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With the announcement of the convocation of the Estates-General in July of 1788, questions of representation and suffrage pertaining to the Third Estate enflamed debates. Prior to this date, each of the three orders (Nobility, Clergy and the Third Estate) enjoyed their own voice at


*[Petition of Citizens Domiciled in Paris from the 8th of December 1788]*

---

**Image**: Unattributed. The aristocratic Hydra this male and female monster has only human heads; its naturalness is ferocious, barbarous, sanguinary; he repents only of blood, tears, and the sustenance of the unfortunate; he seeks on all sides to invade, to satisfy his ambition and his insatiable greed... [print], [1789]. 1 is.: etching, coul.; 17.5 x 27 cm (trc) Notice and catalog number of the Bibliothèque nationale de France [Paris]. https://purl.stanford.edu/cj802rv3862.
the time of voting, a process which guaranteed a majority comprised of the two privileged orders. Joseph-Ignace Guillotin (1738-1814) participated in these debates, militating in favour of a more fair and equitable representation for the Third Estate. In 1788 he penned a tract, *Pétition des citoyens domiciliés à Paris* (or *Pétition Guillotin*) wherein, among other things, he demanded:

1. that the number of representatives of the Third Estate be at least equal to that of the total number of representatives of both other orders combined;

2. that at every vote, voices be tallied by head count rather than by order.

A preliminary Parisian Parliamentary decision of 19 December 1788 at once quashed Guillotin’s petition and occasioned legal proceedings against him. Adoption of vote by head count would not be effected until June of 1789, following several months of debate which culminated in the famous Jeu de paume oath. A physician by training, Guillotin is equally well known for his contributions to penal code reform. In October of 1789, he presented a speech before the National Assembly in favour of the death penalty by decapitation. He pleaded for humanitarian treatment of the condemned, treatment which he argued would reduce agony and curtail suffering. The machine that would equalize all people on the scaffold was named after him: the guillotine.


[A Gentleman’s Brief and Impartial Consideration of the Question that Perturbs French People […] with Respect to the Number of Representatives with which this People Ought to Furnish the Estates-General]

Emulating Guillotin, the author of this text defends a more equitable representation of the Third Estate at the Estates-General as he takes up that momentous, controversial and divisive subject that has stirred spirits since the Estates’ convocation. If the issue occasioned plentiful spilling
of ink in 1788, this particular document captures attention by way of colourful use of metaphor and analogy designed to convince readers of the importance of a more equitable composition of the Estates-General.

Louis XVI is presented as a “tender father who wants to call his entire family to his side.” Thus, the author maintains, the privileged orders of society, those “first born”, cannot claim alone to nearly constitute the entirety of the nation; the “youngest” must also be allowed to express themselves. The author considers the historical evolution of an “oppressive system.” And, in order to reveal the necessity of doubling the number of representatives from the Third Estate as well as that of the adoption of votes by headcount rather than by order, the author underscores the 18th as “a century that prides itself most of all on the light of its reason.” A well-devised request is extended to the clergy and the nobility, an invitation to consider and fell “this deep, dark forest of abuses”.

This text, which surely speaks to a different audience than does that of Guillotin by way of his imagistic explanations, concludes with a symbolic analogy depicting the body politic and the human body: the clergy of thoughtful mind; the nobility, arms ever-ready to serve; and the people, the essential trunk, that gathers together the vital organs necessary for life, organs whose general functioning, like that of the body politic, depends “on the unison of all organs”.

3 Ouverture des États-Généraux, faite à Versailles le 5 mai 1789, Paris, Imprimerie royale, 1789.

[The Opening of the Estates-General, at Versailles the 5th of May 1789]

The Estates-General are a temporary assemblage of representatives of the totality of the king’s subjects, thus Nobility, Clergy and the Third Estate. Created in the Middle Ages, this political system permitted the king to, for example, raise exceptional taxes designed to refill the coffers of the State or to prepare for war.

For the first time since 1614, on 8 August 1788, Louis XVI recognized the need to convene the Estates-General in order to contain the raging financial crisis and to dampen burgeoning revolts. Presided over by the King, the
Estates-General opened at Versailles on the 5th of May, 1789. The document at hand is a transcription of speeches from the first session.

In his opening address, Louis XVI, who presents himself as “the first friend of his people”, speaks to the circumstances that brought him to this convocation. He mentions the State’s astronomical debt, amassed by others during their wars, and he expresses the desire to reestablish order as well as to assure happiness and prosperity for the kingdom.

Next, Barentin, keeper of the seal, presents the king’s intentions. He positions himself against insubordination and expresses the hope that sessions to follow will continue agreeably and respectfully.

Finally, Necker, the minister of finances, sets out France’s financial reality. He presents a table of the general state of revenues and expenses and proves optimistic with respect to the measures he proposes in order to balance the budget.

