

H-France Review Vol. 22 (January 2022), No. 9

Shalon Parker, *Painting the Prehistoric Body in Late Nineteenth-Century France*. Lanham, MA: University of Delaware Press/ The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc., 2019. 184 pp. Notes, bibliography, index, and illustrations. \$100.00 U.S. (hb.) ISBN 978-1-61149-670-3; \$95.00 U.S. (eb). ISBN 978-1-61149-671-0.

Review by Emmelyn Butterfield-Rosen, Williams Graduate Program in the History of Art at the Clark Art Institute.

Shalon Parker's title, *Painting the Prehistoric Body in Late Nineteenth-Century France*, suggests a broad contribution—the first to focus specifically on representations of the body—to a growing literature on modern art's interaction with the new imaginative horizons created after the “bottom dropped out of time” in the nineteenth century, when the age of the earth and the human species began to be calculated with numbers vastly larger than the mere thousands of years previously estimated from biblical chronology.[1] However, the synthetic scope suggested by this title is slightly misleading and, moreover, undersells the book's primary original contribution. In fact, the four chapters of this monograph track key projects in the career of a single artist: Fernand Cormon (1845-1924). To the best of my knowledge, this is the only scholarly monograph on Cormon, an influential, understudied academic painter whom history has mostly remembered as a footnote in the early lives of many now-famous avant-garde figures. (Toulouse-Lautrec, Van Gogh, Bernard, Matisse, and Picabia, among others, learned the craft of life drawing in Cormon's bustling teaching atelier.)[2]

As an artist in his own right, Cormon is known almost exclusively for one outstanding picture: *Caïn*, a 13 x 23 ft. history painting that today hangs prominently in the Musée d'Orsay. Much as 1874's inaugural Impressionist Exhibition marks the arrival of instantaneity in the visual language of French painting, the debut of *Caïn*, produced for the 1880 Salon, announces what we now call “deep time” as an equally modern temporal concept driving artistic activity. With its biblical title tacked onto an image informed by new findings of paleolithic archaeology, *Caïn* recast the vagabondage of the Bible's mythical first murderer—as told in Victor Hugo's 1859 poem “*La Conscience*”—as a scene of migrating stone-age hunter-gatherers.

*Painting the Prehistoric Body*, which expands on a Cormon-centered chapter from Parker's 2003 dissertation, does not engage as robustly as it might have with the intellectual history of prehistory through either primary sources or recent secondary literature.[3] Nor is this book in conversation with the plethora of recent literature addressing how prehistory's expanded timescales and the discoveries of paleolithic cave-painting and portable artifacts influenced more experimental artists of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries.[4] Compared with Maria

Stavriniaki's book, *Saisis par la préhistoire: enquête sur l'art et le temps des modernes*, also published in 2019, Parker's inquiry seems less invested in the question of what artists found intellectually and existentially riveting about prehistory, and more concerned with the sociological conditions enabling career success or failure. Prehistory, in Parker's account, emerges as a strategic refuge for academic figure painters at a time when the material conventions and formal idioms of history painting were losing—or had already lost—their previous cultural relevance.

Parker's introduction, "The Prehistoric World in Fin-de-Siècle France," gives a general overview of the emergence and popularization of prehistory with emphasis on a particular synchronicity: the period of the "Salon's demise" (p. 13) coincided with prehistory's emergence as a subject of both formal scientific inquiry and public fascination. The chapter traces how scenes in the life of "early humanity" became a distinct "subgenre of history painting" (p. 5) in Salon exhibitions between 1880 and 1910. (Most of Parker's examples featured in the landmark 2003 exhibition, *Vénus et Caïn: Figures de la préhistoire, 1830-1930*.)<sup>[5]</sup> The chapter's main claim is that artists who staked their careers on the survival of *La Grande Peinture* looked to prehistory for an untapped repertoire of motifs "to revive academic art" (p. 14).

