹¹⁹ *Une fleur sur le tombeau de Louis XVI*, 19. « Vous vous trompez…l’odeur de la misère est un parfum pour celui
qui vient la secourir. »
when Louis and his brother, the Comte d’Artois, were on a walk, they encountered a carriage stuck in mud. The brothers ran to help the carriage driver “who did not recognize them” and gave him money. Artois gave him two *louis*, but Louis only gave him one. Later on, Louis ran into the driver again and explained why he gave him less than his brother: “It is not surprising that [Artois] was more generous,” he tells him, “He only has one child, and I have twenty four million.” Louis thus asserts his need to care for his other “children,” or his subjects, as king. Despite this, the fact that he helped rescue the carriage and gave the driver money at all demonstrates his generosity. Other stories include his encountering a poor family during the year of the wheat famine and furnishing their house, sending their children to boarding school, and providing enough money for them to be raised; as well as supplying enough money to care for the widows and children of the men who died in a fatal disaster on the Rue Royale. The author of *Une fleur sur le tombeau* thus presents Louis as a loving and charitable man devoted to the welfare of his subjects. This characterization opposed the revolutionary image of a bloodthirsty tyrant, unmoved by the suffering of his people. Stories about Louis’ private life, which reveal his true character, were therefore the most effective way to prove the fallacy of these accusations.

The author also uses religious imagery to prove Louis’ dignity. Not only was Louis innocent because of his good character, but he was also a martyr, and became more divine through his death. The author writes, for example, that “the life of Louis XVI was that of a sage, his death was that of a Christian hero.” Therefore, when he reached the scaffold on the day of his execution, he “was no longer a man; he was no longer even a king; he was a pure & immortal
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120 Une Fleur sur le tombeau de Louis XVI., 27.
121 Une fleur sur le tombeau de Louis XVI., 27–28. « Il n’est pas surprenant qu’il ait été plus généreux. Il n’a qu’un enfant, & moi j’en ai vingt-quatre millions. »
122 Une fleur sur le tombeau de Louis XVI., 13–14; Une Fleur sur le tombeau de Louis XVI., 28–29.
123 Une fleur sur le tombeau de Louis XVI., 173. « La vie de Louis XVI avait été celle d’un sage, sa mort fut celle d’un héros chrétien. »
substance that soared up to divinity, towards that merciful God who held out His arms to him.”

Unlike the revolutionaries, who saw Louis’ execution as a transition from his metaphorical fatherhood over his subjects, to the revolutionary “fraternité” (Marat described January 21 as the day that revolutionaries were “penetrated by the sentiment of fraternity”), royalists believed that the execution transformed the late king into a martyr.

For royalists, according to historian Susan Dunn, “regicide was tantamount to deicide, the decapitation of God’s representative on earth.” In the same way that the king was Christ-like in life, according to Ernst Kantorowicz’s Two Bodies theory, so he was in death. Just as Christ died on the cross for the sins of his people, Louis was the victim of the misguided revolutionaries. Therefore, royalists focused on vignettes from the
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124 Une fleur sur le tombeau de Louis XVI, 174. « n’était plus un homme ; ce n’était plus même un roi ; c’était une substance pure & immortelle qui s’élançait vers la divinité, vers ce Dieu miséricordieux qui lui tendait les bras. »


127 Dunn, 5.
king’s final days, which were often circulated in newspapers, books, and images. These episodes replicated scenes from the Passion of Christ, such as the Last Supper, the Flagellation of Christ, and the Crucifixion. In this sense, royalists created a “Passion of Louis XVI,” through which the wronged king became a martyr at the hands of his tormentors. These images were circulated to preserve these scenes in their memory, to capture the humanity and melodrama that his death evoked, and recall Catholicism, which the revolutionaries had attacked.

In the first scene, Louis teaches his young son, Louis-Charles, about the history of Charles I while locked away in the Temple. One engraving depicts Louis indicating England on a globe to his son (Figure 1). The caption reads:

In the depths of his dungeon the unfortunate Louis,
Paints the misfortunes of Charles I to his son,
What a deadly omen! Oh, too sensitive father,
Did you mean to indicate the painful end of your days?

Louis’ son, who was commonly depicted by royalists as precocious and thus fit to succeed his father on the throne, sees the irony in the situation. In Étienne Aignan and Jules-Julien-Gabriel Berthevin’s play La Mort de Louis XVI, Louis-Charles, during a similar scene to that in the engraving, starts to cry, telling his father, “It seemed to me, Papa, to see Charles in Louis.”

The allusion to Charles I was a common royalist motif of connecting the fates of the two kings who were tried and executed by rebellious subjects, but it also asserts Louis’ innocence while demonstrating him as a loving father and a responsible monarch, making sure his son receives a good, education despite their imprisonment.

Louis’ situation was constantly compared to that of Charles I of England, who was executed by his subjects in 1649. Royalist writers viewed Charles, just like Louis, as innocent,
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128 Aignan and Berthevin, La Mort de Louis XVI, 16. « Il me semblait, papa, voir Charles dans Louis. »
and used his unjust execution to bolster their arguments to save Louis. Gautier de Syonnet’s

*Feuille du matin* used a snippet of a biography on the English king written after his execution:

His enemies wanted to make him seem like a cruel and bloodthirsty prince; but they were never able to prove any specific action that demonstrated such a penchant—Many people called him a *martyr*, claiming that he greatly suffered in his death, to support the truth of religion; and they call the day of his death, which is celebrated every year on January 30, the day of his martyrdom.\(^{129}\)

The inclusion of this passage implies that Louis’ situation is analogous to that of Charles. The success of Charles’ supporters in securing a date to celebrate his martyrdom suggests their ultimate victory—thus, the *Feuille du matin* is suggesting that, like Charles’ reputation was saved after his death, contemporary French royalists would also be able to do the same for Louis.

The *Courier de Londres* takes a more violent approach: “history teaches us that of all the judges of Charles I, only one died a natural death.”\(^{130}\) The fact that his judges were killed not only hints at an anger from his subjects, which implies that the decision to execute him was not unanimous, but it also hints at a divine retribution: God punished those men who killed His worldly representative. Furthermore, since the monarchy was restored in England eleven years later, in 1660, the allusions to Charles’ execution reassured royalists that the good subjects who were uncorrupted by the revolutionaries, would also work to restore the throne in France.

Royalist writers also used England as a comparison point: while the French were persecuting their own king, these writers portrayed the people across the Channel as shocked by the barbarity of the Revolution. According to these writers, the English had already experienced—and regretted—their regicidal phase, especially since they ended up restoring the

\(^{129}\) *Feuille du matin ou le Bulletin de Paris*, February 2 1793, 106. « Ses ennemis ont voulu le faire passer pour un Prince cruel et sanguinaire ; mais ils n’ont jamais pu lui prouver aucune action particulière qui ait marqué un tel penchant –Bien des gens lui donnent le nom de *Martyr*, prétendant qu’il a souffert la mort en très grande partie, pour soutenir la vérité de la religion ; et ils appellent le jour de sa mort qui se célèbre tous les ans le 30 Janvier, le jour de son martyre. »

\(^{130}\) Cox, Cox, and Baylis, *Courier de Londres*, January 24 1793, 75. « l’histoire nous apprend que de tous les juges de Charles Ier, un seul mourut de sa mort naturelle. »
throne in 1660. Now, they watched in horror as the same scenario unfolded in France, and were
dismayed to see Louis die. Several newspapers reported a scene from London where “the
people” responded in shock to hearing the news of the execution:

When the news spread among the people that the unfortunate Louis XVI had perished on the
scaffold, a sudden movement of indignation and horror froze all their minds. One heard some
English people cry out, “All sentiments of humanity is stifled in France! That country is therefore
only inhabited by tigers and their victims! One only breathes blood there! When will they be
satisfied? Will the death of the just finally put an end to the fury that has lasted for so long?” 131