4 Anonyme, Rapprochement de la déclaration des intentions du roi du 23 juin 1789 et de la Déclaration des droits de l’homme décrétée par l’Assemblée constitutante, avec leur développement mis à la portée de tout le monde, Paris, J. Girouard [1789].

[Comparison of the Declaration of the King’s Intentions of June 23, 1789 with the Declaration of the Rights of Man as Decreed by the Constituent Assembly, with the Development Thereof Put within Reach of All]

This document’s anonymous royalist author reconsiders the Declaration of the King’s Intentions from the June 23, 1789, meeting of the Estates general, as well as the text of the Declaration of the Rights of Man. He maintains that the latter was written by “factious enemies of the king and monarchy” in order to replace the former whom he regards as “holding the same advantages, stripped of insidious ambiguities from which fateful interpretations were derived and which currently cause the disasters assailing France.”

With an eye to educating his “unfortunate fellows”, who all too easily allow themselves to be manipulated by the “oracles” of the constituent Assembly, the author transcribes anew each of the 35 articles of the Declaration
of the King’s Intentions in the hopes of demonstrating the generosity, wisdom and clarity of the measures this “good prince” of “right and impartial” judgment has established.

The author next attacks the Declaration of the Rights of Man, which he considers “insidious”. He then takes up an interpretation and refutation of each of the 17 articles, in turn, in order to make their vices and inconsistencies available “to all”. He calls for a return of the monarchy, hereditary nobility and respect for religion — each, in his view, indispensable pillars of good government. This document is of interest as it illustrates an example of one of the strategies of discrediting the social and political gains obtained by revolutionaries.


[Crimes Unveiled: the Order for the Attack on the City of Paris, Set for the Night of the 14th - 15th July 1789]

This pamphlet presents an account of a planned attack on Paris recounted for all to read. From the July 1, 1789 a rumour had run rampant through Paris: The city is surrounded by troops loyal to the king; an attack is imminent. The citizenry to whom the pamphlet is addressed are referred to as children, and are regarded as the innocent citoyens whose just republican cause is threatened. The pamphlet announces that it provides “an exact history of the execrable projects” designed to effectuate the citizens’ demise.

The storming of the Bastille and events earlier in the day of the 14th helped to dash the maneuvers here outlined; troops loyal to their fellow citizens failed to follow orders. Yet, the famed event, which saw the release of the final few prisoners from the old stronghold, did not erase the fact that the odious expedition had been planned, and its willing participants identified.

The pamphlet itemizes regiments and places of origin. Readers are told of hussars and dragoons, German infantrymen and generals. The latter are named explicitly. Of two — De Lambert and Du Châtelet (son of the well-known Émilie Du Châtelet, author of a translation of Issac Newton’s Principia) — it is said “we think they were no longer at their regiment and so would
not have commanded.” Honesty is served, though Du Châtelet was later guillotined. Another figure of note, Du Broglie, permanently repaired to Russia and so avoided republican repercussions.

Counter-revolutionary plans and fervour did not go unnoticed; they were often severely punished. In describing cannons to be fired, sabres to be swung, and terror to be wrought on Paris and her citizenry, this pamphlet was certainly incendiary in nature even while describing intention that never crystallized as fact.

Anonyme, *Semaine mémorable, ou Récit exact de ce qui s’est passé à Paris depuis le 12 jusqu’au 17 juillet*, Nantes, chez Louis, 1789.

*The Memorable Week, or A Precise Account of What Happened in Paris From the 12th Through the 17th of July*

This meticulous account is offered to those outside of Paris, in the provinces, during the days preceding the storming of the Bastille, an event precipitated by the death-by-sabre of a 66-year-old man taking refuge in the Tuileries from the few audacious soldiers who opened fire on the citizens of Paris on July 12th.

We read of the courageous citizens who, during the night of the 13th, attempt to contain the furious mob who has taken up arms. The following day, Paris is sealed off and becomes a seething mess of drums, trumpets, pillaging and tumult. All sides frantically seek arms. Confusion and fear reign. On the 14th, the republican cockade is born, serving to readily identify the political position of those who wear it. Amid the frenetic events, troops arrive neither to contain nor to fight, but to aid their fellow citizens. Decapitated heads brandished on pikes are triumphantly paraded through Paris; then, things settle slightly.

Apprised of the goings-on, Louis XVI orders troops to leave Paris and Versailles, for which he is praised. The King arrives in Paris, as a father comes to see his children, to celebrate the return of peace. Thousands line the streets to cheer their monarch; hearts and life, we read, belong to their King. In a moment heady with significance, Louis is offered and dons a tri-coloured cockade. Only three days prior, the rosette had reflected death and loss of hope; on the
17th it becomes a symbol of “an eternal alliance between Crown and Country.” A bit of French Revolutionary history is made.