Why exactly did academic painters recognize this potential for revival in prehistory? At times, Parker gives the impression that the appeal resided simply in "a fresh set of themes that could excite Salon audiences" (p. 50), as if, after the intense historicism of previous decades, French painting had exhausted all available historical content and needed another epoch to feed the beast. But prehistory was not simply another historical period. A redefinition of both history and history painting was inherent in the effort to represent a past before and beyond written records, a past deduced not from texts, but from fossils and prehistoric artifacts.<sup>[6]</sup> Perhaps the only criterion that placed prehistory in continuity with history, as academic painters like Cormon perceived with ease, was the status of the human being—or more precisely, the hominin—as history's presumed protagonist (since one did not speak of a prehistory for animals, plants or planets). In that sense, academic history painting's embrace of prehistory re-grounded history painting in its primordial anthropocentrism: the genre consecrated to human figures.

Yet while Parker rightly stresses that prehistory offered a unique "opportunity...to picture and explore the sheer physicality of [human] bodies" (p. 17), she does not say exactly how or why. Nor does she explore the larger paradox inherent in the gambit to use prehistory to revive the anthropocentric aesthetics of *La Grande Peinture*. The deep time of prehistory necessarily entailed the realization that human history was not coterminous with the history of Planet Earth; that the "antiquity of man" was a mere blip in Earth's geological timescale—a blip that was in itself a duration of hard-to-imagine immensity—and one in which "human" could not be taken as a given or stable species category. For close contemporaries of Cormon like Cézanne or Odilon Redon, engaging with prehistory went hand in hand with internalizing its decentering of the human being.<sup>[7]</sup>

Parker's choice to concentrate her book on Cormon was motivated by her conviction that he "emerged in the French art press by the 1880s as the preeminent painter of the prehistoric" (p. 5). Cormon also seems to have initiated the wider trend for prehistoric Salon pictures, though the book leaves this ambiguous.<sup>[8]</sup> As a rationale for the monographic focus, Parker's suggestion that Cormon was aesthetically superior to other academic prehistory painters, less prone to "the quality of costume drama," (p. 21) and more steeped in the complexities of scientific (or pseudoscientific) literature, is difficult to accept, given the simplistic, propaganda-like quality of

the works that followed *Caïn*. As a contribution to an understanding of what history painting became, however, Parker has identified in Cormon a deeply instructive case study. She has also brought to light a career that has the benefit of making stark the ideologies that state-sponsored entities (like museums) utilized prehistory to perpetuate. In both senses, Parker's survey of Cormon's key projects—especially the lesser-known commissions for museum decorations—will be an indispensable resource for future scholars.

Chapter one, “Précis of a Model Career, or Following in the Footsteps of Delacroix,” enumerates the facts of Cormon's early years; his education under Alexandre Cabanel, the quintessential Second Empire Salon painter, whose nude Venuses were prized by Napoleon III; and Eugène Fromentin and Jean-François Portaels, both prominent Orientalist painters. Surveying Cormon's early output up to 1880, with its profusion of harems and other prototypical Orientalist iconographies, Parker sets up Cormon's turn to prehistory, with the debut of *Caïn*, as a “new manifestation of Orientalism” (p. 52). Prehistory painting deepened the Orientalist “pretense of authenticity and precise ethnographic detail” (p. 51), while also complicating the clearcut structures of distantiation built into the Orientalist idiom. As Parker stresses, Cormon was extremely aware that, when presenting images of prehistoric humans, white French audiences would no longer presume they were confronting different places and different races. The appeal of prehistory—with so much of the first evidence of early humans unearthed in French territory—was that it seem to offer a glimpse at the “forebears of Western civilization” (p. 52).<sup>[9]</sup> Cormon succeeded in becoming prehistory's “preeminent painter,” Parker convincingly claims, because he learned how to “manage [his prehistoric source material] in the least offensive way” (p. 26).

