

Abbildung folgende Seite: Heinrich Christoph Jussow, Johann Christian Ruhl (and atelier), *Hessendenkmal* (view from northwest), 1793, marble and basalt over a core of bricks, bronze, total height, approx. 4.40 m, Frankfurt a. M., Friedberger Tor, January 2014



HIER SCHARBEN DEN TUDNER HELDEN
HERST PRINZ CARL VON HESSEN PHILIPSTRAL
HARR CARPANE C. D. VON JUNG
C. VON VOLTZ
D. DESSLERS
C. VON NACHHAUSEN
HERMANN C. G. RADEKNER V. R. DEHRESEN
FRIEDRICH C. H. DEBERGEL
VON OFFICERS
C. ROSCHTHER HEWENEN I. BRIT. C. W. A. H. S.
C. A. V. E. L. P. F. R. E. N. D.
B. A. T. T. A. M. B. O. V. C. H. E. R. S. T. I. N. G.
E. I. M. E. N. E.
FRANCIS WENDEL DALLEY MILLER L. A. P.
ROELZER ROR. FARCES STESSE VOLT
RECHT KNUTTE KOENIGER WAZNER KNIPP
DREBERT WEL HERBUD THOMAS W. A. S. C.
ZWICK BERBE HILDEBRAND FENEL BYACE
CULMAR GERSLACH TRIBE PRIESTER COVERFIELD
H. SENFELD FRANCIS KILBY PERST KLANCKE
R. ENDERUD NOLL DEERHUYDER SCHLENGER
S. M. VAN COERENDE

LIBERTY SONS
E. C. T. I. N. G. H. A. M. B. I. N. G.
T. R. A. C. T. I. N. G. H. A. M. B. I. N. G.
M. I. A. N. D. E. C. E. N. T. I. N. G.
D. O. O. K. I. N. G. S. A. C. C. O. M. P. A. N. Y.
P. O. W. I. N. G.
M. I. N. I. T. E. C. O. N. S. T. A. N. T. I. N. G.
T. R. A. C. T. I. N. G. H. A. M. B. I. N. G.
D. O. O. K. I. N. G. S.

The Hessendenkmal in Frankfurt. A Hybrid Warrior Memorial between Late Absolutism and Revolution

Hendrik Ziegler

The so-called Hessendenkmal commemorates the liberation of the city of Frankfurt on December 2, 1792. On this day, Hessian troops under Prussian command successfully reclaimed the Free Imperial City, which had been occupied by the French Revolution Army since October 22 of the same year. Today, the Hessendenkmal is still located at its historical site in front of the former Friedberger Tor, the city gate of the northern district at which the German alliance breached the French defences suffering heavy losses, but ultimately freeing the city. From the beginning, the honorific monument, which was completed within one year in 1793, was located at a much-frequented public place on one of the northern roads that lead to the metropolis (fig. 1).¹

The Hessendenkmal in Frankfurt, by the mere peculiarity of its design, is different from other 18th century memorials in public places. One is puzzled by the combination of the two main elements: atop a 2-meter-high pedestal of rough basalt blocks is a marble cube each edge 1.4 meters in length, featuring bronze inscription plates on the outward-facing sides.² Another oddity is the minimalistic arrangement of weaponry, which is without any additional figurative elements, consisting only of a shield, helmet, battering ram, club, and a lion skin. Finally, the Hessendenkmal is also of significance because it served as a piece of artistic policymaking. The inscription plate on the northern side of the cube lists the names of 55 Hessian military officers, as well as those of common soldiers, who fell

The author is indebted to Mr. Ruben Bieker, Philipps-University Marburg, for his translation of the following contribution from German into English.

- 1 However, the city fortification and its gates were removed in 1804 and replaced by a park-like circle of greenery. Additionally, in 1971, the monument was moved slightly to the west of its original position to improve the flow of traffic. This led to its present isolated position by the side of Friedberger Landstraße. Cf. Meinhold Lurz, "Das Hessendenkmal. Vorgeschichte – Entstehung – Wirkung", in *Archiv für Frankfurts Geschichte und Kunst* 62, 1993, pp. 119–235, here p. 147.
- 2 Basalt quarries were to be found in Bockenheim, now a district of Frankfurt, and in the Taunus, a mountain range to the north of the city. However, the basalt blocks merely cover a hollow brick construction which forms the actual base for the cube. Cf. note 32.



1 a-b Heinrich Christoph Jussow, Johann Christian Ruhl (and atelier), *Hessendenkmal* (view from north-west and north-east), 1793, marble and basalt over a core of bricks, bronze, total height, approx. 4.40 m, Frankfurt a. M., Friedberger Tor, January 2014



during the retaking of Frankfurt in 1792. Publicly honouring enlisted men by name on a memorial in the urban space was an absolute novelty. Not until the 19th century would commemoration of common soldiers take root in Germany—or France for that matter—and it was only with the German-French war of 1870/1871 that it became customary.

The hybrid design, through the intentional contrast between the rough, rock-like base and the smooth geometrical socle as well as the scarcity of figurative elements, links the Hessendenkmal to the design principles of the so-called *Revolution Architecture*. Moreover, honouring a common soldier was a concession to the ideals of the French Revolution and its tendencies towards democratisation. And yet, despite these innovative aesthetic and social characteristics, this essay argues that the Hessendenkmal should not be viewed exclusively as a product of the Age of Revolution. Regarding its formal aspects, the superposition of rock-like base and cubic top exemplifies a design method which had been common since the Renaissance and the Baroque. By way of metaphor, the arrangement typically suggests an upward movement representing moral purification. With regard to its function, the Hessendenkmal also closely follows a commemoration policy of honouring military success as a collective achievement of several actors rather than a sole accomplishment of the King. This policy had been in place since Frederick the Great and had emerged from the aesthetics formulated within the circle of the Berlin Enlightenment by Johann Georg Sulzer. According to this doctrine, commemorability was attributable, in principle, to any deceased citizen of quality.

It is the aim of the present essay to understand the Hessendenkmal as a product of the transition time between the later Enlightenment-influenced stages of European Absolutism and the period of the French Revolution, two periods with mostly opposing, but at times overlapping calls for reform (the so-called “Schwellenzeit”). The design and functional properties of the memorial must be seen and evaluated primarily in connection with the specific historical contexts of production and reception. To this end, this essay will for the first time take into account the medals and tokens that were produced as part of the planning and erection of the monument: They are highly valuable sources for understanding the intentions of the Prussian and Hessian initiators of the art work.

Furthermore, the Hessendenkmal must also be seen in connection with another monument outside the gates of Frankfurt: the so-called Leopold Column at Berger Warte (see fig. 12). The honorific column was erected in 1791, only two years before the Hessendenkmal, also on Friedberger Landstraße. It was commissioned by the Landgrave of Hesse to commemorate the successful safeguard of the election and coronation of Emperor Leopold II, which had taken place in 1790 in Frankfurt. The Hessendenkmal was thus part of a large-scale monument campaign by the House of Hesse-Kassel which spoke not only to Prussian patrons, but also to the Emperor in Vienna.

In German research, warrior monuments have been subject to detailed study and discussion since the 1970s. Most notable breakthroughs were made by a small circle of historians with socio-historical and iconographical areas of interest, such as Thomas



- 2 Heinrich Christoph Jussow (design), J. L. J. F. Schüler (engraving), *Monument, welches von Sr. Majestät dem König von Preußen, denen bey der Einnahme von Frankfurth gebliebenen Hessen errichtet wird*, 1793, copper engraving, 24 x 30 cm, Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz

Nipperdey, Reinhart Koselleck, and his pupil Michael Jeismann.³ In the mid 1980s, art historian and monument conservator Meinhold Lurz presented his still unparalleled six-volume inventory of the *Warrior Memorials in Germany* which spans the time from

3 Cf. Thomas Nipperdey, “Nationalidee und Nationaldenkmal in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert”, in *Historische Zeitschrift* 206, 1968, pp. 528–585; reprinted in Thomas Nipperdey, *Gesellschaft, Kultur, Theorie: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur neueren Geschichte*, Göttingen, 1976 (Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft, 18), pp. 133–173; Reinhart Koselleck, “Kriegerdenkmale als Identitätsstiftung an die Überlebenden”, in Odo Marquard and Karlheinz Stierle (eds.), *Identität*, Munich, 1979, pp. 255–276; Michael Jeismann, *Das Vaterland der Feinde: Studien zum nationalen Feindbegriff und Selbstverständnis in Deutschland und Frankreich 1792–1918*, Stuttgart, 1992 (Sprache und Geschichte, 19); Reinhart Koselleck and Michael Jeismann (eds.), *Der politische Totenkult: Kriegerdenkmäler in der Moderne*, Munich, 1994.

the German Campaign of 1813 up until the period of the Bonn Republic.⁴ It was also Lurz who, in 1993, in the periodical *Archiv für Frankfurts Geschichte und Kunst*, published the only essay that is directly and exclusively concerned with the Hessendenkmal.⁵

Lurz's essay continues to be seminal for any discussion of the topic. Lurz already emphasised that the Hessendenkmal was meant to make a statement of pro-Prussian and pro-monarchist patriotism, which was in direct opposition to the ideals of the French Revolution.⁶ However, Lurz did not go so far as to show the extent to which the Hessendenkmal incorporated the design principles and the political demands of Late Absolutism influenced by Prussian culture. It also seems that he was unaware that the Hessendenkmal, in the mind of the Landgrave of Hesse, was part of a monument policy which had begun with the establishment of the Leopold Column. Therefore, the present essay is meant to serve as a complement to Lurz's groundbreaking work.