7 Philippe-Antoine Grouvelle, *De l’autorité de Montesquieu dans la révolution présente*, [s.l.], [s.n.], 1789.

*[On the Authority of Montesquieu in the Current Revolution]*

This vindication of Montesquieu as a philosopher of positive significance to revolutionary goals reflects Enlightenment values and spirit. Grouvelle praises the philosopher’s lucidity of style, which at once amuses and elucidates. Montesquieu, who is likened to the intellectual giants Buffon and Fontenelle, is credited with having an influence on the human spirit that will be as durable as his influence on the spirit of his century.

In short, Grouvelle defends the philosopher against those who label him an enemy of true liberty and republican values. Grouvelle’s aim is to enlighten the inattentive — of whom he facetiously notes there are many — as to Montesquieu’s real value to France and the call for a constitution embracing liberty and equality.

Montesquieu’s thought was peremptorily regarded as being at odds with this goal. He did, for example, claim that women are weaker than men. This anthropologically-derived observation in no way diminishes his insistence that women can govern and will bring their own important strengths to government. The French situation is one in which, notes Grouvelle, women must inform themselves and enter into the sharing of knowledge (though with less vanity and more pride!).

It is precisely this sort of precision that Grouvelle brings to light; Montesquieu must be thoughtfully read. Grouvelle attempts to set out and defend Montesquieu by way of reasoned argument and claims that in doing so he has fulfilled the work of a good Citizen. “Montesquieu,” concludes Grouvelle, “will enlighten the Nations, but will blind the French.” The French would do well to read and think carefully, as would we.
PART II: THE POLITICAL POWER OF THE PRINTING PRESS


*[A Hugely Patriotic Letter By the Real Father Duchêne]*

In the autumn of 1790, we see the arrival of a colourful imaginary character in the press: Father Duchêne. Presented as an ex-sailor turned stove merchant, Father Duchêne covers a diversity of current topics in an informal register richly peppered with profanity.
In September of the same year, Antoine-François Lemaire began publication of the paper *Lettres bougrement patriotiques du Père Duchêne*, which would see over 400 issues published between 1790 and 1792.

Extremely popular, Father Duchêne rapidly became the central character of multiple papers, such as those of Jacques Hébert or even Jean-Charles Jumel, which led Lemaire to react to the name that had become “so prostituted”. “One must be mean of spirit to thusly borrow another’s title and name in order to garner a little reputation,” he wrote in a preamble to the letter presented here which is dedicated to the topic of assignats [French Revolutionary fiduciary funds].

Lemaire’s Father Duchêne tries to rally men and women to the Revolution, he strongly criticizes its enemies and speaks in the name of, and for, the people: “And me too, people, I am and I want to be your friend, but not in order to trick you. [...] It’s for the people that you’ll speak; in defending their cause one is always eloquent, one stops being a fucked animal, and spirit grows in the brain as a mushroom on moss.”

From the beginning of the French Revolution, pamphlets and journals had proven themselves to be the principal means of mass communication. In light of the proliferation of patriotic pamphlets flooding the streets of Paris, engendered by the numerous iterations of Father Duchêne, anti-constitutional right-wing writers themselves decided to incarnate their discourse and so invented working-class characters to voice right-wing views.

This is the context in which the abbot Adrien Quentin Buée imagined Mother Duchesne, the equally boorish wife of her already established husband. In 1790 and 1791 Buée published four pamphlets, each approximately thirty pages in length, whose aim was to defend the church and refractory priests.

A dialogue set in a market, the commoners’ meeting place, the heroine plays a role alongside Recto, the bookseller, and Mr.
Auvrai, the wig merchant. The three 
try to convince Father Duschesne, 
who enters the scene mid-dialogue, 
of the illogicality of extreme poverty 
enforced on the clergy by the civil 
constitution.

Entrenched in his pro-revolutionary 
stance, Father Duschesne defends 
the patriots, but is rebuffed by his 
wife: “Really yes, patriots; a pile of 
fucked beggars who call themselves 
that. Me, I’d say instead that we’ve 
abused the poor long enough, and 
that those who reveal the villains 
render service to the nation.”

Buée uses the female Duschesne as 
a means of propaganda: he aims to 
denounce the new revolutionary 
order, which he identifies as the 
origin of the people’s misery.

Marat played an important political 
role from the beginning of the 
Revolution until his criticism, 
in July of 1789, of the project of 
Constitution presented by Mounier 
in the pamphlet, The Patriotic 
Monitor.

Necker would continue to make his 
voice heard by means of his paper, 
Friend of the People, which counted 
685 published issues between 1789 
and 1792. At the beginning of the 
Revolution, Necker was Minister of 
Finances and adored by the people 
in particular for the assistance 
he afforded with respect to the 
doubling of their representation in 
the Third Estate. It was by virtue 
of this aid that he was deemed a 
patriotic minister.