Chapter two, “*Caïn*, Evolutionary Science, and the *Académie*,” covers the ground most familiar to historians of nineteenth-century French painting. While the chapter does not contain a great deal of new archival or interpretive material on *Caïn*, the book as a whole transforms understandings of the picture by placing it in a career context.<sup>[10]</sup> For instance, after digesting Parker's previous chapter, which expounds upon Cormon's “blatant attempt to align himself ...with the pantheon of significant nineteenth-century French artists” (p. 66) and his direct compositional lifting from Delacroix in his Ramayana-inspired painting *La mort de Ravana, Roi des Lanka* (1875), certain citational elements of *Caïn* become far more clear.

After reading Parker, I became convinced that *Caïn*, like *La mort de Ravana*, has a compositional referent. With its orientational thrust towards an outstretched arm at right, and with its rickety wooden litter piled high with a promiscuous jumble of human babies and animal carcasses, *Caïn* seems to transpose the shipwrecked band from Théodore Géricault's *Le Radeau de la Méduse* (1818-1819) from the North Atlantic to the land of Nod, East of Eden. As a work that likewise spectacularly thematized survival—and survival in the most basic alimentary terms—*Le Radeau* is a fitting point of reference. Géricault's exploration of survival in a state of emergency (or more broadly, under the cruel conditions of modern imperialism) becomes, in Cormon's hands, an exploration of evolutionary survival. The allusion to Géricault is important not only thematically, but also because Géricault embodies a critical stance towards an audience who might identify with the French state's projects of imperialism. As we know from Darcy Grimaldo Grigsby's foundational study of the picture, Géricault's painting of the persons (both black and white) left to die by government-appointed colonial powers thematized the anxieties of Bourbon Restoration society around the collapse of racial hierarchies and the limits of civilization by channeling the academic fixation on human flesh into an image that made *académies* into meat.<sup>[11]</sup> (Some of the white survivors of the shipwreck resorted to cannibalism.)

Parker argues throughout the book that Cormon “visualize[d] a rather sanitized vision of early humanity, in which graphic violence is glaringly absent” (p. 109). This argument chimes far less well for *Cain* than the later works. After all, *Cain* presents paleolithic humans docilely trailing after a fratricidal murderer. And it depicts the dependents of the group—especially the wizened matriarch and plump sleeping children carried with the meat on the litter—in a manner that, I would argue, leaves deliberately ambiguous whether they are being hauled along as the start of Cain’s biblical chain of begats (the germ of a genealogical line to be preserved) or as a potential provision of food.

To put it a bit more bluntly than Parker does in this monograph, *Cain* is a complex and internally contradictory picture that revels in aspects of prehistory that, unlike Cormon’s later, government-commissioned works, do not merely flatter the self-regard of French colonial powers.[12] That Cormon invoked prehistory to suggest the cannibalistic potential of the man identified in the Bible as founder of the world’s first city underscores the degree to which his first foray into prehistory foregrounded some of the findings (or fantasies) about prehistoric humanity that European culture most wanted to assert its distance from. This impulse is evident not only in *Cain*’s intermixing of human bodies and animal meat, but also its formal assertion of the human being’s ancestral relation to primates and, through its deliberately ambiguous marking of racial identity, its potential allusion to the evolutionary idea of *monogenesis*, a moment in deep time before differentiations of race.

