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ABSTRACT

During the reign of Napoleon, the Paris Opéra was placed under the State’s supervisory system wherein its productions were closely monitored by Napoleon through the intermediary of the Prêfets du Palais, and later, through the office of Surintendant général des spectacles. During the period, Napoleon intended to capitalise on the institution’s potential for state propaganda. Étienne de Jouy’s Fernand Cortez was a case in point, as Napoleon hoped to gain support for his war in the Spanish peninsula. Apart from writing for musical theatre, Jouy worked as a journalist and as a critic of social themes throughout his literary career. A lifelong admirer of Voltaire, he inherited the Enlightenment’s claims to social justice, as he demonstrated in a lecture series of 1822 on socio-political topics.

By focusing on Jouy’s librettos from the Napoleonic period, whose subjects had been the site of Enlightenment’s debates, and in particular on imperialism, colonialism and the status of women, I explore his narratives and dramaturgies in relation to the politics pursued by the Napoleonic state, as it embarked on a series of colonial wars and reintroduced a distinctive patriarchal order.

My thesis also seeks to shed light on Jouy’s activities during the Romantic revolution of the 1820s. On the one hand, he defended some central conventions of eighteenth-century French opera in his Essai of 1826, such as the concept of the marvellous and a happy ending. On the other hand, his choice and treatment of the Tell legend itself reveals Jouy’s empathy with the new wave of liberalism, as it was in the process of sweeping away the Restoration. He also showed himself under the influence of Anglo-German literature, particularly propagated in Germaine de Staël’s De l’Allemagne (1814), and of the popularity of Rossini.
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Introduction

In the general preface to his *Œuvres complètes* published in 1823, Victor-Joseph Étienne de Jouy wrote that close observation of people and places, which he aimed for in his *L’Hermite de la Chaussée-d’Antin* and its sequels, was also the guiding principle of his dramatic literature and librettos, concluding that:

It allows me to end with this one remark about an ensemble of my works: It contains the most direct reflection of the manners, customs, thoughts, feelings, and opinions that have stirred France during three great epochs when they were written. Jouy thus emphasised the connection between his journalist career and that of dramatist and librettist. This study aims to examine to what extent Jouy’s awareness of social reality is invested in his librettos. It follows, in particular, Diana Hallman’s approach in her book on *La Juive* to take biographical factors (Fromental Halévy’s and Scribe’s education, political position and alliances, etc.) as a decisive element of their work. And by similarly exploring the link between Jouy’s personal views on contemporary social problems and his works, it seeks to connect Jouy’s identity as a journalist with that of a librettist.

In this introduction, I firstly offer a brief biography of Jouy, before proposing two main research questions. I will then provide an outline of my thesis, and review the state of research on Jouy.

Jouy (*b* 19 October 1764; *d* 4 September 1846) was born Victor-Joseph Étienne to a cloth merchant in Versailles. He attended the college directed by Antoine-Joseph Gorsas, an
anti-monarchist journalist and politician, who became a Girondist and a vocal opponent of the Jacobin politics during the Revolution, for which he was executed during the Terror. Jouy’s admiration of Voltaire is said to have developed during this period. At the age of sixteen, he joined the army and served in French Guiana between 1781 and 1785, and in India between 1787 and 1790. Sent back to France soon after the outbreak of the Revolution, Jouy briefly turned to writing, but he enlisted again in 1791, presumably in sympathy with the Revolutionary cause, and served in the Revolutionary war against Austria on the northern frontier of France as aide-de-camp to the Irish Lieutenant General Jacques O’Moran. In 1793, the promotion to the adjudant-général was followed by his marriage to Isabelle Walker, who was living in Lille, with a Scottish aristocrat mother Lady Mary Leslie Hamilton and a wealthy Scottish merchant stepfather George Hamilton, also a confidant of O’Moran. Immediately after the marriage, the local representative on mission Ernest-Dominique-François-Joseph Duquesnoy issued Jouy’s arrest warrant on suspicion of counterrevolutionary intent, but his bold move to appeal directly at the Ministry of War in Paris won him an order of the Committee of Public Safety to organise the relief column for Valenciennes. When he returned to Lille, Duquesnoy, who had arrested O’Moran a few days earlier, again issued the order to suspend Jouy. He fled to Paris, then went into exile in Switzerland until the execution of Robespierre. In 1795, barely reinstated in the army, he was suspended again and incarcerated twice following accusations, first, of having fraternised with the royalist troops prior to the 13 Vendémiaire insurrection, and second, of political liaison with a British diplomat John Harris, Earl of Malmesbury, a social acquaintance

---


6 See Jackson L. Sigler, *General Paul Thiébault: His Life and His Legacy*, PhD., Florida State University, 2006, 8-10. Paul Thiébault (sent to O’Moran’s headquarters in Tournai as one of commissioners) befriended Jouy and later became his brother-in-law, by his marriage to Isabelle’s sister Elizabeth. Isabelle’s mother, Lady Mary Hamilton became a successful novelist after George Hamilton’s death, some of her works were translated and edited by Charles Nodier.

7 Thiébault and Jouy fled together to Paris, where they learned that their arrest warrants were issued. While Jouy spent six weeks in hiding, during which the Revolutionary tribunal condemned both Jouy and O’Moran to death, Thiébault with the aid of a falsified gate pass, returned to his regiment on the Belgian frontier. There was no pursuit for Thiébault by the authorities. Thiébault’s memoirs give a detailed account of their flight. See Paul Thiébault, *Mémoires du général Baron Thiébault: publiés sous les auspices de sa fille, Mlle Claire Thiébault, d’après le manuscrit original*, ed. Fernand Calmettes, 5 vols., Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie, 1893-1895, vol.1, Chapter 15, 419-441.
of George Hamilton. Following the unsuccessful attempts of military reinstatement, Jouy turned to libretto writing.

The first phase of his librettist career, launched with a *comédie-divertissement, La Paix et l’amour* of 1797 (it celebrated the Treaty of Campo Formio, which recognised the French annexation of the Austrian Netherlands by the French Revolutionary forces), produced further nine one-act vaudevilles in collaboration with several writers, amongst them, Charles de Longchamps (whom Jouy met in India) and Michel Dieulafoy. The libretto of *La Vestale*, Jouy’s first text to be staged by the Opéra in 1807 (set by Spontini), also originates from this period (Jouy read the libretto to the *jury de lecture* of the Opéra on 28 August 1799). In 1800, Jouy accepted his friend Gustave Le Doulcet de Pontécoulant’s invitation to join the government administration in the new *département de la Dyle* in Brussels, and thereby returned to his non-literary career between 1800 and 1805. While in Brussels, Jouy nevertheless wrote his first *opéra-comique* libretto *Milton* with Dieulafoy. Set to music by Spontini, its premiere in 1804 had an immense success. At Pontécoulant’s move to the Senate in 1805, Jouy also returned to Paris to devote himself again to writing.

Between 1806 and 1808, Jouy ventured decisively into writing bourgeois comedies and opera librettos (although *La Vestale* predates his Brussels appointment). Five comedies were premiered during this period and four librettos - (in chronological order) *Les Amazones*, *Joseph*, *Les Bayadères* and *Fernand Cortez* - were accepted by the Opéra’s *jury de lecture* (see below). Beginning with a triumph of *La Vestale* in 1807, the Opéra staged four more librettos of Jouy during the Empire – *Cortez* (1809; Spontini), *Les Bayadères* (1810; Catel), *Les Amazones* (1811; Méhul), and *Les Abencérages* (1813; Cherubini). The period also saw two premières of Jouy’s *opéras-comiques* – *Le Mariage par imprudence* (1809; Martin-Pierre

---

9 For the list of Jouy’s vaudevilles and *opéras-comiques*, see *Biographie nouvelle des contemporains* and *Nouvelle biographie générale*. Jouy’s *Oeuvres complètes* (vol.21) includes only five vaudevilles, co-authored by Longchamps and (or) Dieulafoy.
10 Pontécoulant was also an opponent of radical revolutionaries, and was forced to flee the reign of Terror to Zurich, where Jouy met him. (Cf. ‘Pontécoulant, Louis-Gustave-Doulcet, comte de’ in *Biographie nouvelle des contemporains*, vol.16, 429-430, and Faul, *Les Aventures militaires*, 62.)
11 Four of his early comedies are included in *OC*, vol.20.
Dalvimare) and *Les Aubergistes de qualité* (1812; Catel) – and in 1813, his first tragedy *Tippô-Saëb* was also performed at the Théâtre-Français. In the early years of Napoleonic surveillance over the press, Jouy was a censor of *Le Publiciste* between 1807 and 1811, the year of its suppression, when Jouy embarked on his *L’Hermite de la Chaussée-d’Antin* essays for *La Gazette de France*. His rise to prominence during the Empire procured him admission to the Académie française in 1815.

During the period between the First and Second Restoration, Jouy acted as a political weathervane. He went from condemning Napoleon’s regime and welcoming the returning Bourbon king with his *Pélage, ou le Roi et la paix* (music by Spontini) in 1814 to writing his second series, *Guillaume le Franc-parleur* for the liberal journal *Le Nain jaune*, then to accepting the office of *commissaire impérial* of the Théâtre Feydeau (Opéra-Comique) at the return of Napoleon. As a result of his association with the Bonapartist cause during the Hundred Days, Jouy fell from favour during the regime of Louis XVIII. A week after the Second Restoration, Jouy launched his third nom de plume, *L’Hermite de la Guiane*. Throughout the Restoration, he co-edited and contributed to literary newspapers, including *Le Miroir des spectacles* (1821-1823), *La Pandore* (1823-25), and *L’Opinion* (after 1825). He also took part in the publication of *Biographie nouvelle des contemporains*, issued between 1820 and 1825. During the entire Restoration period, only three librettos of Jouy - *Zirphile et Fleur de Myrte* (1818), *Moïse et Pharaon* (1827) and *Guillaume Tell* (1829) - were mounted by the Opéra. However, he submitted nine other texts to the jury, most of which were accepted. Jouy also produced his last opéra-comique,13 *L’Amant et le mari* (1820) with François-Joseph Fétis, three tragedies – *Sylla* (1821), *Bélisaire* (1825) and *Julien dans les Gaules* (1827), and two comedies, *L’Héritage, ou les Mœurs du temps* (not performed) and *Les Intrigues de cour* (1828).

This study takes Adolphe-Simonis Empis’s evaluation as a central point of enquiry. Empis’s account stands as the most complete, and in many ways, insightful description of Jouy’s life and

---

12 See Appendix: Librettos of Jouy for the Opéra.
13 The collection of Jouy’s works in manuscript at the Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal includes two other opéra-comique librettos. Cf. Victor-Joseph Étienne, dit de Jouy. Pièce de théâtre. F-Pa, MS 6053 and MS 6055.
his literary career written by Jouy’s contemporaries, although also the most adulatory. It served as his reception speech addressed to accept Jouy’s seat at the Académie française in 1847, and at the beginning, he observed:

The hallmark of the works of M. de Jouy is to consistently deliver a striking allusion to contemporary events that, among the dramatic compositions of the author, the more severe and enduring have the appearance and character of pièces de circonstance. Associated with great and noble passions of France, with all its glories, as well as with misfortunes, M. de Jouy irrefutably obeys the impulse of mores and prevailing ideas. Yes, he is the writer of the Empire. Having been given with a sort of contempt, true or feigned, the denomination still remains glorious.  

On one hand, Empis acknowledged the influence of contemporary society in Jouy’s works, on the other hand he suggested that Jouy’s observational approach was obedient to contemporary manners and accepted views of the Napoleonic Empire.

As the details of Jouy’s public life indicate, his life coincided with turbulent twenty-six years in French history – from the outbreak of the Revolution in 1789 to the Second Restoration of the Bourbon monarchy in 1815 – which saw the rapid succession of different regimes and subsequent political purges. As the studies of the French political weathervane (the Girouette) by Alan Spitzer and Pierre Serna have shown, many individuals (born most commonly between 1740 and 1760), who managed to sustain a governmental position throughout the period, were reduced to political opportunism which was marked by an about-face at each regime change. Jouy also was such an individual who ‘navigated perilous waters to arrive at some snug harbor in 1815’. According to Jouy’s brother-in-law, Paul Thiébault, Jouy ‘went from royalism to liberalism, from ultraroyalism to republicanism, from Bourbonism to Napoleonism and vice

---


versa whenever the opportunity presented itself.\textsuperscript{17} Indeed, Jouy did not escape mention in the *Dictionnaire des girouettes* of 1815, a royalist satire on the opportunism of many imperial functionaries like him.\textsuperscript{18} In Thiébault’s account of Jouy’s conduct during the Terror, we already identify a *girouette* in the making: while Jouy was opposed to radical politics of the Terror and to Robespierre, at one dinner given by the representatives of the Convention he complied with the request of a commissioner whom Thiébault knew, and improvised a winning republican poem.\textsuperscript{19} But of course, events like the executions of Gorsas, which Jouy may have witnessed in Paris on 7 October 1793,\textsuperscript{20} and of General O’Moran, as well as his own precarious existence as a fugitive in shadows of Paris, should have taught Jouy to act sensibly for his survival and success under the successive regimes.\textsuperscript{21}

The radical transformation of regimes also had an impact on the institution of the Opéra.\textsuperscript{22} According to Mark Darlow’s recent research, during the Revolutionary years the long-standing debate on its royal ownership led to deregulation by the state, and the management was handed over, firstly to the Paris municipality, secondly to private enterprise, then to a committee of artists of the Opéra.\textsuperscript{23} The Le Chapelier law of 1791 abolished the system of licencing of new theatres and the monopoly rights of the privileged theatres, although in terms of surveillance and censorship the debate veered between the principles of liberty and free competition on one hand, and the idea of theatre as a tool to communicate republican virtue on the other.\textsuperscript{24} The latter did not prevail until during the period of the Terror, when state control over the Opéra’s repertory was reinforced in the law published in August 1793, while strict

\textsuperscript{17} ‘Toutes les fois que l'occasion s'en est présentée, (Jouy) a passé du royalisme au libéralisme, de l'ultracisme au républicanisme, du bourbonisme au napoléonisme et vice versa.’ Thiébault, Mémoires, vol.1, 416.
\textsuperscript{19} Thiébault, *Mémoires*, vol.1, 422-424.
\textsuperscript{20} Comeau, Étienne Jouy, 34. Comeau indicates that contrary to Empis’s claim, Jouy could not have witnessed the execution of O’Moran on 6 March 1794.
\textsuperscript{21} Both Spitzer and Serna tend to redefine opportunism of the *girouettes* as pragmatism.
\textsuperscript{22} For an overview of theatre administration for the period from the ancien régime to the Empire, see F.W.J. Hemmings, *Theatre and State in France, 1760-1905*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 119-121.
Censorship returned in the form of the Commission exécutive de l’instruction publique (created in April 1794), in addition to surveillance by other regulatory authorities (the municipality, the Convention and the Commune). As the Opéra financially continued to rely on subsidies provided by the state and the municipality throughout the period, selective funding was used as means of coercion over repertory. Yet the censoring system remained inconsistent, due to the absence of a coherent policy among the regulatory bodies.²⁵

This period of confused administration at the Opéra, which Darlow has described as a period of ‘experiment in cultural regulation’,²⁶ came to an end under the Consulate when Napoleon began to reinstitute a state supervisory system similar to that of the ancien régime.²⁷ The surveillance over repertory was assigned to the Minister of the Interior in 1800, and to the councillor of State in 1802. Later on in the same year, the administration of the Opéra was entrusted to the Préfet du Palais. In 1805, the tutelage over all aspects of the Opéra was delegated to a member of the imperial household, first, to the Préfet du Palais, Jean-Baptiste-Charles Legendre de Luçay, then to the surintendant des spectacles, Augustin-Laurent de Rémusat (Napoleon’s First Chamberlain) after the decree of 1 November 1807,²⁸ which also appointed Louis-Benoît Picard as new director of the Opéra. Napoleon had the final say on the programming of each opera season,²⁹ and Rémusat’s role was to present projects to Napoleon, to inform him about the progress of production, and to pass on the intentions of Napoleon and his ministers to Picard, while Picard had authority over internal administration. Legislative reform measures were passed during 1806-1807: the decree of 8 June 1806 reinstated the system of state licence and privileges, while that of 25 April 1807 defined the genres of

---
²⁵ Ibid., see Chapter 4.
²⁶ Ibid., 393.
²⁸ The surintendant des spectacles held supervisory authority over three other subsidised Parisian theatres, the Théâtre-Français (the Comédie-Française), the Opéra-Comique, and the Théâtre de l’Impératrice (the Odéon).
²⁹ Chaillou, Napoléon et l’Opéra, 175. In 1810, Napoleon reminded Rémusat that no new opera project should begin without his consent. (Cf. ibid., 45.)
spectacle for each institution, and the decree issued on 29 July 1807 limited the number of authorised theatres to eight and eliminated the other eleven.  

Except for pièces de circonstance, all librettos had to be submitted to the jury de lecture at the Opéra (created in 1789). Under the decree of 8 June 1806, all theatre performances also required a formal approval from the Minister of Police which was based on a report (un procès-verbal) of the state censorship bureau, le Bureau de la presse. Le Bureau de la presse was also responsible for reporting the news in the foreign press, for the daily bulletin of the Ministry of Police sent to Napoleon, and thus was abreast of current political affairs. The focus of Napoleonic censorship was political, moral, and religious. Le Bureau de la presse aimed at suppressing elements like sensitive themes (such as the Bourbons and Henri IV), inflammatory names and phrases, moral maxims directed against the regime, and themes inconvenient to the regime’s current foreign relations. Reflecting the revival of conservative familial and religious values under the Empire, portrayals hostile to traditional sexual morality or those containing anticlerical overtones were also strictly censored.

The Napoleonic regime also capitalised on opera’s artistic extravagance and its capacity to influence public opinion. A number of pièces de circonstance were commissioned to serve the imperial agenda. Hence, they were exempt from the submission procedure of the Opéra. For example, Le Triomphe de Trajan of 1807 (Ésmenard/ Persuis and Le Sueur) was designed to glorify Napoleon’s clemency; in 1811, the birth of a long-awaited heir, the King of Rome, was celebrated by an opera-ballet Le Triomphe du Mois de Mars, ou le Berceau d’Achille.
(Dupaty/Kreutzer); *L’Oriflamme* (Étienne and Baour-Lormian/Méhul, Paër, Berton, and Kreutzer) was written in early 1814 to stir up national feeling as the allied forces were approaching Paris and the regime was breaking down.\(^\text{35}\)

As its genesis indicates, *Fernand Cortez* of 1809, for which Jouy wrote the libretto, was also intended as state propaganda. The commission was first proposed to Joseph Ésmenard (a dramatist and a member of *le Bureau de la presse* who was later instructed to collaborate with Jouy on the project), when Napoleon’s Peninsular War began in spring 1808, with his ousting of the Spanish monarch and the appointment of his brother Joseph Bonaparte to the throne. As in *Le Triomphe de Trajan*, the libretto represented Napoleon through transparent allegory, and an idealised portrayal of Cortés’s conquest of Mexico was designed to justify Napoleon’s war in Spain, and to solicit public support. Even though such close representation of Napoleon as an operatic hero was rare, the regime continued to favour works which used kings, gods, and military heroes as protagonists, and contained themes of military triumph and valour, e.g. *La Jérusalem délivrée* (1812), the founding of a dynasty (Jouy’s *Les Amazones*), or generous emperors, e.g. *Le Laboureur chinois* (1813). They all manifestly contributed to the creation of Napoleon’s public image and the maintenance of imperial values.\(^\text{36}\)

Such Napoleonic cultural control was an important aspect of Jouy’s literary career, as records of the censorship and the Opéra’s literary committee indicate. As regards his texts themselves, the military theme is present in all of his librettos that reached the stage during the Empire. His first two works, in particular, *La Vestale* and *Fernand Cortez* produced distinctively imperial images, involving the public celebration of military triumph and cavalry charge, while all his narratives dealt with heroic individual action in one way or another. (Napoleon once remarked that ‘in general, the best way to praise me is to do things that inspire heroic sentiments in the nation, youth, and in the army.’\(^\text{37}\)) As Empis observed, Jouy clearly followed the line of the regime, which sought to create a sort of imperial cult. This was also the

---

\(^{35}\) Ibid., 157-175. Also see M. Elizabeth C. Bartlet, ‘Pièce de circonstance’, *Grove Music Online*.

\(^{36}\) Ibid., 251-282.

\(^{37}\) ‘En général, la meilleure façon de me louer est de faire des choses qui inspirent des sentiments héroïques à la nation, à la jeunesse et à l’armée.’ Ibid., 279. Cf. Napoleon’s letter to his minister of the interior Jean-Baptiste de Nompère de Champagny, 16 January 1807.
view of Jackie Assayag in his analysis of Jouy’s tragedy *Tippô-Saëb* of 1811, nevertheless rejected by the censors and performed only in 1813 (see the next chapter).\(^{38}\) Presumably Jouy won Napoleon’s esteem, as Napoleon saw all Jouy’s works on his rare and selective visits to the Opéra.\(^{39}\)

On the other hand, the entry of his name in the list of the *girouettes* raises the question of ‘equivocal loyalties’.\(^{40}\) Alan Spitzer referred to Alexis de Tocqueville’s analysis, which came in his 1842 reception speech delivered at the Académie française in honour of General Jean-Girard de Cessac, who built an excellent military career under the royal, revolutionary, and imperial regimes. (However, unlike Jouy, Cessac kept his oath to the Bourbons during the Hundred Days and is not listed in the *Dictionnaire des girouettes*.) Tocqueville argued that under the Napoleonic despotism, there were two types of servants: ‘the first, incompetent or corrupt, often pleased their master but ultimately harmed him; the second […] was harnessed to unquestioning obedience but often displayed an intellectual vigor and integrity that rose to a certain moral grandeur’.\(^{41}\) He concluded that Cessac belonged to the latter, and that he did not abandon the legacy of the Enlightenment and the Revolution, but at the same time managed to become a loyal servant of the emperor.\(^{42}\)

Dennis Libby noted that Jouy ‘was not an admirer of Napoleon’, although he arrives at this conclusion hastily by simply referring to Jouy’s own assertion made after the collapse of the Napoleonic regime that ‘I had never been in the good graces of the Emperor’\(^{43}\) (thereby ignoring the element of opportunistic self-justification: see below). Jacques Joly’s analysis of the libretto of *Fernand Cortez* also argued that the libretto contained some ambiguities that

---


\(^{40}\) Spitzer, ‘Malicious Memories’, 46.


\(^{42}\) Ibid.

obscured its positive support of imperial propaganda. At the beginning of the First Restoration, Jouy emerged as a liberal: he was a vocal supporter of constitutional monarchy, defending both the charter and the crown. After the Second Return of Louis XVIII he identified more with the interests of the nation and with liberalism of the Left. Jouy’s plays written under the reign of Louis XVIII reflect his lifelong admiration of Voltaire, and are highly critical of despotism and fanaticism within monarchical establishments (Bélisaire and Julien dans les Gaules), as well as of the royal court (Les Intrigues de Cour). With the exception of Sylla, the royal censors rejected all his plays, and the ban was lifted only after the death of Louis XVIII.

In the preface to his Œuvres complètes, Jouy stated that his theatrical works showed ‘the virtues of man and citizen’, and dealt with ‘the notion of political greatness, legal liberty, and devotion to one’s native country’. Such an assertion distinctly resonates with the liberal rhetoric of the Enlightenment paving the way for the Revolution. Furthermore, like his model Voltaire, Jouy believed in the utility of literature in diffusing ideas of social justice. And as if to defend his own literary career, Jouy wrote:

He [a writer] should consider himself as worthy of envy, the man of letters who can say: I leave some useful traces in my path; never did venom and gall flow from my pen; it is devoid of jealousy, lies and flattery; even in its [verbal] games, it respected what men must respect, namely, justice, morality, and the country: I have not deified power, advocated baseness, praised stupidity; I have flattered neither the prejudices of the great nor of the people, […], and if some of my thoughts survive me, they will perpetuate, I dare believe, neither the images of shame nor maxims of tyranny, but useful teachings and noble memories.


Comeau, Étienne Jouy, 207-214. In terms of constitutional party, the Liberal Opposition was made up of the Left and the more moderate Centre-Left.


‘La grandeur politique’, ‘la liberté légale et le dévouement à la patrie’. Ibid. The notion of ‘La patrie’ during the eighteenth century evolved to be specifically linked to the Republican ideology and the notion of liberty. (See for instance, Edmond Dziembowski, Un nouveau patriotisme français, 1750-1770: la France face à la puissance anglaise à l’époque de la guerre de Sept Ans, Studies on Voltaire and the eighteenth century, vol.365, Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1998.)

Il doit se regarder comme digne d'envie, l'homme de lettre qui peut dire: je laisse quelques traces utiles de mon passage; jamais le fiel n'a coulé de ma plume: elle est pure de jalousie, de mensonge et d'adulation; jusque dans ses jeux mêmes elle a respecté ce que doivent respecter les hommes, la justice, la morale, et la patrie: je n'ai point divinisé la puissance, préconisé la bassesse, encensé la sottise en faveur;
While Jouy thus seems to deny his own subservience to cultural control of various regimes, Spitzer has indicated that such justification of one’s career with reference to one’s principles (along the line of Tocqueville) became frequent amongst the girouettes. accordingly, Jouy’s assertion on one hand may be read as a characteristic attempt by yet another girouette to render his past commitment acceptable, but on the other hand it seems a reminder of difficult circumstances of Jouy’s writing career, and raises the question: In what way did Jouy’s Napoleonic works indeed reflect his own views about social reality? (Let us assume that authors are perhaps unlikely to renounce their personal initiatives completely in favour of state cultural policy.) And to what extent did Jouy then reconcile his personal beliefs to Napoleonic cultural control and to the accepted view of his society?

Chapter One will explore these questions in the context of his Fernand Cortez. As we know, Spanish-American colonial history provided useful metaphor for the problem of colonial conquest in the liberal Enlightenment tradition. As will be seen, Jouy’s Napoleonic tragedy Tippô-Saëb, as well as his post-Napoleonic writings, reveal his own anti-colonial view. The chapter examines Jouy’s narratives and dramaturgies by exploring how the theme of the Spanish conquests were exploited in the context of contemporary debates, what were Jouy’s own pronouncements on colonial conquest (I also take into account Jouy’s personal experience as a French colonial soldier), and the way in which the efforts towards territorial expansion increased under the Empire, including the above-mentioned war in Spain.

In Chapter Two, I will explore Jouy’s views on women’s status in society, and how they were reflected in his La Vestale, Les Bayadères, Les Amazones, and Velleda. I found that as with the history of Hernán Cortés, four themes developed in his librettos – the Vestals, the Bayadères, the Amazons, and the women of Gaul (to whom Jouy’s Velleda belongs) - had been appropriated in eighteenth-century writings with an explicit ‘feminist’ perspective. I consider the Jouy entry in the Biographie universelle (1818) which emphasised Jouy’s interest in

je n’ai flaté ni les préjugés des grands ni ceux du peuple, […] et si quelques unes de mes pensées me survivent, elles ne perpétueront, j’ose le croire, ni des tableaux de honte, ni des maximes d’esclavage, mais des préceptes utiles et de nobles souvenirs.’ Jouy, ‘Discours préliminaire’, OC, vol.1, 2.

49 Spitzer, ‘Malicious Memories’, 56-57.
women’s welfare,\textsuperscript{50} and his defence of women in his lecture series of 1822, against a Napoleonic perspective on women (reflected in Jouy’s Napoleonic articles) which re-instated a manifestly patriarchal social order, and examine the way in which Jouy’s libretto deals with these opposing attitude to women.

Empis’s observation that Jouy became ‘the writer of the Empire’ as a result of his particular responsiveness to the world around him also raises the question of how Jouy then reacted to the new environment of the Restoration, when literary and operatic directions changed to a considerable extent. In literature, the promotion of foreign influences, partly suppressed by the Napoleonic censorship, was revitalised in 1814 by the publication of Germaine de Staël’s De l’Allemagne. Her book called for a renewal of French literature through the influence of German romanticism, thereby laying a foundation for French romanticism by favouring northern European literature as opposed to classical subject matter drawn from southern European sources.\textsuperscript{51} The influx of northern European literature increased in the early Restoration: Translations of Walter Scott, Byron, Shakespeare, Schiller and Goethe were published, and melodrama, pantomime and vaudeville adaptations reached Parisian audiences, as well as an English troupe’s Shakespeare season in 1822. Notably, the period saw a growing interest in northern European supernaturalism exploiting gothic fantasy and devilry, as in Goethe’s Faust.\textsuperscript{52} As the penetration of foreign literature progressed between 1823 and 1826, the opposition of the older classicists grew, and the classic/romantic dichotomy developed into a generational struggle between older classicists and young romantics entering maturity during
the 1820s.\textsuperscript{53} In the operatic domain, a generational antagonism also opposed the partisans of classical tradition against the particular modernity presented by Italian and German operas. The traditional French conception of the relationship between libretto and music was contested by Rossini’s operas, and as the composer’s popularity at the Théâtre Italien became evident, Henri-Montan Berton’s defence of Gluckian declamatory melodic style, corresponding to French interest in text, in his *De la musique mécanique et de la musique philosophique*\textsuperscript{54} (1821), clashed sharply with Stendhal’s defence of Rossini operas which emphasised the importance of the composer.\textsuperscript{55} Around mid-1820s, the world of north European supernatural fiction also entered the Parisian operatic environment. German romantic operas by Winter, Weber, Spohr, Hoffmann and Mozart were performed at the Théâtre Italien and at the Odéon, where Weber’s Faustian *Der Freischütz* (1821) was adapted by Castil-Blaze and Thomas Sauvage in 1824.\textsuperscript{56}

As will be shown in Chapter Three on *Essai sur l’opéra français* (published in the midst of the classic/romantic conflict) and Chapter Five, Jouy firmly defended classicism as the conflict intensified towards the middle of the 1820s. In contemporary accounts, as well as in various studies of the period from Stendhal’s *Souvenirs d’égotisme* (which relates his personal memories of the period between 1821 and 1830) to Jule Marsan’s *La Bataille romantique* of 1912, Jouy is seen as a leading figure of the classical faction;\textsuperscript{57} more recently, Spitzer’s study of the young romantics of 1820s referred to Jouy as a ‘a vieille perruque, a “powdered wig.”


\textsuperscript{54} Henri-Montan Berton, *De la musique mécanique et de la musique philosophique, suivi d’une épître à un célèbre compositeur français*, Paris: Alexis Eymery, 1826.


petrified in his nostalgia for the cultural artifacts of the Old Regime,’ and ‘the antediluvian boulder in the path of progress’. Against the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century views, Claude Pichois emphasised some flexibility in Jouy’s classicist stance despite his earlier hostile attitude towards German influence, by pointing to his appreciation of Byron and also to Le Miroir’s position (Jouy was one of its editors) encouraging innovations in view of modernising French literature. Paul Comeau similarly noted that Jouy showed ‘a gradually mellowing, tolerant, and at times even sympathetic attitude towards romanticism’. From a dramaturgical point of view, Anselm Gerhard also observed some contemporary perspectives in Jouy’s Essai, otherwise dominated by eighteenth-century operatic conventions, asserting that Jouy is ‘unsuccessful in reconciling his awareness of his own time with his conservative theories’. 

Indeed, his libretto Zirphile et Fleur de Myrte of 1818 reveals that Jouy already drew some inspiration from Shakespeare’s The Tempest, before adapting three works – Werner’s Attila, König der Hunnen, Goethe’s Faust (this libretto was not set to music) and Schiller’s Wilhelm Tell, all of which had been cited in Germaine de Staël’s De l’Allemagne. Jouy also showed his eagerness to produce Faust at the Opéra in collaboration with Rossini in 1827, despite Rossini’s rejection of his Les Athéniennes (accepted by the jury on 16 January 1822) sent to the composer by the Opéra, as well as his abandonment of Le Vieux de la Montagne (accepted on 3 November 1824) during the composition process (see Chapter 3). In contrast to the Empire period when his libretto reached the Opéra’s audiences nearly every year between 1807 and 1813 (hence he clearly had a dominant presence in the institution), after his Zirphile et Fleur de Myrte mounted in 1818, there was a gap of almost ten years before the Opéra finally produced two Jouy-Rossini operas between 1827 and 1829, as the Restoration was drawing to a close. The fact that the jury received nine other works by Jouy (only one was rejected) during this period indicates that his interest in the institution was far from declining, and some re-

58 Spitzer, The French Generation of 1820, 119 and 122.
60 Comeau, Diehards and Innovators, 53.
62 Chaillou, Napoléon et l’Opéra, 90.
submissions of older accepted works with a new title and some revision even suggest that Jouy made apparent efforts to win their favour.

The other aim of my thesis will be to explore the way in which Jouy responded to new trends during this understandably disappointing period of his career. **Chapter Three** will first explore the content and the context of his *Essai sur l’opéra français*. It will then consider the text’s ‘extreme conservatism’, in the context of the Classic/Romantic conflict of the 1820s, and the emergence of the Rossinian view of librettist’s role. **Chapter Four** surveys the extant librettos of Jouy, their style, technique and subject matter, with a view to establishing a better picture of his entire output. **Chapter Five** will focus on his last libretto *Guillaume Tell*. This work seems to epitomise Jouy’s move in a new direction under the Restoration. In terms of its narrative, I will first consider the choice of a revolutionary hero in relation to his defence of liberty, and the revival of revolutionary memory in the 1820s. I will then explore the way in which Jouy responded to foreign influences, and ask why Jouy came to treat several German literary themes during the last years of the Restoration.

The state of research

In 1965, Claude Pichois, in the form of an article, ‘Pour une biographie d’Étienne Jouy’, published the first modern biographical study of Jouy. His study of Philarète Chasles from the same year also investigated the period when Chasles acted as literary assistant to Jouy, and when he collaborated, amongst a number of projects, on two librettos, *Le Vieux de la Montagne* and *Faust*, and possibly also on the libretto *L’Amazone de Lutèce* (see Chapter 5). Comeau’s 1968 doctoral thesis *Étienne Jouy, His Life and His Paris Essays*, providing the first full biography of Jouy and a study of his three Paris essay series (*L’Hermite de la Chaussée-d’Antin*, *Guillaume le Franc-parleur*, and *L’Hermite de la Guiane*) is the first and only full-

---

64 Pichois, *Philarète Chasles*, vol.1, 180-183, and vol.2, 264-266.
length research on Jouy. The more recent biography, entitled *Les Aventures militaires, littéraires et autres de Étienne de Jouy de l’Académie française* by Michel Faul published in 2009, is largely based on Comeau’s thesis, although it contains a certain amount of new materials from Jouy’s contemporaries’ memoirs. Anselm Gerhard’s *The Urbanization of opera* on the other hand remains the only research on grand opera to devote a chapter to Jouy, with his discussion focused on *Essai sur l’opéra français*.

Over the years, various theses and publications on composers who set Jouy’s librettos have treated all staged serious operas based on Jouy’s texts, except for *Pélage*. While these studies mostly concentrated on composers, all also examined historical and cultural background in one way or another, and some dealt with institutional aspects of the works considered. Regarding the Napoleonic operas, Denis Libby investigated *La Vestale* and *Fernand Cortez* as set to music by Spontini, and Patrick Barbier provided a thorough examination of archival sources relating to the two operas. Sylvan Suskin offered a study of *Les Bayadères* and *Zirphile et Fleur de Myrte*, which, apart from its excellent discussion of Catel’s musical style, also covered the literary sources of these works. M. Elizabeth C. Bartlet’s research on Méhul shed light on archival materials as well as the historical and institutional context of *Les Amazones*, and also of the aborted operatic project *Sésostris* (see the next chapter), which came to nothing following Méhul’s decision to abandon the composition, and whose libretto Jouy co-authored with Antoine-Vincent Arnault. And lastly, an article by Jean Mongrédien explored the literary sources of *Les Abencérages,* while Oliver Heidemann devoted his entire book to

---


66 Gerhard, ‘Victor-Joseph Étienne de Jouy’, 41-62. The main part of his discussion derives from his ‘Incantesimo o specchio dei costumi’, 46-60. Gerhard’s texts will be considered in Chapter 3.

67 Libby, *Gaspare Spontini*.


the same work. Karin Pendle’s book on Scribe discussed Jouy’s librettos (La Vestale, Les Bayadères, and Guillaume Tell) from a dramaturgical point of view by comparing them with Scribe’s librettos.

Many studies of the two operas on which Jouy and Rossini collaborated have focused on literary aspects, amongst them Marcello Conati’s article on Moïse et Pharaon, and the articles by Jacques Joly, Gilles de Van and Albert Gier on Guillaume Tell dealing with the literary sources of the libretto. Bartlet’s preface to the critical edition of Guillaume Tell meticulously documented the progress of the project. Gerhard showed how Jouy’s and Hippolyte-Louis-Florent Bis’s libretto was transformed considerably through Rossini’s radical approaches to the older conventions. More recently, Cormac Newark also produced a chapter, and Benjamin Walton provided a dense contextualisation of both Moïse and Guillaume Tell through the study of social, political, and cultural characteristics of the 1820s.
Fernand Cortez (1809): Imperialism versus the critique of Empire

The opera, as premiered on 28 November 1809, begins with a mutiny in Cortez’s camp. Cortez urges his soldiers: ‘L’Europe avait sur vous les yeux,/ Un monde était votre conquête;/ Encore un pas, vos noms victorieux/ Du temple de la gloire allaient orner le faîte’ (Europe was keeping a watchful eye on you./ You set out to conquer the world./ One step more, and your victorious names will adorn the summit of the temple of fame). Cortez succeeds in reuniting his forces. Cortez swears to rescue his brother Alvar and his soldiers, taken captive by the barbarous Mexican priests. He also promises the Mexican princess Amazily, his lover, to avenge her mother, the victim of human sacrifice. Amazily tells that Alvar still lives. To their surprise, the Mexicans come to propose a truce. Amazily’s brother Télasco, who has been sent by the king, Montezuma, exchanges gifts with Cortez and the Mexican women sing and dance in recognition of suspended hostilities. The Spaniards then decide to stage a cavalry charge which frightens the Mexicans, leading Télasco to demand Cortez should leave Mexico. Cortez refuses violently, burning his own vessels, and the truce is broken. Spanish soldiers advance towards the capital of Mexico (Act II), and Télasco deplores the plight of his country. He also accuses Amazily of being in love with Cortez and rejects her claim that Cortez is a civilizing hero. Cortez and Amazily learn that the Mexicans refuse to liberate Alvar and are demanding the sacrifice of either Alvar or Amazily. To save both, Cortez decides to attack the city. Alone, Amazily decides to save Alvar. She leaps into the lake, and swims through it to reach the city. In Act III, a sacrificial altar is prepared for the Spanish prisoners and the Mexican crowd demands an immediate blood sacrifice. But Amazily arrives in time, and the

1 Jouy, Fernand Cortez ou la Conquête du Mexique, opéra en trois actes, Paris: Roullet, 1809. It was revised by Jouy and Spontini, and was re-staged at the Opéra on 28 May 1817 (see below). The new version was very successful (248 performances; the 1809 version had only 24) and kept in the repertoire until 15 September 1839 (see Théodore de Lajarte, Bibliothèque Musicale du Théâtre de l’Opéra: catalogue historique, chronologique, anecdotique, 2 vols. Paris: Librairie des bibliophiles, 1878, vol.2, 69-70).

2 Jouy, Fernand Cortez, Roullet, 1809, Act I/2, 15.
High Priest accepts her wish to be a substitute victim. As Cortez’s siege of the city begins off-stage, the High Priest commands Amazily’s immolation. The moment when a priest raises the axe over Amazily’s head, Cortez’s soldiers burst in, rescue Amazily and destroy the Aztec temple. The Spanish soldiers and the Mexicans reconcile and celebrate Cortez’s victory.

The libretto thus builds on a colonial narrative, which promoted the expansionist mission on the pretext of abolishing religious human sacrifice. Derek Hughes’s recent book notes: ‘in Paris, [...] there was a more straightforward celebration of Napoleon as the foe of sacrificial superstition.’ According to the allegory of the opera, Napoleon (represented by Cortez) was to triumph over the Inquisition of Spain (represented by Mexico). Colonial rhetoric is explicit in Cortez’s speech which he delivers before he sets fire to his own fleet:

Un prêtre impie asservit ces climats;/ Il outrage à la fois le ciel et la nature;/ Au pied de vos autels, sa féroce imposture/ Feint d’honorer un Dieu par des assassinats:/ Ce culte fait horreur, je viens pour le détruire,/ L’Amérique appartient à qui saura l'instruire./ Cette terre est à moi, je ne la quitte plus.

(A blasphemous priest controls these regions;/ He insults both heaven and nature;/ At the foot of your altar, his ferocious imposture/ Pretends to honour a God by murders:/ This cult horrifies, I come to destroy it,/ America belongs to one who will be able to educate it;/ This land is mine, I will never leave it.)

On the other hand, it is traditionally accepted that the opera’s imperialist narrative did not have its intended effect. The ambiguous beginning of the opera has been repeatedly noted in earlier studies. Jean Mongrédién wrote that its propaganda ‘backfired’ when Napoleon’s war came to a crisis, and that the police suspended the performances. Dennis Libby on the other hand noted that the opera was temporarily suspended for five months after its thirteenth performance in February 1810 and explained that:

At the beginning of 1810, when Cortez took its temporary leave from the Académie,

---

6 His source is Théodore Lajarte, *Curiosités de l’Opéra*, Paris: Calmann Lévy, 1883, 168.
Napoleon was still deep in the Spanish problem. [...] Cortez, we are told, instead of raising public enthusiasm for the fight among the French had rather the opposite effect. The audience did not identify Cortez with Napoleon, the Aztecs with the Spaniards of 1809, as they had been meant to do, but made the more obvious identification of sixteenth- and nineteenth-century Spaniards. They were then demoralized by the courage of the ancestors of their present enemies, and for this reason the opera was suspended.\(^7\)

Libby nevertheless added that ‘there is very little evidence either to prove or disprove this attractive story’.\(^8\) The records show however (see below), that the five-months interruption did not take place in the winter of 1810. The sources also reveal that the opera’s mismatch with the crisis of the Spanish war possibly arose much later, since the shows were completely stopped following the performance of 24 January 1812.

Jacques Joly’s analysis of the libretto on the other hand proposed that even though Cortez was conceived in an environment where the state exerted a sort of dictatorial control over certain arts, and although Cortez’s representations of heroism and militarism appear to flatter the regime, some portrayals in the text of Cortez were hardly conducive to imperialist propaganda.\(^9\) The portrayal of Cortez falls short of an outstanding leader, as his conquest is characterised by a mutiny of his army. And while Mexico is debased by the notion of religious superstition, the resistance of the Mexican population, Télasco’s patriotism, and Amazily’s heroic gesture are given an important place in the narrative. Alluding to the abrupt termination of performances, Joly argued that:

One may question the political appropriateness, [...] of emphasizing, in this way, in the month of December 1809, the determination of the Mexicans to resist their invaders. Did difficulties faced by Napoleon in Spain make it desirable to recall the glory of the Spanish armies and the patriotism of an invaded population?\(^10\)


\(^8\) Libby, ibid.


\(^10\) ‘On peut s’interroger sur l’opportunité politique, [...] d’insister de la sorte, au mois de décembre 1809, sur la détermination des Mexicains à résister à leur envahisseur. Les difficultés rencontrées par Napoléon en Espagne rendaient-elles souhaitable le rappel de la gloire des armées espagnoles et du patriotisme des nations envahies?’ Ibid., 251.
For Joly, *Fernand Cortez*, while appearing to support Napoleon’s imperialism, also reveals undeniable problems of conquest and uniting irreconcilable cultures.¹¹

Joly’s claim seems to point us to Diana Hallman and Sarah Hibberd’s observations on political meaning in grand operas, namely that as a result of strict censorship and the presence of different social groups in Opéra audiences, grand opera librettos often presented both a ‘safe’ narrative and a subversive undercurrent.¹² In the preface to the text, Jouy and Ésmenard (see below) described that Cortez’s conquest was the event in history that ‘inspired the greatest astonishment and admiration’. Yet they also articulated what could be seen as apologetics, that ‘Cortez did not tarnish his glory by any cruelty’, which, they claimed, characterised Francisco Pizarro’s conquest of Peru.¹³ Jouy’s preface to the 1817 version of the libretto published in volume 19 of his *Œuvres complètes* after the fall of the Empire in 1823 still retained these descriptions in tact. But at the same time, Jouy noted that ‘the passion for wealth and fame devoured the usurpers. They deployed in their conquest as much force of will, intellectual resources, as they did cruelty and barbarism’.¹⁴ Jouy also stated that:

I thought it my primary duty to present the spectator with a natural exposition, and compel him to pity the fate of the Spanish prisoners, in order to soften the odious aspects of their victory later on. That was my subject’s principal stumbling block. I was perhaps successful in avoiding it; I do not flatter myself that I surmounted it. Between the sympathy inspired by the temerity and audacity of the conquerors and that felt for the miserable fate of the conquered, the soul remains uncertain and, as it were, suspended.¹⁵

Anselm Gerhard has observed that ‘when a drama depicts warfare, the audience will be moved to spontaneous pity for the losers, and consequently the victory of the other side will seem abhorrent, at least if it is represented as a good outcome’;¹⁶ therefore Jouy’s statements

---

¹¹ Ibid., 259.
¹⁶ Gerhard, ibid., 49-50.
prompts us to explore further his view on colonial conquest. Edward Said in *Orientalism* claimed that the European literary representations of the exotic Other derived from the power relationship between Occident and Orient (as emerged in the history of modern European imperialism, which Said claims to have begun with Napoleon’s Egyptian campaign), and that put more bluntly, these representations reflected European racism, imperialism and ethnocentrism. Many studies, however, have since then drawn attention to the fact that in the second half of the eighteenth-century, French literary exoticism, including the history of Spanish colonisation in the Americas, had been a site of anti-colonial debates, and a study by Yves Benot has shown that Napoleon’s territorial expansion did not have unanimous support from the French population. The opera’s idealisation of the conqueror itself may then be seen as a debatable act in 1809 Paris.

Building on Joly’s proposition, this chapter explores conflicting perspectives on imperial conquest in the libretto of *Fernand Cortez*. It explores its socio-political context, firstly, the ways in which Spanish colonialism was viewed in the second half of the eighteenth century, in particular by Diderot, and by Marmontel in his *Les Incas*, one of Jouy’s literary sources, and secondly, how views on non-Europeans evolved against the backdrop of Napoleon’s colonial projects. Thirdly, it considers *Fernand Cortez* within Napoleon’s artistic policy, exploring how Napoleon’s war in Spain progressed in the context of rivalry with British imperialism, and how the regime was involved in the conception and performances of the opera. Fourthly, it examines Jouy’s attitude towards colonialism. As he often emphasised (see below), Jouy had himself witnessed colonial reality at first hand, having joined the French military in French Guiana (1781-1785) and in India (1787-1790). While his tragedy *Tippo-Saëb* (1811) reveals

---

his anti-imperialist stance, two texts written after the fall of the Empire, his essay ‘La guerre considérée d’après les principes de la morale’ (1822), and his unfinished novel Les voyages et aventures du jeune Scarmentado\(^{20}\), set in India, also present his critique of colonial conquest. Furthermore, his Tippo-Saëb, Cortez, as well as his Sésostris, written in collaboration with Antoine-Vincent Arnault, presented some contradictory perspectives; on the one hand a conventional view of conquest supported by the regime, and on the other, certain portrayals that oppose the former. And lastly, it reflects on the revised version of the opera premiered in the wake of Napoleon’s fall.

I

In the second half of the eighteenth century, as France’s colonial efforts increased (motivated primarily by perennial Franco-British imperial rivalry), European colonial history attracted strong criticism of philosophes like Diderot and Voltaire. Diderot was one of contributors to Guillaume-Thomas Raynal’s Histoire philosophique et politique des établissements et du commerce des Européens dans les deux Indes (1770), which surveyed the history of European colonial and commercial activities in the Americas, while also addressing the problems of slave trade and imperialism. According to Diderot\(^{21}\), Hernán Cortés ‘was despotic and cruel, and his successes are tarnished by the injustice of his projects. He was an assassin covered with innocent blood.’\(^{22}\) As his conclusion makes clear, for Diderot, imperial conquest was no more than a simple repetition of injustice and violence:

We leave Mexico to move on to South America where we see, by an order of Providence that will never change, the same effects produced by the same causes, the same hatred aroused by the same ferocity, the same precautions suggested by the same alarm, the same

\(^{20}\) ‘L’Hermite du Louvre: œuvres diverses’, Papiers autographes (brouillons) de Victor-Joseph Étienne, dit de Jouy, F-Pa, MS 6338.915 bis H.F.


obstacles opposed by the same jealousy, the depredations caused by robbery, evil avenged by misfortune, foolish perseverance in the evil, and the lesson of useless experience.\textsuperscript{23}

At the same time, Diderot also criticised the Eurocentric perspective on Mexican civilization:

They fancied that these people had no form of government because it was not vested in a single person; no civilization because it differed from that of Madrid; no virtues because they were not of the same religious persuasion; and no understanding because they did not adopt the same opinions. [...] This national pride, carried to an excess of infatuation beyond example, would have inclined them to consider Athens in the same contemptuous light as they did Tlascala. They would have treated the Chinese as brutes, and have everywhere left marks of outrage, oppression, and devastation.\textsuperscript{24}

Muthu has demonstrated that the recognition of cultural difference, conveniently argued in the context of Europe’s colonial history, was also crucial in the re-orientation of contemporary prejudices in eighteenth-century France. Diderot wanted to attack the institutions of French absolutist regime on the basis that political and social injustice within the ancien régime was bound up with its global politics.\textsuperscript{25} The denouncing of the Catholic Church formed part of the polemics,\textsuperscript{26} and Diderot’s criticism was often focused on the ‘ideological and material support that religious institutions provide to the imperial enterprise’.\textsuperscript{27} Yet Diderot viewed despots and priesthoods as global woes, and he also deployed his account of Montezuma’s kingdom to expose injustice in all autocratic and intolerant regimes. According to Diderot, Montezuma was an incompetent king, who despised and oppressed his subjects, and who could only offer gifts to his European invader, while his stagnant country was filled with the violence of

\textsuperscript{23} ‘Nous quittons l’Amérique Septentrionale pour passer dans la Méridionale, où nous verrons, par un ordre de la Providence qui ne changera jamais, les mêmes effets produits par les mêmes causes, les mêmes haines suscitées par la même férocité; les mêmes précautions suggérées par les mêmes alarmes; les mêmes obstacles opposés par les mêmes jalousies; le brigandage engendré par le brigandage; le malheur vengé par le malheur; une persévérance stupide dans le mal, et la leçon de l’expérience inutile.’ Raynal, \textit{Histoire}, vol.3, 454.