When, in the Friend of the People, 
Marat began to criticize the 
“favourite of the Nation,” he was 
asked to provide proof, which 
he quickly did in publishing his 
Denunciation: “Well, sirs, I will 
explain myself in a manner that all 
will understand.” In this pamphlet, 
Marat attacks Necker whom he 
qualifies as an “opulent banker”, an 
“inept administrator” and a “public 
enemy.” He also accuses Necker 
of having become wealthy on the 
backs of the poor thanks to his 
“trading of stocks”.

---

10 Jean-Paul Marat, 
Dénonciation faite au 
tribunal public, par M. Marat, 
l’ami du peuple, contre M. Necker, 
premier Ministre des finances, [s.l.], 
[s.n.], 1790.

[Denunciation Before a Public 
Tribunal, by Mr. Marat, Friend 
of the People, Against Mr. Necker, 
Prime Minister of Finances]

Physician and journalist Jean-Paul
To this *Denunciation*, Necker replied by way of his own *The Justification of Mr. Necker, Prime Minister of Finances*, or, *Reply to the Denunciation by Marat*; this reply was countered by Marat’s *New Denunciation*.

The proliferating counter-attacks nicely illustrate the role of the press as a widely available denunciatory weapon during the revolutionary period.

11 [Charles d’Agoult], *Ouvrez donc les yeux!* [s.l.], [s.d.]

[So, Open Your Eyes!]

This royalist pamphlet is attributed to the Bishop of Pamiers, Charles Constance d’Agoult. Using a very informal register, the author speaks directly to his still overly credulous fellow citizens in order that they *open their eyes* and see the catastrophic state of France, which once was “the friendliest of all civilized nations.”

“Listen to a friend,” writes the man who presents himself as a real and impartial citizen who “espouses no quarrel” but who “sees quite clearly those who are wrong.” He expresses himself with “the
greatest exactitude of truth, always”
and, amongst other things, against
the double-representation of the
Third Estate at the Estates-General,
all the while deploring the fact that
each was able to offer his opinion
on this topic “in a flurry of written
submissions, ever more ridiculous
the one than the other.”

He calls for the army and soldiers
to “accomplish the most beautiful
action in the world” by freeing the
king and assuring the return of
the monarch, without whom the
French people live in the most cruel
of anarchic states. He plays on the
populace’s fear, “thousands of abuses
will be heaped upon you,” he warns,
if nothing changes. He adds: “Oh!
French people! Into what horrid
abysses you will fall!”

This pamphlet elicited numerous
reactions, including that of the
Research Committee charged with
guarding against the circulation
of incendiary libel, on the heels of
which followed an entire literature,
including: Yes, I Will Open My Eyes;
Close Your Eyes; The Clairvoyant
Parisian, Response to “So, Open
Your Eyes”; So Listen, to Serve as
Counterpart to “Open Your Eyes”;
Read and Shudder, by the author of
“So, Open Your Eyes”.

12 Anonyme, Parisiens,
réveillez-vous donc! [s.l.],
[s.n.], 1790

[So Parisiens, Wake Up!]

The author of this pamphlet, similar
in tone to that of So, Open Your Eyes!,
invites Parisians to continue rather
than to weaken their Revolution,
and so to remain a model for the
more distant provinces. Marat is
applauded, whereas Bailly, Lafayette
and Mirabeau are criticized. This text
is among the many and numerous
pamphlets (both revolutionary and
counter-revolutionary) intended for
Parisians.

In addition to a plurality of Addresses
to Parisians, among these pamphlets
— to name a few — we find The
Triumph of Brave Parisians Against
the Enemies of the Public Good; Oh!
Parisians, What Have You Done? and
even So You Want Paris to Become
Deserted?

In So Parisiens, Wake Up! we
see an honest desire to mobilize
the readership, an incitement to
action: “But wake yourselves up.
Ah! Parisians, what has become
of your original conviction? You
who have bravely shaken off the
chains of slavery; [...] you who were
nothing but united when it was a
matter of helping [the motherland], of shaping, of destroying the temple of despotism, show yourselves once again to be the same; have you not the force to continue, to achieve your work, to consolidate, to strengthen, to uphold the great work which cannot but ensure your revived grandeur, the edifice of your wellbeing, of that of future races of the entire universe who, eyes fixed upon you, await all that falls out of your miraculous enterprise?"

Also of note is a reference to “public opinion”, which, according to the author, “determines the course of the spirit of a state” in order to influence this call to action presented to the citizenry.

13 Camille Desmoulins, *Discours de la Lanterne aux Parisiens* [1789].

[The Discourse of the Lantern to Parisians]

A lawyer by trade, Camille Desmoulins became an incendiary force in Paris during the summer of 1789. Following Necker’s dismissal, the public prosecutor overcame his debilitating stutter to deliver an impassioned speech, which two days later culminated in the storming of the Bastille. Desmoulins had found his calling. Hoping to further foment the people, he turned to penning pamphlets. *Discours de la Lanterne aux Parisiens*, one of Desmoulins’ earliest pieces, appeared on September 15, 1789. Its legacy was immediate, profound and long-lasting.

