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ABSTRACT

Stendhal divides humanity into the two categories of *dupes* and *fripons*. The introduction to the thesis shows how Stendhal's heroes and heroines attempt to transcend these two categories, modelling themselves on great souls (exemplars), most notably the heroes and heroines of the French Republic (Danton, Mme Roland) and Empire (Napoleon). The former exemplify a sublime form of *duperie*, the latter a sublime form of *friponnerie*. Stendhal relates these two categories of exemplars to their respective counterparts or pairs drawn from Plutarch's *Parallel Lives*, most notably Brutus (a sublime *dupe*) and Caesar (a sublime *fripon*). The introduction begins to explore these parallels by tracing Stendhal's attitudes to Plutarch prior to 1829.

The first part of the thesis examines Stendhal's non-fiction of 1829-42, beginning with his evocations of Ancient Rome in the *Promenades dans Rome* and of specific Plutarchian exemplars in the *Souvenirs d'égotisme* (Epaminondas), *Vie de Henry Brulard* (Brutus) and *Mémoires sur Napoléon* (Caesar). The first part concludes with an analysis of Plutarchian themes in Stendhal's translations (*Vittoria Accoramboni, Les Cenci, La Duchesse de Palliano*) and travel-writings in contemporary France (*Mémoires d'un touriste, Voyage en France, Voyage dans le Midi de la France)*.

The second part deals with Stendhal's fiction of the period, tracing his exploration of the related oppositions between Brutus and Caesar, *duperie* and *friponnerie*, generosity and ambition, the sublime and the vile. In the process, the thesis brings out the parallels Stendhal establishes between his fictional heroes and heroines as well as between these heroes and heroines and their exemplars, whether drawn directly from Plutarch or from more recent history (the Middle Ages, Italian sixteenth century, French Republic and Empire). I conclude by arguing that Stendhal's writings of the period constitute a modern *Parallel Lives*, part (auto-)biographical, part fictional.
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NOTE ON REFERENCES

I have decided not to refer to the novels in the Pléiade edition given that it is about to be superseded. In the interests of clarity, I refer to Henri Beyle as Stendhal throughout. The following abbreviations will also be used throughout. See Bibliography for full bibliographical information.

1. Works by Stendhal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armance</td>
<td>Armance (Garnier-Flammarion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondance</td>
<td>Correspondance (Pléiade-Gallimard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chroniques Italiennes</td>
<td>Chroniques Italiennes (=OC, XVIII-XIX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'Abbesse de Castro</td>
<td>L'Abbesse de Castro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Duchesse de Palliano</td>
<td>La Duchesse de Palliano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Cenci</td>
<td>Les Cenci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suora Scolastica</td>
<td>Suora Scolastica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trop de faveur tue</td>
<td>Trop de faveur tue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vittoria Accoramboni</td>
<td>Vittoria Accoramboni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Chartreuse de Parme</td>
<td>La Chartreuse de Parme (Classiques Garnier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De l'Amour</td>
<td>De l'Amour (Folio-Gallimard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vies de Haydn, de Mozart et de Métastase</td>
<td>Vies de Haydn, de Mozart et de Métastase (=OC, XI.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Littéraire</td>
<td>Journal Littéraire (=OC, XXXIII-XXXV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamiel</td>
<td>Lamiel (Garnier-Flammarion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucien Leuwen</td>
<td>Lucien Leuwen (Garnier-Flammarion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mémoires sur Napoléon</td>
<td>Mémoires sur Napoléon (=OC, XI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oeuvres Complètes</td>
<td>Oeuvres Complètes (Cercle du Bibliophile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oeuvres Intimes</td>
<td>Oeuvres Intimes (Pléiade-Gallimard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Souvenirs d'égoïsme</td>
<td>Souvenirs d'égoïsme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vie de Henry Brulard</td>
<td>Vie de Henry Brulard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Rouge et le Noir</td>
<td>Le Rouge et le Noir (Classiques Garnier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans et Nouvelles</td>
<td>Romans et Nouvelles (=OC, XXXVIII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mina de Vanghel</td>
<td>Mina de Vanghel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Rose et le Vert</td>
<td>Le Rose et le Vert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Théâtre</td>
<td>Théâtre (=OC, XLII-XLIII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voyages en France</td>
<td>Voyages en France (Pléiade-Gallimard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mémoires d'un touriste</td>
<td>Mémoires d'un touriste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voyage en France</td>
<td>Voyage en France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voyage dans le Midi de la France</td>
<td>Voyage dans le Midi de la France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promenades dans Rome</td>
<td>Promenades dans Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome, Naples et Florence (1826)</td>
<td>Rome, Naples et Florence (1826)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vie de Napoléon</td>
<td>Vie de Napoléon (=OC, XXXIX)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Works by Plutarch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Age of Alexander</td>
<td>The Age of Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fall of the Roman Republic</td>
<td>The Fall of the Roman Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Makers of Rome</td>
<td>The Makers of Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rise and Fall of Athens</td>
<td>The Rise and Fall of Athens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I
INTRODUCTION
1

DUPES AND FRIPONS

'On peut dire de [...] Stendhal, qu'il avait grande frayeur d'être dupe.'

(Charles Baudelaire)\(^1\)

I. 'Un langage sacré'

Stendhal's texts are pre-eminently concerned with the vanity, charlatanism, vulgarity and mediocrity of French society under the Restoration and Orleanism. Stendhal contrasts these perceived failings with the idealism of the French Republic and the grandeur of Napoleon's Imperial project. He therefore presents the fall of Napoleon as a major cultural discontinuity: a Fall responsible for a set of cleavages, between art and politics, language and action, imagination and reality, passion and vanité. Stendhal's post-lapsarian world is populated by an inferior generation, forever dividing into dupes and fripons. Stendhal's heroes and heroines seek to reverse this generational decline, re-inventing themselves in the image of great souls such as Mme Roland, Danton and Napoleon, themselves modelled on the exemplars of Republican and Imperial antiquity.

Stendhal identifies passion as the quality proper to an appreciation of music and the figurative arts, in particular the works of Cimarosa and Mozart, Raphael, Michelangelo and Correggio. Stendhal also shows this quality as proper to an understanding of historical exemplars such as Brutus and Caesar, Mme Roland, Danton and Napoleon. Thus Napoleon's Italian campaigns represent a fusion of art and politics: 'le canon du pont de Lodi (mai 1796) commença le réveil de l'Italie. Les âmes généreuses purent oublier l'amour et les beaux-auts; quelque chose de plus nouveau se présentait aux jeunes imaginations' (VTI, p.1039 [PR]). Passion offers Stendhal a point of contact between language and action, representation and emulation. It therefore helps Stendhal's heroes and heroines span the generations and so reverse centuries of cultural decline. It also functions as 'un langage sacré' between Stendhal and his ideal readers.

Esprit and savoir-vivre have often been privileged at the expense of passion in critical readings of Stendhal, particularly those which attempt to decode Stendhal's authorial irony. Yet Stendhal's work finally deals more with the limitations than the satisfactions of esprit and savoir-vivre. Indeed, Stendhal opposes esprit both to a proper understanding of the arts (VIT, p. 741 [PR]) and to the effective management of public affairs: 'Clément VII avait beaucoup d'esprit et manquait tout à fait de caractère. Or nous avons vu dans notre Révolution que, dès que les circonstances politiques deviennent difficiles, l'esprit est ridicule: c'est la force de caractère qui décide de tout' (p. 1031). Stendhal links French esprit to vanity (p. 948, 1053), itself opposed to the qualities of 'âmes italiennes chez lesquelles l'habitude de la politique la plus fine ne peut éteindre les sentiments passionnés' (p. 1021). Stendhal is similarly critical of savoir-vivre: 'Hélas! toute science ressemble en un point à la vieillesse, dont le pire symptôme est la science de la vie, qui empêche de se passionner et de faire des folies pour rien' (p. 752). Indeed, the ironic reader is more often the subject of Stendhal's irony than the 'ironically-viewed ironic hero' identified by Brombert. Only the passion of the reader can hope to fill in the narrative blanks that recur at moments of heightened emotion within the texts. It is through the performance of such passion that the reader produces the music of the Stendhalian novel: 'un roman est comme un archet, la caisse du violon qui rend les sons c'est l'âme du lecteur' (OI, ii, 699 [VHB]).

Pearson describes the 'Happy Few' as an 'aristocracy of taste' (p. 6), opposing them to Bentham's 'greatest number'. Stendhal both praises and blames the press for simultaneously extending political freedoms ('le bonheur du plus grand nombre') and promoting a culture of charlatanism and mediocrity, founded on vanity and vulgarity: 'en France, les journaux auront créé la liberté et perdu la littérature' (VIT, p. 1101 [PR]). The pursuit of artistic excellence (le bonheur des 'Happy Few') is therefore shown to be inversely proportionate to the pursuit of political freedom: 'la liberté est ennemie des beaux-arts' (p. 933). Stendhal nevertheless also imagines an alternative, Alfierian world

---

4 See Roger Pearson, Stendhal's Violin (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988) for an analysis of the metaphors Stendhal uses to describe the novelistic process.
5 See also VFR, p. 14, 100 [MT], pp. 463-64 [VF].
where the reintroduction of *passion* frees language from hypocrisy and vanity, so allowing for the integrated pursuit of artistic and political happiness.\(^6\)

Stendhal himself stands outside this still imaginary world, reserved for his anachronistic heroes and heroines: 'l'auteur pense que, excepté pour la passion du héros, un roman doit être un miroir' (LL, I, 89). Although he lays claim to *le sentiment des arts*, Stendhal stops short of likewise claiming the heroism of his protagonists, except of course when he idealizes himself as a fictional character, most notably in *Une position sociale* and the *Vie de Henry Brulard*.\(^7\) It is therefore important to maintain a distinction between Stendhal's displays of secondary *passion* and the primary *passion* of his heroes and heroines.

Stendhal's life as Louis-Philippe's Consul in the 'ornière administrative' of Civitavecchia (Ol, II, 541 [VHB]) cannot be seen as exemplary. Even before this compromise with Orleanism, Stendhal appears to have doubted himself as a man of action. In 1811, at the height of his bureaucratic career, Stendhal writes:

> Ce qui me chagrine, c'est l'idée qu'estimant le caractère comme je fais, peut-être n'en ai-je point. Ne sais-je pas hasarder et agir dans les choses que j'affectionne, comme faisait Frédéric II, ou du moins comme je me figure qu'il faisait? (Ol, I, 697 [J])

Stendhal consistently ironizes such relative ingloriousness through his curious choice of textual personae (a German Baron, an itinerant iron merchant, a cotton-nightcap salesman) and pseudonyms, the latter sometimes featuring bethetically grandiose first-names (Louis-Alexandre-César, Alexandre) combined with humiliatingly bourgeois surnames (Bombet, Cotonet).\(^8\)

---

\(^6\) See in particular Vittorio Alfieri's *Del principe e delle lettere* in *Della tirannide; Del principe e delle lettere; La virtù sconosciuta*, ed. by Marco Cerruti and Ezio Falcomer (Milan: Rizzoli, 1996). Stendhal echoes Alfieri by suggesting that language is corrupted by 'l'extrême civilisation'. As a result of this process, 'passions' in general are slowly replaced by the debased passion of 'vanité' (*LL*, II, 547 ['Pilotis']). This process can, however, be reversed: 'les barbares du nord rendirent les passions aux Romains de Constantin, qui n'avaient plus que la vanité' (ibid.).

\(^7\) A marginal note to *Une position sociale* reads: 'For me: En un mot, Roizand est Dominique idéalisé' (RSN, p.357). The pseudonym Dominique is in turn an idealization through the implied self-identification with Domenico Cimarosa.

The secondary *passion* of the 'Happy Few', Stendhal included, reveals no more than a latent capacity for primary *passion*. Instead, the ideal reader resolves the modern opposition, created by *fripon* society, between the interests of the 'Happy Few' and 'le plus grand nombre', thereby reuniting imagination and reality, art and politics, language and action through the emulation of exemplary great souls:

Il est sans doute parmi nous quelques âmes nobles et tendres comme Mme Roland, Mlle de Lespinasse, Napoléon, le condamné Lafargue, etc. Que ne puis-je écrire dans un langage sacré compris d'elles seules! (*VIT*, p.880 [PR])

*Passion* is the province of the young, the idealistic and the energetic: ideal readers who will themselves become exemplars through the display of their own primary *passion*. Such *passion* proves incompatible with artifice, ludism and *savoir-vivre*. Stendhal's texts are written to exalt the passionate (Italian) reader: l'essentiel pour faire la conquête d'une Italienne, c'est d'avoir l'âme *exaltable*. L'esprit français, qui prouve du *sang-froid*, est un obstacle (*VIT*, p.645 [PR]). The ideal reader therefore responds passionately to Stendhal's texts, in the manner of a sixteenth-century Italian: 'au XVIe siècle, on aimait l'exactitude dans les histoires d'amour. C'est que l'esprit ne jugeait pas ces histoires-là, l'imagination les sentait, et la passion du lecteur s'identifiait avec celle des héros' (*CI*, i, 155 [AC]). This is the manner of Mme Roland, 'nourrie de la plus pure morale, familiarisée avec les grands exemples', or else of a sublime Don Quixote, surrounded by vile Sancho

---

9 Stendhal goes on to repeat himself in the *Promenades*, referring to 'les âmes bonnes et tendres, telles que Mme Roland, Mlle de Lespinasse, etc., pour lesquelles seules on écrit' (p.1053). Elsewhere, Stendhal consistently cites Mme Roland as his ideal reader:

Il me serait doux de plaire beaucoup à trente ou quarante personnes de Paris que je ne verrai jamais, mais que j'aime à la folie, sans les connaître. Par exemple, quelque jeune Mme Roland, lisant en cachette quelque volume qu'elle cache bien vite au moindre bruit, dans les tiroirs de l'établi de son père, lequel est graveur de boîtes de montre. (*DA*, p.36)

J'avoue que le courage d'écrire me manquerait si je n'avais pas l'idée qu'un jour ces feuilles paraîtront imprimées et seront lues par quelque âme que j'aime, par un être tel que Mme Roland ou M. Gros, le géomètre. (*OI*, II, 429 [SE])

S'il y a succès, je cours la chance d'être lu en 1900 par les âmes que j'aime, les Mme Roland, les Mélanie Guilbert, les [un blanc]. (*VHB*)

Il me faudrait pour lecteur une Mme Roland, et encore peut-être le manque de description des charmants ombreges de notre vallée de l'Isère lui ferait jeter le livre. (*VHB*)

10 Stendhal refers to his renaissance exemplars as heroic because they are born 'dans un siècle où tout le monde cherchait à faire et non pas à écrire' (*MN*, p.34).

Panzas (CP, p. 189). Indeed, the primacy of passion over esprit results in Stendhal occasionally defending the ideal status of readings founded on misprisions of the kind that also finally undermined the politics of the French Republic and Empire.\textsuperscript{12}

The 'langage sacré' of Stendhal's texts promotes an imaginative escape from the realities of a world divided into 	extit{dupes} and 	extit{fripons}, allowing for a magical synthesis of language and action, self and society. Stendhal optimistically heralds the triumph of such a language in 	extit{Qu'est-ce que le romantisme?}.

Toujours les arts font de grands progrès dans le premier moment de repos réel qui suit les convulsions politiques. Les pédants peuvent nous retarder de dix ans; mais, dans dix ans, c'est nous, ignorants en livres, mais savants en actions et en émotions, c'est nous, qui n'avons pas lu Homère en grec, mais qui avons assiégé Tarragone et Girone, c'est nous qui serons à la tête de toutes choses. (\textit{JL}, III, 120 [1818])\textsuperscript{13}

However, the July Revolution and social unrest of the 1830s, whether Republican or Legitimist, failed to wrest power away from what Stendhal saw as a 	extit{fripon} hegemony of vested interests. All the more important, then, that Stendhal's texts provide his ideal readers with suitable exemplars. Assuming the next revolution is to succeed, and Le Canu predicts the fall of Louis-Philippe by the time Lucien Leuwen is forty (1848), a language must be found to unite not only the French nation but also the forces represented by the idealism (generosity) of the Republic and the grandeur (ambition) of Empire.

2. 'Un homme distingué'

The hero or heroine must pre-emptively construct his or her personality around a set of absolute values through prospective fictions of the self \textit{(le roman de l'avenir)}.\textsuperscript{14} René Girard

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{12} Ann Jefferson stresses Stendhal's positive emphasis on the misprisions of Mme de Rênal in \textit{Reading Realism in Stendhal} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp.81-86. Peter Brooks makes a similar point about Julien in \textit{Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative} (New York: Knopf, 1984): 'he creates fictions, including fictions of the self, that motivate action. The result is often inauthenticity and error, the choice of comportments that are inappropriate' (p.163).
  \item \textsuperscript{14} Napoleon is portrayed as exemplary in this respect \textit{(VTT}, p.1137 [\textit{PR}], \textit{MN}, p.51). Brooks similarly suggests that: 'Julien must unceasingly write and rewrite the narrative of
has noted Stendhal's emphasis on 'mediation', in particular making the point that desire is always imitative in his work.\(^\text{15}\) There can be little doubt that Stendhal frequently mediates notions of both love and heroism by invoking exemplars drawn from the myths and legends of literature and history. Stendhal, however, makes a clear distinction between mediation through the _parestre_ of imitation and the _habitudes morales_ of emulation. Thus his interest in the construction of the self can be related to Plutarch's emphasis on emulation and parallelism as well as to Maine de Biran's concept of _habitude_.\(^\text{16}\) Stendhal follows Biran in opposing _habitude_ to _passion_: 'les qualités, les vertus, sont les _habitudes_ de l'âme; or, tout ce qui est _habitude_ disparaît dans les moments de passion' (OC, XLIX, 62). Biran nevertheless suggests that _passion_ can actually be stimulated by certain _habitudes de l'imagination_. Stendhal similarly argues that _passion_ must be buttressed by a self-taught (habituated) strength of character (_la force de l'âme_):

> La force que nous admirons, c'est celle de Napoléon visitant l'hôpital de Jaffa, ou s'avançant avec simplicité vers le premier bataillon des troupes royales, sur les bords du lac de Laffrey (mars 1815); c'est la force de l'âme. (OC, XLIX, 62)

Thus Julien constructs his personality around a 'koran' of Plutarchian texts, drawn from Rousseau (Brutus) and Napoleon (Caesar): Julien is 'written' in his choice of texts. The choice of Rousseau appears particularly telling, given the latter's project of constructing the self through literary texts.\(^\text{17}\)

I shall therefore be arguing against Michel Crouzet, who suggests that Stendhal increasingly sought to _se dérouseausir_. Crouzet means by this that Stendhal came to realize the futility of his obsession with sincerity, purity and moral coherence, and began instead to advocate a ludic form of compromise. Crouzet supports his argument with an unprecedented breadth of analysis.\(^\text{18}\) In particular, he proposes a number of oppositions

---


\(^\text{17}\) Pearson notes that Lamiel is related anagrammatically to Rousseau's Emile (p.259).

or tensions in Stendhal's work, always eventually resolved in favour of ludic compromise: pureté/fourberie, misanthropie/sociabilité, vérité/mensonge. The alternative to such compromise, Crouzet maintains, can only take the form of humourless isolation. Yet Stendhal's humour is derived more from satirizing the smug satisfaction of those who congratulate themselves on their self-indulgence than from pointing up the priggishness of those who think themselves pure. Crouzet nonetheless resolves his opposition between mensonge and vérité into one between the hypocrite and the 'hypocrite de sincérité': 'ne voulant pas être faux en dedans, il mène croisade contre le faux en dehors' (Le Héros fourbe, p.149).