\textsuperscript{25} See Muthu, \textit{Enlightenment against Empire}, 115; Jennifer Pitts, \textit{A Turn to Empire}, 165.

\textsuperscript{26} It may be recalled that the anticlerical polemics in eighteenth-century France coincided with the institutionalisation of religious intolerance which began with the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. The persecution of Jansenists was authorised by the Pope in the Bull \textit{Unigenitus} that Louis XIV obtained in 1713, and in 1724, an Act was passed, confirming Catholicism as the only religion in France. The period saw many victims of persecution such as the Huguenot Jean Calas executed in 1762. See for instance, Marisa Linton, ‘Citizenship and Religious Toleration in France’, in \textit{Toleration in Enlightenment Europe}, ed. Ole Peter Grell and Roy Porter, Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000, 158-163.

\textsuperscript{27} Muthu, \textit{Enlightenment against Empire}, 112.
religious superstition and evil priests. Muthu sees that such criticism, however, was not intended to license European imperial rule, which Diderot regarded as a greater threat to the non-European world: ‘We cannot accuse the Spanish for having rebelled against this absurd barbarity, but it was not necessary to destroy them [the Mexicans] with greater cruelties, it was not necessary to pounce on the people assembled in the city’s principal temple and to slaughter them, it was not necessary to kill the aristocrats in order to despoil them.’

Similarly, criticism of conquest and religious fanaticism were the central themes of two immensely popular eighteenth-century texts set in sixteenth-century Peru: Voltaire’s tragedy *Alzire, ou les Américains* (1736), and Marmontel’s novel *Les Incas, ou la Destruction de l’Empire du Péru* (1778). Marmontel’s text included an account of Cortés’s conquest in Mexico, and incidentally, two names of main characters in Jouy’s *Fernand Cortez*, Amazily and Télasco, are carried over from this novel. *Les Incas* tells a story of the Spanish invasion and devastation of Peru. In an ominous prologue to the fatal event awaiting the Peruvians, a Mexican refugee tells the Peruvians of the destruction of Mexico by Cortés. He is portrayed as a military officer who quickly turns into a cruel conqueror allowing massacres and pillages,

---

29 Muthu, *Enlightenment against Empire*, 80.
30 ‘On ne peut faire un crime aux Espagnols d’avoir été révoltés de ces absurdes barbarie; mais il ne fallait pas les détruire par de plus grandes cruautés; il ne fallait pas se jeter sur le peuple assemblé dans le premier temple de la ville, et l’égorger; il ne fallait pas assassiner les nobles pour les dépouiller.’ Raynal, *Histoire*, vol.3, 313.
33 Jouy’s 1809 preface to *Fernand Cortez* refers to Marmontel’s *Les Incas*; Antonio de Herrera’s *Histoire générale des voyages et conquêtes des Castillans dans les îles et terre ferme des Indes occidentales*, 3vols., Paris : La Coste, 1660-71 (the original Spanish edition: 1601-1615); Antonio de Solis’s *Histoire de la conquête du Mexique ou la Nouvelle Espagne par Fernand Cortez*, Paris: Villery, 1691 (the Spanish text was published in 1684).
which give the lie to his earlier promotion of peace (‘my God is the God of peace’) and lofty Christian ideals. Like Diderot, Marmontel thus implies the Catholic religion’s share in colonial violence. Similarly, Diderot’s use of the word ‘assassin’ (see fn. 22) in Marmontel’s text represented a powerful rejection of imperialist glory: ‘glory! […] do assassins have it? Is it glorious to follow a timid herd of naked, vulnerable and defenceless people, to cut their throats without risking one’s life and with cowardly cruelty? Your glory is that of a vulture, ripping open the dove.’ Here Marmontel seems to suggest that European imperialism is merely a conflict between a peaceful and vulnerable population and an aggressive western power. This is also suggested in the conclusion of another conquistador Pizarro, who in the novel becomes increasingly tormented by the bloodshed of colonial wars: ‘what ever we say, we bring an unjust war to this people who lived peacefully, without us, and faraway from us.’ At the same time, Marmontel’s critique of religious fanaticism is also presented in a non-European context. A Peruvian priestess Cora conceives a child with Alonzo de Molina and as religious laws require, she is condemned to be entombed alive for her violation of vows of chastity. De Molina, however, protests by attacking religion’s complicity in the injustice of a despotic regime at Cora’s trial: ‘The horror [of persecution] can hardly please god, and the law which you impose on them could not come from him. It is of human origin, it is conceived by a jealous king, haughty and despotic, who gave his god a heart like his.’

Anticolonial and anticlerical opinions continued to be voiced during the Revolutionary years. The opposition to the slave trade in particular, on the eve of the Revolution, had led to the establishment of the anti-slavery Société des Amis des Noirs, and slavery was abolished by the

34 Marmontel, Les Incas, 65.
35 ‘La gloire! […] en est-il pour les assassins? En est-il à tomber sur un troupeau timide d’hommes nus, faibles, désarmés, à les égorger sans péril, avec une cruauté lâche? Votre gloire est celle du vautour, lorsqu’il déchire la colombe.’ Ibid., 106.
36 ‘Chez des peuples qui, sans nous, et loin de nous, vivaient paisibles, sur des bords où, quoi qu’on en dise, nous portons une guerre injuste.’ Ibid., 408.
37 ‘Ces horreurs ne peuvent lui plaire; et la loi qui vous les commande ne saurait émaner de lui. Elle est des hommes; elle vous vient de quelque roi jaloux, superbe, et tyrannique, qui attribuait à son dieu un cœur comme le sien’. Ibid., 354.
Convention in 1794. Yet at the same time, Revolutionary governments made new efforts to restore colonies lost previously. Furthermore, the Revolution ‘gave birth to the idea that France was the “universal” nation, the nation that represented the future of civilization and was charged with rescuing other peoples from tyranny and ignorance’, foreshadowing a politics of foreign expansion in the decades to come.

II

When Napoleon seized power in 1799, French colonies in the West Indies, Africa and the Indian Ocean consisted of the Ile de France (Mauritius), the Ile Bourbon (Réunion), Saint-Louis in Senegal, Guyane (French Guiana), Guadeloupe and Saint-Domingue (Haiti). Through the first years of the Revolution, France had lost Tobago (1793), Martinique (1794) and Sainte-Lucie (Saint Lucia) (1796), to Britain, which had entered war with France in February 1793. The war itself renewed a long-standing rivalry between the two leading European powers. Franco-British antagonism was also an important part of Napoleon’s military career. Napoleon advised the Directory against the invasion of Britain on the basis of insufficient control of the Channel, proposing instead an indirect threat by way of the Egyptian expedition. Within less than a month after landing in Egypt, Napoleon entered Cairo on 24 July 1798. He brought considerable urbanisation to the city and the studies on Ancient Egypt were launched. Yet as the hostility of the Muslim powers in the surrounding countries mounted, the population

---

39 Pitts, A Turn to Empire, 166.
40 Pitts indicates that Condorcet, a prominent critic of empire in the Revolutionary period, continued to denounce both colonialism and priesthood in his Esquisse d’un tableau historique des progrès de l’esprit humain (Paris: Agasse, 1794), but in contrast to Diderot, he believed that non-Europeans might be civilised by European nations. See Pitts, A Turn to Empire, 170-171.
of Cairo, led by Sheikhs, revolted in the autumn. Napoleon responded to two days of fighting and bombardment with heavy retribution in the form of execution of Arabs by the axe to economise on bullets. Napoleon’s further expedition to Acre in Syria ended in disaster, and he was forced to return to Egypt. Soon after, he deserted his command and slipped back into France in a secret operation in October 1799. By the autumn of 1799, the British naval blockade in the Mediterranean Sea was virtually complete, and, following Nelson’s devastation of the French fleet at Aboukir Bay on 1 August 1798, the British government was also successful in forming the Second Coalition with Turkey, Naples, Russia, Austria and Portugal against France. Russia and Austria withdrew from the war, Napoleon resumed his continental campaigns, and the peace treaty of Amiens was ratified in March 1802, which Britain broke off in May 1803. Napoleon then prepared for an invasion of Britain, with his resources augmented by a profit from the sale of Louisiana to the United States in April 1803. However, after the defeat of the French fleet at Trafalgar in 1805 Napoleon reverted to ‘more costly and inefficient indirect means’ to subdue Britain.

Shortly after the coup d’état of 1799, in the wake of slave revolts and the loss of colonies to Britain, Napoleon initiated the rapid re-establishment of aggressive colonial legislation in the West Indies. On 25 December 1799, three commissioners were appointed to launch a significant French intervention against the civil unrest in Saint-Domingue, together with an army of 4000 troops, and commissions were also set up for Guyane and Guadeloupe in the same year to restore French control. Although the commissioner reassured liberty and freedom of the black people in Saint-Domingue, in contrast to the constitution of 1793, the constitution of 1799 declared the application of ‘special laws’ to French overseas territories.

42 His army eventually capitulated to a British expeditionary force in 1801.
44 France had bought Louisiana from Spain in 1800. See Branda and Lentz, Napoléon, l’esclavage et les colonies, 178-182.
making a decisive move towards the re-establishment of slavery and slave trade, which were
eventually enshrined into law in all French colonies on 20 April 1802. In December 1801, a
major military expedition under the command of Napoleon’s brother-in-law, Charles Leclerc
was sent to Saint-Domingue, which had established an autonomous constitution under the
governance of former black slave Toussaint-Louverture. The expedition to the West Indies of
26,000 soldiers and 100 ships in total was unheard-of up to then, and Leclerc managed to arrest
Toussaint, who was deported to France and died in prison in 1803. But victory over further
insurrections was not forthcoming, and Leclerc himself died from yellow fever in October 1802.
Furthermore, despite its unprecedented colonial efforts, Napoleonic France was to lose all its
overseas possessions by 1811.46

With Napoleon’s colonial policy bringing France once again into the overseas military
arena, pro-slavery opinions became dominant around 1801-1802.47 The Mercure de France
became the principal agent of pro-slavery propaganda led by Chateaubriand and Louis de
Fontanes, who defended Napoleon’s intervention in Saint-Domingue. They attempted to
counter the Enlightenment’s idea of universal human rights:

It has been repeated that the Blacks were like the others, and that their enslavement was an
affront to humanity, and this maxim has been dominating our thoughts in the name of
humanity; as much as this word has authority, so the appearance of reason often confuses
reason and even the conscience.48

The Mercure also advocated the necessity of slavery for the sake of France’s foreign trade and
the restoration of its overseas empire. The authors routinely blamed the supporters of freeborn
rights and the abolitionists like the Amis des Noirs as the cause of civil violence in the colonies
and of economic set-back, attacking their ideologies as being ‘more damaging than the war’.49

46 See Branda and Lentz, ‘L’héritage. La politique coloniale de l’Ancien Régime et de la Révolution’, in
Napoléon, l’esclavage et les colonies; Benot, La Démence coloniale.
48 ‘On a répété que les Noirs étaient des hommes comme les autres, l’humanité était outragée par leur
asservissement, et cette maxime a subjugué tous les esprits au nom de l’humanité, tant ce mot a de
pouvoir, tant l’apparence de la raison déconcerte souvent la raison et la conscience même.’ Mercure de
France, 21 July 1802, 217, quoted in Benot, La Démence coloniale sous Napoléon, 194.
49 Mercure de France, 18 December 1802, quoted in Benot, La Démence coloniale sous Napoléon, 195.
Similarly, in line with the restoration of Catholicism by the regime, the idea that religious hypocrisy could be behind the imperial enterprises was refuted. Conscious of the recent Concordat, an article on 4 June 1802 in the Mercure claimed that slavery is simply necessary for ensuring peace for the French colonists:

According to them [British journalists] the law concerning the condition of non-emancipated Blacks, contradicts philosophy, but also Christianity. At a time when religion is being re-established, the law does not make sense to them. Likewise, to honour a religion which promotes peace and humanism, in Martinique, Sainte-Lucie, and the Ile de France, one had to liberate a race whose customs were not entirely proper and thereby ensure the definite ruin and inevitable massacre of the Whites in these colonies.50

In a similar vein, Chateaubriand defended Christian missionaries against claims of complicity in colonial oppression, while also maintaining that these missionaries defended the cause ‘of slaves, the powerless, and the poor’, 51 in their accounts of the New World. Chateaubriand stated that ‘the intelligent and religious voice in which the missionaries spoke of Negroes in our colonies, was the only thing worthy of reason and humanism’. 52 Yet by explicitly rejecting negrophilia, he sanctioned sterner measures against black people:

With big words [ie. reason and humanism] we have lost everything: we have even ceased to be merciful, since who would still dare to appeal for the cause of the Blacks, in spite of the crimes they have committed?53

Yves Benot’s study has shown that the persistent critics of Napoleon’s colonial wars were however present during the period, as well as the anti-slavery minorities. 54 The debate was led by La Décade philosophique, littéraire et politique (later La Revue philosophique), which Napoleon forced to merge with the Mercure in 1807, and the Annales de la religion, edited by

50 Mercure de France, 4 June 1802, 414-415, quoted in Benot, La Démence coloniale sous Napoléon, 193.
52 ‘Le ton sensible et religieux dont les missionnaires parlaient des Nègres de nos colonies était le seul qui s’accordât avec la raison et l’humanité.’ Ibid., 164.
53 ‘Avec de grands mots on a tout perdu: on a étéint jusqu’à la pitié; car qui oserait encore plaider la cause des noirs, après les crimes qu’ils ont commis?’ Ibid.
54 See Benot, La Démence coloniale sous Napoléon.
former revolutionaries like Pierre-Louis Ginguené and Henri Grégoire. Napoleon’s entourage itself also included some former revolutionaries who continued to oppose colonialism. His legislative body, the Council of State for instance, made some staunch opposition to his colonial policy, as did the figure of Laurent Truguet, one of Napoleon’s associates in the coup d’état of 1799. In December 1799 and January 1800, Truguet famously addressed personal reports to Napoleon, intervening in his latest policy for Saint-Domingue. Another associate in the coup d’état, Pierre-Louis Ginguené, similarly was a member of the Tribunate,\textsuperscript{55} from which Napoleon eliminated him in 1802. Ginguené famously defended the Enlightenment against Chateaubriand: ‘Who would still dare to appeal for the cause of the Blacks, in spite of the crimes they have committed? Who? Every rational and intelligent individual, every supporter of humanism.’\textsuperscript{56} In 1805, Ginguené closed his lectures on the history of Italian literature by referring to the history of conquest in the New World. For Ginguené (speaking in the wake of the recent war in Saint-Domingue), the conquest still stood as a process of absolute violence and destruction:

Happy are men when they are led only by noble sentiments, when a vile thirst for gold does not guide them, or bring about ruin, devastation, further human failings, fatal calamity, the inexhaustible outpouring of human blood, the extinction of entire races, slavery of other races, with the most atrocious barbarities and, further in the future, the vengeance of these excesses by no less horrific atrocities! But such is the wretched condition of man.\textsuperscript{57}

In contrast to France’s new policies on slavery, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, slavery was abolished in Denmark in 1802 and in Britain and in the United States in 1807. A year before the British abolition of slavery, Charles James Fox, a prominent Whig politician and

\textsuperscript{55} Pierre-Louis Ginguené (1748-1816) was a co-editor of the Encyclopédie méthodique, Musique, 2 vols. (Paris : 1791-1818), together with Nicolas-Étienne Framery and Jérôme-Joseph de Momigny.

\textsuperscript{56} Quoted in Benot, La Démence coloniale sous Napoléon, 246.

\textsuperscript{57} ‘Heureux les hommes s’il n’y étaient conduits que par ces nobles passions, si la vile soif de l’or ne les guidait pas, si elle n’entraînait à sa suite la ruine, la dévastation, les infirmités nouvelles, les fléaux destructeurs, l’intarissable effusion de sang humain, l’extinction de races entières, l’esclavage d’autres races, accompagné des plus atroces barbaries, et, dans le lointain, la vengeance de ces excès par des atrocités non moins horribles! Mais telle est la malheureuse condition de l’homme.’ Quoted in Benot, La Démence coloniale sous Napoléon, 247-8.
a radical abolitionist died, and in 1807 a French translation of his biography *Vie de Fox* was published. The book praised Fox’s sustained campaign against the slave trade since 1791, paving the way for the recent abolition. Stimulated by this new development, in France, around 1808-1810, the question of colonialism returned. Seizing this opportunity, in 1808, Henri Grégoire published his *De la littérature des nègres*, urging France to follow the examples of other European imperial powers:59

Although the outcry of humanism rises from all sides against the hideous crime of slave trade and slavery, and although Denmark, England and the United States repel each other, we in France still dare to solicit its re-establishment, despite the decrees issued and those words proclaimed by the Head of State to the Negroes of Saint-Domingue: ‘You are all equal and free before God and the Republic.’60

III

After the Peace of Tilsit (25 June 1807), Napoleon virtually gained total dominance over continental Europe. The alliance formed with Russia at Tilsit gave Napoleon a new hope of defeating Britain. He subsequently conceived of the ‘staggering plans to thrust French and Russian troops into Spain and the Balkans, through Gibraltar and Constantinople into Africa, and finally to India, wiping out Britain’s commercial interests and strategic bases’.61 Napoleon thus turned his attention to the Peninsula, initially to Portugal, Britain’s last remaining ally on the Continent. Manuel Godoy, scheming First Minister of Spanish King Charles IV, and who

59 He was a member of the *Amis des Noirs*, which Napoleon suppressed in 1799. See Lawrence C. Jennings, *French Anti-Slavery, the Movement for the Abolition of Slavery in France, 1802–1848*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000, 3.
60 ‘Quoique le cri de l’humanité s’élève de toutes parts contre les forfaits de la traite et de l’esclavage; quoique le Danemark, l’Angleterre, les États-Unis repoussent l’une et l’autre, on ose chez nous en solliciter le rétablissement, malgré les décrets rendus, et ces mots de la proclamation du chef de l’État aux nègres de Saint-Domingue: “Vous êtes tous égaux et libres devant Dieu et devant la République.”’ Henri Grégoire, *De la littérature des nègres*, Paris: Maradan, 1808, 55, quoted in Benot, *La Démence coloniale sous Napoléon*, 261. I follow Kate Marsh who uses ‘England’ and ‘the English’ (when Britain or the British were meant) only when translating from the French ‘Angleterre’ and ‘les Anglais’.
virtually held autocratic leadership of the State, conspired with Napoleon to invade Portugal (November 1807), in view of subsequently crushing the Spanish monarchy. By March 1808, French troops seized control of major frontier fortresses in northern Spain, and as Ferdinand VII\textsuperscript{62}, whom Napoleon summoned to Bayonne to be coerced into abdication, finally surrendered to pressure, Charles IV, the Queen and Godoy were exiled to France. Napoleon signed a decree appointing his elder brother Joseph to the Spanish throne on 6 May 1808. The forced abdication of the popular king Ferdinand and the prospect of French annexation provoked huge Spanish patriotic sentiment, and by the beginning of June 1808 Spain was already in a nationwide revolt against Napoleon. This was the moment when the Cortez project was proposed to Ésmenard (see p.38), Napoleon’s close ally, presumably by the Emperor, acting though Fouché. The French defeat at Bailen (21 July 1808) had a significant impact on its European prestige, leading to the re-forming of anti-French policies in the allies. The British government, seizing an opportunity for their intervention in the Continent, devoted its significant expenditure to a massive military operation in the Peninsula (for the next six years), at the expense of its growing financial crisis. In October 1809 when a new government was formed under Spencer Perceval, a serious reform of the government’s wartime budget had to be considered. Between the end of August 1809 and the end of June 1810, Britain made little progress against the French army. In October 1809, in the hope of bringing an end to the war, Napoleon assembled 140,000 reinforcement troops for Spain. Nevertheless, as the year 1810 began, Napoleon increasingly believed that the French could never take Spain without ousting Wellington’s army from Portugal, and he again raised another expedition of 130,000 troops to Portugal in spring 1810. Yet Wellington’s preparations for the threat of French invasion proved effective, so at the end of 1810, the French army continued to struggle to take Lisbon and was retreating to Santarém, to the northeast of the city.\textsuperscript{63}

\textsuperscript{62} The son of Charles IV, who had abdicated. He took the throne in March 1808, after a series of domestic intrigues.

\textsuperscript{63} See Muir, \textit{Britain and the Defeat of Napoleon}; Chandler, \textit{The Campaigns of Napoleon}; Gates, \textit{The
This was the state of affairs of the Franco-Spanish war at around the time of the first performance of *Fernand Cortez* on 28 November 1809. The impact of the war is evident in an outbreak of other productions based on Spanish subjects (some treated the recent events) in Parisian theatres in 1809, when, as we saw, the conflict was still in its early days. The following works were given in 1809:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title of the work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Jan</td>
<td>Gaité</td>
<td>Pixérécourt</td>
<td>Alexandre Piccini</td>
<td><em>La Citerne, Mélodrame</em>⁶⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Jan</td>
<td>Cirque Olympique</td>
<td>Cuvelier</td>
<td>D’Haussy</td>
<td><em>La belle Espagnole, ou l’Entrée triomphale des Français dans Madrid</em>⁶⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Mar</td>
<td>Théâtre Italien</td>
<td>Lemercier</td>
<td>None</td>
<td><em>Christophe Colomb</em>⁶⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Mar</td>
<td>Vaudeville</td>
<td>Barré/Radet/Desfontaines</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td><em>Le Peintre français en Espagne, ou le Dernier soupir de l’Inquisition</em>⁶⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Mar</td>
<td>Cirque Olympique</td>
<td>Franconi</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td><em>La Prise de la Corogne, ou les Anglais en Espagne</em>⁶⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 May</td>
<td>Vaudeville</td>
<td>Barré/Radet/Desfontaines</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td><em>Le Procès du Fandango, ou la Fandangomanie</em>⁷⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Grosley</td>
<td>None</td>
<td><em>L’Entrée des Français à Madrid</em>⁷¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Nov</td>
<td>Opéra</td>
<td>Jouy/Ésmenard</td>
<td>Spontini</td>
<td><em>Fernand Cortez</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


⁶⁹ Henri Franconi, *La Prise de la Corogne, ou les Anglais en Espagne, scènes équestres*, Paris: Barba, 1809. The battle of Corunna (La Corogne) took place on 16 January 1809, when, having successfully evaded Napoleon’s pursuit, Sir John Moore’s army (Britain’s only field army in Spain) was in the final process of temporary evacuation to Britain at the port of Corunna. Moore was wounded in the battle and died, when the British nevertheless succeeded in completing their evacuation. After the battle, the French took possession of the port. See Chandler, *The Campaigns of Napoleon*, 643-658.


While the French troops were stationed in Madrid by April 1808, their initial occupation soon provoked a full-scale insurrection in May, and after a major French defeat at Bailen in July 1808, Joseph Napoleon retracted from Madrid. The French however managed to re-enter Madrid on 4 December 1808 after an intense bombardment. Joseph was restored to the capital, and Napoleon regarded his Spanish campaign as practically complete.72 Two productions, La belle Espagnole and Grosley’s L’Entrée des Français à Madrid should have celebrated this recent victory. Grosley’s L’Entrée des Français à Madrid glorifies the establishment of Napoleonic rule in Madrid, promising peace and its fair governance.73

Le Peintre français en Espagne, ou le Dernier soupir de l’Inquisition by Barré and others initiated nationalist propaganda by also depicting the recent French victory in Madrid. Kate Marsh has observed that the situation of French colonial struggle in India in the second half of the eighteenth century was likewise characterised by a triangular power relationship between France, Britain and India, and that the relationship was often reflected in contemporary French literary representations of India, as in Jouy’s tragedy Tippô-Saëb, discussed below.74 Le Peintre Français offers a crude representation of France’s rivalry with Britain played out in Spain, in favour of France. An Englishman commissions an allegorical painting from a French painter (disguised as a Castilian), depicting an English leopard (‘léopard anglais’) devouring a French eagle captured by a Spanish lion. The painter, however, produces a painting which depicts a French eagle sparing his pray, a Spanish lion, and he claims that this will soon become a reality.75 As Marsh also observed, since 1770s and 1780s the Franco-British rivalry in India had generated a pervasive colonial rhetoric in France, that its presence in India was designed to liberate the Indians from British colonial oppression.76 The same rhetoric is used in Le Peintre Français, and the French victory in Madrid is claimed not only to have been welcomed by the

---

72 See Chandler, ibid., 642-643.
73 Grosley, L’Entrée des Français à Madrid, 33.
74 Marsh, India in the French imagination.
75 Radet and others, Le Peintre français, Act I/ 3.
76 Marsh, India in the French imagination, 129-137.
Spanish nation, but also to have liberated the Spanish from British oppression: ‘The people of Madrid enthusiastically took the oath of loyalty for King Joseph Napoleon, and at every possible opportunity they show the greatest joy of being liberated from the yoke of English tyranny’. Moreover the play also refers to the theme of religious fanaticism. It however turns Diderot’s and Marmontel’s anticlericalism on its head, as did Jouy’s Cortez, claiming that the French bring civilization to superstitious Spain. The French painter is captured, and due to be executed by an agent of the Inquisition. However, the French troops save him, and the Englishman, of course, has no role to play in the final celebration that promises an enduring friendship between France and Spain.

In stark contrast, Népomucène-Louis Lemercier’s representation of the doomed exploration voyage of Christophe Colomb may be easily seen as a warning against developments in the Peninsula, revealing a division of opinions. Columbus faces opposition and, to begin with, his wife thinks that he ‘has a troubled mind’, ‘possessed by a demon’. At Queen Isabella’s court in Granada, one of the courtiers also expresses his objection: ‘Are we going to recklessly engage the navy,/ Only to steer the vessels to their ruin?/…/ In the name of Isabelle, to her reign, to her State/ This reputable era adds enough brilliance/ We strive for living in peace after the war,/ And not to travel to the land of dreams’. The play ends with a destruction of Columbus’s vessel in a shipwreck. Lemercier, a republican, and Napoleon fell out when he crowned himself Emperor in 1804.

---

77 In reality, the Spanish resistance resumed shortly afterwards. See Chandler, The Campaigns of Napoleon, 653.
78 ‘Le peuple de Madrid a prêté avec enthousiasme le serment de fidélité au roi Joseph Napoléon et tous à l’envi, manifestent la joie la plus vive d’être délivrés du joug des Anglais.’ Radet and others, Le Peintre français, 36.
79 Ibid., 34-37.
80 ‘Ira-t-on, sans prudence, engager la marine/ À livrer ses vaisseaux conduits à leur ruine?/…/ Au grand nom d’Isabelle, à son règne, à l’État,/ Cette époque célèbre ajoute assez d’éclat./ C’est à jouir en paix qu’on tend après les guerres,/ Et non à voyager au pays des chimères.’ Lemercier, Christophe Colomb, Act II, 2.
According to Jouy, when Napoleon returned from the battle of Wagram (July 1809), he took the opportunity of the forthcoming production of Jouy’s new opera to promote his recent victory. Meanwhile, Joseph Fouché, Minister of Police, instructed Joseph-Alphonse Ésmenard at the censorship to make changes to the proposed libretto, thereby reshaping the opera into a pièce de circonstance.

Yet Ésmenard referred to an opera based on the Spanish conquest in the New World in a letter of 6 May 1808 (the same day that Napoleon signed his decree appointing Joseph Bonaparte to the Spanish throne) to Fouché, asking for an extra monthly payment of 1,000 francs: ‘Your Excellency, while ordering me to occupy myself immediately and exclusively with the opera entitled La Conquête du nouveau monde, has acknowledged that I cannot give up the labours required for the support of a numerous family and maintain it only with the slight resources of a position paying 6,000 francs, etc’. The letter not only reveals that the commission was made in direct response to the latest development in Spain, and that the regime sought to exploit the history of Spanish conquest for their imperialist propaganda; it confirms Ésmenard’s readiness to capitalise on the regime’s own interest in exploiting opera for political

82 Napoleon left Spain, the day after the battle of Corunna (16 January 1809). He then led the army to fight afresh the Austrian war from April to July 1809. Austria accepted a harsh peace treaty after the defeat at the battle of Wagram (5-6 July).
83 Jouy, ‘Notes anecdotiques’, Fernand Cortez, OC, vol.19, 105. Joseph-Alphonse Ésmenard (b 7 Nov 1767; d 25 Jun 1811), born in Pélissanne (Bouches-du-Rhône), and the son of a magistrate, was educated at the oratory at Marseille. His biography also presents a number of colonial experiences: he travelled to the Americas and to Saint-Domingue before the Revolution, and he is said to have met Marmontel on his return to France and written a libretto based on Marmontel’s novel Les Incas. Ésmenard was outlawed on 10 August 1792 for his royalist newspaper articles, and went into exile in several European countries until 1797. After the coup d’état of 1799, he became Napoleon’s close ally. Ésmenard actually accompanied Leclerc on the expedition to Saint-Domingue as his secretary, and between 1803 and 1805 he held the post of Consul in Saint-Thomas in the West Indies. Ésmenard was a member of Le Bureau de la presse from 1806, and the head of the third division of the Police from 1808. His contemporaries regarded him as Napoleon’s official poet and police spy and yet, in 1811, despite his loyalty, as the rupture with Russia was brewing, he was disgraced by Napoleon and ordered to leave France, after the Russian ambassador objected to Ésmenard’s satire aimed at an envoy of Emperor Alexander I. On his way back to France three months later, Ésmenard was injured in a carriage accident in Naples, and died a few days later. (See ‘Ésmenard (Joseph-Alphonse)’, Biographie universelle ancienne et moderne, second edition, ed. Michaud, Paris: Desplaces, 1855, vol.13, 40-41; ‘Ésmenard (Joseph-Alphonse)’, Nouvelle biographie générale : depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu’à nos jours, ed. Ferdinand Hoefer, Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1858, vol.16, 389-391; Chaillou, Napoléon et l’Opéra, 238-240; Henri Welschinger, La Censure sous le Premier Empire, Paris: Charavay, 1882, 62-65.)
84 Quoted in Welschinger, La Censure sous le Premier Empire, 63, translated in Libby, Gaspare Spontini, 109.
propaganda, and in responding immediately to foreign events.

As regards Jouy’s own account of the opera (fn. 83), which does not mention the original commission of Cortez from Ésmenard, Jouy was happy to take the credit, many years later, when the 1817 version had established itself as a repertory piece. As a matter of record, the estimate of the staging costs for Cortez was approved on 25 July 1808 by Picard. This nevertheless was approved only much later by Rémusat, in a letter to Picard addressed on 27 January 1809. And the next day, when Picard arranged a committee meeting to hear the libretto, both Ésmenard and Jouy were invited.

In 1807 Ésmenard had produced the libretto for Le Triomphe de Trajan for

85 See ‘Devis approximatif de la dépense pour la mise au théâtre de l’opéra Fernand Cortez’, 25 July 1808, F-Pan, AJ15 92. Louis-Benoît Picard (b 29 Jul 1769; d 31 Dec 1828) was an astoundingly prolific dramatist whose literary output (around 80 works) was largely devoted to comedies and opéras-comiques. Born in Paris, and the son of a magistrate, Picard abandoned his law studies to embark on a dramatist career which began with Le Badinage dangereux (comédie; 1) premiered on 27 November 1789 at the Théâtre de Monsieur (Feydeau). He was also an actor between 1797 and 1807. In 1801, he became the head of a theatre troupe resident at the Théâtre Louvois and in 1804, became also the director of the Théâtre Italien. Following the success of Un jeu de la fortune ou les Marionnettes (comédie; 3) premiered there on 14 May 1806, Napoleon demanded him to perform the piece at Saint-Cloud. On 13 April 1807 he became a member of the jury de lecture of the Opéra, and abandoned the acting career after his appointment as the director of the Opéra on 9 November 1807. The same month, his reception to the Académie française also took place (on 24 Nov). As a result of his loyalty to the Empire, at the Second Restoration, he was replaced as the director of the Opéra by Louis Victoire Papillon de la Ferté on 8 Jly 1815. On 1 November 1815, Picard was nevertheless appointed as the director of the Odéon, which he left in 1821, and under the new decree issued on 26 August 1816, became a member of the Opéra’s literary jury, in which position he remained until his death. (See Chaillou, Napoléon et l’Opéra, 48-62; Biographie universelle ancienne et moderne, vol.33, 175-180; Nouvelle biographie générale, vol.40, 49-53; Gabriel Vauthier, ‘Le Jury de lecture et l’Opéra sous la Restauration’, La Revue musicale 10 (1992), 15, 20, 24, and 78.)

86 Augustin-Laurent de Rémusat (b 28 Aug 1762; d 15 May 1823) was born into an old aristocratic family in Valensole (Alpes-de-Haute-Provence). At around 20, he began his career as an avocat général at the Court of Accounts in Provence. After the suppression of the sovereign courts in 1790, he was sent to Paris. In 1796 he married Claire de Vergennes, whose flight from Paris (following the execution of her father and brother during the Terror) with her mother and her sister he had accompanied. Through Claire’s mother who was an old friend of Josephine, he met Napoleon, who named him Préfet du Palais in 1802, First Chamberlain in 1804, then surintendant des spectacles in 1807. After 1810, his relationship with Napoleon deteriorated. During the Hundred Days, he was exiled by Napoleon from Paris. Under the Second Restoration, he was made Préfet of Haute-Garonne in 1815, then of the department of Nord in 1817. He was discharged from the post in 1822. (See Chaillou, Napoléon et l’Opéra, 40-48; Nouvelle biographie générale, vol.41, 976.)

87 Picard, letter to Ésmenard, Jouy and Spontini, 28 January 1809, F-Pan, AJ13 92.

Louis-Luc Loiseau de Persuis and Jean-François Le Sueur at Napoleon’s request. The opera was intended similarly as a piece of propaganda and it celebrated the clemency Napoleon granted to a Prussian lieutenant general Hatzfeld, who was arrested as a spy after his secret report to the Prussian king fell into Napoleon’s hands in October 1806, shortly after the battle of Jena. Napoleon burnt his report informing the king of the numbers of French troops advancing towards Berlin, in front of Hatzfeld’s wife, whose personal appeal swayed Napoleon. The libretto treats the Roman Empire’s conflict with Dacia, and in a transparent allegory, Trajan spares the life of Décébal - a Dacian prince and Trajan’s prisoner in Rome - who plotted Trajan’s assassination, by burning a letter proving the conspiracy. Again, the regime’s eagerness to exploit the recent event is evident, as the project of the opera was set up by early December 1806, and its premiere was scheduled on 16 August 1807. In order to accelerate the preparation, Persuis was allowed to suspend his singing lessons at the Conservatoire, and Fouché interrupted the staging of *La Vestale*, yet the deadline proved to be too tight, and the premiere only took place on 23 October 1807. Its lavish staging was unprecedented: the total cost of costumes, originally estimated at 30,000 francs, amounted to the sum of 72,000. The Franconi brothers, who were to provide nine horses for Trajan’s spectacular procession in the last scene of Act II, finally supplied thirteen horses. Moreover, the vogue of classicism in the arts was also apparent in the staging of *Le Triomphe de Trajan* (the sets presented ‘trophies, triumphal arches, ancient altars, lictors and vestals’) as part of the regime’s propaganda, which sought to define its own image by associating itself with the grandeur of the Roman Empire.

89 Louis-Luc Loiseau de Persuis (b 4 Jul 1769; d 20 Dec 1819), born in Metz to a father who was a composer and choirmaster, rose to prominence as a composer (mainly of the stage works), chorus master and conductor of the Opéra during the Empire. His another pièce de circonstance, also composed in collaboration with Le Sueur, *L’Inauguration du temple de la Victoire*, as well as a ballet *Le Retour d’Ulysse*, whose subject was proposed to the Opéra’s choreographer Pierre-Gabriel Gardel by Napoleon himself, had been premiered earlier in 1807. His *Jérusalem délivrée* of 1812 was dedicated to Napoleon’s second empress Marie-Louise. (Cf. Chaillou, *Napoléon et l’Opéra*, 82-85; Jean Mongrédien and Laurine Quetin, ‘Persuis, Louis-Luc Loiseau de’, Grove Music Online.)

90 Mongrédien, *Jean-François Le Sueur*, 664.

91 Ibid., 665-666.


Fernand Cortez was staged with much greater extravagance, as suggested by the staging cost estimated at 180,000 francs. As regards the estimate for the costumes, it was calculated at 90,586 francs, also higher than the sum expended for the costumes of Le Triomphe de Trajan. Since the Opéra owned no costumes reusable for Cortez, all costumes were created from scratch. Its impressive and exotic sets presented Cortez’s camp with an imperial pavilion that had a throne of Charles V (the Holy Roman Emperor, 1519-1556) decorated with his portrait (Act I); a mountainous landscape of Mexico with torrents cascading down the cliff into the lake (Act II); the Aztec temple (Act III). The Franconi brothers were engaged again for a higher fee to supply fourteen horses to perform a military pageant of Cortez’s Spanish cavalry.

Rémusat wrote on 27 January 1809 to Picard that ‘it is the intention of the Emperor to present Cortez as soon as possible’, and instructed Picard to begin the preparations at once. As had occurred in the staging process of Le Triomphe de Trajan, he suggested interrupting the project of Les Bayadères, so that Cortez could be premiered ‘in three months time at the latest’. While accepting the Opéra’s proposal of the costs of 180,000 francs, Rémusat nevertheless reminded Picard that Napoleon had set the opera’s budget at 50,000 francs, yet assured him at the same time that it could easily be doubled. Although the planning of Cortez was taking place in the summer of 1808, as we saw earlier, it seems that the project had not been progressing, as hereafter until the premiere, the scene painters and Spontini were constantly working under pressure. Their delays were the regular subject of Picard’s reports

94 See ‘Devis approximatif’, fn. 85.
95 Mongrédié, Jean-François Le Sueur, 735, fn. 13.
97 According to the contract, for Le Triomphe de Trajan, the Franconi brothers were to receive 850 francs per performance for the first six shows, then 425 francs for the later shows. (See Mongrédié, Jean-François Le Sueur, 666.) For Cortez, the contract stated that the sum of 6,000 francs was to be paid for the first six shows, and 500 francs thereafter. (See Article 1 of the original contract signed by Henri Franconi, 1 July 1809, F-Pan, AJ13 92.)
99 Jouy’s libretto had been accepted at the Opéra on 7 November 1807. See ‘Jury de lecture: Procès-verbaux des séances’, F-Po, AD23 (535).
submitted to Rémusat. Despite Rémusat’s insisting on the date of the premiere, which was planned to coincide with Napoleon’s arrival in Paris, it had to be deferred several times (as it was also the case for Le Triomphe de Trajan). The delays in the preparation seem to have been unforeseen, and even though they did not seem to have created problems for Le Triomphe de Trajan, they may have worked to Cortez’s disadvantage. All the theatre productions on Spanish themes (those whose dates of premiere are indicated in the list above) were given by the spring. During April to July 1809, Napoleon was already fighting the Austrian war, and the opera may have missed the initial wave of the public’s interest in the Spanish campaign generated by some victories, although it should have still been of current French political interest in November 1809.

It seems appropriate at this point to revise the traditional account of reception surrounding the 1809 version of Cortez, suggesting the direct link between the opera’s lack of success and the Spanish war crisis, as it was mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. It may be noted that Picard was very pleased with the premiere, writing to the committee the next day that ‘the performance was perfect and the success of this work is, for the artists, the most flattering reward for their efforts’. The opera’s success was also mentioned in the daily bulletin of the ministry of police submitted to Napoleon on 30 November 1809. Although Fernand Cortez’s daily takings at the box office were in general similar to Les Bayadères, after the first month the number of performances dropped to one or two per month (see below), whereas Les Bayadères continued to be shown four times in its second and third months, and was thereafter shown at far more regular intervals (performed every month, more often twice)

---

100 The progress up to the premiere is followed in Patrick Barbier, Spontini à Paris, 155-161.
101 ‘L’exécution a été parfaite et le succès de cet ouvrage est pour les artistes la récompense la plus flatteuse de tous leurs efforts.’ Picard, letter to chorus masters, principal ballet master and conductor, 29 November 1809, F-Pan, A J13 92.
102 See Ernest d’Hauterive, La Police secrète du Premier Empire, bulletins quotidiens adressés par Fouché à l’Empereur, nouvelle série 1809-1810, Paris: Clavreuil, 1964, 257. This was the only occasion Fernand Cortez was mentioned in the bulletin, between 28 November 1809 and June 1812. Also see Nicole Gotteri, La Police secrète du Premier Empire, bulletins quotidiens adressés par Savary à l’Empereur, 4 vols., Paris: Champion, 1997-2000, which cover the period under the next Minister of Police, Anne-Jean-Marie-René Savary, following the disgrace of Fouché at the end of May 1810.
throughout 1811. Alluding to the link between the interruption of shows and the situation of the war, Libby erroneously indicated that after its thirteenth performance in February 1810, the production was suspended for five months. He then noted that it was when ‘Napoleon was still deep in the Spanish problem’, even though ‘the official reason given was the indisposition of the prima donna Mme. Branchu’. Libby also surmised that by the end of 1810, the war had passed its crisis. The following table lists the complete dates of performances during the Empire:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1809</th>
<th>1810</th>
<th>1811</th>
<th>1812</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 Nov</td>
<td>2 Jan</td>
<td>18 Jan</td>
<td>21, 24 Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 5, 15, 22 Dec</td>
<td>2, 27 Feb</td>
<td>30 Apr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 9 Mar</td>
<td>27 Apr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 19 Jun</td>
<td>13, 27 Jul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 11 Sept</td>
<td>13 Nov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Libby in fact cited a letter which Spontini addressed to Picard (undated but probably written in 1810), asking desperately for the reason of frequent interruptions to the performances:

Cortez was suspended for five months because of illnesses and other circumstances. Since then you have given it once, and with all the women in good health it has still been suspended for the past two weeks and until further notice. Yet last time it earned 5050 francs for you. What unlucky star is it then that shines upon this unfortunate work? Or what muddled-headedness prevents the realisation of the good it has done for the box office and the terrible injustice that is being done to it? We have now two women to sing it. I hope, my dear Picard, that you will give consideration to this request and to a work which deserves it as much as any other.

103 Journal de l’Opéra (1791-1850), F-Po, 3306.
104 Libby, *Gaspare Spontini*, 111. Caroline Branchu sang the role of Amazily.
105 Ibid, 111-112.
106 Journal de l’Opéra, F-Po, 3306.
107 ‘Cortez a été suspendu pendant cinq mois pour maladies et autres circonstances, vous l’avez donné depuis une fois, et avec toutes les femmes bien portantes le voilà encore accroché depuis quinze jours jusqu’à nouvel ordre, il vous a cependant produit la dernière fois cinq mille cinquante francs: quelle mauvaise étoile lui donc pour ce malheureux ouvrage? Ou quel vertige peut empêcher de voir le bien qu’il fait à la caisse, et l’injustice affreuse de qu’on lui fait. Il y a maintenant deux femmes pour le jouer. J’espère mon cher Picard que vous voudrez bien avoir égard à la demande et à l’ouvrage qui le mérite.
‘Five months’ could have been a simple error for five ‘weeks’ referring to the period between 9 March and 27 April when two singers were reported to be ill. Less than two months after the premiere, on 16 January, the Journal de l’Empire had reported that performances were suspended due to ‘the indisposition of Mme Branchu’. In the report of 4 March, we learn that the performances had been resumed with a younger singer, Mlle Hymm as Amazily. While its author praised her that ‘Mlle Hymm has a beautiful figure, good stature, beautiful voice, a good technique’, in short, ‘she has everything it takes to please the eye and satisfy the ear’, he maintained that ‘she has not yet learned to speak to the soul’. Rémusat, in a letter sent on 23 April to Picard, however complained not only about the long illness of Branchu, who ‘is holding up a large number of productions’, but also Hymm’s illness. He insinuated that Branchu’s absence was simply due to her laziness, and asked Picard to persuade her to return promptly. (It was only in the performance of 1 June that Mme Branchu returned to the role of Amazily.) Rémusat even stated that it was imperative that the Conservatoire provide them some singers, ‘if it does not wish that I accuse it of incompetence in front of the Emperor’. He hoped that at least Hymn would return, and that performances would resume, adding that the opera had suffered many set-backs and hadn’t had its proper run. Earlier in April, Rémusat had also instructed Picard to give two free performances of Cortez (on 1st and 3rd), to mark the occasion of Napoleon’s marriage to Marie-Louise. All these aspects indicate that around April 1810, the shows were indeed interrupted due to the illness of singers, and that the opera was not awkwardly associated with the war in Spain.

The following, however, may also be connected to the low number of Cortez’s

---

autant qu’un autre.’ Spontini, letter to Picard, GB-Lbl, Additional Manuscript 33965, f. 392. Cf. the translated version in Libby, Gaspare Spontini, 112–113. Libby omitted the line referring to two singers.

106 Journal de l’Empire, 16 January 1810.

109 Journal de l’Empire, 4 March 1810. The author of the article ‘Académie Impériale de Musique: seconde représentation de l’Abel’ (Journal de l’Empire, 31 March 1810) regretted that ‘the brilliant destinies of Fernando Cortez were suddenly thwarted by the illness of Mme. Branchu.’

110 Journal de l’Empire, 5 June 1810.

111 ‘S’il ne veut pas que je l’accuse devant l’Empereur d’inutilité.’ Rémusat, letter to Picard, 23 April 1810, F-Pan, AJ 76.

112 Ibid.
performances in the early months of 1810. The record shows that the staging of \textit{Cortez} had given rise to some practical problems. Picard wrote to Rémusat on 20 January 1810 to address some issues raised in two reports of the head of stage machinery, Étienne Boutron.\footnote{Picard, letter to Rémusat, 20 January 1810, F-Pan, AJ\textsuperscript{13} 76.} On 29 December 1809, Boutron reported to Picard that due to the performances of \textit{Cortez} which required the workmen of the \textit{menuiserie} to be in the theatre, there had been no progress in the atelier since its premiere, which meant that the preparation for \textit{La Mort d’Abel} (premiered on 23 March 1810) and \textit{L’Enlèvement des Sabines} (26 June 1811) had been suspended. He informed him that until the premiere of \textit{La Double épreuve, ou Colinette à la cour}\footnote{It was first presented at the Opéra in 1782. The libretto was written by Jean-Baptiste Lourdet de Santerre, and was set to music by Grétry. It returned to the Opéra in a revival-premiere on 20 January 1811. See the online Chronopera database at http://chronopera.free.fr.} the work on these two projects could not resume, and that even after its premiere, if the situation continued to require the workmen to be at the theatre, external workmen would be needed in order to finish the work waiting at the atelier.\footnote{Étienne Boutron, ‘Rapport’, 29 December 1809, F-Pan, AJ\textsuperscript{13} 76.} On 19 January 1810, Boutron addressed another report to Picard, informing him this time that the workforce at the \textit{menuiserie} was insufficient for the repair of the structure of the theatre, which had been worn away by the recent performances of \textit{Cortez}. Boutron requested Picard’s prompt authorisation to recruit extra workers.\footnote{Boutron, ‘Rapport du machiniste en chef à Monsieur le Directeur de l’Académie impériale de musique’, 19 January 1810, F-Pan, AJ\textsuperscript{13} 76.} The next day, Picard hence requested Rémusat’s approval, and also a special permission to close the Opéra for a month, between 10 July and 10 August, so that necessary repairs could take place. Rémusat did not respond to this request until 23 April, when he only reassured Picard that the request would be mentioned to the Emperor. Did the administration decide to keep the low number of \textit{Cortez} performances, in order to speed up the preparation of other productions? The list above also shows that there was no performance of \textit{Cortez} between 27 July and 4 September. This interruption may have been due to the absence of Franconi brothers: only on 24 August, did Picard instruct Spontini and the Opéra’s principal ballet master...
Pierre-Gabriel Gardel to make the necessary cuts to the opera, so that the performance could take place without involving the Franconi brothers, who, he wrote, were not in Paris at the time.117 On 10 September, the Journal de l’Empire reported that the recent resumption of Cortez was marked by three absences: of the Franconis, who were performing in Brussels, of Lainez (he created Cortez), who had other engagement in Bordeaux, and of Branchu, who was singing the role of Laméa in the recently opened opera Les Bayadères (premiered on 8 August) and could not sing the two roles at the same time.118

Yet after two shows in January 1812, the performances ceased completely until its revival in 1817. I found no document to prove the intervention by the regime. What David Chaillou has shown, however, seems relevant to the abrupt shelving of Cortez: in 1812, both Picard and le Bureau de la presse became vigilant against potential provocations in their operas against the Spanish war.119 In reality, during the year 1812, the situation of the war had worsened dramatically with Wellington’s victories. He relaunched a campaign in the beginning of 1812, and Madrid was liberated on 12 August. To put this into a wider context: The epic French retreat from Moscow started by the middle of October. The British victories in Spain in 1812 set off the shift in the balance of power on the Continent, never to be restored in Napoleon’s favour.120 According to Chaillou, on 13 December 1811 Picard submitted a copy of another libretto by Jouy based on the history of Spain, Les Abencérages, which treated the conflict of two Moorish tribes in the kingdom of Granada during the fifteenth century (the libretto had been accepted by the jury on 21 May 1810). The only correction of the censors was a deletion of a word ‘funeste’ in the verses ‘Laissons respirer la victoire,/ Funeste amante de guerriers (let us breathe victory/Doomed lovers of warriors)’ in Act I/5. On 15 October 1812 Picard, however, requested an exceptional second reading of the libretto to the censors, on the pretext that the copy that came back with the censors’ authorisation in December 1811 had

117 Picard, letter to Spontini and Gardel, 24 August 1810, F-Pan, AJ13 76.
118 Journal de l’Empire, 10 September 1810.
119 Chaillou, Napoléon et l’Opéra, 231-236.
120 See Muir, Britain and the Defeat of Napoleon, 193-231.
been lost. However, it still survives today in the file AJ\textsuperscript{13} 94 at the Archives nationales, and Chaillou therefore suggests that Picard’s unusual request should have been in direct response to the changed political circumstances. The censors this time concluded that ‘although the subject of the Abencéragés presents no allusion to the current events in Spain, we have nevertheless cut out the majority of expressions which could bring them to mind there’\textsuperscript{121}, erasing most references to ‘l’Espagnol’ or ‘l’Espagnols’ (in seven verses: replaced by ‘chevaliers’ or ‘le Chrétien’), and also the name ‘Ferdinand’ (in two verses), which was resonant with the memory of Ferdinand VII, dethroned in 1808.\textsuperscript{122} Jouy’s letter to the Opéra’s general secretary Courtin, on 13 October 1812, alludes to Picard’s reservations about his text.