In the *Discours*, the eponymous Lanterne admits he is but a lantern, yet urges drastic action to bring about revolutionary ends. All modesty aside, Desmoulins’ narrative commentary introduces his spokesperson as “the illustrious lantern”, and we understand. The burning light of reason — so representative of Enlightenment ideas — shines forth from the pages of this discourse. This charismatic metaphor for reason speaks of philosophy, patriotism, liberty, equality, and non-partisan religion.

The Lantern calls the citizenry to action, pointing out that when people are not provided justice, they obtain it for themselves. He urges action, which will become memorialized in the sans-culottes’ version of the still famous “Ah, ça ira”, alongside the terrible cries of “O Lantern! Lantern”, which he recounts having heard as he stood at the epicentre of the fray. The carefully crafted frontispiece positions the
Lantern – from which would be hung hundreds of aristocrats – above a bust of Louis XVI, and Desmoulins himself delivers the impassioned discourse to a clearly roused citizenry.

14 Rapport fait à la Convention nationale, au nom du Comité de salut public, par le citoyen Robespierre, sur la situation politique de la République; le 27 Brumaire, l’an 2 de la République. Imprimé par ordre de la Convention nationale, Paris, 1793.

[A Report Given Before the National Convention, in the Name of the Committee of Public Safety, by the Citizen Robespierre, on the Political Situation of the Republic; the 27th of Brumaire, Year 2 of the Republic]

The young lawyer Maximilien Robespierre, ardent supporter of Enlightenment ideals, defended the poor. Later a force of the political left, Robespierre earned the nickname of “The Incorruptible” for his steadfast promulgation of universal ideals and virtues.

In the Rapport before us, Robespierre explains the import of the universal ideals to the health and stability of France, and so to all of Europe and the entire planet. The aptly named foggy month of “Brumuary” overlaps October and November; “year 2” corresponds to 1793/4. The titular use of the newly implemented Republican calendar underscores the fervour of rationally defended republicanism represented in this text that heralds the birth of a new republic.

Similarities between Roman history and current world affairs by way of relevant truths concerning humanity and nature attest to the fact that if liberty is allowed to die in France — if certain crowned heads of Europe, abetted by journalists for hire, succeed in dividing the citizenry from truth and so from representative government — despotism will engulf the planet. Tyranny accelerates the progress of liberty which, in turn, multiplies the crimes of tyranny; the struggle escalates.

Thus, argues Robespierre, the legislature must feel the pull of universal truths and take up the true character of the nation they have the honour of representing. The French Republic fights on behalf of the universe, for all time.
PART III: REVOLUTION IN MUSIC AND ON STAGE


*New Song to the Tune of Ahi povero Calpiggy!*

This song in rhyme is part of a large corpus of pieces published during the period running from 1789 to 1800. Written to a tune borrowed from the opera *Tarare*, this song modifies the original words and takes the form of a list of names of the deputies.
comprising the constituent National Assembly.

“In this rage for thus putting everything in couplets, it isn’t just political passions, patriotic sentiments, which excite the verve of songwriters [then: particularly satirically inclined musical artists], they create rhymes based on written decrees, on articles of law, and even go so far as a complete list of representatives’ names,” writes Charles Nuitter in his preface to his Sung History of the First Republic (1892). In his introductory paragraph Nuitter mentions the refrain of the patriotic piece *Ah ! ça ira, ça ira*, which had since become one of the symbols popularly associated with the French Revolution.

The opera *Tarare* — composed by Salieri on a libretto by Beaumarchais — was presented for the first time in Paris in 1787 and then again in 1790. The use of a well-known aria was a current practice that permitted the anchoring of a text in popular culture. If the contents of this song might at first glance appear innocent, the opera from which it borrows its aria speaks of despotism and exalts liberty and equality, values dear to the new republican regime.


*[The Suspects: A Comedy in One Act, Peppered With Little Airs]*

This piece from the Picard Theatre, a satirical comedy, presents Damis, a young man who takes refuge in a hamlet far from Paris to flee the Terror raging in the capital city.

The village inhabitants, presented as very simple folk, learn of the nearby presence of a man whose mission it is to search everywhere and thus flush out “suspects” to be returned to Paris. Convinced that the affair is one of promotion (of elevation in status), the village men enthusiastically take up the idea of being named *suspects*.

As soon as Courantin, the agent of the Public Health Committee, arrives “half-drunk” in the community of Bonlieu [“good place”], he is astonished by the greeting he receives, and witnesses a surrealist scene wherein every man boasts of the qualities by virtue of which he is the best suspect. The national agent dreams
of razing the counter-revolutionary village and of sending each man to prison, when Damis receives a letter from a Parisian friend, and so announces that Robespierre, Couthon and Saint-Just, those “monsters who had covered all of France in mourning”, are dead on the scaffold. Upon hearing this news, Courantin saves himself, and the citizen Gillian wonders what will become of his promised post as suspect.