Parker adds crucially to prior discussions by emphasizing *Cain*’s (deliberately?) confused semiotics of race, which were largely elided in earlier discussions seeking to explain the vociferous distaste many reviewers expressed for the picture’s presentation of bodies. As Martha Lucy observed, Cain’s carefully honed posture—with the curvature of his back, his knee’s exaggerated bend, his right arm that dangles down and seems to twist slightly fist-forward—evokes the knuckle-walking of apes. Parker underscores that the figure’s animalization went hand in hand with his perceived racialization, a perception Cormon seems to have invited through his ambiguous treatment of facial features and skin. Although Cain and his clan all “[conform] more or less to nineteenth-century physiognomic standards of whiteness” (p. 70), Parker notes that skin tones appear darkened and, moreover, that Cain’s profile evokes the “low facial angle” that, from Petrus Camper forward, became a visual shorthand for conflating apeliness and blackness (p. 75). The argument about racial ambiguity might have been pushed further by fusing it with Parker’s discussion of Cormon’s dramatic departure from his prior palette. Critics lamented *Cain*’s monotonous coloration and missed the vivid colorism of his Orientalist canvases, with their jewel-toned textiles and pairings of black and white flesh in stark juxtaposition. In the same way that critics who expressed their yearning to replace the figures of *Cain* with “a simple Greek statue” might be communicating their desire to reassert a racially white and securely human ideal of the figure, so can the nostalgia for Cormon’s Orientalist palette be read as a desire to restore a color language corresponding to a conceptual world with far more clearly demarcated racial distinctions.[13] Such demarcations fade in the low-contrast, middle-range earth tones that came to define Cormon’s prehistoric palette.

Although *Cain* was a controversial picture, it was also readily assimilable by the state. The painting produced two major commissions from public museums where skeletons and prehistoric artifacts were displayed. In 1881, Cormon was commissioned to paint a mural for the Salle de l’archéologie comparée of the Musée des Antiquités nationales, which became the lunette-form painting *Retour d’une chasse à l’ours, l’âge de pierre polie*, completed in 1884.[14] And in 1893, he

was invited to decorate a lecture hall adjoining the Galleries of Comparative Anatomy, Paleontology, and Anthropology at the Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle. These two projects, both of which remain *in situ*, are the focus of the last two chapters of Parker's book. They represent a rupture in Cormon's trajectory as a painter of prehistory, which Parker acknowledges but does not precisely define. Although prehistory has always been a topic that "de facto and de jure invites positivist theorization," *Cain* does not operate according to that "main style for introducing prehistory to an 'interested public,'" the style of "declar[ing] truths about prehistoric facts." [15] While Cormon's later prehistoric works are profoundly didactic—indeed the last was for a lecture hall—his first prehistory painting is more provocative, speculative, and deliberately contradictory. It seems to ask its audience to reflect self-consciously upon what it might mean for biblical history or literary origin stories to be displaced by the new science of prehistory. And it seems to invite observations about the origins of modern European civilization that were self-critical, rather than self-congratulatory. As Parker's survey demonstrates, that dynamic would dramatically change.

Chapter three, "Cormon, 'Ethnographer' of the Prehistoric," focuses on *Retour d'une chasse à l'ours, l'âge de pierre polie* (1880), a picture more classicizing than *Cain* in its approach to the figure, less ambiguous in its racialization of bodies, and far more triumphal in its imaging of the stone-age food quest. It represents five hunters presenting—with a theatrical, *et voilà* gesture modeled on the *Apoxyomenos*—a dead and bound bear to a bearded patriarch who sits protectively by the fire with women and blond children in a wooden shelter. [16] Parker's analysis addresses how the picture internalized the commonplace "perception of equivalence between past and present primitiveness" (p. 9), or the temporal illogic Johannes Fabian defined as the "denial of coevalness." [17] The periodization schema invented by nineteenth-century prehistorians, which classified time in reference to characteristic technologies or implements, fostered a supremely labile conception of time, unmoored from calendar dates. Thus John Lubbock, who popularized the word "prehistory" and refined the three-age system to distinguish between the paleo- and neolithic periods, wrote in his influential *Pre-Historic Times, As Illustrated By Ancient Remains, And The Manners And Customs Of Modern Savages* (published in 1865), that "ancient remains found in Europe" could be understood by studying the contemporary peoples he termed the "non-metallic savages." For him, these were contemporary indigenous peoples "in America, in Australia, and in the Oceanic Islands." [18] Lubbock's categories are taken up in the very title of the painting (*pierre polie* was the French equivalent of Neolithic), which, as Parker argues, borrowed extensively from a familiar repertoire of ethnographic representations of Indigenous North Americans by George Catlin and Karl Bodmer. Parker's analysis of *Retour* suggests that Cormon's conflation of prehistory with living indigenous cultures went hand in hand with a more positive perception of Europe's prehistoric ancestors. For instance, *Retour* departed decisively from *Cain's* activation of a long-pedigreed set of fantasies about the anthropophagic practices of racialized "savages." At the same time, Cormon's turn to ethnography elevates a characterization of human progress that cast all non-European races and civilizations as part of the past, rather than present or future.