King, Landgrave, and City Council: Diverging Intentions Regarding the Erection of the Monument

The initiator and main sponsor for the erection of the Hessendenkmal in Frankfurt was the Prussian King Frederick William II, nephew of Frederick the Great, whom he succeeded in 1786. The programme was devised by German diplomat Johann Friedrich Freiherr von und zum Stein, the Prussian delegate at the court of the Electorate of Mainz. In 1793, on the occasion of the completion of the monument, he published a memorandum as well as a *Festschrift*, the latter of which was re-published in 1794 with a new preface.⁷ To

4 Cf. Meinhold Lurz, *Kriegerdenkmäler in Deutschland*, 6 vol., Heidelberg, 1985–1987.

5 Cf. Lurz, 1993 (note 1), pp. 119–235, also includes a list of the entire corpus of previous literature on the subject, pp. 233–235. The only longer discussion of the Hessendenkmal is the entry in the online database of architectural drawings of the graphic collection of Museumslandschaft Hessen-Kassel. It provides a critical reflection on the research done until 1999, URL: <http://architekturzeichnungen.museum-kassel.de/> [accessed: 21.02.2018]. The information was taken from the accompanying volume: *Heinrich Christoph Jussow, 1754–1825. Ein hessischer Architekt des Klassizismus*, Wanda Löwe (ed.), exh. cat., Kassel, Staatliche Museen, Worms, 1999; accompanying volume: CD ROM including the entirety of the drawings left by the artist. The Hessendenkmal is not mentioned in the comprehensive study of Thomas von der Dunk, *Das Deutsche Denkmal. Eine Geschichte in Bronze und Stein vom Hochmittelalter bis zum Barock*, Cologne/Weimar/Vienna, 1999 (Beiträge zur Geschichtskultur, 18). The period analysed ends in the middle of the 18th century.

6 Cf. Lurz, 1993 (note 1), p. 134.

7 Cf. Anonymous [Johann Friedrich von und zum Stein], *Nachricht von dem Denkmal, welches auf Befehl Sr. Kgl. Majestät von Preußen Friedrich Wilhelm II. am 2. Decbr. 1792 den bei der Einnahme von Frankfurt geliebten Hessen errichtet worden ist*, Frankfurt a. M., 1793. (Message from the monument which by order of His Royal Majesty of Prussia Frederick William II was erected on 2 December 1792 for the Hessians who remained during the taking of Frankfurt). The same note was published again in 1794, but with an altered preface: *Der löblichen Bürgerschaft* (To the Laudable Citizens), Frankfurt a. M., 1794.



3 a-b Heinrich Christoph Jussow (inventor), Johann Christian Ruhl (sculptor), *Model of the Hessendenkmal*, 1793, bronze, 25 x 15 x 15 cm, Museumslandschaft Hessen Kassel, Hessisches Landesmuseum Kassel



the 1793 memorandum, he added an illustration of the monument in order to announce to the broader public its intended design and its location in front of the city walls (fig. 2).

However, Landgrave William IX of Hesse-Kassel was also involved in the establishment of the monument. In a first step, Hessian sculptor Johann Christian Ruhl produced a miniature model in bronze, following the design of his fellow countryman, construction inspector Heinrich Christoph Jussow, who the Hessian Landgrave held in high esteem and who was well-versed in antiquarian matters. The model received the approval of the royal patron in Berlin (fig. 3).⁸ Jussow can be seen as the inventor of the overall appearance of the monument while Ruhl was the originator of the design of the bronze components. However, the realisation of the monument as a whole was left to various artisans from Frankfurt, Jena, and Kassel.⁹

Hence, the Frankfurt monument should be seen as a collaborative Prussian-Hessian project, with Prussia in the decision-making role. Frederick William II sought to install

Cf. Lurz, 1993 (note 1), p. 233. Also cf. Anonymous [Johann Friedrich von und zum Stein], *Zum Jubiläum der Erstürmung Frankfurts durch die Hessen am 2. Dec. 1792. Festschrift vom 16. Februar 1794 dem Hochedlen Magistrat der kaiserl. Freien Reichsstadt Frankfurt a. M. gewidmet [...]* (For the anniversary of the storming of Frankfurt by the Hessians on December 2, 1792, *Festschrift* from February 16, 1794 to the Noblest Magistrate of the Free Imperial City of Frankfurt), Frankfurt a. M., 1793, presented in Erwin Kleinstück, “Frankfurt und Stein”, in *Archiv für Frankfurts Geschichte und Kunst* 41, 1953, pp. 79–113, appendix 1, pp. 100–107. On the authorship of Johann Friedrich von und zum Stein cf. Erwin Kleinstück, “Johann Friedrich Freiherr von und zum Stein, der Verfasser der ‘Hessendenkmal-Schrift’”, in *Archiv für Frankfurts Geschichte und Kunst* 47, 1960, pp. 57–62. The original *Festschrift* (Stein, Anniversary) has not been preserved; it only remains as reprints from the 19th century. Therefore, it is quoted throughout according to the transcription “Kleinstück, Frankfurt”.

- 8 Cf. Stein, 1793 (note 7), p. 107: “Nach der Zeichnung und unter Aufsicht des Hessen-Casselischen geschickten Bau-Inspectors Herrn Jussow ward das Modell zu diesem Denkmal vom Bildhauer Herrn Ruhl aus Cassel verfertigt und erhielt den Beifall des Königs.” (“According to the drawing and supervised by the construction inspector of Hesse-Kassel, Mr Jussow, the model for this monument was completed by the sculptor Mr Ruhl and received the king’s praise.”) The bronze model is published here for the first time. This visual record, along with the chalcography (see fig. 2), depicts a state which does not correspond with the final work: the plate with the German inscription honouring Frederick William II of Prussia as the benefactor of the monument which he had built for the “noble Hessians fallen here victoriously fighting for the country” (note 23) is placed below the shield and the battering ram with its massive ram’s head. On the original, this plate is on the side with the fur of the Nemean Lion draped over the edge of the cube.
- 9 Stein 1793 continues (note 7), p. 107: “Die Steinarbeit ist vom Maurermeister Herrn Strobel und Steinmetzenmeister Herrn Scheidel aus Frankfurt und alle Metallarbeiten sind in Cassel durch den Herzoglich-Weimarischen Hof-Kupferschmied Herrn Pflug aus Jena und die Herren Franke, Steinhofer, Schwarz und Falkeisen aus Cassel ausgeführt worden.” (“The stone work was done by master mason Mr Strobel and master stone cutter Mr Scheidel from Frankfurt, all metal work was done in Kassel by Mr Pflug from Jena, the court coppersmith of the Duke of Weimar, and Mr Franke, Mr Steinhofer, Mr Schwarz and Mr Falkeisen from Kassel.”) For details on Christian Carl Gottlob Pflug, court coppersmith in Jena since 1780, cf. Uwe Plötner, “Der Hofkupferschmied Christian Carl Gottlob Pflug (1747–1825)”, in “*Wie zwey Enden einer großen Stadt...? Die ‘Doppelstadt Jena-Weimar’ im Spiegel regio-*

a symbol of victory after the disaster involving coalition troops in the campaign against France. In 1792, they had set out with the aim of freeing the detained Royal couple and of occupying Paris, but their advances had been stopped at Valmy in September of the same year. The subsequent retreat had turned into a military debacle when the French Revolution Army gave pursuit and managed to take the fortress of Mainz and the Free Imperial City of Frankfurt. After these defeats, the retaking of Frankfurt in early December rekindled the hopes of Prussia and its allies to change the tide of the war, and the memorial in Frankfurt was meant to be a visual reinforcement of this turn of events.¹⁰ The bronze weaponry on top as well as the bronze plates in the socle were made from the metal of French cannons and howitzers taken from the enemy in the previous year.¹¹ The honorific memorial thus turned into a war trophy to humiliate the enemy.¹²

For William IX of Hesse-Kassel, on the other hand, the establishment of the Hessendenkmal offered an opportunity to demonstrate his allegiance not only to Prussia, but also to the Emperor in the jointly fought war against revolting France. For a long time, the Landgrave had sought to see his house raised to prince-electoral status, which was only possible by a decree from the Emperor.¹³ Thus, the Hessendenkmal was a way for the aspiring contender to demonstrate his military potential.

ner Künstler 1770–1830, Katalog der Städtischen Museen Jena und des Stadtmuseums Weimar, vol. 1: *Jenaer Künstler*, Städtisches Museum Jena, Stadtmuseum Weimar, and Bertuchhaus Weimar (eds.), exh. cat., Jena, Städtische Museen, Jena, 1999, pp. 29–39; however, Pflug's involvement in the construction of the Hessendenkmal is not mentioned here.

- 10 Cf. Stein, 1793 (note 7), pp. 101–105; Isidor Kracauer, “Frankfurt und die französische Revolution 1789–1792”, in *Archiv für Frankfurts Geschichte und Kunst* 11 (3^d series), 1907, pp. 213–298, here pp. 247–268; Lurz, 1993 (note 1), pp. 128–131.
- 11 Cf. Stein, 1794 (note 7), p. 107. The practice was not new. Probably the most prominent precedence in the Early Modern Period is the bronze statue which Duke Alba, Fernando Álvarez de Toledo, Governor of the Netherlands from 1567 until 1573 had installed in the citadel of Antwerp. The statue made by Jacques Jonghelink between 1569 and 1571 depicts Duke Alba as he tramples down the two-headed and many-armed personification of the Dutch rebellion. It was cast with the metal from the cannons which the duke had taken from the Count of Nassau, the rebellion leader, after the battle of Jemgum on July 21, 1568. However, the statue was seen as a presumption against the king by the Spanish court, and after Alba's dismissal in 1574, was removed by the Spanish garrison. It was destroyed at the latest in 1577, when the citadel was taken by the Flemish people. Cf. Tatjana Trussowa, “Anvers, statue du duc d'Albe”, in François Lemée, *Traité des Statuës*, Paris 1688, Diane H. Bodart and Hendrik Ziegler (eds.), 2 vol., vol. 1: Fac-similé/Reprint, vol. 2: Commentaires/Kritischer Apparat, Weimar, 2012, here vol. 2, pp. 133–137, p. 135.
- 12 On a possible criticism of the Hessendenkmal's vainglorious character by Goethe, which however is not recorded, cf. *Goethes Weimar und die Französische Revolution. Dokumente der Krisenjahre*, W. Daniel Wilson (ed.), Cologne, 2004, pp. 523–524, no. 363 and p. 531, no. 373.
- 13 For an elementary discussion cf. Ludolf Pelizaeus, *Der Aufstieg Württembergs und Hessens zur Kurwürde 1692–1803*, Berlin/Bern/Frankfurt a. M., 2000 (Mainzer Studien zur Neueren Geschichte, 2), pp. 414–417; also see the brief mention of the Hessendenkmal in William IX's memoirs: *Wir Wilhelm von Gottes*