The *Feuille du matin* reports that in London,

The day we received news of the death of Louis XVI, *Sylvie*, the opera by Lillo, was showing at
the Haymarket Theater: there is a procession in this play where all the flags of the different
peoples of Europe appear; when the flag of France appeared, there was such a terrible noise in all
the hall, that it was absolutely necessary to remove it. An actor announced at the end of the play
that the theaters would be closed the following night because of the death of the king of France:
he had barely finished speaking when the famous national refrain, “God Save the King,” was
heard, repeated many times from all parts of the hall. 132

Whether through shock and dismay, or through passionate displays of mourning, the English
reacted to Louis’ death in a way that royalists felt the French should have felt towards the trial
and death of their king. The English showed the appropriate reactions of pity and grief at Louis’
fate. Not only does this demonstrate the abnormality of the Revolution—and its deviation from
the morality of the Ancien Régime—but it demonstrates that revolutionaries were blind to how
history was repeating itself.
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131 *La Révolution de 92, ou Journal de la Convention nationale*, January 31 1793, 4. – Also in *Feuille du matin*,
January 30 1793, 294 ; and * Courier de Londres*, January 22 1793, 58. « Quand la nouvelle fut répandue parmi le
peuple que l’infortunée [sic] Louis XVI avait pérî sur l’échafaud, un mouvement soudain d’indignation et d’horreur
plaça tous les esprits. On entendait des Anglais s’écrier : ‘Tout sentiment d’humanité est donc étouffé en France ! Ce 
peys n’est donc habité que par des tigres et leurs victimes ! On y respire que le sang ! quand en seront-ils assouvis ? 
La mort du juste mettra-t-elle enfin un terme à des fureur qui durent depuis si longtemps !»

132 *Feuille du matin ou le Bulletin de Paris*, February 3 1793, 118. « Le jour qu’on a reçu la nouvelle de la mort de 
Louis XVI, on donnait au théâtre de Haimarket, *Sylvie* opéra de Lillo : il y a dans cette pièce une procession où
paraissent tous les drapeaux des différents peuples de l’Europe ; lorsque celui de France parût, il se fit un tapage si 
effroyable dans toute la salle, qu’il fallut absolument le retirer. Un acteur annonça à la fin de la pièce que les théâtres
seraient fermés le lendemain à cause de la mort du roi de France ; à peine eut-il achevé de parler que le fameux 
refrain national *God save the king* se fit entendre à plusieurs reprises de tous les points de la salle. »
The most commonly replicated scene of Louis XVI’s “Passion” is the “final interview,” when the king bids his family a tearful goodbye on the day of his execution. The Quotidienne, for example, recounted the events of his final day, when he passed his last moments with the family: “The interview [between Louis and his family] lasted two and a half hours; the conversation was lively and animated and the goodbyes were touching.”133 The Révolution de 92 laments,

The device dismays all who have a soul; but the lost people believe that they see in this death the source of their future happiness…May one make, if it is possible, a painting of what is happening inside the Temple. May one imagine the final goodbyes of a miserable husband and father, of a family damaged by dismay and grief. 134

Here, he is not the tyrant of revolutionary accusations but a father, a husband, and a brother who is saying goodbye to his beloved family. It is true that the republican newspaper Révolutions de Paris also retells these events in touching on the “tears” and the “sobs” shared by the family, and later, between Marie-Antoinette and Louis’ sister Élisabeth.135 But even if this newspaper showed the sadness expressed by the family, it is important to note that this reporting was not framed by any words or phrases that influenced the emotions of readers. In the Quotidienne, the goodbyes were “touching,” and in the Révolution de 92, the king’s death not only affects anyone who still “has a soul,” but causes his family intense misery. In Révolutions de Paris, they were in tears, but no more than that.

The scene is also included in Aignan and Berthevin’s play, and opens on Louis, his family, and his confessor. The revolutionary general Santerre is also there, waiting to take him to
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134 La Révolution de 92, ou Journal de la Convention nationale, January 21 1793, 1. « L’appareil consterne tous ceux qui ont une âme ; mais le peuple égaré croit voir dans cette mort la source de son future bonheur…Qu’on se fasse, s’il est possible, un tableau de ce qui se passe dans l’intérieur du Temple. Qu’on se représente les derniers adieux d’un époux, d’un père malheureux, à une famille abîmée de consternation et de douleur. »
135 Révolutions de Paris, January 26 1793, 196.
the scaffold. Louis greets his family: “Oh my wife! Oh my sister! / Oh my dear children.../
Come and receive goodbyes from your dearest friend!...”¹³⁶ He then turns to his wife, Marie-
Antoinette, who is clearly distraught, and comments: “She is shaken, and can no longer hear
me.”¹³⁷ The interaction between the royal family opened on a melodramatic tone, shown through
how the characters are greatly emotionally affected by the fact that this is their last goodbye.
Louis’ family was devastated to lose him, especially Marie-Antoinette, who was so emotionally
affected that she was unaware of what was happening in the scene. Then, she takes her anger
with the situation out on the guard, explaining how their crimes against her husband and the
monarchy would soon be met with divine retribution: “God Himself, in strokes of blood, on your
perfidious foreheads, / Will impress these words: fear a patricide.”¹³⁸ The range of emotions
shown by the queen in reaction to her husband’s sentence demonstrates the attachment she feels
towards him. Aignan and Berthevin thus portrayed the royal couple as loving and familial, and
they and their children form a familial unit, just as legitimate as any other family. They are
captured in a sad and intimate moment that stressed their mutual affection in contrast to the
defamatory pamphlets that insisted on the family’s dysfunctionality, where Marie-Antoinette was
an unfaithful wife, and their children had different fathers. Here, it was visible that in killing
Louis, the revolutionaries were tearing a husband, father, and brother away from his adoring
family.

¹³⁶ Aignan and Berthevin, La Mort de Louis XVI, 29. « ô ma femme ! ô ma sœur ! / O mes tendres enfants !... /
Recevez les adieux de l’ami le plus tendre !... »
¹³⁷ Aignan and Berthevin, 28. « Elle chancèle, et ne peut plus m’entendre. »
¹³⁸ Aignan and Berthevin, 29. « Dieu même, en traits de sang, sur votre front perfide, / Imprimera ces mots : Fuyez
un parricide. »
The “final interview” was also a popular subject for engravings. Counterrevolutionary artists, like authors, were persecuted, which prompted them to instead print their drawings in England.\(^{139}\) Many engravings were published with captions in English and German, suggesting their marketability to non-francophone countries. Due to the immediacy of the image, these engravings allowed the viewers to feel sympathy for the king and to understand the rupture that the execution created within the royal family. They also used pity to move the viewer, portraying the subjects in styles ranging from the emotional to the melodramatic. Some depict the family falling over each other, sobbing, and gazing skyward in anguish (Figure 2). Others, like Figure 3, demonstrate a more tender moment among the family, but still play on their viewers’ emotions: Marie-Antoinette cries into Louis’ shoulder as

their children run into his arms to hug him goodbye. Élisabeth weeps into a handkerchief. There is also a caption, both in French and German, suggesting it was also sold in Germany, though it claims to primarily be sold in Paris. The first line of this caption reads, “Who can view this scene without affliction?” This line makes evident that the engraving was meant to move its viewers, and stir pity for the misfortunes that the “principal barbarians” were making him suffer, as well as depriving a family of its father. Figure 4 is a third example of these motifs. Once again, the royal family is sorrowfully reacting to the news that Louis would be guillotined the following day. The pain on the faces of the royal family, especially Louis’, is visible and evokes sympathy in itself. The caption reads, “Again this last goodbye, again this last embrace,’ says Louis while

Figure 9. Congé et séparation douleureuse de Louis XVI à la reine et à sa famille. 1793-1795. BnF.
leaving, ‘it is the last! But we will see each other beyond the grave! Goodbye! Beyond the grave we will feel happiness, for I die innocent.” Louis’ last words on the scaffold are brought to mind—“I die innocent, I pardon my enemies”—which contrasts with Saint-Just’s declaration that “no one can reign innocently.” The caption’s heartfelt monologue attributed to Louis demonstrates his love for his both his biological family and his metaphorical “children” (by pardoning his subjects), while at the same time insisting on his innocence.