Chapter four, "Representing Human Development in the *Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle* Murals," discusses the project Parker treats as the summa of Cormon's prehistory painting career, and the point of terminus for her own narrative. This series of paintings for the museum's small lecture hall is also, by far, the work in which the virulent racism simmering in Cormon's prior prehistoric imagery bursts forth with a didactic explicitness, and is coupled most clearly to a triumphalist and chauvinist argument about the dominant role of Western societies in world history. The

foundational research on these murals was undertaken by Maria Gindhart. Parker builds on Gindhart's work, fleshing out the various compositional sources Cormon may have tapped. (Her attention to the *Revue d'ethnographie* founded by Ernest Hamy, the Museum's chair in Anthropology, and also founder of the Musée d'Ethnographie du Trocadéro, is particularly revelatory.)<sup>[19]</sup> Cormon's decoration featured eight compositions, each organized around a male-female couple, cataloguing key developments in the history of techniques or technologies, from foraging to metallurgy. The subjects are "Primitive Man: The Crab Eaters"; "Flint: Man Has the Idea for a Tool and He Makes That Tool"; "Hunters: Ice Age"; "Fishermen: Age of Polished Stone"; "Pottery: Age of Polished Stone and Dolmens"; "Bronze Age: Farmers"; "Bronze and Iron: Gallic Workshop"; and "Iron Age: Gauls."<sup>[20]</sup> The decoration also included a ceiling allegory, in which Cormon represented, parading through a whirl of clouds between a glacier and volcano, "The Human Races." In an 1897 exhibition catalogue, the artist himself glossed the allegory as follows: "The human races. Aryan, Semitic, yellow, black, red races. In the foreground, primitive man. Behind him and to the left the Aryan races are led to civilization, by the light, to Greece. At right, at the top of the canvas, the Semitic races. In the background, the yellow races, the blacks of Africa and of Oceania and the Redskins of America."<sup>[21]</sup> The iconography and message of this ensemble is so unsubtle that perhaps it requires little exegesis, but given Parker's careful attention to questions of race in prior chapters, this reader yearned for a fuller discussion of how this ceiling interacts with the narrative of the panels beneath it, and more broadly, what it means for our understanding of Cormon's prehistory painting project at large. Moreover, one wonders what this project says about the larger fate of academic history painting, which Parker's introduction raises. For if this book exposes how prehistory enabled artists to maintain *La Grande Peinture*, Cormon's decoration for the Natural History Museum offers a very dire picture of what that project became.

## NOTES

[1] I take this phrase from Daniel Lord Smail, *On Deep History and the Brain* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2007), p. 1.

[2] From 1882-1887, Cormon ran a private atelier, and from 1897-1899, he taught night courses at the École des Beaux-Arts. The most comprehensive prior studies of Cormon's career can be found in Frédéric-Gaël Theuriau's self-published book, *L'influence romantique dans l'art académique de Fernand Cormon: L'alliance entre littérature et peinture* (Saint-Denis: Mon petit éditeur, 2013), and two dissertations: *Mayumi Kamada*, "Fernand Cormon, sa vie et ses oeuvres peintes" (PhD dissertation, Université de Paris IV, 1987), and *Chang-Ming Peng's*, "Fernand Cormon, 1845-1924: sa vie, son oeuvre, et son influence" (PhD dissertation, Université de Paris IV, 1995).

[3] Shalom Parker, "A Tradition Gone Awry: The Salon Nude in Fin-de-Siècle France" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 2003).