Francine Marill Albérès likewise insists on Stendhal's decision to divest himself, as well as his heroes and heroines, of a Rousseauist isolation in favour of successful social participation based on calculation and manipulation. Marill Albérès sees this change in approach as a continuation of the individual's quest for heroism: 'il n'est point changement de direction, mais adaptation progressive du naturel à la société, introduction de l'héroïsme dans un milieu qui lui est hostile' (p.363). Intransigence, she argues, can lead only to a form of pride (espagnolisme) which leads either to insanity, or in the case of Octave, to suicide (p.312, 343). Instead, the individual must learn to abandon chimerical ideals in order to 'travestir le naturel pour l'introduire dans la comédie des masques' (p.343). She therefore claims, as an interim position, that by learning to be false, the individual protects his or her potential for le naturel, 'car ce moi n'est plus qu'un robot, un personnage mécanique qui remplace le vrai moi en société, qu'il est commode d'utiliser, mais que l'on peut abandonner à volonté' (p.373). Marill Albérès and Crouzet therefore both finally see Stendhalian heroism in ludic terms: 'l'hypocrisie se présente comme un pacte, une manière de refaire volontairement, ludiquement, le pacte sociale' (Le Héros fourbe, p.242).


19 Stendhal adopts a similar strategy in his invective against industrialists, D'un nouveau complot contre les Industriels:

| L'INDUSTRIEL | Mon cher ami, j'ai fait un excellent dîner. |
| LE VOISIN    | Tant mieux pour vous, mon cher ami.        |
| L'INDUSTRIEL | Non pas seulement tant mieux pour moi. Je prétends que l'opinion publique me décerne une haute récompense pour m'être donné le plaisir de faire un bon dîner. (OC, XLV, 271) |

the practice of *fourberie ludique* can open the doors to a world of 'gaieté' and 'savoir-vivre' (p.246).

Marill Albérès goes on to claim that *La Chartreuse de Parme* represents the definitive exposition of such heroism: 'l'éthique stendhalienne trouve sa conclusion dans l'optimisme : le naturel doit triompher, car il est une exigence de la condition humaine' (p.402). Yet it is doubtful whether *La Chartreuse* is any more optimistic than Stendhal's other novels. Furthermore, Fabrice's unthinking identification with the interests of his caste renders him incapable of addressing issues of purity and sincerity. As a result, it is Fabrice himself who represents an interim stage in personal development, exhibiting the passive, spontaneous and reactive *passion* associated by Stendhal with exemplars such as Epaminondas and Lafayette, or else with Neapolitans (contrasted to the ardent Milanese and energetic Romans) of the kind Fabrice presumably encountered in the course of his theological studies: 'à proprement parler, la plupart des Napolitains n'ont pas de passions profondes, mais obéissent en aveugles à la sensation du moment' (*VIT*, p.967 [PR]). Fabrice, in the manner of the ideal reader, offers *passion* in potential form only. He lacks the moral framework (*habitudes morales*) necessary to direct the promise of his ardour, and so create a distinguished man, uniting the virtues of Republic and Empire, Brutus and Caesar:

Pour faire un homme distingué, il faut à vingt ans cette chaleur d'âme, cette duperie, si l'on veut, que l'on ne rencontre guère qu'en province; il faut aussi cette instruction philosophique et dégagée de toute fausseté que l'on ne trouve que dans les bons collèges de Paris.

Mais la *faculté de vouloir* manque de plus en plus à Paris. (*VFR*, p.37 [MT])

Distinction is only possible in Stendhal's fiction if the hero or heroine learns to balance imagination and utility, generosity and ambition ('la faculté de vouloir'). Stendhal's solution to generational decline emphasizes the attempt to transcend the squalor of *duperie* and *friponnerie* as opposed to the compromise of Crouzet's ludic *fourberie*. Stendhal suggests that, through the successful emulation of exemplars such as Brutus and Mme Roland, Caesar and Napoleon, *duperie* can be elevated to the sublime 'chaleur d'âme' of generosity, *friponnerie* to the sublime energy of ambition. It is precisely because *duperie* and *friponnerie* are related to generosity and ambition in this way that the process of generational decline can be reversed so dramatically through the intervention of a charismatic exemplar. Thus over two-and-a-half centuries of Italian decline are reversed by Napoleon's triumphal entry in Milan:
Le 15 mai 1796, le général Bonaparte fit son entrée dans Milan à la tête de cette jeune armée qui venait de passer le pont de Lodi, et d'apprendre au monde qu'après tant de siècles César et Alexandre avaient un successeur. Les miracles de bravoure et de génie dont l'Italie fut témoin en quelques mois réveillèrent un peuple endormi. \(CP\), p.5

Richard N. Coe offers a rival set of oppositions to those of \textit{duperie} and \textit{fripomerie}, generosity and ambition.\(^{21}\) Coe suggests that Stendhal opposes \textit{la grâce} and \textit{le beau moderne} to \textit{la force} and \textit{le beau antique}. This model allows for a more nuanced assessment of ludism than that proposed by Crouzet. In particular, Coe acknowledges that the essentially ludic concept of \textit{la grâce} can have negative as well as positive connotations in Stendhal's critical writing (vulgarity, weakness, insipidity). Both \textit{la grâce} and \textit{la force} are inaccessible to vulgar minds, chiefly preoccupied with \textit{l'odieux} (the fraudulent pursuit of wealth). However, in Coe's analysis, Stendhal is made to espouse a specifically aristocratic \textit{grâce} over republican \textit{force} on the dubious grounds that republicanism has been hijacked by \textit{l'odieux}. Conversely, Marxist critics have suggested that Stendhal espouses republican \textit{force} as the only means of escaping a bourgeois \textit{odieux}. Indeed, Fernand Rude\(^{22}\) goes on to suggest that 'la chasse au bonheur', usually associated with \textit{grâce}, has a strong social dimension for the heroes and heroines of Stendhal's fiction and can therefore be equated to Bentham's 'bonheur du plus grand nombre'.

Coe and Rude fail adequately to account for Stendhal's radicalism, which allows him simultaneously to occupy Jacobin, Girondin, Vendéen and Bonapartist positions. This radicalism takes the form of an attempt to revive \textit{le beau antique}, and so unite utility and taste, political economy and aesthetics. Stendhal therefore finally discards \textit{le beau moderne}, likely to appeal to the worldly, and therefore the old, because of the way it encourages social conformity through the cant of economic liberalism and the charlatanism of fashion: 'la vieillesse est amie de l'ordre et a peur de tout' \(LL\), 1, 88. \textit{Le beau antique}, on the other hand, is more attractive to the young because of its emphasis on the \textit{passion} that alone can unite language and action. Thus \textit{le beau antique} eschews conventional aesthetics in favour of an aestheticized moral philosophy:


Il faut d'abord écarter toutes les phrases vides de sens empruntées à Platon, à Kant et à leur école. L'obscurité n'est pas un défaut quand on parle à de bons jeunes gens avides de savoir, et surtout de paraître savoir; mais dans les beaux-arts elle tue le plaisir. Jérémie Bentham conduit à l'intelligence du beau antique cent fois mieux que Platon et tous ses imitateurs. (*VIT*, p.780 [PR])

*Le beau antique* has, of course, been revived by the French Republic and Empire. If Stendhal's ludic characters occasionally mock its high-mindedness, it is largely to focus the reader's attention on the shortcomings of modern values, with their inversion of age behaviour: selfish irresponsibility in middle-age (Soubirane, François Leuwen); calculation and premature cynicism in youth (Bonnivet, Ernest Dévelroy).

3. 'La clé qui explique le XIXᵉ siècle'

Rude suggests the categories of *dupe* and *fripon* may originate in Fourier's throwaway formula: 'ainsi va le monde civilisé, il n'y a que dupes et rieurs' (p.247). Stendhal certainly associates Fourier (a 'rêveur sublime') with the idealism of *duperie*:

Fourier, vivant dans la solitude, ou, ce qui est la même chose, avec des disciples n'osant faire une objection (d'ailleurs il ne répondait jamais aux objections), n'a pas vu que dans chaque village un fripon actif et beau parleur (un Robert Macaire) se mettra à la tête de l'association, et pervertira toutes ses belles conséquences. (*VFR*, p.763 [MT, 'Fragments'])

For his part, Crouzet repeatedly suggests that Stendhal implicitly divides his world into Orgons and Tartuffes: 'si l'on n'est pas Tartuffe, on est 'orgonifié'. A la limite le beyliste sera Tartuffe par crainte surtout d'être Orgon: passif et mené' (*Le Héros fourbe*, p.33).

The division of the world into *dupes* and *fripons* can twice be found in the *Promenades*:

M. d'Italinsky [the Russian minister in Rome], trop vieux pour être ambitieux, disait: 'Un siècle doit exceller dans ce dont il fait sa grande affaire. Notre affaire à nous est d'opérer des conversions politiques. C'est dans ce but que, trompeurs comme trompés, nous parlons sans cesse du bon, du juste, de l'utile. [...] Voyez les revues littéraires écrites par les hommes graves qui dirigent l'opinion publique, quelle effroyable cant (hypocrisie de mœurs), etc.' (*VIT*, p.925)

Le monde se divise, à nos yeux, en deux moitiés à la vérité fort inégales: les sots et les fripons d'un côté, et de l'autre les êtres privilégiés auxquels le hasard a donné une âme noble et un peu d'esprit. Nous nous sentons les compatriotes de ces gens-ci, qu'ils soient nés à Velletri ou à Saint-Omer. (pp.1048-49)

Stendhal similarly allows for 'êtres privilégiés' in *Lamiel*:
Le premier sentiment de Lamiel à la vue d'une vertu était de la croire une hypocrisie.

'Le monde', lui disait Sansfin, 'n'est point divisé, comme le croit le nigaud, en riches et en pauvres, en hommes vertueux et en scélérats, mais tout simplement en dupes et en fripons. Voilà la clef qui explique le XIXe siècle depuis la chute de Napoléon; car, ajoutait Sansfin, 'la bravoure personnelle, la fermeté de caractère' n'offrent point prise à l'hypocrisie. Comment un homme peut-il être hypocrite en se lançant contre le mur d'un cimetière de campagne bien crénelé et défendu par deux cents hommes?' (p.118)

Sansfin specifically relates the emergence of a *dupe-fripon* culture to the fall of Napoleon. Sansfin is of course a *fripon*, characterized by his Norman esprit. He therefore sees distinction in terms of the Napoleonic (Caesarist) virtues of military valour and resolute ambition. The hypothetical man storming enemy lines cannot be a *fripon* for want of hypocrisy ('bravoure personnelle'), nor can he be dismissed as a *depe* if he displays 'fermeté de caractère'. There is no place in Sansfin's analysis, however, for 'chaleur d'âme'. Thus he encourages Lamiel to reject rather than transcend her childish *duperie*. She is therefore reduced to a choice between venal (odious), ludic and sublime versions of *friponnerie*. Lamiel's three *fripon* suitors each represent one of these states: Jean Berville is venal, Nerwinden ludic, the criminal Valbaire sublime. Interestingly, Lamiel's eventual choice of Valbaire is predetermined by her choice of exemplars (Mandrin and Cartouche, singled out for both their courage and generosity).

Valbaire is another Lafargue: 'probablement tous les grands hommes sortiront désormais de la classe à laquelle appartient M. Lafargue. Napoléon réunit autrefois les mêmes circonstances: bonne éducation, imagination ardente et pauvreté extrême' (*VIT*, pp.1079-80 [PR]). Jean Prévost has demonstrated that Stendhal also based Valbaire on Lacenaire, a criminal famous for his seemingly incongruous love of the arts. Stendhal appears similarly to have been attracted to Lafargue on account of the latter's 'exaltation', that is to say his sensitivity to the arts (*VIT*, p.1070 [PR]). Only the criminal, presented by Stendhal as simultaneously imaginative and energetic, can storm the well-defended bastions of *fripon* society and so transcend both *duperie* and *friponnerie*.

Stendhal first makes an explicit connection between, on the one hand, the two strands of Plutarchian heroism represented by Brutus and Caesar, and on the other, the actions of spontaneous, passionate and violent criminals, in the 1826 edition of *Rome, Naples et

Florence. Stendhal quotes from Vittorio Alfieri's \textit{Del principe e delle lettere}, a work in turn influenced by both Plutarch and Machiavelli, giving his own, rather skewed translation in a footnote:

L'Italie moderne, arrivée au comble de la nullité et de l'abaissement, me démontre encore (grand Dieu! dois-je le dire?) par les crimes exécrables et pourtant sublimes que chaque jour voit commettre, qu'elle abonde, même aujourd'hui, et plus qu'aucun autre pays de l'Europe, en âmes ardentessupérieures à toute crainte, et à qui rien ne manque, pour s'immortaliser, qu'un champ de bataille et le moyen d'agir. (\textit{VTI}, p.426)

The words 'même aujourd'hui' are designed to refer modern Italians to a generic Roman past and its tradition of republican \textit{virtù}. Alfieri therefore associates modern crime with ancient virtue in order to legitimize the modern criminal's use of force.\textsuperscript{24} Stendhal's heroes and heroines, themselves 'âmes ardentes supérieures à toute crainte', will spend their time searching for 'un champ de bataille et le moyen d'agir'. It is for this reason that, from Lamiel's perspective (that of a young Mme Roland, a Napoleon or a Lafargue), the exemplar of \textit{fourberie ludique} (Nerwinde) is in the end barely preferable to the common run of \textit{fripons}.

In the nineteenth century, it was usual for detractors of Stendhal to focus almost exclusively on the supposed immorality of his portrayal of criminals. Stendhal would presumably have been delighted to hear Charles Bigot describe \textit{Le Rouge et le Noir} as 'le livre le plus capable de perdre et de dépraver à jamais une âme jeune où le ressort moral serait faible'.\textsuperscript{25} The majority of attacks refused to accept Stendhal's distinction between \textit{friponnerie} and \textit{énergie}, presenting the latter merely as a particularly unpleasant example of the former. Georges Dumesnil therefore describes \textit{Le Rouge} as: 'une apologie de la force qui nie le droit, mais de la force vue sous une forme abhorrente de toute beauté, une apologie de la friponnerie et de l'hypocrisie'.\textsuperscript{26}

Bigot and Dumesnil presumably sensed that Stendhal's novels serve as revolutionary tracts for a youthful, passionate and therefore impressionable readership: 'l'homme n'est jamais

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{24} Pearson suggests that 'in a world of cant, crime is the only authentic act' (p.260).
\textsuperscript{25} Crouzet notes that 'le criminel incarne la non-duperie républicaine' (\textit{Stendhal et l'italianité}, p.224).
pendant toute sa vie que le développement de ce qu'il était à vingt ans' (RSN, p.273 [RV]). Stendhal's vision is revolutionary precisely because instead of political programmes, he advocates a political method, based on Mme Roland's cultivation of 'la plus pure morale' through a familiarity with 'les grands exemples' (p.284). Exemplars serve to exalt passion, defined by Biran as 'une sorte de culte superstitieux rendu à un objet fantastique, ou qui, dans sa réalité même, sort du domaine de la faculté perceptive, pour passer tout entier sous celui de l'imagination' (Influence de l'habitude, pp.191-92). Equally, they serve to encourage the habitudes morales that alone can sustain and direct such passion. Only the worship and emulation of exemplars can produce the 'êtres privilégiés' who transcend Stendhal's dupe-fripon paradigm. Stendhal therefore advocates an imaginative politics of 'l'imprévu, le divin imprévu' (VFR, p.46 [MT]), that is to say a politics based on generosity and ambition (duperie and friponnerie elevated to the status of positive values). He writes in the hope of influencing his ardent readers in the same way that Plutarch, through the Parallel Lives, influenced not only the young Stendhal, but also many of his literary heroes, most notably Shakespeare, Montaigne, Alfieri, Rousseau and Mme Roland.

27 Michel Guérin, in La Politique de Stendhal (Paris: PUF, 1982), argues that this method is based on the cultivation of passion:

Disons que son [Stendhal's] tempérament le portait dans le sens d'une république paroxystique, cruelle et généreuse. Passionnée. Celle de l'an II, mais aussi celle, tôt brisée, qu'il savait vive et gardée dans le cœur des brigands italiens que la tyrannie renvoya à la vie sauvage. Des idées tout cela? Pas même. Plutôt des images flamboyantes, la version politique de la passion, dieu suprême. (p.10)
2
PLUTARCH

'Plutarque semblait être la véritable pâture qui me convînt.'
(Mme Roland, Mémoires, p.212)

1. 'Le livre par excellence'

Plutarch's *Parallel Lives*, with their focus on great souls, figure prominently in Stendhal's literary pantheon. Stendhal divides Plutarch's heroes into two principal groups, establishing fine distinctions between the qualities of their great souls. The first group is that of tyrannicides and republicans (âmes nobles): Dion, Timoleon and Marcus Brutus.¹ To this group, Stendhal rather immodestly attaches his young self as he appears in the *Vie de Henry Brulard*, as well as a number of his heroes and heroines, most notably autobiographers such as Mme Roland, Alfieri and Rousseau, dramatists such as Corneille, Alfieri again and Schiller, and historical exemplars such as Aristides, Junius Brutus, Cincinnatus, Servilius Ahala, Regulus, Crescentius, Cola di Rienzo and Charlotte Corday. The second group is that of tyrants or conquerors (âmes de feu): Alexander, Caesar and Hannibal as he appears in Plutarch's lives of Fabius Maximus and Marcellus.² To this group, Stendhal attaches his personal myth of Napoleon, especially as developed in the *Mémoires sur Napoléon*, as well as other modern heroes such as Turenne and Frederick the Great.

---


² Stendhal uses the pseudonym Louis-Alexandre-César Bombet to represent an alliance of tyrants and conquerors: Louis XIV, Alexander the Great and Caesar. Del Litto, in his 'Postface' to the *Vies de Haydn, de Mozart et de Métastase*, suggests an alternative grouping: Louis XVIII, Alexander of Russia and Napoleon as Caesar (*MMM*, p.505). Stendhal may also be referring to Napoleon's chief-of-staff, Louis-Alexandre Berthier, held responsible in the *Mémoires sur Napoléon* for promoting the empty bombast of Empire.
Victor Del Litto traces Stendhal's youthful readings of Plutarch, but makes no attempt to place these readings in the context of Stendhal's later literary output. Marill Albérès is therefore the only critic who seeks to evaluate Plutarch's place in Stendhal's writings. She discusses his influence, however, exclusively in terms of le sublime cornélien and the anarchy of sixteenth-century Italy. She therefore draws no distinction between rival schools of Plutarchian hero, noting that the Cardinal de Retz, Lauzun, Mirabeau and Napoleon are each the successors of Brutus and Regulus (p.238). Plutarch's enduring influence on Stendhal, however, exerts itself primarily through the opposition of Brutus and Caesar, two self-conscious types of hero, driven respectively by generosity and ambition.

Stendhal summarized the importance of Plutarch's Parallel Lives in a letter to his sister, Pauline, of 22 January 1803: 'Plutarque est le livre par excellence: qui le lit bien trouve que tous les autres n'en sont que des copies' (C, i, 44). Stendhal is referring to the uses made of the Parallel Lives by a number of authors from his then current literary pantheon, in particular Montaigne, Shakespeare, Rousseau, Alfieri and Schiller. It is hardly surprising, given Stendhal's subsequent record of borrowing from other authors, that he should in turn have decided to 'copy' Plutarch. The Journal littéraire suggests a link between his reading of the Parallel Lives and his first notes, probably dating to December 1802, for the unwritten epic poem, La Pharsale. Stendhal ends a brief list of books he plans to buy with a more ample reference to the Brotier and Vauvilliers edition of Jacques Amyot's Plutarch translation (JL, l, 47 [1802]). He then reminds himself to order the works of Machiavelli from Turin. Immediately thereafter, Stendhal sketches the subject for a potential drama, which on 20 December 1802 evolves into the project for La Pharsale: 'une partie des dieux veut faire périr l'empire romain et l'autre le soutenir. Cette dernière est pour César. La première pour Pompée' (JL, l, 47).

---


In the same period, Stendhal again writes to Pauline: 'je te conseille de lire et de méditer Plutarque: il t'apprendra en même temps l'histoire, et à connaître les hommes' (C, i, 52).

Oeuvres de Plutarque, trans. by Jacques Amyot, ed. by Gabriel Brotier and Jean-François Vauvilliers, 22 vols (Paris: Cussac, 1783-87). Stendhal's interest in Plutarch prompted him at various times in his life to consult other versions of the Lives, most notably the translations by Dacier and Ricard, as well as Prévost's translation of Middleton's English version.