His letter also suggests that Fernand Cortez may have become problematic in regard to the recent political situation:

It is impossible that even over-zealous circumspection could find either a single thought, or, I would say, even a word to regret in this work. In Fernand Cortez, I presented on stage the Spanish in the most glorious moment of their history: in Les Abencéragés, they appear only in the celebration in the first act, and they are mentioned just to announce the victory of the Moors over them. I also do not see what analogies to the feuds between the Zégris and the Abencéragés could ever be possible. […] if it is the case that they manage to find evidence for political censorship, we henceforth have to give up hope of writing even one innocent line.\textsuperscript{123}

When Jouy originally wrote Les Abencéragés, he nonetheless should have been responding politically to the topicality of the Spanish subject. His text for Les Abencéragés was approved

\textsuperscript{121} ‘Quoi que le sujet des Abencéragés n’offre aucune allusion avec les événements actuels de l’Espagne, on a néanmoins retranché la plupart des expressions qui pouvaient y reporter la pensée.’ Lemontey, d’Avrigny and Lacretelle, ‘procès-verbal’ of Les Abencéragés, 30 October 1812, F-Pan, F\textsuperscript{21} 969, quoted in Chaillou, Napoléon et l’Opéra, 235.
\textsuperscript{122} The first libretto published in 1813, however, retained the word ‘l’Espagnol’ (or ‘l’Espagnols’) in most places. See Les Abencéragés, ou L’étendard de Grenade, opéra en 3 actes, Paris: Roullet, 1813.
\textsuperscript{123} ‘Il est impossible que la circonspection la plus exagérée puisse trouver, je ne dis pas seulement une intention, mais un mot à craindre dans cet ouvrage. J’ai mis dans Fernand Cortez les Espagnols en scène à l’Époque la plus glorieuse de leur histoire: dans les Abencéragés, ils n’apparaissent que dans la fête du 1er acte et l’on n’en parle ailleurs que pour annoncer la victoire que les Maures ont remporté sur eux. Je ne vois pas d’ailleurs à quels rapprochements les querelles des Zégris et des Abencéragés pourraient jamais donner lieu. […] s’il est vrai qu’on parvienne à y trouver matière à censure politique il faut désespérer d’écrire désormais une seule ligne innocente.’ Jouy, letter to Courtin, 13 October 1812, F-Pan, AJ\textsuperscript{13} 94, quoted in Chaillou, Napoléon et l’Opéra, 234.
by the jury of the Opéra on 21 May 1810. As we have seen, at the time, the production of *Fernand Cortez* was arguably having a success. In the post-Napoleonic preface to *Les Abencérages*, Jouy quoted from a text which depicted the king Boabdil, the last Moorish ruler of Granada lamenting the siege of Alhama in 1482. An old man, however, approaches him and tells him that he well deserves this catastrophe, as he has been an equally cruel ruler, having ordered the extermination of the Abencerrages and chased away his own father, the old king. In the light of Jouy’s opposition to imperial wars, as seen in what follows, Jouy may have been invoking the history of civil war in Granada to indirectly generate a sympathetic public interest in the current plight of Spain.

IV

In his weekly articles under the nom de plume *L’Hermite de la Chaussée-d’Antin* for *La Gazette de France* between 1811 and 1814, Jouy reflected extensively on Parisian middle-class life, but he never mentioned Napoleon’s wars. As Jouy himself noted, *L’Hermite de la Chaussée-d’Antin* was conceived in the spirit of the Enlightenment which claimed social critics’ role in directing morality: ‘To prove that the profession of a man of letters is one of the states most honourable, it is said that his goal is to educate, amuse and correct the human race’. But as his word ‘amuse’ seems to determine the genre, Jouy’s criticisms were on lighter social issues like the vogue of somnambulism, the continuing tradition of fighting duels etc., and

---

124 Cf. F-Po, AD 23.
125 Jouy, ‘Préambule historique’, *Les Abencérages, opéra en trois actes, OC*, vol.19, 239-241. The preface to the original 1813 libretto is unusually brief (barely one page long). It only provided a brief plot summary. (See *Les Abencérages*, Roullet, 1813)
126 For a detailed study of Jouy’s Parisian essays, see Comeau, *Étienne Jouy*.
never on the regime, until when the abdication of Napoleon came\textsuperscript{129}. In the Restoration, his silence during the regime received some harsh judgements; for example, Stendhal argued that the author of such articles was a ‘false’ successor of Voltaire (Jouy’s admiration of Voltaire was well-known).\textsuperscript{130} Jouy’s assistant Philarète Chasles called the articles ‘timidly elegant lies’.\textsuperscript{131} And much later on, Edmond Biré observed:

What perhaps seems most curious in these volumes is what they do not say. The first article of \textit{L’Hermite} appeared […] on 17 August 1811; the last on 30 April 1814. These three years saw the war with Russia, the campaign in Germany, the war in France, the most frightful disasters and the most terrible catastrophes. \textit{L’Hermite} does not seem to have the least idea.

In reading \textit{L’Hermite}, one might think that during these three years, France had no history. […] (But) even if he had wanted to make the day’s events even a distant allusion, the censorship and the police were there to bring order.\textsuperscript{132}

Jouy nonetheless was a censor of \textit{Le Publiciste} between 1807 and 1811, and member of censorship council, \textit{Le bureau de l’Esprit Public}, which Napoleon established in 1810, and which included the censors of the officially sanctioned newspapers.\textsuperscript{133} It is then not surprising that Jouy approached the role of journalist in a pragmatic manner. On one occasion, reflecting on the year 1812, he wrote favourably of Napoleon: ‘Under the influence of this enterprising genius, swift as the eagle which serves as his emblem, I’ve seen that all the arts of peace flourished in Paris’.\textsuperscript{134} But as the following confession shows (‘l’Hermite de la Guiane’ was

\textsuperscript{129} In ‘La prise de Paris’ (9 April 1814) Jouy writes: ‘Il était aisé de prévoir que la France, poussée hors de toutes limites, débordée comme un torrent sur l’Europe entière, épuisée par d’innombrables victoires, écrasée par ses conquêtes, dégoûtée de la guerre, et même de la gloire; il était, dis-je, aisé de prévoir que la France était menacée d’une grande catastrophe […] L’Europe s’est liguée contre un seul homme’. Jouy, \textit{L’Hermite de la Chaussée-d’Antin}, \textit{OC}, vol.3, 430.


\textsuperscript{132} ‘Ce qu’il y a peut-être de plus curieux pour nous dans ces volumes, c’est ce qu’ils ne disent pas. Le premier feuilleton de \textit{L’Hermite} a paru, […] le 17 août 1811; le dernier est du 30 avril 1814. Ces trois années ont vu la guerre de Russie, la campagne d’Allemagne, la guerre de France, les désastres les plus épouvantables, les catastrophes les plus terribles. \textit{L’Hermite} n’a pas l’air de s’en douter. On croirait, à le lire, que, pendant ces trois années, la France n’a pas eu d’histoire. […] S’il eût voulu faire aux événements du jour une allusion même lointaine, la censure et la police étaient là qui y auraient mis bon ordre.’ Edmond Biré, 145-146, \textit{Causeries historiques et littéraire}, Lyon: Emmanuel Vitte, 1927, 145-146, quoted in Comeau, \textit{Étienne Jouy}, 177, translation is mine.

\textsuperscript{133} Comeau, \textit{Étienne Jouy}, 70.

his third fictional name, launched eight days after the return of the Bourbon monarchy on 16 July 1815) it couldn’t have been easy for Jouy: ‘I was convinced that in the civilised world there were only two classes of men, the oppressors and the oppressed. Without hope of being part of the first, and much determined not to place myself amongst the second, I became an outcast, resentful of not being able to be the king.’

Yet another fact remains, that Jouy was a political weathervane. At Louis XVIII’s return, Spontini and he produced a two-act opera Pélage, ou le Roi et la paix which represented a virtuous king re-claiming his throne. When Jouy, however, realised that his request for the croix de Saint-Louis to the new king would not materialise swiftly, he briefly turned a political liberal, writing articles for La Nain Jaune, which he abandoned during the Hundred Days, writing again for La Gazette de France in support of Napoleon. The Second Restoration accordingly was not in favour of Jouy, as the authorities rejected his request for the croix de Saint-Louis and placed a ban on his plays.

‘I had never been in the good graces of the Emperor, and I was, I think, the only man of letters of that period to whom his favour had not been extended; however, he could complain only of my silence.’

This was nevertheless Jouy’s own analysis dating from later in the Restoration, and in the context of his tragedy Tippô-Saëb of 1811. Its first performance was not authorised until 1813, and the following was Jouy’s own explanation:

In 1811, England, sheltered on her island and defended by her countless vessels, overcame the terror that Napoleon had aroused, and the French Nation, tired by the futility of its efforts, yearned to see the end of a battle whose duration was ruining her commerce, without adding anything to her glory. […] Rupture with Russia seemed inevitable and perhaps the campaign appears in Jouy’s dream, from which he is woken by the clock striking midnight and the dawn of 1813.


136 See Jouy, OC, vol.19.

137 See Comeau, Étienne Jouy, 82-92.

to Moscow had already been decided\textsuperscript{139}: this fatal enterprise, conceived in the delirium of an insatiable ambition, weakened the hatred that we felt for England, which seemed the only power capable of putting an end to it. In this frame of mind, Minister of Police felt obliged to oppose the staging of \textit{Tippô-Saëb}.\textsuperscript{140}

Tipu Saib was the last sultan of Mysore in Southern India. Under the governance of his father Hyder Ali, Mysore continued to repulse the British, and acted as a crucial French ally in the Anglo-French territorial conflict in India. After his death, as the British continued their military advances to occupy Mysore, Tipu sent ambassadors to Versailles in 1788, seeking French military cooperation.\textsuperscript{141} When Napoleon’s territorial conquest in the East began in Egypt in April 1799, he promised Tipu to intervene against the British in Mysore. Yet nothing came of the promise, because only a month later Tipu was killed during the British invasion of Seringapatam, and Napoleon’s campaign in Egypt failed.\textsuperscript{142} Mysore was annexed to British India.

Napoleon’s campaign against the hegemony of the British in India continued until June 1808, when the nationwide revolt in Spain broke out. In the wake of the Treaty of Amiens, an army under Charles Decaen was sent to India in January 1803. When arriving in Pondichéry (Pondicherry) in July, Decaen realised that the British had no intention of returning the five French trading posts in India. He was forced to flee to the Ile de France. Based on Decaen’s commission reports, in January 1805 Napoleon was planning to send an expeditionary force of 16,000 men to Decaen, which he subsequently postponed. Shortly after the Peace of Tilsit,

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{139}] In 1811 Russia virtually withdrew from Napoleon’s Continental System and negotiated a coalition with Sweden, Austria and Britain. Napoleon finally mobilised his troops for the Russian campaign in the summer of 1812.
\item[\textsuperscript{140}] ‘En 1811 l’Angleterre, retranchée dans son île et défendue par ses innombrables vaisseaux, était revenue de la frayeur que Napoléon lui avait inspirée, et la nation française fatiguée de l’inutilité de ses efforts aspirait à voir cesser une lutte dont la durée, sans rien ajouter à sa gloire, achevait de ruiner son commerce. […] La rupture avec la Russie paraissait inévitable, et peut-être la campagne de Moskow [sic] était-elle déjà résolue: cette fatale entreprise, conçue dans le délire d’une insatiable ambition, affaiblissait la haine que l’on portait à l’Angleterre qui semblait seule pouvoir y mettre un terme. Dans cette disposition des esprits, le ministre de la police […] crut devoir s’opposer à la mise en scène de la tragédie de \textit{Tippô-Saëb}.’ Jouy, ‘Anecdotes, relative à la tragédie de \textit{Tippô-Saëb}, \textit{Tippô-Saëb}, OC, vol.18, 97.
\item[\textsuperscript{142}] Marsh, \textit{India in the French Imagination}, 18.
\end{itemize}
Napoleon made new plans and in May 1808, still uncertain about the destiny of the Spanish war, he gave a new order for an expedition of 18,000 soldiers to join Decaen in the Ile de France.\textsuperscript{143}

Jouy’s Tippô is a despotic ruler who ‘inherited a love of war, an ardent ambition which consumes his soul, and an absolute horror of the word ‘English’’.\textsuperscript{144} This hatred makes him deaf to the advice of Raymond (a loyal French officer in his court), namely to renounce his Anglophobia for the sake of his war-stricken nation, and Tippô dies as his kingdom falls to the hands of the British. The play of course presents a scathing critique of British colonial rule in India. For instance, the memory of devastating Bengal famine in 1770 is evoked in one of Tippô’s virulent speeches against the British governor, Warren Hastings:

To quench the thirst of gold that preoccupies him,/ [he] instigates a famine in our fertile field./ Three million Indians die on the banks;/ The terrified Ganges carries only the dead;/ While their tormentors in the harbour of abundance/ Count the products of this immense disaster.\textsuperscript{145}

For Raymond, such conduct by the British negates their eradication of tyranny at home.\textsuperscript{146} By contrast, he asserts France’s commitment to the defence of universal human rights:

It is here [i.e., India] […] that one day, in avenging the earth, /A victorious arm shall strike England./ The people, despoiled by a destructive power,/ but armed by the voice of their liberator [i.e., France]/ Will witness India escape from the hands that subjugated it.\textsuperscript{147}

Thus here, the colonial rhetoric, that claimed the French as liberators, is again apparent, and Jackie Assayag has observed that:

To believe the playwright, French presence in overseas territories is not colonialism since it is out of philanthropy that it joins the side of the oppressed. While the soldiers of the Empire are the hussars of the liberation, in the rearguard, its writers form the old guard of the

\textsuperscript{143} See Benot, La démence coloniale sous Napoléon, 104-107, and 128-131.
\textsuperscript{144} ‘Tippô n’a recueilli que l’amour de la guerre,/ L’ardente ambition qui dévorait son cœur,/ Et pour le nom anglais son invincible horreur.’ Jouy, Tippô- Saëb, Barba, 1813, Act I/ 1, 4.
\textsuperscript{145} ‘Pour étancher la soif de l’or qui le domine, /Dans nos fertiles champs fait naître la famine:/ Trois millions d’Indiens expirent sur ces bords; / Le Gange épouvanté ne roule que des morts; / Tandis que leurs bourreaux au sein de l’abondance/ Calculent les produits de ce désastre immense.’ Ibid., Act I/ 3, 10. During the famine, the British East India Company, which monopolised Bengal’s grain trade, refused to alleviate the situation for the Bengalis. Cf. Marsh, India in the French Imagination, 129.
\textsuperscript{146} Cf. ibid., Act III/ 5, 44-45.
\textsuperscript{147} ‘C’est ici, […] qu’un jour, vengeant la terre, / Un bras victorieux doit frapper l’Angleterre;/ Les peuples, qu’avilit un pouvoir destructeur,/ En s’armant à la voix de leur libérateur, / Verront l’Inde échapper aux mains qui l’ont soumise.’ Ibid., Act II/ 4, 26.
Thus for Assayag, Jouy’s *Tippō-Saēb* indirectly supported the regime’s colonial agenda. And therefore, the play’s denunciation of British imperialism itself is not a result of humanitarian feelings towards the Indians, but a result of nationalism, which then similarly undermines Jouy’s claim that he was an eyewitness of British colonial rule in India:  

149 In the age where the spectacle of oppression and misery leaves impressions vivid and enduring at the bottom of the soul, I witnessed the frightful evils that greed and English politics have inflicted on these shores. At that time, one single prince fought against the most odious tyranny that was ever inflicted on a people; this prince was Tippō Saēb, sultan of Mysore: I was admitted twice in his presence, and intimate connection with some French officers in his service had put me in the position to know his character, his noble ambition, and hatred of the English, which they themselves had mindfully used to justify their violence.  

151 Although Assayag seems to acknowledge Jouy’s admiration for the heroic resistance of Tipu, Jouy’s depiction of Tipu, which drew on a commonplace notion of oriental despotism, is similarly seen as ‘fuel[ling] the common representation of barbarous government, that is lawless and regulated by mere whim’, in order to license French intervention.

As Kate Marsh has responded, Assayag’s claim ‘calls attention to what could be described as

---


149 Ibid., 117.


151 ‘Dans l’âge où le spectacle de l’oppression et du malheur laisse au fond de l’âme [sic] des impressions aussi vives que durables, j’avais été témoin des maux affreux que l’avarice et la politique anglaises ont versés sur ces climats. Un seul prince à cette époque luttait contre la plus odieuse tyrannie qui ait jamais pesé sur les peuples; ce prince était Tippō Saēb, sultan de Myzore: j’avais été admis deux fois en sa présence, et des relations intimes avec quelques officiers français à son service m’avaient mis à portée de connaître son caractère, sa noble ambition, et sa haine contre les Anglais, dont ils avaient eux-mêmes pris soin de justifier la violence.’ Jouy, ‘Préface’, *Tippō-Saēb*, 6-7. Kate Marsh however has shown that ‘the rhetoric of truth and eyewitness authenticity’ was common in French representations of India.


153 ‘Jouy alimente la représentation commune du gouvernement barbare, dépourvu de loi et réglé sur le seul caprice.’ Ibid., 118.
Jouy’s benevolent colonialism (which appears to represent Indians sympathetically while using discursive strategies associated with colonialism). Indeed, not only does Jouy address the injustices of British colonial rule, his identification with Tipu’s personal tragedy is in evidence from the point where Tipu realises that both British victory and his own death are inevitable. The siege of Seringapatam is seen in sentimental terms; more precisely, Jouy presents Tipu’s private existence as a doting father, who is preoccupied with the survival of his children and deplores their imminent separation. And nowhere in his writings do we find Jouy sharing the rhetoric of French liberation. Jouy’s extensive moral critique of war and conquest is found in ‘La guerre considérée d’après les principes de la morale’, originally one of his lectures covering a wide range of socio-political topics, given in 1822 at the Athénée de Paris.

Here his rejection of the idea of civilizing conquerors is in evidence, when he refers to what he considers as perverse and detestable military dictums:

If it is a question of subjugating completely a people that is still capable of strong resistance, you can first give them everything that has the appearance of independence and freedom, but then take back from them everything that might ensure them one and the other.

Drawing upon Montesquieu’s notion of legitimate self-defence, Jouy maintains that the legitimate war is fought within the limits of self-defence, adding that ‘violence committed, after the victory over the defeated who laid down their arms, or for destroying the enemy country, is an act worthy of blame and punishment’. The offensive war, in other words, the imperial conquest, is categorically condemned: ‘Everything is shameful and criminal, the purpose and means. Aggression is based on hypocrisy and deception.’

---

155 Cf. Tippô-Saëb, Act IV/9 and Act V/8
157 ‘S’il s’agit de soumettre entièrement un peuple encore capable d’une forte résistance, on peut lui accorder d’abord tout ce qui a l’apparence de l’indépendance et de la liberté, sauf à lui retirer ensuite tout ce qui pourrait lui assurer l’une et l’autre.’ Jouy, *La Morale appliquée à la politique*, 183.
158 ‘Toute violence commise après la victoire sur des vaincus qui ont mis bas les armes, ou pour ravager le pays ennemi, est un acte digne de blâme et de châtiment.’ Ibid., 175.
159 ‘Tout est honteux et criminel, le but et les moyens. L’agression se fonde sur la mauvaise foi et le
between overseas conquest and the Catholic Church, sarcastically commenting that colonial violence is ‘odious and impious on the part of a Christian who is under the order of his religion to consider and to treat other men as brothers. Preachers, missionaries, it is against such crimes that one’s voice should be raised, that one must shout from a height of the missionary pulpit’.  

Jouy then extends his critique of conquests to current European powers. In warning against the modern states’ permanent military forces, Jouy argues that their existence is completely incompatible with the well-being of the modern society. Soldiers, ‘who had been educated to conquer abroad, learned to subjugate their own countrymen; discipline took great care to ban, in military ranks, all political opinion, any duty of citizens, any sentiments of brotherhood and family’. Yet, modern politics now advocates the attack on the neighbour in order to maintain peace, state powers increase their troops, and build immense armouries and munitions in time of peace. Jouy maintains:

Tomorrow all the people of Europe may be replaced under the yoke imposed upon them by the barbarians who destroyed the Roman Empire; tomorrow all moderate monarchies, all constitutional monarchies, may be replaced by oriental despotism. To carry out this great moral and political degradation, it only requires the assembly of two or three wills. Civilization or barbarism, freedom or servitude, light or darkness, the glory or shame of one hundred and fifty million people are now in the hands of two or three ministers.

160 ‘Elle est odieux et impie de la part du chrétien, à qui sa religion commande de regarder, de traiter les autres hommes comme des frères. Prédicateurs, missionnaires, c’est contre de tels crimes qu’il faut élever la voix, qu’il faut tonner du haut de la chaire évangélique.’ Ibid., 181. Such a statement contrasts sharply with Chateaubriand’s argument earlier (p. 31).

161 ‘[Soldiers] qu’on avait instruits à vaincre l’étranger ont appris à soumettre leur propre concitoyens; la discipline s'est efforcée de bannir des rangs des armées toute opinion politique, tout devoir de citoyens, tout sentiment de fraternité et de famille.’ Ibid., 188. Blind obedience seems to have been a virtue of military men for Napoleon: he attended the première of Tippô Saëb, and in his report addressed to Jouy commented that Raymond ‘donne parfois des conseils quand on ne lui en demande pas, et discute trop souvent les ordres avant de les exécuter. Il aurait mérité que le sultan, d’un revers de son sabre, lui fît sauter la tête quand il s’avise de faire sauver l’ambassadeur anglais’ (sometimes gives advice when one does not ask him, and discusses things too often before executing orders. He would have deserved to have had his head served with Sultan’s mighty blow for daring to save the English ambassador). Jouy, ‘Anecdotes, relative à la tragédie de Tippô-Saëb’, in Tippô-Saëb, OC, vol.18, 102-103.

162 ‘Demain tout les habitants de l'Europe peuvent être replacés sous le joug qui leur fut imposé par les barbares qui détruisirent l'empire Romain; demain toutes les monarchies tempérées, toutes les monarchies constitutionnelles, peuvent être remplacées par le despotisme oriental. Pour opérer cette grande dégradation morale et politique, il faut la réunion de deux ou trois volontés. La civilisation ou la barbarie, la liberté ou la servitude, les lumières ou les ténèbres, la gloire ou la honte de cent cinquante millions d'hommes, sont maintenant entre les mains de deux ou trois ministres.’ Jouy, La Morale appliquée à la politique, 190.
Jouy here regards imperialism of European states on the verge of ‘oriental despotism’. His portrayal of Tipu as an oriental despot then is not so much a means to ‘fuel the common representation’ in favour of French nationalism as a means to criticise the abuse of political power in general, as it was in Diderot’s debate on Spanish colonialism. His Tippô Saëb may then be seen as an indirect critique of Napoleonic regime, whose anti-British campaign was at odds with the interests of the French population, as Jouy’s later account suggests.163

In the last quiet phase of his life as a chief librarian in the Louvre, Jouy was still writing about the involvement of European powers in India. His short fiction Les voyages et aventures du jeune Scarmentado164 is based on his military life in French India. (Its model was Voltaire’s short novel, Histoire des voyages de Scarmentado écrite par lui-même,165 a tale about the son of the governor of Candia (Heraklion, Crete), who travels through Europe, Asia and Africa and comes to recognise the universal triumph of injustice, tyranny and religious fanaticism.) Jouy’s text hence originated outside the context of Napoleonic Franco-British antagonism, yet it still presents his invectives against the British in India. On one occasion, jeune Scarmentado refers to a young Banian166 who gave an account of the cruelties of European colonial rule in India. This young Banian also reported the sad circumstances of a woman who had appealed to Warren Hastings a few days before the execution of her husband, a Rajah, who had previously ruled over the province of Bengal. She deplored the way in which the arrival of the British had transformed her husband’s kingdom, and appealed as follows: ‘If

163 In fact, some parallels may be drawn: As the British conquered Tipu’s kingdom by means of Mir Sadiq’s treason, there were some deep ruptures within Napoleon’s ministry at the time. After the resignation from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1807, Talleyrand was increasingly hostile to Napoleon’s war efforts in the Continent, and was co-operating with Austria and Russia. Joseph Fouché on the other hand, was dismissed from the Ministry of Police in 1810, after his secret peace negotiation with Britain was uncovered. While Tippô’s daughter regards his arrangement of a diplomatic marriage between her and his wavering ally as meaningless, Napoleon’s marriage to Marie-Louise of Austria took place in 1810, shortly after the Austrian defeat at Wagram.

164 Jouy, ‘L’Hermite du Louvre’, Papiers autographes, F-Pa, MS 6338.915 bis H.F. The novel is unfinished.


166 It refers to the Indians with Brahmanic faith.
our treasures are an offence in your eyes, take all our possessions and all our gold, rob us of our jewelry and our precious stones, but return my Aly Kan to me, the father of my children, the companion of my bed'. The rhetorical device giving voice to the oppressed had been used in Diderot’s critique of the British conduct during the Bengal famine in the *Histoire des deux Indes*. Strugnell suggested that such rhetoric shared the postmodernist notion of true justice (as articulated by Jean-François Lyotard and Emmanuel Levinas), which ‘rejects totalising forms, responds to the event and respects the heterogeneity of the Other’, and which therefore privileges ‘the appeal for justice from the Other’. Jouy’s appeal for the justice of the colonised Indians, as well as his sympathetic portrayal of Tipu, then seems to have little in common with the regime’s liberation rhetoric, whose nationalism was in favour of the Western powerful.

But it may also be that the reference to the common liberation rhetoric in *Tippô-Saëb* was simply a convenient way to ‘satisfy the government’. *Sesostris, tragédie lyrique en trois actes*, which Jouy and Antoine-Vincent Arnault wrote for Méhul, similarly presents a conventional image of the ruler as imperial victor on one hand, and a more virtuous king, despite his military incompetence on the other. Its opening scene set in the *salle du Trône*, where the ambassadors of various countries gathered to celebrate the return of Sesostris, the king of Egypt, from his expedition, soon suggests that it was yet another libretto allegorising Napoleon’s imperial power. The Cretan prisoners in Memphis, led by the dethroned king

---

167 ‘Si nos trésors sont un crime à tes yeux, prends tous nos biens, tout notre or, dépouilles nous de nos bijoux, de nos pierres précieuses, mais rends mon Aly Kan, le père de mes enfant, le compagnon de mon lit.’ Jouy, *Les voyages et aventures du jeune Scarmentado*, 182 r.


169 Strugnell, ibid.


171 A manuscript libretto is found amongst the collection of Jouy’s theatre works at the Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal (see MS.6054). According to Elizabeth Bartlet, Arnault read the libretto to the Opéra’s *jury de lecture* on 23 December 1811. Bartlet also indicates that although the record mentions only Arnault as the author, Méhul’s letter to Jouy expressing his intention to abandon the project and to retire attests Jouy’s co-authorship, and that the editor of Arnault’s *Œuvres* credited two librettists. Méhul composed the third act and a part of the second act, before giving up the project. See M. Elizabeth C. Bartlet, *Étienne-Nicolas Méhul and opera: source and archival studies of lyric theatre during the French Revolution, Consulate and Empire*, 2 vols., Heilbronn : Musik - Edition Lucie Galland, 1999, vol.2, 624 and 627-629.
Narbal, destroy the altar of Typhon, and the barbarous High Priest Borcoris demands a punishment for the sacrilege. Although Sésostris swears that he will never liberate the Cretans, he intends to eradicate the barbarous cult from Egypt. The notion of a civilising ruler is thus apparent also in this narrative, which describes Sésostris’s conquest as civilising mission: ‘Portons-y nos bienfaits; que tout barbare usage/ […]/ Disparaisse devant nos lois’ (Let us bring our benevolence; so that all barbaric customs/ […]/ May disappear before our laws).172

Yet, as the narrative progresses, it diverges from this Napoleonic perspective. As Sésostris is in love with Narbal’s lover Onéide, Sésostris arranges Narbal’s escape from Egypt in the hope of winning her heart one day in Narbal’s absence. Onéide hails Sesostris for his generosity while still resisting his courting. Narbal refuses to part from her. The High Priest demands Sésostris’s permission to execute all the Cretan prisoners, but Sesostris persuades him to kill only one, who comes first to offer himself as a sacrifice for all. As if claiming the deserved respect for the conquered, Narbal here defies Sesostris: ‘Je suis capable aussi d’un effort magnanime,/ Et tu sauras bientôt si ce cœur qui t’estime/ A droit d’être estimé de toi’ (I’m also capable of magnanimous effort,/ And you will realise soon if this heart which respects you/ Has the right to be respected by you).173 Narbal then asks the assembled Cretans whether they will follow the order that the dethroned miserable king is about to dictate. When they respond that they will, he declares that it is himself who will die for the Cretans in Memphis. The Cretans refute him, and swear to die for the king. But it is announced that a first volunteer had already presented himself, and the veiled victim is revealed as Onéide. As Onéide, Narbal and the Cretans all try to protect others from the impending execution, the overwhelmed Sesostris asks the High Priest for a solution. It is however the crowd which demands that Sesostris should forgive, in contrast to the Metastasian conclusion, in which the king pardons his subjects, thereby preserving the position of the absolute ruler.174 Sesostris’s greatness characterised by

172 Arnault and Jouy, Sésostris, tragédie lyrique en trois actes, F-Pa, MS. 6054, Act II/ 4, 254 r.
173 Ibid., Act III/ 3, 257 r.
174 See Michael Fend, ‘Romantic Empowerment at the Paris Opera in the 1770s and 1780s’, Music and
his military conquests and yet partly fabricated through his colonial rhetoric, as well as his generosity towards Narbal that derives from his personal interest in Onéïde, these are at the end eclipsed by the dethroned king’s selfless devotion to his unfortunate subjects, as well as by the loyalty of Onéïde and the Cretans to the king.

As we saw in the beginning of this chapter, the narrative of Cortez similarly builds on the colonial rhetoric of civilizing conquerors. Yet at the same time, the verses of a Spanish officer in the mutiny scene already carry some contradictory expressions, such as ‘À nos sanglantes mains [les mexicains] disputent la victoire’ (Against our bloody hands [the Mexicans] contend for victory).\(^{175}\) and ‘Attendrons-nous qu'au pied de ces remparts/ L'inflexible Cortez nous immole à sa gloire?’ (Shall we wait at the foot of these ramparts/ For inflexible Cortez to sacrifice us for his glory?)\(^{176}\) In the first act’s truce scene where the sequence of divertissement also takes place, aggressive European imperialism is contrasted by the peaceful and primitive existence of the Mexicans. If Diderot had aligned the imperial conquest with robbery (p.25), the conquistadors’ thirst for gold is suggested in certain lines of the Spanish chorus when the Mexicans brings various objects made of gold: ‘Quelle richesse éclatante/ Sera le prix des vainqueurs! (What dazzling wealth,/ Will be the prize of the victors!)\(^{177}\) It seems revealing that whereas in the beginning of the opera, a colonial projection of Mexican human sacrifice provided a justification for Cortez’s conquest: ‘Je les renverserai sur ces prêtres cruels/ Qui, pour changer le destin des batailles,/ Souillent de sang leurs coupables autels’ (I will bring down [the walls] upon these cruel priests’ head/ Who, to change the fate of battles,/ Defile their guilty altars with blood),\(^{178}\) here bloody cruelty is associated with the gifts from the Spanish side to the Mexicans, metal armour and sword: ‘Le fer dans leur main sanglante/ De l’or prend l’éclat trompeur;/ Leur amitié menaçante/ N’inspire

---


\(^{175}\) Jouy, Fernand Cortez, Roullet, 1809, Act I/ 1, 14.

\(^{176}\) Ibid.

\(^{177}\) Ibid., Act II/ 6, 24.

\(^{178}\) Ibid., Act I/ 3, 18.
que la terreur’ (Weapons in their bloody hand/ Takes on the false glory of gold;/ Their menacing friendship/ Only inspires terror).179

As the Mexican women dance, the Spanish soldiers come to appreciate their sweet hospitality: ‘L’astre éclatant de la lumière/ A-t-il jamais vu des climats/ Que cette rive hospitalière/ Par ses trésors n’efface pas?/ La volupté la plus pure/ Habite dans ce séjour’ (The bright star of the light/ Has it ever seen the regions/ That this hospitable shore’s/ Treasures fail to outshine?/ The purest pleasure/ Fills this place).180 On the other hand, the Spanish display of military exercises and horses, which Cortez describes as ‘the noble games of the masters of the earth’, presages the devastation of their country for the Mexicans: ‘Ô terreur! ô prodige!/ […]/ Les enfants de la guerre/ Font sortir de la terre/ Des monstres bondissants,/ Pour eux obéissants:/ Dans leur bouillante audace,/ Ils dévorent l'espace’ (Terror! Spectacle!/ […]/ The children of war/ Bring forth from beneath the earth/ The leaping monsters:/ Obedient to them:/ With their boiling audacity/ Traverse the country).181 Such a portrayal seems to echo Marmontel’s reference to the Spaniards’ abuse of the vulnerable Peruvians.

In the first two acts, the words of Amazily are highly instrumental in claiming Cortez’s civilizing mission. For instance, in Act II/ 2, Amazily reminds Téласко how Cortez saved her from the hands of monstrous priest, concluding that ‘Un héros protégea ma vie;/ Je suis ses pas victorieux’ (A hero protected my life;/ I follow his victorious steps).182 This angers Téласко, who sees Cortez as a destructive invader, but Amazily swears never to part with Cortez. During the duet ‘Dieu du Mexique, dieu vengeur’, Téласко swears to take revenge on his homeland, and denies his sister. Amazily however asks her European God to save both her brother and her homeland, then tells Téласко: ‘Ah! malgré tes refus,/ Mon cœur, dans ta furie,/ Reconnaît tes vertus’ (Ah! Despite your refusal,/ My heart sees virtue,/ In your fury).183 Such

179 Ibid., Act I/ 6, 25.
180 Ibid.
181 Ibid., 26-27.
182 Ibid., Act II/ 2, 32.
183 Ibid., 34.
verses seem to be an important counterbalance to her promotion of Cortez’s colonial intervention.

Indeed, some portrayals of Amazily and Télasco, on one hand, also offset the narrative set out to promote the veneration of imperial power, and on the other hand, seem to deny ethnocentric contentions about the inferiority of the non-Europeans. Amazily’s dramatic leap into the lake at the close of Act II, to swim back to the city and to become a substitute victim for Cortez’s brother, may be related to the conquered king Narbal’s claim earlier, ‘I’m also capable of magnanimous effort’ (p.58). Télasco opposes the sacrifice of the Spanish prisoners as a means of averting the plight of Mexican population (Act III/2), despite his hatred of the invaders. At the same time, the imminent fall of Aztec civilisation, the ruined peace and the presence of death, these consequences of colonial process are invoked in Télasco’s second aria, ‘Ô patrie! ô lieux pleins de charmes!’:

Ô patrie! ô lieux pleins de charmes!
Ville des rois, séjour des dieux!
Faut-il que tes enfants te remplissent d’alarmes!
Faudra-t-il, accablés par leur coupables armes,
Abandonner la terre où dorment nos aïeux?
   Ah! Plutôt dans ces murs en cendre
   Péris et venger mon trépas!
   Sur quels bords irai-je descendre,
   Exilé de ces doux climats?
   Dirai-je aux ombres de nos pères:
   Levez-vous, sortez du tombeau
   Et sue des rives étrangères
   Cherchez un asile nouveau?

(O homeland, O places full of charms!/ City of kings, retreat of gods!/ Should your children fill you with fears?/ Should he, overwhelmed by their guilty weapons,/ Abandon the land where our ancestors sleep?/ Ah! Rather within these walls burnt to ashes/ Perish and avenge my death!/ On which shores shall I go down,/ Exiled from this sweet region?/ Shall I say to the shadows of our fathers:/ Rise, leave the tomb/ And on foreign shores/ Find a new
In this Italianate aria (slow-fast), the lyricism and poignancy in the slow section (E major) derive from the evocation of the idyllic Mexican landscape, now exposed to devastation. The idyllic nature is conjured up by the horns accompanying the vocal line for the words ‘Ô patrie! ô lieux plein de charmes!’ The vocal part progresses in close association with the orchestral accompaniment, and it features recurring expressive leaps on to E above middle C, given at the beginning of interrogative phrases: ‘faut-il que tes enfants te remplissent d’alarmes?’; ‘faudra-t-il accablés par leurs coupables armes, abandonner la terre où donnent nos aîeux?’ A sudden shift to the relative minor brings the fact section (a b a’ coda). While the text highlights further the plight of the invaded nation sentimentally, by its reference to the nation’s past, the music reverts to the military style, featuring martial rhythms and the dotted patterns in the vocal part, conveying an upsurge of patriotic sentiment in Télasco. The dramatic tension is built up through the harmonic changes over long pedal points. The libretto supplies no aria of this kind for any of the Spanish characters, nor for Cortez. Libby has observed that ‘he [Cortez] sings no real arias in the opera; he has no complex thoughts, feelings, or doubts that such an aria would expose’.

And the last blistering remark of the High Priest, provoking Cortez - ‘Puissiez-vous dans ces murs en cendre,/[…]/ Par vos propres forfaits surpasser mes fureurs!’ (Within these crumbling walls,/ […]/ May your hideous crimes surpass my furies) - seems to call forth Diderot’s earlier claim that in the New World, the barbarity of indigenous religious practices were surpassed by the violence and aggression of European conquerors. Jouy then joins Diderot and Marmontel in their identification with the conquered, whose misfortunes Jouy should perhaps have realised in India.

---

184 Ibid., Act II/1, 31-32.
186 Libby, Gaspare Spontini, 142.
187 Jouy, Fernand Cortez, Roullet, 1809, Act III/6, 58.
He nevertheless provides a conclusion whose imperialism is unequivocal. Cortez rescues Amazily from Mexican human sacrifice and shows clemency towards the High Priest, then absolves him from his punishment. While the High Priest leaves the scene after his final expression of rancorous hate, Télasco promptly acknowledges the conqueror's virtue. This Metastasian ending illustrating Cortez's magnanimity is particularly problematic, when one bears in mind the fact, as shown above, that the colonial projection of indigenous culture lay on slippery terrain in 1809, as well as Michael Fend's claim that after the 1789 Revolution, the Metastasian narrative which may be seen as a product of political absolutism became 'politically untenable'. Jouy's ending clearly followed the regime's programme of imperial progress, which reveals its decisive return to a regressive imperial past.

In the revised opera, premiered on 28 May 1817 (see fn. 1), Jouy weakened emphasis on Cortez's crusade against barbarous Mexico. The new intrigue centered on the Aztec king Montezuma's (the character was absent in the 1809 version) peace negotiation with Cortez in the hope of saving Mexico from the ravages of the war. The character of Montezuma is separated from fanaticism of the High Priest and the crowd: he rejects their demand of immediate killing of the Spanish prisoners (the scene in the temple was moved from Act III to Act I). As in the 1809 text, Cortez refuses to leave Mexico (this event is moved to Act II), and the Mexicans insist on sacrifice, either of Alvar or Amazily (moved to Act III), leading to Cortez's decision to attack. In the revised plot, as the siege begins, inside the imperial palace Montezuma sets to commit honorable suicide and orders to set the imperial palace on fire. In other words, the character of Montezuma - humane and conciliatory, and at the same time, who faces death with dignity – seems to emerge as an object of sympathy. Amazily, on the other hand, became Montezuma's envoy to seek peace. At the moment of Montezuma's suicide,

189 Fend, ‘Romantic Empowerment’, 276. Fend identified this dramaturgical evolution in various works, in which absolute power is compromised, such as Roulet's Les Danaïdes (1784) and Beaumarchais's Tarare (1787), both set by Salieri.
Amazily arrives in time to announce that Cortez finally accepted her pleading for peace (off-stage). Amazily thus has a clearer role in the final reconciliation. Jouy eliminated the scene of her sacrifice originally featured in Act III: she is no longer a powerless victim waiting to be saved by the western powerful. Moreover, there is no dramatic dénouement in which the destruction of the Mexican temple by Cortez’s army took place, symbolising the triumph of western civilisation.

The review of the 1817 premiere in the conservative Journal des débats preferred Jouy’s original libretto by virtue of its plot centered on Cortez’s struggle and triumph. It was also critical of Jouy’s introduction of Montezuma to the plot, and commented that ‘the unfortunate emperor defeated by a handful of Spaniards could only be an object of pity, and not of noble and dramatic interest’.¹⁹¹ It continued that the scene of Montezuma mounting his throne to die represented ‘cold and unimpassioned heroism’ (héroïsme froid et impassible) on the operatic stage, adding that ‘at the Opera, the approach to dénouement requires action, movement, even a great crash’,¹⁹² presumably favouring Cortez’s destruction of the temple.

In contrast, the review written by Évariste D[umoulin] and published in the liberal newspaper Le Constitutionnel spoke favourably of Jouy’s revision.¹⁹³ He began by engaging in an explicit moralistic critique of conquest (it was the first review to do so since the opera’s premiere in 1809). While accepting Jouy’s and Ésmenard’s description that Cortez’s conquest was the event in history that ‘inspired the greatest astonishment and admiration’ (see p.22), Dumoulin asserted that however glorious Cortez and his soldiers may be, ‘the prudent minds

---

¹⁹¹ ‘Le malheureux empereur vaincu par une poignée d’Espagnoles, ne pouvait être qu’un objet de pitié, et non celui d’un intérêt noble et dramatique.’ Journal des débats politiques et littéraires, 1 June 1817, 2.


¹⁹³ Évariste Dumoulin (b 1776; d 4 Sep 1833) came from the department of Gironde to Paris in 1815 and soon became an editor at Le Constitutionnel. He was one of the first journalists to specialise on parliamentary reports, and was also in charge of theatre reviews. According to the article in Biographie nouvelle, Dumoulin did not shy away from making assessments of those who in power, and from signing his articles. Also according Biographie nouvelle, Dumoulin had many friends among the dramatists whose works he reviewed. Thus, it may well have been that Jouy also was Dumoulin’s friend at the time of the publication of the review. In 1818, Dumoulin co-founded the liberal newspaper Le Minerve française, of which Jouy also was an editor. (See Nouvelle biographie générale, vol.15, 221-223; Biographie nouvelle des contemporains, vol.6, 179-180.)
can not help but observe that these illustrious warriors were at least the instrument of most dreadful misuse of power, talent and courage that one can commit'.

He continued that ‘an independent people live in peace, […], under the pretext of making them enjoy the benefits of civilisation, an idea occurs to sovereign, […], to send some of his soldiers overseas, with nothing but the aims to expand his power and his wealth. They bring war, devastation, and death.’

Dumoulin then asserted that ‘the enslavement of people and these miraculous conquests are no longer feasible except in theatre. It is only there that one obeys tyrants and usurpers’. Because ‘people begin to have mutual respect among themselves: one does not want to serve as an instrument to oppress the other; […] and one would not try in vain to make disappear from the world a nation which has the feeling of strength and dignity’. He continued: ‘the reign of the conquerors is over; combinations of politics may well still give them the means to satisfy their ambition for a short while; but their power would not last long: a single reflection of the oppressed would be enough to destroy it, and nowadays everyone thinks’. Here, Dumoulin surely points to the gap between the conclusion of the 1809 libretto and the reality, that is, a certain contemporary scepticism about colonial conquest. He went on to observe that for this reason, the subject of the opera ‘took much of skilled effort to make it vraisemblable’, and that ‘Jouy could assess all difficulties to overcome: he depicted his hero

---

194 ‘Les esprits sages ne peuvent s’empêcher de remarquer que ces illustres guerriers furent au moins les instrument du plus épouvantable abus que l'on puisse faire de la puissance, du talent et du courage.’ *Le Constitutionnel*, 30 May 1817, 4.

195 ‘Un people indépendant habite en paix, […], sous prétexte de le faire jouir des bienfaits de la civilisation, il passé par la tête d’un souverain, […], d’envoyer au-delà des mers quelques-uns de ses soldats, dans les seules vues d’étendre son pouvoir et ses richesses. On porte la guerre, la dévastation et la mort.’ Ibid.

196 ‘Ces asservissements de peuples, ces conquêtes miraculeuses ne sont plus praticable qu'au théâtre. C'est là seulement qu'on obéit aux tyrans et aux usurpateurs.’ Ibid.

197 ‘Les peuples commencent à se respecter entre eux: l'un ne veut pas servir d'instrument pour opprimer l'autre; [...], et que l'on ne tenterait pas vainement de faire disparaitre du monde une nation qui a le sentiment de sa force et de sa dignité.’ Ibid.

198 ‘Le règne des conquérants est passé; les combinaisons de la politique pourraient bien leur donner encore les moyens de satisfaire, pour quelques instants, leur ambition; mais leur puissance ne serait pas de longue durée: a seule réflexion de opprimés suffirait pour la détruire, et aujourd'hui, tout le monde réfléchit.’ Ibid.
even better than he was: Amazily only abandoned her gods and nation in the hope of waning the conqueror’s anger, while at the same time she was seized by love that the figure of Cortez inevitably inspired; every character in Jouy’s text holds interest, because each has a great danger to overcome. And referring to the dénouement, Dumoulin wrote: ‘how can one repress some emotion when one sees the image of people seeking in death the last refuge from the yoke of their oppressors?’

In the wake of Napoleon’s fall, Dumoulin recorded the difficulty of the librettist whose plot featured the hero, the marker of colonial injustice in the eighteenth century France, and who sought to reconcile in some manner, the contemporary (and personal) awareness of the sad reality of conquest, and the imperial propaganda which preferred to espouse the historically inaccurate representation of conqueror’s victory as ‘a good outcome’ at the expense of the logic of vraisemblance. In the last scene of the revised text, Cortez says to Montezuma: ‘Pardonne-moi ma gloire’ (Forgive me for my glory). What Jouy made the conqueror utter before the final celebration of his glory was words of apology.

199 ‘Il a fallu beaucoup d’efforts de talent pour le rendre vraisemblable, […]. M. de Jouy a su apprécier toutes les difficultés qu’il avait à surmonter; il a peint son héros meilleur encore qu’il ne l’était.’ Ibid.
200 ‘Comment se défendre de quelque émotion lorsque l’on voit l’image de tout un people qui cherche dans la mort un dernier refuge contre le joug de ses oppresseurs?’ Ibid.
201 Gerhard, 50. See fn. 16 above.
The feminine themes in *La Vestale*, *Les Bayadères*, *Les Amazones*, and *Velleda*

The entry on ‘Jouy’ in the *Biographie universelle* (1818) underlines his devotion to the emancipatory claims of Voltaire and describes that Jouy brought explicitly philosophical and political questions to his libretto *La Vestale*. Here we also find a reference to Jouy’s interest in women’s issues:

Passionate student of Voltaire, […] Jouy was opposed to superstition, fanaticism and all that is called prejudices, […]. Hence arose *La Vestale*, […]. A young girl condemned to die after the most brutal torture! And condemned by whom? By the priests! Condemned why? To have heard the *cry of nature*! The eighteenth century is encapsulated in these two words; Jouy, who was a true son of this century; Jouy, who by natural generosity was interested in everything that concerns women; Jouy, who in his travels in the East had seen an Indian girl mount the stake and had saved her; Jouy brought to the opera all the ardour of his convictions, all the impulses of his soul, etc.1

For this author the Vestals combined the theme of gender with a Voltairean polemic on religion.

Indeed, according to recent studies, Jouy’s subjects - the Vestals, the *Bayadères* (temple dancers), the Amazons (women warriors), and the women of Gaul (to whom Jouy’s *Velleda* belongs) had all appeared in the eighteenth-century feminist debate.2

Enlightenment liberalism extended to the status of women, and the philosophes

---

1 ‘Élève passionné de Voltaire, […] Jouy était animé contre la superstition, contre le fanatisme, contre tout ce qui s'appelle préjugés, […]'. De là naquit *La Vestale*, […]. Une jeune fille condamnée à mourir du supplice le plus affreux! Et condamnée par qui? *Par des prêtres!* Condamnée pourquoi? Pour avoir *écouter le cri de la nature*! Tout le dix-huitième siècle est dans ces deux mots; et de Jouy qui était un vrai fils de ce siècle; de Jouy, qu’une générosité naturelle intéressait à tout ce qui touche les femmes; de Jouy, qui dans ses voyages en Orient avait vu monter une jeune Indienne sur le bûcher des veuves et l’en avait arrachée; de Jouy transporta à la fois dans son opéra tout l’ardeur de ses convictions, tous les élan de son âme, etc.’ *Biographie universelle ancienne et moderne: ou histoire, par ordre alphabétique, de la vie publique et privée de tous les hommes qui se sont fait remarquer par leurs écrits, leurs actions, leurs talents, leurs vertus ou leurs crimes*, second edition, ed. Louis-Gabriel Michaud, Paris: C. Desplaces and Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 185-?, vol.21, 268.

2 In applying the word ‘feminism’ for the eighteenth-century sources, I follow the position of Tjitske Akkerman and Siep Stuurman, which takes into account the recent research that ‘demonstrated that the early-modern history of feminism is not one of isolated examples’ of a history that ‘begins only in the nineteenth-century’, and which locates its beginning at around 1400. They defined ‘feminism’ in three points (following Nancy Cott): 1) ‘criticism of misogyny and male supremacy’; 2) ‘the conviction that the women’s condition is not an immutable fact of nature and can be changed for the better; 3) ‘a sense of gender group identity, the conscious will to speak “on behalf of women”, or “to defend the female sex”, usually aiming to enlarge the sphere of action open to women’. See Tjitske Akkerman and Siep Stuurman, ‘Introduction’, *Perspectives on feminist political thought in European history: from the Middle Ages to the present*, ed. Akkerman and Stuurman, London: Routledge, 1998, 2-4.
actively wrote in favour of gender equality and the emancipation of women. However, the traditional ideas of gender difference and women’s submissive role within male society were generally taken for granted even by many philosophes, as it was theorised in Rousseau’s concept of female modesty, and of separate spheres, insisting on women’s maternal and familial duties, while at the same time repressing women’s participation in civic life. The Revolution stirred a new feminist consciousness in some French women, resulting in popular protests, circulation of pamphlets, and the formation of women clubs. Notably, during this period, terms such as ‘female Amazon’ and ‘Amazonianism’ were widely in use, and like the word virago, the Amazons carried a double charge; it denoted heroic women, and, pejoratively, those who attempted to claim a politically active role. In 1792, the female activist Anne-Josèphe Théroigne de Méricourt petitioned the Legislative Assembly for the formation of ‘the legions of amazons’, the women’s regiments in the Revolutionary Army, as part of her campaign for women’s civic identity. The Revolutionary legislation granted women equal rights in affairs of marriage, inheritance and divorce. The legal situation of women, however, was to be reformulated with a distinctively patriarchal perspective in the Empire. Although the Civil Code of 1804 retained some features of egalitarian marriage and equal inheritance, it reinstated men’s right to exercise marital and paternal authority over women. The Code stipulated that marriage required father’s consent, not the mother’s. It also imposed women’s obedience to their husbands and forbade women to take up employment without a husband’s permission. The husband also had the right to administer the wife’s property and income.