Royalist publications thus continued the rhetorical themes seen in their responses to Varennes to defend their political view and their opinions of the king. The execution marked a

Figure 10. Les derniers adieux de Louis XVI à sa famille... 1793. BnF.
rupture, where royalist writers transformed their king into a martyr, a symbol of a good king and father to his people, whose death represented the misguidance under which the revolutionaries acted. However, they also recalled his human side, including his kindness to others and the grief of his family, to illustrate his humanity, and the cruelty of the revolutionaries’ decision to execute him. Not only were these elements used in the rhetoric of these publications, but also through the replication of several scenes that led up to his death. Not only did these scenes liken him to Christ in his final days and imply his martyrdom, but they also evoked pity by visualizing the king’s final moments with his family.

The royalists ultimately argued that Louis was a benevolent king who cared for his subjects. In the *Dernier tableau*, Peltier describes his benevolent character: “the king was always happy about union and concord, he was always eager to join spirits together.” Thus, if Louis had to go to the scaffold for the monarchy to be restored, he was willing to do so. Louis himself evoked this idea of sacrifice in his attempt to address the crowd moments before his execution. Though he was silenced by the executioners, he managed to tell the crowd: “*I die innocent, I pardon my enemies.*” It is thus apparent that this trope of the “good king” was used not only to save Louis’ image, but to evoke pity for the fact that he was sacrificed for the people. The fact that Louis also tapped into it suggests that it was effective. In addition to demonstrating his benevolence, the idea that Louis pardoned his people’s wrongdoings while on the scaffold was a noble effort which also likened him to Christ, who is said to have died for the sins of his
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141 *Journal français, ou Tableau politique et littéraire de Paris*, January 21 1793, 4. There seem to be many variations on this quotation. The *Bulletin national* (January 22 1793, p. 89) quotes it as “*I pardon my enemies, & I desire my death to be useful to France.*”
followers. Therefore, royalist representations used Louis’ admirable character and tragic last scenes to paint him both as an innocent victim and a Christ-like martyr.

Despite the death of their king, royalists did not give up on their cause. Instead, many began to invest their hopes for the reestablishment of the monarchy to Louis’ son Louis-Charles, whom they recognized as Louis XVII, his father’s legitimate successor at eight years old. He was the center of a third scene: begging the guards of the Temple for the life of his father, which will be addressed in the next section.
IV. The Nine-Year-Old King: Royalist Representations of Louis XVII

In March 1793, the National Convention implemented a censorship law ordering that any person who advocated for the restoration of the monarchy be executed. Therefore, when Marie-Antoinette was executed that October, royalist newspapers that had previously spoken out against the death of her husband reported the news without commentary. Opposition to the Terror was nonetheless on the rise, which in July 1794 led to the overthrow of Robespierre and the Thermidorian Reaction. Moderate members of the National Convention, as well as supporters who feared they would be targeted by Maximilien Robespierre, arrested him and several of his supporters, accusing him of planning to declare himself dictator. The following day, despite an attempt to gather supporters and retaliate, Robespierre and his followers were guillotined. Although the Terror itself had come to an end, the National Convention implemented measures to avoid a restoration of the monarchy. Censorship laws were reinforced to prevent the spread of monarchist ideas in the wake of the coup. After Thermidor, however, censorship was expanded to included extreme republican publications that expressed nostalgia for the Terror.

Although most post-Thermidorian revolutionaries rejected the monarchy, French royalists, both inside and outside of France, recognized nine-year-old Louis-Charles as their new king, Louis XVII. The boy and his sixteen-year-old sister, Marie-Thérèse, had been imprisoned in the Temple since their father’s trial. In the wake of Thermidor, royalists, though still suppressed, saw the young siblings as a rallying point for restoration. In mainstream Terror and post-Thermidorian politics, though, the young prisoners were often forgotten.

---

146 To avoid confusion with his father, I refer to him in this section as Louis-Charles.
royalist faith in his ability to rule, the young king had suffered during his captivity. After separating him from his mother, sister, and aunt, the Committee of Public Safety placed him in the custody of Antoine Simon, a cobbler, who was charged to instruct him in republican citizenship. Temple guards later took Simon’s place, depriving the boy of proper care, and forcing him to eat minimal, and often rotten, food. He was abused and neglected to the point that he became sickly, deformed, and mute.\textsuperscript{148} Despite his death on June 8, 1795, the young Louis-Charles remained a potent symbol of the monarchy and revolutionary cruelty. These writers presented Louis-Charles as another Christ-like martyr, but also as a young orphan who suffered after the deaths of his parents.

This section explores the ways that the royalist press defended Louis-Charles through further development of the Christ-like analogy. It will also address royalist comparisons of Louis-Charles to his ancestor, Henri IV, which emphasizes his dynastic legitimacy. Royalist writers also referenced contemporary ideas on childhood to condemn the revolutionaries’ mistreatment of Louis-Charles and his sister, whose impressionable age made their abuse even more unwarranted. Ultimately, Louis-Charles’ death, and his sister’s imprisonment, marked a turning point for the sympathy of all French people, who, traumatized by the Terror, wanted to extend compassion towards all people—not just republican citizens. Altogether, blood and pity continued to be prevalent in post-Thermidor representations of the royal family.

Similar to their portraits of Louis XVI, royalists interpreted Louis XVII as a symbol of monarchical sanctity. The boy was the focus of a third scene of Louis XVI’s aforementioned “Passion,” in which he escaped the Temple prison and tearfully pleaded with the guards to spare

\textsuperscript{148} Vial, 269-71.
his father from his execution. One example of this scene is recounted by émigré journalist Jean-
Gabriel Peltier:

The Dauphin found a way to escape, and was not recognized until he reached the middle of the
courtyards near the entry to the street. Stopped by the guards, he cried, he moaned, he begged
them to let him through: *But where do you want to go*, one of those barbarians asked him, moved
by his beauty and his tears, *I want to go*, he said, *I want to go beg the people to not make Papa
die; my god! Don’t keep me from speaking to them!*149

While the Revolutionaries were convicting the king of crimes, royalists were considering how
this decision impacted the people closest to him: his family, and particularly his children. In this
scene, Louis-Charles is anguished at the thought of losing his father, as any young child would
be. But he decides to take matters into his own hands and plead for mercy directly from the
French people. His bravery and resolution display his qualities as a future king. Although only
eight years old at the time, he risked his life to address the people as if already their leader. His
confidence in his ability to sway their opinion hints at his fitness to be king. Further, the scene
implies that the people were misguided by the Revolution, and could be brought back to their
senses if the king and his family addressed them directly. Therefore, this scene of Louis XVI’s
“Passion” insists that the Revolution had imposed an artificial barrier between the king and his
people.