- 4 Unknown punchcutter, *Jeton on the occasion of the retaking of Frankfurt a. M., 1792*, tom-bac (brass alloy), ø 27 mm, art market



The Council of the municipality of Frankfurt however, always eager to maintain the neutrality of the European trade metropolis, took a sceptical stance toward the establishment of the monument. While it failed to prevent the erection of the monument on the site of the battle, i.e. within the limits of Frankfurt, it successfully convinced the King of Prussia to disallow explicit mentioning of the town in the inscriptions.¹⁴

Tokens, Medals, Monument Inscriptions: The Difficult Road to a Prussian-Hessian Compromise

To understand the significance of the medals that were produced in the wake of the retaking of Frankfurt and the erection of the monument, as well as the political implications of the four large inscription plates, it is necessary to take a closer look at the events of the occupation of Frankfurt in autumn and winter of 1792. Since October 22, 1792, Frankfurt had been occupied by the French revolution troops led by Adam-Phillip Count of Custine.¹⁵ However, military presence in Frankfurt in the next few months was low because Custine focused on the fortress of Mainz, which he had also captured. When on November 25, the Prussian-led allied forces made advances toward the Main River, Custine even reacted with a withdrawal of most of his combat units from the Imperial City.

Despite this, the Duke of Brunswick, who was Commander in Chief of the Prussian and Allied troops, was hesitant to launch an attack on Frankfurt. It was only on December 2, when the Prussian King Frederick William II had caught up with the main part of the baggage train, that the attack was ordered; however, at that point, any hope of surpris-

Gnaden. Die Lebenserinnerungen Kurfürst Wilhelms I. von Hessen 1743–1821, translated from the French and edited by Rainer von Hessen, Frankfurt a. M./New York, 1996, pp. 286–287.

14 Cf. Kracauer, 1907 (note 10), p. 272. Note the merely indirect mention of the city as “Furt am Main” (ford at the Main) in the inscription facing west (cited in note 22).

15 On what follows cf. Stein, 1794 (note 7), pp. 101–105; Kracauer, 1907 (note 10), pp. 247–268; Lurz, 1993 (note 1), pp. 128–131.



- 5 Johann Christian or Johann Matthias Reich, *Medal on the occasion of the retaking of Frankfurt a. M., 1792*, silver, \varnothing 43 mm, art market

ing the enemy was lost. When at mid-day, the Hessian troops, with the Prince of Hesse-Philipsthal's battalion at the forefront, made their advance from Berger Warte toward the Friedberger Tor, they were fully exposed to relentless fire from the French soldiers who were in the fortress. It was not until the small French occupation force had exhausted its ammunition and local craftsmen broke the chains of the drawbridge from within that the Hessian troops were able to enter the city. This caused the French soldiers to flee and meet with Custine's main unit stationed near Höchst, while Frederick William entered the city victoriously.

Casualties on the German side amounted to seven officers and 75 enlisted men, with 93 enlisted men and nine officers wounded. The carnage outside Friedberger Tor could have been avoided if Prince Karl von Philipsthal, who died from his wounds in January 1793, had been quicker to give the order to retreat and thus allowed the troops to fortify their position in the surrounding houses and gardens.¹⁶

However, the courage and steadfastness of the Hessian troops were highly lauded and honoured by both Frederick William II and Landgrave William IX of Hesse-Kassel, although the latter did not arrive in Frankfurt until December 6. The prizes consisted not only of promotions and decorations with medals; survivors and the family of fallen soldiers as well as the craftsmen involved in the recapture of the city also received payments.¹⁷ For this reason, Frederick William II, immediately after the battle at Frank-

¹⁶ Cf. Lurz, 1993 (note 1), pp. 128–131.

¹⁷ Cf. Kracauer, 1907 (note 10), pp. 268–269.



- 6 Daniel Friedrich Loos, *Medal on the opening of the Hessendenkmal*, 1793, tin, ø 37 mm, Frankfurt a. M., private collection Horst-Dieter Müller

furt, saw to the coinage of tokens which could be traded for currency (fig. 4).¹⁸ An explicit inscription on the reverse made it clear that the city was retaken from the French through a collaborative effort, but the Prussians were mentioned in first place before the Hessians: “D. 2 DEC./ 1792 / WURDE DIE STADT / DURCH DEN MUTH / DER K. PREUSS. U. / HESS. TRUPPEN / DEN FRANZOSEN / WIDER / ENTRISSEN” (The 2nd of December 1792, the city was, by the courage of the Royal Prussian and Hessian troops, retaken from the French). It seems that William IX of Hesse-Kassel was at first somewhat irritated by Frederick William II’s taking primary credit for the victory. He therefore ordered the coinage of a medal with his counterfeit on one side and on the other the clarifying legend: “WILHELM IX. DER HESSEN TAPFERER FÜRST” (William IX, valiant prince of the Hessians) (fig. 5).¹⁹ In an explicative broadsheet accompanying the

18 Cf. Jacob Christoph Carl Hoffmeister, *Historisch-Kritische Beschreibung aller bis jetzt bekannt gewordenen Hessischen Münzen, Medaillen und Marken in genealogisch-chronologischer Folge*, 4 vol., Kassel, 1857–1880, here vol. 2, 1857, p. 94; Paul Joseph and Eduard Fellner, *Die Münzen von Frankfurt am Main nebst einer münzgeschichtlichen Einleitung und mehreren Anhängen*. Mit 75 Tafeln Lichtdruck und 52 Zeichnungen im Texte, Frankfurt a. M., 1896, no. 955 and slight variation no. 956; Artur Schütz, *Die hessischen Münzen des Hauses Brabant, Teil 4: 1670–1866*, Appendix: *Königreich Westfalen 1807–1813*, Frankfurt a. M., 1998, p. 343, no. 2126. The token, whose diameter according to Schütz was 28 mm, was issued both in gold and in brass or tombac (this mint also silver-plated).

19 Cf. Hoffmeister, 1857 (note 18), p. 93; Joseph/Fellner, 1896 (note 18), no. 953; Schütz, 1998 (note 18), pp. 342–343, no. 2125: This medal, whose diameter according to Schütz was 42 mm, was issued as a silver cast and as a tin mint with a copper shaft; cf. Horst-Dieter Müller, “Wilhelm IX. (*1743–†1821)

medal, printed specifically for its distribution, a parallel was drawn between the victory over the French and the defence against the Romans by Germanic tribes, some of whom were the “Chatti”, the indigenous tribes of Hesse.²⁰ When another medal was coined on the occasion of the first anniversary of the battle at Friedberger Tor and the erection of the monument by Frederick William II in 1793, care was taken not to risk another affront against the Hessian brother in arms. The Berlin-based punchcutter Daniel Friedrich Loos produced a detailed representation of the battle at Friedberger Tor that was to be placed on the reverse of the coin along with the legend: “DURCH DEUTSCHE TAPFERKEIT BEFREIT” (Freed by German Valour) (fig. 6).²¹

Another indicator of Prussia’s and Hesse’s willingness to find a compromise are the inscriptions written in German and Latin. The Latin text on the western side of the monument concludes by praising Frederick William II as its patron; however, his decision to establish the monument is presented as the result of witnessing the courage and steadfastness of the Hessian troops.²² The inscription on the eastern side, written in German, even leads with a reference to the Prussian monarch as the patron of the monument. However, once again, a comment is added drawing attention to the “noble Hessians” who fell here “victoriously.”²³ On the northern bronze plate, the name at the top of the list of the fall-

1785–1803 Landgraf von Hessen Kassel zuvor Graf von Hanau und danach Kurfürst” in *Moneytrend* 3, 2012, pp. 157–165, p. 157, URL: http://www.moneytrend.at/numismatikportal/includes/source/mt-ausgaben_get_pdf.php?mt=3&seite=42 [accessed: 21.02.2018].

- 20 Auction catalogue of the Dorotheum in Vienna: *Dorotheum, Münzen und Medaillen*. 524. Auction, Wednesday, November 16 and Thursday, November 17, 2016, Palais Dorotheum, Vienna, 2016, p. 80, no. 486.
- 21 Cf. Hoffmeister, 1857 (note 18), no. 2675; Joseph/Fellner, 1896 (note 18), no. 954; Schütz, 1998 (note 18), pp. 343–344, no. 2127: Of this medal also a thick mint and a later bronze mint was issued. I thank Horst-Dieter Müller of the Frankfurt Association of Numismatics for kindly providing me with a photograph of the medals and for the inspiring exchanges on this piece.
- 22 Inscription of the west-facing bronze plate; cf. Stein, 1794 (note 7), p. 106 (where a German translation is given): LABORVM · SOCIIS · / E · CATTORVUM · LEGIONIBVS · / TRAIECTO · AD · MOENVM · / IIII · NON · DECEMBR · / RECEPTO · / DECORA · MORTE · OCCVMBENTIBVS · / PONI · IVSSIT · / **VIRTVTIS · CONSTANTIAE · TESTIS · / MIRATOR · / FRIED: GVIL: II · BORVSS: REX · / MDCCLXXXIII** · . English translation: “To the companions of laboursome ventures / of Hessian peoples / who during the capture of the Ford at the Main [Stein translates this as Frankfurt] / on the 2nd of December / died a valiant death / the establishment of the monument was ordered by / **a witness of their courage, an admirer of their steadfastness / Frederick William II King of Prussia / 1793**” (my emphasis). – The Latin version of the inscription was authored by Ewald Friedrich Count of Hertzberg in his capacity as curator of the Prussian Royal Academy. Hertzberg, who until 1791 was the foreign minister for Frederick William II, was an admirer of Frederick the Great and wrote a biographical sketch about his final years: *Mémoire Historique Sur La Dernière Année De La Vie De Frédéric II. Roi de Prusse: Avec l’avant-propos de son histoire, écrite par lui-même*, [Berlin] [1787], URL: <http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/resolve/display/bsb10015129.html> [accessed 21.02.2018].
- 23 Inscription on the east-facing plate; cf. Stein, 1794 (note 7), p. 106: FRIED: WILH: II · KOENIG · VON · PREVSSEN · / DEN · EDLEN · HESSEN / DIE · / IM · KAMPF · FVR’S · VATERLAND · / HIER

en “heroes” is Karl of Hesse-Philippsthal, Lieutenant Colonel in the Hesse-Kassel regiment—the so-called “Leibregiment” under direct authority of the Landgrave. This was a special tribute to the Hessian contribution to the victory at Frankfurt.²⁴ The inscription on the southern side records the date of the battle.²⁵