According to Del Litto, Stendhal did not get around to reading Machiavelli until 1804 (p.243).
Stendhal appears to forget, when presenting Caesar as the saviour of the Roman Empire, that the latter is also the destroyer of the Roman Republic. This surprisingly positive characterization is extremely topical given the political events of March and August 1802: the Peace of Amiens which saw Napoleon, the saviour of the French Republic, bring the last of the Revolutionary wars to a successful conclusion, and his subsequent election as Consul for life, in a direct echo of Caesar's acclamation as life-dictator after his victory at Pharsalus. In his more detailed project for *La Pharsale*, Stendhal makes it clear that he, rather illogically, associates Caesar with Napoleon in the latter's guise of Republican general, while identifying Pompey with the rival monarchist coalition (p.55). This allegorical structure leads to difficulties when Stendhal begins to develop the characters of his epic. Caesar is defined in Bonapartist terms: 'rien n'est trop grand pour César. Il est guerrier et conquérant parfait' (p.51). Pompey, on the other hand, despite being credited with 'grandes qualités', is dismissed immediately thereafter as 'peu intéressant' (p.52). Caesar and Pompey prove too similar, primarily because Caesar does not make for a very satisfactory Republican hero. A note of 29 January 1803 suggests that Cromwell might prove a better foil for Caesar/Napoleon, even though Stendhal admits that they are again essentially the same character: 'César et Cromwell avaient le même but, par conséquent la même conduite. Le premier peut me servir à la peindre en beau, le deuxième en horrible' (p.113).

Stendhal's preliminary list of characters therefore places Cato, a 'grande figure stoïque' (p.51), second only to Caesar, with Pompey trailing behind in fourth after Caesarion. Stendhal, however, cannot think of anything for Cato to do other than kill himself once he realizes that Caesar has won (p.61). Stendhal is clearly baffled as to how he can turn Cato into a hero without undermining the status of Caesar/Napoleon. Stendhal therefore decides to dismiss Cato as an idealist, whose life can be taken to demonstrate 'que la sagesse n'est pas le moyen de faire réussir une grande entreprise' (pp.60-61). This attempt to criticize integrity by placing it in opposition to achievement will recur in Stendhal's later work, although it will typically be paired with an inverse critique of achievement placed in opposition to integrity.

---

7 Del Litto notes in his discussion of *La Pharsale*: 'chose curieuse, à l'époque où le jeune Beyle affiche le jacobinisme le plus intransigeant, le personnage de César lui inspire une vive sympathie' (*La Vie intellectuelle*, p.105).
Stendhal's plan shows Cato meeting the same end as his son-in-law and disciple, Brutus, in an allusion to Plutarch's account of the latter's visitation by a ghost prior to his defeat and suicide (p.62). Thus the false opposition between Caesar and Pompey, although still dominant in Stendhal's plans for La Pharsale, already faces a challenge from the more logical opposition of Caesar and Brutus, key to Plutarch's Life of Caesar and Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, as well as implicit within Machiavelli's political writings, which superficially divide into the Caesarist The Prince and Republican Discourses.

The title of La Pharsale appears to refer to Lucan. Nonetheless, it is clear from his plan (pp.63-64) that Stendhal decided to base his characterization of Caesar on Dacier's translation of Plutarch's Life. The fourth cahier of La Pharsale, written from 11 January 1803 lists the authors Stendhal plans to consult. Lucan is among the 'ouvrages de première importance' (p.103). Towards the end of an ambitiously long list, however, in a section entitled 'Etudier', Stendhal makes the following entry: 'Plutarque, toujours et avant tout' (p.109).

On 6 February 1803, Stendhal turns his attention away from La Pharsale, in order to concentrate instead on a comedy entitled Les Deux hommes. On 10 February he writes: 'je montre que l'éducation philosophique a produit un homme vraiment honnête, tandis qu'au contraire l'éducation dévote a produit un homme faible inclinant à la scélératesse' (T, I, 243). Already, Stendhal is opposing the dupe to the fripon for comic effect. Furthermore, the dupe, honest product of enlightenment philosophy, will soon be transformed into another product of a philosophical education. Thus, in one of the plans for Les Deux hommes, the virtuous man is explicitly compared to Marcus Brutus as he appears in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar (p.273). By July 1804, Stendhal appears to have abandoned Plutarch's Life of Caesar altogether: 'de tous les hommes c'est Brutus que j'aime le mieux. J'aurai du plaisir à relire souvent sa vie. Acheter le Plutarque de Dacier in-12 dès que j'aurai de l'argent' (JL, II, 15).

Stendhal now wishes to buy a copy of Plutarch in order to

---

8 Plutarch, Vie des hommes illustres, translated by Joseph Dacier, 9 vols, vol 7 (Amsterdam: [n.pub.], 1735). Del Litto claims that Stendhal did not have a detailed knowledge of Lucan's Pharsalia, despite probably consulting Marmontel's 1766 two-volume translation (p.104).

9 Del Litto suggests that Stendhal may simultaneously be referring to Rousseau's Emile (La Vie intellectuelle, p.72).

10 Stendhal similarly notes of Brutus: 'de tous les hommes que j'ai rencontré[s] dans le monde ou dans l'histoire, c'est le plus grand comme le plus aimable à mes yeux' (JL, II, 14).
read the life of Caesar's assassin. In May 1806, Stendhal definitively abandoned La Pharsale, admitting he no longer felt himself equal to the task of writing an epic poem (OI, I, 448 [J]). Another reason may have been his growing disillusionment with Caesars in general, and Napoleon in particular: 'dès 1807, j'avais désiré passionnément qu'il ne conquît pas l'Angleterre; où se réfugier alors?' (OI, II, 858 [VHB]).

The first chapter of the Vie de Henry Brulard suggests that between 1800 and 1803 Brulard had spent his time 'à étudier M. de Turenne et à l'imiter' (OI, II, 537). In the Mémoires sur Napoléon, Turenne is mentioned alongside Hannibal, Frederick the Great and Caesar as a model conqueror (MN, p.215), whereas in the earlier Vie de Napoléon, Napoleon is shown admiring Turenne's ruthless ability to steel himself to crime (the burning of the Palatinate) in order to ensure victory (VN, p.6). Thus, according to Brulard, the Stendhal who planned La Pharsale had simultaneously planned to 'imiter' Turenne and so turn himself into a new Napoleon. The period between 1803 and 1806 shows Brulard forgetting his Napoleonic ambitions (OI, II, 537-38), instead reading Montaigne, Rousseau and Alfieri in a fifth-floor apartment of the rue d'Angivilliers and thereby exalting his quixotic idealism: 'je vivais solitaire et fou comme un Espagnol, à mille lieues de la vie réelle' (p.538). Montaigne and Rousseau both refer frequently to Plutarch, the latter famously ascribing the formation of his own character to the Lives of Brutus and Aristides. Alfieri's tragedies also concentrate on two of Plutarch's republican heroes, Timoleon (Timoleone) and Marcus Brutus (Bruto Secondo), as well as on the latter's ancestor and founder of the Roman Republic, Junius Brutus (Bruto Primo). Thus Brulard divides his own adult education into two three-year periods, the first dominated by the myth of Caesar (La Pharsale), the second by that of Brutus (Les Deux hommes).

2. 'Dérousseauiser mon jugement'

Mme Roland links her discovery of Rousseau to her earlier discovery of Plutarch:

J'avais vingt et un ans, j'avais beaucoup lu, je connaissais un assez grand nombre d'écrivains, historiens, littérateurs et philosophes; mais Rousseau me fit alors une impression comparable à

---

11 Stendhal expresses similar sentiments in the Voyage en France: 'je suis ravi que Napoléon n'ait pas compris l'invention du bateau à vapeur que Fulton lui offrait, dit-on; il eût ôté à la liberté et aux exilés de tous les pays le seul asile qui leur reste' (VFR, p.542).
12 In an autobiographical sketch dated 30 April 1837, Stendhal writes of himself: 'sa vie se passa ainsi de 1803 à 1806, ne faisant confidence à personne de ses projets, et détestant la tyrannie de l'Empereur qui volait la liberté à la France' (p.978).
celle que m'avait fait Plutarque à huit ans: il sembla que c'était l'aliment qui me fut propre et
l'interprète de sentiments que j'avais avant lui, mais que lui seul savait m'expliquer.

Plutarque m'avait disposée pour devenir républicaine: il avait éveillé cette force et cette fierté qui
en font le caractère; il m'avait inspiré le véritable enthousiasme des vertus publiques et de la
liberté. Rousseau me montra le bonheur domestique auquel je pouvais prétendre, et les ineffables
délices que j'étais capable de goûter. (p.302)

Stendhal's appreciation of Plutarch appears similarly to have been linked to his regard for
Rousseau, 'l'homme le plus fait pour les arts' (VIT, p.611 [PR]). Stendhal's first extant
letter, addressed to his sister Pauline and dated 9 March 1800, specifically links these two
authors:

Je te conseille de tâcher de lire la Vie des Grands Hommes de la Grèce, de Plutarque; tu verras
quand tu seras plus avancée en littérature que c'est cette lecture qui a formé le caractère de
l'homme qui a jamais la plus belle âme et le plus grand génie, Jean-Jacques Rousseau. (C, i, 2)

Stendhal's grievance against Rousseau (that the latter's works had rendered him 'solitaire
et fou comme un Espagnol') therefore also applied to Plutarch, as shown by a note of July
1804:

h[enri]. Construire son âme de manière à ce qu'elle ait le plus grand bonheur possible dans la
carrière que je prévois que je parcourrai. Je serai plus heureux et souvent moins vertueux. Voici
le point ou la religion est utile. Par exemple, la haine des tyrans m'a rendu malheureux l'année
dernière; je suis plus heureux cette année que je les hais moins. Hier j'ai lu la vie du divin Brutus
(le deuxième). Elle m'a rendu ma haine pour les tyrans, et depuis hier je suis malheureux.

[...] La haine des tyrans a été ma plus forte passion après l'amour de la gloire. (JL, I, 474)

Stendhal, eager both to find a private accommodation with Napoleon's régime prior to
embarking on an administrative career under the Empire in 1806, and to construct his
personality through his choice of texts, finds himself caught between his love for glory
(Caesar/Napoleon) and his Jacobin/Girondin hatred for tyrants.

Stendhal's regard for Plutarch, as opposed to his subjects, was always in question on
account of the latter's priesthood at Delphi (VIT, p.739 [PR]), as well as his reputation for
almost Fenelionic goodness, ill-suited to the hard-headed depiction of heroism (JL, II, 14).
Stendhal's critique of Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, written in April 1811, therefore
dismisses Plutarch as 'un vieux philologue à caractère doux' (JL, II, 340). This critique
can, however, be seen as evidence of Stendhal's frustration at his inability to compete with
his literary heroes, themselves Plutarch 'copyists'. Stendhal criticizes both Shakespeare
and Plutarch, implying that he would have done better with the available material (pp.341-42). Around this period, Stendhal similarly disparages Alfieri’s Plutarchian tragedies, *Bruto Secondo* and *Timoleone*, although again Stendhal’s doubts are ostensibly due to Alfieri’s personal shortcomings (in this case his aristocratic prejudice which Stendhal also blames for Alfieri’s hostility to the Revolution and its foremost general, Napoleon).

Stendhal’s criticisms of Alfieri also reveal an impatience, familiar from his criticisms of Rousseau, with the Italian dramatist’s moral inflexibility:

> Je suis convaincu qu’un com[ic] ba[rd] doit arranger sa vie d’une manière toute différente de celle d’Alfieri. Il eût eu plus d’esprit, plus de talent et plus de bonheur en ne voulant pas lutter de caractère et d’orgueil avec des institutions inébranlables; il fallait regarder la vie comme un bal masqué où le prince ne s’offense pas d’être croisé par le perruquier en domino. (*OI*, i, 663 [J, 1811])

These criticisms of Plutarch, Shakespeare and Alfieri come in the months that followed what was to prove the high-point of Stendhal’s civil service career: his nomination as an ‘auditeur’ to the Conseil d’Etat. They therefore come at a time when Stendhal was at least considering the possibility of abandoning his literary endeavours altogether, perhaps leaving such thankless work to someone else, as his will of 1 September 1810 implies.¹³ Brulard notes of this period: ‘réellement, je n’ai jamais été ambitieux, mais, en 1811, je me croyais ambitieux’ (*OI*, ii, 542).¹⁴

Stendhal uses the verb ‘dérousseauiser’ to refer to this process of accommodation with worldly values. The term is coined in an entry to the *Journal* dated 21 November 1804 (*OI*, i, 152). Interestingly, Stendhal proves as keen to ‘délaharpiser’ and ‘dégagnoniser’ his literary taste (educate his imagination) by reading Shakespeare, Corneille, Alfieri and other playwrights, as to ‘dérousseauiser’ his intellectual judgement by studying Destutt de Tracy and Lancelin. He further suggests Tacitus as a possible antidote to Rousseau, before emphasizing the importance of reading Sallust. Stendhal is therefore intent on balancing Rousseau’s worship of Brutus with a study of the Roman Emperors and of the leaders of the Catiline conspiracy respectively. The desire to retreat from the world is

---


¹⁴ Brulard insists on this point later in the chapter: ‘alors [1811] j’étais ou me croyais ambitieux; ce qui me gênait dans cette supposition c’est que je ne savais quoi désirer’ (p.546).
opposed to the desire to manipulate society, Brutus to Augustus and Catiline (Caesar),
imagination to realism. Thus, as early as 30 April 1805, Stendhal is blaming Rousseau's
influence for his own state of 'folie' (p.325). Around the same period, he also comments
on the need to correct his 'engouement de Rousseau' (p.315), suggesting in a letter of 6
February 1806 that he should learn instead to be a hypocrite (C, I, 281). Crouzet in
particular has made much of this phase in Stendhal's intellectual (as opposed to artistic)
development, repeatedly suggesting that it marks a definitive abandonment of his youthful
obsession with purity, associated by Stendhal with his study of Rousseau, and other
Plutarch 'copyists' during the Brutus-obsessed years of 1803 to 1806. Pearson, for his
part, has noted that 'the wish to "se dérousseauiser" is a recurrent theme in Stendhal's
writing between 1804 and 1811' (p.48). Certainly, by 1811, 'auditeur Beyle' appears the
obverse of his earlier Bohemian incarnation. Brulard notes that in October 1806 he began
to work as an 'adjoint' to the 'commissaires des Guerres', a 'place honnie par les soldats'
(OI, II, 538 [i.e.]). Place is typically used as a derogatory term in Stendhal's work,
designed to indicate the fribon attainment of wealth and status, more through the exercise
of improper influence than that of merit. Furthermore, this place would have been
despised by the dragoon of 1800. Stendhal goes on to list his promotions of August 1810
before ending the paragraph, and with it the opening chapter of the Vie, with the
deliberately ambiguous: 'mais je m'égaré' (p.538).

The second chapter begins as follows: 'je tombai avec Napoleon en avril 1814. Je vins
en Italie vivre comme dans la rue d'Angivilliers' (p.540). Thus, Napoleon's fall, although
culturally disastrous, occasions Stendhal's relapse into folie: 'qui le croirait! quant à moi
personnellement, la chute me fit plaisir' (ibid.). Stendhal returns in spirit to the apartment
where he spent the years between 1803 and 1806 reading about Brutus. Stendhal's doubts
with regard to Rousseau therefore coincide with his attempts to make the most of an
administrative career very much rooted in le réel as opposed to l'imaginaire. Stendhal's
admiration for the 'sentiments nobles, espagnols' (p.545) of Métilde Dembowski marks
instead a return to Rousseau and Plutarch. He is once again the idealist of 1806, willing to
abandon hopes of social advancement in favour of a more meditative life: 'je vois que la
rêverie a été ce que j'ai préféré à tout, même à passer pour homme d'esprit' (p.542).

3. Plutarquiser

Stendhal spent 1814 working on two very Plutarchian projects, the Vies de Haydn,
Mozart et Métastase (1815) and the Histoire de la peinture en Italie (1817). The former
is ostensibly an exercise in parallel biography; the latter carries Stendhal's biographical project forward, its third book given over to a *Vie de Léonard de Vinci*, its seventh to a *Vie de Michel-Ange*. Stendhal went on to start a *Vie de Napoléon* in 1817 and published the *Vie de Rossini* in 1823. Although the subjects of his modern lives, single or parallel, are mainly artists and musicians, Stendhal uses these biographies to advance political considerations: 'les arts sortent des mœurs' (*OI*, II, 102 [*J*, 1829]).

Plutarch's renewed influence can again be detected in *Le Vigneron Jean-Louis*, an 1823 sketch for a novel. Jean-Louis is implicitly a 'copy' of Plutarch's Marcus Brutus, the following description of Jean-Louis applying equally well to either hero: 'philosophe rêveur et tendre d'abord, il finit par avoir besoin de l'exercice de la force et des autres vertus, dans un degré héroïque, pour ne pas se mépriser soi-même' (*JL*, III, 164). Stendhal helps the reader identify the intended parallel between Jean-Louis and Brutus by having the former undertake a new translation of Plutarch in his spare time (p.166), just as Schiller famously alerts the audience of *The Robbers* to Karl von Moor's Brutus-like, and ultimately criminal heroism by insisting on the young Karl's obsession with Plutarch's heroes. Plutarch's Brutus resolves on tyrannicide because he realizes that his conception of legitimate republican government is inconsistent with allowing Caesar to fulfil his monarchical ambitions. Jean-Louis and Karl in turn resolve on forms of tyrannicide once they realize that their generous conception of human relations is inconsistent with the greed, hypocrisy and therefore tyranny of the men and women who daily intrude in their lives of philosophical reverie. In both cases, *force* (defined as moral and physical courage) is self-consciously posited as a way out of the self-contempt that arises from any collusion with the new tyranny of *l'odieux* (defined as the fraudulent pursuit of money on the part of *fripons*).

Stendhal has therefore modified Alfieri's definition of the criminal as an 'âme ardente' in search of a 'champ de bataille', in particular extending the latter's concept of tyranny (*Della tirannide*, pp.77-86). Stendhal shows Restoration and *juste milieu* governments promoting *fripomérie* as the sole means of shoring up their illegitimate power. Such *fripomérie*, however, soon exercises a tyranny of its own, outside the control of governments. Just as criminals such as Julien Sorel are shown to be the new tyrannicides,

---

15 Stendhal recommends *The Robbers* in *Qu'est-ce que le romantisme?* of 1818 (*JL*, III, 127). He later identifies himself with Schiller in *Les Gens dont on parle* of 1829 (pp.173-74).
so l'odieux, le vil, and friponnerie replace Alfieri's kings and ministers as the tyrants they must attempt to defeat. Indeed, the tyranny of Charles X is so irrelevant to Julien that Stendhal famously allows the latter's trial to continue under the former's alleged jurisdiction, even though the reader knows from the timescale that he has already been deposed. Furthermore, Frilair, the self-appointed local tyrant, is shown entirely at the mercy of a fripon jury. The criminal is no longer heroic for resisting the authority of a Charles X, as in Alfieri's analysis, but for refusing to collude with the vile aspirations of twelve jurors. Indeed, the violent criminal is heroic qua criminal precisely because his or her violence alone proves inimical to the spread of corruption and injustice (hence Stendhal's frequent comparisons of republicanism and brigandage).

Jean-Louis and Schiller's Karl von Moor both find themselves facing Julien Sorel's basic predicament: how to avoid being duped, without themselves becoming fripons. All three see criminal violence as the solution. Thus, Le Vigneron Jean-Louis foreshadows the conclusion explicitly drawn in Lamiel. The display of 'la bravoure personnelle' (force) in combination with 'la fermeté de caractère' ('la faculté de vouloir') allows Jean-Louis to circumvent the two established social roles of dupe and fripon. Jean-Louis represents a more forceful model of Stendhal's projected hero in Les Deux hommes, sharing the latter's repudiation of what Stendhal consistently sees as the cant of arbitrary convention. Jean-Louis and Karl therefore reject positive law as well as the arbitrary teachings of the church, already disowned in the plans for Les Deux hommes.