A similar theme appears in an engraving that depicted the young Louis-Charles praying
for his parents. According to Charles-Eloi Vidal, there were many versions of the scene
published, which originated in England, and circulated in both London and Paris.150 These
images connect the boy’s innocence to his religious significance. He is a member of the royal

149 Jean-Gabriel Peltier, *Dernier tableau de Paris, ou, récit historique de la révolution du 10 août, des causes qui
l’ont produit, des événemens qui l’ont précédé, et des crimes qui l’ont suivi.*, vol. 2 (Londres, 1792-3), 39,
http://hdl.handle.net/2027/nyp.33433069323073. « Le Dauphin trouva le moyen de s’échapper, & ne fut reconnu
qu’au milieu des cours près la porte de la rue. Arrêté par les gardes, il pleure, il gémit, il supplie qu’on le laisse
passer : mais où voulez-vous aller, lui dit un de ces barbares, attendri par sa beauté & ses pleurs, je veux aller, dit-il,
je veux aller supplier le peuple de ne pas faire mourir papa ; mon dieu ! ne m’empêchez pas de lui parler ! »
150 Vial, *La famille royale au Temple*, 274.
family, but he is also a helpless child, desperate to save his parents, on whom his wellbeing depends. In the scene from Louis XVI’s “Passion,” Louis-Charles turned to the people. Here, he turns to God—as the rays of light streaming through the window indicate—acknowledging the religious aspect that the revolutionaries had sought to eliminate, and this moment of vulnerability endears Louis-Charles to the viewer (Figure 5). This element of religion is intensified by two verses from Exodus placed under the picture, which translates to, “[do not take advantage of a widow or an orphan.] If you do and they cry out to me, I will certainly hear their cry. My anger will be aroused, and I will kill you with the sword; your wives will become widows and your children fatherless.” This verse evidently parallels Louis-Charles’ situation. He is the orphan of which the revolutionaries are taking advantage, and thus the artist

151 By London-based printer Paul Colnaghi. Not much else is known about Colnaghi, other than that he was an Italian-born printer based in London. He also printed an engraving titled “The Separation of Lewis the Sixteenth from his Family,” depicting a farewell scene originally painted by Charles Benazech, and engraved by Luigi Schiavonetti. Figure 1 also has a counterpart by Colnaghi, featuring Marie-Thérèse. She stands in front of her parents’ urn, praying and weeping. The text is Psalm 27 (mistakenly labeled as Psalm 26) in Latin, which translates to “When my father and my mother forsake me, then the Lord will take me up.” The capital letters scattered throughout the text spell out “Madame,” as in her title, “Madame Royale.” The purposes of these prints are unknown, but the fact that these prints depict the royal family in a flattering light suggest that Colnaghi, watching the Revolution unfold from England, had royalist sympathies.
summoned divine retribution and restoration. Furthermore, the use of a verse from Exodus implies that, like the Israelites whose story it follows, the royal family was the victim of unjust persecution but destined for salvation. Nonetheless, the boy’s connection to God serves as evidence that once the people—and God—united to save him, the monarchy would be restored. Cleverly hidden in this verse is “Louis XVII, Rex Galliæ” (Louis XVII, French king), which further asserts his rightful place on the throne.

Royalist writers further emphasized the young king’s natural aptness to rule through anecdotes about his upbringing prior to the Revolution. As mentioned in the previous section, Étienne Aignan and Jules-Julien-Gabriel Berthevin’s play La mort de Louis XVI captures the child’s precociousness in his ability to discern the similarities between Charles I of England’s fate and that of his father. His father asks him to choose between “the bed of Oliver Cromwell,” who had ordered Charles killed to serve his own despotic desires, and who died peacefully in his bed, and “the scaffold of the king.” The boy responds, “Ah! Papa, upon the scaffold, death is not horrible. / The death of the criminal is the only terrible kind.” Louis-Charles’ intelligence served to evoke sympathy from readers, who already know that he will lose his father. But he was still alive when the play was published, meaning that royalist readers like Aignan and Berthevin were confident that he would be a qualified and successful ruler, even at nine years old.

Another document, titled Louis XVII, also details his precociousness. Published after his death, this eulogistic text pays homage to Louis-Charles by providing details of his short, yet noble, life. During the imprisonment of the royal family, for example, the document recounts that

153 Aignan and Berthevin, 17. « Ah ! Papa, l'échafaud, la mort n'a rien d'horrible. / La mort du criminel, est la seule terrible. »
he “was for [his parents] a consoling angel: his sensibility, his kindness lightened the weight of their sorrow; sometimes, even, the liveliness of his responses and his ingenious wit made them smile involuntarily.”  

Here, the author describes Louis-Charles not only as wise and courageous beyond his years, but asserts that his youth added some charm to the lives of his parents—and that of readers—in spite of their despair. While recounting how Simon treated him, the author writes, “Louis tolerated everything with an angelic patience, and such was already the magnanimity of his heart, that, when his tyrant asked him what he would do to take revenge on him if he became king, the heroic child responded without hesitating: ‘I would forgive you...’”

Even in the face of such abuse, the young king was able to maintain his composure and say he would pardon those who wronged him, just as his father had done on the scaffold. Louis-Charles’ assertion emphasizes his nobility of character, which came naturally to the latest heir of the Bourbon line, even at such a young age. Furthermore, his tolerance and forgiveness for the abuse through which the revolutionaries put him likened him, like his father, to Christ. This allusion thus served to demonstrate his natural—and God-given—ability to rule. Since Louis XVII was a eulogy, it was meant to stir pity among his supporters, and implicitly condemn the Revolution: a child this admirable, so fit to be king, died because of the Revolution: his talents for ruling went to waste.

Royalist writers also often drew comparisons between Louis-Charles and his sixteenth-century predecessor, Henri IV. In the 1793 preface to the 1783 publication Le dauphin enlevé, ou
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154 Jules de Lateux, “Louis XVII (Louis-Charles de Bourbon, Duc de Normandie), 68e Roi de France, Fils de Louis XVI et de La Reine Marie-Antoinette, Né à Versailles, Le 27 Mars; Dauphin En 1789 ; Roi Le 21 Janvier 1793 ; Mort Au Temple, Le 8 Juin 1795.” 1795, 2. « fut pour [ses parents] un ange consolateur : sa sensibilité, sa douceur allègerent souvent le poids de leurs chagrins ; quelquefois même, la vivacité de ses réparties et ses saillies ingénieuses les firent involontairement sourire. »

155 de Lateux, 3. « Louis supportait tout avec une patience angélique, et telle était déjà la magnanimité de son cœur, que, son tyran lui ayant demandé ce qu'il ferait, pour se venger de lui, s'il devenait roi, l'héroïque enfant lui répondit sans hésiter : "Je vous pardonnerais..." »
l'art de se diriger dans les airs, author Charles Grant, vicomte de Vaux writes that the sovereigns that were able to “become enlightened, & to gain experience,” through either journeying in different lands, or through facing adversity, were “very fortunate.” He adds that “[such] were Henri IV of France, the Czar Pierre I, &c. May the Heavens allow us to add to those names, that of the unfortunate Dauphin of France, Louis XVII!” Peltier, in Paris, pendant l’année, expresses a similar idea: “raised like Henry IV, at the school of adversity, we like to repeat that he would have traced the virtues of his father, the graces and the majesty of his mother.” Just as his father’s situation was compared to that of Charles I of England, the situation of Louis-Charles was paralleled to that of his ancestor Henri IV. Not only does this legitimize his reign through blood relations, but it demonstrates that the young king was to be both pitied and respected for the adversities he had to face. These comparisons to Henri IV reflected a growing interest in and nostalgia for the founder of the Bourbon line was spurred by Voltaire’s 1723 epic poem celebrating the late king’s life, the Henriade. Filled with reverence for Henri IV, contemporaries excitedly made comparisons between him and Louis XV—who rejected these comparisons—and later Louis XVI, who was more ambiguous towards them. In fact, in Louis XVI’s time, Pierre-Barnabé Farmian de Rozoi, who would eventually be the first royalist journalist guillotined during the Terror, wrote a play celebrating him as his ancestor’s reincarnation. Therefore, since the allusion to Henri was so popular, it only made sense to

156 Charles Grant (Vicomte de) Vaux, Le dauphin enlevé, ou L’art de sediriger dans les airs (de l’imprimerie de T. Spilsly & Fels, 1793), 8–9. « s’éclairer, & acquérir de l’expérience » / « trop heureux. »
158 Jean-Gabriel Peltier, Paris pendant l’année ... (De l’Imprimerie de T. Baylis, 1795), 188. « [élevé] comme Henri IV, à l’école de l’adversité, on se plait à répéter qu’il aurait retracé les vertus de son père, les grâces & la majesté de sa mère. »
160 Chéry, 1.
161 Chéry, 3.
assign it to the prince when the royalists were desperate for a hero, like Henri IV, to restore the monarchy.