The monument features another design element which incorporates iconography that is distinctively Hessian. The club and the lion skin on top of the monument may have been understood as Herculean objects, an aspect pointed out by Lurz.²⁶ However, they were not intended to make a mere generalised allusion to the ancient hero who climbed the mount of virtue to be purified. Rather, this was a deliberate and specific historical reference to the colossal statue at the top of Karlsberg in Kassel-Wilhelmshöhe, established between 1714 and 1717 by William IX’s grandfather, Landgrave Karl of Hesse-Kassel (who reigned from 1677 to 1730). The landmark figure of the bronze Hercules statue still today rises on top of its monumental octagonal base, representing the Castle of Giants which, according to the myth, was overthrown by the hero. As pointed out by Stefanie Haereus, the statue was not meant primarily to celebrate the Landgrave as a new Hercules, but was rather a tribute by the House of Hesse-Kassel to the reigning Emperor Karl IV. Like the legendary hero who fought the giants, the Emperor was heroic alongside the allied Princes of the Empire in fighting back the French during the Spanish War of Succession.²⁷ Alluding to the Hercules statue at Kassel, William IX thus managed to emphasise the

· / SIEGEND · FIELEN. English translation: “Frederick William II / King of Prussia / to the noble Hessians / who / fighting for their country / here / died victoriously.”

24 Inscription on the north-facing plate; cf. Stein, 1794 (note 7), p. 106: HIER · STARBEN · DEN · TOD · DER · HELDEN · / OBERST · PRINZ · CARL · VON · HESSEN · PHILIPSTAHL / MAIOR · C: D: VON · DONOP / CAPITAINE · C: VON · WOLFF · / D: DESCLAIRES · / C: W: VON · MVNCHHAVSEN · / LIEVTENANT · F: C: C: RADEMACHER · VON · RADEHAVSEN · / FAEHNRICH · C: HVNDESHAGEN · / VNTEROFFICIERS · / C: CROSCVRTH · H: WISNER · L: ORTH · C: WACHS · / C: VAVPEL · P: FREVND · / BAT: TAMBOVR · C: KERSTING · / GEMEINE · / FRANCKE · NENSTIEL · DOELLET · MVLLER · LAPP · / HOELZER · HORN · KARGES · STEISSEL · VOGT · / HECHT · KNOTTE · KOEHLER · WAGENER · KNIPP · / GIEBERT · MEIL · HERZOG · THOENE · WVNSCH · / ZWICK · BERBE · HILDEBRAND · SCHILL · BVRGER · / COLMAR · GERLACH · TRVBE · PRIESTER · OSTERHELD · / HASENPFLVG · FRANCKE · IKLER · GERST · KRANCKE · / BENDERODT · NOLL · DEICHMVLLER · SCHLENSTEIN · / ASMANN · GOERECKE.

25 Inscription on the south-facing bronze plate; cf. Stein, 1794 (note 7), p. 106: MDCCLXXXII. / *am · zten · Dec.*. A later addition commemorates the renovation of the monument in 1844; cf. Lurz, 1993 (note 1), p. 197: FRID. GUIL. IV. REX BORUSS. MONUMENTUM / AB AVO POSITUM RESTITUIT MDCCCXLIV.

26 Cf. Lurz, 1993 (note 1), pp. 166–170.

27 Cf. Stefanie Haereus, “Die Wiedergeburt des guten Geschmacks in Hessen. Landgraf Karl als Kriegsheld und Kunstmäzen”, in Christiane Lukatis and Hans Ottomeyer (eds.), *Herkules. Tugendheld und Herrscherideal*, Staatliche Museen Kassel, Eurasburg, 1997, pp. 79–98, here p. 93 and p. 153, no. 43; cf. Michael Eissenhauer, “Herkules”, in Uwe Fleckner, Martin Warnke, and Hendrik Ziegler (eds.), *Politische Ikonographie. Ein Handbuch*, 2 vol., vol. 1, Munich, 2014, pp. 465–472, here pp. 465–467 and note 6.

idea of the never-failing readiness of Hesse-Kassel to aid the Empire in resisting French hegemonial tendencies. In this way, a pro-Imperial element made its way into the otherwise more pro-Prussia monument.

Between *Revolution Architecture* and Baroque Allegory of Virtues: Positioning the Design of the Hessendenkmal

The concept of *Revolution Architecture* is ambivalent and controversial, and it is not necessary here to engage in a detailed examination.²⁸ For the present purpose, this observational term will serve to better explain some specific aspects of the Hessendenkmal and help to clarify its position within the production of art in the transitional period between the late 18th and the early 19th centuries (the so-called “Schwellenzeit”). It has been noted that in *Revolution Architecture*, there is an explicit pictorial and expressive element, intensely neo-classical in nature and with a strong leaning towards massiveness and monumentality. In France, this style arose as early as the mid-1770s during the reign of Louis XVI, whereas in Germany it did not emerge until the Coalition Wars in the 1790s.²⁹

The warrior’s equipment in bronze placed atop the marble cube—the shield, the club, the battering ram, the helmet and the lion’s skin—lend the monument a sepulchral quality. While these objects are more typical of ancient mythology and thus evoke a sense of combat situated in a distant past, the rock base is strongly reminiscent of a tomb.³⁰ At the same time, the shield laid across the cube conjures the image of a tomb cover closing over a crypt of fallen soldiers on the battlefield. For the learned beholder, as Lurz observes, the battering ram with its mighty head protruding from beneath the shield transforms the cube into a sacrificial altar: rams’ heads were the typical ornament with which the

28 A seminal piece of literature to date is *Revolutionsarchitektur. Ein Aspekt der europäischen Architektur um 1800*, Winfried Nerdinger, Klaus Jan Philipp, and Hans-Peter Schwarz (eds.), exh. cat., Frankfurt a. M., Deutsches Architekturmuseum, Munich, 1990.

29 Cf. Johannes Langner, “Ledoux und die ‘fabriques’: Voraussetzungen der Revolutionsarchitektur in den Architekturen der Landschaftsgärten”, in *Kunstchronik* 15, 1962, pp. 280–281; Gundolf Winter, “Das Bauwerk als Bildwerk. Zur Revolution der Revolutionsarchitektur”, in Martina Dobbe and Christian Spies (eds.), *Bildräume. Schriften zur Skulptur und Architektur*, Paderborn, 2014, pp. 207–231, here pp. 229–230: He notes that the function and the meaning of the specific construction was expressed by the *Revolution Architects* through a “visually announcing shape design”.

30 Frielinghaus makes the incorrect assumption that the Hessendenkmal is the first public monument featuring the Ancient Greek Corinthian-style helmet characterised by the closed face screen. However, the helmet on the Frankfurt monument is an imaginary type, closest in design to the Attic type with an open screen and large cheek pieces. Cf. Heide Frielinghaus, “Grabmäler mit Helm: Rezeption und Neuschöpfung am Beispiel Mainz”, in Heide Frielinghaus and Jutta Stroszeck (eds.), *Vorbild Griechenland. Zum Einfluss antiker griechischer Skulptur auf Grabdenkmäler der Neuzeit*, Möhnesee, 2012 (Beiträge zur Archäologie Griechenlands, 3), pp. 127–137, here p. 133.



7 François-Joseph Bélanger, "Rocher" in the park "Folie Saint-James", 1778-1784, Neuilly-sur-Seine near Paris, state after the restoration in 2016

corners of such altars were embellished in antiquity.³¹ However, the Hessendenkmal was by no means a publicly accessible tomb. The basalt blocks indeed contain a cavity within, but this space was never intended as a sepulchre for soldiers; its existence was due solely to the economical use of material for the base.³² Moreover, Heinrich Christoph Jussow, as the designing architect, was careful not to enforce the association with a graveyard tomb. He consciously refrained from arranging the weaponry in an ordered way and thus gave the impression of it having been left behind on the battlefield. This clearly distinguishes the monument from typical officer's tombs at the time, which were characterised by symmetrical arrangements and an organised layering of weapons.³³ The Hessendenkmal, with its sizable, bulky and pictorial design which connected it to the aesthetics of *Revolution Architecture*, is thus to be understood less as a tomb than as a mass cenotaph with epitaphs.

Another design feature of *Revolution Architecture* is the close interconnection between artistic and natural forms: man-made architecture was considered to be the continuation of natural morphological form-making processes. Furthermore, these transformations depicted by artistic means could be regarded as a metaphorical illustration of overcoming untamed natural forces or of the moral refinement of man as the inhabitant and the user of these architectures. In particular, it seems that the French landscape gardens laid out in the English style with its *Fabriques*, were places for experimentation with—and the display of—the development of architecture based on primal geological forms such as grottos and rocks.³⁴ Jussow, who was the chief designer of the Hessendenkmal, had received training from 1783 until 1785 at the Paris Academy and from Charles de Wailly before he went to spend more time in Italy and England.³⁵ Wailly, who in 1781 had been commissioned the design of the Landgrave Castle of Kassel-Wilhelmshöhe, had himself visited Kassel in 1782.³⁶ Jussow was therefore familiar with the latest architectural

31 Cf. Lurz, 1993 (note 1), pp. 157–160.

32 Ibid. p. 172. The idea that there are as many basalt blocks as fallen soldiers is a legend which took hold around the mid-19th century; cf. J. W. Appell, *Führer durch Frankfurt am Main und seine Umgebungen*, Frankfurt a. M., 1851, pp. 55–57.