This piece uses humour to underscore the reality of the divide between Paris and the provinces during the Revolution. The author satirizes both the abuses committed during the Terror and the abusive denunciation of counter-revolutionary suspects by surveillance committees.


*[The Patriotic Artist, or the Sale of National Goods: A Comedy in Five Acts and in Verse]*

The sale of national goods, concretized by the decree of the 2nd of November 1789 with respect to the confiscation of Church goods, marked an important point in the Revolution. It was a matter of measures taken in attempt to reduce the financial crisis that precipitated the convocation of the Estates-General in 1788.

This patriotic comedy presents Henry, an artist, who goes to Paris in the hopes of making a living by his art. Mr. Clerville engages Henry as tutor to his daughter Elise with whom Henry falls in love. Central to the piece is Mr. Clerville's coveting of the goods of an abbey, which belong to a Bishop.

A struggle arises between the defenders of the Church – the bishop to whom the abbey belongs and his friend the Count of Vermon – on the one hand, and the revolutionaries, represented by Mr. Clerville and Henri, on the other. The latter triumph and as a reward for the courage demonstrated by Henri, Mr. Clerville offers him his daughter's hand in marriage.

*The Universal Gazette* praises the piece, which “breathes love of virtue and obedience to law [which] cannot but enlighten the people as to their true interests.” *The Patriotic Artist* is a concrete
example of the theatre as celebratory locus of republican exploits. With didactic intent, republican values are exalted and revolutionary heroes are commemorated. For instance, the protagonists are moved by the tableau of the Jeu de paume oath, crying before it and thus acting out the death of Mirabeau who, we recall, was a supporter from the beginning of the nationalization of the goods of the Church.


*[The Divorce: a Comedy in Two Acts, in Verse]*

Charles-Albert Demoustier left the law to take up writing. *The Divorce: a Comedy in Two Acts, in Verse* richly represents 18th-century France. This comedy, or humour-tinged drama, presents social and philosophical concerns instantiated in the lives of everyday people. As art, the play is expected to entertain aesthetically as well as instruct or provoke thought.

It is 1793, a year after the adoption by the National Assembly of the law authorizing divorce (by mutual consent or by incompatibility of morals). A crafty valet hopes to effect a divorce between his master and mistress. He flames their discord.

But, a Justice of the Peace, defender of family values and old-fashioned arrangements, helps the sparring couple to realize, as he puts it, that laws invented by men should tremble when forced to permit what nature denies: by nature, the sterile hymen permits newly instituted human law to harmonize with natural law; the couple without child may rightly divorce.

By nature, parents love their child and so each other; the child needs them both. Demoustier is able to dramatize social and political discussions thanks to the Chapelier law of 1791, which freed playwrights and theatre from government censorship.

This play considers the relative roles of men and women, the reason/emotion distinction, the proper foundation and interpretation of society’s laws, as well as the needs of children and adults. There is also sharp political innuendo: the Justice concludes that when the honest man is
disabused of error, the evil man disappears as his reign is over.


[The Perfect Equality, or, the Tu and Toi: A Comedy in Three Acts, in Prose]

“Dorvigny” is the stage name of actor and writer Louis-François Archambault, whose comedic drama of social circumstances depicts the implementation of the universal use of the second person singular “tu” regardless of the speaker or person addressed. Ontology and habit quickly create comedy as Nicolas, the country bumpkin gardener of a weekend house, is informed by his employer that grammatical rules support newly adopted political reality: the plural “vous” cannot correctly apply to an individual, regardless of societal position. Nicolas grasps the concept yet at first stumbles in its application, all the while persisting in his use of the third person plural to describe his own doings. The gardener knows that the head servant will not appreciate his addressing her as “tu”; her household status is dear to her.

Francoeur (“honest heart”), bourgeois master of the house, genuine in his republican desire to recognize the equality of all men, actually commands Nicolas to “tutoie” him in order that the

---

gardener practice and learn the newly legislated dignity of all men. Dorvigny’s audience laughs while witnessing the distinction between well-intentioned re-labeling and the lived reality that a label neither belies nor – at least immediately – remedies.

The *Gazette Nationale* heralded the play’s artistry and patriotism. Its publisher, Barba, includes the glowing review in the manuscript; it will boost sales. There too Barba claims his rights as publisher, just before his republican valediction, “one and indivisible”. Republican spirit is manifest on multiple levels in this document, as is humour.
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Anonyme, *Charlotte Corday, ou la Judith moderne*, Caen, À l'imprimerie des nouveautés, 1797.