The accounts of Louis-Charles’ precociousness and nobility of character also serve as a commentary on his legitimacy as monarch. In *Paris pendant l’année*, Jean-Gabriel Peltier made a similar observation in 1795 about Louis-Charles’ successor and uncle, Louis XVIII: “the most capable sovereign by his knowledge and his foresight to reconcile all minds, repair all evils, to be just to everyone, & to generate the happiness of such an agitated nation.” Therefore, all these rulers, according to royalist writings, were naturally fit to rule from a young age, as was described in the case of Louis XVII. Therefore, these depictions of Louis XVII were not only aimed to endear him to readers, but they asserted how naturally capable Louis XVII was of doing so—being a king was in his blood—the “pure blood of the Bourbons,” to borrow the phrase from Gautier de Syonnet, ran through Louis-Charles’ veins, too. Therefore, even in childhood, he knew how to rule. These ideas suggested, then, that the revolutionaries made a grave mistake in abolishing the monarchy. In addition, the torture of the young Louis XVII was not only abhorrent because he was a child, but also because he had proven even at such a young age to be a legitimate and reliable future leader.

Contemporary ideas of childhood shaped royalist images of Louis XVII. Eighteenth-century thinkers and doctors identified childhood as a vulnerable stage of life, where children, though naturally innocent, were molded by their surroundings. Louis-Charles’ “tender age” – a phrase often used in royalist descriptions of him—exacerbated the circumstances of his

---

162 Peltier, *Paris pendant l’année* ..., 190. « le souverain le plus capable par ses lumières & sa sagesse de concilier tous les esprits, de réparer tous les maux, d’être juste envers tous, & de faire le bonheur d’une nation si agitée »

captivity.\textsuperscript{164} Education and healthy living were crucial to a child’s development, but Louis-Charles received neither. A pamphlet titled \textit{Mémoire adressé à la nation pour Marie-Thérèse-Charlotte de Bourbon}, addressed these concerns. Although it was published after Louis-Charles’ death, it aimed to unite readers of all political backgrounds—“royalists or republicans, whoever you may be”—to abandon their biases in favor of humanity with the goal of freeing Louis’ sister, Marie-Thérèse, from the Temple: “You cannot, without insulting justice, without outraging humanity, without declaring yourself an accomplice of the barbarians that you are sending to the scaffold, keep this unfortunate one in chains for any longer.”\textsuperscript{165} The pamphlet appealed to readers’ emotions by highlighting the abuses that Louis-Charles endured during his imprisonment. While under the care of Simon, the pamphlet reports that his wife “used whatever means that her ministry gave her, to corrupt his heart.”\textsuperscript{166} This included forcing him to sing a revolutionary song vilifying his late mother: “Madame Veto had promised / To have all of Paris slaughtered.”\textsuperscript{167} Not only did Madame Simon “corrupt” him, similar to accusations during the trial of Marie-Antoinette that she and her sister-in-law Élisabeth had sexually corrupted him, but the fact that he was forced to mock his mother’s memory was gratuitous cruelty. Later on, the pamphlet recounts that the Temple prison guards would prevent the boy from sleeping:

A little later on, when he just had drifted off to sleep, one of these Cerberuses, fearing that the devil or the aristocrats had carried him across the prison vaults, called out to him in a frightening voice: \textit{Capet? Where are you? Are you sleeping?} —“I’m here,” said the child, half-asleep and fully trembling. —“Come here so I can see you.” And the little unfortunate one was to come
\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{164} i.e. de Maistre, \textit{Les derniers régicides ou Madame Elizabeth de France et Louis XVII. Causes premières de la révolution, esprit des républiques.}, 35.
\end{flushright} \begin{flushright}
\end{flushright} \begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{166} Beaulieu, 20–21. « employait tous les moyens que lui donnait son ministère, pour corrompre le cœur »
\end{flushright} \begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{167} Beaulieu, 21. « Madame Veto avait promis / De faire égorger tout Paris. »
\end{flushright}
running, profusely sweating and completely naked: --“I’m here, what do you want from me?” –
“To see you; go on, go back to bed: housse,” –Two or three hours later, the other bandit started up
the same little game again, and the poor child was obliged to obey.168

Although the pamphlet was not identified as royalist, its description of the guards as “Cerberus”
transforms them into infernal beasts. The boy was thus the tortured hero, and the guards—as well
as the Terror revolutionaries that kept the boy imprisoned—were the villains. The fact that they
deprived the boy of the sleep necessary for his wellbeing evoked pity and humanity that
transcended political bounds. It also demonstrated the characteristic post-Thermidor attitude of
distancing themselves from the Terror. They were not responsible for the abuse, therefore they
used it as a rallying point to save his sister.

The fact that the revolutionaries abused a child allowed royalist writers to portray them as
villains. While Louis XVI could be judged as a man who was capable of making decisions, Louis
XVII was a boy, separated from his parents by the revolutionaries. With this in mind, royalist
writers often cited Louis-Charles’ youth to stir pity and rally for the boy’s release. A print
gilded by Nicolas-Xavier Willemin captures the injustice of his circumstances (Figure 6).
Louis-Charles is depicted with his wrist enchained, and the caption reads, “Alas! I am still so
young, / by what crime did I deserve my misfortune?” The “enchained boy king,” echoing the
“king in chains” imagery that royalists used to defend Louis XVI in the wake of Varennes, was
even more shocking because Louis-Charles was a child. His innocence was thus reinforced by
the fact that he was “still so young.” The line in the caption is taken from Racine’s 1689 play
Esther (based on the Book of Esther in the Old Testament) and was spoken by a young Israelite

168 Beaulieu, 19–20. « Quelque temps après, lorsqu’il était plongé dans son premier sommeil, un de ces Cerbères,
craignant que le diable ou les aristocrates ne l’eussent enlevé à travers les voûtes de sa prison, lui criait d’une voix
je te voie. Et le petit malheureux d’accourir tout suant et tout nu : --Me voilà; que me voulez-vous ? --Te voir ; va,
retourne te coucher: housse. --Deux ou trois heures après, l’autre brigand recommençait le même manège, et le
pauvre enfant était obligé d’obéir. »
whose people were persecuted by the Persians. However, it also suited Louis-Charles’ contemporary circumstances. Willemin implied that Louis-Charles, and the royalists who supported him, were like the persecuted Israelites. As in the play, these abuses were arbitrary: even though Louis-Charles was a child, revolutionaries still found him worthy of arrest. By likening Louis-Charles to the Israelites, who were persecuted because they were God’s “chosen people,” royalists insisted on the boy’s eventual triumph over his adversaries. Although he never committed a crime, he was imprisoned because of his royal blood, but God would protect him.

Louis XVII’s death in June of 1795 drew attention to the mistreatment he and his sister faced during imprisonment. The boy’s untimely death caused many writers—not just royalists, but also many republicans—to reconsider the inhumane ways in which the royal family had been treated. The Mémoire, published to raise awareness of Marie-Thérèse’s imprisonment was widely covered in both moderate and royalist newspapers, which expressed shock and outbursts of emotion in response to its claims. The royalist papers Abréviateur universel and Postillon des armées both prefaced their coverage of the Mémoire with “one will not read without emotion
what we are about to transcribe,” demonstrating the pity that it would evoke in readers.\textsuperscript{169}

Though the publication itself was not royalist, it targeted the humanity and emotions of its readers to secure the release of his sister..