33 One of the earliest examples of an officers' tomb with ancient-style weaponry in Germany is the tomb of the commander or the invalids' centre, Colonel Michael Lodewig Arnim von Diezelsky, in Berlin. It was built around 1779/1780 based on a design by Christian Bernhard Rode: as a crown-like feature, there is a Roman-Attic imaginary helmet placed on a shield which is resting on an oak wreath with a Roman-style shortsword going through. Cf. *Der Invalidenfriedhof. Rettung eines Nationaldenkmals*, ed. by Förderverein Invalidenfriedhof e. V. in collaboration with Fachreferat Gartendenkmalpflege des Landesdenkmalamtes Berlin, Hamburg, 2003, pp. 33–34; also Lurz, 1993 (note 1), p. 163 and p. 162, fig. 17.

34 Cf. Langner, 1962 (note 29); Hans-Christian Harten, *Die Versöhnung mit der Natur: Gärten, Freiheitsbäume, republikanische Wälder, heilige Berge und Tugendparks in der Französischen Revolution*, Reinbek bei Hamburg, 1989.

35 Cf. Exh. cat., Kassel, 1999 (note 5).

36 Cf. Daniel Rabreau and Monique Mosser, *Charles de Wailly (1730–1798) peintre-architecte dans l'Europe*



8 Unknown artist, *Vue de la décoration de la statue d'Henri IV*, 1790, coloured etching, 1st state, 15 x 21.5 cm, Paris, BnF

innovations coming from France. To name just two examples: on the terrain of the Folie Saint-James, a landscape garden located in Neuilly-sur-Seine near Paris and set out in the English style by François-Joseph Bélanger, one of the pavilions is designed in the shape of a laterally extending rock. The front of this *Rocher*, preserved to this day, is decorated with a portico of Doric columns placed in a niche with an artificial waterfall flowing out from behind (fig. 7). The inside of the artificial rock contains a delicately designed domed space accessible through a portal on the back. The particular design alludes to the theme of the cloddish grotto as the origin of the architecture, and the increasing sophistication of architectural styles in the course of human history.³⁷ This combination of architecture with (seemingly) untamed natural forms—understood as an evolutionary correlation—

des Lumières, Paris, 1979; Hans-Christoph Dittscheid, *Kassel-Wilhelmshöhe und die Krise des Schloßbaues am Ende des Ancien Régime: Charles De Wailly, Simon Louis Du Ry und Heinrich Christoph Jussow als Architekten von Schloß und Löwenburg in Wilhelmshöhe (1785–1800)*, Worms, 1987.

37 Cf. *La fortuna di Paestum e la memoria moderna del dorico, 1750–1830*, Joselita Raspi Serra and Giorgio Simoncini (eds.), exh. cat., Padua, 2 vol., vol. 2, Florence, 1986, pp. 56–57, figs. 18a and b; Gabrielle Joudiou, *La Folie de M. de Saint-James: une demeure, un jardin pittoresque*, Neuilly-sur-Seine, 2001.

is typical of the period. Another example, albeit of a different scale, is the portal of the Saline Royale at Arc-et-Senans, constructed by Claude-Nicolas Ledoux between 1773 and 1779 in the Franche-Comté region near Besançon. The portal is a representation of the process by which sunlight causes saltworks to crystallise into lasting shapes. The columns seem to have been created by nature and, in a second step, further refined by man based on these natural materials.³⁸

There are a number of French monument designs from the early years of the Revolution which also make purposeful use of hybrid superposition of bare rock and geometrically designed forms. On July 14, 1790, the *Fête de fédération*, a lavish celebration of the unity between the people and the king, was held on the Champs-de-Mars. However, on the following day, there was a similar, although smaller-scale, honouring at Pont-Neuf in Paris (fig. 8).³⁹ Henry IV of France, the first Bourbon king, had been honoured there in 1614 with an equestrian statue on a high base, situated to one side of Pont-Neuf on the western end of Île de la Cité, in the centre of the city of Paris. Since the 17th century, legend had it that Henry was a king of extraordinary populism.⁴⁰ His equestrian monument was the centre of attention during the celebrations of 1790. As part of the temporary installations for the event, the base of the monument was encircled by an artificial rock, and planted on each side were two liberty trees with medallions. Upon the rock, in front of the base, was an altar of ancient design with a bucranium on each corner. The inscription “[Morts] pour la patrie” commemorated the revolutionaries who had fallen during the Storming of the Bastille one year earlier. However, there was also a longer inscription carved into the artificial rock which paid tribute to Louis XVI as a descendant of the much-loved Henry IV.⁴¹ As part of the celebrations, a *Te Deum* was sung in front of the altar, and there was dancing until well after nightfall.

While the Hessendenkmal is certainly not directly derived from such temporary expressions of the French Revolution, it does indeed possess a similar hybrid nature in terms of the materials used and the associated statements. In both cases, the progression from bare rock to cubic, socket-like altar alludes to the ennoblement of the “heroes” who fell for their country, as well as for their king or prince. In the same way that the rough rock becomes an even-surfaced cube, the sacrificial death refines the souls of the fallen.⁴²

However, one must not fail to realise that arrangements of superimposed or juxtaposed bare nature-like shapes and sophisticated artistic forms have been among the

38 Cf. Bruno Reudenbach, “Natur und Geschichte bei Ledoux und Boullée. Friedrich Ohly zum 10. Januar 1989”, in *Idea* 8, 1989, pp. 31–56, here p. 41.

39 Cf. James A. Leith, *Space and Revolution: Projects for Monuments, Squares, and Public Buildings in France, 1789–1799*, Montreal, 1991, pp. 50–51 and p. 51, fig. 47.

40 Cf. Christian Biet, *Henri IV. La vie, la légende*, Saint-Germain-du-Puy, 2000.

41 “Il eu l’amour du peuple – Louis XVI est son héritier.”

42 The extent to which doctrines of the free masons made their way into this design would have to be subjected to further research. For the present discussion, it should be noted that Erasmus of Rotterdam, referencing an ancient signet ring in his possession, had made the representation of the ancient god of

common *Topoi* of art theory and practice since the Renaissance and the Baroque. Primarily in garden architecture, such designs were meant to illustrate art's ability to refine and surpass the forms of nature.⁴³ A prominent figure who exhausted this potential of design and meaning by contrasting rock formations with architectural or sculptural elements placed atop is Gian Lorenzo Bernini.⁴⁴ Consider for example the Fontana dei Quattro Fiumi at Piazza Navona in Rome: the obelisk crowned by a dove is placed on the rock structure upon which the four river gods are seated, symbolising the omnipresence of the Holy Spirit over the Earth (thus expressing the claim for sovereignty both of Christianity and of the acting Pamphili Pope Innocence X). Another example is found in Bernini's various drafts for the Louvre Palace in Paris from the mid 1660s, which envisioned the French royal residence as placed on a rock-like base, similar to that of the castle of Hercules. The equestrian monument of Louis XIV installed in the garden of Versailles in the 1680s follows the same principle. The French monarch is shown as climbing the rocky side of the Mount of Virtue, upon which the hero achieves his apotheosis—again alluding to Hercules.⁴⁵ It is likely that Jussow, who stayed in Paris and Rome in the 1780s, had seen these works himself. As discussed above, making references to Hercules had been a popular form of praising the ruler in Hesse-Kassel since the Baroque period. This

limits and borders “Terminus” – along with the motto “Concedo nulli” (“I yield to none”) – his signature theme. The reverse of a portrait medal dedicated to Erasmus, designed by Quentin Massys in 1519, showed this theme: the unmovable stone block marked with the word “Terminus” and the bust of the god as well as the motto. The humanist interprets the theme as a reminder of inescapable death (the signet ring and the medal are kept at the collection of the historical museum in Basle). It is possible that this ancient humanist emblematic of death, which had been spread by the emblem books of the 16th and 17th century from Andreas Alciatus to Georg Rollenhagen had an influence on the design of the Hessendenkmal. Cf. Jochen Becker, *Hendrick de Keyser, Standbeeld van Desiderius Erasmus in Rotterdam*, Bloemendaal, 1993, p. 48. I thank Dr. Wolfgang Cilleßen, vice director of the Historisches Museum Frankfurt for pointing out this possible connection.

- 43 Cf. Stephanie Hanke, *Zwischen Fels und Wasser: Grottenanlagen des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts in Genua*, Münster, 2008, pp. 61–70. The theme of surpassing nature made its way primarily into French theories of art and gardening. It was first presented by André Félibien in his “Description de la grotte de Versailles,” which was first published in 1672. The text describes the Grotto of Thetis established between 1664 and 1668 in the gardens of Versailles, which was demolished in 1683 during the construction of the northern wing of the castle. Cf. André Félibien, *Description de la grotte de Versailles*, Paris, 1672, pp. 2–3; on the various versions of Félibien's texts cf. Stefan Germer, *Kunst – Macht – Diskurs. Die intellektuelle Karriere des André Félibien im Frankreich von Louis XIV*, Munich, 1997, pp. 518–519.
- 44 A seminal discussion in this context is Irving Lavin, “Le Bernin et son image du Roi-Soleil”, in Jean-Pierre Babelon (ed.), *Il se rendit en Italie. Études offertes à André Chastel*, Rome/Paris, 1987, pp. 441–478; examples hereafter are also taken from this source.
- 45 Bernini had received the order to build the equestrian monument from Jean-Baptiste Colbert in 1667; it was completed by 1677. However, it was not until 1685, several years after the artist's death, that the piece made its way to France. Since the statue met with the King's disapproval, it was re-worked into a statue of Marcus Curtius by François Girardon in early 1687. The original is now kept at the orangery of the Versailles palace, and a copy is located behind the Pièce d'eau des Suisses.

shows that the connection between the Hessendenkmal and the Herculean apotheosis lies not only in the stylistic attributes of club and fur, but also in the structural elements of the rough rock base and smooth cube. In other words, the monument becomes a part of the long-lasting tradition of a humanist allegory of virtues.