---


The Revolutionary period also saw the ideal of the Republican mother progressively appropriating Rousseauist concepts of woman, consolidating the groundwork for the overt conservatism of Napoleonic France in its views on women’s status and sexual morality. Early in Napoleon’s reign, Louis de Bonald advocated an education for young girls rigorously devoted to domestic and familial matters. Joseph de Maistre’s *Lettres à une dame protestante et une dame russe* (1809-1810) insisted on women’s chastity and obedience, while denying them any opportunities to take bold and influential actions. The double standard of sexual chastity was reflected in the Civil Code’s stipulation concerning conjugal infidelity. In the event of wife’s adultery, the husbands had the right to separation, while wives did not have the same recourse. Similarly, the Penal Code specified that an adulterous woman could be liable to maximum of two-year imprisonment, while man faced no such criminal penalties.

Women’s disadvantaged position in the Empire was not without its critics. In 1807, the utopian thinker Charles Fourier anonymously published his *Théorie des quatre mouvemens et des destinées générales*. As discussed below, he notably criticised the institution of marriage, as it was defined by the Civil Code, and also called for the liberation of married women’s passion from repression and frustration. Jouy’s *L’Hermite de la Chaussée-d’Antin* contains some articles (though not many) relating to the morality of married woman and the education of young girls. His view reflects the general conservatism of the Empire. Jouy’s prefaces to the four librettos published during the Empire do not take up feminist issues either. Yet these may have been due to his conscious self-censorship: he added references to patriarchal religion oppressive to women in his post-Napoleonic prefaces to *La Vestale* and *Les Bayadères*.

---

This seems to point us to feminist aspirations of these librettos. Furthermore, Jouy addressed himself to women’s issues in 1822, in ‘Influence des femmes sur les mœurs et le bonheur des nations’, one of his lectures debating on the role of women in the moral progress of society.\(^\text{12}\)

It is true that Jouy denied some radical eighteenth-century claims on women (like the Amazonian narratives of the period, see below) which sought to challenge the traditional notion of sexual difference (e.g., men had physical and mental strength, while women were more sensitive and emotional) in the interest of gender equality. Still, this text may be seen as his genuine defense of women. It embraces the feminist debates of the Enlightenment, in its defense of women’s special contribution to society in terms of its morality and happiness, and also acknowledges her historical presence in the public political sphere. In particular, he devoted a section of his text to the women of Gaul, the subject of his libretto _Velleda_. (Jouy’s text bears a particular resemblance to Antoine-Léonard Thomas’s influential book written in defense of women, _Essai sur le caractère, les mœurs et l’esprit des femmes dans les différents siècles_ (1772),\(^\text{13}\) cited by Jouy.\(^\text{14}\))

This chapter examines how four feminine subjects were appropriated in eighteenth-century writings, revealing the authors’ feminist consciousness, and how Jouy himself made use of these subjects in his librettos. It will also consider the way in which his narratives respond to a Napoleonic perspective of women, while at the same time reflecting his personal views on the status of women, as expressed on various occasions.

_

La Vestale_ (1807)

Jouy read the libretto of _La Vestale_ to the literary jury of the Opéra on 11 fructidor an VII (28

\(^\text{12}\)_ Jouy, ‘Influence des femmes sur les mœurs et le bonheur des nations’, _OC_, vol.14, 475-495. See the previous chapter (p.54) for the context of these lectures.


August 1799), four years before Spontini’s arrival in Paris (in 1803), and it was accepted the same day. Following Mehul’s and Cherubini’s rejection of the libretto, it was proposed to Spontini, who had set Jouy’s opéra-comique libretto Milton (co-authored with Michel Dieulafoy) in 1804 to great acclaim. Spontini had barely completed the score, when the jury unanimously objected to his musical style. His patroness, the Empress Joséphine petitioned to the Opéra for the mounting of the work, and the Opéra complied in December 1805, when the budget (29,000 francs) was approved by Napoleon. For the following six months, there was virtually no progress in the works, and it was not until in autumn 1807 that the premiere was scheduled in April 1807. During 1807, the project suffered various delays and disruptions, amongst them, the staging of Le Triomphe de Trajan as we saw (p.40), and the hostility towards Spontini, stemming from jealousy, prejudices towards his unconventional score and a general antipathy towards his authoritarian character. Despite its troubled preparations, the enthusiasm of the audience at the premiere on 15 December 1807 was such that Spontini, Gardel and Mme Branchu were called on to the stage, and Napoleon later acknowledged the triumph by rewarding Spontini and Jouy with a large payment. The production saw 200 performances, and it stayed in the repertory until 1830.

Amongst the librettos with Classical subject matter staged by the Opéra between 1800 and 1815, Jouy’s La Vestale is the only text which does not have a historical male hero as protagonist. The action of La Vestale begins with the Roman general Licinius confessing to Cinna his love for a Vestale, Julia, who was once promised to him in marriage. Her father objected to the union because of Licinius’s low status, and on his return to Rome as a victorious general, he learned that Julia had been consecrated to the service of goddess Vesta. Although at first Cinna warns of gods’ punishment, he agrees to help Licinius redeem his former lover.

16 Barbier, ibid., 103-104. See a letter of Luçay (the Préfet du Palais) to the director, F-Pan, AJ13 91.
17 Barbier, ibid., 105-112 and 115.
The High Priestess reminds the Vestals that the sacred flame will be extinguished if any amongst them violates her vow of chastity. She is aware of Julia’s reluctance to embrace the cult of Vesta, and alone with her, warns against the danger of human love. When Julia begs for the permission to absent herself from the coming victory celebration – dreading the encounter with Licinius whom she still loves, the High Priestess instead tasks her to attend the flame and to crown the hero during the ceremony. The celebration takes its course, and as Julia presents Licinius a golden laurel wreath, he whispers her his plan to abduct her that night.

In the temple, the High Priestess declares that Julia will guard the flame through the night (Act II). Alone, her fear of gods gradually works her up into a frenzy. In delirium, overcome by her love for Licinius, she steels herself to receive the wrath of gods, and throws open the door of the temple. Licinius was waiting. Having at first refused to run off with him, Julia finally consents: the sacred fire goes out. Cinna arrives on the scene, a crowd is gathering outside the temple. Unwilling Licinius leaves with Cinna, and Julia faints. The angry crowd demands vengeance for the sacrilege. Julia comes round to herself and admits her crime to the High Priest, but refuses to name her lover. The High Priest condemns her to be entombed alive.

Cinna has arranged forces for Licinius to save Julia (Act III). Licinius accuses the High Priest of barbarity and swears to rescue Julia, while admitting his complicity in her crime. His protest is fruitless, and the High Priest orders the lictors to escort Julia into her tomb. Licinius stops them, and by claiming himself as her seducer, begs the High Priest to take his life instead, but Julia in turn protects him by pretending not to know him. Their confessions agitate the crowd, and Julia makes her way into the tomb. Licinius’s soldiers try to break into the vault already sealed, but the vengeful crowd blocks their way. Yet suddenly, a flash of lightning strikes the altar, igniting Julia’s veil placed upon it. The High Priest accepts it as a divine grace, and unites the lovers.

Michel Delon’s study indicates that the theme of Vestals formed part of the eighteenth-century cultural imagination, owing much to its ideological, aesthetical and
The theme played an important role in the anticlerical debates of the Enlightenment, in particular as regards its attack on Christian asceticism and the promotion of virginity. In various fictional narratives anticlericalism is also evident; in Robert-Martin Lesuire’s *La Vestale Clodia à Titus* or in Charles-Albert Demoustier’s *Lettres à Émilie sur la mythologie* (1790) the Vestal is represented as a victim of religious power prohibiting natural human sentiments. The image of the unfortunate Vestal generated numerous paintings presented at official art exhibitions (Salons), from 1760s to early 1800s. Joseph-Benoît Suvée’s *La Vestale qui rallume le feu sacré* from 1781, like in Jouy’s dénouement, depicts the moment when the condemned Vestal’s veil placed on ashes is miraculously set ablaze, as she looks up to heaven, the witness of her innocence. The poignancy of Suvée’s portrayal also seems to convey the painter’s critical stance towards the Vestal’s public humiliation.

Jouy’s libretto has many similarities with Dubois-Fontanelle’s tragedy *Ericie, ou la Vestale* from 1768, banned by censors. The Vestal Ericie loves Osmide, who urges her to flee from the temple with him. Torn between love and duty, she refuses Osmide’s plea, when Emire, a vestal candidate, finds them: the fire goes out. The High Priest, who has to pass judgment on Ericie’s fate, realises that she is his daughter, whom he had made to take the Vestal vow. Ericie accuses him of coercing her into the service of goddess. But when Osmide threatens to kill him, she succumbs to her filial love and stops Osmide. In the last act, as she finally makes her way to the tomb entrance, Osmide arrives with a troupe of Roman soldiers. He curses gods who persecute love and pleads with Ericie to leave with him. Overcome by a sense of duty, she runs straight towards the point of his dagger and kills herself. Osmide

---

21 Charles-Albert Demoustier’s *Lettres à Émilie sur la mythologie*, 4 vols., Paris: Grangé, 1790. Delon mentions many works, amongst them, by Greuze (1761), Carle Van Loo (1765), Lavallée-Poussin (1767), Gamelin (1798), Peytavin (1801), and Danloux (1802).
22 Reproduced in Delon, ‘Mythologie de la Vestale’, 165.
23 Although in Jouy, Julia is in the course of being carried out of the vault still unconscious, when the miracle occurs.
follows her.  

The critique of both religion and patriarchy is at the heart of Dubois-Fontanelle’s tragedy. Ericie is a victim of religious fanaticism, which violates the natural right to liberty: ‘Is it a crime, in this place, to love liberty?/ The first desire of a human being is that of being free’.  

At the same time, the High Priest emerges as an embodiment of patriarchal power. Ericie accuses him that ‘you were my tyrant, and now you become my judge’. The Vestal on the other hand embodies female submissiveness and subordination. When Ericie deplores her servitude to Vesta, Emire replies: ‘But this liberty, the cause of your regrets,/ Does our sex ever have her share?/ The victim of fashion, slave of custom,/ She must marry out of duty, and not by choice,/ Crawl under his power, obey his rules,/ Tolerate his faults, honour his whims,/ Cherish him, respect even his injustices.’  

Although Jouy casts aside the lengthy religious and gender debates found in Dubois-Fontanelle, he adopts the same thematic and characteristic formula. Even if there is no father-daughter conflict, Julia had also been forced to become a Vestal by her father. She also describes herself ‘an unfortunate victim’, and ‘being fettered by force’.  

Licinius on the other hand, in confronting the High Priest, condemns the malice of their cult, and also blames the High Priest himself for perpetrating the sacrifice of an innocent (Act III/ 3).  

During the eighteenth century, many Enlightenment figures called for the liberation of women from male tyranny, and Sylvana Tomaselli points out that the emancipation of women during this period was frequently perceived as an index of the progress of society as a whole.

---

28 ‘Vous fûtes mon tyran, vous devenez mon juge.’ Act II/ 3.
29 ‘Mais cette liberté, qui cause vos regrets,/ Jamais de notre sexe est elle le partage?/ Victime de la mode, esclave de l’usage,/ Il faut prendre un époux par devoir, non par choix,/ Ramper sous son pouvoir, obéir à ses lois,/ Supporter ses défauts, honorer ses caprices,/ Le chérir, respecter jusqu’à ses injustices.’ Act I/ 3.
from tyranny to freedom. Montesquieu, for example, argued that the female servitude was indicative of prince’s despotism, their liberty, of the nation’s freedom. In William Alexander’s succinct account,

[…] the rank, therefore, and condition, in which we find women in any country, mark out to us with the greatest precision, the exact point in the scale of civil society, to which the people of such a country have arrived; and were their history entirely silent on every other subject, and only mentioned the manner in which they treated their women, we would, from thence, be enabled to form a tolerable judgment of the barbarity, or culture of their manners.

Jouy’s lecture of 1822 presents a similar view, that ‘one historical observation may underline the importance of women in the ancient nations: the people were virtuous wherever they were respected, degraded wherever they lived in slavery’.

In particular, he perceives female chastity (illustrated by a commonplace oriental context) not as a virtue but a form of male tyranny over women:

It is a moral truth which does not need to be explained in order to be proven, that any action not determined by free will ought not earn the person blame or praise. Modesty and extreme chastity of women in the East are praised; but where is the merit of a virtue which is maintained just like the continence of their guardians, by the impossibility of corruption?

In these populous and vast countries, the best half of the human species is under lock and key.

Jouy’s post-Napoleonic preface to the libretto wherein he points out the parallel between Christian asceticism and the chastity of the Vestals, also refers to the draconian strictness with which the Vestals’ chastity was regulated at the expense of their natural desire:

There was a certain secret relationship between the new dogmas of Christianity and the cult

---


34 Il est une vérité morale qui n'a besoin d'être énoncée pour être prouvée, c'est que toute action qui n'a pas été déterminée par une volonté libre, ne doit attirer ni blâme ni éloges à son auteur. On vante la pudeur et l'extrême chasteté des femmes de l'Orient; mais où est le mérite d'une vertu qui se conserve comme la continence de leurs gardiens, par l'impuissance de se corrompre? Dans ces contrées si peuplées et si vastes, la plus belle moitié de l'espèce humaine est sous les verrous. Ibid., 476.
of pagan Vestals. This peculiarity of virtues, this abnegation of earthly passion that they soon followed to the folly and madness, was the basis for the institution of the Vestals.\(^{35}\)

In Jouy’s Act II/2, Julia’s sudden yet momentary surrender to passion inside the temple gives rise to the melodramatic moment. Awestruck, Julia kneels down before the sacred fire.\(^{36}\) Initially, she invokes Vesta’s assistance in repressing her passion in her first aria (A-B-A’) in larghetto espressivo. But as she stands up and kindles the flame during the accompanied recitative, she imagines herself rejected by goddess. She runs all over the stage without direction, and at the point where the orchestra drops out momentarily, declares to surrender to the gods of love and desire: ‘Eh bien! Fils de Vénus, tu le veux, je me rends!’ (Well! Son of Venus, you demand it, I surrender!).\(^{37}\) The recitative from this moment onward has ostinato accompaniment (marked prestissimo) with a series of falling figures on the diminished seventh chords and their resolutions (first in the lower strings and bassoons then in the violins), which perhaps suggests Julia is now falling from her former moral being. She nevertheless tries to reconcile her conflicting emotions, but as rushing chromatic scales conclude the section, she loses her reason. In a state of delirium, Julia surrenders herself to love, and in the final aria (which works like a stretto to the recitative\(^{38}\)), she appeals to gods to grant her the pleasure of love, even at the expense of her own life.

In such a portrayal of the Vestal who only in her madness can liberate her natural desire, we may recognise a powerfully negative image of married women in the Empire, as identified in Charles Fourier’s Théorie des quatre mouvemens of 1808. Fourier argued that women in the modern institution of marriage were deprived of both economic and amorous fulfillment. Barred from most productive employment, they had to accept being sold into


\(^{37}\) Jouy, La Vestale, P. Didot, 1807, Act II/2, 18.

\(^{38}\) Libby, Gaspare Spontini, 66-69.
conjugal servitude when reaching marriageable age. More radically, Fourier believed that desires were one of the prohibited human faculties in current society which ought to be liberated. He fiercely criticised women’s emotional and sexual deprivation in marriage, that the marriage institution persecuted women ‘as soon as (they) obey the dictates of nature; (they) are forced to behave in insincere manner, and to listen only to impulses contrary to their desires’. Marriage also oppressed women by its double standard of adultery: ‘The law gives (men) more freedom and considers that acceptable for the strong sex which is a crime for the weaker sex’. Elsewhere Fourier apparently believed that his proposal of social organisation in the interest of the liberation of passion and desire, would eradicate every human problem. In Jouy, Julia’s fit of delirium perhaps carries a similar utopian aspiration for women and their passionnal liberation.

*Les Bayadères* (1810)

The Opéra accepted Jouy’s libretto *Les Bayadères* on 7 November 1807, less than six weeks before the premiere of *La Vestale*. More than a year later, at the end of December 1808, the staging cost were estimated at 94,000 francs. Around mid-January 1809, Rémusat, who had been awaiting Napoleon’s approval for the production of *Fernand Cortez*, authorised the staging process of *Les Bayadères* to begin. But soon after, the staging of *Cortez* was given priority (p.41), and all work related to *Les Bayadères* was suspended until around February 1810. When work resumed, Napoleon suggested opening the show on 20 March 1810, yet in June the sceneries were still not ready, while Catel was still composing the music for the ballet. At the

40 ‘[…] nous persecute dès que nous obéissons à la nature; on nous oblige à prendre un caractère factice, à n’écouter que des impulsions contraires à nos désirs.’ Fourier, *Théorie des quatre mouvements*, 200-201, cited in Goldstein, ibid., 101.
41 ‘[…] la loi leur donne plus de latitude et déclare gentillesse chez le sexe fort, ce qui est crime chez le sexe faible.’ Fourier, ibid, 123, in Goldstein, ibid.
42 Goldstein, 98.
end of July, the premiere was set for 9 August 1810, but it eventually took place a day earlier. Subsequently, the opera became the best box-office success of 1810, and performances continued until 10 October 1813. The production was revived in 1814, and in the 1820s it returned to the repertory. Its last performance took place on 30 April 1828.

In Jouy’s libretto, the young rajah of Banares, Démaly, has to choose a bride amongst three willing favourites in the harem, as the sacred law commands. Démaly, however, loves the bayadère Laméa, whose marriage tie is forbidden. As Démaly is about to reveal his feelings for Laméa to his ministers and the crowd, Olkar’s Maratha army invades the city and captures him. Laméa plans a rebellion by taking advantage of Olkar’s love for her (Act II). Olkar on the other hand contemplates exploiting Laméa for making Démaly divulge the hiding place of the treasure, the Vishnu diadem. Laméa goes to the rajah to reassure him that she has secretly instructed forces to gather, and then returns to Olkar to tell him that, as the diadem is in the temple whose profanation would provoke public agitations, she will fetch it herself discreetly during a forthcoming victory celebration. The celebration begins, and the bayadères gradually intoxicate the Marathas with music, dance, drink and perfume, as the Indian army is mobilised and finally storms its way into the city. Victorious Démaly once more proposes marriage to Laméa (Act III), but she refuses as a virtuous bayadère. Still determined to win her, Démaly goes off with Rustan (the intendant of the harem) to invent a ruse. As the women of the harem wait to be chosen by the Rajah, Rustan announces that a poisoned arrow struck Démaly during the recent battle. The priest, however, insists that the rajah must marry before he dies, adding that his bride must also die on his funeral pyre. His three favorites all refuse, but Laméa volunteers. As she ignites her own pyre, the healthy Démaly reveals himself. His

---

people sing the praises of Laméa’s virtue and courage, and rejoice over couple’s marriage.

As stated by Jouy, his first two acts are based on Voltaire’s narrative poem *L’Éducation d’un prince* from 1764. Voltaire’s poem tells a story of an indolent young prince in Benevento (Italy) whose court continues its decline, as the prince’s ineptitude and love of frivolities give free reign to two ministers and a priest. They had expelled the prince’s wise adviser, and conspire further to get rid of prince’s new lover Amide. As she was leaving him, the city is invaded by the Turks led by Abdala and the prince and his court were taken into captivity. Amide, by exploiting Abdala’s love for her, persuades him to punish the three statesmen, then in a discreet meeting with the prince (made one of Abdala’s muleteers), summons up his courage to successfully recover the country from the Turks. Jouy’s plot combines this story with an account in Hindu mythology (found in the *Puranas*), which he also mentions in the preface. According to Jouy’s account of the myth, the rajah Devendren – the god Shiva’s human incarnation is forced by his people to choose a bride, but he seeks love, and therefore devises a test. He pretends to be dying and declares on his deathbed that he will take as his wife whoever volunteers to mount his funeral pyre. His concubines all remain silent, but a young *bayadère* agrees to it. As she throws herself into the fire, it is miraculously extinguished. Shiva appears, now in his divine form, and immortalises their union, while also declaring that from now on the *bayadères* will serve the temple, and that the profession will be honoured.

As we saw in the previous chapter, Jouy’s interest in Indian subjects derived from his

---

48 Jouy, ‘Notice historique sur Les Bayadères’, 5-7. In *Women of pride: the devadasi heritage*, Lakshmi Vishwanathan only mentions one similar *bayadère* legend (closer to Goethe’s poem, see below) in which the *bayadère* Manikka Nachiyar is taunted for her profession and seeks a refuge in the temple. Shiva appears to her in his human form, and takes her as his wife, but soon after midnight, he dies. The *bayadère* follows him on the funeral pyre, but as she does, Shiva emerges in his divine form, and immortalises her soul. See Vishwanathan, *Women of pride: the devadasi heritage*, New Delhi: Lotus collection, 2008, 48-50.
personal experience in the country that was made available by the French colonial presence in India. At the same time, as Kate Marsh has shown, the literary tropes associated with India had already been established by the mid-eighteenth century in France. During the period between the recall of the governor Joseph-François Dupleix from Pondichéry in 1754 and the fall of the Napoleonic Empire, fictions, as well as historical writings and travel accounts which claimed eyewitness authenticity, all used such tropes as a form of literary shorthand to establish a convincing Indian setting. Two feminine tropes which Jouy’s narrative used - the figures of the bayadère dancers and the Hindu widow who carries out self-immolation at her husband’s death (the practice is called ‘sati’) - were both prevalent as a marker of Indian women, and in various texts, the self-sacrificing bayadère served as an exemplar of female fidelity, like André-Guillaume Contant d’Orville’s Histoire des différens peuples du monde (1770-1), and Pierre Sonnerat’s Voyage aux Indes Orientales (1782). Goethe’s poem ‘Der Gott und die Bajadere’ (1797), which Jouy cited later, drew inspiration from Pierre Sonnerat’s account in which bayadère is a prostitute. An Indian god descends to earth to inspect human love, and a bayadère falls in love with him, only to find him lying lifeless besides her, the following morning. Although the priests refuse her to follow him on the pyre, she leaps into the blaze. Her divine lover embraces her in the flames and they ascend to heaven. Goethe evokes the redemption of Mary Magdalene in the bayadère’s departure from the earth: ‘Arms outstretched she leaps tormented/ To the burning blaze of death./ But the god-youth freely soaring/ From the flames ascends the sky:/ With him, in his arms restoring,/ His beloved floats on high./ For penitent sinners divinity jubilates;/ Immortals lift children of darkness that desolates/ In burning

49 Marsh, India in the French Imagination, 23-24, 41 and 79. In 1795, the Théâtre de la République mounted Julie Candeille’s now lost La Bayadère ou Le Français à Surate (it had only two performances). Its review described that her bayadère was also ‘noble, chaste, and virtuous’. See Jacqueline Letzter and Robert Adelson, Women Writing Opera. Creativity and Controversy in the Age of the French Revolution, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 68.


51 Sonnerat’s description reflects the general trend to focus on the bayadères sexuality in eighteenth-century accounts (see Marsh, India in the French Imagination, 42-47). For further discussion, see below.
embraces to heaven on high.”\textsuperscript{52} Much later, the faithful bayadère once again appeared as a protagonist in Eugène Scribe’s libretto \textit{Le Dieu et la Bayadère} (1830).\textsuperscript{53}

Similarly, in Jouy’s libretto, the illicit love of the bayadère is redeemed by her exemplary devotion, as it is applauded in the last scenes: ‘Honneur à l’amante fidèle,/ Gloire à la tendre Laméa!’ (Honor the faithful lover, /Glory to sweet Laméa!).\textsuperscript{54} But in Jouy, Laméa’s selfless love not only redeems herself, but is seen also as a source of happiness of the rajah’s kingdom: ‘De l’heureuse alliance/ Des vertus et de la puissance/ Que tous les cœurs soient satisfaits;/ Et que le bonheur des sujets/ Du prince soit la récompense.’ (Let the happy alliance/ Of virtues and power/ Satisfy every heart;/ And let the happiness of the subject/ be the reward of the prince).\textsuperscript{55}

From a perspective of gender relations, the bayadère as such seems to relate to eighteenth-century cult of womanhood, whose virtue was seen as the foundation of public and private morality. The cult, at the same time, formed part of the gendering of public and private spheres, for example in Rousseau’s claim that women’s contribution to the ethical life of the community was only through marriage and motherhood, it insisted on male-defined feminine values like chastity, submissiveness, and selfless devotion to family and home.\textsuperscript{56}


\textsuperscript{53} Eugène Scribe, \textit{Le Dieu et la Bayadère, opéra en deux actes, Théâtre complet de M. Eugène Scribe}, second edition, 24 vols., Paris: A. André, 1835, vol.14, 117-155. It was set by Auber, and was first performed at the Opéra on 13 October 1830. In Scribe’s libretto, a mute bayadère Zoloé gives shelter to the god Brahma in human form. An arrogant Grand juge Olifour, orders to arrest the bayadères for interrupting the court, but tells the beautiful Zoloé that if she agrees to become his mistress, he will revoke his order. Zoloé’s refusal angers Olifour further. ‘The stranger’ (Brahma in disguise) protests and is arrested, but Olifour pardons him when Zoloé volunteers to become Olifour’s mistress in return for the stranger’s release. The stranger however had been involved in a violent dispute and the Grand Vizier comes to deliver his death warrant. Zoloé decides to hide him in her house. Brahma, in order to return to heaven, has to find a true love, and he devises a test to prove Zoloé’s love: he pretends to be interested in her bayadère friends and arouses her jealousy. Zoloé however pleads with him to take her as his slave. But soon, Olifour and his officers arrive at Zoloé’s door and arrest her. As she refuses to reveal the stranger’s hiding place, she is put onto the stake, but the god Brahma appears, rescues her, then takes her to heaven.

\textsuperscript{54} Jouy, \textit{Les Bayadères}, Roullet, 1810, Act III/ 6, 65.

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., Act III/ 7, 71.

himself inherited such a perspective on women’s place in society which resulted in the creation of the first government-funded school for young girls (the Institution Nationale d’Éducation des Jeunes Filles) in 1807, to educate daughters of Legion of honour recipients, designed to raise modest and frugal wives: ‘I am desirous that they may leave [the school] not as pleasing women but as virtuous women, that their pleasing qualities be those of morals and of heart, not of the mind and of amusement’.  

Whereas Jouy’s last act then reflects a male view of women’s role, his first two acts propose their public role. They unfold the admirable strength and resourcefulness of Laméa and the bayadères in the national crisis, in which the raja and his ministers have no role to play. In Act I, the ministers dismiss the raja, when he tells them of the danger of Olkar’s army, and press him to choose his bride that same sacred day. The wedding must take place, and the bayadères begin the entertainment for the courtiers gathered for the wedding, but Laméa

---

58 Napoleon, ‘Notes sur l’établissement d’Écouen’, addressed to the comte de Lacépède, 15 May 1807, translated in Bell and Offen, Women, the family and freedom, vol.1, 95.  
59 Pietro Metastasio’s satî libretto Alessandro nell’Indie (1730) has a similar plot, in which Cleofide (Cleophis), the wife of defeated Indian king Poro (Porus) actively negotiates with Alessandro (Alexander the Great), who in turn seeks her hand. Cleofide agrees to marry Alessandro to pacify his Greek army, but remains loyal to Poro, whose suicide is falsely reported to her, and leaps upon the blaze inside the temple, when they are about to wed. She is interrupted by the appearance of Poro. See, Pietro Metastasio, Alessandro nell’Indie, dramma per musica del teatro di S.M.B. (It./Eng.). London: Woodfall, 1756 and Alessandro nell’Indie, Tutte le opere di Pietro Metastasio, ed. Bruno Brunelli, Verona: Arnoldo Mondadori, 1953, vol.1, 307-354. Jouy’s contemporary critics commented on the mismatch between Voltaire’s tale and the Sati narrative. At the revival of the opera in 1814, the last act was eliminated. (See Suskin, The Music of Charles-Simon Catel, 192-193 and 268-271.)
interrupts it. In her recitative, the alternation of orchestral outbursts and tremolos, with diminished seventh chords suggest the stupefaction of the crowd and Laméa’s agitation as she tentatively begins her speech: ‘Dieux, vous me l’ordonnez, je romprai le silence’ (Gods, you command me, I will break the silence). The motif (characterised by dotted rhythms and a five-note figure) associated with ‘feelings of agitation, torment, anxiety, passion’, is used throughout the recitative. Then as the turbulent first section of the aria (in D minor) is suddenly let loose, she warns that the enemy attack is about to shatter the kingdom:

Voyez-vous du haut des montagnes
Accourir ces enfants du nord?
Au sein de nos belles campagnes
Ils portent le fer et la mort.
Dans cette fatale journée,
Des chants d’amour et d’hyménéé
Suspendez les molles douceurs;

(You see from the top of the mountains/ Come running the children north?/ To our beautiful fields/ They bring arms and death./ On this fatal day./ Suspend the dull sweetness/ Of love songs and nuptial blessing)

She then raises a rallying cry in the D major section, where the conventional formulas of martial rhythms, strictly periodic phrasing and large melodic leaps delineate Laméa’s heroic and valiant character. The chorus of the bayadères enthusiastically responds to it.

Aux accents de la gloire
Réveillez la victoire,
De sa flamme sacrée
Embrasez les grands cœurs.

(To the cry of honour/ Wake up victory./ With its sacred flame/ Set ablaze the great hearts.)

Laméa has another vehement aria (A-B-A-B-Coda), which she sings before going off to tell

---

62 Cf. ibid., 226-227.
63 Jouy, Les Bayadères, Roullet, 1810, Act I/ 5, 32.
the rajah about her plan to defeat the Marathas in Act II/5: ‘Sans détourner les yeux/ Des vains périls où je m'expose,/ Marchons vers le but glorieux/ Que mon cœur se propose’ (Without averting the eyes/ From the insignificant perils to which I expose myself,/ Let us march towards the glorious end/ To which my heart aspires), etc. The motif returns at the opening in B minor, and as in the previous aria, the disjunct upward motions that reach high F-sharps in the melodic line convey a sense of the heroine’s audacity and pride.

The bayadères also play important roles in Laméa’s ruse. They enrapture the Marathas with their seductive dance and successfully cajole them into disarming:

Elles se mêlent aux Marattes [sic]: tandis que les unes exécutent autour d’eux les danses les plus voluptueuses; d’autres brûlent des parfums; d’autres sur le dernier plan leur versent dans des coupes d’or des liqueurs enivrantes: la musique, la danse, les chants, les parfums, les breuvages, tout est mis en usage pour séduire les compagnons d’Olkar, qui partage bientôt le délire de ses guerriers.

(While some perform the most voluptuous dances around them, some burn incense; others upstage pour the intoxicating liquors into their golden cups; music, dance, singing, perfume, and drinks, everything is done to seduce the soldiers of Olkar, who soon shares the delirium of his warriors.)

The image of an oriental harem which Jouy evokes here appears to be indebted to the eighteenth-century commonplace sexualisation of bayadères, characterised by its focus on female body, the object of male gaze, as in Le Maistre de la Tour’s description (cf. Sonnerat’s account, p.80):

It could be said that they would appear delightful on stage at the Opéra in Paris: with these women all the singing and all the dancing takes place at the same time; their heads, their eyes, their arms, their feet, and their whole bodies seem to move only to bewitch (the spectator); they are very light and they have strong legs; they pirouette on one foot and then jump in the next instance with a surprising force; they have such a good sense of timing with

---

64 Ibid., Act II/ 5. 41.
65 Ibid., Act II/ 9, 49-50. Seduction of the hero is frequent in the divertissement of eighteenth-century French opera (for instance, in Act II/ 5 of Rameau’s Castor and Pollux (1737)). In Essai sur l’Opéra français, Jouy mentions the divertissement (in Act II/ 4) of Quinault’s Armide (1686) in which nymphs, shepherds and shepherdesses sing and dance to entice the sleeping Renaud to give in to fleeting pleasures. (Jouy, Essai sur l’Opéra français, ed. Gerhard, 89.)
66 See Marsh, India in the French Imagination, 42-47.
their steps and movements that they accompany the musical instruments with small bells which they wear around their feet, and as their bodies are the most svelte and most elegant, all their movements take place with grace.67

But as Jouy later added in his post-Napoleonic preface, for him, sexual license of the bayadères stood as an example of religious institution’s control over feminine sexuality, like in the case of the Vestals (alongside the notion of the Vestals as a victim of religious power, that of bayadères as a victim of the Brahmins’ also had existed68):

À Rome, la direction des vestales appartenait au souverain pontife; celle des bayadères était confiée au grand Gourou, chef des Brahmes.[…] Autant la chasteté des vestales était sévère, autant les mœurs des bayadères étaient licencieuses. Sacrifier à l’amour était le devoir des unes et le crime des autres. On eût puni la bayadère pudique avec la même rigueur qui frappait la vestale infidèle à ses serments.

(In Rome, the supervision of the Vestals belonged to the High Priest; that of the bayadères was assigned to the guru, the chief Brahmin. […] As chastity in the Vestal Virgins was maintained completely, so the customs of the bayadères were licentious. To submit oneself to love was the duty of the latter, and a crime for the former. They would have punished a modest bayadère with the severity that befell a vestal unfaithful to her vows.69

Jouy’s licentious bayadères who succeed in subjugating their adversaries surely speak in defence of women, in that these female figures manipulate the male gaze to their advantage, while at the same time revealing a weakness of male characters. His bayadères may then symbolise women’s empowerment through their seductive power.

Les Amazones, ou la Fondation de Thèbes (1811)

The libretto of Les Amazones was accepted on 11 September 1806 with a rare unanimous approval of the literary jury, who preferred it to La Vestale.70 Because Spontini was occupied

68 See Marsh, ibid., 44.
with revisions and rehearsals of *La Vestale*, Jouy turned to Méhul, who began the composition by the autumn of 1808. When the rehearsals started around late July 1811, various obstacles arose (the inadequacy of the Opéra’s women’s chorus, a change of choreographer due to the illness of the ballet master Gardel, and the baritone François Lays’s sudden withdrawal from the role of Amphion, followed by his replacement by the tenor Louis Nourrit), forcing Méhul to make substantial changes to the score; the decision was taken to delay the premiere until 1812. Anxious to celebrate the anniversary of Napoleon’s coronation and the Battle of Austerlitz with a performance of *Les Amazones*, Rémusat however pressed Picard for an earlier premiere in December 1811. The premiere, which finally took place on 17 December 1811, only had a lukewarm reception. The critics were unanimously unimpressed by Jouy’s *deus ex machina* conclusion, involving Jupiter. The production only saw nine performances in total, ending on 31 March 1811.\(^{71}\) Jouy’s subsequent revision of his text at Méhul’s insistence was insufficient for the composer to revise his score, and Jouy’s wish for a revival was never fulfilled.\(^{72}\)

As Jouy’s preface refers to the historiographical tradition of the Amazon myths, this nation of female warriors were supposed to have originated in the city of Themiscyra on the banks of the river Thermidon in Pontic Asia Minor. Through numerous conquests, the Amazons founded many settlements, amongst them Sinope, Cyme, Priene, Mytilene, Ephesus, Smyrna and Myrina. They sought men for procreation but, according to one account, then crippled their male children.\(^{73}\) The Amazons appear in several Greek myths. Bellerophon killed them in Lycia. The Amazon queen, Penthesilea, led her army in the Trojan war in support of the Trojans, but she was killed by Achilles. Hercules’s ninth labour was to steal the girdle of the Amazon queen Hippolyte. Hercules was accompanied by Theseus, whose abduction of the Amazon queen, Antiope, led to an Amazon invasion of Attica.\(^{74}\)

---

\(^{71}\) Cf. *Journal de l’Opéra, F-Po*, 3306.


\(^{74}\) See ibid., and Jessica Amanda Salmonson, *The Encyclopedia of Amazons: Women Warriors from*
In the context of gender politics, the Amazon defeat in these myths, Jessica Amanda Salmonson suggests, is an outcome of a misogynistic tradition, asserting ‘the propriety of patriarchal ascendancy’. At the same time, as Josine H. Blok has observed, these Amazon myths ‘embody an otherness to the set of values of masculinity and femininity in epic-heroic life’, and according to Alain Bertrand, in France, the theme of the Amazons as such was used to counter misogynistic preconceptions about the roles of the sexes from the last quarter of the seventeenth century, antecedently to Johann Jakob Bachofen’s influential theory of matriarchy Das Mutterrecht (Mother Right; 1861). In his De Amazonibus dissertatio (1687; French translation in 1718), Pierre Petit refuted previous skepticism about the historical existence of the Amazons by rejecting sexist assumptions that denied women’s ability to fight and conquer their male adversaries. To defend the historical existence of the Amazons was again the object of Claude-Marie Guyon’s Histoire des Amazones, anciennes et modernes (1740). Building on Petit’s argument, his preface offered an overview of illustrious queens in history, argued that females in power had all the qualities of good rulers, and claimed women’s equal ability to hold power. In the light of a warlike existence of the Amazons, Guyon also believed that the traditional distribution of social roles between the sexes, as well as women’s physical capacities, were only a matter of custom and education, and contended that ‘women would display the same strength and activity [as men] if they were not confined to tasks whose tenderness and weakness restrict the resources that nature has given them’.

---

80 ‘Elle seroient capables de la même force et de la même action, si on ne les bornoit à des ouvrages, dont
Over the course of the eighteenth century, the question of gender roles entered numerous stage works with themes of the Amazons and women’s rule. Characteristically, in these works, the gender roles are reversed. Common elements as identified by Alexandre Stroev can be seen, for instance, in *Les Amazones modernes* (1727) by Louis Fuzelier and Marc-Antoine Legrand: 1) The sea voyage, symbolising the separation of male and female world: a group of men arrives to the island of the Amazons in search of their abducted lovers. 2) The origin of the island is either a male tyranny, provoking revolt and liberation of women, or men’s degeneration: on the island, women, suffering from maltreatment, steal the arms from men and kill them. 3) When power is gained, women organise society according to their wishes. The modern Amazons opt for a military democracy and a republic, whose military leader and Prime Minister are elected every year, so that they can take turns. The legislation also obliges women to denounce love. 4) Conflict is often present, not only in terms of a gender opposition, but also within women: kidnapped on the island by the Amazons, Finette is reluctant to embrace their hatred of men. Her sister Julie had decided to disguise herself as a man, ‘Valere’ (the name of her lover), to avoid becoming an Amazon, with the hope of escaping and returning to him. Furthermore, the General of the Amazons falls in love with the disguised Julie, in spite of their oath. She cannot hide her jealousy when Julie’s lover Valere turns up, disguised as a woman (to avoid becoming a male slave of the Amazons). 5) Men are

---


excluded from all ruling positions, the army, science and religion: The prisoners are obliged to take on occupations previously the preserve of women. Thus, a courtier dresses a distaff, a persecutor stitches clothes, a poet cards wool, an apothecary makes tapestry, etc.

Matters return to the status quo in the conclusion: The reported attack of an enemy turns out to be men who had come to reclaim their lovers, and the Amazons abandon the army to join them. Hence, it endorses the triumph of love over militant feminism, but at the same time the return of male domination is put on hold, as men promise to allow women to legislate and agree to their condition of capitulation: first, no hierarchy exists between husband and wife; second, women may study, have their colleges and universities, and speak Greek and Latin; third, they may command army and aspire to the important responsibilities in the domains of justice and finance; fourth, it should be a disgrace for men to betray conjugal fidelity, as it has been for women: men ought not honour the action which they consider as a crime for women.  

Similarly, in the only Amazon tragedy written by a woman, Les Amazones (1749) by Anne-Marie du Boccage, part of the Theseus myth is turned round, as he is a prisoner of the Amazons and the next sacrificial victim. As in Fuzelier and Legrand, the inflexibility of Amazonian principles is presented in terms of politically forbidden love, since both the Amazon queen Orithie and her future successor Antiope are in love with Theseus. Although Antiope is loved by Theseus, she rejects Theseus’s love out of Amazonian pride and loyalty to Orithie. The problem of gender relations finds no clear solution in Du Boccage’s ending: on the one hand, Theseus defeats the Amazons, and although he returns the throne to Orithie, she commits suicide, and orders the fanatic Ménalippe to reign. On the other hand, in ‘a patriarchal happy ending’, Antiope is united with Theseus, and follows him to Athens.

Jouy’s Les Amazones begins in the emerging city of Thebes, where its construction

84 Ibid., Act III/ 15.
progresses to the sound of Amphion’s lyre.\textsuperscript{87} His brother Zéthus returns to Amphion and reports the approach of the invading Amazons. On their island of Euboea (Act II), queen Antiope notices Ériphile distressed amongst the combative Amazons, who swear their eternal hatred of men to the goddess Diane. Ériphile reluctantly says that even though she has learned to accept her oath, she is not joining the invasion of her homeland. Antiope reproaches Ériphile, and is determined to have her revenge on the Thebans whose king (her father) ordered the execution of her twins by Jupiter. When Amphion and Zéthus arrive at their camp to negotiate peace, Ériphile is astonished to find her lover Zéthus. Indifferent to their proposition, Antiope captures the two Thebans and goes away with the rest of the Amazons to learn their fate from the goddess. Ériphile reproaches Zéthus for abandoning her, but he swears fidelity, and Ériphile in turn promises him to reject her oath and embrace love. The two Thebans and Ériphile decide to flee from the island but they are stopped by Antiope, who orders that Amphion must die chained to a rock where he would witness the destruction of Thebes by the Amazons, and that Ériphile must herself perform Zéthus’s sacrifice to Diane. The Amazons head for Thebes and Amphion, tied to a rock, sings to invoke the aid of his gods. In hearing him, satyrs, fauns, the Dryads, the Oreads, Iris, Aurore and Phoebe all appear and release him, and the Nereids finally guide his escape from the island. In the third act, the city of Thebes falls to the Amazons, and Amphion (now returned to the city) and Zéthus are condemned to death. But as Amphion invokes Jupiter before his execution, strange fear seizes Antiope, and she interrupts it. When Amphion reveals that they were raised on Mount Cithaeron by herdsmen, and relates their flight from the persecution of Lycus, Antiope realises that they are her twins, but now the Amazons mercilessly reminds her of their oath. The Amazons are on the point of shooting an arrow: Antiope and Ériphile place themselves in front of Amphion and Zéthus. But as the Thebans and the Amazons come to blows, the sky suddenly darkens and

\textsuperscript{87} In Greek mythology, Amphion played the three-stringed lyre, and was able to move stones with his music.
Jupiter intervenes to reunite Antiope to her sons, and to release the Amazons from their oath. Zéthus marries Éraphile and the Thebans and the Amazons are reconciled.

Jouy’s 1811 preface relies on Guyon’s *Histoire des Amazones*, and accepts his theory of the Amazons’ historicity.\(^{88}\) ‘It is at least certain that they banded together in the course of their first expeditions, a crowd of women who, whether by character, or discontent with their parents, their spouses, or for any other reason, gathered under their flags’.\(^{89}\) On the other hand, Jouy shows no further political engagement with Guyon’s book. Nevertheless, various aspects of his libretto have some features consistent with Stroev’s analysis above, and this suggests that Jouy drew inspiration from those texts which appropriated the Amazon myth for the purpose of gender debate: in Jouy, the camp of the Amazons is also situated on an island. Like the young amazons in Fuzelier and Legrand, Éraphile cannot embrace the fanatical Amazonian custom. While Jouy drew on the myth of Antiope, the daughter of the Theban king Nycteus as well as mother of the twins Amphion and Zethus, in the original versions of the myth, after her liaison with Zeus, Antiope suffers from the persecution of Dirce (the wife of her uncle Lycus), and is later avenged by her twins, who kill Dirce.\(^{90}\) In Jouy, as in earlier examples, the power relations between Antiope and the twins are reversed: Antiope is a warring queen, the twins, her enemy and later, her prisoners. At the same time, in Jouy, Antiope is a rebel against patriarchal power, since her determination to destroy the Thebans originates in the supposed sacrifice of her two sons by her father (Act II/3).

By contrast, Jouy’s choice of Antiope, the mother of Theban twins, seems to respond

---

\(^{88}\) Jouy, ‘Avant-propos’, *Les Amazones ou la Fondation de Thèbes, opéra en trois actes*, Paris: Roullet, 1811, iii-viii. Jouy nonetheless expresses some reservations about a popular ethnographical account that the Amazons, while renouncing marriage ties, mated with men. Jouy argues that it is unreasonable that the neighbouring tribes mate with their enemy, especially with the Amazons whose extreme state of chastity manifested as hatred of men, and that reversely, it is odd to think that the Amazons renounced modesty and prudence for the sake of the continuation of their republic. Ibid., v.

\(^{89}\) ‘Il est du moins certain qu’elles s’associèrent dans le cours de leurs premières expéditions, une foule de femmes qui, par caractère, par mécontentements de leurs parents, de leur époux, ou par tout autre motif, se rangèrent sous leurs enseignes.’ Ibid.

to Rousseauist notion of womanhood, ever-present in the Napoleonic France.\footnote{Rogers, ‘Competing Visions’, 147-170.} According to Rousseau, women were a source of society’s moral regeneration only as private persons: ‘But let mothers deign to nurse their children, morals will reform themselves, nature’s sentiments will be awakened in every heart. […] Thus, from the correction of this single abuse would soon result a general reform; nature would soon have reclaimed all its rights. Let women once again become mothers, men will soon become fathers and husbands again.’\footnote{Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Emile or On Education*, trans. Allan Bloom, Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1991, 46. For Rousseau’s gender ideology, see Landes, ‘Rousseau’s Reply to Public Women’, 66-89; Madelyn Gutwirth, ‘Woman as Mediatrix: From Jean-Jacque Rousseau to Germaine de Staël’, in *Woman as Mediatrix: essays on nineteenth-century European women writers*, ed. Avriel H. Goldberger, New York and London: Greenwood, 1987, 13-27.} In Jouy’s dénouement, motherhood restores Antiope herself to a sense of human being: when Antiope recognises her sons, her previous barbarity suddenly gives way to maternal tenderness and sentimentality, and she begs for the Amazons’ consent to free the victims: ‘Aux cris douloureux d'une mère,/ Laissez fléchir votre colère;/ Ce sont mes fils que je défends!/ Jugez de mes tourments, que votre cœur ignore,/ Votre reine, Antiope, à genoux vous implore;/ Rendez moi mes enfants’ (Let the painful cries of a mother,/ Relent your anger;/ These are my sons that I defend!/ Imagine my torments, which your heart does not know;/ Your queen, Antiope, kneeling, beseeches you,/ Give me back my children).\footnote{Jouy, *Les Amazones*, Roullet, 1811, Act III/ 3, 58.}

Indeed, Jouy may well have been ambivalent towards Petit’s and Guyon’s radical claims on gender roles. One may argue that his commentaries on women are essentially in line with the Napoleonic attitude to women that inherited the eighteenth-century attitude to women in general, which on one hand made various appeals for sexual equality and women’s emancipation, but on the other hand endorsed the traditional division of gender roles.\footnote{Cf. Rogers, ‘Competing Visions’ and also McMillan, *France and Women*, 35-44.} In his lecture of 1822, Jouy asserted that:

Considérée sous un point de vue général, il est incontestable que la nature a doué plus particulièrement les hommes des qualités physiques et morales qui constituent la puissance; mais il est également certain qu' une organisation plus délicate, une plus grande sensibilité,
des passions plus vives, une imagination plus heureuse, donnent aux femmes, dans l'ordre social, une influence qui s'accroît avec la civilisation, et finit par leur assurer la souveraineté, qu'elles exercent, comme l'exerçait jadis le cardinal de Richelieu, en laissant à un autre le nom de roi.

(Considered from a general point of view, it is undeniable that nature has endowed more particularly men with physical and moral qualities, which constitute the power, but it is also certain that a more delicate constitution, greater sensitivity, more intense passions, happier imagination, provide women in society with an influence that increases with civilisation, and ultimately ensures their sovereignty, which they exert, as in the case of Cardinal Richelieu, in the name of a different person.95)

While Jouy exalted women’s public status, he perhaps considers men to possess the ultimate authority within the society where women are indeed emancipated. He also maintained that women in French society has played an important role in the lives of great men: ‘Endowed with a wonderful instinct to recognise the man of great merit, to foresee his talent, to appreciate the genius, they are somehow the link which combines them, the sweet and hidden impulse which put them into effect.’96 Such an assertion, again, may be read as a Rousseauist view, as Marisa Linton observes, that women were powerful complements to men, but not powerful as independent individuals.97 Jouy’s trust in the maintenance of gender difference is also apparent in an article (1811) of his L’Hermite de la Chaussée-d’Antin, in which he responded to a female reader, who asked his opinion on her husband’s interdiction to promenade alone in the Tuileries garden, on the grounds that it was inappropriate for a young woman. While asserting that he was more often willing to agree with women than with their husbands, thus perhaps denying the sexist bias, he maintained that it was indeed indecent for a young woman to go out alone. He then continued that ‘one is allowed to defy fashion, but not opinion’,98 thus advising his female reader to respect the accepted division of morality between the sexes, as it is

96 ‘Douées d’un instinct merveilleux pour discerner le mérite, pour pressentir le talent, pour apprécier le génie, elles sont en quelque sorte le lien qui les tient unis, le ressort doux et caché qui les met en œuvre.’ Ibid., 495.
97 Linton, ‘Virtue rewarded?’, 56.
reflected in social customs. Jouy’s here echoes Rousseau’s advice to women in his *Émile* (1762) that:

Their honour is not only in their conduct but in their reputation; and it is not possible that a woman who consents to be regarded as disreputable can ever be decent. When a man acts well, he depends only on himself and can brave public judgment; but when a woman acts well, she has accomplished only half of her task, and what is thought of her is no less important to her than what she actually is. [...] Opinion is the grave of virtue among men and its throne among women. \(^99\)

Furthermore, Jouy once expressed an opinion on women’s education that was in agreement with the Napoleonic view of girls’ education. In his proposal for the above-mentioned girls’ school (p.82), in the interest of training the girls for motherhood and domestic life, Napoleon recommended studies of religion, practical subjects like sewing and cooking bread, elementary reading, writing and mathematics, while excluding from their curriculum, drawing and music, as well as the Old Regime practice of preparing stage performances within the school. As regards subjects, he suggested a smattering of history, geography, botany, physics and natural history in their curriculum, but ruled out more academic subjects like Latin and foreign languages. Largely due to the absence of state legislation on girls’ schools, the period of the Empire as a whole nevertheless also saw the proliferation of schools modelled on the Old Regime’s aristocratic schools, whose programme of study for girls focused on their artistic accomplishments. \(^100\) In his ‘Maison d’éducation: Distribution de prix’, Jouy is critical of girls’ schools which exhibit female students’ talents for dance and singing at the prize-giving ceremony. For him, old convent education was a better model in that, although too sumptuary, it was directed towards domestic life, thus offering elementary education in grammar, arithmetic, and history, taught needlework, but rejected all developments of talent in arts. In relating to his recent visit to a girls’ school during its prize-giving


\(^100\) Rogers, ‘Competing Visions’, 152-152, and 163-167. In *Émile*, Rousseau had argued that girls’ education was determined by their natural role, to please men and to take domestic responsibilities: They should especially acquire skills in needlework, elementary drawing, singing and dancing, but rational subjects like philosophy, physics, mathematics and history should only be taught to boys. (See Book V)
ceremony, Jouy observed that while the students excelled in drawing, singing and dancing, they were incompetent in the subjects of grammar, mathematics, physics, botany and history.\(^\text{101}\)

However, the conservatism of his articles may be regarded as an act of self-censorship and compliance. It also seems important to take into consideration that the Amazons appear to have been an extreme subject matter for the Napoleonic society (see below). It is then possible to see Jouy’s ultimate presentation of Antiope overcome by maternal instinct as his effort to soften the extremeness of his subject by drawing upon a more prevailing Napoleonic image of women.