Jean-Louis, like the hero of Les Deux hommes and Schiller's Karl von Moor, is a Brutus. In The Robbers, however, Schiller links Karl's sublime generosity to the scheming ambition of his brother Franz. Karl seeks to impose a subjective ideal of justice (his own conception of natural law), whereas Franz denies the validity of any form of justice or ethical imperative. Both are seen by Schiller as Promethean in their refusal to rely on the workings of divine justice, and the play ends by condemning them equally, their iniquity symbolized by the fratricide and parricide upon which they respectively resolve. This parallel between the two characters is underlined in a song, performed by Karl (IV, 5). The song has two voices, that of Caesar and that of Brutus, and it soon becomes clear that Schiller associates Franz with the former, while identifying Karl with the latter. Schiller also points out, not quite accurately, that Brutus is himself a parricide. Therefore, although Karl does not realize this until the end of the play, by idolizing Brutus he is to some extent condoning his parricide brother. The moral divergence between the two brothers, initially the ostensible subject of the play, is finally shown to be an irrelevance.
Karl and Franz, Brutus and Caesar, each reserve the right to make their own laws. Schiller pits a tyrannical anti-hero against a tyrannicidal hero, before condemning both as villains. Fearlessness is shown to be directed by a conscious strategy, which places it in the service of either ambition (Franz) or generosity (Karl).

In contrast to *The Robbers*, *Le Vigneron Jean-Louis* offers no Caesarist anti-hero to act as a foil for the hero. By 1830, however, the sketch of Jean-Louis had developed into Julien Sorel, also a young provincial of little or no fortune, who similarly uses literary accounts of heroism as a means of transcending the limited choice of roles society offers. Julien reveals his Plutarchian lineage by deciding to re-enact rather than translate the *Lives*. As a result, *Le Rouge et le Noir* marks a turning-point in Stendhal's attitude to Plutarch. In particular, Stendhal uses Julien's apparently contradictory cults of Napoleon and Rousseau to establish a tension between two distinct camps of Plutarchian hero, the first led by Caesar and the second by Brutus. Out of this tension, Stendhal creates the first of his fully realized great souls, and in the process solves the problem evaded by his comic portrayal of Octave in *Armance*, namely how to render isolation and failure heroic. Thus the lives of Julien, Lucien, Fabrice and Lamiel constitute a series of modern parallel lives, each related to the examples of Brutus and Caesar, Republic and Empire.
II
NON-FICTION
1

**PROMENADES DANS ROME**

'Nous avons examiné, avec une émotion d'enfant, ce pavé sur lequel César et Brutus ont marché.'

*(VTT, p.747 [PR])*

1. **Le Colisée**

Rome is distinguished by its grandeur: 'la plupart des points de vue sont dominés par quelque reste d'aqueduc ou quelque tombeau en ruine qui impriment à cette campagne de Rome un caractère de grandeur dont rien n'approche' (p.605). Roman monuments refer the onlooker back to a glorious historical past: 'ici l'âme est préoccupée de ce grand peuple, qui maintenant n'est plus' (ibid.). Stendhal goes on to cite the Colosseum as an important example of this process:

C'est la plus belle des ruines; là respire toute la majesté de Rome antique. Les souvenirs de Tite-Live remplissaient mon âme; je voyais paraître Fabius Maximus, Publicola, Menennius Agrippa. Il est d'autres églises que Saint-Pierre: j'ai vu Saint-Paul de Londres, la cathédrale de Strasbourg, le dôme de Milan, Sainte-Justine de Padoue; jamais je n'ai rien rencontré de comparable au Colisée. (p.606)

At this point in the text, Stendhal breaks off for the day, preserving the fiction of the diary-form. His next entry begins by noting that 'mon hôte a placé des fleurs devant un petit buste de Napoléon qui est dans ma chambre' (ibid.). This juxtaposition of the Roman and French Empires is the first of many in the Promenades. Thus Stendhal relates the grandeur, simplicity and solidity of the Colosseum's architecture to the qualities of the Roman Empire as a system of government:

Les empereurs de Rome avaient eu l'idée simple de réunir en leur personne toutes les magistratures inventées par la république à mesure des besoins des temps. Ils étaient consuls, tribuns, etc. Ici tout est simplicité et solidité; c'est pour cela que les joints des immenses blocs de travertin qu'on aperçoit de toutes parts prennent un caractère étonnant de grandiose. (pp.615-16)

Stendhal later relates the grandeur of the Colosseum to that of individual Emperors:

Le Colisée est sublime pour nous, parce que c'est un vestige vivant de ces Romains dont l'histoire a occupé toute notre enfance. L'âme trouve des rapports entre la grandeur de leurs entreprises et
celle de cet édifice. Quel lieu sur la terre vit une fois une aussi grande multitude et de telles pompes? L'empereur du monde (et cet homme était Titus!) y était reçu par les cris de joie de cent mille spectateurs; et maintenant quel silence! (p.617)

The excavations of the Colosseum ordered by Napoleon and carried out between 1810 and 1814 (p.618) serve to remind us that a modern Emperor has emulated Titus. Stendhal ends his description of the Colosseum by again comparing Napoleon to ancient Rome: 'on peut faire aux Romains la même objection qu'à Napoléon. Ils furent criminels quelquefois, mais jamais l'homme n'a été plus grand' (p.611). He goes on to analyse the precise nature of the emotions aroused both by Napoleon and the Colosseum:

Quelle duperie de parler de ce qu'on aime! Que peut-on gagner? Le plaisir d'être ému soi-même un instant par le reflet de l'émotion des autres. Mais un sot, piqué de vous voir parler tout seul, peut inventer un mot plaisant qui vient salir vos souvenirs. De là, peut-être, cette pudeur de la vraie passion que les âmes communes oublient d'imiter quand elles jouent la passion. (pp.611-12)

Once again, Stendhal associates passion with the related concepts of duperie and authenticity, artistic enjoyment and emotion. In this particular instance, such emotion is rooted in the young Stendhal's reading of Latin histories. Stendhal's memories of Livy and Florus precede 'toute expérience' in the same way that Napoleon's Italian campaigns form the mind of the young Henry Brulard: 'Florus et Tite-Live nous ont raconté des batailles célèbres, et, à huit ans, quelle idée ne se fait-on pas d'une bataille! C'est alors que l'imagination est fantastique, et les images qu'elle trace immenses. Aucune froide expérience ne vient en rogner les contours' (pp.618-19). The simplicity of the Colosseum triggers similar flights of the imagination: 'l'architecte qui a bâti le Colisée a osé être simple. Il s'est donné garde de le surcharger de petits ornements jolis et mesquins, tels que ceux qui gâtent l'intérieur de la cour du Louvre' (p.615). This lack of ornament produces a fusion of nature and architecture conducive to the workings of memory:

Ce gazouillement paisible des oiseaux, qui retentit faiblement dans ce vaste édifice, et, de temps à autre, le profond silence qui lui succède, aident sans doute l'imagination à s'envoler dans les temps anciens. On arrive aux plus vives jouissances que la mémoire puisse procurer. (p.618)

Henceforth, the Promenades will supply a stream of historical memories uniting five ages of Rome (the Kings, the Republic, the Emperors, the early Popes and the Popes of the Renaissance): 'l'imagination de nos compagnes de voyage était tout à fait transportée dans

1 Stendhal later suggests that the Roman people 'fera à jamais, comme Napoléon, l'occupation des hommes qui ont reçu du ciel le feu sacré' (p.914).
les premiers temps de Rome' (p.914). The pavé of ancient Rome is never far below the modern streets of the city (p.816).

Stendhal brings to Rome translations of Livy, Florus, Suetonius and Plutarch, as well as the modern histories of Montesquieu and Gibbon (p.739). He uses these texts as a starting-point, grouping later historical exemplars around the figures of Marcus Brutus, representing the Roman Republic and Julius Caesar representing Empire. Although Stendhal is disparaging about Plutarch as an author (p.739), the latter's method is well to the fore in the Promenades. Thus the general parallels drawn between the military prowess of ancient Rome and Napoleon are followed by specific parallels, both explicit and implicit, between Napoleon and Scipio Africanus (p.782), Caesar (p.610), Julius II (p.680) and Sixtus V, who suppresses Roman brigandage using Napoleon's energetic methods (p.1034).

Napoleon's despotism is also implicitly compared to that of 'Lorenzo il magnifico', who found a way of containing l'esprit inquiet des républicains de Florence, plutôt à force de finesse qu'en abaissant trop le caractère national' (p.1014). Indeed, Napoleon is credited with a positive influence on the Italian, although not necessarily the French, national character: 'ce grand homme nuisible à la France à laquelle il vola sa liberté au 18 brumaire, a été fort utile à l'Italie' (p.1039). This positive influence can be measured in terms of attitudes to antiquity:

En 1711, on croyait qu'il fallait orner l'antique, et l'on mettait un obélisque vis-à-vis le Panthéon. En 1611, on démolissait les arcs de triomphe anciens pour élargir les rues, et l'on pensait bien faire. Chose singulière, le despotisme de Napoléon a retrempe le caractère d'un peuple étiolé par trois cents ans d'un despotisme tranquille et pacifique! C'est que Napoléon n'était pas ennemi de toutes les idées justes. (pp.798-99)

Stendhal is also concerned with oppositions familiar from earlier projects such as La Pharsale. Thus Caesar is opposed to Cato (p.797) as well as Brutus (p.747, 781, 809). The resurrection of these oppositions allows Stendhal to continue his analysis of Rome as the city of both simplicity and grandeur, generosity and ambition, Republicanism and Empire. It also leads Stendhal to focus on a number of Catonic exemplars, most notably Crescentius, who in the tenth century attempted to re-establish a Roman Republic and so
return 'la liberté à son pays' (p.852). In the process, Stendhal establishes a definite link between Brutus and Girondism:

Comme le marquis de Posa de Schiller, comme le jeune Brutus, Crescentius n'appartenait pas à son siècle; c'était un homme d'un autre âge. Notre Révolution s'est chargée de fournir un nom à cette espèce d'hommes généreux et malhabiles à conduire les affaires: c'était un girondin. Pour agir sur les hommes, il faut leur ressembler davantage; il faut être plus coquin. Peut-être faut-il être au moins aussi coquin que Napoléon. (p.852)

Stendhal later returns to Crescentius in more detail (pp.1061-64), repeating his point: 'le jeune Crescentius était animé de la passion la plus ardente pour la liberté; mais, comme les Girondins de notre Révolution, et Riego en Espagne, il estima trop le peuple' (p.1061). Girondins such as Mme Roland are dreamers, comparable to Rousseau in their determination to explore politics through the imaginary rather than le réel. Their politics therefore manifest themselves in the dramatic gestures of tyrannicide (Brutus, Charlotte Corday) and martyrdom (Mme Roland). Stendhal provides another example of such political quixotry in the form of Lorenzino de Médicis (later Musset's Lorenzaccio), 'celui-là même qui tua le duc Alexandre sans avoir eu l'esprit de convoquer un gouvernement qui pût réorganiser la liberté' (p.848). Lorenzino is finally a pale shadow of his distant relation 'Lorenzo il magnifico', seeking to recreate antiquity through purely artistic, as opposed to political gestures. Thus Lorenzino 'crut s'immortaliser en faisant enlever de nuit les têtes des huit statues de barbares prisonniers de guerre qui sont placées au-dessus des colonnes de l'arc de Constantin' (ibid.).

The Imperial model comes in for similar criticism. Thus Stendhal breaks off a description of the arch of Septimus Severus with the words: 'mais que nous importe la description d'un monument médiocre élevé à de méprisables despotes? Il vaut mieux parler de véritables grands hommes' (p.919). Indeed, the Promenades end with a call to arms against tyranny taken from Alfieri (p.1161). Just as Girondins find their generosity undermined by their unworldliness, so Caesars find the grandeur of their ambitions undermined by the squalid compromises of coquinerie. Thus Stendhal describes Pierre-Charles Lévesque's Histoire critique de la république romaine of 1807 as 'trois volumes contre les anciens Romains, dont l'âpre vertu déplaisait à l'usurpateur' (p.737). Napoleon may not be the enemy of all 'idées justes'; he is nonetheless the sworn enemy of

2 Stendhal maintains his characteristic interest in conspiracies, whether Caesarist or Republican, referring to Catiline (p.883), Cinna (pp.706, 762) and Augustus's general fear of the 'vieux jacobins de Rome' (p.917).
republicanism, controlling the French people through his standing armies in the manner of a Caesar: 'Napoléon faisait peur aux Parisiens par sa garde et par le souvenir du 13 vendémiaire; les empereurs romains, tant qu'ils n'eurent pas une garde dévouée, firent la cour au peuple' (p.763).

In the Promenades, Stendhal offers a number of exemplars who combine the virtues of a Brutus and a Caesar, a Mme Roland and a Napoleon:

Mgr Colonna m'a demandé de lire avec lui l'Histoire de la Révolution de M. Thiers. Je lui explique les parties de cet ouvrage peu intelligibles pour un étranger. Il est frappé des figures colossales de ces hommes qui, en 1793, empêchèrent les soldats autrichiens d'arriver à Paris. Il ne veut pas croire qu'en 1800 nous fussions dégoûtés de la liberté. (p.866)

Similarly, another pair of exemplars, one ancient, the other modern, manage to reconcile simplicity and grandeur:

J'ai vu aux fenêtres du palais du pape qui donnent sur la rue Pia, des serviettes étendues pour les faire sécher. Cette simplicité me touche. Suivant ma façon de sentir, elle n'exclut nullement la grandeur; Cincinnatus et Washington étaient ainsi, mais non pas le maréchal de Villars. (p.815)

Stendhal will go on to investigate the possibilities of such a reconciliation through his opposition of Brutus and Caesar, two Plutarchian heroes locked in a heroic conflict, together capable of exalting the ideal reader into emulating the habitudes and passions of antiquity.

2. Trastevere

Stendhal saw the Promenades as an opportunity to present ideas already developed in earlier works in a more palatable form (Ol, II, 103 [J, 1829]). An example of this process can be found in Stendhal's return to the ideas that underpinned Alfieri's analysis of modern Italian criminals (VIT, pp.425-26 [RNF(26)]). Stendhal portrays the energetic criminals of Trastevere as the spiritual (rather than biological) heirs to 'le peuple roi' of ancient Rome (p.618 [PR]): 'les Transtévériens prétendent descendre des anciens Romains; rien de moins prouvé; mais ce grand nom leur donne du cœur: noblesse oblige' (p.756). This spiritual inheritance accounts in part for Rome's ready acceptance of the French Republican model:

Je ne doute pas que le grand nom de Romain n'ait beaucoup contribué à donner au peuple cette élévation de caractère. Lors de la république romaine, en 1798, de simples ouvriers se firent
soldats, et, dès le premier jour qu'ils vinrent l'ennemi, donnèrent des preuves d'une bravoure héroïque. (p.1097)

Nonetheless, Stendhal's most expansive tribute to criminal energy takes as its subject not a Roman, nor even an Italian, but rather Adrien Lafargue, a Frenchman from the Hautes-Pyrénées (pp.1069-79): 'le lecteur me pardonnera-t-il un récit bien long et un épisode de plusieurs pages, qui n'a aucun rapport avec Rome?' (p.1069). Stendhal's apparent digression is of course designed to bring the reader back to the world of ancient Rome. Thus Lafargue is explicitly compared to Napoleon (pp.1079-80), the pair of Julius Caesar.

Stendhal is forever skirting around an apparent paradox. The energy of Rome renders its citizens superior to their French counterparts: 'ce peuple est moins éloigné que nous des grandes actions; il prend quelque chose au sérieux. En France, dès qu'on a expliqué avec esprit le pourquoi d'une bassesse, elle est oubliée' (p.656). Yet the impetus for such 'grandes actions' last came from the despotism of French Empire (pp.798-99). Furthermore, the reawakening of Roman heroism in 1798 is implicitly related to the example set by General Duphot, assassinated in a Roman riot of the same year (p.744).

Stendhal later relates three separate incidents: the murder of the French diplomat, Hugues Basseville, in 1793, the murder of Duphot in 1798 and the state of near-anarchy that followed the fall of Napoleon:

A la chute du gouvernement de Napoléon, Pie VII envoya à Rome un certain personnage qui se hâta de destituer les autorités établies par les Français; et de propos délibéré laissa Rome sans gouvernement pendant trente heures. Les citoyens honnêtes furent saisis de terreur. Heureusement, la canaille de ce pays, la plus féroce du monde, car elle est façonnée par les moines mendiant, ne s'aperçut pas de cette belle occasion de massacrer et de piller. Si les Transtévérins [a variant of Transtévériens] et autres sans-culottes de Rome eussent compris toute l'étendue de leur bonheur, ils auraient commencé par égorger les sept à huit cents citoyens qui avaient accepté un emploi quelconque des Français. Ce peuple, alléché par le sang comme le tigre, eût massacré probablement tous les riches marchands, et ensuite il se serait enivré et endormi au coin des rues. Cette journée eût fait un beau pendant avec l'assassinat du ministre Prina, à Milan.

C'est cette hideuse canaille de Rome qui fut employée par les mêmes personnages, en 1793 et en 1795 [sic], pour assassiner M. Basseville et le général Duphot. (p.861)

The energy of Trastevere must be organized, whether by a Republic or a military Dictatorship. Otherwise, its greatest strength becomes a weakness and the 'canaille hideuse' will find itself manoeuvred to act against its own interests, that is to say against
the establishment of an equitable rule of law. Thus Stendhal later returns to the anarchy brought about by the fall of Napoleon:

Dans moins d'une heure, Rome se trouva sans gouvernement, sans police, sans aucun moyen de prévenir ou de réprimer les crimes. Le parti fanatique espérait que cette populace redoutable, qui avait autrefois tranché les jours du général Duphot, et surtout les Transtévérins [sic] qui habitent la partie de la ville située au sud-ouest du Tibre, assassineraient les deux ou trois cents hommes choisis auxquels Napoléon avait confié les magistratures de Rome. (p.1000)

Such anarchy is the product of fripon government:

C'est que l'éducation, loin de rien faire pour le Romain, agit en sens inverse; c'est que le gouvernement et la civilisation agissent contre la vertu et le travail, et lui enseignent sans le vouloir le crime et la fraude. Par exemple, le gouvernement traite avec des assassins: que peut-il faire de pis? Leur manquer de parole, et il n'y manque pas. [...].

Les actions de peu d'importance qui remplissent la journée d'un petit marchand, comme celui qui vient de me vendre le portrait de Béatrix Cenci, prennent, en moins de cinquante ans, la couleur du gouvernement, et se décident par des motifs analogues et d'après les mêmes habitudes morales que les actions importantes. (pp.867-68)

Energy has been taught (habituated) to go hand in hand with fraud. The reference to Béatrix Cenci is therefore all the more telling. Later the heroine of Les Cenci, Béatrix is both innocent victim (Mme Roland) and tyrannicide (Charlotte Corday). Yet the haggling that has presumably characterized Stendhal's purchase of her portrait indicates Rome's fall into the fripon values that already disfigure Stendhal's France of l'ordre inverse. Through friponnerie, the energy of Trastevere is turned against those civil institutions designed to provide a 'champ de bataille' and a 'moyen d'agir' to 'âmes ardentes supérieures à toute crainte'. Thus, the extreme ferocity of the local population makes Stendhal fear for the future of a revolution:

Sous Pie VII, en dépit des efforts du cardinal Consalvi, et surtout depuis la mort de ce pape, les Romains sont gouvernés suivant l'ordre inverse. Ce sont les plus ineptes qui obtiennent les places et jouissent de toutes les distinctions. Comme ces nigauds ont la conscience qu'on se moque d'eux, ils deviendraient facilement cruels; mais le poignard du carbonarisme les retient. Le peuple indigné croit qu'il est mûr pour la république. 'Ce régime serait le pire de tous pour vous', disais-je à mes amis; 'songez que Robespierre, Marat et les auteurs des atrocités du régime de la Terreur, avaient été formés par le gouvernement faible et bon de Louis XVI.' Ce langage sincère me fait passer pour un homme de l'extrême-droite. (p.757)

At the same time, Stendhal recognizes that the qualities he most admires betray themselves precisely through excesses of cruelty. In the Promenades, Stendhal marvels at 'les
rigueurs salutaires de la Saint-Barthélemy et de l'Inquisition' (p.937). Stendhal acknowledges that 'la religion chrétienne permettait alors toutes les passions, toutes les vengeance, et n'exigeait qu'une chose: c'est qu'on crût en elle' (p.651). He therefore delights in the fact that 'la Saint-Barthélemy' is still 'classée à Rome parmi les événements glorieux au catholicisme' (p.766). Such cruelty is attributed to religious fanaticism: 'cette passion inconnue des anciens est la pire de toutes' (p.858). It does not prevent Stendhal from admiring St Paul (p.725, 999), compared to both Caesar and Napoleon (p.610), as well as fanatical Popes such as Sixtus V and Paul IV. The latter, later a protagonist of *La Duchesse de Palliano*, is described as 'l'un des fanatiques les plus impétueux et les plus singuliers qui aient paru dans le monde':

Depuis qu'il était pape, il se croyait infaillible, et était sans cesse occupé à examiner s'il n'avait pas la volonté de faire brûler tel ou tel hérétique. Il craignait de se damner en n'obéissant pas à la partie infaillible de sa conscience. (p.1033)

Paul IV is using his imagination to construct external reality in the manner of a Stendhalian *don Juan* (Gilles de Retz, François Cenci).