In addition, the particular form of representing the triumph of virtue on the Hessendenkmal also reinstitutes a specifically Prussian-Frederician iconography which went back to the Seven Years' War and centres around the notion of falling "victoriously" in battle, i.e. achieving victory only through one's own sacrificial death. Between 1761 and 1762, while the war was still ongoing, Christian Bernhard Rode had produced four large-scale paintings to be placed in the garrison church in Berlin, honouring newly fallen officers of the Prussian army. These included the three generals Kurt Christoph Count of Schwerin, Hans Karl Winterfeldt and James Keith. Also among them was the poet Ewald von Kleist, who had fallen in the rank of major. The appearance of these paintings, which were burnt in 1908, is only known thanks to Rode's four-part series of etchings, a first edition of which he published in 1761/1762, and a second in 1774.⁴⁶ The print depicting the death of Kurt Christoph Schwerin is revealing in the present context (fig. 9). In the Battle of Prague of 1757, after his troops had been thrown back by the Austrian barrage, Schwerin tried to lead them anew into battle by placing himself before them waving a banner. He received a lethal hit, yet the battle ended favourably for Prussia. Rode's etchings show the commander embracing the goddess of victory as his body sinks to the ground and is covered by his banner as though by a shroud. Victoria crowns the dying battle hero with a wreath and hands him the palm of martyrs. It is not impossible that Rode, who was the director of the Royal Prussian Academy of Art from 1783 until he died in 1797, was consulted about the design of the Hessendenkmal in 1792/93. As mentioned, the tools of war on top of the cube are arranged in a purposefully asymmetrical way, as though left behind on the battlefield by a fallen warrior. In keeping with this interpretation, the east-facing inscription plate speaks of the "noble Hessians" who fell here "victoriously" for their country.⁴⁷

The Hessendenkmal, in its design, thus proves to be a complex blend of, on the one hand, traditional didactic allegories of virtue and victory and, on the other hand, new aesthetic demands for immediate plasticity and memorable sobriety. As will be shown, it also takes an intermediary position in its approach to the right of certain groups to be honoured in the public urban space: the expansion of the circle of people worthy of commemoration which had already been achieved under Frederick II was increased further in an innovative response to the circumstances of the period.

⁴⁶ Cf. Lorenz Seelig, "François-Gaspard Adams Standbild des Feldmarschalls Schwerin", in *Münchener Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst* 27, 1976, pp. 155–198, here p. 176 and p. 196, note 256.

⁴⁷ Cf. note 23.

- 9 Christian Bernhard Rode, *General Curt Christoph von Schwerin, embracing the goddess of victory while dying*, 1774, etching, 2nd state, 24.5 x 18 cm, London, British Museum



- 10 Unknown artist, *Place des Victoires. Louis le grand renversé pour faire place à la Colonne de la Liberté et de l'Egalité*, 1792, etching, 18 x 24.5 cm (plate), Paris, BnF

Equal Treatment of the *Citoyen* and Commemorability of the “Deserving Citizens of the State”

The Hessendenkmal, inaugurated in 1793, was unique in its time for mentioning the names not only of officers, but also of a large number of common soldiers who had fallen during the re-taking of the City of Frankfurt. It was not until 1813 that Frederick William III, in the context of the German Campaign against Napoleon, would demand that parishes across Prussia install commemorative plates listing the names of soldiers missing in action, decorated with the Iron Cross.⁴⁸ Mentioning fallen enlisted men outside of churches still remained a rarity in the German-speaking regions for a long time. One of the earliest examples is the Lion’s Monument inaugurated in 1821 in Lucerne, Switzerland. However, the list of names consists only of the 44 officers of the Swiss life guard of Louis XVI who were killed during the uprisings of 1792; the number of fallen and surviving soldiers is merely added in a line at the end of the inscription: 760 and 350 respectively.⁴⁹ From what is known, the first example of explicitly naming common soldiers who fell in battles during the Napoleonic Wars is the Waterloo Column in Hanover, erected there between 1825 and 1832.⁵⁰ Another ruler who commissioned a large number of monuments in honour of those fallen during the German Campaign was Ludwig I of Bavaria, and yet only the obelisk on Karolinenplatz in Munich commemorates the 30,000 Bavarian soldiers whose lives were claimed by the 1812 French invasion of Russia.⁵¹ Starting in the 1830s, the veterans, as former allies of Napoleon, installed numerous so-called Napoleon stones, typically on cemeteries, as for example in Mainz or in Koblenz. The majority of these are designed as stone steles crowned by a decorative Ancient Greek helmet, and are often inscribed with long lists of names of German soldiers fallen for the

48 Cf. Lurz, 1993 (note 1), pp. 120–121.

49 The Lucerne Lion was chiselled directly into the rock by Lukas Ahorn between 1818 and 1821 based on a design by Berthel Thorvaldsen. The initiative as well as the funding was provided by Karl Pfyffer von Altshofen, who was a member of Louis XVI’s Swiss life guard: he had escaped the carnage of August 10, 1792. Cf. Claudia Hermann, “Das Löwendenkmal in Luzern”, in *Kunst + Architektur in der Schweiz* 55/1, 2004, pp. 52–55.

50 The Waterloo Column on Waterlooplatz in Hanover, created by Georg Ludwig Friedrich Laves and measuring 46.31 metres in height, is crowned by a Victoria designed by H.L.A. Hengst. On the four sides of the enormous base, the names of fallen soldiers are inscribed, framed by captured French cannons. Cf. Helmut Knocke and Hugo Thielen, *Hannover. Kunst- und Kultur-Lexikon. Handbuch und Stadtführer*, Hanover, 1994, pp. 188–189.

51 The obelisk on Karolinenplatz in Munich, measuring 29 metres in height, was completed in 1833 according to a design by Leo von Klenze. Bronze plates cast by Johann Baptist Stiglmaier are placed around a brick core. The inscription on the western side of the base reads: “DEN DREYSSIG TAUSEND / BAYERN / DIE IM RUSSISCHEN / KRIEGE / DEN TOD FANDEN.” English translation: To the thirty thousand / Bavarians / who in the Russian / war / found their death. Cf. Adrian von Buttlar, *Leo von Klenze: Leben – Werk – Vision*, 2nd edition, Munich, 2014, pp. 68–76.

French Emperor.⁵² Finally, the Wars of German Unification of 1864, 1866, and 1870/1871 led to numerous other monuments being built, many of which featured the names of fallen enlisted men.⁵³

With regard to the design of memorials in France, it is surprising to find that, contrary to what one might expect, it did not become customary to mention fallen citizens by name on public monuments during the French Revolution. The preferred way was to collectively refer to the *Citoyens* who had given their lives to the cause of the revolution. An example of this is the temporary obelisk erected in 1792 in one of the former royal squares of Paris to honour the revolutionaries who died on August 10, 1792 during the storming of the Tuileries Palace (fig. 10). All four sides were inscribed, “Aux citoyens morts à la journée du 10 Août, la patrie reconnaissante.”⁵⁴ It was only under Napoleon that the practice of publicly mentioning soldiers who fought and fell in war would take hold. For instance, the names of all soldiers who fought in the Battles of Ulm, Austerlitz, and Jena were to be inscribed in marble plates in the Madeleine Church in Paris. However, the project was never realised because of the catastrophic outcome of the 1812 invasion of Russia.⁵⁵ In much the same way, the large-scale project to establish an Arc de Triomphe de l’Étoile remained unfinished at first, and was not completed until the 1830s under the Citizen King Louis-Philippe. Carrying out Napoleon’s original plan, he finally had the names of all officers from the French Imperial troops chiselled into the inner walls of the arch, but—for reasons of domestic political consideration—also included the names of the officers of the revolutionary troops; however, none of the common soldiers were mentioned.⁵⁶ In addition, Louis Philippe arranged for the names of the 504 revolutionaries

52 Cf. the well-illustrated overview on German Wikipedia, URL: <https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Napoleonstein> [accessed: 21.02.2018]. The Napoleon Stone, which was opened on October 25, 1857 on a hill in the south-east of the historic district of Leipzig, shows formal and aesthetic resemblance to the Hessendenkmal thanks to its cubic shape. However, the memorial stone is not dedicated to soldiers who fell in battle, but marks the position from which the Emperor commanded his troops. Cf. Reinhard Münch, *Marksteine und Denkmale der Völkerschlacht in und um Leipzig*, Panitzsch, 2000, pp. 10–11.

53 One prominent example is the monument tower on Marienberg in Brandenburg, which was established from 1874 until 1880 and measures 23 metres in height. On its base storey, eleven monumental marble plates were installed with inscriptions of the names of 2,495 soldiers from the Margraviate of Brandenburg who had died during the Wars of German Unification of 1864, 1866, and 1870/1871. The monument was removed in 1945. Cf. Lurz, 1993 (note 4), vol. 2, p. 174.

54 Cf. Friedrich Johann Lorenz Meyer, *Fragments sur Paris*, 2 vol., vol. 1, Paris, 1798, p. 53; cf. Régis Spiegel, “Une métaphore du vide. Des destructions révolutionnaires aux projets du Premier Empire”, in Isabelle Dubois, Alexandre Gady, and Hendrik Ziegler (eds.), *Place des Victoires. Histoire, architecture, société*, Paris, 2003 (Monographien des Deutschen Forums für Kunstgeschichte Paris), pp. 109–123, here p. 113, note 28.

55 Cf. Georges Brunel, “Sainte-Marie-Madelaine”, in Georges Brunel, Marie-Laure Deschamps-Bourgeon, and Yves Gagneux (eds.), *Dictionnaire des églises de Paris: catholique – orthodoxe – protestant*, 2nd edition, Paris, 2000, pp. 291–295, here p. 292.