[Charlotte Corday, or the Modern Judith]

Four years after the assassination of the radical journalist Jean-Paul Marat by Charlotte Corday, anonymity safeguards the author of this play whose dedication and preface indicate pro-Corday sentiments as well as knowledge of theatrical and biblical history. The piece is dedicated to Charlotte's “mânes”, or good spirit that lives on after death in the traditional roman sense.

In tragedy, explains the preface, loyalty to fact is not required; Corday is presented as an analogue of the biblical Judith. Unlike the actual Charlotte Corday whose actions have been posthumously lauded as masculine, the theatrical Charlotte prepares her body and attire in the hope that art will multiply nature's gifts. Her beauty, majesty, grace and magnetism are indeed all mentioned by Marat, whom she charms and is thus able to murder offstage. The accuracy here is that Corday was alone with Marat when she knifed him.

The play closes in happiness: Charlotte announces that France is saved, for Marat bathes in his own blood; she then offers herself to the suitor who has tried to protect her throughout.

In reality a single knife blow to the chest killed the journalist in his medicinal bath. Furthermore, postmortem tests confirmed the virginity of the unmarried Corday who died by guillotine four days after assassinating Marat.
This play honours love of God, country and a particular notion of justice, as well as a subservient sort of femininity and traditional values. Charlotte Corday’s character, actions and legacy against the backdrop of her tumultuous time continue to be interpreted and debated today.


*[Inside Revolutionary Committees, or, the Modern Aristides: A Comedy in Three Acts and in Prose]*

This play exemplifies the excesses of revolutionary committees. Brutus, Aristide, Caton and Toquatus are members of the revolution committee in Dijon. They plan the arrest of Dufour [“the oven”, wherein he finds himself] and of members of his family, despite their reputation as excellent patriots.

The schemers plot a means by which to condemn Dufour and forge a “good and ordered” denunciation by accusing him of an instance of criminal destruction of summonses. He and his family are treated as counter-revolutionaries and become the victims of an expedited trial. At the play’s closing, the plot is discovered, at which very moment Dufour’s son reads an excerpt of a communications bulletin (of the 9th and 10th of the month of Thermidor) from the National Convention: “the members of our infamous triumvirate are finally beaten: Robespierre, Couthon, Saint-Just [...] have just died as cowards in the place where they had so many innocent victims massacred.” The innocent were given liberty and the members of the committee were taken away by police in order that their conduct be thoroughly examined.

As instruments of the Terror, the revolutionary committees are charged with the application of revolutionary laws and with identifying individuals suspected of anti-republicanism. On the 21st of March, 1793, the Convention decreed that each commune must have its own surveillance committee, which led to abusive denunciation, interrogation, arrest and arbitrary condemnation.

In this play the hunt for men instigated by the revolutionary tribunal of Paris is characterized, in
PART IV: THE FINAL DAYS OF LOUIS XVI

In June of 1791, Louis XVI attempted his second escape from Paris. The plan had been ready for months but it was in the spring of the year that two events convinced him...
the time was ripe. First, the death of Mirabeau meant the loss of a defender of liberty who also saw a place for the monarchy in a new regime. Second, the royal family had failed in a previous attempt to escape the capital when discovered by radicals. Louis was no longer the beloved monarch he had once been. So, disguised as a valet, he hoped to reach Austrian lands or to ensconce himself in the safety of a loyalist stronghold. King Louis in fact signed the passport permitting his travel.

The plan was meticulous, but failed. With him were the Queen Marie-Antoinette (herself an Austrian), their two children, a governess and the King’s sister. The very full cabriolet, as depicted in the engraving, nearly burst with royalty and met with mayhem. The King was recognized en route by a postmaster and, as the engraving announces, his coach was waylaid by a pair of young men. Once again the King’s escape was foiled as he found himself surrounded by armed and angry citizens.

Louis was returned to Paris where he would never regain the love of the populace. The happenings at Varennes are well-documented. Hour-by-hour accounts of the events leading up to and following the slice of time captured in this engraving were clearly pivotal in the evolution of the French Republic.

Anonyme, Histoire du départ du roi, des événements qui l’ont précédé et suivi, avec le recueil des pièces justificatives, le rapport des sept comités réunis, les opinions de MM. Penthion, Salles, Barnave, Duport, etc., Paris, Devaux, 1791.

This text of over three hundred pages chronicles and comments on discussions, announcements, propositions adopted and articles ratified in the National Assembly between the morning of Tuesday the 21st of June and 4:00 in the afternoon the following Sunday.

After the departure of the King from Paris is announced, it is quickly agreed that the Assembly must be safe-guarded from disruption and remain constantly in session around-the-clock so
that the general order and safety of the Empire be assured. News of these measures must be trumpeted throughout Paris for all to hear. The capital is to be kept armed, yet tranquil and united by a single will. This unifying will should be that of the meritorious M. de La Fayette (supporter of the American Revolution and friend to Thomas Jefferson).

What follows is an account of all that transpired – day and night – as ministers describe the states of the affairs they govern, letters from Louis are considered, and patrons are admitted to present cases at the bar.