[4] Among recent publications in art history, for example, are Anselm Franke and Tom Holert, eds., *Neolithic Childhood, Art in a False Present, c. 1930*, exhibition catalog (Berlin: HKW, Diaphanes, 2018); Maria Stavrinaki, *Saisis par la préhistoire: Enquête Sur l'art et le temps des modernes* (Dijon: Les presses du réel, 2019, forthcoming as *Transfixed by Prehistory: An Inquiry into Modern Art and Time* [New York: Zone Books, Spring 2022]); Cécile Debray, Rémi Labrusse, and Maria Stavrinaki, eds., *Préhistoire: Une énigme moderne*, exhibition catalog (Paris: Editions du Centre

Pompidou, 2019). Recent publications in the broader field of cultural history and the history of science are too numerous to name. In general, Parker's bibliographic apparatus is sparse on recent scholarship.

[5] *Vénus et Caïn: Figures de la préhistoire, 1830-1930*, exhibition catalog (Bordeaux: Éditions de la réunion des musées nationaux, 2003). A number of these works were recently re-exhibited in the section on prehistory in the Musée d'Orsay's show, *Les Origines du monde: L'invention de la nature au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle* (2020-2021).

[6] This distinction is emphasized by Maria P. Gindhart, see "A *pinacothèque préhistorique* for the Musée des Antiquités Nationales in Saint-Germain-en-Laye," *Journal of the History of Collections* 19/1 (May 2007): 51-74.

[7] For the work of these artists, see Maria Stavrinaki, "We escape ourselves": The invention and interiorization of the age of the earth in the nineteenth century," in a special issue of *Res: Anthropology and Aesthetics* entitled "Writing Prehistory" and co-edited by Maria Stavrinaki and Stefanos Geroulanos. See: *Res: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 69-70 (Spring/Fall): 20-36 for this essay.

[8] The chronology as narrated is confusing; Parker claims that "*Caïn* very much sealed Cormon's reputation as the leading painter of the prehistoric in France, a painter whose imagining of early humanity markedly differed from that of his peers broaching similar subjects" (p. 25). Yet the comparative examples she discusses are painted years after the debut of *Caïn*, suggesting that these artists may have taken up and sensationalized his prehistoric conceit. In the conclusion, she asserts that "he is generally identified as the first French painter to have seriously pursued the prehistoric subgenre" (p. 144).

[9] The fundamental study of the French context remains Nathalie Richard, *Inventer la Préhistoire: Les débuts de l'archéologie préhistorique en France* (Paris: Vuibert, 2008), not cited in Parker's bibliography.

[10] The work has been most extensively treated in a series of essays. See: Martha Lucy, "Cormon's *Cain* and the Problem of the Prehistoric Body," *Oxford Art Journal* 25/2 (2002): 107-126; Chang Ming Peng, "Fernand Cormon's *Cain*: Epic Naturalism in Nineteenth-Century History Painting," in Petra ten-Doesschate Chu and Laurinda S. Dixon, eds., *Twenty-First-Century Perspectives on Nineteenth-century Art: Essays in Honor of Gabriel P. Weisberg* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008), pp. 238-246 and Isabelle Havet, "Fernand Cormon's *Cain*: Man between Primitive and Prophet," in Fae Brauer and Serena Keshavjee, eds., *Picturing Evolution and Extinction: Art and Science in Republican France* (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishers, 2015), pp. 19-40.

[11] See Darcy Grimaldo Grigsby, "Cannibalism. Senegal. Géricault's *Raft of the Medusa*, 1819," in *Extremities: Painting Empire in Post-Revolutionary France* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), pp. 165-236. The writer Eugène Véron seems to have recognized this reference, commenting: "Bravo, monsieur Cormon, voici de l'art grandissime, et dans la corde terrible de Géricault." Quoted in Peng, "Fernand Cormon's *Cain*," p. 245, n23.