The review of the opera’s premier published in the *Journal de l’Empire* indeed asserted that the Amazons were the most unattractive and infelicitous (‘ingrat et malheureux’\(^\text{102}\)) subject one can think of. It questioned the suitability of the subject to the operatic stage, by invoking Jouy’s recent libretto *Les Bayadères*, and stated that whereas ‘the bayadères are devoted to pleasures and sensual delight, the Amazons are the enemies of men and at war with Nature’\(^\text{103}\).

It then continued:

A stage as gallant as the Opera, could it admit this herd of fanatics united for the destruction of society and the overthrowing of all laws of humanity? The *Bayadères* naturally bring onto the stage the dances that are its principal ornament; but how to dance the ferocious beasts who only love to fight! There is a battle between the *Bayadères* and the Indians; but they use no other weapons than their grace: the stronger sex, defeated and disarmed, must cede to the weak, armed with charm. If the image is not heroic, it is sweet and smiling: what is the aim of the Amazons? Two young warriors gentle as lambs among the raging wolves; they said that these warriors are full of courage; they are, only in speech. In this opera, men are women and women are men.\(^\text{104}\)

---

\(^\text{101}\) Jouy, ‘Maison d’Éducation: Distribution de prix’ (12 October 1811), *L’Hermite de la Chaussée-d’Antin*, vol.1, 78-86.

\(^\text{102}\) *Journal de l’Empire*, 20 December 1811.

\(^\text{103}\) ‘Les Bayadères sont consacrées aux plaisirs, à la volupté; les Amazones ont ennemies des homes en guerre avec la nature.’ Ibid.

\(^\text{104}\) ‘Une scène aussi galante que celle de l’Opéra, a-t-elle pu admettre ce troupeau d’enragées réunies pour la destruction de la société, et pour le renversement de toutes les lois de l’humanité! Les Bayadères amènent naturellement sur ce théâtre, les danses qui en font le principal ornement; mais comment faire danser des bêtes féroces qui n’aident qu’à se battre! Il y a un combat entre les Bayadères et les Indiens; mais les Bayadères n’y emploient d’autres armes que leurs grâces: les sexe fort vaincu et désarmé doit céder au faible, armé de ses charmes. Si l’image n’est pas héroïque, elle est douce et riante: quel objet me présentent les Amazones? Deux jeunes guerriers doux comme des agneaux parmi des louves.
We may note that the prevalence of the martial theme in Napoleonic operas does not stop this reviewer opposing the use of women warriors on the operatic stage. It is clear that to this author, the sensuous dances of the Bayadères, even for the purpose of defeating men provided a more acceptable image of women. 'In this opera, men are women and women are men': the reversal of gender roles in Jouy’s text clearly failed to draw support.

In the final scene of the opera, as Jupiter pacifies the Thebans and the Amazons, the Thebans say to the Amazons: ‘Pourquoi, dans les alarmes,/ Chercher de périlleux honneurs;/ Amazones, vos charmes,/ Libres du poids des armes,/ Seront plus sûrs d’être vainqueurs’ (Why, in a state of alarm,/ Seek perilous honours;/ Amazons, your charms,/ Free from the weight of weapons,/ Will more likely be the victors).105 Despite its subject matter, ultimately, Jouy’s narrative neither defended warrior feminism claiming women’s participation in the public and political arenas (as advocated by Théroigne de Méricourt in the recent past, see p.68), nor proposed to solve differences within the power relationship between men and women as in Fuzelier and Legrand. Instead it opted to celebrate Napoleonic womanhood, that is, mothers and pleasing women, who perhaps have to accept that their charm and goodness were the only resources of female power.

_Velleda, ou les Gauloises_ (1811)

Although the libretto was published only in 1823 in volume 19 of Jouy’s _Œuvres complètes_,106 its acceptance by the literary jury of the Opéra dates back to 1811 (on 25 November).107 Jouy offered it to a young composer Léopold Aimon (1779-1866)108 presumably when the composer

---

105 Jouy, _Les Amazones_, Roullet, 1811, Act III/ 4, 63.


107 See Jury de lecture: procès-verbaux des séances, F-Po, AD 23.

108 Léopold Aimon (b 4 Oct 1779; d 2 Feb 1866), born in L’Isle (present-day L’Isle-sur-la-Sorgue, Vaucluse), received his first music lessons from his composer and cellist father Esprit Aimon and at the age of seventeen, became conductor at the theatre in Marseille. He moved to Paris in 1817. Aimon’s
(according to Fétis’s *Biographie universelle des musiciens*) newly had arrived in Paris in 1817 with the hope of commencing his operatic career. As Jouy refers to a re-submission of the libretto (‘a l’époque où il [Aimon] présenta sa partitions achevée’\(^{109}\)) which was due to a new regulation at the Opéra,\(^{110}\) the record shows that the libretto was read to the jury by Jouy himself on 3 September 1817. The jury who found the action of the last two acts not well pursued, approved it on condition that it would be reduced to three acts. Contrary to his statement that ‘je refusai de m’y soumettre’,\(^{111}\) Jouy complied and re-submitted the three-act version, which was examined on 11 February 1818. The jury this time unanimously disapproved of its subject matter as well as its action, and consequently rejected the libretto.\(^{112}\)

*Velleda* is set in ancient Gaul (Armorica) where the Frankish leader Mérovée (dressed as a Roman soldier) accompanied by Lovis looks for a Gaul woman who once saved his life.

The Druidess Velleda appears on the rock by the stream and sings, and Mérovée recognises her. Velleda learns from the Gaulish warrior Isul that the Franks are arming against the Gauls.

---

\(^{109}\) Jouy, ‘Note’, *Velleda*, OC, vol.19, 408. For Aimon’s manuscript score (incomplete), see F-Pn, D. 367 and 368, as indicated in the Appendix.

\(^{110}\) Jouy, ibid.

\(^{111}\) Ibid., 409.

\(^{112}\) See ‘jury de lecture: procès-verbaux des séances’, F-Po, AD 23.
Although in love with a Frank, she reassures him that it is the honour of the Gauls which she will defend. Alone, Velleda laments the situation, but when the women gather around her, she leads their vows to participate in the war, and they strike the bronze shield as a signal. The Gauls assemble (Act II), and led by Velleda, swear to end their subjection to the Romans or die. Isul demands the Roman praetor Flavius to withdraw the army from the region. Angered Flavius swears to reduce the region to ashes. Velleda names Isul as their leader and the Gauls offer up a prayer to the god Esus. In the forest surrounding the temple of Tautatis (Act III), Velleda thinks of her lover. The capture of a Roman is announced and Velleda agrees to sacrifice him to Tautatis. Velleda leads the sacred ceremony of cutting the mistletoe and although hesitant, instructs to bring in the sacrificial victim. The victim is Mérovée. The storm rages, leaving the assembly unaware that Mérovée and Velleda recognise each other. As the assembly takes shelter in the temple, alone with Mérovée, Velleda begs him to run away, but Mérovée refuses to part with her. She decides to accompany his escape through the stream in a boat. As the fourth act opens, Velleda is seen asleep under a roof of foliage in a valley, over which the dawn breaks to reveal its scenic beauty. They have in fact come to Velleda’s birthplace, and the shepherds and shepherdesses celebrate Velleda’s return. But soon, the lovers are discovered by the Franks, who have now allied with the Romans against the Gauls. Flavius orders his men to capture Velleda. Mérovée protests and declares his love, but Velleda voluntarily runs towards the Roman soldiers. In the confusion, Mérovée and Velleda bid a last farewell. The Romans decide on Velleda’s execution and in the last act, Velleda is chained and brought to the Gaulish village under siege. She, however, sends a signal (an arrow carrying a message) to Isul standing by at a nearby village. Velleda’s execution is announced and she walks towards the tomb of Brennus, which opens with a great crash and flames. The Romans soldiers follow her, but hesitate as they notice the glow and the noise inside the tomb. As they enter the tomb, a messenger comes to report the advance of Mérovée’s army. At the same moment, the Gaulish soldiers emerge from the tomb, and the Romans flee. Velleda
raises the battle cry and the women offer up a prayer. The Romans are defeated and the victorious Mérovée returns. United, the Gauls and Franks celebrate the marriage of Velleda and Mérovée.

While the subject of ancient Gaul had produced some influential fictions in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it became the subject of historical enquiry, and it saw numerous publications. At the same time, like the history of the Amazons, the inclusion of women in military and political matters in ancient Gaul had also been mentioned in eighteenth-century feminist texts to support arguments for female empowerment. Antoine-Léonard Thomas’s *Essai sur le caractère, les mœurs et l’esprit des femmes dans les différents siècles* (1772) compiled a list of outstanding women in history, in view of offering ‘the history of this segment of human race which the other flatters and slanders by turns, and sometimes without knowing it’, and to show ‘what women were, what they are, and what they could be’. Thomas referred to Plutarque’s mention of the women of Gaul ‘who in a civil war throw themselves between the two armies, separate and reconcile the combatants, and since then deserve the honor of being admitted to public assemblies and

---


114 Namely, Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo’s medieval romance *Amadís de Gaula* (1508), Gautier de Coste de La Calprenède’s novel *Faramond, ou L’histoire de France* (1661-1670), and Honoré d’Urfé’s novel *Astrée*. Rodríguez de Montalvo’s text was the basis for *Amadis* (5; 1684) by Quinault and Lully.


117 ‘[…ce que les femmes ont été, ce qu’elle sont, & ce qu’elle pourraient être’. Ibid. Sylvana Tomaselli indicated that such compilations in defence of women proliferated in the eighteenth century. See Tomaselli, ‘Collecting Women: the Female in Scientific Biography’, *Science as Culture*, 1/4 (1988), 96.
sometimes regarded as arbitrators between nations'.

Even though in the chapter ‘Influence des femmes’, Jouy considered Thomas’s defense of women as an exaggeration (asserting that ‘the panegyrist of women, at whose helm we must place the eloquent Thomas, seem to have exaggerated the praise in their turn, in giving them a more perfect soul than ours’), in the same chapter he did produce a similar compilation of women in political life of the state. And in a manner similar to Thomas’s assertion, Jouy wrote on the women of Gaul:

The women of Gaul were as wise as their husbands were courageous; and as they shared the public virtues, they were hardly foreign to the affairs of the nation; they were consulted in the national assemblies, and more than once their opinion was beneficial to the republic; they had set an example for the Sabine women of throwing themselves between the armies who had drawn the exterminating sword of the civil war; they had brought peace among the belligerent ready to kill; they were the mediators between the Gauls and their neighbours, [etc.]

Jouy’s description of the women of Gaul as brave and active participants in her political community, was also a key aspect of Laméa’s character in Les Bayadères as we saw, and may also be identified as a key characteristic of Jouy’s other Napoleonic heroines, namely Amazily and Noraïme (Les Abencérages). Although in the 1809 version Amazily is devoted to the victory of Cortez, she sacrifices her love for him by deciding to cause her own death as means to save Cortez’s brother Alvar, and crosses the lake, astounding Cortez and the Mexican women, who cry out: ‘Ô courage! Ô vertu sublime!’ In Les Abencérages, the abencer rage general Almanzor has to be punished by death for losing the standard of Granada, and is escorted to the height of the rampart to take a death leap, but the princess of the same tribe Noraïme blocks

---

118 ‘[… ] qui dans une guerre civile se jette entre les deux armées, séparent & réconcilient les combattans, & par-là méritent l’honneur d’être admises depuis aux délibérations publiques, & quelque fois d’être prises pour arbitres entre des nations.’ Thomas, ibid., 13-14.


120 ‘Les femmes des Gaulois n’étaient pas moins sages que leurs maris n’étaient vaillants: et comme elles avaient part aux vertus publiques, elles n’étaient point étrangères aux affaires de la patrie; elles étaient consultées dans les assemblées nationales, et plus d’une fois leur avis fut salutaire à la république; elles avaient donné l’exemple aux filles des Sabins de se jeter entre des armées qui avaient tiré la glaive exterminateur de la guerre civile; elle avaient ramené la concorde parmi des furieux prêts à s’égorger; elles étaient les médiasrices entre les Gaulois et leurs voisins, [etc.]’ Ibid., 478.

their way and reveals the conspiracy of the rival tribe against him to demand justice. In *Velleda*, its subject matter enabled Jouy to write a plot whose main action itself involved the Gaulish heroine who sacrifices her love out of loyalty to her political community and who bands together the Gauls in an effort to oust the Romans. Jouy’s fifth act heightened the emphasis on the involvement of Gaulish women in the revolt. Velleda had sent a signal to Isul and by the time she is escorted to the tomb, the fires set by them begin to be seen on the distant horizon, causing alarm amongst the Roman soldiers. In his praise of Gaulish women, Jouy went further in endowing them with the superior courage, ferocity and determination:

Their husbands are about to run away, and they throw their children at their feet: ‘Crush them,’ they cry, ‘or return to the enemy’; they rush toward it, their wives follows them, fight alongside them, treat their wounds, and force them to conquer or die with them.

Jouy’s depiction of Gaulish men about to run away from battle may be seen as his conscious rejection of traditional masculinities, and this was exactly the action which Jouy unfolded in his libretto. When Mérovée’s mobilisation of army against the Romans is reported, Velleda instructs the Gauls to join the Franks, but some in a panic take to flight. Velleda thus orders them to proceed to the battlefield: ‘Guerriers, où courez-vous? / C’est là qu’il faut vous rendre./ C’est là qu’est l’ennemi…Que gagnez-vous à fuir?’ (‘Warriors, where do you go? It is there you need to be. / It is where the enemy is… What do you gain by running away?’),

while also insisting on a glorious fate to die fighting for the defence of one’s country: ‘Couvert de gloire ou d’infamie,/ Ne faut-il pas toujours périr?/ Ce n’est donc que pour la patrie/ Que vous ne savez pas mourir!’ (Showered with glory or infamy,/ Shouldn’t we always perish?/ It is therefore only for the country/ That you can die!) Following Velleda, the Gaulish women throw their children at their feet and demand: ‘Si la voix de l’honneur n’entre plus dans vos

---

125 Ibid.
armes,/ Foulez, foulez aux pieds vos enfants et vos femmes’ (If the voice of honour no longer is part of your weapons,/ Trample, trample to death your children and women). This successfully leads soldiers into combat.

At the same time, in the last act (as well as in the first two) Velleda is thus shown in the service of duty over love. In the fourth act, however, she emerges as the antithesis of Rousseauist model of feminine modesty. It is important to bear in mind that the source text for Velleda was the episode of the Druidess Vellëda in Chateaubriand’s Les Martyrs (1809; it tells the story of the conflict between nascent Christianity and official Roman paganism leading to the martyrdom of two Christian lovers Eudore and Cymodocée, and the triumph of Christianity), Books IX and X, in which the Roman soldier Eudore arrives in Armorica on his military mission and succumbs to the resilient enticement of the dark and mysterious Druidess Vellëda. On his discovery of their liaison, her father gathers the army against the Romans to avenge his daughter’s honour and is killed in the battle. Vellëda demands the Gauls to stop their attack by holding herself responsible for it and as an act of atonement for her violation of chastity vows, slits her throat.\textsuperscript{127} For a feminist critic Madelyn Gutwirth, Chateaubriand’s Vellëda presents a clear contrast to the Rousseauist ideas of femininity (presented by the main feminine character of the novel Cymodocée): as in Chateaubriand’s description, ‘the exaltation of her feelings often went to the point of wild behavior’,\textsuperscript{128} ‘he depicted the exaggerated passion of Vellëda as exceeding all bounds of civilised conduct’.\textsuperscript{129} And yet given his conservatism, Vellëda’s transgression, Gutwirth suggests, is an embodiment of the evils of female desire and seductive power, rather than a recognition of women’s empowerment through the pursuit of her own desires (as in de Staël’s Mirza, who loves freely).\textsuperscript{130}

\textsuperscript{126} Ibid., 405.
\textsuperscript{128} ‘L’exaltation de ses sentiments allait souvent jusqu’au désordre.’ Ibid., Book X, 261.
\textsuperscript{130} Ibid., 43-44.
In the final scene of Jouy’s third act, Velleda is shown begging Mérovée to escape alive. However, as he rejects her pleading, she suddenly decides to leave with him. In other words, while Jouy’s Velleda completely departed from the dark *femme fatale* of Chateaubriand, she is nevertheless a heroine who gives voice to her own desire: ‘D’un amour fatal et terrible/ J’éprouve les brûlants transports,/ Et son pouvoir irrésistible/ A brisé mes derniers efforts’ (A fatal and frightening love/ I feel its burning transports,/ And its irresistible power/ Has ruined my last efforts).\(^{131}\) In the fourth act, they are seen in a remote valley and Velleda abandons herself to the sweet bliss of love: ‘Par des liens si chers/ Quand le sort nous rassemble,/ Oublions l’univers:/ Au fond de ces déserts/ Vivons, mourons ensemble.’ (When by the dearest ties/ Fate brings us together,/ Let us forget the world:/ In the heart of this wilderness/ Let us live, and die together).\(^{132}\)

Of the four librettos discussed here, only *Velleda* has the happy end which one may identify as evidently pro-feminist. When taken captive by the Romans, Velleda does not passively accept her fate and instead tells the Gauls: ‘Quel est ce désespoir? Quelle horreur vous accable/ Et semble vous glacer d’effroi?/ Les Chaînes qui présent sur moi/ Ne peuvent arrêter mon âme/ Qu’un saint espoir vient d’embraser;/ Le souffle du dieu qui m’enflamme/ Suffit pour les briser’ (What is this despair? What horror overwhelms you/ And seems to freeze you?/ The chains that are cast on me/ Can not stop my soul/ Which a holy hope has set ablaze;/ The breath of God that ignites me/ Is enough to break them).\(^{133}\) As we saw, she then sends a signal to set fire to surrounding forests, and instructs the Gauls to join the Franks in battle against the Romans. In other words, its happy end involving the Roman defeat is shown to be a result of Velleda’s own actions and determination.

In two texts above, Jouy even had opted for a providential ending, the happy end

\(^{132}\) Ibid., Act IV/ 1, 390.
\(^{133}\) Ibid., Act V/ 1, 400.
associated with political absolutism. In *La Vestale*, he consciously avoided the historically accurate tragic ending, and used a bolt of lightning that ignited the sacred fire, averting Julia’s death punishment. The heroine’s fate is subject to divine will, and she is not given the role neither to accept nor surmount ‘the tragic consequences of her actions’ (unlike Dubois-Fontanelle’s heroine Ericie). In *Les Amazones*, Jupiter’s descent *deus ex machina* prevented Antiope from seeing her twins murdered at the hands of the Amazons. It presented a distinctly patriarchal dénouement in which Jupiter (no other than the twin’s divine father) orders the Amazons and the Thebans to sanction the new empire of his twin sons: ‘Héroïnes, guerriers, à ma voix réunis;/ Abjurez vos haines cruelles;/ Par des promesses solennelles/ Consacrez aujourd’hui l’empire de mes fils;/ Amphion de ces murs doit fonder la puissance;/ Secondez ses heureux travaux’ (Heroines, warriors, united by my voice;/ Renounce your cruel hatred;/ By solemn promises/ Sanction today the empire of my sons;/ Amphion must found his power on these stones;/ Support his favourable work).  

All of Jouy’s librettos discussed here reveal his genuine interest in feminist issues and female power, as it was later shown in his ‘Influence des femmes’ of 1822. Yet the three
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134 See Fend, ‘Romantic Empowerment’, 278.
135 Jouy wrote in the preface to *La Vestale*: ‘En me proposant de transporter sur la scène lyrique une action dont le nœud, l’intérêt, et les détails, me paraissaient convenir particulièrement à ce genre de spectacle, je ne me dissimulai pas les difficultés que présentait le dénouement. La vérité historique exigeait que la vestale coupable subît la mort à laquelle sa faute l’avait exposée; mais cette affreuse catastrophe, qui pourrait, à la faveur d’un récit, trouver place dans une tragédie régulière, était-elle de nature à pouvoir être consommée sous les yeux du spectateur? Je ne le pense pas.’ (In aiming to transport to the lyric stage, an action whose intrigue, interest, and details appeared to be particularly suitable for this genre of spectacle, I did not close my eyes to the difficulties, which the conclusion posed. The historical truth meant that the vestal should suffer a death to which she is exposed by her sin; but this terrible catastrophe, which, thanks to narrative, could find its place in a standard tragedy, is it of nature that can be carried out in front of spectators? I do not think so.) Jouy, ‘Avant-propos’, *La Vestale*, P. Didot, 1807, vii-viii. For Winton Dean, this was Jouy’s ‘shamefaced apology’ for his happy end. (See Winton Dean, ‘French opera’, *The New Oxford history of music*, vol.8: The age of Beethoven 1790-1830, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982, 76.)
136 Elisabeth Bronfen, ‘Femme Fatale: Negotiations of Tragic Desire’, *New Literary History*, 35/1 (2004), 115. Bronfen analysed the *femme fatale*’s sexual transgression and the ultimate suicide in *film noir*, by drawing on tragedy theorist Stanley Cavell’s suggestion that the heroine’s death is ‘an enactment not of fate but of responsibility, including responsibility for fate’. Bronfen argued that the *femme fatale* may be seen as a ‘prototypical instance of modern feminine subjectivity’ (p. 115): ‘She comes to acknowledge her responsibility for her fate’, and ‘she comes to discover her freedom precisely in her embrace of the inevitability of causation’ (p.105).
staged texts - *La Vestale, Les Bayadères*, and *Les Amazones* clearly fall short of more radical feminist ideals. It seems that the feminist narratives, which Jouy could propose to the Napoleonic audience, were the ones suited to a Napoleonic perspective of women (we may recall that Jouy was able to refer to patriarchal religion’s oppression of women in the context of *La Vestale* and *Les Bayadères* only in his post-Napoleonic prefaces). Velleda, although also dating from the Empire period however, conveys more coherent feminist narrative. Did the example taken from France’s own ancient past, as well as Chateaubriand’s heroine, the antithesis of female modesty, stand for Jouy as an authentic feminist image, which resisted the patriarchal portrayal?
Following his prolific years at the Opéra under Napoleon’s empire, Jouy was elected to the Académie Française in 1815. In the Restoration he was a distinguished literary figure and in 1823, with his 60th birthday approaching, Jouy embarked on the publication of his Œuvres complètes (1823-1828; sold on a subscription basis).\(^1\) His Essai sur l’opéra français appeared in its volume 22 in 1826\(^2\) and, long after the success of his operas, Jouy here set down the poetics behind his librettos.

Anselm Gerhard has offered a detailed analysis of Jouy’s Essai in his 1987 article, as well as in a chapter of his The Urbanization of Opera (1998).\(^3\) Gerhard indicates that there was very little debate on the aesthetics of opera between 1789 and 1820 (the year when Castil-Blaze’s De l’Opéra was published\(^4\)), in contrast to the previous 100 years during which various generic problems of French opera were at the centre of literary and philosophical discussions.\(^5\) Apart from the Encyclopédie Méthodique\(^6\), only two treatises may be located: Joseph-Balthazar Bonet de Treiches’s De l’Opéra en l’an XII (1803), which actually was about the management of the Opéra, and Jacques Daniel Martine’s De la musique dramatique en France (1813), which merely presented inconsequential observations on opera.\(^7\)

---

\(^1\) Comeau, Étienne Jouy, 105-106; Claude Pichois, Philarète Chasles et la vie littéraire au temps du romantisme, 2 vols., Paris: José Corti, 1965, vol.1, 141-142.

\(^2\) Jouy, *Essai sur l’opéra français*, OC, Paris: Jules Didot, 1823, vol.22, 225-282. Although the title page of this volume shows the year of publication, 1823, as Anselm Gerhard indicated (cf. Gerhard, ‘Incantesimo o specchio dei costumi: un’estetica dell’opera del librettista di Guillaume Tell’, *Bollettino del Centro Rossiniano di Studi*, no. 1-3 (1987), 49, fn. 11), the publication of the volume was announced in *Bibliographie de la France*, ou Journal général de l'imprimerie et de la librairie on 10 June 1826 (p. 518, n.3867). On further datings of the essay, see the second part of the present chapter.


\(^7\) Jacques Daniel Martine, *De la Musique dramatique en France*. Paris: Dentu, 1813. This author
Gerhard points out an evident anachronism in the way Jouy, as a man of letters, undertook the discussion of opera in 1826 by reflecting the practice of a previous era, wherein opera was considered as part of the arts of letters, in contrast to Castil-Blaze’s 1820 treatise which devoted its discussion more to the musical aspect, revealing some evident shift in the aesthetical conception of opera. Jouy also appears to be ‘unsuccessful in reconciling his awareness of his own time with his conservative theories’, or is even ‘entrenched in a classicist aesthetics, going back further even than the position reached during the second half of the eighteenth century’, especially, in his insistence on *le merveilleux* as a central category of French opera. Gerhard finds more modern perspectives in Jouy’s essay, namely, his insistence on contrasts, realism in local colour (such as also found in Victor Hugo’s preface to *Cromwell* from 1827), as well as his suggestion of a five-act format. Although the first two concepts originated in the late eighteenth century, Hugo recasts them as his own revolutionary statement, while in Jouy, those more modern views were held back by older conventions.

What Gerhard did not take into account in pointing to Jouy’s conservatism however, was the conflict between the French classicists and romantics in the decade 1820-1830, and the arrival of Rossini operas in Paris in the early 1820s which once again provoked debates on French operatic theory vis-à-vis the Italian tradition, and which challenged the French view on the relationship between words and music. This chapter first explores the content of Jouy’s

---

9 ‘[…] egli non riesce a conciliare la sensibilità per la sua epoca con le proprie teorie conservatrici.’ Gerhard, ‘Incantesimo o specchio dei costumi’, 49-50. In his chapter ‘Victor-Joseph Étienne de Jouy, a Hermit in the City’, Gerhard puts it more bluntly that ‘certainly, this normative treatise contains no trace of any effort to find aesthetic justifications for the artistic beliefs of the time’. (p.44)
10 Gerhard, ‘Victor-Joseph Étienne de Jouy, a Hermit in the City’, 44.
13 Ibid., 59.
*Essai*, then argues with reference to contemporary sources that the conservatism of the *Essai* was a direct response to contemporary polemics. It also explores the way in which Jouy’s collaboration with Rossini was perceived by his critics, and how Jouy came to terms with the Rossinian view of opera characterised by its focus on the musical aspect.

**Libretto**

Jouy’s *Essai* is structured in three sections: the first concerns his general observations on French opera and discusses libretto writing, the second is dedicated to music, and the third, to dance and scenery. Although there is no mention of co-authorship in the *Essai*, we should be aware that its second section was probably written by Philarète Chasles, Jouy’s young literary assistant between 1820 and 1828 (see Chapter 5). Jouy himself confirms the authorship, although only in the general preface to his complete works:

Amongst the young generation, which I consider destined for great literary career, I do not hesitate to also name the author of the second part of *Essai sur le grand Opéra Français*, which will appear in this collection of my works: Mr Ph. Chasles possesses two distinguishing qualities, a broad knowledge and burning imagination. The application of these two qualities, controlled by judgement and directed by good taste, promises this young author a brilliant success in his long career, which opens before him.\(^{14}\)

Claude Pichois nevertheless remains somewhat cautious about this statement of Jouy,\(^{15}\) and Gerhard, in reflecting on Pichois’s reading, wonders why Jouy does not mention Chasles in the

---

\(^{14}\) *Je ne crains pas d’indiquer encore parmi les jeunes gens que je crois appelés à de hautes destinées littéraires, l’auteur, pour la seconde partie, d’un *Essai sur le grand Opéra Français*, que l’on trouvera dans cette collection de mes œuvres: M. Ph. Chasles réunit deux qualités qui semblent s’exclure, une érudition vaste, et une imagination vive; l’emploi de ces deux facultés, modérées par le jugement et dirigées par le goût, promet au jeune écrivain de brillants succès dans la longue carrière qui s’ouvre devant lui.* Jouy, ‘Discours préliminaire’, *OC*, 1823, vol.1, 21.

\(^{15}\) He only noted that the section of music has ‘quelque chance d’être de Chasles’. Pichois, *Philarète Chasles*, vol.2, 122, fn 33. Also see Comeau, ‘Etienne Jouy’, 106. Comeau’s reference is Pichois, but he also implies dishonesty on Jouy’s part: ‘Jouy apparently allowed him [Chasles] to write exclusively, and without the proper credit, the second part of *Essai sur l’opéra français*, which deals with operatic music.’ (Ibid.)
actual volume in which *Essai* appears. He also points to the degree of authority in the writing, which supposedly came from young Chasles, and concludes that the content should have had ‘Jouy’s total approval’.\(^{16}\)

Jouy’s *Essai* takes a systematic approach and considers the principal elements of opera in some detail: choice of subject, *le merveilleux*, unity of action, number of acts, characters, chorus, and conclusion. His model is largely based on librettos produced after the operatic reforms of the 1770s and 1780s: a libretto may be founded on ‘fable, fairy tale, and history at its most heroic’\(^{17}\); *le merveilleux* may be used; it should present a unity and simplicity of action\(^{18}\) (no complicated subplots); the opera should be divided into three acts (or five, in subjects which require a sequence of festive or ceremonial gathering\(^{19}\)); it should have a chorus, and a happy ending.

The reform operas of Gluck and his successors adopted the alternative practice, seen from 1739, of structuring operas for the Académie Royale de Musique in three acts instead of five, and also introduced a fast-moving plot by eliminating Quinault’s subplots.\(^{20}\) In the *Essai*,

---

18 Ibid., 68.
19 Castil-Blaze’s view on the act-pattern remains conventional, and he maintains that opera should preferably consist of three acts (2 acts or 4 acts are permissible) but no more than four, and that ‘un opéra en quatre actes est déjà trop long, comment soutenir l’intérêt, alimenter la curiosité, et prévenir l’ennui si on étend l’ouvrage jusqu’à cinq?’ Castil-Blaze, *De l’Opéra en France*, 52.
Jouy also insists on the ‘extreme simplicity of the plot’ on several occasions: ‘the action should be simple, be free of all episodes, and the intrigue should aim to bring about and overcome those obstacles which stand against the happy resolution that this kind of work requires. In a lyric drama, which does not permit much development, unity and simplicity of action are necessarily important’. As regards subject matter, exotic and historical subjects entered French reform operas such as Ernelinde (Poinsinet/Philidor:1767) and Adèle de Ponthieu (Razins de Saint-Marc;La Borde/P.-M. Berton:1772), while the use of mythology continued to be defended by authors like Marmontel. Jouy’s categorical definition of the ending of any opera is that ‘the dénouement must be prompt, unforeseen, true to life, and happy’, and he prefers the Metastasian conclusion involving revelation (la reconnaissances) or le merveilleux. Scott L. Balthazar’s description of the eighteenth-century convention of the happy ending (of Metastasio) is that it presents ‘a point of discontinuity where accumulated tension is discharged unexpectedly’, in contrast to nineteenth-century linear plots (of Scribe) in which events have causal relationship; this was anticipated in Alessandro Manzoni’s manifesto on tragedy of 1823, in which he advocated ‘the focus on cause and effect and the exclusion of unrelated incidents’. Jouy’s narrative of Armida in the Essai does not close with her curse on Renaud and the destruction of her palace by demons, as in Quinault: ‘But the intense storm, which the emotions have momentarily stirred up, calms at the first beam of love; peace returns, the air becomes clear again, Armida has disarmed hell, and her peaceful victory is returning amongst entertainment and festivities’.

21 Jouy, Essai, ed. Gerhard, 71.
22 ‘Il faut que l’action soit simple, dégagée de tout épisode, et que l’intrigue se borne à créer et à surmonter les obstacles qui s’opposent au dénouement heureux qu’exige ce genre d’ouvrage. C’est de l’unité, de la simplicité de l’action, que résulte nécessairement l’intérêt du drame lyrique, où les développements sont interdits.’ Ibid., 68.
23 ‘Le dénouement de tout opéra doit être prompt, imprévu, vraisemblable et heureux.’ Ibid., 72.
26 ‘Mais l’orage terrible, que les passions ont un moment soulevé, s’apaise au premier sourire de l’amour; le calme renaît, l’air s’épure, Armide a désarmé l’enfer, et son triomphe paisible se prépare au milieu des
In effect, Jouy evoked Tasso’s sorceress Armida to indicate a generic characteristic of French opera, that it is essentially a genre merveilleux:

I see the muse of opera in the figure of the enchantress Armida, in a magic domain where nature is completely subjected to her laws: soon, with languid and voluptuous eyes, she sits in a cool bower which spreads the perfume of flowers, and which brightens a day, hesitant and tinted by the different colours in Iris’s rainbow: Zephyr stirs the bucket and the leaves with a harmonious breath.\(^{27}\)

Numerous eighteenth-century commentators on opera mention the figure of Armida for the same purpose, amongst them, Rémont de Saint-Mard in his Réflexions sur l’Opéra (1741),\(^{28}\) and Marmontel in the entry on ‘opéra’, in his Éléments de littérature (1787). Quinault and Lully’s Armide (1686) had a canonic value in France in the eighteenth century\(^ {29}\) (and in the early nineteenth century), and as if to allude to this fact, Jouy referred to the work as ‘the most perfect model’\(^ {30}\) of tragédie lyrique libretto. Armida’s recitative as set by Lully informed Rousseau’s polemic in Lettre sur la musique française (1753).\(^ {31}\) There was of course Gluck’s version (1777) based on Quinault’s libretto.

The special association of the marvellous with French opera was a dominant concept in the late seventeenth and in the earlier part of the eighteenth century that defended tragédie lyrique as a genre, vis-à-vis the genres of spoken tragedy and comedy.\(^ {32}\) La Bruyère’s

\[^{27}\] ‘Je me représente la muse de l’opéra sous la figure de l’enchanteresse Armide, dans un séjour magique où la nature entière est soumise à ses lois: tantôt, les yeux pleins de langueur et de volupté, elle s’assied sous un frais bocage qu’embaume le parfum des fleurs, qu’éclaire un jour douteux et nuancé par les teintes variées de l’écharpe d’Iris: le zéphir anime le seaux et le feuillage d’un souffle harmonieux’. Jouy, Essai, ed. Gerhard, 64.


\[^{29}\] See, Olivier Pot, ‘Introduction’ to Lettre sur la musique française, in J.-J. Rousseau, Œuvres Complètes: V, Écrits sur la musique, la langue et le théâtre, Paris: Gallimard, 1995, cxxii-cxxxiii. Pot points out that the recitative was ‘one of key references within the repertoire of French opera, and lists other writers commenting on the recitative (cxxxii.).

\[^{30}\] Jouy, Essai, ed. Gerhard, 68.

\[^{31}\] Rousseau used Lully’s setting of Armida’s recitative (Act II/5) as a case in point for his argument against French opera, made in favour of Italian model. Rousseau attacked French opera for its lack of ‘natural’ and gripping musical expression, for its ‘monotonous’ and lifeless recitatives, for its uniform modulations, its convention of melodic ornamentation, etc, all of which, in his view, derives from a poor observation of the text, both in terms of its dramatic intention and its natural verbal articulation. Gluck responded to this critique with his Iphigénie en Aulide. J. – J. Rousseau, Lettre sur la musique française, in Œuvres Complètes: V, 322-328.

\[^{32}\] See Catherine Kintzler, ‘Théâtre lyrique, théâtre dramatique. Le parallélisme et la logique du
assertion that ‘the particularity of this spectacle is to captivate the spirits, eyes and ears in equal enchantment’ finds echo in Jouy’s view that ‘the austere truth should be banished from a theater where everything is a illusion, and where everything aims to fascinate the heart, eyes, and ears’. But Gerhard maintained that Jouy’s view cannot be seen other than a complete anachronism when considering that the debates on the reform of the nature of tragédie lyrique had taken place around 1750:

Jouy regarded the purpose of opera as being to enable the audience to forget their everyday circumstances by transporting them to a realm of mythological fantasy. It is only logical, therefore, that he devoted an entire section of his book to ‘the marvellous’, although it was more than sixty years since this central category of classicist operatic aesthetics had been dismissed by Encyclopedists such as Diderot and Rousseau.

Indeed, several years before the Querelle des Bouffons, Pierre-Mathieu Martin de Chassiron’s Réflexion sur les tragédies en musique had denounced both the exaggerated emphasis on the marvellous and the concept of opera as genre of pleasure, and advocated the observation of stronger passions and dramatic situations, anticipating the polemics of Grimm, Diderot and Rousseau.

Gerhard’s assertion however underplays the type of the marvellous Jouy specifies. As far as the Essai is concerned, Jouy in fact rejects the use of a demigod hero like Achilles, as well as Greco-Roman deities as protagonists, common in Lullian operas. ‘Any historical subject which is merveilleux enough in itself, and which, if I dare say so, is of truthfulness sufficiently fantastical to be able to dispense with all supernatural intervention, is the one to be chosen’.

34 ‘L’austère vérité doit être bannie d’un théâtre où tout est prestige, où tout a pour but de fasciner le cœur, les yeux, les oreilles.’ Jouy, Essai, ed. Gerhard, 66.
35 Jouy quoted the verses by Louis Chevalier de Jaucourt from his entry on ‘Opéra’ in the Encyclopédie (1765), that opera was a place ‘Where in sweet enchantment/A citizen forgets sorrow/And the war, the parliament/the tax, the country;/And in a moment of intoxication/Believes seeing the pleasure of life’. Jouy, Essai, ed. Gerhard, 63.
38 ‘Tout sujet historique, assez merveilleux par lui-même, et, si j’ose m’exprimer ainsi, d’une vérité assez
The study of all the existing librettos of Jouy reveals that he continued to use mythological subjects. While Gerhard refers to this quote as ‘rather tortuous reasoning’, 39 Jouy here seems to be in line with Marmontel’s definition of le merveilleux proposed in response to the polemic of Rousseau and the others, which privileged the aspect of ‘rarity’, and of ‘the extraordinary’ in historical events:

The merveilleux naturel occurs [...] at the extreme limit of the possible. Truth is able to encompass it and common sense gives it credence. Such are extremes in all things, events without example, unheard of characters, virtues, and crimes, the accidental happenings that seem to indicate a fate already decided or the influence of a powerful force which directs these accidents. [...] Such also, in human concerns, are great invasions and vast conquists, the overthrow of empires and their rapid succession, especially when it is one man whose genius and courage have produced these great changes; such are, consequently, personalities and spirits of an extraordinary force, vigour, and loftiness. 40

Here Catherine Kintzler’s definition seems useful, that in exoticism the notion of extraordinary is provided by ‘geographical distance’ and ‘physical rarity’ 41, and thus, ‘the effect is analogous to enchantment’. 42 Gilles de Van has argued for the continuity of such a notion in nineteenth-century grand operas, in contrast to Gerhard’s position that le merveilleux had disappeared from French opera by 1820s. 43 As Philarète Chasles referred to the power of visual spectacle in Halévy’s La Juive (1835), which was set in magnificent medieval décor, both the invention of fabulous décor and the reconstitution of historical time provided scenic enchantment for the

42 ‘La fonction est analogue à celle de l’enchantement’. Ibid. As far as the account of Adolphe-Simonis Empis goes, Tipu Sahib, the last sultan of Mysore, was impressed with Jouy’s audacious manoeuvre during an equestrian event, and rewarded him with a golden necklace, and permitted him to see an entertainment of Tipu’s seraglio: ‘It was a play in which singing mingled with dancing, by the young and ravishing bayadères, who, amongst the most beautiful ladies of Asia, crossed their voluptuous steps, while displaying the floating veils, golden fabric, cashmere and silk.’ (Empis, Réception de M. Empis, Discours prononçé.) While the authenticity of such an account is impossible to verify, it is tempting to think that the origin of dance sequence in Jouy’s Les Bayadères was Tipu’s seraglio, and to imagine the effect as the entertainment unfolded before Jouy’s eyes.
The fidelity to the aspect of *le merveilleux*, de Van asserts, is therefore not contradictory to the new taste for documentary realism (exoticism) of grand opera. De Van also points out that the eighteenth-century French notion of opera as genre of the marvelous lingered on in some descriptions of grand opera, such as the ones offered by Eugène Briffault (1834) and Théophile Gautier (1859).

On the other hand, Marmontel also continued to believe that the supernatural dimension, such as god’s assistance of humans in their missions (as found in mythology), was still necessary in the context of an epic poem, in order to dramatise and to give human actions some inordinate proportions. And it is what Jouy also advocates:

In works in which *le merveilleux* is allowed, it must always bring the solution (dénouement); the poet’s main talent is to present a god’s intervention as necessary for the conclusion of an undertaking, that is important enough by itself, imposing enough by the grandeur of protagonists, interesting enough by the nature of danger and bad fortune to which they are exposed, to make them worthy of supernatural assistance.

For Gerhard, this was the most conservative aspect of Jouy’s poetics. Indeed, as noted in the previous chapter, the intervention of Jupiter in the conclusion of *Les Amazones* was criticised even by the critics of 1811. In *Moïse et Pharaon* of 1827, Jouy did not limit the use of divine intervention to the conclusion. Jouy and Balocchi added to Tottola’s text the apparition of the rainbow, followed by a falling meteor setting fire to the bush to reveal the Ten Commandments in Act I. The critic of the *Journal des débats* suggested the elimination of the scene, arguing that the former was not necessary to the narrative and the latter was not true to the biblical chronology of the events.

---

44 Ibid., 331-332.  
47 ‘Dans les ouvrages où le merveilleux est admis, c’est toujours de là que le dénouement doit sortir, et tout le talent du poète consiste à avoir su rendre l’entremise d’un dieu nécessaire à l’accomplissement d’une entreprise assez grande par elle-même, assez imposant par la majesté des personnages, assez intéressante par la nature des périls ou des malheurs auxquels ils ont été exposés, pour les rendre dignes d’une assistance surnaturelle.’ Jouy, *Essai*, ed. Gerhard, 72.  
48 *Journal des débats*, 29 March 1827.
Music

Charels and Jouy revisit the eighteenth-century opera debates in some detail in the section on music. They for instance refer to Rousseau’s defence of melody against Rameau’s focus on harmony, and in retrospect, see that the French school has come a long way since Rousseau and it has learnt to connect the two parameters.49

The relationship between words and music was also a constant theme in eighteenth-century operatic theory. While in the Lullian tradition, music’s role was to enhance theatrical declamation of text, the increasing attention paid to musical expression of human sentiment set in motion the shift of focus by the mid-century, amplified by the Querelle des Bouffons of 1752-1754.50 Charles and Jouy recall Rousseau’s stance, pursued by Chabanon and Lacépède, that music was a ‘natural language’ (‘comme langage naturel à l’homme’51), i.e., a more direct and immediate means of human expression, and that beyond the initial reception through the ear, music’s real impact will be experienced by the emotions. (This stance also modified the concept of imitation in music): ‘Under the influence of different emotions, the voice has different tones. Music’s task and the only imitation which this art could rise to and fulfil, is to remind us of the tones of nature and by copying them, to transmit the same feelings which led to their inception.’52

Pursuing Rousseau’s focus on human emotions, Lacépède maintained that music contributed to the text ‘by giving more force to events, by rendering them more horrifying or more pleasant, and by enlarging the effects which result from it’,53 and ‘by animating a range of passions

50 Saloman, *Aspects of ‘Gluckian’ Operatic Thought*, chapters 2 and 3.
53 ‘En donnant plus de force aux événements, en les peignant plus horribles ou plus agréables, en
which stir the characters, by giving more intensity to hatred or to love, by representing - in the manner more forceful than the poet - all emotions which belong to the stage’. 54 Charles and Jouy also understand that, in order to take the musical aspect into consideration, the libretto must contribute to music’s special ability to touch the heart and to surpass verbal language by way of instinctive communication. This is suggested particularly in a number of assertions concerning libretto writing:

Developments, gradations, ingenious comparisons, and even reasoning are here nothing else but more or less indispensable to a style which relies principally on sentiments and images. Its main quality lies in the precision, naturalness, variation, charm, and energy: in all that should be ‘sung’, that is to say, except in recitative, the poet must remember that the developments of passion which he drafts belong to the musician, and he should be as sparing with words as the composer can be profuse with notes. 55

And on the subject of libretto, they assert:

The subject should be such that one scene is sufficient for exposition, that the protagonists are shown in a well-contrasted manner, that passionate, tender, terrible, and always noble situations emerge from one another; that varied tableaux follow one another in natural succession, that a powerful interest, in which the tender passions should dominate, makes itself constantly felt. 56

The Essai also firmly rehearses all the main aspects of Gluck’s reform. 57 It insists on the study of the text for the composers so that music can seize the strong emotions in the libretto:

It is the text alone that gives real meaning to music. It is what lends its vague charm a

54 ‘En animant dans ses peintures toutes les passions qui agitent les personnages, en donnant plus de vivacité au feux de la haine et à ceux de l’amour, en représentant d’une manière plus énergique que le poëte, tous les sentiments qui doivent paraître sur la scène’. Ibid. Cf. the similar assertion in Chabanon, ‘De la Musique relativement au poëme’, De la musique considérée en elle-même, vol.2, 3.

55 ‘Les développements, les gradations, les rapprochements ingénieux, la pensée même n’y sont que les accessoires plus ou moins indispensables, d’un style qui vit principalement de sentiments et d’images. La précision, le naturel, la variété, la grâce et l’énergie en font le mérite principal: dans tout ce qui doit être chanté, c’est-à-dire dans tout ce qui n’est pas récitatif, le poëte doit se souvenir que les développements de la passion qu’il indique appartiennent au musicien, et qu’il doit être d’autant plus avare de paroles que celui-ci peut être plus proLife of notes.’ Jouy, Essai, ed. Gerhard, 76.

56 ‘Le sujet doit être tel qu’une scène suffise à l’exposition, que les caractères s’y présentent fortement contrastés, que les situations alternativement passionnées, douces, terribles, et toujours nobles, y naissent les unes des autres; que les tableaux variés s’y succèdent dans un ordre naturel, qu’un intérêt puissant, où doivent dominer les passions tendres, s’y fasse constamment sentir.’ Ibid., 66.

definite and fixed colour. Expression is the first condition that must compel the composer of lyric theatre. He can never spend sufficient time studying the poem, plumbing the deepest of its intentions, nor identify himself enough with the passions of the characters created by his collaborator. It is not the meaning of the words he must follow, it is the unfolding of sentiments and their progressive development.  

And for this purpose, composers should rigorously observe the verbal declamation: ‘Musical expression is based on a single foundation, that is, accurate and true declamation. […] Declare with good judgement, and your airs, linked to action, should always depict the emotions involved’.  

Also, the vocal part should have a dominant role over the orchestra: ‘The passion then should manifest itself in your singing part; it should even dominate your orchestra.’ Yet the orchestra must convey the emotions (Charles and Jouy define the characteristics of individual instruments in a similar manner to Lacépède) which the words of the text cannot express, as it is also the chant of the orchestra alone that can express secret thoughts and emotions of protagonist, who tries to hide it with words.

Jouy does assert that ‘the poet is incontestably the first and the most important author of an opera. He draws the general design of the work. He ploughs, he sows, he enriches the

---

58 ‘C’est le poëme seul qui donne un sens réel à la musique. C’est lui qui prête à son charme vague une couleur certaine et fixe. La première condition à laquelle doit s’astreindre le compositeur de musique théâtrale, c’est l’expression. Il ne saurait trop étudier le poëme, se pénétrer trop profondément de ses intentions, s’identifier trop complètement aux passions des personnages créés par son collaborateur. Ce n’est pas le sens des mots qu’il doit suivre, c’est la marche des sentiments et leur développement progressif.’ Jouy, Essai, ed. Gerhard, 82. In the preface to Alceste (1769), Gluck (or Calzabigi) asserted that his intention was ‘to restrict music to its true office of serving poetry by means of expression and by following the situation of the story’. (Oliver Strunk, ed., Source readings in Music History: From Classical Antiquity through the Romantic Era, New York: Norton, 1950, 673-679, quoted in Saloman, Aspects of ’Gluckian’ Operatic thought, 62.) Saloman explains that although such an assertion is faithful to the Lullian tradition, their musical aims differed, as in Gluck, ‘the words were not considered solely as intermediaries to be imitated in sound or sense. Rather music was to seize the accent of the feelings and the inner state of the soul through the expression of strong passions motivated by interesting dramatic situations’. (p. 61)

59 ‘L’expression musicale repose sur une seule base; c’est la justesse et la vérité de la déclamation. […] Déclamez avec justesse, et que vos chants, unis à l’action, peignent toujours rapidement les sentiments qui s’y joignent’ Jouy, Essai, ed. Gerhard, 83.

60 ‘Que la passion respire donc dans vos chants; qu’elle domine encore votre orchestre.’ Ibid.