Now that her brother was dead, though, humanity became a legitimate factor in the debate for her freedom. Recognizing that the French government wanted to avoid restoring the monarchy, the \textit{Mémoire} cited Salic Law to justify her liberation, since no woman could inherit the throne. Robespierre and his accomplices could justify the imprisonment of the young son of Louis XVI for fear of the plots that his freedom could have brought about; but the same cannot be said about his sister.\textsuperscript{170} Additionally, the pamphlet argued that she was unjustly imprisoned for the crimes of her parents, even though she was innocent: “we have said in our laws: \textit{men are not anything by birth}; however Marie-Thérèse-Charlotte cries in the dungeons, because she was born in the palace of kings.”\textsuperscript{171} Even here, post-Thermidor publications were distancing themselves from the mentalities that drove the Terror. While Montagnards kept the royal family in captivity for Louis XVI’s crimes, post-Thermidor revolutionaries criticized the sordid conditions under which they were kept. The \textit{Mémoire} even criticized the way Marie-Antoinette, so vilified by the revolutionaries during her trial in 1793, was treated in the Conciergerie: “They placed her in a room…that is seen as the most noxious of this dreadful prison, in all weathers humid and foul.”\textsuperscript{172} While the Terror was characterized by hateful oppression, the republic after Thermidor strove to maintain revolutionary values while also remaining humane and rational.

\textsuperscript{169} \textit{Abréviateur universel}, June 19 1795, 1082; Alexandre Cretot, \textit{Le Postillon des armées}, June 20 1795, 2. « “[on] ne lira pas surtout sans émotion celle que nous allons transcrire,”

\textsuperscript{170} \textit{Abréviateur universel}, June 16 1795, 2. ; Beaulieu, 6. « Robespierre et ses complices pouvaient justifier la réclusion du jeune fils de Louis XVI, par la crainte des complots que sa liberté eût pu occasionner ; mais on ne peut pas en dire autant de sa sœur. »

\textsuperscript{171} Beaulieu, 13. « nous avons dit dans nos lois : \textit{les hommes ne sont rien par la naissance}; cependant Marie-Thérèse-Charlotte gémit dans les cachots, parce qu'elle est née dans les palais des rois. »

\textsuperscript{172} Beaulieu, 18. « on la plaça dans une chambre…qui est regardée comme la plus malsaine de cette affreuse prison, dans tous les temps humide et infecte. »
Forcing Marie-Antoinette to live in sordid conditions, and punishing Marie-Thérèse for the crimes of her parents, was no longer acceptable.

In this last installment of the trilogy of events, we see a continuation of royalist rhetorical tactics to defend Louis-Charles, but also a change in the way revolutionaries saw the royal family. The Terror was a traumatic period, and its collapse in 1794 encouraged revolutionaries to seek an equilibrium between the republic and tyranny without restoring the monarchy. Here, we see resurfacing among republicans the enlightened idea that everyone deserved pity, even Marie-Antoinette, Marie-Thérèse, and Louis-Charles. Therefore, Terror-era “hypocritical pity” was replaced by universal post-Thermidor-era humanity.
Conclusion: Revolutionary Pity and Martyrdom

Republican writers and artists sought to inspire pity among their supporters in strikingly similar ways to the royalist cause. Republicans, however, were more concerned with their leaders’ heroism than their humanity. They used tropes of martyrdom to garner sympathy for citizens who were sacrificed their lives for the Revolution. A striking example of this phenomenon is Michel Lepeletier, a representative to the National Convention, who was assassinated on January 20, 1793, the eve of Louis XVI’s execution.

Lepeletier, whose full name prior to the Revolution was Louis-Michel Lepeletier, Comte de Saint-Fargeau, Marquis de Montjeu, Baron de Perreuze, Grand-bailli de Gien, was a wealthy landowner and member of the robe nobility. He was well-versed in politics, having inherited the position of president à mortier—a magistrate of the parlement—from his late father. After the fall of the Bastille, he was elected president of the National Constituent Assembly in 1790, and, in 1792, deputy to the National Convention. Though he initially worked in the interests of the First and Second Estates, he joined the Jacobin club in October 1792 and renounced his noble titles. Not much is known about Lepeletier’s personal life, but his image and political career rocketed to stardom on the night of his death. After spending the afternoon of January 20 holding a vote on the king’s fate—Lepeletier voted for his immediate execution—the National Convention finally let out in the evening. Lepeletier went to the Palais-Égalité (formerly the Palais-Royal) to have dinner. Midway through his meal, he was accosted by a man, later revealed to be Louis Philippe Marie Nicolas de Pâris, a member of the Constitutional Guard, created by the National Constituent Assembly in 1791 to protect the king. Upon confronting him, Pâris denounced Lepeletier for having voted for the king’s death, and proceeded to stab him with his

---

spear. Lepeletier died at one the following morning, nine and a half hours before the king’s execution.\footnote{Chicouard et al., 45.} Thus, in January 1793, two tragedies on either side of the Revolution occurred in quick succession. While royalists mourned Louis XVI in secrecy, their republican counterparts publicly mourned Lepeletier. He was dubbed the “first martyr of the Revolution,” and was often joined in later imagery by others who died in the name of the republic, including Jean-Paul Marat, Joseph Chalier, and a thirteen-year-old drummer boy named Joseph Bara.

Lepeletier’s martyrdom propelled him to mythical proportions, and republicans celebrated him as a hero among men for his sacrifice for the nation. Ceremony played an especially important role in the memorialization of Lepeletier’s image as a martyr. Four days after his death, the National Convention held a grandiose and solemn funeral (Figure 7). The sound of drums and the national guard playing funerary airs were implemented to make a deep
impression on guests. The somber atmosphere was intensified by the “nebulous sky” under which it unfolded. Lepeletier’s body was exhibited atop the pedestal of what used to be a statue of Louis XIV in the Place des Piques (current-day Place Vendôme). His body was exposed down to his waist, which drew attention to the gaping wound in his side, and his bloody clothes were displayed next to it, adorned with “garlands of oak and cypress.” He would later be paraded around the city, making stops at the Jacobin and Cordelier clubs, and finally laid to rest in the Panthéon. On the base of the statue were carved what are said to be his last words—“I am happy to spill my blood for the patrie; I hope that it will serve to consolidate liberty, and to make its enemies known.” Historians Richard Wrigley and Alain Chicouard both contest the legitimacy of this quotation, particularly because, as the latter compellingly argues, how could he have had the strength to have formulated such an eloquent sentence after being so brutally wounded? Wrigley further points out the similarity of these final words to those that Louis XVI spoke on the scaffold. The similarities between their last words suggest that, in the same way that Louis attempted to appeal to his followers to support with his last words, the revolutionaries who attributed this quote to him did the same for his supporters.

Revolutionaries also regarded Lepeletier’s assassination as an affront both to the Revolution and the nation: the Jacobin Convention member Bertrand Barère declared in his eulogy for his deceased colleague, “It is not Lepeletier who was assassinated, it was the
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176 Révolutions de Paris, January 19 1793, 227. « ciel nébuleux. »
177 Chicouard et al., Lepeletier de St. Fargeau, 47.
178 Révolutions de Paris, January 19 1793, 226. « festons de chêne & de cyprès. »
179 Chicouard et al., Lepeletier de St. Fargeau, 45. « Je suis satisfait de verser mon sang pour la patrie, j’espère qu’il servira à consolider la liberté, l’égalité, et à faire connaître ses ennemis. »
180 Chicouard et al., 45. Additionally, a speech that a “deputy from the Departement d’Yonne” who indicated that he was friends with Lepeletier and that the only words he uttered were “I’m cold” (“J’ai froid”).(Citation)
The assassination was therefore not only an attack on their efforts to establish the republic, but a reminder that royalists remained dangerous enemies. Those devoted to the Revolution in their hearts would defend their nation by honoring Lepeletier, which Barère emphasized in his address: “You have been told that Louis’ death would unite you; no, it is not over the tomb of a tyrant that we must swear to destroy factions…it is over the tomb of a martyr of liberty that we must all swear friendship and fraternity.” Here, Barère makes clear that Lepeletier’s death should unite the revolutionaries who had recently voted to execute the king. Lepeletier’s corpse could reconcile the factions that had been growing over the course of the Revolution, and to build a republic through their unity. For this reason, Jacques-Louis David’s paintings of Lepeletier’s final moments, as well as those of Marat (Figures 8 and 9), after he was assassinated that July, were displayed at the front of the National Convention, flanking the podium, “rather like a prominent feature in a landscape that is always there to be seen even if it is seldom noticed by those familiar with the terrain,” as Donna Hunter puts it. The placing of these paintings in the National Convention thus reflects the republican effort to idolize these men as heroes, as well as to commemorate how their deaths contributed to the strength of the republic.