Stendhal similarly admires the victims of cruelty, flirting with Joseph de Maistre's notions of sacrifice, expiation and reversibility (p.885, 952-55):

Dès que la religion des martyrs a été la plus forte, elle a eu ses autodafés, et plusieurs rois d'Espagne en ont joué comme Néron. Les pauvres brûlés sont toujours les mêmes, les âmes passionnées et poétiques. La civilisation, en étiolant ces deux dernières qualités, va détruire la cruauté. (p.679)

Duphot and Napoleon are shown to have taken over the civil and despotic functions of the Papacy, formerly exercised by men of energy, but more recently surrendered by the apathetic successors of a Paul IV. Stendhal underlines this point by reporting the following joke: 'le peuple romain, fort moqueur, prétend qu'en 1796 c'était la République française, une et indivisible, qui était chanoine de Saint-Jean-de-Latran' (p.943). The joke contains a double irony for Stendhal. The godless Republic alone can elevate itself to the level required for the proper exercise of Papal functions. This same Republic was not, however, to remain 'une et indivisible' for very long. Indeed, 1796 marks the high point of Napoleon's career as a Republican general. The opposition between energy and

---

^ Stendhal earlier notes that 'l'antiquité n'eut ni Inquisition, ni Saint-Barthélemy, ni tristesse puritaine' (p.689).
republicanism in Trastevere is therefore mirrored by that between Empire and Republic, Caesar and Brutus.

3. 'La beauté parfaite'

The energy of Trastevere leads Stendhal to re-examine the familiar opposition between liberty and the arts. Thus Stendhal relates the murder of Basseville to Vincenzo Monti's poem, 'La Basvigliana':

Ce pauvre Hugues Basseville ne se doutait pas, en mourant, qu'il allait être immortalisé par Monti. Cet assassinat politique, célébré comme un haut fait dans lequel la victime a tort, a donné lieu à l'admirable poème de la Basvigliana (égal ou supérieur à tout ce qu'a fait lord Byron); ce qu'il y a de plaisant, c'est que Monti était libéral alors et mourait de peur. Il avait connu Basseville, lui avait offert des renseignements pour ses projets d'organisation libérale, et ne pensait pas un mot de ce qu'il écrivait. Qui le dirait en lisant ces vers magnifiques? (p.861)

Monti's example flies in the face of Alfieri's insistence on il vero as a measure of artistic worth. It therefore leads Stendhal to a number of conclusions. First that passion can be voided of specific ideological content, and even counterfeited (p.865), second that art might best be produced outside the civilizing platitudes of liberal politics (p.657, 706, 825) and finally that barbarism and cruelty therefore favour artistic production. Caravaggio is exemplary in this respect:

Stendhal goes on to cite the example of the sculptor Antonio Canova, also a man of humble origins searching for live models:

Canova ne songeait aux intrigues du monde que pour les craindre; c'était un ouvrier, simple d'esprit, qui avait reçu du ciel une belle âme et du génie. Dans les salons, il cherchait les beaux traits et les regardait avec passion. A vingt-cinq ans, il avait le bonheur de ne pas savoir l'orthographe; aussi à cinquante refusait-il la croix de la Légion d'honneur parce qu'il y avait un serment à prêter. (p.879)  

4 Stendhal compares Raphael to Canova, noting that 'ce grand homme n'eut aucun besoin de l'intrigue' (p.638). Similarly, 'Michel-Ange manquait d'intrigue pour se faire employer' (p.686).
Canova goes on to refuse Napoleon's offer of a house and pension, preferring instead to return to his *troisième étage* in Rome. Stendhal gives 1811 as the year of this refusal, the same year that saw the heights of his own ambition. Stendhal suggests that Canova would have seen 'son génie se refroidir' had he accepted Napoleon's offer and moved to a France 'occupée alors de victoires et d'ambition' (p.879). Stendhal similarly suggests that the politics of Jacobinism finally prove inimical to the arts:

Nous avons continué ainsi jusqu'à deux heures du matin à faire les jacobins en prenant du punch excellent chez un grand seigneur. Il y a cinquante ans, nous cussions parlé peinture et musique; et vous demandez pourquoi les arts tombent! Ils tombent même ici. Rome a cet avantage immense d'avoir du loisir ou d'être trop petite ville pour que le charlatanisme y soit possible; mais même ici va mancando l'anima, comme disait Monti: la passion s'esteint tous les jours. On ne pense qu'à la politique. (p.892)

Politics are the province of French *esprit*, producing winners and losers, *dupes* and *fripons*. The *passion* prompted by Napoleon's victories or the generosity of Jacobin ideals is undermined by the 'intrigue du monde' that accompany the pursuit of ambition and political programmes. It is in this way that the arts find themselves separated from action. Yet art and politics ideally share a common impetus. Stendhal acknowledges this in an early comparison of the Spanish and Italian national characters. Thus Spanish women are credited with 'l'énergie qu'il faut pour les grandes actions' whereas Italian women possess 'le feu sombre et voilé des passions tendres et profondes' (p.645). 'Une ressemblance des deux peuples, c'est qu'une Espagnole, comme une Romaine, désire la même chose *six mois de suite*, ou n'est agitée par aucun désir, et s'ennuie' (ibid.).

It is only through the unification of politics and art, action and language, reality and imagination that the *beau parfait* can be attained:

La jeune *marchesina* Métilde Dembos*** a été d'une éloquence admirable; elle a parlé du dévouement sincère, plein d'alarité, sans ostentation, mais sans bornes, que certaines âmes nobles ont pour leur Dieu ou pour leur amant. C'est ce que j'ai entendu, dans ce voyage-ci, de plus voisin du *beau parfait*. (p.865)

Stendhal is referring back to the epigraph of the *Promenades*, attributed to Shakespeare:

**ESCALUS**
Mon ami, vous m'avez l'air d'être un peu misanthrope et envieux?

**MERCUTIO**
J'ai vu de trop bonne heure la beauté parfaite. (p.595)
Needless to say, Stendhal has invented this epigraph with its allusion not so much to Stendhal's love for Matilde Dembowskí but rather to his early brush with the glories of French Republicanism and in particular Napoleon's Italian campaign of 1796. Stendhal is therefore fusing his love for Napoleon, later the 'Dieu' of Julien Sorel, and his love for the Carbonarist Matilde/Métilde. This fusion of politics and love is again illustrated later in the Promenades:

Une dame anglaise vient de rapporter de Londres des fac-similés de huit ou dix lettres de Bonaparte. Bien différent de la plupart des conquérants, qui furent des êtres grossiers, on voit que Napoléon était fou d'amour pendant sa campagne de 1796; ceci ne le distingue pas moins que ce culte de la vraie gloire et de l'opinion de la postérité, qui semble si absurde à M. Bourrienne.

Ces lettres d'amour de Napoléon ont le plus grand succès à Rome. Mme R*** disait, en les lisant: 'On voit bien qu'il était Italien.' C'est aussi mon avis. (p.960)

Napoleon can therefore be compared to the two Italians 'du plus rare mérite' who represent 'la réunion la plus parfaite du plus rare bon sens, de l'âme de feu qu'il faut pour les beaux-arts et d'un esprit étonnant' (p.1096). Napoleon unites the personal qualities required both for great actions and for the proper understanding of the arts. Not only is he constant in his desires (through his 'culte de la vraie gloire'), he also pursues these desires with an eye on 'l'opinion de la postérité'.

Stendhal earlier relates this concern for the opinion of posterity to the emulation of historical exemplars, a process promoted by the Roman Republic:

Un empereur, ou un riche citoyen, parvenait-il à acheter un petit coin de terrain vacant dans une rue à la mode, il en profitait bien vite pour élever un monument par lequel il prétendait s'illustrer. Formés par les idées d'une république qui avait honoré par des monuments Horatius Coélès et tant de héros, les citoyens riches du siècle d'Auguste avaient horreur de l'oubli profond où ils allaient tomber dès le lendemain de leur mort. (p.893)

The elevation of republican monuments can therefore be compared to the Roman practice of granting triumphs, defined as a 'cérémonie qui mit l'émulation parmi les patriciens et empêcha ces aristocrates de tomber dans la torpeur, comme ceux de Venise' (p.739). Ancient Rome is perennially concerned with uniting beauty and utility. As a result, it chooses models (exemplars) in nature and seeks to represent them simply and honestly. Stendhal therefore praises the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius:
Pour l'expression, le naturel admirable et la beauté du dessin, la statue de Marc Aurèle est le
ccontraire de celles que nos sculpteurs nous donnent à Paris. Par exemple, le Henri IV du Pont-
Neuf n'a l'air occupé que de ne pas tomber de cheval. Marc Aurèle est tranquille et simple. Il ne
se croit nullement obligé d'être un charlatan, il parle à ses soldats. On voit son caractère et
presque ce qu'il dit. (p.740)

This unity of word and action, image and character is contrasted to the modern cleavage
(hypocrisy) between image and reality:

Les esprits un peu matériels qui ne sont émus toute la journée que par le bonheur de gagner de
l'argent ou par la crainte d'en perdre préféreront le Louis XIV au galop de la place des Victoires.
Quoique je ne voulusse pas passer ma vie avec ces sortes de gens, cependant j'avouerai sans peine
qu'ils ont tout à faire raison. L'action courageuse qu'ils accomplissent est la base du bon goû:
louer hardiment ce qui fait plaisir, de là mon admiration pour M. Simond, de Genève, qui
plaisante le Jugement dernier de Michel-Ange. (pp.740-41)

Stendhal concludes that the ancients always viewed beauty as 'la saillie de l'utile' (p.744). He
goes on to modify this opinion, noting that the Pantheon, 'bâti par le gendre d'Auguste,
fut le premier grand monument d'architecture non utile' (p.762). The construction of the
Pantheon, as well as the later basilicas, is explained in political terms. Thus Stendhal
comments that Augustus was rightly fearful of assassination (ibid.) before noting that 'les
basiliques les plus vastes et les plus commodes furent élevées dans les premiers siècles du
gouvernement impérial, et contribuèrent à faire oublier la liberté' (p.763). Indeed, the first
basilica (the Aemilia) was funded by Caesar in an attempt to buy support for his impending
dictatorship (ibid.). Thus the cleavage between art and utility coincides with that between
ruler and citizen, occasioned by the fripon tyranny of the Augustan Empire.5

The Renaissance revival of ancient artistic and architectural conventions therefore faced an
interesting set of problems. Unsurprisingly, given the tyrannical nature of Papal rule, the
dome of St Peter's was finally modelled on that of the Pantheon. Bramante had initially
thought to give St Peter's a cupola on the model of Brunelleschi's design for the cathedral
in Florence: 'il sentit que cet ornement, par son inutilité et par sa grandeur, convenait à la
religion chrétienne' (p.681). Michelangelo's eventual design achieves the same effect; he
first needed, however, to walk around the Colosseum in order to 'monter son âme au ton
qu'il fallait pour pouvoir sentir les beautés et les défauts de son propre dessin' (p.614).

5 Stendhal later makes the same point slightly differently: 'jusqu'au temps des Gracques,
l'architecture fut sévère, et ne chercha que l'utile' (p.914). The Gracchi were of course
early challengers to the Republican constitution.
A fratone, defined by Stendhal as 'un moine intrigant', denies that the Catholic religion ought to be defended as being either useful or beautiful, that is to say 'utile à nos plaisirs' (p.774). Yet it is precisely this new definition of beauty and utility that reconciles Stendhal to the Popes credited with centuplicating 'l'étendue de l'amour du beau, en lui donnant pour auxiliaire la peur de l'enfer' (p.979). The pursuit of beauty as an end in itself, an end justified by the utility of pleasure, characterizes a series of sublime despots, ranging from Julius Caesar to Napoleon, via 'Lorenzo il magnifico' and the exemplary Popes (Julius II, Leo X, Sixtus V) to whom both Caesar and Napoleon are compared. Thus an act of bravado on the part of Charles VIII is discussed in the following terms: 'sans doute cette expédition fut une folie; elle ne fut utile à personne, mais elle fut belle. C'est parce qu'il fut, sans s'en douter, un artiste, que nous avons répété si souvent aujourd'hui le nom de Charles VIII' (p.932). Perhaps Stendhal should reappraise the bravado of Lorenzino's anti-tyrannical gesture.

Napoleon's campaigns nonetheless prove superior: 'les guerres de Napoléon ont été extrêmement belles et un peu utiles. De là leur réputation, qui durera des milliers d'années' (p.933). Thus only paintings of Napoleonic subjects, such as Gros's La Bataille d'Aboukir (p.1119) and La Peste de Jaffa (p.1120; see also VFR, p.209 [MT]) or Vernet's La Bataille de Montmirail (p.772) manage to escape 'l'amour du laid, qui caractérise nos jeunes peintres' (ibid.). Modern, post-Napoleonic utility cannot for its part be reconciled with beauty (p.933). It is for this reason that tourists find themselves disoriented in Rome: 'dans la ville qu'ils habitent, ils voyaient un objet d'art huit ou dix fois par an; à Rome, il leur faut voir chaque jour huit ou dix choses qui ne sont nullement utiles pour faire gagner de l'argent, et nullement plaisantes; elles ne sont que belles' (p.672). Utility, whether political (generous) or artistic (pleasurable), cannot be reconciled with the charlatanisme that imposes fashion on taste through the mechanisms of esprit and vanité (p.770). Money is finally ugly: 'la bouche surtout, exempte de toute sympathie chez les gens à argent, est souvent d'une atroce laideur' (p.721).

'Un beau mensonge'

France's rising 'culte du laid' (p.874), later explored in the Mémoires d'un touriste, owes its success not only to the charlatanism promoted by the press, but also to the obsession with imitation (as opposed to the emulation of ancient Rome): 'à Paris, la vie est fatiguée, il n'y a plus de naturel ni de laisser-aller. A chaque instant il faut regarder le modèle à imiter, qui, tel que l'épée de Damoclès, apparaît menaçant sur votre tête' (p.1079). It is
little surprise, then, to learn that Paris is the home of paintings which seek to copy Roman original: 'ce sont les tableaux que l'on voit à Paris qui empêchent d'admirer les fresques de Rome' (p.600).

Canova again proves exemplary in his rejection of imitation, and with it aesthetic philosophy:

Chez M. Tambroni, nous parlions quelquefois, devant Canova, de la nécessité pour les sculpteurs des nations civilisées d'imiter les gestes des acteurs célèbres, d'imiter une imitation. Nous avions beau chercher à être piquants, Canova ne nous écoutait guère; il faisait peu de cas des discussions philosophiques sur les arts; il aimait mieux sans doute joir des images charmantes que son imagination lui présentait. (p.887)

Stendhal expands on this theme in a later discussion of ancient statuary (for instance the Aristide of Naples): 'les sculpteurs à qui l'on doit ces portraits sublimes savaient faire de l'idéal (ils savaient le choisir dans la nature, et non pas le copier sottement d'après quelque statue admirée)' (p.925). Thus Canova, the son of 'un simple ouvrier' (p.887), has found a way of emulating the ancients. Stendhal restates his views of 1818, allowing for imitation only in the form of Dante's emulation of Virgil. Thus Tasso receives qualified praise: 'quel divin poète, quand il oublie d'imiter!' (p.970).

6 Stendhal's analysis of imitation offers him a new way to tackle the opposition of force and grâce, related to the oppositions of ancient and Christian beauty, Republican and Imperial patronage of the arts, Brutus and Caesar. Stendhal also uses the Promenades to oppose Michelangelo and Raphael. Indeed, he goes so far as to include a Plutarchian 'vie de Raphaël' (pp.635-39) and 'vie de Michel-Ange' (pp.1129-37).

Stendhal describes how Michelangelo was employed by the short-lived Florentine Republic:

Soderini, homme faible placé par des sots à la tête de la République de Florence, engagea le jeune Buonaroti [sic] à peindre à fresque une partie de la salle du conseil dans le palais du gouvernement. Il fut chargé de représenter une bataille qui avait eu lieu dans la guerre de Pise. Le jour de l'action, la chaleur était accablante; une partie de l'infanterie se baignait tranquille dans l'Arno, lorsque tout à coup on cria aux armes; l'ennemi s'avancait. Michel-Ange s'attacha à représenter ce premier mouvement d'épouvante et de courage; ce n'était pas là une bataille. Son

6 Similarly, Stendhal notes in the Vie de Henry Brulard: 'à mes yeux, quand par bonheur le Tasse oublie d'imiter Virgile ou Homère, il est le plus touchant des poètes' (OI, II, 732).
carton a péri. Voir l'estampe des Grimpeurs, par Augustin de Venise; c'est tout ce qui nous reste de ce grand effort de l'art, pour sortir de la froide et minutieuse copie de la nature.

Le vulgaire a coutume de dire que Michel-Ange manque d'idéal; c'est lui qui, parmi les modernes, a inventé l'idéal. (pp.1130-31)

Stendhal instead regards Raphael's drawings for the fresco of Constantine's victory over Maxentius in the Stanze, later painted by Giulio Romano, 'comme une des grandes erreurs de Raphaël; très probablement, il n'avait jamais vu de bataille' (p.819). Stendhal suggests Raphael's drawing owes more to 'l élégance' than to 'la vérité' (ibid.). Raphael therefore produces a different kind of ideal:

Tous les peintres modernes, chargés de représenter des batailles, ont pillé à plaisir le dessin de Raphaël. Probablement jamais on ne se battit ainsi; mais c'est un beau mensonge. Ce tableau ressemble à une bataille des Romains comme l'Iphigénie de Racine ressemble à l'histoire tragique qui se passa en Aulide. Il a encore été imité par MM. Gros et Girodet. La Bataille de Montmirail, de M. Horace Vernet, est enfin venue arrêter ce mouvement d'imitation. Pour la première fois, un tableau a osé représenter la manière dont on se bat aujourd'hui. (p.772)

Raphael's ignorance of military operations may lead him into error; he is nonetheless capable of producing 'un beau mensonge'. To this extent, both Raphael and Michelangelo are finally untruthful in their art, even though they both take reality as their starting-point:

Comme les grands artistes en formant leur idéal suppriment certains ordres de détails, les artistes ouvriers les accusent de ne pas voir ces détails.

Un ouvrage d'art n'est qu'un beau mensonge.