62 Jouy, Essai, ed. Gerhard, 84. Lacépède explained similarly that ‘lorsqu’un acteur cherchera à se faire illusion à lui même, ou à cacher à ceux qui l’entoureront, le sentiment qui agitera son âme, lorsqu’il dira le contraire de ce qu’il pensera, que l’accompagnement trahisse alors ses sentiments secrets’. (Lacépède, ‘Des accompagnements’, 380.)
field which his collaborators are in charge of adorning and embellishing’. Yet his definitions that largely adopts the new musical theory proposed during the latter half of the eighteenth century, seems to contradict Gerhard’s assertion that Jouy wrote ‘from the standpoint of the “men of letters, whose ignorance of music was complete, and who considered that art only as an accessory of poetry”’. We must remember that in the 1820s, critics like Julien-Louis Geoffroy were able to assert that ‘Music weakens and degrades all genres to which we associate it: grand opera is no more a tragedy, than opéra-comique is a comedy’. Jouy, on the other hand, echoes Castil-Blaze when he insists on the notion of collective work, giving equal credit to the components of opera that ‘an opera, in order to meet all the conditions of the genre, should be a collective work of four different authors’ (i.e. librettist, composer, choreographer, and scenery painter), and that ‘the perfection of opera results less from the perfection of all the parts that form it, than from their harmony. It is the type of spectacle like the orchestra in which

63 ‘Le poète est incontestablement le premier et le plus important auteur d’un opéra; il trace le dessein général de l’ouvrage; il laboure, il sème, il féconde le champ que ses collaborateurs sont chargés d’orner et d’embellir.’ Jouy, Essai, ed. Gerhard, 65. This was a traditional view in the eighteenth-century. The literary theorist Ulrich Weisstein has proposed that historically, there are mainly five ways to consider the relationship between text and music: ‘1) the “neo-classical” view, according to which opera is essentially a literary genre; 2) the “Romantic” view, according to which “the poetry must be altogether the obedient daughter of the music”; 3) the “Wagnerian” view, according to which opera is a veritable symbiosis in which sense and sound unite as equals; 4) the “anti-Wagnerian” notion of Epic Opera, according to which text and music enjoy equal rights and privileges but must retain their independence; 5) the “Baroque” (seventeenth-century) view, according to which opera is primarily spectacle’. In ‘Librettology: the Fine Art of Coping with a Chinese Twin’, Komparatistische Hefte, V-VI (1982) 23-25. The article is discussed in David Charlton, ‘Continuing Polarities: Opera Theory and Opéra-comique’, French Opera 1730-1830: Meaning and Media, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000, 2-8.


65 ‘La musique affaiblit et dégrade tous les genres auxquels on la marie: un grand opéra n’est pas plus une tragédie qu’un opéra comique n’est une comédie.’ Julien-Louis Geoffroy, ‘Gluck: Armide’, in Cours de littérature dramatique, vol.5. Paris, 1820, 16, quoted Gislason, Castil-Blaze, de l’Opéra en France and the feuilleton of the Journal des Débats, 34. On Geoffroy, see Andrea Fabiano, ‘Les Bouffons au service de la France: l’aventure de l’Opéra Buffa (1801-1804)’, Histoire de l’opéra italien en France (1752-1815), Paris: CNRS, 2006, 170-175. To note, Gislason’s dissertation above seems to suggest incorrectly that until Castil-Blaze’s De l’Opéra en France, the common perspective in the aesthetics of opera in France was the one voiced by Geoffroy: ‘Geoffroy, writing at the beginning of the nineteenth-century, in the period immediately preceding the arrival of Castil-Blaze in Paris, is still firmly ensconced in the tradition of the literary appreciation of musical stage works that begins in the seventeenth-century. […] Geoffroy, his polemical adversaries, and his readers alike, seemed all to have agreed that criticism of the lyric theatre, in the opening decades of the nineteenth century, was still a literary affair alone.’ (p. 34).

the wonderful instruments may be heard individually, without contributing in any way to make the ensemble better'. Jouy also acknowledges the situation where the composer should be given authority over the text. He explains that often a text for the chorus ‘owes some sacrifice to music’, referring to the chorus of Thebans in Act I/3 of Les Amazones, where the caesura of the verses had to be changed after Méhul’s request.

Jouy’s defence of the Gluckian heritage, as well as of the conventions of eighteenth-century French libretto, seems to suggest that what motivated him to write the Essai was the contemporary musical quarrel over Rossini’s music, whose growing popularity became evident in early 1820s Paris, coinciding with the literary Romantic revolution of the decade. The dispute polarised the critics once again into partisans of French and Italian opera. Jouy’s hostility towards Italian opera is apparent in a number of places in the Essai: for instance, he maintains that the Italians, while excelling at singing, ignore declamation (with the exceptions of Metastasio and Apostolo Zeno), continuing that ‘Italy, with good poems and excellent music, can boast of having the most insipid, most boring spectacles’. The continuing veneration of Gluck was also apparent in Henri Montan Berton’s De la musique mécanique et de la musique philosophique, published in the spring of 1821. Berton insisted on some Gluckian concepts, such as the simplicity of style, the fidelity to declamation, and the dominance of vocal part over

---

67 ‘La perfection de l’opéra résulte moins de la perfection de toutes les parties qui composent, que de leur harmonie. Il en est de ce genre de spectacle comme d’un orchestre où des instruments admirables peuvent se faire entendre, sans contribuer en rien à rendre le concert meilleur.’ Jouy, Essai, ed. Gerhard, 89.
68 ‘La poésie doit quelque sacrifice à la musique.’ Ibid., 78.
69 Ibid., 77-78.
71 ‘Italie, avec de bons poèmes et d'excellente musique, peut se vanter d'avoir le plus insipide, le plus ennuyeux des spectacles.’ Jouy, Essai, ed. Gerhard, 67.
orchestra, while at the same time defending the Italianate tradition brought to the Opéra in the late eighteenth century. He then denounced the modern Italian generation, and in particular, Rossini, who would favour ‘ambitious modulations, unusual transitions, heavy instrumentation, rhythmic incoherence, pretentious harmonic progression, mannered melodic shapes, and above all, an outrageous profusion of semiquavers’, and the excessive use of the roulade, sacrificing its dramatic expression and reducing ‘musical art to the sole employment of its physical means’.74

Rossini’s operas also challenged the Gluckian notion that emphasized the music’s fidelity to the text by means of expression. In Stendhal’s definition, ‘among all known composers, he (Rossini) is the one who is least dependent upon his librettist; he has, as far as it lies within the nature of his medium to do so, liberated his art from the inglorious fetters of a necessity which left it shorn of half its glory’.75 His view reflected the Italian theoretical tradition and the contemporary definition of Giuseppe Carpani, another champion of Rossini:

If then, the composer has a most beautiful poetic text to set to music, he must not treat it in so servile a way that he loses sight of his chief duty, that is, to offer musical delight. Expression will therefore be his second objective, and he will always treat the musical thought, or the cantilena, as his primary aim, and as the sine qua non of his science. I challenge the most ardent supporter of Gluck to argue differently. […] A music that is not allied with, but a slave to, the word; music of bumps, of clashes, of caprices which dragged along by the varying progress of the passions, scarcely permits you the hint of a taut-laced and foreshortened song, whose ups and downs seem like the sea in a storm; a song that is not song, but the interrupted wish for song, etc.76

What follows will reflect on Gerhard’s observation on Jouy’s Essai: ‘this normative treatise contains no trace of any effort to find aesthetic justifications for the artistic beliefs of the time.

The careful observer of the changing face of city life shows himself here to be entrenched in a

74 Ibid., 40.
classicist aesthetics'. Whilst Jouy’s text is completely free from obvious opposition towards its contemporaneous context, thus perhaps eluding the kind of contextualisation which Berton’s article easily permits, Jouy’s intention may have been no less political, that is, the defence of French operatic convention. At least it seems this was the case when Jouy published the article ‘L’Opéra français’ in *La Pandore* (of which he then was one of the chief editors), where he offered the introductory version of the *Essai* (see Table on p.123).

II

The important aspect of the intellectual life of the Restoration era was the generational division in terms of ideology and attitudes that gave rise to a decade of classicist/romantic conflict in the 1820s. The older generation (many including Jouy were members of the Académie française) was steeped in classical tradition and continued to venerate the rules of classicism, while writers born around 1800 emerged in the 1820s as the young Romantics, rebelling against the old conventions. As generational antagonism then became evident, Jouy was viewed by the opposition as the leading figure of the Académie’s classical faction. Stendhal for instance, spoke of Jouy with sarcasm in *Souvenirs d’égotisme* (1832):

Since 1829, the Romantic writers, who even do not have as much wit as M. de Jouy, make him look like Cotin of the time (Boileau), and his old age is made miserable (embittered) by the extravagant glory of his middle years. He shared the literary dictatorship, when I arrived in 1821, with another idiot, much cruder, M. A. -V. Arnault of the Academy.

---

78 We of course need to bear in mind that the essay in its final form was published as part of Jouy’s complete works.
80 It was written between late June and early July 1832, but the first edition was published only in 1893 by Casimir Stryienski. See Béatrice Didier, ‘Notice’, *Souvenirs d’égotisme, suivi de Projet d’autobiographie et de Les Privileges*, ed. Béatrice Didier, Paris: Gallimard, 1983, 201-205.
81 ‘Dupuis 1829 les littérateurs romantiques, qui n’ont pas même autant d’esprit que M. de Jouy, le font passer pour le Cotin de l’époque (Boileau), et sa vieillesse est rendue malheureuse (amareggiiata) par la gloire extravagante de son âge mûr. Il partageait la dictature littéraire, quand j’arrivai en 1821, avec un autre sot bien autrement grossier, M. A.-V. Arnault, de l’Institut.’ Stendhal, *Souvenirs d’égotisme*, ed.
Stendhal, in his *Racine et Shakespeare*\(^\text{83}\) (appeared in March 1823, some months before the announcement of Jouy’s *Œuvres complètes*) urges the new generation of dramatists to invent the works of their time, discarding tragedy in verse and its classical norms of unity of time and place. The chronology of the events important to the conflict of the decade is given in the following table:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Berton: ‘De la musique mécanique’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Jun</td>
<td>Rossini <em>Otello</em> (Théâtre Italien)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 Dec</td>
<td>Jouy: <em>Sylla</em> (Théâtre-Français)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Stendhal’s chapter (<em>Racine et Shakespeare</em>) in <em>Paris Monthly Review</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Manzoni: <em>Lettre à M.C</em>*** (see Chapter 5, p.181)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>Stendhal: <em>Racine et Shakespeare I</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 Aug</td>
<td>Jouy: <em>Œuvres Complètes</em> (announced in <em>La Pandore</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Nov</td>
<td>Rossini visits Paris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      | 22 Nov | A review: Stendhal: *Vie de Rossini* (*La Pandore*)
| 1824 | 29 Mar | Jouy: ‘Classiques et Romantiques’ (*La Pandore*) |
|      | 24 Apr | Auger’s speech at the *Académie Française* (see Chapter 5, p.164) |
|      | Dec    | Rossini becomes the director at the Théâtre Italien |
| 1825 | Mar    | Stendhal: *Racine et Shakespeare II* |
|      | 18 Apr | Jouy: ‘L’Opéra français’ (*La Pandore*) |
|      | Nov    | Jouy leaves *La Pandore* |
| 1826 | Jun    | Jouy: *Essai sur l’Opéra français* in *Œuvres Complètes*, vol.22 |
|      | 9 Oct  | Rossini: *Le Siège de Corinthe* (Opéra) |
| 1827 | 1 Jan  | Rossini signs a formal contract to be *premier compositeur du roi* and *inspecteur général du chant en France* |
|      | Feb    | Jean-Toussaint Merle: *De l’Opéra* (see Chapter 5, p.164-165) |
|      | 26 Mar | Rossini: *Moïse et Pharaon* (Opéra) |
|      | Dec    | Hugo: *Cromwell* (see Chapter 5, p.171) |
| 1832 | Jun-Jul| Stendhal works on *Souvenirs d’égotisme* |

Stendhal mentions Jouy only in passing when he refers to the unities in relation to Jouy’s tragedy *Sylla*. In his *Racine et Shakespeare* of March 1825\(^{86}\) however, Stendhal adopts a bellicose tone:

> What would happen to miscellaneous works by gentlemen like Jouy, Dupaty, Arnault, Étienne, Gosse, etc, the editors of those journals, clever as they are, if ever Talma was given a permission to perform *Macbeth* in prose […]? It is for this fear that those gentlemen arranged

---

\(^{84}\) The publication of Merle’s book was noted in *Bibliographie de la France* issued on 21 February 1827, p.162, n.1373.

\(^{85}\) The article finds that the main aim of Stendhal’s book is not to talk about Rossini but to accuse the French of their ‘failings, faults and ignorance’. The publication of the first edition of Stendhal’s book was noted in *Bibliographie de la France* issued on 15 November 1823 (p. 667, n. 4864), and that of the second, in the same journal on 13 December 1823 (p. 745, n. 5606).

\(^{86}\) This was a direct response to Louis-Simon Auger’s speech delivered at the *Académie Française* on the 24 April 1824, made against Romanticism (which he called ‘la secte insolente’). See Stendhal, ed. Martino, 59-60.
the hissing of English actors.  

The enemies of French tragedy in prose and of Romanticism, he also writes, are ‘the members of the Académie Française’, ‘the authors who make money with their Tragedy in verses, and those who despite the hiss upon their works receive a pension’.  

La Pandore, on the other hand, had published Jouy’s article ‘Classiques et Romantiques’ on 29 March 1824. In this article Jouy’s attitude is seemingly diplomatic when he asserts that the terms ‘Classic’ and ‘Romantic’ are nothing but a ‘puerile distinction’. Paul Comeau commented that ‘in 1824, the classical group was still not concerned. Jouy and Chasles even denied that an opposition school existed’. Jouy nevertheless writes in defence of classicism, that if Romanticism is ‘understood as the élan, or even the unconventionality of an ardent imagination which enjoys its lofty ideas, attained without losing sight of nature and reasoning: then reverence for this old school!: Homer, Corneille, Voltaire, Goethe, Milton are Romantics’.  

In 1823, Jouy had already referred to the publication of Essai in the preface to the first volume of his complete works, whose publication was announced in La Pandore on 26

---

87 ‘Que deviendraient les divers chefs-d’œuvres de messieurs Jouy, Dupaty, Arnault, Étienne, Gosse, etc., rédacteurs de ces journaux, et rédacteurs habiles, si Talma avait jamais la permission de jouer Macbeth en prose [...] C’est dans cette crainte que ces messieurs ont fait siffler les acteurs anglais.’ Stendhal, Racine et Shakespeare, ed. Martino, 106. In the summer of 1822, the Théâtre Saint-Martin engaged the Penley theatre troupe to perform works by Shakespeare. The scepticism for this presentation is noted in Le Constitutionnel, which finds little point in introducing Shakespeare in the capital of Corneille, Racine, and Voltaire. The presentation was interrupted following the protests and a riot. This initially prompted Stendhal’s articles in Paris Monthly Review mentioned above. To note, in 1821, Guizot’s preface to the complete works of Shakespeare published between 1821-1822, had asserted that ‘le système classique est né de la vie de son temps; son temps est passé, […] le système de Shakespeare peut seul fournir, ce me semble, les plans d’après lesquels le génie doit travailler’ (See Martino, ‘Préface’, xcii-xcvi). All editors mentioned in the quote were at La Pandore, except Étienne, who was at Le Constitutionnel. Jean-François Talma was the greatest French actor of the Napoleonic era and created title roles in Jouy’s tragedies, Tippo-Saëb, Bélisaire and Sylla.  
88 Stendhal, Racine et Shakespeare, ed. Martino, 125.  
89 Comeau, ‘Étienne Jouy’, 120.  
90 ‘Entend-on par romantisme les élans, quelquefois même les écarts d’une imagination ardente, qui se plait sur les hauteurs de la pensée; où souvent elle s’élève, sans perdre de vue la nature et la raison: honneur à cette ancienne école! Homère, Corneille, Voltaire, Goethe, Milton sont romantiques.’ Jouy, ‘Classiques et Romantiques’, La Pandore, 29 March 1824.  
91 La Pandore was a daily journal dealing with ‘spectacle, literature, arts, customs and styles’ (‘Journal des spectacles, des lettres, des arts, des mœurs et des modes’). It replaced Le Miroir des spectacles (1822-1823), and was issued from 16 July 1823 to 14 August 1828. The issues resumed in 1830 until 11 May. Each issue consisted of four pages, including one title page, which gave the performance listings in Parisian theatres. Jouy was one of its chief editors (which also included A.-V. Arnault, Emmanuel
August 1823. The next evidence that the project was on its way comes almost two years later, when his article ‘L’Opéra français’ appeared in the same journal on 18 April 1825. What Jouy offered in this issue later became the introduction of Essai published in the Œuvres complètes.

How far had the essay progressed? It promises that another article will follow, but it never did.

The article had an opening paragraph, which the Essai in the Œuvres complètes omitted:

The state of decadence to which our principal theatres are reduced, is felt especially at the Académie royale de musique [the Opéra]: good reason to remind our readers of the importance of this national institution. The value of people and things are never more acutely felt than when they are under threat of their disappearance. 92

This text formed the last of Jouy’s three consecutive articles which appeared within a span of ten days to address ‘the state of decadence’ in Parisian theatres. (Earlier, Berton’s pamphlet of 1821 also spoke of ‘the decadence of musical art’, which, he maintained, was caused by the wrong use of the word ‘effect’. 93) The first two articles concerned the Théâtre-Français and were published on 9 and 14 April 1825. In the first, 94 Jouy argues that the decadence of the theatre was caused by lacking ‘the observation of mores’. What he envisaged here is a return to the neo-classical theatre, of Tartuffe (Molière), Horace (Corneille), Athalie (Racine) and Mahomet (Voltaire). Jouy writes that ‘once observation of mores is banished from the stage, it is the end of Théâtre-Français: its ruin is inevitable’ and that ‘the aim of a comedy is to correct mores by laughter; that of tragedy is to elevate the soul and provoke pity by inducing tears.’ Jouy’s continues:

In this appalling situation where so much harm has been done to the theatre, some cater to the bad taste of a blasé public and bring their poor dramatic products, empty of meaning and rich in rhymes and adjectives, to the stage of Corneille and Voltaire. They seek innovation without taste. They imitate without talent. These schoolboys to whom much encouragement has been given gain confidence to the point of calling themselves the restorers of dramatic
Given such artistic factionalism of the period, it seems difficult to account for Jouy’s willingness to collaborate with Rossini in the late 1820s. Jouy mentions Rossini in the *Essai* only in passing as ‘this brilliant meteor, which at present seems to set our stage ablaze rather than to enlighten it, has not yet appeared on our musical horizon’. The account is accurate as far as the Opéra was concerned at the time of its publication in 1826, although in some ways it seems to underplay Rossini’s success at the Théâtre Italien, evident by 1822. In the 1820s, the anti-Rossini faction like some liberal journals (*Le Courrier français*, *Le Frondeur* and *La Pandore*) took sides with Spontini, as Jouy also did. In the words of Stendhal, ‘a certain Parisian gentleman, of some note in the world of letters, and an influential correspondent in the daily press, assures us (particularly since Rossini had the imprudence to turn down his libretto, entitled *les Athéniennes*) that the greatest composer of our age is Signor Spontini’. As Stendhal thus refers to Rossini’s rejection of Jouy’s libretto *Les Athéniennes* reported in the press in 1822, *Le Réveil*, an organ hostile to Jouy, had published a similar sarcastic observation that, after Rossini’s rejection, the editors of *Le Miroir des spectacles* (which included Jouy himself), who had enthusiastically promoted Rossini, now declared themselves to be his fierce enemies.

Spontini had left Paris for Berlin in 1820 to take up the Prussian Kapellmeister post in Berlin, after a series of unsuccessful campaigns for the directorship of the Opéra between 1814 and 1819, and the failure of his Voltairian opera *Olympie* (1819). Shortly after Rossini’s

---

95 ‘Dans l’état d’anéantissement où tant de maux ont amené le théâtre, d’autres se prêtent au mauvais goût d’un public blasé, […] et transportent sur la scène de Corneille et de Molière, leurs pauvretés dramatiques, vides de sens, et riches de rimes et d’épithètes. […] on cherche à innover sans goût; on imite sans talent. Les écoliers auxquels on a prodigué les encouragements, s’enhardissent au point de se proclamer eux-mêmes les restaurateurs de l’art dramatique.’ Jouy, ‘Causes de la décadence du Théâtre-Français’, *La Pandore*, 9 April 1825.


rejection in 1822, Jouy proposed the libretto *Les Athéniennes* to Spontini,\(^{100}\) who was in Paris on leave. Spontini agreed to compose the music, and continued to discuss the work with Jouy during his trips to Paris throughout the 1820s.\(^{101}\) But according to Berlioz’s account, sensing the unlikelihood of future project with Spontini, Jouy had to associate himself with Rossini against his own judgment. In a letter to a friend which began with severe critique of Rossini’s *Guillaume Tell*, Berlioz continued:

> And they dare to consider it above Spontini! The day before yesterday, I spoke about it with M. de Jouy, in the stalls. They gave Fernand Cortez, and although being the author of the text of *Guillaume Tell*, he spoke of Spontini just like us, with adoration. He (Spontini) returns constantly to Paris; he fell out with the king of Prussia, his ambition put him off the track. He has recently given a German opera that fell flat; the success of Rossini drives him mad, which is understandable; but he would have to have power over the infatuations of the public. The author of *La Vestale* and Cortez does write for the public!\(^{102}\)

Jouy did write *Le Vieux de la Montagne* for Rossini in collaboration with Charles at the request of the Opéra in 1824.\(^{103}\) The libretto was accepted by the *jury du lecture* on 3 November 1824 and sent to Rossini on 12 November.\(^{104}\) Rossini presumably decided to set it


\(^{101}\) Libby, 446–447. In February 1829, Spontini wrote that the composition would be completed by the end of the year. (Spontini even sent the libretto in January 1832 to Goethe, whom he had visited in Weimar on his way to Paris in March 1831, and who showed great interest in the libretto.) In November 1844, *Gazzetta Musicale di Milano* reported the completion of the score, yet according Wagner, around the time of the report Spontini told Wagner that he had abandoned the project completely. Cf. Libby, 447–448.


\(^{103}\) On 17 February 1824, François-Antoine Habeneck, the director of the Opéra since 1821, wrote to Jacques-Alexandre-Bernard Law, marquis de Lauriston, Minister of the Maison du Roi (who was responsible for the surveillance of the Opéra) that in order to have a selection of librettos at Rossini’s disposal, he was intending to ‘stimulate the competition among the well-known authors, such as Jouy, Étienne [Charles-Guillaume], Scribe, Delavigne [Germain], Dupaty [Emmanuel], or even others’, with a special fee arrangement. (See Habeneck, letter to Lauriston, 17 Feb 1824, F-Pan, O\(^1\) 1666, in Rossini, *Lettere e documenti*, vol. II, 227–228. Also see the letter (fn. 100 above) in which Jouy, somewhat annoyed by the Opéra’s decision to revive Spontini’s *Olympe* before staging *Le Vieux de la Montagne* (acting contrary to its promise), pointed out the fact that he produced *Le Vieux* at the request of the Opéra.

\(^{104}\) See the administration of the Opéra, letter to Rossini, 12 November 1824, F-Po, AD 43, in Rossini,
to music (or had already started the composition) in June 1825, as on 23 June, the Opéra wrote to Jouy on behalf of Rossini, in view of arranging their meeting to discuss the details of the text. Although *Le Vieux* was originally planned to be premiered in January 1826, the Opéra decided to mount *Le Siège de Corinthe* before it. While the project was thus temporarily suspended, in February 1826 a dispute over the suitability of Jouy’s libretto in the old French style for a Rossini opera broke out. *Le Frondeur* on 22 February 1826 cited Antony Deschamps’s criticism of the libretto, which censured its ‘introductory scene constantly interrupted by recitative, uneven line-lengths in the parts that were meant to be sung and not spoken, whole acts without ensemble pieces.’ Deschamps continued: ‘And it is with such librettos that they claim to regenerate our premier opera theatre! These are works of a kind which look as if it had been written fifty years ago, which they insist on comparing with *Othello* and *Moïse*, all shining with radiant freshness and youth!’ In rebuking Deschamps, *Le Frondeur* launched a direct attack on Rossini that his *duetto, terzetto, quartetto*, and *finale*, these ‘concert pieces’, although full of verve and spirit, have little connection with action of the libretto, and that:

It is not the case for the music composed for French opera; it must take every hue of the

---

105 See the administration of the Opéra, letter to Jouy, 23 June 1825, F-Po, AD 44, reproduced in Rossini, *Lettere e documenti*, vol. II, 369. Subsequently, the meeting (Jouy, Rossini and Cicéri) was arranged to take place on 27 June. (The administration of the Opéra, letter to Rossini (and letter to Cicéri), 24 Jun 1825, F-Po, AD 44 and AD 45, in Rossini, *Lettere e documenti*, vol. II, 370-371, and 374.)
106 See Jouy, letter to La Rochefoucauld, fn. 100.
107 ‘Une introduction, coupée à tout moment par du récitatif, des vers inégaux dans des passages qui doivent être chantés, et non récités, des actes entiers sans morceaux d’ensemble.’ (Italics in the original.) *Le Frondeur*, 22 February 1826, cited in Pichois, *Philarète Chasles*, vol.1, 182. These were precisely the aspects of Jouy’s original libretto of *Guillaume Tell* that were Italianised by Hippolyte Bis’s revision. See Chapter 5.
108 ‘Et c’est avec de tels poèmes que l’on prétend régénérer notre première scène lyrique! Ce sont des ouvrages de cette espèce, qui ont l’air d’avoir été écrits il y a cinquante ans, que l’on veut opposer aux *Othello* et aux *Moïse*, tout brillants de fraicheur et de jeunesse!’ (Italics in the original.) *Le Frondeur*, ibid. Rossini’s *Mosè in Egitto, Azione tragico-sacra* in three acts to a libretto by Andrea Leone Tottola was first performed at the Teatro San Carlo in Naples in 1818. It was performed in Italian in Paris in 1822, first at the Opéra on 20 October, then at the Théâtre Italien on 9 November. Jouy collaborated with Luigi Balocchi, the librettist of *Il viaggio a Reims* on its French adaptation, *Moïse et Pharaon* in four acts, premiered at the Opéra on 26 March 1827. (See Marcello Conati, ‘Between Past and Future: The Dramatic World of Rossini in *Mosè in Egitto* and *Moïse et Pharaon*’, *19th-Century Music*, 4(1980), 32-47; Richard Osborne, ‘*Mosè in Egitto*, Grove Music Online; Benjamin Walton, ‘1827. Dying for music: Rossini and *Moïse*’, in *Rossini in Restoration Paris*, 154-209.)
subject and of characters, identify with the action, and with the poem, form an ensemble of things, an indivisible whole. But to combine these great effects, for acquiring this close alliance of music and poetry, you need a power of thought, the power of creation and combination, which is given only to a very small number of the composers. If nature has denied you these gifts, Mr. Rossini, to speak disparagingly or to make people speak disparagingly about what is beyond your strength, is a really bad recourse, etc.\footnote{\textit{Il n\'en est pas ainsi de la musique composée pour un opéra français; elle doit prendre la teinte du sujet et le caractère des personnages, s\'identifier à l'action, et ne former avec le poème qu\'un tout indivisible. Mais pour combiner ces grands effets, pour contracter cette alliance intime de la musique et de la poésie, il faut une force de pensée, une puissance de création et de combinaison qui n\'est donnée qu\'à un bien petit nombre de compositeurs. Si la nature vous a refusé ces dons, monsieur Rossini, dénigrer ce qui est au-delà de vos forces, est un bien méchant recours, etc.}}

Such a diatribe reflects the fact that, for the traditionalists, Rossini in the 1820s emerged as a threat to the Gluckian musical procedure, and to the French theoretical tradition where, in Jouy’s own words (p.117), ‘the poet is incontestably the first and the most important author of opera; he draws the general design of the work; he ploughs, he sows, he enriches the field where his collaborators are in charge of adorning and embellishing’. But perhaps the traditionalists were not alone in feeling troubled by the dominance of musical elements in Rossini opera.

When \textit{Moïse et Pharaon} was premiered in 1827, the author of the above-mentioned review in the \textit{Journal des débats} (whose critics included Castil-Blaze) maintained that ‘I am not one of those who consider that a French opera must derive all from music, and that the words are its
less important aspect'. At some length, he then explains how all aspects of opera derive from the libretto, echoing the words of Jouy, that ‘the poet is responsible for designing and drawing the general plan; for indicating the situations and characters, and for giving inspirations to his collaborators.'

But of course it was precisely such notions as these that the French Moïse challenged, as Jouy and Balocchi wrote new words to Rossini’s extant music. A review in La Pandore on 30 March 1827 asserted that:

Thanks to the talent of Rossini and the skill of Jouy and Balocchi, all music originally set to the Italian text hasn’t lost its charm. This uninviting and difficult work will not be considered as banal, but it will be appreciated by connoisseurs, who acknowledge all the difficulties, and it will be a chance to admire even more the versatile talent of a foreign artist who finally offers a brilliant and long-contested response to claims made on French language, which when treated by skilful poets and musicians, offers resources. Thus the prophecies of J.-J. Rousseau are disproved, and if he were still alive, he would praise Rossini in the same way as he praised Gluck, having heard the beautiful aria of Orpheus.

This author thus gives equal credit to the librettists and the composer by defending both the adaptation process, which Jouy and Balocchi had undergone, and Rossini’s effort to adapt to the style of French opera (evoking Gluck’s revision to produce his Parisian Orfeo). But was Jouy intimidated by the process, as well as by Rossini’s music, which challenged traditional (and his) notion of the poet’s superiority over composer? The same review above in the Journal des débats noted that only the librettists insisted on being anonymous (although the names of...

---

110 ‘Je ne suis pas de ceux qui pensent qu’un opéra français doive tenir tout de la musique, et que les paroles n’en sont que la partie la moins importante.’ Journal des débats, 29 March 1827.
111 ‘Le Poëte est chargé d’en concevoir et d’en dessiner le plan général; d’indiquer les situations et les caractères et de suggérer des inspirations à ses collaborateurs.’ Jouy, Essai, ed. Gerhard, 64.
112 Walton, Rossini in Restoration Paris, 173.
113 Thanks to the talent of M. Rossini, et à l’adresse de MM. Jouy et Balochi [sic], toute la musique faite sur des paroles italiennes n’a rien perdu de son charme: ce travail ingrat et difficile ne sera pas connu du vulgaire, mais il sera apprécié par les connaisseurs, qui en jugent toutes les difficultés, et il sera une occasion pour admirer davantage la souplesse du talent d’un artiste étranger qui donne enfin une preuve éclatante et si long-temps contestée de tout ce que la langue française, maniée par des écrivains et des musiciens habiles, offre de ressources. Ainsi les prophéties de J.-J. Rousseau se trouvent démenties, et s’il vivait encore, il adresserait à Rossini les mêmes compliments qu’il adressa à Gluck, après avoir entendu le bel air d’Orphée.’ La Pandore, 30 March 1827.
114 Conati suggests that the intimidation operated the other way round, i.e., Rossini, like the other foreign composers, felt ‘the cultural intimidation of the French capital’. Cf. Conati, ‘Between Past and Future’, 34.
the two librettists soon spread in the theatre at the premiere), adding that ‘probably it is modesty, perhaps it is an opposite sentiment’. By the time of Guillaume Tell’s premiere in 1829, however, it seems that Jouy had begun to acknowledge the aesthetic premise of Rossini operas and its impact on the French conception of the primacy of poetry and librettist. In the preface to Guillaume Tell, Jouy and Bis claimed that for the first time in history, their printed libretto presented the text as it was set to music. It was, they explained, in order to pay an indirect tribute to the composer. They then continued that:

We strongly declined to conceal even the defective verses which musical rhythms (sometimes decided in advance) compelled us to set out as they are: besides, we hear harmony so powerful that it seem to sanction the words to which they lend their magic. In this immense, completely new creation, which finally makes Rossini a French composer, Guillaume Tell seems only the work of one man, his own.

---

115 ‘Probaomment c’est modestie; peut-être aussi est-ce un sentiment contraire.’ Journal des débats, 29 March 1827.
116 ‘Il nous aurait répugné de faire disparaître même les vers défectueux que le rythme musical (parfois arrêté à l’avance) nous a contraints d’arranger tels qu’ils sont: il est d’ailleurs des accords d’une telle puissance qu’ils semblent consacrer les paroles auxquelles ils prêtent leur magie. Au milieu de cette immense création toute nouvelle, qui fait enfin de Rossini un compositeur français, Guillaume Tell ne semble plus que l'ouvrage d'un seul, le sien.’ Jouy and Hippolyte Bis, ‘Avertissement’, Guillaume Tell, opéra en quatre actes, Paris: Roullet, 1829, vij.
This chapter studies the style and the techniques of Jouy’s libretto writing. It is based on a survey of all the available serious opera librettos of Jouy, published and unpublished, as in the following. In total, the Opéra staged ten librettos of Jouy (see the Appendix), all of which were published. His Œuvres complètes\(^1\) contained seven of these – La Vestale (in 3 acts: 1807), Fernand Cortez (3: 1817), Les Bayadères (3: 1810), Les Amazones (3: 1811), Les Abencérages (3: 1813), Pélagie (2: 1814), Zirphile et Fleur de Myrte (2: 1818), plus Velleda (5: 1811), never performed. The non-staged librettos submitted to the jury of the Opéra, found in the collection of manuscript librettos at the Archives nationales, and the librettos found in the Jouy manuscripts kept by the Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal\(^2\) are: Joseph (3: 1806: later set to music with a new title Sophonis), Nausica (3: 1809: re-submitted in 1816 as Alcinoïs ou les Phéaciens, then set to music as Nausica ou Ulysse à Corcyre), Sésostris (3: with Arnault: 1811), Phidias ou la Statue (2: 1820: previously submitted with a title La statue de Phidias in 1816), Les Athéniennes (3: 1822), Le Vieux de la Montagne (4: 1824), L’Amazone de Lutèce (3: 1825), Faust (4: 1827), Hersé (5) and Geneviève de Brabant (5: synopsis only).

In describing the programming of the Opéra at the end of the eighteenth century, Jean Mongrédienn offers three characteristic aspects. First, ‘no more than two or three’ new productions were mounted each year; second, the list made up of around twenty works ‘consisted of revivals of Gluck’s five operas, along with works by Sacchini, Piccini, Salieri, and two or three titles by Grétry, including La Caravane du Caire (The Caravan of Cairo) and Anacréon chez Polycrate (Anacreon visits Polycrates)’, and in particular the Rameau operas virtually disappeared from the repertory as the Gluck operas predominated; Third, the

---

\(^2\) See Poème ou livrets manuscrits et imprimés des opéras et ballets soumis au Comité de lecture de l’Opéra, numérotés de 1 à 147 (1735-1842), F-Pan, AJ\(^{13}\) 138-141; Victor-Joseph Étienne, dit de Jouy. Pièce de théâtre. F-Pa, MS 6053-6055.
prevalence of Greco-Roman subject matter is apparent in the new productions.\(^3\) In terms of old repertory, this programming did not change much at the Opéra around 1810. For instance, in 1811 four, and in 1812 six of Gluck’s Parisian operas were revived, whereas the older tragédie lyrique by Lully and Rameau are completely absent from the programme.\(^4\) On the other hand, we find some post-Gluck operas like Didon (Marmontel/Piccinni: 1783), Oedipe à Colone (Guillard/Sacchini: 1786) and the above mentioned Anacrôn chez Polycrate (Guy/Grétry:1797), characterised by the Gluckian subject matters and plot structure, yet embracing the Lullian divertissement. Also found are the exotic and historical operas of non-Gluckian type which do not involve the supernatural merveilleux, like La Caravane du Caire (Morel de Chédeville/Grétry: 1784), indebted to the opéra-comique model, and Arvire et Evelina (Guillard/Sacchini/Rey: 1788), treating non-classical history like the pre-Gluck reform operas such as Ernelinde, Adèle de Ponthieu and Sabinus. As regards new works, the number of premieres each year is again similar, for instance in 1809, two operas were mounted, three in 1810 and 1811.\(^5\)

A general survey of around thirty-five operas created at the Opéra during the period between 1800 and 1815 reveals that nine works drew from Greco-Roman antiquity, nine were based on exotic themes (three Middle Eastern; three Spanish; one Indian; one Chinese), four on Biblical and religious themes.\(^6\) While the Greco-Roman operas indicate the continuing tradition of Gluck, equally significant is the non-Gluckian strand mentioned above, as shown by the number of the exotic operas. Whereas the operas of Lully and Rameau eclipsed from the repertory, their heritage did not completely disappear, Proserpine (Guillard/Paisiello: 1803) was based on Quinault’s text from 1680, and Castor et Polux (Morel de Chédeville/ Winter: 1806)

---

\(^3\) Mongrédien, *French Music from the Enlightenment to Romanticism*, 71-72.


\(^6\) This grouping follows the one offered by Chaillou, in *Napoléon et l’Opéra*, 252-266.
was the arrangement of Gentil-Bernard’s original for Rameau from 1737.\(^7\) While in the former, the original five acts were reduced to three, and its secondary love intrigue was eliminated, the latter retained the five-act formula, as well as the intrigue of the original.

Greco-Roman Mythology (treated by nine works), and the representation of supernatural *merveilleux* renewed strength during this period.\(^8\) At the same time, some Romantic tendencies were emerging in new types of supernatural *merveilleux* witnessed at the Opéra. For instance, *Ossian ou Les Bardes* (Dercy/Deschamps/Le Sueur: 1804) based on MacPherson’s Gaelic epic, staged an unknown world of Celtic and Scandinavian mythologies.\(^9\) During the same years, the concept of the Christian supernatural was proposed by Chateaubriand in *Le Génie du christianisme* (1802), which argued in favour of new poetics based on Christianity, promoting Milton’s *Paradise Lost* alongside Tasso’s *Jerusalem Liberata*, which was the source of Baour-Lormian’s libretto *La Jérusalem délivrée* for Persius premièred in 1812.\(^10\) Chateaubriand notably recognised the significance of overwhelming figure of Satan in Milton,\(^11\) and two operas deriving from Milton’s text, *La Mort d’Adam* (Guillard/Le Sueur: 1809) and *La Mort d’Abel* (Hoffmann/Kreutzer: 1810) may be related to his proposition: The former had Satan leading Adam’s descent into hell, and in the latter, when Cain (Abel’s brother) falls asleep,\(^12\) Satan appears with a club, with which Cain kills Abel when he awakens.

---

\(^7\) We may recall that numerous librettos of Quinault were adapted in the 1770-1780s, in response to Gluck’s reform operas, notably by Marmontel, but also by Gluck himself. See Guiet, *L’Évolution d’un genre*, 107-118.

\(^8\) Chaillou, *Napoléon et l’Opéra*, 252-253.

\(^9\) See Mongrédiéen, *French Music from the Enlightenment to Romanticism*, 75-78.


\(^11\) Chateaubriand, *Génie du christianisme*, 738-741. This is in stark contrast to the view of Marmontel fifteen years earlier. While also suggesting Milton as an alternative to mythological *merveilleux*, he is sceptical about the literary potential in the figure of Satan whose use, in his view, lacks moral interest, and remains hesitant also about the idea of *merveilleux* in religious context. See Marmontel, ‘Merveilleux’, in *Éléments de littérature*, ed. Sophie Le Ménahèze, Paris: Desjonquères, 718-719.

\(^12\) The representation of dream notably occurred in Act IV of *Ossian*. 
The Napoleonic operas also re-embraced the element of lavish spectacle.\textsuperscript{13} The Franconi Brothers were engaged frequently by the Opéra during the Empire period to be delegated the equestrian episodes,\textsuperscript{14} while in the librettos themselves, the prevalence of the scenes of celebration, wedding, and gift giving ceremony, interrupting the progress of action (as in Quinault), is striking.

In terms of plot structure, the librettos predominantly adhere to a Gluckian type,\textsuperscript{15} developed in favour of unity of action and fast pace of dramatic action. Although many of the love intrigues involved a rival, only two librettos, \textit{Sémiramis} (Desriaux/Catel: 1802) and \textit{Mahomet II} (Saulnier/Jadin: 1803) had four characters in their love intrigue.

\textbf{Subject matter}

In his \textit{Essai sur l'opéra français}, Jouy provided a good starting point: ‘Fable, fairytale and history at its most heroic are the only sources from which the librettist should draw his subject’.\textsuperscript{16} Out of Jouy’s ten texts staged by the Opéra, four were based on non-classical history, two on mythology, one on classical history, and one treated fairytale. Non-classical history (exotic) indeed predominates in his staged, as well as non-staged librettos, and the non-staged manuscripts reveal that he produced a text based on the Bible and three more mythological librettos. The rarity of Greco-Roman history then characterises Jouy’s works as a whole, otherwise, the mixture of themes is very much in line with the choice of subject matter of the new works created between 1800 and 1815. The following table lists the subject matter of Jouy’s librettos (see the Appendix for further details):

\textsuperscript{13} It may be recalled that the Gluck reform operas subdued the visual element of the earlier \textit{tragédie lyrique} in favour of musical and dramatic development. It returned however to the post-Gluck operas.
\textsuperscript{14} Chaillou, \textit{Napoléon et l’Opéra}, 287.
\textsuperscript{15} See Noiray, ‘Le Nouveau visage de la musique française’, 213.
1: Staged librettos

*La Vestale* (1807)  History: Roman

*Fernand Cortez* (1809; 1817)  History: Spain/Mexico: 16th Century

*Les Bayadères* (1810)  Mythology: Indian

*Les Amazones* (1811)  Mythology: Classical

*Les Abencérages* (1813)  History: Spain/the Moors: 15th Century

*Pélagé* (1814)  History: Spanish

*Zirphile et Fleur de Myrte* (1818)  Fairytale (Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*)

*Moïse et Pharaon* (1827)  Adaptation (Biblical: the Old Testament)

*Guillaume Tell* (1829)  History: Swiss (Schiller’s *Wilhelm Tell*, 1804)

2: Non-staged librettos

*Joseph* (1806)  Biblical: the Old Testament

*Nausica* (1809)  Mythology: Classical (Homer’s *The Odyssey*)

*Velleda* (1811)  History: the Gauls (Chateaubriand’s *Les Martyrs*, 1809)

*Sésosstris* (1811)  History: Egyptian

*Phidias ou la statue* (1816)  Personage: Greek

*Les Athéniennes* (1822)  Mythology: Classical

*Le Vieux de la Montagne* (1824)  History: the Syrian Assassins

*L’Amazone de Lutèce* (1825)  History: the Huns (Werner’s *Attila, König der Hunnen*, 1808)

*Faust* (1827)  Literary (Goethe’s *Faust*)

*Hersè*  Mythology: Classical (Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*)

*Geneviève de Brabant* (synopsis)  History/legend: German

One of Jouy’s earliest texts to be accepted at the Opéra, *Joseph* is the only original text of Jouy to draw on biblical source (He later adapted a biblical opera, Rossini’s *Mosè*), a story of Joseph in the Bible’s Book of Genesis (chapter 37 to 45). In relation to the conception of Alexandre Duval’s opéra-comique libretto *Joseph* (1807) for Méhul, as well as of Jouy’s *Joseph*, Bartlet offered two other staged versions antedating these texts, pointing to the topicality of

---

17 It was however resubmitted to the *jury de lecture* on 30 July 1816 and again in 1821 under the title ‘Sophonès’, subsequently set by Manuel García, but never staged.

18 Bartlet cited *Pharaon, ou Joseph en Egypte, melodrama* in three acts by Nicolas Lefranc-Ponteuil, premiered at the Théâtre de la Gaîté on 22 July 1806, and Baour-Lormian’s tragedy *Omasis, ou Joseph en Egypte*, which had its premiere on 13 September 1806. See Bartlet, *Étienne-Nicolas Méhul*, 572 and 575.
Egyptian motif in the early years of the Empire (in the wake of Napoleon’s campaign between 1798 and 1799), and also pointing to a strong pro-religion orientation of the period. Jouy’s *Joseph* begins with the Egyptians in Memphis celebrating the marriage of Joseph (under the name Sophonés) and Noëma. She senses however that something is troubling Joseph, who tells her of a voice he heard in his dream urging his swift return to the land of his father Jacob, interpreting it as an indication that Jacob is dying. To his surprise, his brothers arrive to Memphis and without recognising him, ask his aid to their famine-stricken land. They also tell Joseph that their father lives in their land, sorrowful and aging, and that one of their brothers was savaged by wolves. Joseph, while relieved to learn that Jacob is alive, confides to Noëma that he still cannot forgive his brother Siméon, for selling him into slavery (conspiring with other brothers), then inventing his death by staining Joseph’s robe with goat’s blood, and warns Noëma of their conspiracy. In the second act, Joseph’s younger brother Benjamin is arrested for stealing the golden cup on the altar, and against his brothers’ pleading, Joseph condemns him to slavery. His brother Ruben appeals to Joseph to take him instead and Siméon also takes Benjamin’s crime upon himself. The act ends with Joseph praising brotherly love in releasing Benjamin, and ordering the brothers to load their camels with grain and leave Memphis at dawn. The brothers, in hearing Joseph’s speech, regret their past crime. Before their departure, in the wilderness of Dothan where Joseph was sold by his brothers, Joseph arranges to have a play staged (Act III), enacting his brothers past crime. When the play ends, Noëma presents Joseph’s blood stained robe. Overcome with guilt, Siméon admits his crime and pleads to be executed. Joseph, however, reveals his identity and forgives his brothers.

On the other hand, Jouy dealt with mythology in five texts. Jouy characteristically provided an element of historical concreteness to mythological narratives, as seen in *Les Amazones, Les Bayadères, and Hersé.* David Chaillou has identified that in *Les Amazones,* Jouy’s text situates the Amazonian myth at the boundary of history, by associating it with the
founding of Thebes. Jouy’s main intrigue does not deal with a well-known episode of Hercule’s quest for the girdle of Ares worn by the Amazonian queen Hippolyte, nor with Theseus’s abduction of the queen, Antiope, provoking a retaliatory raid of the Amazons in Attica which Jouy mentions in the preface, but instead treats Thebes’s founder heroes, Amphion and Zethus, whose mother was also called Antiope, although not an Amazon. Although this libretto involves scenes of supernatural merveilleux, Jouy’s preface points to the historicity of the Amazons, and thus offers their origins in the shore of the Euxine Sea, from where the tribe, formed as a result of a massive massacre of its male members by the Scythians, spread its raids up to the Aegean Sea, conquering Sarmatia, then cities like Ephesus and Themiscyra. (Sarah Hibberd, analysing Scribe’s method of adapting Goethe’s Faust for his Robert le diable (1831), observes that Scribe discards Goethe’s mysticism and re-casts the narrative ‘within the broader framework of historical reality’. Jouy’s approach to the supernatural narrative in most cases is the same as in Scribe.) Jouy’s Les Bayadères was the first work staged by the Opéra to use Hindu mythology. In the preface to Les Bayadères, Jouy similarly treats the Devendren myth (a story of a young bayadère who is made immortal by her act of self-immolation for the rajah Devendren) as a foundational history of the bayadères.

In Hersé, whose action itself does not have a historical dimension (it is concerned with the elaboration of love theme in the style of Quinault), Jouy again links the myth of king Erichthonius, the ruler of Athens, to Ovid’s account of Mercury and Herse. Hersé begins in the gallery of Cecrops’s palace in Athens. Cecrops’s daughter Aglaure rebels against the goddess Pallas, and wishes Ericton to be her sister Hersé’s husband. Aglaure is loved by Egyptus, a prince and a relative of Cecrops’s. In the temple of Pallas (Act II), Iris tells

19 Chaillou, Napoléon et l’Opéra, 255.
22 Jouy’s short introduction indicated that the intrigue links an episode in Ovid’s Metamorphoses to the account of Athenian king Erichthonius. Cf. Hersé, tragédie lyrique, Victor-Joseph Étienne, dit de Jouy. Pièce de théâtre, F-Pa, MS 6053, f.255.
Mercure that love usually seizes one in spite of himself. Mercure falls in love with Hersé, and woos her, but she is reluctant to accept his affection for her. The act ends with a sudden thunderbolt breaking up the assembly in disorder, and Aglaure defying Pallas, who in the next act enters the house of Envy and names Aglaure as her victim. While Aglaure is asleap, the Envy and her followers enter Aglaure’s apartment and makes her jealous of Hersé, loved by Mercure. Awaken, Aglaure tells Egyptus that when love becomes too intense, it causes her nothing but fear, and mentions Mercure. Egyptus suspects her love for Mercure. Lovesick Hersé escapes to the forest outside Athens (Act IV). Aglaure finds her and claims to console Hersé, but she also proposes that she will hand over the throne to Hersé, in exchange of Mercure’s love. Hersé refuses the proposition, and when Mercure returns to her, they swear their eternal love. Mercure however departs again, leaving Hersé lamenting their separation. At the start of the fifth act however, Aglaure has already imprisoned Hersé in the palace’s tower. Jealous of Mercure, Egyptus insults Aglaure and leaves. Aglaure warns Mercure that Hersé is condemned for appearing too charming to him, and that the poison has already been taken to Hersé. Mercure strikes Aglaure with his caduceus and she metamorphoses into stone. He then heads to the tower and strikes the wall, which crumbles to pieces and reveals Hersé dead. Mercure grieves for her, but the sky reddens and Jupiter descends on a cloud to bring Hersé back to life. Mercure and Hersé finally marry in heaven.

During the period of Napoleon’s reign, the Opéra premiered four works treating various cultural figures in classical antiquity: Praxitèle ou la ceinture (1800), Anacréon ou l’amour figutif (1803), Aristippe (1808) and Sophocle (1811). Jouy also produced a libretto of this kind, choosing a Greek sculptor as protagonist (as in Praxitèle) in Phidias ou la statue. Phidias is exiled to the island of Keos by the archon Eudamas as a result of his love affair with the archon’s daughter Théone. Phidias reveals to his slave Phormion that he is keeping his statue of Venus modelled on Théone in a grotto. Phormion proposes Phidias to take the statue to Athens so that the Athenians would realise Phidias’s talent, and appeal for Phidias’s return to
the city. To their surprise, Théone arrives to the island and while Phidias leaves Phormion to meet her, a sculptor Bathos, native of Keos, boasts him that his statue will be chosen to be consecrated in the coming festival of Venus Anadyomene. Phormion shows him Phidias’s statue in the grotto, as he hopes to trick Bathos into helping him transport the heavy statue to the vessel. He tells Bathos that he will give up the first prize for him by leaving the island immediately with the statue, and Bathos agrees to help him board the vessel waiting at the shore. Phidias meets Théone who has come to the island to give offerings to the goddess. As the vessel is embarking, she must part with Phidias again, and the veiled statue is carried out of the grotto. Bathos however has secretly exchanged Phidias’s statue with his (Act II), and presents it at the festival as his own creation. When it is chosen to be placed on the altar, Phidias protests that it is his creation, but Bathos denies his claim and the High Priest dismisses Phidias’s protest. At this moment, the sky darkens, and as Phidias prays for Venus to save Théone in the sea, the statue is struck by lightning and smashed to pieces. In order to appease Venus, the High Priest orders Phidias to be thrown into the whirl of stream. But as he is about to throw himself into the whirlpool, Théone arrives to his aid, revealing how his statue reached there to the assembly, who in learning the truth, menaces Bathos to die. As Théone’s appeal for Bathos’s pardon, Venus intervenes, and promises Théone and Phidias’s return to Athens. Having restored the statue and re-placed it on the altar, Venus departs to heaven.