The proceedings are not without emotion, or humour. We read of an aged speaker, weak of voice, whose “touching words” the president attentively repeats so that they may be heard. Emotion and applause ensue. Later, the King’s sanction is decreed to no longer be required in order that actions of the National Assembly have the force of law. Again, the menace the royal departure from Paris occasions is noted. One of the final events recorded is a scission amongst the Jacobins leading to a seating reorganization in the hall; one sits alongside those with whom one is most closely aligned.

[Considerations Presented to the French Nation: on the Trial Against Louis XVI]

In 37 densely-packed pages, Jacques Necker presents his reasoned and impassioned argument in favour of forgiving Louis XVI, against whom the proceedings which would result in decapitation had begun.

Necker legitimizes his project, citing his intimate familiarity with the King by reason of having served him for seven years and because the position he held obliged him to see the monarch's reactions to an incredible diversity of affairs. Louis is described as studious and assiduous of taste, as a student of history, morality and politics, and as never having acted from pure self-interest but always with consideration of morality and the good of the People.

Necker takes up accusation after accusation levelled against the King and demonstrates their flaws or misconceptions. He adds that it is erroneous to think that a King might be judged by his peers — people who, from similar experience appreciate his circumstances.
A king, by definition and birth though not by choice, is peerless. Yes, kings inevitably err and cause harm (as well as good), for their reach extends widely. However, notions of responsibility and intent are not the same for kings as they are for commoners. One is responsible for what one can reasonably foresee; one cannot be said to intend distant repercussions. Judgment passed over Louis XVI should come from the hearts of individuals, not from redoubtable collective opinion whose fervour is fanned daily and whose certitude is ill-founded.

Necker explains that by raising his feeble voice he attempts to penetrate the noise of delusory public passions in defence of the King. The tribunal of posterity, he notes, will not judge well those who have subjected their captive to the decrees of their all-powerfulness, and even before then, they will have their own remorse and repentance with which to deal.

A simple machine and great equalizer, the guillotine embodied the inventive and philosophical spirit of the Enlightenment. All condemned to death would alike be decapitated, quickly and cleanly. (The case of Charlotte Corday did give pause as her head sans body was observed to respond to a slap on the cheek.)

In *The Supplice of Louis Capet* we see Louis XVI on the 21st of January, 1793, having pulled open his own collar in preparation for his impending execution. Louis had been escorted to the scene in a coach-trip of nearly two hours, rather than by the usual cart of the condemned. Passing throngs of silently watchful citizens, he finally arrived at what is today La Place de la Concorde.

A hangman, his son and an aide met the King atop the platform around which swarmed onlookers and soldiers brandishing bayonets. Only after the royal head rolled at 10:22 that morning did the crowd erupt in cheers: “Long live liberty! Long live the Nation!”

The physical instantiation of things royal was dead, bits of Louis’ hair and clothing were quickly auctioned off; the once king had


[The Execution of Louis Capet]
been equalized. Bayonets were dipped in his blood and brandished.

The aberrant monster, internal threat to the Republic — that singular individual spuriously said to be designed by heritage and God to rule over all others — was no more. Louis had been shown few special privileges throughout the certainly humbling early stages of the process. It is reported that just before his death Louis Capet said, “People, I die innocent.”

26 John Moore, *A Journal during a residence in France: from the beginning of August to the middle of December 1792: to which is added an account of the most remarkable events that happened at Paris from that time to the death of the late King of France, London, Robinson, 1793-1794.*

A contemporary biographer, H.J. Fulton explains John Moore’s popularity in 18th century England: travel-writing was in vogue, Moore was uniquely privy to high and low society, and had a fascinating passion for the study of custom and culture. Moore’s compelling personalized account ranges across philosophical commentary regarding the good that is liberty in the abstract and the confusion that attends it in practice, through heartfelt praise of the French people who remain “as gay as ever, notwithstanding the formidable armies now prepared to attack.” Moore recounts his experiences as he travels from tavern to town, around Paris and across social strata.

Fulton emphasizes Moore’s growing disillusionment, citing criticism of the book following its publication, which identified the dissipation of Moore’s original enthusiasm for the country and for its revolution, which he regarded as a step toward that best form of government exemplified by the British constitutional monarchy. Certainly, the tumult and savagery he documented resulted in Moore’s conclusion that France was not what he had first thought.

Fulton concludes that the much-chastened Moore became a royalist sympathizer and lost a good measure of passion for the Revolution. Moore does speak of “anarchy and confusion,” of the “wretched individuals” for whom it will matter little whether “their misery is derived [...] from foreign invaders, or their own internal distractions”.
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Yet he also insists that “it is impossible not to admire the generous spirit that glows all over the nation in support of its independency.”

The travelogue provides a study from a British perspective, a perspective that changes — but not radically — as he becomes increasingly familiar with his subject.