On ne trouve pas de muscles en repos chez Michel-Ange; les muscles extenseurs sont aussi renflés que les muscles adducteurs, ce fut un des moyens de son idéal. (pp.1136-37)

Raphael depicts the Imperial/Christian ideal of beauty for pleasure (le beau moderne), Michelangelo the Republican ideal of utilitarian beauty (le beau antique). Both artists emulate the art of the ancients. Stendhal notes that at the time of Julius II's first commissions, 'la seule passion que nous trouvions chez Raphaël, est celle de l'antique' (p.638). Furthermore, Raphael's method is reminiscent of that employed by Canova and the sculptor of the Neapolitan Aristides: 'nous verrons, dans une lettre adressée au comte Baldassar Castiglione, par Raphaël, qu'il cherchait la beauté en copiant les plus belles têtes de femmes qu'il pouvait rencontrer et corrigéant leurs défauts' (p.693). As a result, he is at times capable of portraying strength of character and even 'cette féroceité que l'on
rencontre dans le quartier de Trastevere' (p.639). The mark of the ancients on
Michelangelo is even more pronounced:

Un jour, le hasard le conduisit dans les jardins de San Marco, où l'on déballait des statues
antiques qui arrivaient de Grèce, d'où Laurent le Magnifique les faisait venir à grands frais. Il
paraît que, dès le premier instant, ces ouvrages immortels frappèrent Michel-Ange. Le triomphe
du peintre Ghirlandaio, son maître, était lorsqu'il faisait le portrait d'un homme, de bien copier
une verrue ou un petit pli de la peau; les misérables détails plaisent au vulgaire parce qu'il les
comprend. La vue de l'antique fit sentir à Michel-Ange qu'il faut être averse de l'attention du
spectateur. (p.1129)

There is, however, an important difference in approach. Raphael has allowed himself to
be influenced by the philosophy of aesthetics: 'le travail qui devait se faire dans la tête d'un
grand peintre pour trouver la beauté était embarrassé par les rêveries de Platon, fort à la
mode du temps de Raphaël' (p.693). This theoretical approach is underlined by Raphael's
choice of correspondents. Castiglione was of course the author of The Courtier, a mirror
for princes in the form of a dialogue on the ideal courtly life, modelled on that of Urbino,
Raphael's hometown. Raphael is therefore associated both with the sublime tyranny of
Urbino, comparable to that of 'Lorenzo il magnifico' in Florence, and associated with that
of his famous patrons, Julius II (p.818) and Leo X (p.833).

Michelangelo, by contrast, can be associated more with the Machiavelli of the republican
Discourses than with The Prince or Castiglione. Whereas Leonardo agreed to become the
engineer-in-chief of Cesare Borgia, model for The Prince (p.1018), Michelangelo agreed
to serve the Florentine Republic in the same capacity: 'ses constructions hardies et habiles
avaient beaucoup contribué à retarder la prise de Florence' (p.1132). This unexpected
application of Michelangelo's talents is reminiscent of Plutarch's portrait of Archimedes in
the Life of Marcellus. Michelangelo therefore combines art with science, utility
(simplicity) with beauty, where Raphael combines 'le grandiose de l'antique et l'onction
d'un chrétien!' (p.926). Michelangelo is a Catholic painter only to the extent that he
depicts le terrible: 'ce grand homme commença, comme Canova, par imiter fidèlement la
nature. Ensuite, les prédications et la mort de Savonarola lui firent comprendre la religion
catholique, et il adopta le style sublime et terrible dans lequel personne ne peut lui être
compared' (p.699). Stendhal therefore suggests that the differences between Raphael and
Michelangelo can finally be explained by the fact that the former was quietly working in Perugino's workshop at a time when the latter, haunted by the torments of Savonarola's execution, gave up work altogether (p.1019).

Raphael, 'cette âme tendre, généreuse et si amoureuse du beau' (p.638), responds perfectly to the Rome of Julius II and its 'amour du beau'. He is the ideal Christian artist: 'la peinture des passions nobles et tragiques, la résignation d'un martyr, le respect tendre de la Madone pour son fils, qui est en même temps son Dieu, font la gloire de Raphaël et de l'école romaine' (p.994). Michelangelo, on the other hand, marks his paintings with 'la force et la terreur' (p.648) of antiquity. Canova even suggests that Michelangelo's work betray too much force (p.688). Stendhal's travelling companions go still further:

Le son de voix de ces paysans, qui me semble beau, fait horreur à nos compagnes de voyage. Telle est l'origine de tous nos différends: beaucoup de choses insignifiantes à mes yeux leur semblent jolies, et ce qui est la beauté sublime pour moi leur fait peur. Les Romains, qui entendent parler de Michel-Ange depuis leur enfance, sont accoutumés à le vénérer, c'est un culte. Leur âme simple et grande le comprend. (p.689)

Michelangelo can finally be compared to the 'canaille hideuse' that threatens a new Terror and the Trasteverini whose ferocity Raphael can portray but not emulate. The fear both Michelangelo and the energy of the 'canaille' prompt in Stendhal's friends mirrors modern government's horror of 'les gens de génie impertinents, c'est-à-dire les Michel-Ange, les Canova' (p.812). Art, in Rome more than anywhere else, reflects the politics of energy. The study of Raphael and Michelangelo lead to the emulation of antiquity and their values of generosity and grandeur, exemplified by the Republicanism of Brutus and the Imperialism of Caesar. 'Les âmes romanesques et généreuses doivent se faire artistes' (p.1139).

---

10 Canova is the sculptor of Les Grâces, necessarily devoid of passion (p.708).
OEUVRES INTIMES

'Voir un homme sur le modèle des Grecs et des Romains et vouloir mourir plutôt que de n'être pas comme lui ne fut qu'un moment'

(OI, II, 861 [VHB])

1. Epaminondas

In a note of 6 January 1831, Stendhal relates his nascent autobiographical project to his early efforts at biography:

J'ai écrit les vies de plusieurs grands hommes: Mozart, Rossini, Michel-Ange, Léonard de Vinci. Ce fut le genre de travail qui m'amusa le plus. Je n'ai plus la patience de chercher des matériaux, de peser des témoignages contradictoires, etc.; il me vient l'idée d'écrire une vie dont je connais fort bien tous les incidents. Malheureusement, l'individu est bien inconnu: c'est moi. (OI, II, 970)

The autobiographies, as much as the previous biographies, compare the subject to heroes of antiquity, most notably Plutarch's Epaminondas, Brutus and Caesar.

The Theban general Epaminondas, and his modern pair, Lafayette, serve as doubles for Stendhal in the Souvenirs d'égotisme, thereby performing the same function as Marcus Brutus and Louis-Gabriel Gros in the Vie de Henry Brulard or Caesar and Paoli in the Mémoires sur Napoléon. Plutarch and Montaigne both considered Epaminondas the most impressive of the former's subjects. Stendhal, by contrast, presents Epaminondas as an unreflecting, haphazard hero. Stendhal implies that his knowledge of Epaminondas is derived directly from Plutarch's extant discussions of Epaminondas in the Moralia. It is more likely, however, that Stendhal bases his notion of Epaminondas on what he can remember from Montaigne. Stendhal is on more familiar territory discussing Lafayette, an acquaintance from the salon of Destutt de Tracy. Stendhal notes that despite an unprepossessing appearance, Lafayette is undoubtedly 'le premier personnage du salon':

Je sentis aussi, sans que personne m'en avertît, que M. de La Fayette [Stendhal uses both spellings] était tout simplement un héros de Plutarque. Il vivait au jour le jour, sans trop d'esprit, faisant, comme Epaminondas, la grande action qui se présentait. (OI, II, 455 [SE])
Lafayette occupies his spare time, in between acts of random heroism, chasing after much younger women and expounding the platitudes of a simplistic liberal politics. Lafayette's behaviour is therefore apparently no more prepossessing than his appearance, yet Stendhal knows better than to trust to superficial appearances: 'pour moi, accoutumé à Napoléon et à lord Byron, j'ajouterai à lord Brougham, à Monti, à Canova, à Rossini, je reconnus sur-le-champ la grandeur chez M. de La Fayette et j'en suis resté là' (p.456).

Lafayette and Epaminondas present Stendhal with a template which he uses to explain and order the events of his life, lived 'au jour le jour': 'j'ai toujours vécu, et je vis encore, au jour le jour et sans songer nullement à ce que je ferai demain' (p.440). 'Je n'eus pas assez de bon sens pour arranger systématiquement ma vie. Le hasard guidait toujours mes relations' (p.489). Eventually, Stendhal devises the following motto: 'je prends au hasard ce que le sort place sur ma route' (p.510). This theme of a day-to-day existence, governed by chance, dominates the first chapter of the Souvenirs, which opens with a series of questions equally applicable to Epaminondas and Lafayette:

Ai-je tiré tout le parti possible pour mon bonheur des positions où le hasard m'a placé pendant les neuf ans que je viens de passer à Paris? Quel homme suis-je? Ai-je du bon sens, ai-je du bon sens avec profondeur? Ai-je un esprit remarquable? En vérité, je n'en sais rien. Emu par ce qui m'arrive au jour le jour, je pense rarement à ces questions fondamentales, et alors mes jugements varient comme mon humeur. Mes jugements ne sont que des aperçus. (pp.429-30)

The Souvenirs therefore begin with the assumption that Stendhal knows relatively little about his own intellectual and moral life (a premise later shared by the Vie de Henry Brulard). His judgements are at the mercy of emotions produced by chance and day to day circumstance. As a result, they implicitly lack the profondeur Stendhal craves. The next paragraph, however, suggests that Stendhal hopes to remedy this failing through the process of writing: 'voyons si, en faisant mon examen de conscience la plume à la main, j'arriverai à quelque chose de positif et qui reste longtemps vrai pour moi' (p.430).

Stendhal hopes to establish a measure of consistency (habitude) in his ideas, and so escape his lifestyle of the previous nine years, with its emphasis on the spontaneity, and therefore superficiality, exemplified by Epaminondas and Lafayette. Stendhal later reiterates the point: 'je ne conçois pas un homme sans un peu de mâle énergie, de constance et de profondeur dans les idées, etc.' (p.451).

Stendhal is formulating a concept of masculinity similar to Alfieri's notion of il maschio animo, defined in terms of virtues such as courage, honour, patriotism, plain-speaking and
the passionate desire for liberty (*Del principe*, pp.231-37). Such masculinity is unattainable unless fearlessness is combined with the Catonic virtues ultimately embodied by Brutus. Stendhal, however, prefers to analyse masculinity by disaggregating these virtues.

Stendhal makes it clear he does not consider himself lacking in either courage (*OI*, II, 476 [SE]) or 'vertu politique' (p.437), yet his lack of 'constance' and 'profondeur' has hitherto prevented him from developing such virtue into a strategy by which he can direct the course of his life:

*Suis-je bon, méchant, spirituel, bête? Ai-je su tirer un bon parti des hasards au milieu desquels m'a jeté et la toute-puissance de Napoléon (que toujours j'adorai) en 1810, et la chute que nous fîmes dans la boue en 1814, et notre effort pour en sortir en 1830? Je crains bien que non; j'ai agi par humeur, au hasard. (p.431)*

This time Stendhal is explicit in his answers to questions about his intellectual and moral capacities. The questions have been reformulated in order to focus on Stendhal's reaction to political change. As a result, by admitting that he has acted 'par humeur, au hasard' (as opposed to through his 'vertu politique'), Stendhal concedes that he has failed to live up to his ideals. This conclusion is underlined in the course of the *Souvenirs* by the incident of the missed duel, the first of several interlinked allegories Stendhal employs to deal with the sensitive subject of his political virtue. Stendhal is insulted in a Calais tavern, but fails to realize the seriousness of the incident until his travelling companion, Edwards, tells him he ought to have challenged his antagonist to a duel. Stendhal again blames his lack of a coherent ideology (the lack of *constance* and *profondeur*):

*Cette faute horrible, je l'ai commise une autre fois en 1813, à Dresde, envers M [un blanc], depuis fou. Je ne manque point de bravoure; une telle chose ne m'arriverait plus aujourd'hui. Mais, dans ma jeunesse, quand j'improvisais, j'étais fou. (p.476)*

Stendhal presents his inability to think strategically as a form of madness, on this occasion the failure to tilt at an enemy, as opposed to Don Quixote's tilting at windmills. Both the *Souvenirs* and the *Vie de Henry Brulard* show Stendhal failing to measure his responses to challenges, either perceived or intended, to his honour and dignity. Stendhal therefore partially abandons the Plutarchian parallel of the *Souvenirs*, replacing it with the concept of *espagalogisme*, that is to say the quixotry engendered by two of Brulard's favourite authors, Cervantes and Ariosto (p.780 [VHB]) and his favourite playwright, Corneille. It first manifests itself when he is taken to see a performance of *Le Cid*, prompting the
following diagnosis from his doctor-grandfather: 'mais cet enfant est fou' (p.571).
Stendhal/Brulard remains afflicted by the 'abominables duperies' of espagnolisme for the
first thirty years of his life (p.595): 'dès que je suis ému je tombe dans l'espagnolisme,
communiqué par ma tante Elisabeth qui disait encore: "Beau comme le Cid" ' (p.835).
Espagnolisme affects Brulard's judgement by shifting the focus of his ideology away from
generosity or even ambition, towards primarily emotive and ill-judged considerations of
honour. As a result, Brulard finds himself perpetually at the mercy of chance events.
Stendhal/Brulard shares such espagnolisme with many of his fictional heroes, most notably
Julien, who also regrets not having fought a duel over a perceived insult. Stendhal accepts
that the irrationality of espagnolisme, if it is not balanced by the rationality of constance
and profondeur, makes a quixotic mockery of virtue.

Quixotry stands condemned not only for its emotive irrationality, but also for its
aristocratic pretensions. Indeed, Stendhal refers to espagnolisme as 'noblesse à
l'espagnole' (OI, II, 595 [VHB]). Such feelings of superiority are shown to undermine the
hero's quest for 'la douce égalité' of fraternity (p.698). Henry stands aloof from society
once he has escaped the tyranny of his family, his 'orgueil insupportable' (p.624)
preventing him from associating with 'ce qui est sale', that is to say the very class he
consistently associates with energy (p.547, p.743). In his personal dealings, Stendhal
cannot help himself confusing le sale with le vil. He therefore runs the risk of passively
supporting the aristocracy against the interests of the people (p.687):

Il faut l'avouer, malgré mes opinions alors parfaitement et foncièrement républicaines, mes
parents m'avaient parfaitement communiqué leurs goûts aristocratiques et réservés. Ce défaut
m'est resté [...]. J'abhorre la canaille (pour avoir des communications avec), en même temps que
sous le nom de peuple je désire passionément son bonheur [...].

[...] J'ai horreur de ce qui est sale, or le peuple est toujours sale à mes yeux. Il n'y a qu'une
exception pour Rome, mais là la saleté est cachée par la férocité. (Par exemple, l'unique saleté
du petit abbé sarde Crobras, mais mon respect sans bornes pour son énergie [...]'). (pp.678-79)

Stendhal is alerted to the heroism of Crobras by the latter's ferocity, the same quality
identified by Alfieri in his criminals (described as 'ferocissimi') and by Brulard in himself,
once he has tasted freedom from the tyranny of his family: 'alléché par un peu de liberté,
j'étais devenu féroce' (p.682). Ferocity is consistently associated by both Stendhal and
Alfieri with the pursuit of liberty. However, Stendhal, unlike Alfieri, goes on to admire
both the French Revolution and the Terror for their display of this quality. Alfieri's virtue
has presumably been undermined by his sense of honour, Montesquieu's mainspring of
monarchic government. *Espagnolisme's* obsession with honour therefore risks turning Brulard into a monarchist.

It is in the above context that Stendhal takes his failure in Calais extremely seriously. Stendhal has again shown himself incapable of analysing a chance occurrence, allowing his emotions, in particular his snobbish disdain for 'un demi-manant, capitaine anglais au petit cabotage' (p.476 [SE]), to determine his response to the developing situation. Stendhal therefore suffers from illogicality of the kind he claims is displayed by the conspirators of 19 August 1820 (p.441).

Stendhal appears irritated by the strategic shortcomings and consequent failure of this conspiracy. The previous chapter ends with the suggestion that Stendhal had himself resolved to assassinate Louis XVIII. He may therefore be transferring his own sense of inadequacy onto the young men who, however ineffectually, have chosen, unlike him, to act on their tyrannical principles. Stendhal has failed to take up the challenge issued by tyranny, just as in Calais he had failed to take up the challenge of a drunken captain. The conspirators therefore serve the same function as Edwards in Calais. Again, Stendhal's failure has to be pointed out to him by the actions of others; again, he shows hostility to those who would remind him of his duty. Stendhal hints at such a transfer of guilt when he links the failure of these conspirators to his own later failure in Calais: 'la vue journalière de mes conspirateurs à la Chambre des Pairs me frappait profondément de cette idée: tuer quelqu'un à qui on n'a jamais parlé n'est qu'un duel ordinaire. Comment aucun de ces niais-là n'a-t-il eu l'idée d'imiter Louvel?' (p.443). Stendhal's question as to why these 'niais' had not thought of a similar solution can be read as a proleptic questioning of his own inability to instigate a duel, itself an allegory of his inability to challenge tyranny through the logical application of valour and virtue.

Stendhal's transfer of self-contempt onto failed tyrannicides is again apparent in his ambiguous attitude towards the exiled *carbonari* he meets in Paris between 1821 and 1830 and whom he describes as both poetic and absurd (p.490), that is to say illogical, even though they apply virtues he claims to admire (for instance the secret generosity of Mme Pasta). It is possible that Stendhal's doubts about the *carbonari* reflect his dismay at the lack of logic he discerned in the memoirs of Silvio Pellico, *Le mie prigioni*, published to great acclaim in 1832. Alternatively, Stendhal may be expressing, yet one more time,

---

1 Louvel had killed the duc de Berry in a duel on 13 June 1820.
his frustration and resentment that his love for the Carbonarist sympathizer Méthilde Dembowski had gone unrequited, possibly due to her doubts concerning his political reliability. Nonetheless, Stendhal again provides a clue that his professed contempt may constitute a disguised form of self-criticism. Stendhal refers the reader to the period 1821 to 1830, exactly the same nine years already mentioned at the beginning of the first chapter (p.429). Perhaps it is Stendhal who is poetic and absurd.

Stendhal's unease when confronted with revolutionary heroism is further explored during his trip to England. Stendhal claims he is torn between his respect for the honest respectability of the impoverished bourgeoisie, and his contempt for the class of political toadies (described as English versions of the courtier Philippe de Ségur) who sell their services to a tyrannical government in order to live above their means: 'je partis comme [un blanc] sans savoir, à cause du combat de ces deux idées, s'il fallait désirer une Terreur qui nettoierait l'étable d'Augias en Angleterre' (p.488). Stendhal's doubts are apparently founded on humanitarian concerns, and yet a closer inspection reveals that they are instead based on a mixture of sentimentality and squeamishness.

Stendhal's only experience of English domestic manners comes somewhere off the Waterloo Road, in a household of impoverished prostitutes. Stendhal finds this 'family' particularly congenial, describing it in the same terms of honest respectability used to describe the impoverished bourgeoisie he wishes to spare from the effects of revolution. Stendhal therefore questions the need for a Terror because of his emotional response to Miss Appleby, one of the prostitutes, just as he questions Carbonarism as a result of his emotional response to his rejection by Mathilde. Stendhal immediately moves from his considerations on the possible need for bloody revolution to whether or not he should bring Miss Appleby back with him to Paris, eventually deciding not to on the grounds that he would be taking on too big a responsibility. A link is again established between his wishes for an English Terror and a lasting emotional attachment. In both cases, Stendhal favours the theory, but rejects shouldering responsibility for its practical application. The proximity of these considerations suggests that Stendhal's political resolve has been undermined as much by his reluctance to live with Miss Appleby as by his fondness for her. In either case, Stendhal's emotions have been allowed to affect his political and moral judgement, undermining the very ferocity already identified above as the basis of his claim to the status of tyrannicidal hero.
Stendhal moves straight from his decision regarding Miss Appleby to the news that there will soon be a public hanging of eight English criminals, observing as follows: 'à mes yeux, quand on pend un voleur ou un assassin en Angleterre, c'est l'aristocratie qui immole une victime à sa sûreté, car c'est elle qui l'a forcé à être scélérat, etc., etc.' (pp.488-89). Stendhal is repeating a point made earlier in the *Souvenirs*: 'cette bassesse à la Philippe Séguar à été ma bête noire. J'estime et j'aime cent fois mieux un simple galérien, un simple assassin qui a eu un moment de faiblesse, et qui, d'ailleurs, mourait de faim habituellement' (pp.448-49) The aristocracy sacrifices criminals in order to tyrannize the people through a Terror of its own. Stendhal's emotive response to his relationship with Miss Appleby has resulted in an unwitting support for *fripon* aristocrats against the common criminals he supports intellectually. The chapter ends with Stendhal deciding not to witness the execution, despite his previous resolutions to the contrary. Stendhal suggests that he was deterred by the nature of the proposed spectacle, although he also states that it was raining. For the third time in the space of six paragraphs, Stendhal has chosen the line of least resistance. He is partly to blame for the executions, having allowed sentiment to undermine his political resolve. He has not wished for one form of Terror, thereby leaving the door open for another. Furthermore, his refusal to witness the executions show that his political resolve is also undermined by a squeamish inability to recognize and face the practical consequences of his political inaction. This theme is echoed in the *Vie de Henry Brulard*, again through the careful separation of intellectual conviction and emotional response. The young Henry does indeed witness an execution, this time of two priests he believes deserve to die. Nonetheless, Henry is so repulsed by the spectacle that it is voided of ideological meaning.