56 Cf. Isabelle Rouge, “L’Arc de Triomphe de l’Étoile”, in *Art ou politique? Arcs, statues et colonnes de Paris*,

who fell during the July Uprisings of 1830 to be inscribed on the Colonne de Juillet in the Place de la Bastille.⁵⁷ Listing the names of common soldiers fallen in war did not become common practice in France – much like in Germany—until after the German-French war of 1870/1871.⁵⁸

This cursory glance at the development of war memorials in Germany and France between the Revolutionary Wars and the Wars of German Unification proves the innovativeness of mentioning all officers and enlisted men by name on the base of the Hessendenkmal. However, this should not be seen exclusively as a concession to the egalitarian tendencies of the age of revolution. Instead, the Hessendenkmal perpetuated a liberal monument policy which had already been introduced by Frederick II in Prussia, yet with a specific patriotic military agenda in mind. Between 1757 and 1786, by request of Frederick II, the commanders Kurt Christoph Count of Schwerin, Hans Karl von Winterfeldt, Frederick William Freiherr von Seydlitz and James Keith were honoured posthumously with publicly displayed marble statues. Three of these officers, Schwerin, Winterfeldt, and Keith, were also honoured by Christian Bernhard Rode in his abovementioned series of paintings at the garrison church in Potsdam in 1761/1762. By request of Frederick II, the statues, which are now kept in the Kleine Kuppelsaal at the Bode Museum in Berlin, were progressively erected on Wilhelmsplatz, a market square and parade ground in the Friedrichstadt district which had existed since the 1730s; the statues finally became a series.⁵⁹ During the long years of his reign, the four officers remained the only soldiers whom Frederick the Great honoured with a full-sized statue in the capital of Brandenburg, which underscores the exclusivity of such a posthumous tribute. Meanwhile, the king himself exercised humility with regard to being honoured personally with a public monument. In 1779, he declined a proposal made by his general staff to erect an equestrian monument based on an existing model. In Gottfried Schadow's memoirs, Frederick II's reply to the suggestion was, "that it is a decent custom to erect a monument for a commander not during his lifetime, but after his death."⁶⁰ Frederick II thus consciously

Geneviève Bresc-Bautier, Xavier Dectot, and Ilham Ben Boumehdi (eds.), exh. cat., Paris, Délégation à l'Action Artistique, Paris, 1999, pp. 122–126, here pp. 125–126.

57 Cf. Géraldine Rideau, "Les génies de la Bastille", in Exh. cat., Paris, 1999 (note 56), pp. 114–121, here pp. 118–119.

58 An example of this is the high, column-like *Monument aux enfants de l'aube*, which was inaugurated in 1890 in Troyes, the capital of the French county Aube in the southern Champagne region. On its shaft are marked the names of all soldiers from the Aube county who fell during the war in the 1870s. At the base, there are scenic bronze bas-reliefs by Désiré Briden while the female personification of Revanche designed by Alfred Boucher is placed on the top of the column. Cf. Jacques Piette, *Alfred Boucher 1850–1934: l'œuvre sculpté. Catalogue raisonné*, Paris, 2014, pp. 363–367.

59 Regarding this series cf. the still seminal article by Seelig, 1976 (note 46).

60 Johann Gottfried Schadow, *Kunstwerke und Kunstansichten. Ein Quellenwerk zur Berliner Kulturgeschichte zwischen 1780 und 1845*, new commented edition of the 1849 publication, Götz Eckardt (ed.), 3 vol., Berlin 1987, here vol. 1, p. 21, vol. 2, pp. 353–354. On the plaster model for an equestrian monument for Frederick II by Jean-Pierre-Antoine Tassaert (previously Berlin Academy of the Arts), which was

opposed a practice preferred predominantly by the Bourbon kings, who regarded it as a royal prerogative to be honoured with a public monument during their lifetimes. In the context of the Counter-Reformation, Bishop Gabriele Paleotti had already provided a brusque justification for such a practice in his 1582 treatise *Discorso intorno alle immagini sacre e profane*. The ruling sovereign, by the mere position and dignity bestowed upon him by God, was considered to deserve a statue to honour him during his lifetime. Frederick the Great, on the other hand, adhered to a more self-sufficient, stoic kind of practice by which the erection of a personal public monument was only justified by extraordinary, mostly military accomplishments for one's country, and strictly speaking could only occur posthumously in order to avoid encouraging any vanity in the honouree. This view had been justified theoretically in the mid-17th century in the compendia *De statu illustrium Romanorum* by Edmund Figrelus and *Delle statue* by Andrea Borboni. Both texts praised the refusal to be honoured through a personal monument as the highest form of virtue.⁶¹

In the German-speaking region, between 1771 and 1774, Johann Georg Sulzer published his four-volume encyclopaedia, *General Theory of the Fine Arts*, in which he sought to provide an extensive rationale for the moralising function and the great educational utility of art. The entry on "Monument" was among the most elaborate in the reference work, which remained influential until the 19th century. In it, Sulzer emphasised that monuments ought to present posterity with the memory of "any deserving citizen of the state." The place for such monuments was not the cemetery, "where no-one likes to go," but "public places" in town. Finally, the philosopher attributed a markedly pedagogical responsibility to these public monuments: they were to serve as "schools of virtue" and instill in the viewer, "the great patriotic sentiments," ultimately inspiring imitation.⁶²

The series of statues of commanders on Wilhelmsplatz was an implementation of Sulzer's theoretical considerations. The sequence expands the scope of commemoration

destroyed during the Second World War, cf. Jutta von Simson, *Das Berliner Denkmal für Friedrich den Großen. Die Entwürfe als Spiegelung des preußischen Selbstverständnisses*, Frankfurt a. M./Berlin/Vienna, 1976, p. 134 and fig. 2. On the monument cult around Frederick II, cf. René Du Bois, *Lebe er wohl, ...: bewahrte, wieder errichtete und zerstörte Denkmale für Friedrich den Großen*, Norderstedt, 2010.

61 On the monument practice in France during the Baroque period, cf. Diane H. Bodart, "Der Traktat über die Statuen von François Lemée: zu einer Theorie des öffentlichen Herrschermonuments", in Bodart/Ziegler, 2012 (note 11), vol. 2, pp. 40–66, here pp. 48–49 on Paleotti, pp. 43–45 on Figrelus, pp. 52–53 on Borboni.

62 Johann Georg Sulzer, "Denkmal", in Georg Sulzer, *Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste*, 4 vol., 1st Edition, Leipzig, 1771–1774, vol. 1 (1771), pp. 238–240, here p. 238: "Man stelle sich eine Stadt vor, deren öffentliche Plätze, deren Spaziergänge in den nächsten Gegenden um die Stadt herum, mit solchen Denkmälern besetzt wären, auf denen das Andenken jedes verdienstvollen Bürgers des Staats, für die Nachwelt auf behalten würde; so wird man leicht begreifen, was für grossen Nutzen solche Denkmäler haben könnten. [...] Man begnügt sich an den Begräbnisstellen, wo niemand gerne hingehet, das Andenken der Verstorbenen durch elende Denkmäler zu erhalten, und auf öffentlichen Plätzen, die jederman mit Vergnügen besucht, und wo man mit leichter Mühe täglich den besten Theil der Bürger



- 11 Georg Friedrich von Boumann, according to a design by Prince Henry of Prussia, *Obelisk*, 1790/1791 (inaugurated on July 14, 1791), Rheinsberg, Schlosspark, close up of the photograph taken by Frank Liebig, 2016

- 12 Unknown artist, *Leopoldsäule*, 1791, basalt, Frankfurt a. M., district of Seckbach (relocated in 1962), photograph taken by Frank Behnsen, June 2014



- 13 Karl Ludwig Holtzemer, *Medal on the occasion of the reception of the Emperor Leopold II by the Hessian Landgrave William IX, in his military camp in Bergen near Frankfurt a. M., 1790*, silver, ø 86 mm, Frankfurt Association of Numismatics

to include military figures other than the King himself. It was only indirectly that Frederick II attributed the success in battle to himself, i.e. via publicly honouring his fallen military commanders and advisors. Their statues were not placed in a cemetery, but in a much-frequented market square and parade ground – to serve as an example for the general public. Frederick II appreciated the effective aesthetics formulated by Sulzer that centre around a better understanding of the impact of artworks on the beholder: in 1775 he appointed the Swiss intellectual to become director of the philosophy classe at the Berlin Academy of Sciences.⁶³

At almost the same time as the erection of the Hessendenkmal, Frederick's younger brother, Prince Henry, built a monument which was also primarily dedicated to the officers who fell in the Seven Years' War. In the park of his castle Rheinsberg in the north-west of Berlin, the prince, in 1790, commissioned Georg Friedrich von Boumann to erect an obelisk that could be seen from afar (fig. 11). The monument was inaugurated on July 14, 1791, a purposefully chosen date which was meant to underscore Prussia's will to resist the French revolutionaries.⁶⁴ Not only to distance himself from Frederick's selection, which he regarded as one-sided and restrictive, Henry significantly expanded the circle of the officers who were honoured. In addition to issuing the portrait medallion of his favourite brother August Wilhelm, who had died in 1758, he honoured 28 deserving officers of the Prussian army with round or rectangular plates that bore inscriptions in French.

It has to be remembered that the Hessendenkmal was inaugurated only one and a half years later by Frederick William II, the son of August William, who was the chief honouree of the Rheinsberg obelisk: hence, the series of statues of commanders on Wilhelms-

versammeln könnte, sieht man nichts, das irgend einen auf rechtschaffene Gesinnungen abziehenden Gedanken erwecken konnte. [...] Was wäre leichter, als alle Spatziergänge durch Denkmäler, nicht bloß zu verschönern, sondern zu Schulen der Tugend, und der grossen patriotischen Gesinnungen zu machen?" English translation: "Imagine a city whose public squares and whose walks around the adjacent areas are occupied with such monuments preserving for posterity the memory of every deserving citizen of the state; one would soon realise the great utility of such monuments. [...] One contents oneself to preserve the memory of the dead through miserable monuments at cemeteries, where no-one likes to go; and in public places, which everyone takes pleasure in visiting, and where it would be easy to gather the largest number of citizens every day, nothing is to be seen to inspire any thought aimed at a righteous sentiment. [...] What would be easier than not only to beautify the walks through monuments, but also to make them schools of virtue and of the great patriotic sentiment?"