As we saw in the previous chapter, Jouy’s definition of historical subject for operatic setting, ‘history at its most heroic’, was in line with Marmontel’s condition of appropriate historical subject in favour of extraordinary events, superhuman characters, and exotic local colour. Jouy’s description of Fernand Cortez reflects this approach to history, that ‘following the opinion of a celebrated critic (La Harpe), the conquest of Mexico is the finest subject which modern history offers to the genius of epic’, continuing that ‘le grand opéra français a pour le moins autant de rapport avec l’opérette qu’avec la tragédie, quoi qu’il soit également inférieur à l’une et à l’autre’ (French opera has at least as much connection with epic as with tragedy,
although it is equally inferior to both of them). Jouy explained similarly that Les Abencérages’s ‘oriental magnificence and Christian chivalry mixed and brought together in the manners of these Arabs of Europe, offer in its every movement, the most marvellous and captivating tableau’.

History reached a new height in his Velleda, which drew from Chateaubriand’s Les Martyrs (1809), although Jouy departs from his source. The Napoleonic Empire itself picked up the pursuit of Celtic identity in the Revolutionary France. Although the regime initially appropriated James Macpherson’s Ossian as national mythology, it sought to establish an antiquity of its own and the Académie Celtique was founded in 1805, whose archeological and linguistic studies were intended to contribute to the Empire’s political project of territorial expansion that would reunite the Celtic realm.

Jouy stated in the preface that the writing took a whole year, and that he ‘wanted to write in a new system’. By this Jouy meant the use of five-act format (rather than three), and also the influence of the novel:

Persuadé, […], que l’opéra tient à-la-fois de la tragédie, de l’épopée, et du roman, j’ai cru trouver dans le sujet de Velleda, la réunion de ces diverses convenances. Il m’offrait en même temps des situations dramatiques, des fictions romanesques, et un intérêt épique qui s’attachait au berceau de la monarchie française.

23 See the prefatory note in Jouy, Fernand Cortez, Paris: Roullet, 1809, 6.
28 He stated that ‘Cinq actes étaient nécessaires à l’exécution du plan que je m’étais tracé’ (Five acts were necessary to realise the plan which I had drawn). Ibid.
(Convinced, [...], that opera draws from tragedy, epic, and novel, I believed to find in the subject of Velleda, the merging of these diverse conventions. It offered me at the same time dramatic situations, novelistic fiction, and epic interest, which was linked to the cradle of the French monarchy).  

In *Essai sur les institutions sociales* (1818), Pierre-Simon Ballanche hailed as a new path for historical fiction, both Chateaubriand’s *Les Martyrs* and Walter Scott’s *Old Mortality* (1816) that used ‘historically unknown’ central characters as opposed to well-known historical figures in traditional epic (although Chateaubriand compensated for this by giving noble lineage to Eudore and Cymodocée, hence ‘not entirely departed from poetic norms of classicism’). Recently, the literary critics have similarly pointed out that before Walter Scott’s historical novels (the first of the series *Waverley* was published in 1814), the Scottian novel genre is nascent in Chateaubriand’s text, in that, in the description of Marc Fumaroli, ‘Chateaubriand has chosen to show the great moments of history, its princes, battles and great deeds through the eyes, passion, inner and domestic drama of a secondary character’. More precisely, *Les Martyrs*, like Scott’s novels, was set in the historically specific moment of crisis (i.e. the period of Christian persecution under the Roman Emperors Diocletian and Galerius, and its termination at Constantine’s rise to the throne), presented through the personal lives of the ill-fated lovers, the Christian warrior Eudore and a pagan virgin Cymodocée, daughter of a
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33 Pinel, *Chateaubriand et le renouveau épique*, 19.
priest of Homeric temple.

Scott’s approach to history found its way into Scribe’s *La Muette*, in which certain episode of social crisis is presented through the private dilemmas of main characters.\(^{34}\) As we have seen in Chapter 2, Jouy’s libretto focused on the figure of the pagan Velleda, whose unbridled passion threatens the Christian Eudore, but Eudore became the Frankish Mérovée (who appeared in Chateaubriand’s Book VI), the lover of Gaulish Velleda. In Jouy, the conflict between the Gauls and the Franks is indicated by the two characters, but unlike Scribe’s *La Muette*, the conflict is not revealed in a specific historical episode.\(^{35}\) Moreover, Mérovée was a great Frankish ruler in Gallic history,\(^{36}\) in other words, Jouy failed to retain Chateaubriand’s historically unknown central character.

Even though Jouy noted in *Essai* that ‘the history unfortunately has a very small number of subjects in which the truth appears in the appearance of grandeur, with those supernatural proportions that subjugate every sense and surpass all the miracles in the imagination’,\(^{37}\) the non-staged manuscripts, *Le Vieux de la Montagne*\(^{38}\) and *L’Amazone de Lutèce* reveal that Jouy continued to favour such historical subject matters well into the 1820s.

*L’Amazone de Lutèce*,\(^{39}\) involving Attila, king of the Huns as protagonist is at the same time, an adaptation of Zacharias Werner’s *Attila, König der Hunnen* of 1808, cited in de
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\(^{35}\) Cf. ibid., 101.


\(^{39}\) See Chapter 5, p. 171-173.
Staël’s *De l’Allemagne*. The Sicambrians and the Romans have come under Attila’s rule, and a Sicambrian Valmir, although now Attila’s soldier, contemplates revolt. The Roman ambassador proposes to Attila that he may forge peace by marrying Honoria, a sister of the Roman Emperor Valentinien. During the military celebration, Valmir recognises his former lover Martia, dressed as an Amazon, but Attila, remembering her bravery in a battle, tries to entice her to his camp, but she refuses. Honoria can no longer resist the marriage, and distraught, she confides her fear to Martia, who reassures her. When Honoria is about to take her marriage vow, Martia offers to take the place of Honoria, and the marriage is finally celebrated. But alone with Attila in his tent, Marcia reveals that he is her father’s murderer, and kills him. At the same moment, the defeat of the Huns is reported, and Marcia is united with Valmir. As it will be discussed in detail in the next chapter, in his last works, Jouy decisively turned to German Romanic literature, and the influence of *De l’Allemagne* is also evident in his choice of other two subjects, Goethe’s *Faust*, and Schiller’s *Tell*. Jouy’s synopsis of *Geneviève de Brabant* also reveals that he was planning another libretto with a German theme.

The organisation of libretto

In relating to Quinault and Metastasio, Patrick J. Smith speaks of certain homogeneity in the texts of two librettists. In Jouy’s librettos, from *La Vestale* to his last text *Guillaume Tell*, there is also a set of consistent stylistic and dramaturgical features, as set out in the following.

During the Empire period, the three-act pattern prevailing since the Gluck reform operas is predominant, although a considerable number of operas also used two or one act pattern, and three operas (*Ossian, Castor et Pollux*, and *Jérusalem délivrée*) had five-act format. All Jouy’s Napoleonic librettos were in three acts apart from *Velleda* as noted above, while his
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40 Patrick J. Smith, *The Tenth Muse*, 58.
three texts produced in the early years of the Restoration all had the two-act pattern. A shift in the direction of four/five-act grand opera then is in evidence in his Napoleonic work *Velleda*, long before his four-act *Faust* (1827) and *Guillaume tell* (1829), as well as in his draft of *Geneviève de Brabant*, which Jouy also intended for Rossini, drawn up in five acts.

While Gluckian simplicity of action in his *La Vestale* has been noted, most of his staged libretto involves a subplot (which in all cases has some connection to the main plot) or secondary action. In the 1809 version of *Fernand Cortez*, the scene of the mutiny (which became the second act’s main event in the 1817 version) opens the opera before the start of main action, which concerns Cortez’s rescue (with the aid of Amazily) of his brothers and other hostages from the Mexicans. In *Les Bayadères*, its main action, the choosing of Raja’s bride is interrupted by the invasion, the Raja’s imprisonment and his re-conquering of the city to which the entire second act is devoted. The subplot of *Les Amazones* is similar to that of *Guillaume Tell*, it concerns a love affair of a secondary Amazonian character with a secondary Theban character. The mutiny scene in *Cortez* and the subplot in *Les Bayadères* provide for the trend of martial motif in Napoleonic operas, and particularly in *Les Bayadères* and also in *Nausica*, where the intrigue has no connection to the military theme, an appropriate solution is offered by the subplot. The subplots in *Les Amazones* and *Guillaume Tell* provide for the convention of love between the opposing factions, as neither Antiope nor Tell is suited to a love intrigue of this type.

All of love intrigue in Jouy’s librettos has so-called ‘false triangle’, the eighteenth-century pattern in which, as Scott L. Balthazar identified, ‘no infidelity occurs and the lovers realise that their problems originate elsewhere’. While many of Napoleonic librettos involve a rival, the simplicity of Jouy’s text is especially apparent here, as it is virtually non-existent in Jouy’s love intrigues, and the conflict consistently relies on the political or religious oppositions. The false triangle pattern follows the old convention of a happy ending, and all Jouy’s texts also
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respect this convention invariably. (The tragic ending is extremely rare in the operas of Napoleonic period, and it occurred only in two works, *Hécube* (1800) and *Sémiramis* (1802).) This fact, however, seems rather astonishing when one understands that Jouy was aware of the problem of the convention. Anselm Gerhard has drawn attention to Jouy’s strict adherence to the convention, despite the fact that Jouy, while writing *Cortez*, had realised the problematic nature of a happy end in the theme of the ‘justified conflict’. Jouy had encountered the problem already in *La Vestale*, which meant departing from historical reality for the sake of operatic convention, hence sacrificing the rule of vraisemblance. He thus took pains to cite historical accounts in which the vestals were saved from execution and also some vestals who married, in order to contend that the conclusion of his plot was true to life.

All of Jouy’s peripeteia (change of fortune) and conclusion also follows the eighteenth-century pattern in which they are treated ‘as a point of discontinuity where accumulated tension is discharged unexpectedly’. *Les Bayadères, Joseph* and *Nausica* have the Metastasian device in which ‘the revelations and confessions produce resolution and stability’. For instance, as we saw, in *Les Bayadères*, in order to marry a *bayadère* Laméa, the Raja Démaly feigns death, and looks for a bride who will join his funeral pyre. As Laméa is about to throw herself into the flames, Démaly appears, very much alive. The *merveilleux* conclusion is used in four librettos, *Les Amazones, Phidias, La Vestale* and *Hersè*. The conclusion in the first two texts involves a sudden thunderstorm followed by Jupiter or Venus descending to avert catastrophe. In *La Vestale*, Vesta’s intervention in Julia’s trial is presented in a miraculous event, in which, again, a sudden storm darkens the sky and the sacred flames are restored when the lightning strikes Julia’s garments on the altar and it flames up. In *Phidias*, a sudden thunderbolt also occurs, when Phidias claims the statue as his, and the statue is
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42 Gerhard, ‘Victor-Joseph Étienne de Jouy, A Hermit in the City’, 49-50
44 Jouy, ‘Avant-propos’, viii-ix
46 Ibid., 26.
destroyed. This dramaturgical device common in baroque operas,⁴⁷ is frequent in Jouy (cf. Hersé, Velleda, Joseph and Nausica), and he still made use of it in Moïse et Pharaon and Guillaume Tell.

Most of Jouy’s libretto contains at least one divertissement and it is provided by chorus, dance and also by military entertainment (in La Vestale, Cortez and Les Bayadères). It consistently relies on a procedure, common in tragédie lyrique, in which the central conflict is temporarily forgotten,⁴⁸ and it takes place in the context of a truce (Cortez), enticement (Les Bayadères and Faust), a wedding (Nausica, Les Abencérages, and Guillaume Tell) or religious ceremony (Velleda and Phidias). For instance, in Cortez, as a temporary peace is established between Télasco and Cortez, the chorus of Mexicans and Spaniards sings in praise of peace and the Mexican dance is performed. The conflict is immediately resumed at the end of the Spanish military pageant which completes the sequence: Télasco demands Cortez to retreat, and Cortez refuses by setting fire to his fleet. The other type of divertissement, which occurs in Les Amazones and Hersé, again in the style of the tragédie lyrique, involves supernatural figures, and in both works, the sequence is a part of the central plot.⁴⁹ In Les Amazones, at the end of Act II, when the Amazons leave Amphion chained to a rock, a band of nymphs appears to release him and guides his escape, in hearing his appeal to God. In Hersé, in the third act, as Aglaure falls asleep, L’Envie and her followers enter her room to instil jealousy, and form a whirlwind around Hersé.

One of the characteristics of the Scribe grand operas is a use of tableau, ‘a large ensemble scene, that will contain a crucial event relating the private drama of principals with public “historical” action, always using the chorus’.⁵⁰ In Jouy’s historical operas La Vestale, Les Abencérages and Guillaume Tell, as well as in Les Bayadères, the tensions between the private and public narratives are also played out in such large scenes, all of which are linked to

⁴⁷ Kintzler, Poétique de l’opéra français, 108.
the *divertissement* sequence. For instance, in *La Vestale*, when the High Priestess warns Julia of the danger of love, she hesitates to be present at the triumphal ceremony celebrating the achievement of the Roman general Licinius, her former fiancé whom she still loves. By the order of the High Priestess, Julia nevertheless has to award Licinius a laurel wreath at the ceremony. In the first act’s finale, the processions of citizens, priests, the Pontifex Maximus, the Chief Soothsayer, the senate, the consuls, matrons, soldiers, the High Priestess and the vestals assemble to witness Licinius’s entrance in his chariot. As a succession of entertainments, dances, combats of fighters and gladiators is about to begin, Licinius whispers Julia that he will abduct her the same night. In the first act of *Les Abencérages*, for the occasion of the marriage between the general of the Abencerages, Alamanzor and the Spanish princess Noraïme, the wedding entertainment takes place in the Court of Lions. The rival moor tribe Zégris’s Grand Vizier Alémar, is however, about to conspire against Alamanzor, while pretending to give his blessing to Alamanzor’s marriage.

According to David Charlton’s formulation, the large stage tableau developed by Scribe ‘juxtaposed the “public” and the private elements in a focal scene’,51 which attained ‘greatest effects not simply by projecting an ironic relation between “public” and private, but by welding these together more closely by means of an absolute, even shocking dramatic intersection. Amassed grand opera forces would thus gain dramatic validity through the value of the irony in each given case’.52 Although Jouy’s intrigues do not have the Scribian dramatic intersection, a similar technique is used in *Les Amazones* and in *Velleda*. In *Les Amazones*, the Amazonian queen Antiope is opposed to love between Ériphile and the Theban Zéthus, and when the Amazons triumph over the Thebans, orders the execution of Zéthus and his brother

52 Ibid. Charlton here refers to the fourth act of *La Muette de Portici*: ‘Through revolutionary circumstance, Alphonse and his wife Elvira find themselves sheltering, with Fenella’s assent, in Masaniello’s own dwelling. Out of a sense of honour, Masaniello opposes his co-revolutionaries, who want vengeance on these enemies, and lets the latter escape. At the same juncture, the common people enter to acclaim Masaniello in triumph as leader in a supremely emotive finale, though it is a climax punctured by irony’.
Amphion, whom she had previously left chained on a rock to die. This culminates in the ironic reversal in the final act in which Antiope for the first time recognises the two brothers as her sons, at the moment when she has to give order to consummate their sacrifice. As she stops the execution, the assembly pressurises her to keep her vows of eternal war against men. Similarly in Velleda, in Act III, Velleda agrees to lead the sacrifice of a Roman captive during the ceremony of mistletoe, but the victim brought to her is her lover Mérovée. The raging storm prevents the assembly to realise that Mérovée and Velleda recognise each other.  
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5 Guillaume Tell (1829): Jouy in the Restoration

In the years of the Restoration, after his two-act libretto Pélage, ou le Roi de la paix of 1814 (set by Spontini; 4 performances only), which celebrated the restored Bourbon throne by staging the return of the exiled Christian king Pelagius in Moorish Spain, and his Zirphile et Fleur de Myrte, ou Cent ans en un jour of 1818 (in collaboration with Noël Lefèvre; see below), no libretto of Jouy reached the stage of the Opéra until Moïse et Pharaon and Guillaume Tell. Jouy nevertheless had hardly abandoned the Opéra, as records kept at the Bibliothèque-Musée de l’Opéra reveal that he submitted numerous librettos to the jury during the period between 1816 and 1827. Moreover, three texts – Nausica, Joseph and Velleda, which had been accepted during the Empire, were re-submitted. Perhaps an indication of Jouy’s determination to see a new production based on his libretto, La statue de Phidias (1816) was submitted again in 1820 with a modified title, Phidias ou la Statue. By contrast, in the early years of the Restoration, La Vestale, Les Bayadères and Les Abencérages were the three works of Jouy firmly in the repertoire of the Opéra. The first two and the revised Fernand Cortez (1817) still remained as well in the repertoire in the late 1820s. La Vestale for example, had 10 performances on average between 1824 and 1827, before the number drastically fell. Fernand Cortez was staged much more frequently: twelve performances in 1824, thirteen in 1825, eighteen in 1826, twenty-one in 1827, seventeen in 1828 and eleven in 1829. Les Bayadères whose popularity was dwindling in these years, was performed twice in 1824 and 1825, ten times in 1827, before its last performance in 1828.

As seen in Chapters 3 and 4, despite some signs of a new direction, Jouy firmly defended eighteenth-century French operatic tradition, and he also emerged in various contexts
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1 Jouy, Pélage, ou le Roi de la paix, opéra en deux actes, Paris: Roullet, 1814.
2 Looking through the original libretto of Joseph and the surviving manuscript score of the same opera re-titled as Sophonès (F-Po, 1023. I-III), I noticed a substantial revision. By contrast, Nausica had only minor changes, when it was re-submitted as Alcinoüs.
3 Cf. the database Chronopera at http://chronopera.free.fr.
as a chief defender of the older generation at the Académie française. Yet, this image, which Jouy himself fought for until well into the early 1830s, seems to contradict the fact that during the last years of the Restoration he submitted to the Opéra three librettos based on German literary works, namely, *L’Amazone de Luîèce* (1825), based on Werner’s *Attila*, *Faust* (1827), an adaptation of Part I of Goethe’s tragedy, and his last libretto *Guillaume Tell*, closely based on Schiller’s *Wilhelm Tell*. All three works were reviewed in de Staël’s *De l’Allemagne* whose promotion of German literature became the point of reference for the French Romantics.

This chapter asks why Jouy turned to the subject of William Tell in the last years of the Restoration. Two points seem to emerge. First, the Swiss hero, traditionally imbued with the narratives of liberty and patriotism, became the focus of emergent liberalism, which Jouy enthusiastically embraced. Second, the classicists were also taking account of the fact that some reform was necessary as shown in the classicist Louis-Simon Auger’s speech (1824; see p.123), conceding that Greco-Roman literary topics might be abandoned. In relation to the narrative of *Guillaume Tell*, I firstly explore the way in which the peculiarity of Swiss political life and the story of William Tell had been subject to various interpretations, before focusing on Jouy’s version. I then explore how the classicists responded to the influence of foreign literature and the way in which, Jouy, despite his initial rejection, ventured into the world of Ango-German literature.

I

Historically, in thirteenth-century feudal Switzerland, the region of Uri belonged to the Fraumünster monastery in Zürich. In Ecclesiastical lordship, the monastery only retained the taxes and dues, but submitted the administration of justice to a lay protector. As the St.
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Gotthard route, which linked Germany and Italy, became important for his dynastic ambitions in Italy, the Emperor directly held jurisdiction over the region, through which the former in turn was able to secure his entrance to the passage. Thus there was no immediate feudal lord in the region of Uri, and united by an agricultural community, it kept considerable independence. It defended its status at the time when the protectorate over the valley fell to the Habsburgs, obtaining a royal charter declaring the Empire’s re-purchase of the rights over the valley in 1231. The neighbour region of Schwyz, whose feudal rights by the thirteenth century were owned by the Habsburgs, similarly obtained the Empire’s immediate protection in 1240. The charter, however, did not bring direct imperial control over Schwyz, as the Empire previously held no rights to the region, and as a result, the region rose up in rebellion against the Habsburgs, several times in the 1240s.

During the interregnum between 1254 and 1270, the region of Uri was virtually independent. The origin of the alliance of three forest cantons - Uri, Schwyz and Unterwalden - dates back in 1273, when the interregnum ended with the election of Rudolph of Habsburg to the throne as Rudolph I. As he had purchased the rights over Schwyz and Unterwalden shortly before, in Schwyz, the crown and feudal rights fell into the same hands for the first time, and the inhabitants of both Uri and Schwyz were gradually subjected to the intervention of functionaries or bailiffs, like the lay and ecclesiastical serfs of Unterwalden. During the reign of Rudolph I, the acquisition of feudal rights extended to the surrounding valleys of the three cantons, while the taxation tripled and a toll-system was placed at the St. Gotthard pass. These led to their first federal Pact (rediscovered in 1760), firstly sworn at Rütli, on the southeast shore of Lake Lucerne, initiated by Rudolph Stauffacher of Schwyz, Werner von Attinghausen and Fürst from Uri, and sealed on 1 August 1271, following the death of the Emperor in July. This pact of an official alliance also prohibited all appeal to the seigneurial judge, defending the judicial rights of the community’s elected leaders.

Due to the absence of chroniclers in the region, the earliest account of the Pact was not
recorded until in 1470, in the White Book of Sarnen. According to this text, which set the Swiss chronicle tradition, after the death of Rudolf I, the tyranny of the Habsburg bailiffs began, leading to the three cantons’ oath of perpetual alliance at Rüti. The story of Gessler and William Tell is also mentioned: Gessler, a bailiff in Uri, stuck his hat on a pole - the symbol of the law-court at the time - in Altdorf and issued an order to salute it. Tell disobeyed and was forced to shoot an apple off his little son’s head, then taken prisoner to Gessler’s castle by boat. On their way over the lake, a storm arose and Tell was unchained in order to help the navigation. Tell steered the boat towards the bank and escaped by leaping ashore, and later ambushed and killed Gessler. This precipitated the rising of three cantons, culminating in the destruction of the bailiffs’ castles. These accounts were later narrated in the text of the Renaissance historian Aegidius Tschudi (died in 1572), the *Chronicon Helveticum*, published only in 1734-6, and in Johannes von Müller’s *Geschichten schweizerischer Eidgenossenschaft* (History of the Swiss Confederation), which appeared in 1786.5

In France in the second half of the eighteenth century, the Swiss federalism was keenly promoted by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, as the most suitable system for assuring individual liberty.6 In the context of this debate, Rousseau notably idealised his childhood memories of pastoral Switzerland in his description of the rural community in the high Jura of Neuchâtel, advocating their exclusively localised agricultural life as the basis of economical and political independence.7 Musically, Rousseau referred to the capacity of the *Ranz des vaches* (a collection of Swiss mountain melodies, used by both Grétry and Rossini in their overtures to

---

5 The authenticity of the accounts in these chronicles was not effectively challenged until 1835. The apple-shooting episode on the other hand had been contested to have originated in the Danish legend told by the twelfth-century Danish chronicler Saxo Grammaticus in the *Gesta Danorum*, as early as 1760.


Guillaume Tell) to induce nostalgia in the Swiss soldiers.8

Three texts, all of which played a part in Jouy’s libretto, embrace both the evocation of pastoral Switzerland and the narrative of Swiss liberty: Michel-Jean Sedaine’s opéra-comique libretto Guillaume Tell (1791), set by André-Ernest-Modeste Grétry; Jean-Pierre Claris de Florian’s prose drama Guillaume Tell ou la Suisse libre (published posthumously in An X); Friedrich Schiller’s verse drama Wilhelm Tell (1804; French translation in 1818).9 Sedaine’s text derived from Antoine-Marin Lemierre’s tragedy Guillaume Tell (1766), whose stage revival took place on 1 August 1790. In the revolutionary years it was frequently performed at the Théâtre de la nation (Théâtre-Français), as part of the Committee of Public Safety’s republican propaganda.10 Lemierre’s tragedy treated the theme of tyrannical power, and departing from the chronicle tradition, Tell was placed at the centre of the conspiracy against Gessler. As the argument of tyranny in Act I also touched on the virtue of female submissiveness, in the dialogue between Tell and his wife, Cléofé, who protests against Tell’s denial of her role in the uprising, Cléofé’s participation in Tell’s revolutionary cause provided an important aspect of Lemierre’s narrative.11 Sedaine came to terms with the Revolution in his Guillaume Tell, embracing Lemierre’s commitment to the expression of national struggle for liberty.12 Its picturesque opening scenery was accompanied by the Ranz des vaches which opened the overture, and the scene of rural idyll with its reference to family life (as Tell praises

it as the achievement of love in Act I/6), culminated in the singing of villagers assembled to celebrate the marriage of Tell’s daughter Marie and Melktal fils. (Jouy adopted exactly the same process in his text.) The opera indeed made extensive use of the chorus and it was notably exploited to dramatise the report of the blinding of old Melktal, Tell’s incarceration and the day of insurrection.

In the preface of Jouy and Hippolyte-Louis-Florent Bis, only Schiller’s and Florian’s texts are actually mentioned as their immediate sources. In Florian, Tell is again presented as the revolutionary leader. Although generally given lesser attention, Jouy’s original derived a number of its details directly from Florian’s text, as the study of Gilles de Van has indicated:

- The characterisation of Tell, isolated with private resentment over the tyranny of foreign rule (Act I), and an ideologue of the conspiracy.
- The setting of the Rütli meeting in Jouy’s original version which takes place in ‘le trou d’Uri’ (Act II/1), referred to as ‘la grotte de Grutly’ in Act IV/1, presumably deriving from ‘la caverne de Grutti’ in Florian (livre III), as opposed to ‘les hauteurs du Rutli’ in the published libretto of 1829, revised by Bis.
- The final destruction of the castle in Altdorf.
- The name of Tell’s son ‘Jemmy’ (‘Gemmi’ in Florian)
- The verses directly quoting Florian’s text (livre I), ‘Un esclave n’a point de femme,/ Un esclave n’a point d’enfans. (A slave has no wife,/ A slave has no children)’, firstly shouted by Tell and then taken up by the chorus at the Rütli scene (Act II/7)
- The shooting trial (Act III/7), which like in Florian (livre III), begins by the words: ‘Sois immobile (Stay still)’.

The overall organisation of the acts and their line of action in Jouy’s *Tell* are on the other hand closely modelled on Schiller’s play. In Schiller, in Act I, Konrad Baumgarten of Unterwalden is hunted by Gessler’s men, after the murder of a soldier, who attempted assault on Baumgarten’s wife. Tell successfully takes him to the other bank, as the brewing storm intimidates the fishermen. In Act II, Baron von Attinghausen, a Swiss aristocrat berates his nephew Ulrich von Rudenz for his loyalty to the Austrian monarch and love affair with a rich Austrian heiress Berta von Brunck. The Rütli meeting also takes place in the same act, followed by Berta converting Rudenz to the cause of Swiss liberation, as well as Tell’s apple-shooting and his incarceration (Act III), his escape from the boat and assassination of Gessler (Act IV). In the wake of the Terror, Schiller’s *Tell* reflected his ambivalence towards aggressive activism, seen for instance in his narrative of the Rütli conspiracy which ‘resolves upon a bloodless coup’, while Tell himself is absent from the conspiracy. In contrast to Sedaine’s and Florian’s texts, no support for the common cause comes from Tell’s wife, Hedwig, who remains a wife merely anxious about Tell’s activities, and some female initiatives are offered only by the Habsburg princess Berta.

By contrast, the revolutionary themes of activism, sacrifice and patriotism are unequivocally revived in Jouy’s version. Tell is once again presented as the political leader invoking a national revolt, and Jouy’s original contains some explicit revolutionary rhetoric:

Écoutez le tyran, écoutez, il vous crie,
Qu’il n’est plus de patrie;
Que pour jamais elle est tarie
La source du sang généreux
Qui bouillonnait au cœur de nos ayeux
Un peuple sans vertus n’enfante plus de braves.

17 Jouy’s plot, however, omits Schiller’s Act V, in which the assassination of the Emperor is reported and his murderer Duke John of Swabia comes to Tell to seek support.
18 See Raymond Ockenden, ‘Wilhelm Tell as political drama’, *Oxford German Studies* 18/19 (1990), 32-44.
19 Ibid., 37.
20 Cf. Gier, ‘*Guillaume Tell* in French Opera: from Grétry to Rossini’, 238-240.
Que légueriez-vous à vos fils?
Les fers dont vos bras sont meurtris?

(Listen to the tyrant, listen, he [Gesler] shouts./ That there is no longer a homeland;/ That it has dried up forever/ the source of noble blood/ which was boiling in the hearts of our ancestors./ A people without virtue no longer breeds brave men./ What would you pass on to your sons?/ The swords which wounded your arms?)

As in Lemierre and Florian, Jouy’s original also stresses the idea of individual sacrifice for the patriotic cause, dramatised by Jemmy’s climbing of a glacier (omitted by Bis: see below) which Hedwige deplores: ‘Il meurt pour délivrer son père./ Il meurt pour sauver son pays’ (He dies in order to liberate his father./ He dies in order to save his country). This idea is ubiquitous in the text: for instance, Tell and Walter sing that ‘Et pour son pays s’il expire./ Son beau destin semble nous dire:/ C’étaient aux palmes du martyr/ À couronner tant de vertus’ (And if he dies for his country./ His noble fate seems to tell us:/ Such virtue is crowed/ With the martyr’s wreath). While Paul Comeau observes that as regards Jouy’s Paris essays, ‘after Bonaparte’s second abdication, Jouy’s pronouncements became more and more liberal and he effectively began to divorce himself from the government in power by insisting on the idea of patriotism rather than that of allegiance to a ruler’, there are elements of this attitude in Jouy’s Napoleonic librettos. As seen in previous chapters, Les Bayadères contained self-sacrifice of a heroine, revealing her devotion to her lover, as well as to the national cause. Fernand Cortez depicted the resistance of conquered Mexicans to Spanish rule. The Mexican Télasco’s patriotic appeal (see p.61-62) anticipates the one offered by Tell (fn.21), both meditating on the past and the future of the defeated nation.

As shown by Paul Comeau, it is however in the two articles which appeared soon after Napoleon’s second abdication, that we find, for the first time, Jouy’s statements extensively revealing his ideas of patriotism and good monarchy, his view of the Revolution, and his

---

22 Ibid., Act IV/ 4, 93.
23 Ibid., Act II/ 4, 50.
defence of liberty. In the article ‘Prosopopée française (French Prosopopeia)’, Jouy emphatically writes that the concern of the French at present is not the next head of their government, but the protection of the homeland which they are called upon to defend: not the cause of an emperor, but that of their nation. The power, which deserves to govern such a nation, Jouy asserts, will be founded on its people’s interest, on liberty and on its respect of laws.\textsuperscript{25} In his ‘profession de foi politique (profession of political faith)’, which coincided with the return of Louis XVIII to Paris, Jouy condemns Napoleon’s despotism then asserts that ‘the true French are those who welcomed Louis XVIII with joy, and asked nobly what French nation had been entitled to expect from him, (that is), the liberal institutions, for which we had been battling for twenty-five years and whose conquest alone can put an end to the Revolution’.\textsuperscript{26} It is for this cause, Jouy continues, that the king himself will embrace the Charter. Thus for Jouy, the quest for liberty was not yet over, and later on, he also accepts the Revolution in favour of liberty, when he claims that the defence of liberty was the driving force behind his writing career up to present: ‘I should have wished and it always was the sentiment that directed my quill, that under any government France found itself, she would not lose the only fruits of the terrible Revolution which she has suffered, (namely), liberty and political rights’.\textsuperscript{27} He also states that as an ‘enemy of anarchy and of despotism, I was able to protect my freedom under all governments which were in power in France over twenty-five years’, continuing that ‘I did not seek, I did not wish either placement, recognition or favour’\textsuperscript{28}. There is an element of political opportunism in these assertions, as we may recall that Jouy welcomed Louis XVIII’s return with

\textsuperscript{25} Jouy, ‘Prosopopée française’ (4 July 1815), \textit{Guillaume le Franc-parleur, OC}, vol.5, 291 and 296.

\textsuperscript{26} ‘Les vrai Français sont ceux qui, […] accueilliren avec joie Louis XVIII, et lui demandèrent noblement ce que la nation française avait droit d’attendre de lui, des institution libérales, pour lesquelles nous combattions depuis vingt-cinq ans, et dont la conquête peut seule mettre un terme à la révolution.’ ‘Profession de foi politique’ (8 July 1815), \textit{Guillaume le Franc-parleur, OC}, vol.5, 301.

\textsuperscript{27} ‘J’aurais voulu, et tel a toujours été le sentiment qui a dirigé ma plume, que, sous quelque gouvernement que la France eût été placée, elle ne perdit pas le seul fruit de la révolution terrible qu’elle a subie, cette liberté, ces droits politiques.’ Ibid., 305. Also see Jouy’s lecture (1822) on the Revolution ‘Etat moral des différentes classes de la société’, \textit{OC}, vol.14, 454-474.

\textsuperscript{28} ‘Ennemi de l’anarchie et du despotisme, j’ai su me conserver libre sous tous les gouvernements qui se sont succédé en France depuis vingt-cinq ans: je n’ai sollicité, je n’ai voulu ni place, ni grâces, ni faveurs’. Jouy, ‘Profession de foi politique’, \textit{OC}, vol.5, 305.
his opera *Pélage* in 1814, then went over to Napoleon’s side during the Hundred Days.

Nonetheless, the following was Jouy’s concluding appeal to the returning king:

> We need to all convince ourselves that the monarch […] should be invested with total trust of the nation, and this trust can only be the result of mutual sacrifice. It is not a restoration, but a regeneration which we need; it is an inviolable social pact, which will unite for ever the people and the sovereign, and which will guarantee their interests and rights under which royal authority and public liberty will both flourish.  

These beliefs, which put emphasis on the constitutional monarchy and individual liberty, were also views promoted by liberals (such as Benjamin Constant) in the Restoration. And during this period, encouraged by the revival of liberal political thought that insisted on the heritage of the Revolution (as Jouy does), the so-called ‘liberal historiography’ emerged, as seen in the historian Augustin Thierry’s observation in 1820 that the French ‘lack a history of citizens, a history of subjects, a history of the people’. Its narratives focused on social struggles in history, while aiming to propose historical justifications for the Revolution. Thierry’s *Histoire de la conquête de l’Angleterre par les Normands* (1825) for instance, traced back the rise of the Third Estates to the struggles of the Gauls against the Franks, and his *Lettres sur l’Histoire de France* (1827) was extensively devoted to popular risings in medieval France. It was also in this context that *Résumés de l’histoire de tous les peuples, anciens et modernes*, a series of history books for the general public edited by Félix Bodin, was published. The often cited *Résumé de l’histoire de Suisse* (1824), a volume in the series, was

---

29 ‘Nous avons besoin de nous convaincre tous que le monarque, […] doit être investi de toute la confiance de la nation, et que cette confiance réciproque ne peut être le résultat que de mutuels sacrifices. Ce n’est pas un restauration, c’est une régénération qu’il nous faut; c’est un pacte social inviolable, qui unisses à jamais le peuple et le souverain, qui garantisse leur intérêts et leurs droits, à l’abri duquel puissent fleurir à-la-fois l’autorité royale et la liberté publique.’ Ibid., 306.


34 Philarète Chasles, *Résumé de l’histoire de Suisse*, Paris: Leconte et Durey, 1824. Its second edition was reviewed by Jouy in *La Pandore* issued on 6 October 1825. (Cf. Pichois, *Philarète Chasles*, vol.2, 162.) Chasles was a regular guest at Jouy’s literary salon since 1820 and his collaboration with Jouy on
written by Jouy’s assistant Philarète Chasles. The general preface to the series boldly maintained that ‘history is a major court case between the people and those who oppressed them’\textsuperscript{35}, continuing that ‘the series pay tribute to all noble actions, and exterminate all crimes regardless of class and rank’\textsuperscript{36}. Chasles’s narrative dealt with the history of Switzerland in terms of its national struggles against foreign threats, starting from the Roman conquest, then the Habsburgs and the expedition of François I, to the invasion of the Revolutionary French army. At the same time, the Swiss nation is once again depicted from the traditional perspective of Helvetic liberty:

Independence of all citizens; guarantees of individual liberty, guaranteed by laws and disseminated everywhere; this supreme political dogma, that is, the inviolability of individuals and of property, protected with constant and unwavering loyalty; such was the underlying firm foundation of the peaceful and strong existence of the Swiss.\textsuperscript{37}

The threats of foreign powers in Switzerland presented a complete antithesis to this image of the Swiss nation, and the invasion and extortion of the French revolutionary army in Switzerland was given a particularly harsh assessment: ‘France […] proved itself worthy, neither of democratic liberty, nor of constitutional liberty. She needed tyranny: she found it impressive, absolute and victorious’.\textsuperscript{38}

II

The fact that Jouy turned to Schiller’s \textit{Tell} as his source, presumably in late 1827, seems

\footnotesize

\begin{itemize}
  \item his journal articles started shortly afterwards. He also met Félix Bodin in Jouy’s salon. Chasles fell out with Jouy after the premiere of Jouy’s \textit{Les Intrigues de Cour} which took place on 18 November 1828. See Pichois, ibid., vol.1, 136, 297-300. On Charles’s collaboration with Jouy, see below.
  \item ‘L’histoire est un grand procès entre les peuples et ceux qui les ont opprimés.’ [Félix Bodin ?], ‘Défense des résumés historiques’, in \textit{Résumé de l’histoire de Suisse}, 7.
  \item ‘On rend hommage à toutes les actions généreuses; on flétrit tous les crimes sans égard pour la caste, ni pour le rang.’ Ibid., 14.
  \item ‘L’indépendance de tous les citoyens; les garanties de la liberté individuelle, consacrées pas les lois et partout multipliées; ce premier dogme politique, l’inviolabilité des personnes et des propriétés, conservé avec une constante et imperturbable fidélité; telles furent les causes intimes de la paisible et forte existence des Suisses.’ In ‘Réflexions préliminaires’, cited in Pichois, \textit{Philarète Chasles}, vol.1, 207.
  \item ‘La France, […] ne se montrait digne ni de la liberté démocratique, ni de la liberté constitutionnelle. Il lui fallait une tyrannie: elle la trouva brillante, absolue, victorieuse.’ Chasles, \textit{Résumé de l’histoire de Suisse}, 223.
\end{itemize}
significant when considered in relation to his firm defence of classicism throughout the
Restoration. Jouy was writing in 1815 that ‘I feel a holy wrath against those foreigners who
seek to degrade in France the twin muses of drama, by completely covering them with the faded
finery of foreign fabric which good taste must forbid’. And he continued:

For two centuries, the Théâtre-Français has had no rival; and whatever the romantics of
Germany and England might say, they would do well to accept that the stage on which the
masterworks of Corneille, Molière, Racine, Voltaire are given, is preferable to the one where
the monstrosities of Shakespeare, Otway, Lillo, Schiller’s novel with dialogue, and
Kotzebue’s rhapsodies are shown. Our superiority in this respect is overwhelming; this part
of our national fame has seen no failure: we have, for this reason, all the more interest in
preserving it.

In particular, Jouy sarcastically dismissed the German romantics again in 1817 in his definition
of ‘romantic’, which he considered a ‘term of sentimental jargon’, to identify a new school of
German literature, encouraging the ‘melancholic ecstasy’ that could lead them to the mad
house. As we saw, although Jouy dismissed the categories of classic and romantic in the
article for La Pandore in 1824, his Essai sur l’Opéra français, written in the same period,
revealed his continuing defence of the old conventions. Officially, his classicist stance
remained unchanged even in the second half of the 1820s, as in 1828 Jouy was amongst a group
of authors - Arnault, Lemercier, Viennet, Jay, Andrieux, Leroy - who petitioned Charles X to
intervene against the rise of Romantic theatre. And shortly afterwards, Jouy joined
Baour-Lormian, Arnault, Étienne for a second petition to the king.

Schiller’s *Tell* had been reviewed in Germaine de Staël’s *De l’Allemagne* (1810)\(^{43}\). It promoted French interest in German literature, thereby indirectly addressing the literary conservatism of the Empire, and its general hostility towards the diffusion of German theatre in France.\(^{44}\) After its proper publication in 1814, *De l’Allemagne* became the foundation of German literary criticism in France, and in particular the point of reference for the polemic between the classicists and the Romantics. After 1820, de Staël’s promotion of Anglo-German literature came to be largely accepted, and between 1820 and 1825, there was a boom in the French translations of Byron, Walter Scott, Shakespeare, Schiller and Goethe.\(^{45}\) According to Edmond Eggli, Schiller and Shakespeare in particular were the two foreign authors most mentioned in the Parisian literary press between the years 1815 and 1830, although Schiller, during this period, was generally considered to fit better into French taste than Shakespeare, whose style appeared more extreme; he was also perceived as a better model of romantic literature than Goethe.\(^{46}\) The prominence of Schiller’s *Tell* amongst his dramatic works was particularly in evidence from 1818, when its first French translation (by Jean-Henri Merle d’Aubigné)\(^{47}\) was reviewed by the Parisian press. In 1821, Prosper Brugière Barante similarly expressed his unconditional admiration of the work in his *Œuvres dramatiques de Schiller* in which its translation also appeared.\(^{48}\) And F.-R. de Toreinx (Eugène Ronteix) was still writing in 1829 that ‘(Schiller’s) *Wilhelm Tell* has been up to present and will be for much longer, the


\(^{44}\) See Henning, *L’Allemagne de Mme de Staël*, 32.


\(^{46}\) Edmond Eggli, *Schiller et le romantisme français*, 2 vols., Paris: Gamber, 1928, vol.2, 84 and 190-193. Several biographical accounts of Schiller were published, including J.G. Hess’s preface to *Marie Stuart* (1816); Prosper de Barante’s *La Vie de Schiller*; Loève-Weimar’s *Résumé de l’histoire de la littérature allemande* (1826).


masterwork of Romantic tragedy’. Schiller’s *Tell* was also a particular case where the critics were on the whole unanimous in their praise. Like de Staël, the critics gave special credit to the beauty and magnificence of its Swiss tableau, and the critic of *Lycée français* even pointed out the absence of such a tableau from Lemierre’s tragedy. When a series of *Tell* adaptations appeared in Parisian theatres in 1828, the importance of Schiller’s play was pointed out in the press: ‘Schiller has given a new life to this popular subject, and his tragedy more than history inspires our writers today’. Jouy and Bis publicly acknowledged their debt to Schiller in their preface in 1829.

While the romantic conflict continued to 1830 and beyond, by 1821, *Le Miroir des spectacles* (Jouy was its co-editor) was reporting in favour of foreign literature, and was inclined to accept some innovations, on condition that they were in keeping with the rules of the classical theatre:

> Should we conclude […] that all playwrights born and unborn should never deviate a step from the road so deeply furrowed by their illustrious predecessors? We are far from believing so, and while blaming the deviations of this foreign Pegasus who prances about randomly without guide or purpose, however, we will continue to ask our authors occasionally to consult their own genius, and while keeping themselves within the limits of art that reason and nature had laid down before Aristotle, to try sometimes, without losing sight of earlier masters, to find or even to make a path parallel to the road, which the latter have closed off behind them.

---


50 Eggli, ibid., vol.2, 112.

51 Ibid., vol.1, 484.

52 ‘Schiller a donné un nouvel éclat à ce sujet populaire, et sa tragédie plus que l’histoire inspire aujourd’hui nos écrivains.’ *Le courrier des Théâtres*, 17 June 1828, quoted in Eggli, ibid., vol.1, 616, fn.4.


54 ‘Faut-il en conclure, […], que tous les auteurs dramatiques nés et à naître ne doivent jamais, […], s’écarter d’un pas de la route que leurs illustres prédécesseurs ont si profondément sillonné? Nous sommes loin de le croire, et, tout en blâmant les écarts de ce pégase [sic] étranger qui caracole au hasard sans guide et sans but, nous continuerons cependant à inviter nos auteurs à prendre de temps en temps conseil de leur propre génie, et, tout en se maintenant dans les limites de l’art que la raison et la nature avaient posées avant Aristote, d’essayer quelquefois, sans perdre de vue les traces des maîtres, de trouver,
More forthright was Louis-Simon Auger’s speech (see Chapter 3, p.123) delivered in defense of classicism at the Académie française in 1824, the year when the polemics intensified. Auger conceded that French tragedy should abandon Greco-Roman subjects and embrace (as in Anglo-German theatre) ‘subjects of the Middle Ages or the modern Europe’ and ‘religious and chevaleresque themes’. He also suggested departing from Greco-Roman mythology as a source of the supernatural and to adopt the ‘Germanic’ merveilleux, which has taken recourse to ‘fairytales, sorcery and black magic’. While allowing ‘fairies, necromancers and sylphs’, however, he warned against the exaggerated use of sinister fantasy involving ‘ghosts, larvae (phantoms), lamias, lemurs (the spirits of the dead)’, and deprecated current vampirism and satanic narratives. He nevertheless concluded by insisting on fidelity to the rules and language of traditional French theatre.

While Auger here was concerned with theatre, Jean-Toussaint Merle’s De l’Opéra (1827; see p.123) suggested new operatic subject matter in these terms:

I believe that it is time to put into the storehouse all Greek, Roman and mythological frippery. Homer and Virgil have long enough done the honours of the Opéra. We need to find another kind of merveilleux, […] I am convinced that there is more money in fairytales and the Bibliothèque bleue than in the Iliad and the Aeneid, etc. […] Milton and Dante would

ou même de se frayer un sentier parallèle à la route que ceux-ci ont fermée derrière eux.’ Le Miroir, 242, Oct 1821, 2-3, quoted in Comeau, Diehards and Innovators, 130.

55 The speech of Louis-Simon Auger, in Recueil des discours prononcés dans la séance publique annuelle de l’Institut royale de France le samedi 24 Avril 1824, Paris: Didot, 1824, 12. Louis-Simon Auger (b 29 Dec 1772; d Jan 1829), born in Paris, first worked in the governmental bureaucracy (first in the administration of the food supply of armies, then in the ministry of the Interior, where he was employed until 1812). In the early years of his career, he also wrote a comedy Arlequin odalisque, comédie-parade en un acte et en prose, mêlée de vaudeville, premiered at the Théâtre des Troubadours on 15 messidor An VIII (4 Jul 1800), and collaborated on some other comedies and vaudevilles, but soon turned to literary criticism. When the Imperial University was founded by Napoleon, he became a member of a commission reviewing literature. During the Empire, Auger edited numerous books including the Complete Works of Mme de la Fayette and Mme de Tencin (5 vols.;1804) and of Charles Duclos (10 vols.;1806). In the First and Second Restoration, he was a member of royal censors (he lost the position during the Hundred Days). He was elected to the Académie française on 11 April 1816 and on 1 January 1826, named its ‘secrétaire perpétuel’. Under the decree passed on 12 October 1824, he became a member of Opéra’s literary jury, and served as its secretary. His illness and depression led him to suicide in the Seine around 2 January 1829. (See Biographie nouvelle des contemporains, vol.1, Paris: Librairie historique, 1820, 302-303; Biographie universelle ancienne et moderne, nouvelle édition, vol.2, Paris: Desplaces, 1843, 423-426; Nouvelle biographie universelle (générale), vol.3, ed. Hoefer, Paris: Didot, 1853, 629-630; Vauthier, ‘Le Jury de lecture et l’Opéra sous la Restauration’, 24.)

56 The speech of Auger, ibid., 6.

57 Ibid., 19.
provide subjects for librettos that the Opéra could accommodate without derogating. Our old chronicles, our witty fables, popular traditions and beliefs of the Middle Ages are inexhaustible sources of topics full of originality and imagination, etc.\(^{58}\)

Merle’s commentary may be seen as a response to recent developments at the Opéra, rather than a radical suggestion. For instance, the fairy-tale had come into vogue at the Opéra in the early years of the Restoration,\(^{59}\) and the works such as Zéloïde, ou les Fleurs enchantées (1818), Blanche de Provence, ou la cour des fées (1821), Aladin, ou la lampe Merveilleuse (1822) had been staged.\(^{60}\) And as David Chaillou has shown, the pursuit of darker supernatural narrative inspiring terror was manifested already at the Opéra during the Empire, in three operas Ossian, ou Les Bardes (1804), La Mort d’Adam (1809) and La Mort d’Abel (1810).\(^{61}\) By way of Ossianism and so-called Christian merveilleux involving Satan, these operas offered a new (romantic) supernatural model as opposed to the classical merveilleux based on mythology and the Italian epic poems. Furthermore, Corinne Schneider has indicated that later on, the distinction between classical and romantic merveilleux (later referred to as ‘fantastique’\(^{62}\)) emerged in the debates surrounding the premiere of the French adaptation of Weber’s Der

\(^{58}\) ‘Je crois qu’il est temps de reléguer dans les magasins toute la friperie grecque, romaine et mythologique. Homère et Virgile ont fait assez long-temps les honneurs de l’Opéra. Il faut trouver un autre genre de merveilleux, […] je suis convaincu qu’il y a plus de succès d’argent dans les contes des fées et dans la Bibliothèque bleue que dans l’Iliade et l’Enéide, et […] Milton et le Dante fourniraient des sujets de poèmes que l’Opéra pourrait accueillir sans déroger. Nos vieilles chroniques, nos spirituels fabliaux, les traditions populaires et les croyances du moyen âge, sont des sources inépuisable de sujets riches d’originalité et d’imagination, etc.’ Jean-Toussaint Merle, De l’Opéra, Baudouin frères, 1827, 21-22. Cf. Anselm Gerhard, The Urbanization of Opera, 48. Bibliothèque bleue refers to ‘a popular collection of ballade-like tales’ (Gerhard, ibid.), which came into existence in the seventeenth century and was produced until the nineteenth century.

\(^{59}\) Suskin, The Music of Charles-Simon Catel, 275-278.


Freischütz in December 1824 (by Castil-Blaze and Thomas Sauvage\textsuperscript{63}). The casting of the magic bullets in the wolf’s glen scene featuring a moonlit forest, ruins and gothic edifice to set off the macabre ambience, called for the supernatural provided by ghostly apparitions. Ipsiboé created at the Opéra earlier in the same year offered the similar world of gothic fantasy.

Jouy’s approach to libretto writing in the Restoration may be characterised by the two essential aspects of Auger’s response to the modernisation of theatre: first, his readiness to accept a shift away from classical subject matter, and second, his view that no fundamental modification of conventions was necessary. Four texts - Zirphile et Fleur de Myrte, L’Amazone de Lutèce, Faust, and Guillaume Tell - all seem to reveal this tendency as shown below.