Stendhal's heroism in the *Souvenirs* exists more in word than in deed. It is the heroism of Alfieri's virile author. Stendhal's words cannot be interpreted as the 'effetto e cagione di corrotti costumi' [the effect and cause of corrupt customs]) but rather as the 'efficacissima cagione di libertà e di vertù' [the highly effective cause of liberty and virtue] (*Del principe*, p.237). Hence the following political programme, with its Alfierian emphasis on the need to promote public morals:

Dès que je serais au pouvoir, je réimprimerais la liste des émigrés déclarant que Napoléon a usurpé un pouvoir qu'il n'avait pas en les rayant. Les trois quarts sont morts; je les exilerais dans les départements des Pyrénées et deux ou trois voisins. Je ferais cerner ces quatre ou cinq départements par deux ou trois petites armées qui, pour l'effet moral, bivouaqueraient au moins six mois de l'année. Tout émigré qui sortirait de là serait impitoyablement fusillé. (*OI*, II, 464 [SE])
Stendhal delivers himself of this diatribe to MM. Thurot and de Tracy. It is heroically calculated to produce the worst possible impression, while at the same time expressing Stendhal's genuine political sentiments, albeit with a measure of comic exaggeration. Stendhal is in a Catonic mood, referring to Napoleon as a usurper of the Revolution rather than of the monarchy. His plan to punish émigrés reflects his patriotic contempt for those who placed the interests of their caste above those of the nation. The armies raised to enforce their exile will be forced to undergo hardships, on the Spartan and Roman model, in order that they develop a hardiness and patriotism which will make them more reliable than the émigrés. The Pyrenean location harks back to Lafargue, who committed his crime in Bagnères-de-Bigorre. In the Promenades, Stendhal contrasts Lafargue's energy with the loss of the 'faculté de sentir avec force et constance' prevalent in Paris (VTT, p.1079). Stendhal is once again clearly on the side of the criminal rather than the aristocrat. This time there is no Miss Appleby to confuse the issue.

Stendhal's political stand draws the predicted response from his immediate audience: 'je semblais atroce à ces petites âmes étiolées par la politesse de Paris' (OI, II, 464 [SE]). Stendhal has braved the disapproval of Thurot and de Tracy, just as he braves the fury of his aunt Séraphie through equally atrocious behaviour in the Vie de Henry Brulard. On this occasion, however, his stand is rewarded: 'une jeune femme présente admirera mes idées, et surtout l'excès d'imprudence avec lequel je me livrais, elle vit en moi le Huron (roman de Voltaire)' (p.464). A couple of pages later, his stock has risen yet further: 'au fait, je surprénais ou scandalisais toutes mes connaissances. J'étais un monstre ou un dieu' (p.467).

Nonetheless, Stendhal appears doomed to failure in contemporary France: 'je ne suis pas mouton, ce qui fait que je ne suis rien' (p.497). Stendhal can only hope for either the posthumous glory prospected by Alfieri in Del principe e delle lettere or else the admiration of fellow great souls. In either case, Stendhal needs to explore his personality further if he is to earn the approval he craves. As a result, he decides to abandon the Souvenirs and their Epaminondian superficiality in favour of the Catonic profondeur he traces back to his childhood in the Vie de Henry Brulard.
2. Brutus

Stendhal dates the first chapter of the *Vie de Henry Brulard* to 16 October 1832 even though he is actually writing in November 1835 at the earliest. Stendhal had abandoned the *Souvenirs d'égotisme* on 4 July 1832, noting that 'la chaleur m'ôte les idées à 1 heure et demie' (p.521). Stendhal therefore resumes his autobiographical project, once the worst of summer has passed, as an implicit continuation of the *Souvenirs*: 'une chaleur délicieuse régnait dans l'air; j'étais heureux de vivre' (p.529 [VHB]). The reader finds Stendhal surveying Rome from his vantage point outside the church of San Pietro in Montorio: 'toute la Rome ancienne et moderne, depuis l'ancienne voie Appienne avec les ruines de ses tombeaux et de ses aqueducs jusqu'au magnifique jardin du Pincio bâti par les Français, se déploie à la vue' (p.531). The choice of location is again designed to establish a parallel between the ancient and modern worlds, inevitably flattering to the former:

Ce lieu est unique au monde, me disais-je en rêvant, et la Rome ancienne malgré moi l'emportait sur la moderne, tous les souvenirs de Tite-Live me revenaient en foule. Sur le mont Albano à gauche du couvent j'apercevais les prés d'Annibal. (p.531)

Stendhal finds himself dreaming of Livy's Roman Republic, measuring himself against Hannibal and the Roman generals who opposed him:

De plus grands que moi sont bien morts!... Après tout, me dis-je, je n'ai pas mal occupé ma vie. Occupé! Ah! C'est-à-dire que le hasard ne m'a pas donné trop de malheurs, car, en vérité, ai-je dirigé le moins du monde ma vie? (p.531)

Stendhal is restating the questions of the earlier *Souvenirs*, stressing the role chance has played in determining the course of his adult life. Stendhal cannot measure up to a Hannibal because he has failed to direct his life by means of a settled strategy. Nonetheless, it is possible that through a thorough examination of his conscience, 'la plume à la main', Stendhal may discern the 'quelque chose de positif et qui reste longtemps vrai pour moi' (p.430 [SE]) which will allow him to re-evaluate his past and shape what remains of his future. Stendhal hopes to discover a latent consistency to his moral and political thinking which, once it has been analysed, will allow him to pre-determine his reactions to the random situations with which he is confronted. In other words, Stendhal hopes to prove, both to his ideal reader and to himself, that he does indeed conform to his own and Alfieri's conception of masculinity.
Stendhal decides to proceed by establishing a parallel between Rome's latent tradition of Republicanism and his own equally latent political virtue, the latter shaped by his attitude to the French Republic, itself in part modelled on that of Rome. Stendhal's virtù will revive the virtue of the Roman Republic in the same way that he suggests Joseph Valadier's park on the Pincio reprises the magnificence of the Appian Way (p. 531 [VIB]).

In order the better to execute this project, Stendhal decides to replace Epaminondas and Lafayette with two more suitable pairs, one Plutarchian and the other modern. Stendhal chooses Marcus Brutus and the Grenoble mathematician Louis-Gabriel Gros.

Henry's sense of self, as a child, is defined by his ferocious support for the French Republic. He even places its interests above those of his immediate family, defending the Republic's decision to declare his own father a political suspect by monstrously pointing out to his family the truth in the Republic's suspicions. This gesture echoes Brutus's assassination of his possible father, and Timoleon's assassination of his brother, both in the interests of preserving Republican rule. Henry himself points out that his devotion to the Republic takes the form of an 'amour filial instinctif, forcené dans ces temps-là' (p. 552).

Henry goes on to forge a call-up letter for himself in order to enlist in the army and so join this alternative and preferred family. In the midst of all this Republican fervour, Henry becomes obsessed with tyrannicides. Stendhal refers to himself in a prefatory note, designed to confuse police spies, as the husband of Charlotte Corday (p. 961). Henry is prompted by Corday's recent assassination of Marat (not least for having advocated a Caesarist form of government) to inscribe on a table, used by him as a desk, the names of all the successful assassins of princes (p. 726). Elsewhere, Brulard discusses the execution of Louis XVI, the execution of two anti-revolutionary priests in Grenoble, the failure to execute the authors of the Ordinances of July 1830, the Lunéville Conspiracy of April 1834, the transportation of its leader, Thomas, the execution of Fieschi in February 1836 for the attempted assassination of Louis-Philippe, and the execution of Morey a month later for conspiring in the same crime. He also alludes to the execution of Charles I of England through a reference to Hampden. The Vie de Henry Brulard therefore serves to substantiate Stendhal's earlier claim in the Souvenirs d'égotisme that he had considered assassinating Louis XVIII on his return to Paris in 1821.

Brulard goes on to state that, in his youth, he devised a system of literature built around the opposition of liens (family loyalties) and passions. Brulard offers by way of example the opposition of 'père' and 'amour de la patrie ou Brutus [probably Junius Brutus]', before noting that he ought perhaps to start using this system once again (p. 877). Thus,
Henry's passions are once again shown to be primarily political (filial loyalty to the Republic, even at the cost of betraying the interests of the original family). The system also tends to equate paternal and political tyranny. Henry has already told the reader, half in jest, that his father holds the same authoritarian principles as Nicholas of Russia, and that all tyrannies are alike (p.624). The prevailing critical interpretation of the Vie suggests that Brulard is here revealing that his politics are no more than a function of his oedipal hatred. Certainly, Brulard dates the beginning of his moral life to the death of his mother when he is aged seven (p.556). A few pages earlier, however, Brulard offers the reader an alternative perspective, dating both his Republicanism and his anti-clericalism to a perceived injustice aged either four or five. He accidentally drops a knife from a first floor window, either missing or hitting a passing lady, known to the family. He is immediately accused of attempted murder and declared 'pourvu d'un caractère atroce' (p.552), therefore eliciting exactly the same reaction from his aunt as from MM. Thurot and de Tracy in the Souvenirs. Brulard's unapologetic tone, inability to remember or care whether he caused any injury, insistence on the moral failings of the woman involved, and subsequent digression, describing the iniquity of her son's eventual political career, all tend to justify the incident as a form of tyrannicide. Brulard seems to be confirming his family's accusations, his subsequent reaction (he explicitly rejects both the teachings of the church, and the King's law) suggesting that he is asserting his right to drop a knife on anyone he pleases. Henry embraces the charge of monstrosity, and with it the virtù which prompts him to reject his family in favour of an ideal Republic. The text therefore offers an alternative conclusion to that arrived at by Crouzet: Stendhal's hatred for his father and aunt is more ideological than oedipal, a function of his hatred for arbitrary authority. The personal and the political are inextricably linked, to the point where the reader accepts an otherwise absurd comparison, made by Brulard, between his growing independence from the tyranny of his family and the overthrow, by the Italian communes, of their tyrants in the eighth (sic) century (p.711).

Henry determines to provide arrangements for his own education in order to escape his family's tyranny. He soon notices that first his private tutors, and then his teachers at the Ecole centrale, treat truth purely as a matter of convention. When Raillane teaches Henry the Ptolemaic system of astronomy and Dr Gagnon half-heartedly objects, Raillane replies: 'M[onsieur]r, il explique tout et d'ailleurs est approuvé par l'Eglise' (p.611). Similarly, Henry's various mathematics tutors prove incapable of explaining a number of the basic
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2 See for instance Crouzet's La 'Vie de Henry Brulard', ou l'enfance de la révolte.
problems he raises, insisting instead on the unquestioning respect Henry owes both to his
text-books and his teachers. Brulard elsewhere relates this kind of subjective science to 'la
bassesse envers le pouvoir', noting that in his experience: 'les poètes ont du cœur, les
savants proprement dits sont serviles et lâches' (p.759). Yet Brulard hopes to use
mathematics in the same way Brutus is shown using philosophy in Plutarch's Life.
Mathematics represent a method of using reason to arrive at a truth independent of fashion
or ideology. This method ought therefore to hold out the possibility of other applications,
particularly as regards questions of politics and justice. Mathematics properly symbolize
the quest for absolute as opposed to relative values: 'suivant moi, l'hypocrisie était
impossible en mathématiques' (p.853). Thus when Henry is finally taught, in chapter 34,
that two parallel lines will eventually meet if they are drawn long enough, Brulard claims
that he almost became a coquin there and then. Had he accepted 'qu'il n'y a rien de faux,
rien de vrai, tout est de convention', his next step would logically have been to go to Paris
and seek the favour of an influential patroness (pp.858-59). Henry is saved thanks to his
determination to try again with a different tutor: 'enfin le hasard voulut que je visse un
grand homme et que je ne devinsse pas un coquin' (p.859).

Brulard is referring to Louis-Gabriel Gros, a Jacobin mathematician, who encourages
Henry's 'manie raisonnable', explaining mathematical problems empirically, without
reference to convention or authority. Gros is the prototype petty-bourgeois hero, echoed
in the Vie de Henry Brulard by Falcon (the owner of a cabinet littéraire), Henry's friend
Lambert, and his violin-teacher Mention, and in the Souvenirs d'égotisme by Stendhal's
wartime comrade, Andrea Corner. The same character recurs in the Mémoires sur
Napoléon, first in the form of General Duroc, and then as the painter Biogi. Stendhal is
initially drawn to each of the above through his espagnolisme, which allows him to
appreciate their shared sense of honour. However, a number of these heroes are further
held out as exemplars for their dispassionate judgement, ultimately very different from the
irrational emotion of espagnolisme. Eschewing fripon self-interest, they each possess an
intellectual detachment which allows them to calculate a strategy on the basis of justice.
Thus Falcon maintains his open devotion to the Republic whether under Napoleon or the
Bourbon restoration, Duroc alone of Napoleon's generals is credited with consistently
judging the Empire on its 'utilité à la patrie' (MN, p.23), and Biogi refuses to allow
Napoleon to buy his friendship. These modern heroes have found a way of emulating
Brutus. Brulard's passion similarly needs to find the right exemplar (Gros): 'voir un
homme sur le modèle des Grecs et des Romains et vouloir mourir plutôt que de n'être pas
comme lui ne fut qu'un moment' (OI, ii, 861).
The Brutus-like example provided by Gros nonetheless comes too late to cure Henry of all error. Brutus cannot be used, any more than Epaminondas, as an exact pair for Stendhal. In particular, Brulard's Republican virtue is compromised by his espagnoliste flirtation with Napoleonic Caesarism. Brulard is finally shown placing his love for honour above the Republican values of justice and fraternity. As a result he is guilty of the same misjudgement shown by Alfieri in his response to the Revolution. Stendhal must therefore continue the Vie de Henry Brulard through the Mémoires sur Napoléon if he is to rehabilitate himself as a constant hero, complementing the Republican heroes of Plutarch and Livy with the examples of Caesar and Alexander. For Stendhal to claim the heroic status that comes with the display of a constant virtue, he must find a way of reconciling his admiration for Caesar and Napoleon with his love for Brutus and the French Revolution. Only once this has been achieved can Stendhal hope to appeal to his ideal readers (Mme Roland, Napoleon and Lafargue).

3. Caesar

The most important event analysed in both the Vie de Henry Brulard and the Mémoires sur Napoléon turns out to be Brulard/Stendhal's political seduction by Napoleon away from the French Republic. In Le Rouge, Julien carries round with him a small portrait of Napoleon which he idolizes in secret as though Napoleon were his mistress. Such guilty eroticism is explained in the Vie de Henry Brulard through a sequence of linked episodes designed to highlight the shame felt by Brulard, and presumably Stendhal, at their common betrayal of Republican values as a result of their infatuation with Napoleon.

Henry allows himself to be seduced by the idea of the heroic general Bonaparte becoming King. Henry hopes Bonaparte will restore the fortunes of France (that is to say the Republic). Yet he cannot see that a Republic ruled by a king is no longer a Republic. Corday's future husband has fallen into Marat's political error. In the process, Henry loses his claim to the virtù that he acquired on the occasion of his original revolt against established convention. Yet Henry is drawn into error by a sense of patriotism entirely consistent with virtù. Brulard claims the fault lies with his family, and the education it provides. Brulard suggests, rather illogically given his passion for the assassins of princes, that his entire family had so taught him to love the word 'king' that they had rendered him defenceless against the charm of a new monarchy. Brulard can only mean that the espagnolisme of his great-aunt has made him place too much value on concepts of honour.
and glory. Henry, in the manner of Fabrice, supports Napoleon in the latter's capacity as pantomime king. At this stage, Henry sees Napoleon purely as an enabler of his own quixotic fantasies. Brulard will eventually realize that Napoleon the Emperor is in fact a coquin, exercising his 'faculté de vouloir' in the interests of ambition.

Henry is in the same position as Napoleon's brother Lucien in the *Mémoires sur Napoléon*, also chided by Stendhal for betraying his political ideals. Lucien started as a Jacobin, writing under the name of Brutus Bonaparte, yet he nonetheless supports Napoleon's political Caesarism (*MN*, p.41). Both the *Vie de Henry Brulard* and the *Mémoires sur Napoléon* dwell on this shared political inconsistency. The problem Henry and Lucien Bonaparte both face is vital to their moral development. They have claimed to admire Brutus and his pairs, both modern and Plutarchian. However, given the opportunity, they fail to emulate them. Henry's abandoned duel with his school-mate Odru, an echo of the Calais incident in the *Souvenirs*, gives rise to a similar sense of failure: 'comment oser admirer Le Cid après ne s'être pas battu? Comment penser aux héros de l'Arioste? Comment admirer et critiquer les grands personnages de l'histoire romaine dont je relisais souvent les hauts faits dans le doucereux Rollin?'

Henry has failed to live up to his espagnoliste mentors, Corneille and Ariosto. More importantly, he has failed to live up to his exemplars, the heroes of Plutarch and Rollin's *Histoire romaine*.

The *Vie de Henry Brulard* repeatedly returns to the theme of the soul corrupted in the interests of political expediency. Thus, Brulard will typically break off a description of a childhood acquaintance to give the reader a summary of the latter's rise in either government or business. In particular, Brulard repeatedly refers the reader to the political career of his school friend Félix Faure, and the latter's inglorious part in the political trials of 1834. Brulard similarly dwells on the corruption of Napoleon's former generals, willing to tarnish their prestige by lending support to a politically repressive regime. In the midst of all these accusations, however, one stands out:

Je m'accuse d'avoir eu ce désir sincère: ce jeune Bonaparte, que je me figurais un beau jeune homme comme un colonel d'opéra-comique, devrait se faire roi de France.

Ce mot ne réveillait en moi que des idées brillantes et généreuses. Cette plate erreur était le fruit de ma plus plate éducation. (p.864)

Each of Henry's relatives is responsible for one or more aspects of his political failure. His grand-father, despite praiseworthy humanist qualities, communicates a series of elegant
tastes to the young Henry, which lead him to prefer Horace to Romulus, Alexander and Numa (p.622). His father and aunt try to teach him to respect authority, imposing what Henry calls their tyranny, as well as that of his tutor, the abbé Raillane. Together, they transform Henry's personality from that of a hero to that of a slave (pp.623-24). This transformation is variously blamed for impeding the development of his judgement, encouraging cowardice, turning him into a wet hen, and most importantly of all, stunting the development of his social skills. The family's chief weapon consists in their power to isolate Henry from other children, not allowing him to attend school until his rival parent, the Republic, introduces the Ecole centrale to Grenoble. In the meantime, Raillane does his best to turn Henry into a fripon.

Henry's great aunt Elisabeth receives her share of blame for encouraging an espagnolisme which makes him appear either mad or imbecilic in public (p.901). There can be no doubt that Brulard finds its irrationality disturbing. Nonetheless, espagnolisme also helps Henry develop a sense of honour which at times, through the process of cristallisation, prompts him to fall in love with virtù and allows him to recognize the inherent nobility not just of Brutus, but also of the mathematician Gros, the latter's unlikely bourgeois pair. It also helps him understand the grandeur of Napoleon.

It is in the above context that I wish to conclude my discussion of the Vie by analysing chapter 32 (pp.833-50), in particular offering an alternative reading to that provided by Carol Mossman. Henry is at a turning point in his moral life. In chapter 33, he flirts with coquinerie, before being converted by the Brutus-like Gros in chapter 34. Chapter 32 is therefore designed to convey the lack of moral direction from which Henry is suffering. Mossman has highlighted the importance of this chapter, pointing out that Stendhal decided to repaginate the manuscript of the Vie so that it opens the third volume. She also argues that the discontinuities of narration and meaning within the chapter are striking even by the elliptical standards of the rest of the Vie. The chapter is divided into three sections, the first describing Henry's initiation to hunting, the second his conspiracy to shoot a tree in the main square of Grenoble, and the third detailing the execution of the parricide, Jomard. As ever, politics and family are interwoven, leading Mossman to a
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3 The study of Horace similarly leads Julien astray in the course of his exams at the seminary (RN, p.191).