63 On Sulzer's close relationships with the circles around Frederick II, cf. Seelig, 1976 (note 46), p. 173, note 200.

64 Cf. Detlef Fuchs, *Das Monument zu Rheinsberg*, ed. by Generaldirektion der Stiftung Preußische Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg, Berlin, 2002; the publication also includes the speech given by Prince Henry during the inauguration of the monument. A detailed description of the obelisk was provided by Theodor Fontane in "Wanderungen durch die Mark Brandenburg"; cf. Theodor Fontane, "Der große Obelisk in Rheinsberg und seine Inschriften", in Theodor Fontane, *Wanderungen durch die Mark Brandenburg* [1859–1881], vol. 1: Die Grafschaft Ruppin, URL: <http://www.textlog.de/40336.html> [accessed: 21.02.2018].

- 14 Johann Matthias Reich (?), *Medal on the occasion of gaining the dignity of prince-elector*, 1803, tin, ø 55 mm, art market



platz in Berlin and the obelisk at Rheinsberg castle are the precursors of the Frankfort Monument. Put another way, this means that the Hessendenkmal is a continuation of the effective, response-oriented aesthetics of the Frederician Enlightenment: erected in a busy town square which was much-frequented by the citizens, it urges the viewer to emulate a readiness to make sacrifices for the country.

A *Via Triumphalis* of the House of Hesse-Kassel: Leopold Column and Hessendenkmal in front of Friedberger Tor

However, this essay argues that the Hessendenkmal must also be seen in connection with a monument which was established due to the initiative of William IX, Landgrave of Hesse-Kassel: the so-called Leopold Column. This monument is located only a few kilometres to the north-east of Friedberger Tor, the very place at which the Hessendenkmal was later erected. The Landgrave of Hesse-Kassel had safeguarded the election and coronation of the Emperor, which took place in the autumn of 1790 in Frankfurt, with an army of 6,000 men mustered in the north of the city.⁶⁵ The monument was meant to commemorate a visit Leopold II made to the military camp of the Landgrave of Hesse on October 11 (fig. 12).⁶⁶ The monument remains today, although slightly displaced from its original position, and consists of a vertically-arranged block which serves as a base and which bears a majuscule inscription in Latin;⁶⁷ on top of the block is a column adorned

⁶⁵ Cf. Rainer von Hessen, 1996 (note 13), pp. 270–271.

⁶⁶ The monument has hardly been addressed in the literature to this day. Cf. Ferdinand Luthmer, *Die Bau- und Kunstdenkmäler des Regierungsbezirks Wiesbaden*, vol. 6: *Nachlese und Ergänzungen zu den Bänden I bis V, Orts- und Namenregister des Gesamtwerkes*, Frankfurt a. M., 1921, p. 15 and fig. 10, p. 14; in addition, see the website created by Kulturamt Frankfurt a. M., Referat Bildende Kunst: [kunst-im-oeffentlichen-raum-frankfurt.de](http://www.kunst-im-oeffentlichen-raum-frankfurt.de), URL: <http://www.kunst-im-oeffentlichen-raum-frankfurt.de/de/page87.html?id=297> [accessed: 21.02.2018].

⁶⁷ IN · CASTRIS · / AD · SECURITATEM · ELECTIONIS · / ET · CORONATIONIS · CAESAREAE · / D · XXIII · SEPT · AD · XVII · OCT · / HIC · POSITIS · / LEOPOLDUM · II · IMP · CUM · AUG · CONI / FRANCISCUM · EIUSQUE · CONIUGEM · / AC · FATRES · AUSTR · ARCHIDUCES · / MAR · CHRIST · CUM · MARITO · ALBERT · / SAXONIAE · ET · TESCHENAE · DUCE · / FERDINAND · IV

with warriors' equipment. The shaft was meant to symbolise the strength (*Fortezza*) of the Hessian army under William's IX lead, which had protected the election and crowning ceremony against feared potential attacks from the French. It seems that the Landgrave sought to draw a parallel to Samson, the old-testament hero who had broken down the pillars of the Philistine palace (Judges 16:29).⁶⁸

William's plan to use the military protection of the ceremony to prove himself a loyal vassal to the Emperor is also visible in a silver medal which the Hessian Landgrave had issued on the occasion. As was the case later with the Hessendenkmal, the construction of the Leopold Column was already accompanied by the creation of a visual token in another medium. The medal designed by the Hanau punchcutter Karl Ludwig Holtzemer, on the obverse, shows the reception of the Emperor at the camp; on the reverse, there is a representation of Leopold II between two female personifications (fig. 13): to the left the Empire, crowning the newly elected Emperor; to the right Strength, leaning airily on a column and casually holding her spear. The legend explains why Strength can afford such complacency: ELIGENDO CORONANDOQUE IMPERATORI PARTA SECURITAS (For the election and the crowning of the Emperor, safeguard was provided).⁶⁹ The high-quality silver coin was minted before the erection of the Leopold Column, and yet the monument's assertion was already manifest: the strength of Hesse is a reliable pillar of the Emperor and the Empire.

The construction of the Leopold Column was not for selfless reasons on the part of the Hessian Landgrave. As mentioned above, William IX was striving to have his house

· UTR · SICIL · REGEM · / [...]REGIA · CONIUGE · / AC · PRIN[CIPES] · ELECTT · MOG · TREV · ET · COLON · / NEC · NON [...]JUNIG · PRINC · REG · POLON · / SUMMO · REVERENTIAE · CULTU · / EXCEPT · / WILHELMUS · IX · HASSIAE · LANDGR[AVIUS ·] / DIE · XI · OCT · M · D · CCXC[·] · Square brackets are added for missing and hardly legible passages. Also cf. Luthmer, 1921 (note 66), p. 15.

68 Cf. Cesare Ripa, *Iconologia Overo Descrittione Di Diverse Imagini cavate dall'antichità, & di propria inventionione*, Rome, 1603, pp. 166–169: on the various attributes of the personification of Strength, URL: <http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/ripa1603> [accessed: 21.02.2018].

69 Cf. Joseph/Fellner, 1896 (note 18), p. 385, no. 937; Gisela Förschner, *Frankfurter Krönungsmedaillen aus den Beständen des Münzkabinetts*, Frankfurt a. M., 1992 (Kleine Schriften des Historischen Museums, 49), pp. 439–440, no. 389; Schütz, 1998 (note 18), p. 338, no. 2111: A tin mint was also issued of this silver coin, whose diameter, according to Schütz, was 83 mm. On the obverse, there is an inscription in addition to the legend, which reads: AD BERGAM GUILIELMO IX. HASS. LANDGR. / CUM COPIIS CONSIDENTE INDE A / D. XXIII. SEP. USQUE AD D. XVII. OCT. / MDCCXC. (William IX, Landgrave of Hesse-Kassel, by way of taking position with his troops near Bergen from September 23 until October 17, 1790). On the reverse, there is an additional motto: IN CASTRIS IMP. LEOP. II CUM FAM. AUG. / ET FERD. IV. SICIL. REX A GUILIEL. / IX HASS. LANDGR. QUO PAR EST / CULTU EXCEPTI D. XI. OCT. / MDCCXC. (At the camp, the Emperor Leopold II with his family and Ferdinand IV, King of Sicily, were received by William IX, Landgrave of Hesse-Kassel with appropriate honours on October 11, 1790). Again, I thank Horst-Dieter Müller of the Frankfurt Association for Numismatics for kindly providing me with a photograph of the medal.

raised to the status of prince-elector, an ambitious goal which he pursued with relentless vigour. His extraordinary investment in the Coalition Wars against France from April 1792 also served to further this goal: the Landgrave of Hesse-Kassel provided six times as many troops as demanded by the Imperial Defence Statutes.⁷⁰ For William IX, the erection of the Hessendenkmal by the Prussian King William II just one year after the Leopold Column must have been a welcome sight. In 1792, the Imperial Crown was passed on again after Leopold II died unexpectedly. His eldest son, Franz was now crowned as Franz II in Frankfurt. There was no better way for the Hessian Landgrave to commend himself to the new German Emperor than to vouch, yet again, for the military security of the city where he was elected and crowned. Friedberger Landstraße, the road leading into Frankfurt from the north, became a veritable *Via Triumphalis* for the house of Hesse-Kassel.

When ten years later, William IX was finally granted the rank of prince-elector, he issued a coin which attested to the role played by the Hessendenkmal as a piece of artistic policymaking in his ultimate political success (fig. 14).⁷¹ In 1803, Emperor Franz II granted William the rank and honour of prince-elector. This was meant to compensate him for lost territory west of the Rhine, which, under pressure from Napoleon, he had to concede to the French Republic as part of the so-called Imperial Recess. In the years to come, Hesse-Kassel again proved itself to be an ally of the Emperor against France when it refrained from joining Napoleon's Confederation of the Rhine. The obverse of the coin of 1803, probably designed by Johann Matthias Reich, shows the newly-appointed prince-elector as a commander mounted on a rearing horse while taking the city of Frankfurt from the French occupants in 1792. In the background, the Hessendenkmal is visible, marking the spot at which Hessian soldiers had fallen, not only for their Landgrave, but for the Empire. On the corners of the cube, below the diagonally-positioned shield, there are two bucrania connected with a garland, features that do not exist on the actual Hessendenkmal. For Prince-Elector William I of Hesse-Kassel, the cenotaph in the public place outside the Frankfurt city gates became a veritable sacrificial altar for his country.

⁷⁰ Cf. Pelizaeus, 2000 (note 13), pp. 414-417; Müller, 2012 (note 19), p. 157.

⁷¹ Schütz, 1998 (note 18), pp. 368-769, no. 2204: This "people's medal," as Schütz describes it, was issued as a gold as well as a bronze and tin mint. The legend on the obverse reads: WILHELMUS IX. HASS. LANDGR. IMPERII PATRIÆ FULTOR. (William IX, Landgrave of Hesse and Patron of Fulda); the motto on the reverse is: ELECTOR. DIGNIT. DOMO HASS. COLL. MDCCCIII (tied the dignity of prince-elector to the house of Hesse in 1803).