But before going further, it is important to mention Philarète Chasles, Jouy’s literary assistant between 1820 and 1828, and in particular, the role he should have played in a marked shift to German literary subject in Jouy’s last three librettos. Philarète Chasles\textsuperscript{64} (b 6 October 1798; d 18 July 1873), the member of the generation which Alan Spitzer has called ‘the generation of 1820’ (see Chapter 3, p.121) was born in Mainvilliers (Eure-et-Loir), the son of Pierre-Jacques-Michel Chasles, a member of the Convention. He received his education in Paris and developed a taste for Ossian, Goethe, Chateaubriand, de Staël, Dante, and Shakespeare. In February 1816, he began an apprenticeship with a Bonapartist printer, who was arrested two month later. Chasles was also incarcerated for five weeks. In March 1817 he left Paris for London to serve as an apprentice with the publisher Abraham John Valpy, who specialised in the publication of classical literature. During this time, Chasles was also put in charge of establishing copies of Michel Maittaire’s letters for John Manners, 5th Duke of Rutland. While in London, he also became an avid reader of English literature. Shortly after


\textsuperscript{64} See Pichois, Philarète Chasles. Pichois indicated some errors in the Chasles entry in the extant biographies, including Nouvelle biographie Nouvelle biographie générale, Paris: Didot, 1854, vol.10, 37-38.
his return to Paris in November 1818, he embarked on a career in literary criticism, writing for the *Revue encyclopédie*, and also publishing articles about England and English literature in *La Renommée* (merged with *Le Courrier français* in 1820) whose writers included Jouy. Also among his articles in *La Renommée* was his review (25 Feb 1820) of de Staël’s complete works published by her son in the years 1820 and 1821. Chasles praised her attention to the merits of foreign literature in *De l’Allemagne*. As Jouy’s assistant, Chasles collaborated on two librettos (*Le Vieux de la Montagne* and *Faust*) and possibly also on *L’Amazone de Lutèce* (see below). We saw in Chapter 3 that Chasles probably wrote the second section of *Essai sur l’Opéra français*. He also aided Jouy’s publication of *Œuvres complètes*, contributed substantially to his novel *Cécile, ou les passions* (Chapter 2, fn. 56), and collaborated on various other projects. Independently, during the 1820s, Chasles contributed to literary journals such as *Le Miroir des Spectacles, La Pandore, L’Opinion*, and the *Revue Britannique* (reporting on articles in British journals) for which he wrote until 1840. In the 1830s, he wrote for journals such as the *Revue de Paris*, the *Journal des Débats*, and the *Revue de Deux Mondes*. Many of his articles from the 1830s and 1840s were devoted to foreign literature, predominantly English, but also German and Spanish. Consequently, he became known as the authority on English writers. In parallel with his journalistic contributions, he was the author of many books, including the abovementioned *Résumé de l’Histoire de Suisse* (fn. 34); *Caractères et Paysages*, and also edited and translated numerous books, including Jean Paul’s novel *Titan* (1800-1803), and Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet*. In 1837 he became librarian of the Bibliothèque Mazarine and in 1841, became Professor of German language and literature at the Collège de France.

---

His biography thus reveals his outstanding interest and knowledge in foreign literature, originating in his youth and expanded through his apprenticeship in London and through his career in literary criticism. It seems logical to think that this fact had a certain effect on Jouy at this critical juncture in the emergence of Romanticism. On a practical level, as we have no evidence to suggest that Jouy read German, it is possible that Chasles’s fluency in German helped Jouy’s adaptation of Werner’s *Attila* whose French translation does not exist, into *L’Amazone de Lutèce*, if not his adaptation of Goethe’s *Faust* (see below) and Schiller’s *Tell* (see p. 162) whose French translations were available.

In terms of subject matter, however, we may argue that Anglo-German influence entered Jouy’s creative output already in 1818, less than three years after his article hostile to Anglo-German influences. As the fairy-tale rapidly came into vogue at the Opéra, Jouy also produced a two-act *opéra féerie*, *Zirphile et Fleur de Myrte* for Catel, written in collaboration with Noël Lefèvre (It only had 12 performances.). His preface in *Œuvres complètes* suggests that it drew some inspiration from Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*. The plot involves a magician Galaor living on the enchanted island. Like Shakespeare’s Prospero, he has a servant with magical power, a gnome Rabiel. Jouy maintains that what he describes as ‘‘mythologie cabalistique (occult mythology)’’ is wrongly despised in France. Only ‘‘le barbaré Shakespeare’’ managed to treat this new type of mythology in a manner worthy of Greek poets, who, in his view, were able to ‘‘lend passion, intelligence, discerning wisdom and soul to their airy beings’’. Interestingly however, Jouy also considers Shakespeare’s observations as too shrewd, perhaps in a similar way that Auger advised against the romantics’ emphasis on realism in the above-mentioned speech: ‘‘There is, in art, an excess of naturalism that is the worst

---


70 Jouy, ‘‘Préambule’, ibid., 318.

71 Ibid. Italics original.

72 Ibid.
affectation of all, and a silly or abject realism which would make one prefer an elegant imposture'. Jouy concludes that far from taking Shakespeare as direct model, his type of mythology ought to be reinvented by the imagination of French poets.

The summary of Jouy’s plot is as follows. The magician Galaor confides to Rabiel that the fairy Morgane gave him eternal youth in exchange for his love, and that once transformed, however, he betrayed her and fell in love with a young princess Zirphile. He is troubled by a warning that he will fall back into Morgane’s power and lose his youthful appearance, if Zirphile discovers love before she reaches twenty. Galaor fears Morganes’s vengeance and influence on Zirphile, thus tells Zirphile that if she fell in love, she would lose her physical beauty, and if a lover kissed her, she would die instantly. Terrified, Zirphile renounces love, but at the same time rejects his wooing. Galaor summons sylphs to perform an entertainment to brighten Zirphile’s mood. The gathering storm interrupts the divertissement: as Rabiel warns of the approach of a ship, Undines and salamanders emerge. Rabiel orders them to whip up the sea, in order to destroy the ship carrying a young shepherd Fleur de Myrte whom Morgane had brought up (and with whom Zirphile falls in love). As the ship breaks up, Morgane however throws her scarf onto the sea. Fleur de Myrte is lifted onto a cloud and transported to the island. On the island (Act II), as devised by Morgane, Fleur de Myrte falls in love with Zirphile. Galaor lies to Zirphile, saying that she has lost her beauty and Zirphile appears before Fleur de Myrte covered by a veil. But Fleur de Myrte asks her to see her unchanging beauty reflected in a mirror held by a sylph. As Galaor tries to seize the lovers, the earth rises up before him to prevent it. Enraged, Galaor conjures up salamanders ready to belch fire. Zirphile finally tells Fleur de Myrte that his kiss will kill her. Instead, when he kisses her, the salamanders vanish and Galaor is metamorphosed into an old man, thanks to Morgane’s spells. Morgane and the chorus finally eternalise the union of Zirphile and Fleur de

73 ‘Il est, dans les arts, un excès de naturel qui est la pire des affectations, et un degré de vérité niaise ou abjecte qui ferait préférer une élégante imposture.’ Auger, Recueil des discours, 14.
Jouy’s text completely departs from Shakespeare and adopts a plot centered on a love triangle (as in French baroque operas), here involving a magician as a rival. In terms of supernatural stage effects, Jouy does not use either of the memorable episodes in Shakespeare. In Shakespeare, one involves a bizarre banquet scene in which the banquet table is first brought by ‘several strange shapes’, then made to vanish by Ariel in the figure of a Harpy, as the plotters against Prospero approach it (Act III/3). In another (perhaps closer to le merveilleux of French Baroque operas) to celebrate the marriage of Miranda and Ferdinand, Ariel, with the help of other spirits, performs a play in which Iris (the goddess of rainbows), Ceres (the goddess of the earth and the harvest), Juno and nymphs appear to bless the couple (Act IV/1). Jouy instead makes use of undines and salamanders, which often appeared in ballets and operas before 1750, including Rameau’s Zoroastre (1749). In Jouy’s libretto at the end of the first act, determined that Fleur de Myrte shall die, Rabiel commands undines and salamanders: ‘Les Ondins tourment les flots, les salamandres vomissent des flammes et allument un volcan sous marin’ (The undines agitate the waves, a salamanders exude flames and create an underwater volcano). Simon-Joseph Pellegrin’s libretto Hippolyte et Aricie (1733) for Rameau, for example, includes a similar merveilleux episode. Neptune summons a sea monster in order to avenge Thésée, who believes that his own son Hippolyte has violated his new wife Phèdre. As the sea churns, the monster emerges, spitting out steam and flames, and carries off Hippolyte. Jouy’s text also involves the apparition of Galaor, jealous of Zirphile and Fleur de Myrte’s mutual affection, in his chariot pulled by dragons (Act II/2). The flying chariot, of course,

was a regular device in supernatural episodes of French baroque operas, while the elements here remind one, for instance, of the final act of Quinault’s Thésée (1675), where the sorceress Médée, a rejected lover in a similar love triangle, descends in her chariot of winged dragons to take revenge on Thésée. Jouy also eliminated the role of Caliban in Shakespeare, the witch Sycorax’s son, but ‘a savage and deformed slave’ of Prospero and Miranda since his attempted rape of the latter. In the preface of Cromwell (1827; see Chapter 3, p.123), Victor Hugo was to embrace antithesis, ‘ugliness alongside beauty, deformity next door to gracefulness, grotesquerie just on the other side of sublimity’. By contrast, Jouy’s approach to Shakespeare was more in line with his own preference for an ‘always noble’ situation in opera.

The next libretto to draw from the foreign literature was his L’Amazone de Lutèce, submitted to the Opéra’s literary jury in early November 1825 and accepted on 26 November. The title is rather misleading, as it was none other than an adaptation of Friedrich Ludwig Zacharias Werner’s five-act tragedy, Attila, König der Hunnen (1808), which de Staël also praised in De l’Allemagne. The first French translation of Werner’s works appeared in a volume in Ladvocat’s series Chefs-d’œuvre des théâtres étrangers devoted to Werner and Adolf Müllner,

---

80 Cf. Quinault, Thésée, tragédie en musique ornée d’entrées de ballet, de machines et de changements de théâtre, Paris: Ballard, 1675, 72.
82 Jouy, Essai sur l’Opéra français, ed. Gerhard, Bollettino, 66.
83 On 2 November 1825, Jouy addressed a letter to Sosthène de La Rochefoucauld, the directeur des Beaux-arts (the minister in charge of royal theatres) since 28 August 1824, to inform that he had just finished his L’Amazone de Lutèce and that he was intending to send it to the jury. Jouy also asked La Rochefoucauld about a possible date when its reading before the jury could take place. La Rochefoucauld responded on 5 November to request Jouy to send the manuscript to the department of Beaux-arts and also to inform that he would advise Auger to arrange its reading with Jouy. On 30 November, Auger informed La Rochefoucauld that the libretto was accepted on 26 November. (See Jouy, letter to La Rochefoucauld, 2 Nov 1825, F-Pan, O3 1669; La Rochefoucauld, letter to Jouy, 5 Nov 1825, ibid.; Auger, letter to La Rochefoucauld, 30 Nov 1825, ibid.)
but the volume only contained Werner’s five-act tragedy *Martin Luther oder die Weihe der Kraft* (1807) and *Der vierundzwanzigste Februar* (1815) in one act. In effect, Werner’s *Attila* was never translated into French and English, except for Philarète Chasles’s translation of its Act II/2, which he offered in his unsigned article published in the *Revue de Paris* (the Romantic monthly founded in 1829) in 1830.

Werner’s tragedy presented a Burgundian princess Hildegunde who murders the Hunnic king Attila (and his son Irnak) on their wedding night to avenge the death of her father and her beloved, Walther. She then throws herself onto her sword and in dying, swears eternal love for Walther, prompting Pope Leo’s remark that love can exist in hell as well as in heaven. She is a sort of diabolical soul whose determination to take vengeance is seen in terms of possession by the ‘Geist der Nacht’ (the spirit of night) which is twice exorcised by Leo. De Staël described the uniqueness of Werner’s Hildegund in these terms:

> It is a mysterious character, which at first takes strong hold on the imagination; but, when this mystery goes on continually increasing, when the poet gives us to suppose that an infernal power has obtained possession of her, and that not only, at the end of the piece, she immolates Attila on the wedding night, but stabs his son, of the age of fourteen years, by his side, this creature loses all the features of womanhood, and the aversion she inspires gains the ascendancy over the terror she is otherwise calculated to excite.

While Jouy’s libretto retained the general line of Werner’s plot, it completely cast aside the dark and diabolic aspect of Werner’s heroine (see Chapter 4, p.143-144). Jouy instead

---

87 Philarète Chasles, ‘La Cour de Valentinien en 494’, *Revue de Paris*, 21 (1830), 193-214. The article is identified as Charles’s by Pichois. See Pichois, *Philarète Chasles*, vol.2, 439. As regards *L’Amazone de Lutèce*, Pichois referred to a report in *La France chrétienne* of 1826 (which may have been written by Chasles), informing that *Les Athéniennes, Le Vieux de la Montagne, and L’Amazone de Lutèce* are ‘in the hands of the greatest composers’ (See ibid., 143-144, fn. 187), but was unable to locate the text and noted that ‘Quant à *L’Amazone de Lutèce* […], on en ignore tout, sauf que la musique devait en être écrit par Hummel’. (Ibid.)
reverted to his usual plot pattern which centered on the opposition of two racial groups. The Roman emperor Valentinian’s sister Honoria (she was a loyal lover of Attila in Werner) is forced to marry Attila in order to forge peace. To save Honoria from the marriage tie which she resists, Martia (Werner’s Hildegunde) offers to take her place. Martia nevertheless kills Attila by declaring that Attila was her father’s murderer. But even here, Jouy unfailingly adhered to the convention of the happy ending: Martia, who does not commit suicide, is united with her lover Valmir, who is present in Jouy’s plot and who defeats the Huns (off-stage) in the end.

But nearly three years after Auger’s speech and before the publication of Hugo’s *Cromwell*, Jouy embraced the demonic. On 30 October 1827, in collaboration with Philarète Chasles (and possibly also with Clémence de Presle, a writer and Chasles’s companion at the time)⁹⁰, he submitted to the Opéra a four-act opera *Faust* libretto based on Goethe.⁹¹ The first French translations of Goethe’s *Faust* had appeared in 1823⁹²; one published in January by Albert Stapfer⁹³ which was more faithful to the original and the other, in November in Ladvocat’s

---


⁹¹ Sarah Hibberd mentions a letter (9 Feb 1827), which reschedules the reading of Jouy’s *Faust* to the jury de lecture, found at the Archives nationales. (Hibberd, “Cette diablerie philosophique”: *Faust* Criticism in Paris c.1830*, Reading Critics Reading, *Opera and Ballet Criticism in France from the Revolution to 1848*, ed. Roger Parker and Mary Ann Smart, New York: Oxford University Press, 2001, 125.) See Andrieux (a member of the jury), letter to the Comte de Tilly, 9 February 1827, F-Pan, O³ 1724, I.475.) Andrieux asked the Comte to obtain La Rochefoucauld’s consent to move the reading originally planned on 14 February to 21 February. Other documents reveal that the Opéra received Jouy’s manuscript much later on 30 October 1827, and the jury finally accepted the libretto on 10 November 1827. (See a letter to Jouy, 30 Oct 1827, F-Pan, O³ 1724, I.475; Auger [Louis-Simon], letter to La Rochefoucauld, 20 November 1827, F-Pan, O³ 1724, I. 499.)


aforementioned *Chefs-d’œuvre des théâtres étrangers*, by Louis-Clair Beaupoil de Sainte-Aulaire\(^{94}\) which simplified Goethe’s text and borrowed from Stapfer’s translation, notably, for the scenes of the Witch’s Kitchen and Walpurgis Night.  Gérard de Nerval’s translation which is reputed to have had a more direct influence on the French Romantics like Berlioz and Théophile Gautier only appeared in November 1827.  In the years 1827-1828, a succession of *Faust* stage works was produced at secondary Parisian theatres.  The first to appear was Emmanuel Théaulon’s three-act drame lyrique, *Faust*, which was given at the Théâtre des Nouveautés on 27 October 1827, that is, three days before Jouy’s libretto was delivered to the Opéra.  Jouy was furious with the news and gave the following instruction to Chasles:

> Write for *Les Voyageurs* a little article in which you express your regret for the habit of vaudeville authors who despoil the grandest subjects by cutting them in pieces to make them look absurd in theatres, to which they are the least suited.  You will announce at the same time that you found out that the author of *La Vestale* and of *Fernand Cortez* had finished a grand opera in which he had treated this magnificent subject in its true proportions, etc. etc. etc. State also that there is only one composer in Europe who can undertake such a work.\(^{95}\)

The composer he meant was Rossini.  According to Emmanuel Reibel, talks were in progress between Rossini and Jouy on the Faust project.\(^{96}\)  In October 1822, the press reported that Rossini rejected Jouy’s *Les Athénienes*, which had been accepted by the Opéra on 16 January 1822.\(^{97}\)  As we saw (Chapter 3, fn.109), Rossini abandoned the project of *Le Vieux de la Montagne* in 1827.  But apart from *Faust*, Jouy was planning yet another libretto (presumably

---


\(^{95}\) ‘Faites dans les Voyageurs un petit article dans lequel vous vous plaindrez de la manie des auteurs de vaudevilles qui déflorent les plus grands sujets en les déchiquetant pour les traduire en ridicule sur la scène où ils conviennent le moins; vous annoncerez [sic] en même tems que vous êtes instruit que l’auteur de la Vestale et de Fernand Cortez a terminé un grand Opéra où il a traité ce magnifique sujet dans ses véritables proportions, etc.etc.etc. Dites en même tems qu’il n’y a qu’un musicien en Europe qui puisse entreprendre un pareil ouvrage.’ Quoted in Pichois, *Philarète Chasles*, vol.2, 222, fn.165.


at around the same period) for Rossini. Even though in 1826, in his *Essai*, Jouy sounded rather undecided about Rossini’s status in France (‘this brilliant meteor, which at present seems to set the theatre ablaze rather than illuminate it, has not yet appeared on our musical horizon’) by 1827 Jouy became eager to collaborate with the composer.

The action of Jouy’s *Faust* begins with a prologue in which Mephisto swears to deliver Faust to hell. The angels protest, but are overpowered by the demons. In his study (Act I), in despair over his love for Marguerite, Faust is about to take poison, when he hears the morning prayer coming from the convent, as well as the songs of the returning soldiers. He puts the cup down, but their spiritual and earthly voices trouble him. A woman’s cry is heard and although his friend Waller laughs at his steadfastness, Faust rescues a young girl from her attacker, the Bailiff’s son. The young girl is revealed to be Mephisto in disguise, and when the Bailiff arrives to arrest Faust, his study changes into a vineyard, where the grape-pickers are at work. As the Bailiff tries to take Faust prisoner, he is caught in the swirl of Mephisto’s infernal waltz. Escorted to the forest (Act II), Faust suspects Mephisto to be Satan but accepts his assistance for fear of losing Marguerite. Mephisto promises Faust ‘glory, pleasure, and greatness’, as well as the status of ‘artist, prince, and king’. He conjures up a sumptuous palace and gives him a luxurious robe. Faust lies on a divan and watches various dancers perform, amongst them being ‘a procession of Athenians’, ‘Egyptian dancers’, ‘the bayadères of India’, ‘Amazons’,

98 The Jouy manuscripts kept at the Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal reveal that Jouy was planning to write a libretto (in five acts) based on German medieval legend, Geneviève de Brabant. (Jouy, Geneviève de Brabant, opera en cinq actes, in Victor-Joseph Étienne, dit de Jouy. Pièce de théâtre, F-Pa, MS 6055, 134-143.) Volume 16 of de Staël’s complete works published in 1821 (see fn. 65), included her three-act play based on the same legend, Geneviève de Brabant, drame en trois actes en prose (1808). (See Œuvres complètes de Mme la baronne de Staël, vol.16, 21-71.) The action of de Staël’s play begins where Geneviève and her daughter leave the cave in search of their protector. She meets her husband, Sigefroi, who hates children, and her son. Thanks to a letter kept by a hermit, Sigefroi finally realises that he had been a victim of treachery. The synopsis in Jouy’s handwriting tells a story of Geneviève, who rejects the wooing of her husband Sigismand’s intendant Waldemar, while Sigismand is away in the crusades. Jealous Waldemar accuses her of adulterous love affair with one of the courtiers, and arranges her and her son’s murder in the remote forest. Her beauty prevents the assassins to complete Waldemar’s order and Sigismand, returning from the crusades, enters the forest on St Hubert’s day, and finds her and her son. Jouy’s ‘note historique’ indicates that the text was intended for Rossini, and Jouy also asserts that his plot promises to produce the opera of the latest kind.

‘fairies’, etc. Faust however becomes impatient at not seeing Marguerite and demands Mephisto, now in the figure of Satan, to take him to her immediately. They visit the witch Bebo in her cave. Faust sees Marguerite in Bebo’s magic picture and the witch also gives Faust a magic ring that would lead him to Marguerite. Against the warning of a voice that he will lose access to heaven forever, he puts the ring on his finger. Marguerite embroiders while thinking of Faust (Act III), and her mother Béatrix brings her the news of her brother Valentin’s return from war. Mephisto arranges a meeting between Marguerite and Faust. They swear eternal loyalty and Marguerite accepts the ring. Furious Valentin provokes Faust, who kills him. Yet Mephisto claims that it is Marguerite who murdered Valentin, and she admits it. Béatrix runs towards the dead Valentin lying under the elm tree, to which Mephisto sets fire. Awaiting her execution in a dungeon (Act IV), Marguerite notices funeral processions of both her mother and brother. She faints. Mephisto promises Faust to rescue Marguerite, in return for his soul. Faust initially refuses but as Marguerite’s execution is finally announced, he takes off the cross and signs the infernal pact. Faust visits Marguerite in her cell and realises that she has lost her senses. When the guards try to carry away the two, Faust makes a gesture and the torches extinguish. Faust carries Marguerite away through the cemetery. The scene changes to the palace of Faust. He is about to swear his marriage vows to Marguerite, but she withdraws her hand from Faust’s in fear and drops the ring. She recovers her reason. When Mephisto emerges from underground to fetch them, Faust tells Marguerite that their union was made in hell. She rejects him, is removed to a cloud, and ascends to heaven. Angry to have lost her, Mephisto orders Faust to follow him to hell. An angel, however, lowers his cross from the sky. Mephisto vanishes, and Faust, saved from damnation, is left alone on the earth.100

In the general outline of the plot, Jouy faithfully followed Goethe’s text and, by doing so, he

100 Jouy, Faust, drame lyrique en quatre actes, in Victor-Joseph Étienne, dit de Jouy. Pièce de théâtre, F-Pa, MS 6053.
entered a new world of Gothic fantasy, completely different from those of his librettos produced so far. The libretto specified the décor of Faust’s study to be in Gothic style, and Act IV involved an eerie scene in which Faust carries Marguerite across the cemetery, covered with will-o’-the-wisps. What also seems striking is Faust’s character, by comparison with other leading roles in Jouy’s librettos. Pointing to the emergence of new type of protagonist in Guillaume Tell, Anselm Gerhard described Arnold as ‘a sentimental lover who gives his subjective state absolute priority over external events and finds himself constantly unable, or able only very reluctantly, to make the decisions demanded of him by the objective situation’. Faust is also an anti-hero, lacking the attributes of Jouy’s Napoleonic protagonists; for example in Act I/1, in his study, he drifts into a reverie during an aria indicated as nocturne, which suddenly gives way to his wild fantasy that Marguerite is dead, and to suicidal despair.

At the same time, the motivation of Faust’s attempted suicide in Jouy is his love. In other words, this exposition also resembles Jouy’s older librettos where such conflicts are introduced. Sarah Hibberd observed that these French adaptations, including Jouy’s version, characteristically omitted the metaphysical aspect of Goethe’s text and made it a simple pursuit of love (and wealth), while providing the marvellous aspect through magic tricks and special effects.

Hibberd’s latter point, on the other hand, may be taken further, so that it may be argued that some of Jouy’s supernatural effects are more reminiscent of those in older operas. While Jouy’s Mephisto conjures up a palace and gives Faust a regal appearance in order to entice him with wealth and power, so for the same purpose, the sorceress Alcine in Antoine Danchet’s Alcine (based on Ariosto’s Orlando furioso) set to music by André Campra (1705) raises a palace for Astolphe, whom she loves.

Furthermore, in Jouy, Faust is given a magic ring in

---

102 Hibberd, ‘Cette diablerie philosophique’, 121-122 and 126.
103 Interestingly, in Charles-Guillaume Étienne’s aforementioned magic opera libretto Aladin, in order to win the heart of the queen Almasie, a fisherman Aladin served by the genie of the lamp, asks also for a rich garb and a magnificent palace (Act I/7 and 9).
the witch’s cave (Act II/5), whereas in Goethe, Faust is given a potion. One of the memorable literary occurrences of a magic ring was Ariosto’s *Orlando furioso*, in which the ring is given to Angelica, rendering her invisible when she puts it into her mouth. According to David J. Buch, the magic ring motif is found in many eighteenth-century French stage productions based on Ariosto’s text. Quinault’s *Roland* (1685) for instance retains the episode in which Angelica becomes invisible. The use of a magic ring was not limited to works based on the Roland legend. For example Rameau’s *Zaïs* (1748), a *pastorale-héroïque*, involves a climactic episode (Act IV) in which Zaïs’s court and palace vanish when he throws away his magic ring. It also played an important part in Grétry and Marmontel’s *Zémire et Azor* (1771). In Act III, before releasing Zémire to visit her family, Azor gives her a magic ring which she rejects in Act IV, causing her to return to him instantly.

Furthermore, in Jouy, the witch’s cave scene involves the chorus of magicians chanting and dancing around the cauldron of magic liqueur. Buch indicates that this so-called ‘incantation scene’ was a characteristic component of ‘marvellous’ musical style in operas before 1750. For instance, in Rameau’s *Dardanus* (1739), like Jouy’s *Faust*, Dardanus seeks the help of the magician Isménor to win the heart of Iphise. Isménor gives him a magic wand that transforms him into Isménor himself, enabling Dardanus to find out who Iphise’s true love is. After the occult ceremony with dances and an incantation chorus of magicians, Dardanus is transformed.

We saw in Chapter 3 that although Jouy’s *Essai* supports opera’s fundamental association with the *merveilleux*, he favours what Marmontel had distinguished as *merveilleux naturel*, treating supernatural aspects of human history. Jouy’s choice of Quinault’s *Armide* as a stylistic model for French opera in the same *Essai* therefore appears totally contradictory, as
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Gilles de Van points out\(^{108}\), or anachronistic, as Anselm Gerhard observes\(^{109}\). Moreover the foregoing comparisons seem to suggest that Jouy appealed to the magic spells and transformations offered by baroque operas like *Armide* in order to engage with German supernatural narratives. Significantly, while Jouy characteristically situated fables at the boundary of history in his earlier mythological librettos, in *Zirphile and Faust* he makes no such effort. It was, however, a historically grounded adaption of the German supernatural, as in Scribe’s *Robert le diable* (1831)\(^{110}\), rather than the revival of baroque conventions as in Jouy, which proved to be the way forward.

The combination of modern subject matter and older conventions similarly characterises the libretto of *Guillaume Tell*. The circumstances and details of Hippolyte Bis’s revision are as in the following. According to Bartlet’s archival study, in spring 1828 Rossini had already chosen the libretto and in June, Cicéri was in Switzerland to make sketches of the scenery.\(^{111}\) Rossini began composing in early autumn 1828, without the libretto being officially submitted to the jury of the Opéra, to whom it was eventually read at Jouy’s request in December 1828. The jury criticised its Act IV in particular, and suggested the omission of a detail – Jemmy climbing a glacier in order to set fire to their house as a signal beacon – seen as superfluous to the action, while Émile-Timothée Lubbert, then the director of the Opéra, viewed it particularly problematic to the staging.\(^{112}\) Sosthène de La Rochefoucauld, the *directeur des Beaux-arts*\(^{113}\), intervened and negotiated the jury’s verdict with Jouy, who later consented to delegate the substantial revision of the last two acts to Bis. As for the oft-mentioned three co-authors (close friends of Rossini) in the revision - Armand Marrast, Issac Adolphe Crémieux and Émile Barateau, Bartlet’s investigation found no documents to prove their aid in the process, while the
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\(^{108}\) Gilles de Van, ‘*Grand opéra entre tragédie lyrique et drame romantique*’, *Il saggiatore musicale* 3 (1996/2) 331.

\(^{109}\) Gerhard, *The Urbanization of Opera*, 44.

\(^{110}\) Cf. Hibberd, ‘*Cett diablerie philosophique*’, 128.


\(^{112}\) Cf. F-Pan, O’ 1680, cited in ibid., xxv.

\(^{113}\) See Vauthier, ‘*Le Jury de lecture et l’Opéra sous la Restauration*’, 22.
posibility remains that Adolphe Nourrit, the tenor who created Arnold, may have provided the text for Arnold’s solo at the beginning of Act IV for Rossini.

Bis discarded half of Jouy’s original verses. Overall, Bis’s considerably Italianised version substantially omitted and abbreviated Jouy’s recitatives, except for three scenes (Act I/3, Act II/2 and 3) which he left virtually intact. The gradual transformation towards Rossini’s final version, one that completely altered the balance between choral and solo numbers in Jouy’s draft, is in evidence for instance in Bis’s expansion of the original texts for two chorus numbers (‘Quel jour serein le ciel présage!’ (Act I/1) and ‘Hyménéé, ta journée, fortune, luit pour nous.’ (Act I/8)), and in his insertion of four completely new choruses (the finale of the Introduction in Act I; ‘Ciel, qui du monde et la parure’ (Act I/6); the chorus of Swiss (Act II/1), and the Tyrolean chorus (Act III/2)). While no change was made to Jouy’s chorus finale of Act I, Bis added the conclusions to those of Act II and III, evidently in order to help the composer to write extensive finales in both acts. By contrast, the role of Werner Stauffacher, who had appeared in Jouy’s Act II and IV, was eliminated. Hedwige’s and Jemmy’s contributions to the revolutionary cause in particular are also weakened in Bis’s version. In Jouy, for instance, Hedwige’s ariosi were followed by choral responses repeating her words (Act I/3 and 6; Act IV/4). Though Bis did not delete her aria in Act IV, three scenes in Jouy’s Act IV were omitted, during the course of which Hedwige would have proposed the confederates to light the beacon and Jemmy would have volunteered to brave dangers of climbing a glacier (as mentioned above). Bis rewrote Jouy’s text for Hedwige’s prière and kept his text for Jemmy’s aria ‘Ah que ton âme se rassure’ in Act IV, both of which were consequently deleted for the premiere.

At the same time, after Bis’s revision, some aspects still retained a flavour of older
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librettos. Balthazar has traced the gradual evolution in the structure of Italian librettos during the late 1820s and 1830s, from the eighteenth-century ‘circular and static’ design, in which the conflicts are prolonged by a succession of often inconsequential events, to a more linear design (as in Scribe’s plots), which focused on ‘cause and effect’, as advocated by Alessandro Manzoni in 1823 (see Chapter 3, p.123). While some of Jouy’s librettos, like La Vestale and Les Abencéragés, have the plot structure of the latter type, Guillaume Tell follows the eighteenth-century procedure present in most of Jouy’s plots, and has inconsequential events such as Leuthold’s escape and the apple shooting, as well as the subplot that concerns the love affair between Arnold and Mathilde. Its climax is typically ‘a point of discontinuity where accumulated tension is discharged unexpectedly’, like the reversal of situation in Tell, brought by Tell’s assassination of Gesler and the off-stage destruction of his castle. (As we saw, such was the procedure of dénouement, which Jouy applied in all of his librettos including La Vestale and Les Abencéragés which have more linear plot construction, and as defended in Jouy’s Essai that ‘the dénouement of every opera should be sudden, unexpected, realistic and happy, […]’. The triumph of crime or even of disaster on a stage, where all speak to senses and to heart, where nothing appeals to reason, would destroy the charm of a spectacle.’) The love intrigue in Guillaume Tell (although it is given to the secondary characters) also retained the pattern used in Jouy’s earlier librettos. It is again the eighteenth-century type that involves no infidelity, i.e. what Balthazar calls ‘false love triangles’, without a presence of a rival (see Chapter 4, p.145).

The storms and ‘the sudden presence of darkness and light’ in the libretto seem to
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118 Ibid.
119 Ibid., 30.
120 ‘Le dénouement de tout opéra doit être prompt, imprévu, vraisemblable et heureux; (…) le triomphe du crime ou même de la fatalité, sur un théâtre où tout parle aux sens et au cœur, où rien ne s’adresse à la raison, détruirait le charme d’un spectacle’. Jouy, Essai, ed. Gerhard, 72.
122 Buch, Magic flutes & enchanted forests, 47.
be also rooted in a traditional merveilleux style of baroque operas. Cormac Newark has pursued the motif of weather in his detailed account of Tell’s synopsis. In contrast to the beautiful day the peasants celebrate at the opening and at the wedding of three couples, the rumble of storm is heard as they are challenged by Rodolphe to betray Tell’s name. At the end of the second act, dawn breaks as the oath is finally sworn: ‘If there are traitors among us, let the sun refuse the light of his torch to their eyes.’ In the last act, as the storm is approaching, the news that Tell is already heading for prison by boat, alarms Hedwig. Tell steers Gesler’s boat against the raging storm, which clears away suddenly when the victory of the conspirators in Altdolf is declared: ‘Everywhere, everything changes and grows in grandeur. What pure air!’ While metaphorical significance of weather in Tell may be related to romantic dramaturgy, the timeliness of scenic transformation, especially at the dénouement of opera, is comparable to Jouy’s earlier examples.

Comeau points out that when the outcomes of what he calls as the classicists’ ‘mild innovations’ along Auger’s lines began to appear in Parisian theatres during 1825 and 1826 (such as Alexandre Soumet’s five-act tragedy Jeanne d’Arc (1825) based on Schiller), classicists praised the initiatives, while the radical young generation, like the critics of Le Globe, were unimpressed, criticising the oldness of style in these works.

How did Le Globe respond to the première of Guillaume Tell? An unsigned review published on 8 August, in fact, made a comparative analysis of two librettos, Guillaume Tell and La Muette de Portici. It observed that the verse style of Jouy and Bis was too mannered and overblown, as opposed to that of Scribe’s, which it characterised by naturalness and authenticity of expression. It also pointed

124 ‘Si parmi nous il est des traîtres,/ Que le soleil, de son flambeau,/Refuse à leurs yeux la lumière’ (Act II/7).
125 ‘Tout change & grandit en ces lieux. Quel air pur!’ (Act IV/11). The storm was used in the post-Gluck operatic repertoire, as a means of dramatising the inner struggle of protagonist, while allowing the opera’s moral meaning to be articulated. See Michael Fend, ‘Literary motifs, musical form and the quest for the “sublime”: Cherubini’s Eliza ou le Voyage aux glaciers du Mont St Bernard’, Cambridge Opera journal, v/1 (1993), 17-38, and David Charlton, ‘Storms, Sacrifices: the “Melodrama Model” in Opera’, French Opera 1730-1830: Meaning and Media, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000, X/1-61.
126 Comeau, Diehards and Innovators, 213.
to the lack of textual and musical continuity in the libretto of *Guillaume Tell*. It then went on to suggest the re-ordering of main action. It mockingly observed that in Jouy’s and Bis’s text, the oath scene in the second act finale was not followed by an immediate uprising, which would have been its logical outcome, but by Tell’s arrival in Altdorf in the midst of celebrations (where he refuses to bow before the hat). It suggested that the arrest of old Melcthal at the end of the first act should instead become the motivation for Tell’s arrival in Altdorf. It should begin the second act, and the events of Jouy’s and Bis’s third act (in which Tell angers Gesler and is ordered to shoot an apple) should follow. This progression would render the finale ‘Anathème à Gesler’ more dramatically effective. It would lead to the third act set in Rüti, to which Tell would appear suddenly, having escaped from Gesler’s boat (taking off-stage), culminating in the final swearing of oath. The ultimate uprising in the final act would then become an immediate consequence of the third act. The reviewer then added that in this manner, the role of Tell would have been a little closer to Schiller’s version. He would become a conspirator in the uprising only spontaneously, when he appears unexpectedly in the oath scene, thereby emerging as a protagonist of sincere soul who succumbs to his courage at the last moment.\textsuperscript{127}

In other words, this reviewer suggests a more logical and linear progression of action along Manzoni’s lines, and a plot construction in the manner of *La Muette*, in which, as Karin Pendle writes, ‘each acts end with a dramatic coup that is the logical outcome of the action which begins the act’.\textsuperscript{128} Furthermore, in his version, Tell’s participation in the uprising seems to resemble the impulsive reaction of Masaniello, roused to summon an immediate insurrection when he realises that his sister Fenella may have been seduced by a Spaniard.\textsuperscript{129} If in Schiller, Masaniello decides to rebel out of legitimate vengeance, it is not with these new types of

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{127}{Le Globe, 8 August 1829.}
\footnotetext{128}{Pendle, Eugène Scribe and French Opera, 402.}
\end{footnotes}
political figure, but with more traditional revolutionary heroes of Lemierre and Florian, that Jouy chose to construct his narrative, albeit an utopian narrative in 1829.
Conclusion

The aim of this study was twofold. First, it sought to examine the way in which Jouy’s awareness of social realities was invested in his librettos.

I first focused on his status as one of the most successful librettists under the Empire, which instituted a stringent cultural control, and which integrated the Opéra into an instrument of state propaganda. While the regime also consolidated its conservatism in many areas of its socio-political life, in the years of the Restoration, during when Jouy emerged as a liberal, he emphasised that his entire work sought to perpetuate the lessons of social justice, revealing his Enlightenment inheritance. My aim was to examine in what way Jouy’s Napoleonic librettos reflected his own anti-colonial view, as seen in his Tippô-Saëb, as well as in his post-Napoleonic writings, and to what extent Jouy was obedient to the political line of the regime. We saw how, in contrast to the way in which the history of Hernán Cortés was exploited in the eighteenth-century anti-colonial resistance, the Napoleonic regime proposed Jouy and Ésmenard to use the same narrative to justify its imperial war in Spain, as it took a keen interest in territorial expansion. In sharp contrast to Diderot and Marmontel’s accounts that vilified Cortez’s military glory, Jouy’s libretto had recourse to a colonial narrative which promoted Cortez’s conquest as a philanthropic enterprise. Its imperialism was unequivocal in the conclusion whose Metastasian ending involved Cortez’s rescue of Amazily from Mexican human sacrifice, as well as his showing of clemency towards the High Priest, forgoing his punishment.

On the other hand, the libretto’s truce scene, which presented the two opposing nations together, effectively contrasted an aggressive European imperialism, symbolised by Cortez’s advanced military forces and their hidden quest for gold and glory, with a peaceful image of the Mexicans’ existence, reflecting Marmontel’s reference to the Spaniards’ abuse of the vulnerable Peruvians. And as Jacques Joly observed, Jouy also gave the Mexican characters an important place in the narrative. His portrayal of Amazily in some ways seems to deny ethnocentric
contentions about the inferiority of the non-Europeans, while Télasco’s aria invites our identification with the misfortunes of the conquered.

Évariste Dumoulin’s review of the revival-premiere, which took place in the wake of Napoleon’s fall in 1817, pointed out the difficulty of the librettist whose plot featured the hero, the marker of colonial injustice in the eighteenth century France, and who sought to reconcile in some manner, the contemporary (and personal) awareness of the sad reality of conquest, and the imperial propaganda which preferred to espouse the historically inaccurate representation. In the revised version, Jouy weakened emphasis on Cortez’s crusade against barbarous Mexico. The new intrigue centered on the Aztec king Montezuma’s peace negotiation with Cortez. Moreover, Montezuma, who sets to commit honorable suicide as Cortez’s siege begins, emerged as an object of sympathy.

In my Chapter 2, focused on Jouy’s four librettos treating feminine themes, I explored Jouy’s stance on women’s status in society, and how it was reflected in his narratives. As we saw, all four themes of his librettos – the Vestals, the Bayadères, the Amazons, and the women of Gaul had been appropriated in eighteenth-century writings with explicit feminist perspectives. In his lecture series of 1822, Jouy wrote in defense of women and their contribution to society in terms of its morality and happiness, while also acknowledging their historical presence in the public political sphere. At the same time, especially during the Empire, Jouy endorsed the traditional division of gender roles, as well as the maintenance of gender difference.

The three works - *La Vestale*, *Les Bayadères*, and *Les Amazones* - revealed this twofold attitude. *La Vestale* characterised female chastity as the embodiment of male control over women’s sexuality. The portrayal of Julia, who liberates her natural desire in her madness, may be seen as a powerfully negative image of married women in the Empire, whose dispossession of rights were reaffirmed by the Civil Code of 1804, asserting legal authority of men. In *Les Bayadères*, Jouy portrayed Laméa’s strength and resourcefulness in a national crisis, as well as her fellow bayadères’ participation in her ruse, both of which lead to the defeat of the enemy. While such a depiction may be seen as his defense of women’s public role, Laméa’s potential
self-immolation as a faithful lover of the raja, symbolising women’s selfless devotion, seems to point us to Rousseau’s regressive view of women’s role, privileging feminine values such as submissiveness and selfless devotion to family and home. This also was the case with *Les Amazones*. Whereas Jouy’s sources included those which used the Amazon myth to propose a shift towards the equality of gender roles, he instead provided a conclusion in which the Amazonian queen is overcome by her own maternal feelings (as she recognises her prisoners as her sons), thereby embracing traditional gender role.

On the other hand, *Velleda*, the libretto never to be staged, conveyed more coherent feminist narrative. The heroine sacrificed her love out of loyalty to her political community and united the Gauls in an effort to oust the Romans. At the same time in the last scene of third act and in the fourth, she emerged as the antithesis of Rousseauist model of feminine modesty, when she made an independent choice to give voice to her own desire. Of the four librettos discussed, this was the only libretto whose dénouement did not involve either a patriarchal or *deus ex machina* solution. Instead, its happy end showing the Roman defeat is produced by Velleda’s own actions and determination.

The second aim of my thesis was to revise Jouy’s image as a chief defender of the classicist faction in the conflict between Classicists and Romantics of the 1820s, and also to explore the way in which Jouy updated his librettos in accordance with the change of artistic and political directions in the Restoration. While nineteenth- and early twentieth-century opinion agreed on Jouy’s status as a leading classicist figure during the period, many more recent critics have emphasised some flexibility in his classicist stance.

His *Essai sur l’opéra français* of 1826 delineated the conventions of French opera, some, as Gerhard observed, reaching back to those which were in use before the second half of the eighteenth century. But it also remains that Jouy’s *Velleda*, accepted by the Opéra in 1811, was an innovative project that anticipated the five-act grand opera. Jouy intended to write in ‘a new system’, which referred to the use of five-act format and the influence of novel.

The conservatism of the *Essai*, however, must be considered within the context of the Classical/ Romantic conflict, as well as the growing popularity of Rossini operas, which
reversed the Gluckian emphasis on declamation, generating polemic in the press. While the *Essai* strongly supported the Gluckian tradition, Jouy seems to have come to accept the Rossinian (Stendhalian) view of opera, which acknowledged the central importance of the composer, by the time of *Guillaume Tell*’s premiere, and by 1827 he became eager to collaborate with Rossini.

*Guillaume Tell* seems to epitomise Jouy’s move in a new direction under the Restoration. After Napoleon’s second abdication, for the first time in his journalist career, Jouy published his ideas on patriotism and good monarchy, his view of the Revolution, not to mention his defence of liberty. Jouy notably evoked the legacy of the 1789 Revolution and underlined the importance of national happiness, while also maintaining that it was a ruler’s duty to safeguard the interest of the nation, and its legal liberty. The choice of a revolutionary hero must have been in response to the revival of revolutionary memory during the 1820s which also became the aim of liberal historiography, tracing the long process of social struggles. *Résumé de l’histoire de Suisse* (1824), written by Philarète Chasles, similarly dealt with the history of Switzerland in terms of its national struggles against foreign threats, from the Roman conquest to the invasion of the Revolutionary French army.

Jouy’s principal literary source, Schiller’s *Wilhelm Tell*, typified German romanticism for the French during the Restoration period. In spite of his initial rejection of foreign influences in 1815, in the last years of the Restoration Jouy’s librettos drew from several German romantic literary works, which had been cited in de Staël’s *De l’Allemagne*. This shift of subject matter may be related to another Academician, Louis-Simon Auger’s acceptance of the medieval and modern European literary topics in 1824. At the same time Auger insisted on fidelity to the rules and language of traditional French theatre. The combination of modern subject matter and the old conventions similarly characterised the libretto of *Guillaume Tell*. Also, it is my view that Chasles, Jouy’s literary assistant between 1820 and 1828 whose biography indicates an outstanding interest and knowledge in foreign literature, also had an important role in a marked shift to German literary subject in Jouy’s last three librettos.
Finally, I would like to return to Empis’s reference to Jouy’s obedience to the prevailing mores and ideas, as mentioned in the beginning of this study. We have seen his contribution to the Napoleonic regime’s attempt to use opera as a tool of propaganda in the case of his *Fernand Cortez*, which showed the clear attitude of regressive imperialism. Yet the libretto also had some portrayals revealing his anti-colonial consciousness. Jouy’s claim of his equivocal loyalty to the regime in the Restoration is then not as opportunistic as one may speculate, and it seems that we ought to grant a partial credence to his own assertion, which I cited in the introduction, denying his subservience to social and cultural controls.

We have also seen that Jouy’s responsiveness was reflected in his attitude towards a new literary trend of the Restoration period. Jouy’s political and literary compromises during his literary career, which saw political transformations and the emergence of Romanticism, seem to point to the hazards of librettists in early nineteenth-century France. And they seem to bear witness to a more general fate of librettists, ‘constrained, in order to be performed, to produce what was likely to be approved’. Jouy, a political *girouette* who had to compromise his political integrity for his survival, surely recognised the necessity and benefit of writing according to the dominant taste and tendency of his time. Still, he surely had a genuine willingness to respond to new literary and musical developments in the Restoration, and to come to terms with the opening up of a new era. We may perhaps see as an indication of such an attitude the fact that Jouy took a young Charles immersed in foreign literature as his assistant already in 1820.

---

1 Darlow, *Staging the French Revolution*, 393.
Appendix: Librettos of Étienne de Jouy for the Paris Opéra¹

A: Texts staged by the Opéra

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of the premiere (Date of reception by the Jury de lecture)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Stated genre</th>
<th>Co-author</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Acts</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/04/1813 (21/05/1810)</td>
<td><em>Les Abencérages, ou l’Étendard de Grenade</em></td>
<td>opéra</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Cherubini, Luigi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Libretto, Paris: Roulet, 1813. MS libretto, F-Pan, AJ¹³ 94. MS score, F-Po, A.433: I-IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/08/1814</td>
<td><em>Pélage, ou le Roi de la paix</em></td>
<td>opéra</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Spontini</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Libretto, Paris: Roulet, 1814. MS libretto, F-Pan, AJ¹³ 94. MS score, F-Po, A.439: I-II.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Sources: Procès-verbaux des séances, Jury de lecture, F-Po, AD 23 (1/12/1803 - 12/12/1821); AD 24 (05/1816 - 04/1825; 09/1828 - 04/1830); AD 25 (16/01/1822 - 15/12/1824).
### B: Texts not staged

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of reception by the Jury de lecture</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Stated Genre</th>
<th>Co-author</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Acts</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29/12/1806</td>
<td>Joseph (later retitled Sophonès)</td>
<td>tragédie lyrique</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>MS libretto, F-Pan, AJ\textsuperscript{13} 139.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/03/1809</td>
<td>Nausica (later retitled Alcinoïs ou les Phéaciens; Nausica, ou Ulysse à Corcyre)</td>
<td>tragédie lyrique</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Pfeffinger\textsuperscript{2}, (Philippe-Jacques?)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>MS libretto (autograph), F-Pa, MS 6055.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/12/1811</td>
<td>Sésostris</td>
<td>tragédie lyrique</td>
<td>Arnault, Antoine-Vincent</td>
<td>Méhul</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>MS libretto, F-Pa, MS 6054; F-Po, Liv. 470. MS score, Act III (autograph and incomplete), F-Po, Rés. 2171.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/03/1816</td>
<td>La Statue de Phidias (later retitled Phidias, ou la</td>
<td>opéra</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{2} See the Procès-verbal, Jury de lecture, 25 June 1817, F-Po, AD 23.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Work Description</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Librettist</th>
<th>Score Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/09/1816</td>
<td><em>Statue</em> (Nausica, ou Ulysse à Corcyre)</td>
<td>opéra</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Zimmerman, Pierre-Joseph-Guillaume, 3 MS libretto, F-Pan, AJ^{13} 140. MS parts (of excerpts from the opera), F-P, no shelf mark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/11/1816</td>
<td><em>Le Scamandre</em></td>
<td>opéra</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None, 1 MS libretto, F-Pan, AJ^{13} 140; F-Pa, MS 6055.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/08/1820</td>
<td><em>Phidias, ou la Statue</em></td>
<td>opéra</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None, 2 MS libretto, F-Pan, AJ^{13} 140; F-Pa, MS 6055.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/03/1821</td>
<td><em>Sophonès</em></td>
<td>opéra</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Garcia, Manuel, 3 MS score, F-Po, 1023. I-III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01/1822</td>
<td><em>Les Athéniennes</em></td>
<td>opéra</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>(Spontini), 3 MS libretto, F-Pan, AJ^{13} 138.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11/1824</td>
<td><em>Le Vieux de la Montagne</em></td>
<td>opéra</td>
<td>Chasles, Philarète</td>
<td>(Rossini), 4 MS libretto, F-Pa, MS 6054.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/1827</td>
<td><em>Faust</em></td>
<td>drame lyrique</td>
<td>Chasles</td>
<td>None, 4 MS libretto, F-Pan, AJ^{13} 139; F-Pa, MS 6053.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td><em>Hersé</em></td>
<td>tragédie lyrique</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None, 5 MS libretto, F-Pa, MS 6053.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C: Synopsis plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Work Description</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Librettist</th>
<th>Score Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td><em>Geneviève de Brabant</em></td>
<td>opéra</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a, 5 MS synopsis (autograph), F-Pa, MS 6055.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 It was performed before the jury on 20 July 1821, and was accepted with corrections. The report of Paëř written the next day specified various changes which should be made to the score. See Paëř, report, 21 July [1821], F-Pan, AJ^{13} 87, and ‘procès-verbal’, 20 July 1821, F-Po, AD 23.

2 See Auger, letter to La Rochefoucauld, 30 November 1825, F-Pan, O^{3} 1669.

3 See Auger, letter to La Rochefoucauld, 20 November 1827, F-Pan, O^{3} 1724. I. 449. Cf. Chapter 5, fn.91.
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