- [12] In Parker's words, Cain was an "intriguing and nuanced painting," in contrast to the "notably contrived images" of prehistory that Cormon painted afterwards (p. 84).
- [13] The remark about the Greek statue is made by Louis Enault, "Le Salon," *La Presse* (16 May 1880), as quoted in Lucy, "Cormon's Cain and the Problem of the Prehistoric Body," p. 119.
- [14] The details of the commission can be found in Maria P. Gindhart, "A pinacothèque préhistorique for the Musée des Antiquités Nationales in Saint -Germain-en-Laye," *Journal of the History of Collections* 19/1 (May 2007): 51-74. Cormon received the commission in 1881. The work was shown at the Salon of 1884, but not placed in the museum until 1890.
- [15] Stefanos Geroulanos and Maria Stavriniaki, "Editorial: Writing Prehistory," in *Res* 69-70 (Spring/Fall 2018): 1-4, 2.
- [16] The Apoxyomenos quote is proposed in Lucy, "Cormon's Cain and the Problem of the Prehistoric Body," p. 126.
- [17] Johannes Fabian, *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes its Object* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983).
- [18] John Lubbock, *Pre-Historic Times, as illustrated by Ancient Remains, and the Manners and Customs of Modern Savages* (London: Macmillan, 1865), pp. 337, 338.
- [19] Maria P. Gindhart, "Fleshing Out the Museum: Fernand Cormon's Painting Cycle for the New Galleries of Comparative Anatomy, Paleontology, and Anthropology," *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide* 7/2 (Autumn 2008), <http://www.19thc-artworldwide.org/autumn08/92-fleshing-out-the-museum-fernand-cormons-painting-cycle-for-the-new-galleries-of-comparative-anatomy-paleontology-and-anthropology> (accessed August 16, 2021). See also Maria P. Gindhart, "Allegorizing Aryanism: Fernand Cormon's The Human Races," *Aurora: The Journal of the History of Art* IX (2008): 74-100. See also Maria Pele Gindhart, "The Art and Science of Late Nineteenth-Century Images of Human Prehistory at the National Museum of Natural History in Paris," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 2002).
- [20] The technophilic thrust of this historical sweep is evident in the surprising absence of any depiction of prehistoric humans engaging in artistic activity, an established trope of Academic representations of prehistory by the end of the nineteenth century--and one that is very surprisingly not addressed at all by Parker in this study. For analysis of an academic artist's approach to this topic, see the discussions of Paul Richer's sculpture *Le Premier artiste* (1890), in Stavriniaki, *Saisis par le préhistoire*, pp. 194-205, and Martha Gindhart, "Appraising Prehistoric Art and Artists: Paul Richer's The First Artist in Context," in "The Art and Science of Late Nineteenth-Century Images of Human Prehistory," pp. 280-369.
- [21] *Exposition particulière de M. F. Cormon: Décoration d'une salle du Muséum*, Catalogue (Paris, 1897), quoted in Maria Gindhart, "Allegorizing Aryanism: Fernand Cormon's The Human Races," *Aurora: The Journal of the History of Art* 9 (2008): 74-101, 78.

---

Emmelyn Butterfield-Rosen  
Williams Graduate Program in the History of Art at the Clark Art Institute  
[eb11@williams.edu](mailto:eb11@williams.edu)

Copyright © 2022 by the Society for French Historical Studies, all rights reserved. The Society for French Historical Studies permits the electronic distribution of individual reviews for nonprofit educational purposes, provided that full and accurate credit is given to the author, the date of publication, and the location of the review on the H-France website. The Society for French Historical Studies reserves the right to withdraw the license for edistribution/republication of individual reviews at any time and for any specific case. Neither bulk redistribution/republication in electronic form of more than five percent of the contents of *H-France Review* nor republication of any amount in print form will be permitted without permission. For any other proposed uses, contact the Editor-in-Chief of H-France. The views posted on *H-France Review* are not necessarily the views of the Society for French Historical Studies.

ISSN 1553-9172