---

182 Jacques-Pierre Brissot, *Le Patriote français : Journal libre, impartial et national / Par une société de citoyens, & dirigé par J. P. Brissot de Warville*, January 23 1793, 89, https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k494978. « ce n’est pas Lepeletier qui a été assassiné, c’est la patrie. »

183 Brissot, January 23 1793, 89. « On vous a dit que la mort de Louis devait vous réunir ; non, ce n’est pas sur la tombe d’un tyran qu’il faut jurer la destruction des factions…c’est sur la tombe d’un martyr de la liberté que nous devons tous aller nous jurer amitié et fraternité. »

According to this logic, anyone who mourned the death of Lepeletier was experiencing or partaking in “true pity,” rather than the royalists’ “hypocritical pity.” Pity for those who had died for the republic was an act of patriotism which reminded citizens of the importance of the republic and the obstacles—such as monarchy, and its supporters—that threatened it. The report in Révolutions de Paris on Lepeletier’s funeral observed that "Many timorous citizens that could have been troubled by the spectacle of Monday the 21 [the execution], watched it with a dry eye, remembering the attack of the night before.” Thus, the injustice of Lepeletier’s assassination kept even the “weaker” citizens from feeling “hypocritical pity” during the king’s execution. Remembering the cruelty of the king and his followers would allow them to regain

---

186 Révolutions de Paris, January 19 1793, 225. « Quantité de citoyens timorés, que le spectacle du lundi 21 aurait pu émouvoir, le virent d'un œil sec, en se rappelant l'attentat de la veille. »
their emotional composure while watching Louis die. This passage recalls that of the author of *Une fleur sur le tombeau de Louis XVI*, who defended the king’s posthumous honor. Because of the “bad, unfair, & atrocious” trial he had endured, Louis was “seen as the martyr of the Revolution,” for whom “all the good French people should revere his memory, avenge his death, & repair in his august family the wrongs & offenses that have been done to them.” Therefore, on both sides of the Revolution, martyrs provided rallying figures to unite their supporters and defend a cause.

Also comparable to royalist techniques was the theme of blood in republican portrayals of martyrs like Lepeletier. For royalists, the purity of Louis XVI’s blood justified his claim to rule through divine mandate. It was what qualified him to be king—being the “grandson of Saint-Louis,” as *Une fleur sur le tombeau* put it, made him both a legitimate, pedigreed sovereign as well as a holy figure. For republicans, blood functioned as proof of a revolutionary’s martyrdom, the ultimate sacrifice for the nation. Therefore, it was the blood that Lepeletier shed that transformed him into a hero of the Revolution, since the revolutionaries believed that it was a person’s martyrdom that made a hero larger than life. Royalists dipped their handkerchiefs in the blood of Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette after their executions, believing it had magical curative powers, and kept this blood as relics. Similarly, republicans, understood that their assassinated heroes’ blood legitimized their republic and their place as citizens. It is through their bloodshed that men like Lepeletier, Marat, Bara, and Chanier became mystical entities. Pannequin confirms this mentality in his eulogy for Marat and Lepeletier, which he presented to the Assemblée Populaire de la Section des Piques in October 1793. In his

---

187 *Une Fleur sur le tombeau de Louis XVI*, 159. « nul, injuste, & atroce » / « regardé comme le martyr de la révolution, » / « tous les bons Français doivent révéler sa mémoire, venger sa mort & réparer dans son auguste famille les torts & les injures qui lui ont été faits. »

188 *Une Fleur sur le tombeau de Louis XVI*, 177.
speech, he likens Lepeletier’s sacrifice to the death of a phoenix: “The blood of Lepeletier has fertilized the field of equality, emerged from these scalding ashes of patriotism is a people of republicans, and over his respected tomb is cemented, consolidated the structure of the French Republic, that nothing from now on can destroy.”¹⁸⁹ In this metaphor, Lepeletier is the phoenix, his blood is the ashes, and it is out of this blood that a stronger republic rises. Therefore, blood both transformed Lepeletier, Marat, and the others into “men superior to other men,” and strengthened the republic and the unity among its people.¹⁹⁰ This is why Lepeletier’s bloodied clothes were a feature of his funeral ceremony. For the same reason, during the funeral of Marat, which took place a few months later in July, the bathtub in which he was assassinated, as well as his own bloody shirt, were also paraded around Paris.¹⁹¹ These objects thus became relics that demonstrated that death and bloodshed were essential to the republican cause.¹⁹²

The Révolutions de Paris writes of Lepeletier’s funeral: “The sight of this touching object wounded the soul of the citizens of all ages, of all sexes, armed and unarmed, that filled up the square.”¹⁹³ This sentence elucidates that not only was the mourning of Lepeletier’s death a common phenomenon among the attendees, but it was an equalizing force that recalls Lynn Hunt’s analysis of sentimental writing in the eighteenth century, in which contemporaries understood that natural capacity to feel emotions made people equal.¹⁹⁴ Later on in the article, the Révolutions correspondent reinforces the intensity of this sentiment by commenting: “we do

---

¹⁸⁹ Pannequin, Éloge de Marat, et Le Pelletier ; Prononcé Par Le Citoyen Pannequin, En Présence de l’Assemblée Populaire de La Section Des Piques, Le 1.Er Jour Du Second Mois de l’an II. de La République Française, Une et Indivisible., 1793, 5, https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k10497348. « Le sang de Lepeletier a fertilisé le champ de l’égalité, de ces cendres bouillantes de patriotisme est sorti un peuple de républicains, et sur son tombeau respecté s’est cimenté, consolidé l’édifice de la République Française, que rien désormais ne pourra abattre. »

¹⁹⁰ Pannequin, 2. , “hommes supérieurs aux autres hommes »

¹⁹¹ Wrigley, “Revolutionary Relics: Survival and Consecration,” 151.


¹⁹³ Révolutions de Paris, January 19 1793, 226. « La vue de cet objet touchant déchira l’âme des citoyens de tout âge, de tout sexe, armés & non armés, qui remplissaient cette place. »

¹⁹⁴ Hunt, Inventing Human Rights, 65.
not know of any more moving tragedies in theater." Pannequin’s eulogy to Lepeletier and
Marat also demonstrates histrionic rhetoric. He calls upon his fellow citizens to “suffer that as an
admirer of these two great men…I come to cover with flowers, and to flood with tears, the tomb
of these two heroes.” Here, Pannequin expresses his own despair. He asks for pity from his
listeners for the loss of these two heroes of the republic. Later on in his speech, he pleads: “Oh,
my fellow citizens! Burst into tears…People, you no longer have a friend,…, You will no longer
hear every day, nearly at the break of dawn, ‘here is Marat, the friend of the people.’ In this
second case, Pannequin continues with the hero theme, but he also reminds listeners of their loss:
not only did the people of France lose a hero, but they also lost a loyal, who fought tirelessly to
protect them through his newspaper, L’Ami du peuple. By highlighting Marat’s connection to
everyday people, Pannequin emphasized the void left by his death. An engraving honoring four
of these martyrs of liberty—Marat, Lepeletier, Chalier, and Bara—also taps into the theme of
tears (Figure 10). It reads:

    All four to the patrie have been loyal,
    And the patrie, in tears, honors their tomb,
    People of France, here are your gods, your friends, your models,
    Of our liberty, their urn is the cradle.

---

195 Révolutions de Paris, January 19 1793, 227. « Nous ne connaissons point au théâtre de tragédies plus
pathétiques. »
196 Pannequin, Éloge de Marat, et Le Pelletier ; Prononcé Par Le Citoyen Pannequin, En Présence de l’Assemblée
Populaire de La Section Des Piques, Le 1.Er Jour Du Second Mois de l’an II. de La République Française, Une et
Indivisible., 1–2. « souffrez qu’admirateur de ceux deux grands hommes…je vienne couvrir de fleurs, et inonder de
larmes la tombe de ces deux héros. »
197 Pannequin, 10. « Ô mes concitoyens! fondez, fondez en larmes…Peuple, tu n’as plus d’ami…, Tu n’entendras
plus crier chaque jour, presque au lever de l’aurore : voilà Marat l’ami du peuple. »
These verses use tears to evoke emotions from viewers, particularly because they identify these four men as “friends” of the people. Therefore, the patrie is shedding tears over the loss of their friends. This sentiment is also echoed in a speech by a deputy from the Yonne to the National Convention the day after Lepeletier’s death. He declared that Lepeletier was his own, close friend, but that he was also “one of the purest friends of the people.” The proximity drawn between these politicians and the French people thus creates a personal connection that incites them to mourn his loss. This amicable relationship was colored by Revolutionary political values—not only did members of the Convention strive to open up their doors to the public, contrasting with the privacy under which politics were conducted under the Ancien Régime, but they also established a fraternal bond that equalized the people. By doing so, they abandoned the

---

198 Cox, Cox, and Baylis, *Courrier de Londres*, January 29 1793, 73. « un des plus purs amis du peuple. »
paternal-filial correlation between the king and his subjects, and instead declared everyone “brothers,” where no one was superior or inferior to their peers.\textsuperscript{200} This dynamic brought the people closer to Lepeletier and Marat: they were their friends and equals as they worked in for a common interest, and only in death were they superior.

Unlike their royalist counterparts, republican writers focused less on family to evoke pity for their heroes. Lepeletier had a daughter, Suzanne, who was eleven years old at the time of his death, but she was not mentioned in eulogies. In a bizarre ceremony following her father’s assassination, she was “adopted” by the National Convention as a “daughter of the state,” but newspapers barely covered the event. \textit{R\'evolutions de Paris}, for example, merely summarized it with no commentary.\textsuperscript{201} Revolutionary writers treated the subject of Lepeletier’s brothers similarly. \textit{R\'evolutions de Paris} noted that one brother gave a eulogy during the funeral, “but not one tear, his eyes were dry.”\textsuperscript{202} However, the correspondent also remarks that when he spoke again, at the hotel where his brother died, he “had enough control over his pain to give a speech there.”\textsuperscript{203} Overall, though, it is evident that revolutionary writers were less concerned with the familial and empathetic aspects of pity for their deceased heroes. Instead, it is republican martyrdom that permeates the mourning of Lepeletier.

It is ironic that revolutionaries used the term “martyr” in the context of a revolution that had attacked and dismantled the Catholic Church. However, in his eulogy, Pannequin also calls Lepeletier and Marat “apostles” (“ap\'ôtres”) of liberty, further echoing the religion they claimed

\textsuperscript{200} Hunt, \textit{The Family Romance of the French Revolution}, 69–70.
\textsuperscript{201} \textit{R\'evolutions de Paris}, January 19 1793, 229.
\textsuperscript{202} \textit{R\'evolutions de Paris}, January 19 1793, 228. « mais pas une larme, ses yeux furent secs. »
\textsuperscript{203} \textit{R\'evolutions de Paris}, January 19 1793, 227. « avait\'t\'e assez ma\'itre de sa douleur pour y prononcer un discours. »
to abandon. Revolutionaries also used “relics,” like Lepeletier’s bloody shirt, to commemorate their heroes’ larger-than-life status. Historian Mona Ozouf presents a compelling argument as to why phenomena like the use of “martyr,” “apostle,” and the importance of “relics” occurred. The sudden purging of all the vestiges of the Ancien Régime—royalty, religion, even times and dates—could not be entirely vacant, causing what she describes as a “horror vacui” among the revolutionaries. Leaders had to find ways to replace what they eliminated, and inspired the Cult of the Supreme Being to fill the void in society where the Church used to be. This religion was intended to ensure that citizens of the Republic performed their duties while constantly being reminded that they collectively believed in a higher being. However, it never reached the degree of acceptance among the French people for which Robespierre had hoped. Essentially, though, we can see similar tactics used by both royalist and republican writers to garner readers’ sympathy for their heroes, particularly in the way that they focus on blood and tears to legitimize and emphasize their mourning. The latter was evidently more concerned with the superhuman status Lepeletier achieved after his death, as opposed to his humanity. Nonetheless, their efforts to mourn his death directly replaced elements of the Ancien Régime; from the most physical, like Lepeletier’s body placed on the pedestal where Louis XIV’s statue used to stand; to the most ideological, where revolutionary writers appropriated Catholic terms such as “martyr” and “apostle” to describe secular figures worthy of worship.

207 Chicouard et al., Lepeletier de St. Fargeau, 65.
While for revolutionaries, Lepeletier was a larger-than-life hero, royalists saw Louis XVI as both an abused king and man. Sacrality, family, and unwavering popular affection were the driving themes in the royalist effort to evoke pity and secure loyalty from readers. Not only did they draw upon Louis XVI’s divine right status to insist on the unnaturalness of the Revolution, but they also emphasized his humanity as a husband, father, and man. He displayed strong affection for his family, and emotions, just like his supporters. Therefore, royalist writers portrayed the revolutionaries’ treatment of the king as both cruel and unjustified. It was emotionally unbearable to watch the king say farewell to his wife and children. The presence of blood throughout royalist coverage also served to both legitimize the king’s divinity and pure lineage, while also bringing the abuses of the Revolution to light. The fact that republican writers also used tears and blood in their coverage demonstrates that these motifs were prevalent within the Catholic culture that defined early modern France even in the eighteenth century. However, their focus on revolutionary heroes such as Lepeletier and Marat as solely superhuman diverges from the royalists’ approach of representing Louis XVI as both human and divine.

Although Nicolas de Maistre published Les derniers régicides after the three events analyzed in this study, he remained hopeful that the monarchy would be restored. He cited the power of royal blood, “the blood of kings is so sacred that it cries vengeance and it always obtains it, even when it has pardoned.”208 His faith in the end of the Revolution was unwavering despite adversity. Even though Louis XVI and Louis XVII had died, and Louis XVI had pardoned the revolutionaries on the scaffold, Maistre believed that the monarchy’s restoration was imminent because the French people truly loved their king. In a way, he was right.

208 de Maistre, Les derniers Regicides ou Madame Elizabeth de France et Louis XVII. Causes premières de la révolution, esprit des republiques., 58. « le sang des rois est si sacré, qu'il crie vengeance et qu'il l'obtient toujours, même quand il a pardonné. »
Throughout the Revolution, royalists remained tenacious, and continued to publish their opinions despite violent censorship. Their tenacity, along with the print community that they fostered, helped them maintain their presence, while also fostering hope for an eventual restoration. Their publications thus stimulated nostalgia for the monarchy and a need to end the Terror. Because of their continuous presence, royalism existed into the nineteenth century. The monarchy was restored in 1814, and Louis XVIII, Louis XVI’s brother, took the throne. Despite the oppression they faced during the Revolution, the royalists finally achieved the restoration they had wanted.
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