Freudian reading which seeks to subordinate Henry's politics to the psychological trauma arising from his mother's death in child-birth.

Brulard claims he does not know why he conspires to shoot a tree. The reader is told elsewhere that Henry has a particular affection for trees. Furthermore, this is no ordinary tree, but rather the officially consecrated 'arbre de la fraternité', transplanted to Place Grenette in order to celebrate the achievements of the Revolution alongside the predating 'arbre de la liberté'. Brulard admits he ought to worship this tree, yet it is he who first comes up with the idea to conspire against it. The tree is eventually shot by someone else, but Brulard cannot remember who this other conspirator might have been. Brulard makes no attempt to explain the link between this episode and the two that flank it in the chapter. Mossman suggests the three stories are designed as an admission of guilt; specifically, an admission that the young Henry had wished the death of his mother while she was in labour (it is his idea to conspire against fraternity), and that his wish had been unexpectedly granted (hence Henry's hysterical outburst against God when he first hears the news). Mossman bases her argument on the following summarized reading of the text. The hunting episode reveals Henry's lust for blood, yet the sight of that blood proves too much for him. He wishes the tree to be shot because it represents fraternity, the brother he did not wish to have. Finally, the parricide Jomard, ostensibly guillotined for murdering his father-in-law, was actually also convicted of murdering a woman, as was Mingrat to whom he is compared. The murder of these two women is 'silenced' in the text as another covert admission of his crime. Brulard is admitting that his reiterated hatred for his father is no more than an 'oedipal screen', designed to draw attention away from his secret hostility to his mother.

My alternative reading focuses instead on Henry's politics. The hunting episodes and the execution of Jomard are linked in that they both show the disjunction between Henry's theoretical values and his reaction to their practical application. Henry wishes to hunt but cannot then accept the moral consequence of his actions. Similarly, Henry has already supported the execution of two priests, and the news of their deaths has filled him with joy. Yet when the priests Jomard and Mingrat are executed, the sight of the former's blood fills him with the same horror as does the sight of his prey's blood in the hunting episode. In particular, he is put off eating beef. This inability to live up to his values is further borne out by his devising, yet not executing, the plan to shoot the tree.
More importantly, the plan is itself flawed. He loves the Republic with a loyalty the reader already knows to be filial, yet his quixotic desire to place himself in danger by conspiring leads him to attack one of its symbols. He dislikes the tree because its decorations strike him as ugly. He has contempt for the tree, just as he has contempt for the whole concept of fraternity. He has already informed the reader that while he is theoretically a Jacobin, he cannot stand the sight of the squalor in which most Jacobins live, and so decides not to associate with them. In the next chapter, he is willing to consider becoming a coquin on the grounds that the Republican cause will always bring him into contact with dirt, just as Revolution will always bring him into contact with blood. Henry's conspiracy against fraternity shows him on the brink of reaching an accommodation with tyranny.

Even though the encounter with Gros soon allows him to pull back from such an accommodation, the meeting comes too late to save him from the political error of wishing for Napoleon's usurpation. In particular, Henry wishes that the drab Republic (symbolized by the tree's ugly decorations) make way for Napoleon, imagined as a handsome young colonel in a comic opera. Chapter 32 can therefore be read as a very different admission of guilt from the one suggested by Mossman: an admission that somehow Henry is ready to collude in destroying his family-in-law, the Republic, just as Jomard proved willing to murder his father-in-law. Chapter 32 shows Henry failing to live up to the example set by Brutus.

The Souvenirs d'égotisme and the Vie de Henry Brulard, with their stress on the role played by the emotivity or illogicality of espagnolisme in directing Brulard/Stendhal's response to chance events, provide some sort of answer to the question of why Henry conspires against the Republic. Stendhal nevertheless needs to write the Mémoires sur Napoléon in order to re-evaluate the precise nature of this conspiracy. In particular, Stendhal must establish whether Napoleonic Caesarism is either sublimely monstrous or execrably monarchist. The Mémoires therefore function both as a gloss on the Vie, and as its continuation. The work is apparently a memoir only in that it occasionally seeks to analyse Stendhal's experience in Italy at the turn of the century, as part of Napoleon's army. However, the Mémoires explicitly focus on Napoleon's career before 1797, the year in which Henry first wishes Napoleon's accession to the throne of France, as well as the year in which Stendhal deems the heroic phase of Napoleon's career to have ended (MN, p.12). The Mémoires therefore serve to address a number of deliberate omissions in Stendhal's previous texts. The unfinished Vie de Napoléon had left out Napoleon's early Italian campaigns, suggesting that their supernatural quality would prove too difficult to
represent (VN, p.17). Similarly, the Vie de Henry Brulard ends with a refusal to describe Henry's first Italian sojourn, on the grounds that 'le sujet surpasse le disant' (p.958).^ The Mémoires therefore hold out the promise of concluding Stendhal's written 'examen de conscience'. The answer to the riddle of Henry's conspiracy against the Republic can only be found through a careful analysis of the precise nature of his early enthusiasm for Napoleon. Such an analysis, Brulard suggests, must start on the battlefields of Arcole and Lodi (OI, II, 864-65), that is to say in the Mémoires, the third instalment in his autobiographical project, itself designed to establish his precise relationship to the monstrous heroes, Catonic and Caesarist, ancient and modern, he claims to admire in the space of his fiction.

^ Stendhal uses variants on this phrase to describe a stay at Les Echelles (pp.658-59) and the character of Gros (p.859). Del Litto suggests Stendhal is alluding to a verse by Francis I on Petrarch (p.1405).
3

MEMOIRES SUR NAPOLEON

'Ce jeune homme est taillé à l'antique; c'est un homme de Plutarque.'

(MN, p. 63)

1. (Auto)biography

The Mémoires sur Napoléon indirectly seek to relate Stendhal's own experiences as a soldier in Italy at the turn of the nineteenth-century by means of a partial biography of Napoleon. The Mémoires therefore obliquely take up the unfinished story of the Vie de Henry Brulard, revealing in the process why Brulard/Stendhal allowed himself to be seduced away from the Republic by his support for Napoleon, the hero of the Italian campaigns. They also show the reader why Brulard/Stendhal proved willing to support tyranny in an attempt to establish the sense of fraternity hitherto absent from his experience of the Republic. Paradoxically, the sense of superiority which had prevented Brulard from establishing such relations of fraternity with his fellow men and women also prevents him from becoming a tyrant. It serves instead to isolate him: 'le bonheur pour moi, c'est de ne commander à personne et de n'être pas commandé' (OI, II, 948 [VHB]).

Brulard determines on a strategy of isolation in order to avoid both the contagion of fripons and the risk of duperie. This strategy, however, results in a detachment which undermines both Stendhal/Brulard's ability to identify his enemies and his resolve to challenge them to duels. In the Mémoires sur Napoléon, Stendhal further explores the possibility that the great military commanders such as Julius Caesar and Napoleon might represent an alternative form of heroism and that, despite their active social participation, they might equally succeed in evading the dupé/fripon paradigm. In particular, Stendhal examines the possible ethical distinctions between a general's commands to his troops (including the young Stendhal) and a monarch's fripon appeals to the greed and vanity of his subjects (MN, pp. 49-50). In the Mémoires, Stendhal allows himself to be subsumed into the narrative of his leader in the same way that in 1800 he allowed himself to be subsumed into the army. Napoleon socializes Brulard's ardour, providing him with Alfieri's 'champ de bataille' and 'moyen d'agir'.

Neither Caesar nor Napoleon need resort to hypocrisy in the exercise of their military power: 'dans ce siècle d'universelle hypocrisie, les vertus militaires sont les seules qui ne
puissent être remplacées avec avantage par l'hypocrisie' (p.207). Instead, their open pursuit of glory in the service of 'le beau idéal militaire' (p.14), specifically associated with 'la vérité' (pp.13-14), recommends itself to both their troops and posterity:

En lisant l'histoire ancienne, dans la jeunesse, la plupart des cœurs qui sont susceptibles d'enthusiasme, s'attachent aux Romains et pleurent leurs défaites; et tout cela malgré leurs injustices et leur tyrannie envers leurs alliés. Par un sentiment de même nature, on ne peut plus aimer un autre général après avoir vu agir Napoléon. On trouve toujours dans les propos des autres quelque chose d'hypocrite, de cotonneux, d'exagéré, qui tue l'inclination naissante. L'amour pour Napoléon est la seule passion qui me soit restée; ce qui ne m'empêche point de voir les défauts de son esprit et les misérables faiblesses qu'on peut lui reprocher. (p.10)

Caesar at Alesia or Napoleon at Mantua find themselves fraternally united with their troops in the face of physical danger. The commander finds himself exonerated of tyranny, redefined as the *fripon* attempt to persuade *dupes* to act against their self-interest. Instead, by virtue of their great skill as commanders, Caesar and Napoleon order their troops to act in accordance with mutual self-interest, initially defined in terms of self-preservation, and later redefined in terms of glory and conquest: 'Bonaparte connaissait son armée; rien ne pouvait être au-dessus de la bravoure de ces jeunes patriotes; il voulut leur donner la gloire d'une action qui retentirait en Europe' (*MN*, p.138).

The commanders are extroverts, eager from the outset to act in order to realize the potential of their fellow men and women. They hope to elevate mankind by providing it with the opportunity for heroism in the service of fraternity as opposed to liberty. As a result, the commanders gloriously succeed in promoting heroism as an extension of self-interest, whereas philosophers such as Brutus fail in the same endeavour by presenting it in terms of self-sacrifice. Caesar recognizes that the people of Rome will need to be regimented if their passion for glory is to be realized; Brutus trusts, unrealistically, that they will understand the need to regiment themselves in order to realize a just society.

Caesar and Napoleon are encouraged to become tyrants of the civil state by their success in engendering a sense of fraternity. They decide to proclaim their status as universal commanders (dictators) in an effort to militarize a corrupt civil society, Napoleon thereby
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1 In the earlier *Vie de Napoléon*, Stendhal makes a similar point, referring directly to Plutarch:

Lisez Plutarque, [...], et vous trouverez que tous ces héros de la Grèce et de Rome n'acquèrent leur gloire qu'en montant sur des milliers de cadavres, mais l'on oublie tout cela et l'on voit le résultat avec respect et étonnement. (*VN*, p.137)
realizing the wishes of the young Stendhal and his schoolmates: 'nous disions tous: "Plût à Dieu que le jeune général de l'armée d'Italie fût le chef de la République!"' (p.300).

Caesar and Napoleon initially seek to unite society around the military virtues of courage and comradeship, stripping it of the selfish hypocrisy that produces friponnerie. However, in order to consolidate their tyrannical civil power, Caesar and Napoleon prove increasingly willing to reach a political accommodation with fripons, even though they each share Brulard's revulsion for such exponents of deceit and mediocrity. In the process, they themselves become at best coquins, at worst fripons for fear of becoming dupes in a civil society they do not fully understand. The military virtue of the commanders, unaided by the statecraft of the philosophers, and undermined by their compromise with friponnerie, therefore proves inadequate to the task of regulating the constitutional affairs of a civil society. Napoleon's bravoure personnelle and fermeté de caractère allow him to command his troops but not to govern a nation (pp.49-50); Brutus's version of the same qualities make him ideally suited to govern Rome but not to command the crowds gathered in the Forum after Caesar's death.

The Mémoires sur Napoléon therefore implicitly present Brutus and Caesar as irreconcilable allies in the battle against friponnerie. Plutarch underlines Caesar's heroism by showing the latter consistently supporting Brutus for high office, even though he predicts, correctly, that Brutus represents the greatest threat both to his ambitions and his life. Plutarch shows Caesar responding to Brutus the same way that Napoleon responds to the painter Biogi. Caesar and Napoleon are each inoculated against coquinerie because, even in their corruption, they cannot help seeking to establish impossible alliances with philosophers to replace those already in place with fripons. These relationships are subject to frequent misunderstandings, providing Stendhal with both comedy and tragedy in his novels. Stendhal thereby solves the problem of La Pharsale, namely how to provide Caesar/Napoleon with an appropriate dramatic foil.

Relatively little has been written specifically on the Mémoires sur Napoléon, although a number of brief studies have been devoted more generally to the subject of Stendhal's attitudes towards Napoleon. Mérimée's contribution can be taken as representative: 'il était difficile de savoir ce qu'il [Stendhal] pensait de Napoléon. Presque toujours il était de l'opinion contraire à celle qu'on mettait en avant' (OC, XLIX, 333 ['H.B.']). Pieter Geyl's classic historiographical study, Napoleon: For and Against, contains a short section on Stendhal which reinforces this critical assessment of the Mémoires and their 'flagrant
contradictions'. Geyl refers to the Mémoires by the title of the earlier Vie de Napoléon (the text he describes is without doubt the Mémoires), noting that whereas Stendhal explicitly limits the focus of his study to the 'heroic' years prior to 1797 (the fall of the Venetian Republic, and its handover to Austria), his apologia for Napoleon rests on the latter's achievements as Emperor. Geyl goes on to suggest that Stendhal's enthusiasm for Napoleon as 'the embodiment of an energy about the purpose of which one is not supposed to bother one's head' (p.33) reveals both wrong-headedness and confusion. In particular, Stendhal is accused of not understanding the contradictions implicit in his various portrayals of Napoleon as energetic, timorous, vain and socially conservative. Finally, Geyl launches into an attack on both Stendhal and 'those who accept the somewhat spurious reputation for "intelligence" and "independence" that it has been fashionable to cultivate for Stendhal among succeeding generations of intellectuals after his death in 1842' (p.33).

Geyl's hostility appears to be in part derived from the parallel he draws and acknowledges between Napoleon's career and that of Hitler (Geyl wrote his text in part while interned at Buchenwald). The main thrust of his argument, however, is founded on a reading of the text which proves on closer inspection to be misleading. Geyl does not take into account the fact that the Mémoires as a whole stand in direct counterpoint to the Vie de Henry Brulard, with its stress on the Catonic energy of the Republic. As a result, Stendhal hopes precisely to make both himself and his readers worry their heads about the purpose of Napoleon's Caesarist energy. In particular, Stendhal seeks to analyse Napoleon's career in terms of his gifts as a commander and faults as a philosopher. In other words, Stendhal is fascinated by Napoleon's doomed alliance with the Republic, by the fripon exploitation of the inevitable differences between these two heroic forces, and by the eventual failure of Napoleon's primarily military virtues in the field of civil government. As Geyl himself acknowledges, Stendhal's apologia for Napoleon ultimately rests on two of his achievements as Emperor: 'the fact that he "has civilized the people en le faisant propriétaire". Also, that he has made it possible for everybody to win the cross of the Légion d'honneur' (p.33). Yet it is through these measures that Napoleon gives the French people a lasting sense of fraternity. This achievement therefore constitutes the civil manifestation of the military virtues, so evident in the years prior to 1797, that originally brought Napoleon to power; it is furthermore the sole legacy of Napoleon's military

---

career, the treaties of Vienna and Paris having stripped France of her territorial conquests. 'Napoléon a refait le moral du peuple français, c'est là sa gloire la plus vraie' (MN, p.15).

Stendhal employs a variety of published sources in the Mémoires, as well as personal recollections, not only of his rare personal encounters with Napoleon, but also of his conversations with members of the Emperor's entourage, most notably his patron and relative, Count Daru. His aim is not to produce an authoritative biography, nor as in the case of the earlier Vie de Napoléon, to defend the Emperor's political reputation. Instead, as Marill Albérès points out: 'c'est en moraliste et non en partisan que Stendhal aime Napoléon' (p.239). Stendhal himself writes: 'mon but est de faire connaître l'homme extraordinaire. Quant à écrire l'histoire de France de 1800 à 1815, je n'y ai aucune prétention' (MN, p.14). Stendhal organizes his material in order to create not so much a myth of Napoleon as a set of conflicting narratives, which allow the reader to isolate and consider individual moral characteristics. Indeed, his method bears a marked resemblance to that of Plutarch as stated in his preface to the parallel lives of Alexander and Caesar:

I am writing biography, not history, and the truth is that the most brilliant exploits often tell us nothing of the virtues or vices of the men who performed them, while on the other hand a chance remark or a joke may reveal far more of a man's character than the mere feat of winning battles in which thousands fall, or of marshalling great armies, or laying siege to cities. When a portrait painter sets out to create a likeness, he relies above all upon the face and the expression of the eyes and pays less attention to the other parts of the body: in the same way it is my task to dwell upon those actions which illuminate the workings of the soul, and by this means to create a portrait of each man's life. I leave the story of his greatest struggles and achievements to be told by others. (AA, p.252)

Stendhal suggests that most biography, and indeed most history, is presented in a pseudo-impartial manner designed to reduce the reader's potential responses to one of two options: 'Jacques est un coquin ou un honnête homme' (MN, p.3). Stendhal's own strategy will be to offer robust opinions, which he claims are founded on 'une connaissance plus intime, et surtout plus délicate, du juste et de l'injuste: des jugements d'âme généreuse' (p.3). Stendhal is in part trying to irritate his reader into the kind of questioning manie raisonnante that helped save the young Henry Brulard from friponnerie. In part, he is claiming his prerogative, as a passive great soul, to judge his active cousin. Indeed, it may be as a result of having established this prerogative in the Vie de Henry Brulard that Stendhal should have next decided to return, in a radically revised form, to a subject apparently definitively abandoned in 1818. Stendhal appropriates Napoleon as a final
heroic alter ego, after Epaminondas and Brutus, thereby binding the Mémoires to the main body of his Plutarch-influenced autobiographical project.

2. Exemplars

In the Vie de Napoléon of 1817-18, Stendhal appears still to be struggling to find a way into his subject. Before abandoning the text definitively, Stendhal showed it to at least two of his friends, and a critique in Italian, signed using the abbreviation Ri., still survives. Ri. echoes Plutarch's definition of the task of the biographer cited above, and suggests that Stendhal retitle his work Considerazioni sulla vita di Napoleone Bonaparte (VN, p.368):

Io non credo che possiate intitolare il libro: Vita di Napoleone Bonaparte. Una vita deve farmi conoscere minutamente tutta la serie dei dolori o dei piaceri che hanno potentemente operato sovrà una grande anima e l'anno fatta divenire ciò ch'ella è. Un accidente inosservato da uno sterile ammiratore è una chiave che apre molti segreti in mano d'un biografo filosofo. (p.367)

[I do not believe that you can properly entitle your book: Vie de Napoléon. A life must acquaint the reader in minute detail of all the many hurts and pleasures which have worked powerfully on a great soul, and which have made it what it is. An incident, which the sterile admirer may not notice, is a key which opens many secrets in the hands of a philosophical biographer.]

Stendhal appears to have taken these comments on board, first by abandoning the Vie, and second by returning to the subject some time after Napoleon's death, immediately after the composition of the Vie de Henry Brulard. The two texts are linked not just by their shared autobiographical purpose, but more importantly by their rival affiliation to the two principal groups of Plutarchian heroes already identified. Indeed, the Mémoires constitute Stendhal's most fully realized Plutarchian project, based as they are on a historically defensible parallel between Napoleon and Caesar.3

Stendhal takes Ri.'s advice in the Mémoires, concentrating on anecdote and personal experience (hence the new title). He also decides to concentrate on the character of Napoleon (MN, p.128, 141), and so writes almost exclusively of Napoleon's career in the Italian campaigns (his heroic period): 'en 1797 on pouvait l'aimer avec passion et sans restriction; il n'avait point encore volé la liberté à son pays; rien d'aussi grand n'avait paru

3 See Marin de Las Cases, Mémorial de Sainte-Hélène, ed. by Joël Schmidt (Paris: L'Intégrale-Seuil, 1968), p.37. Stendhal may also have been influenced by Henri de Jomini's Vie politique et militaire de Napoléon, racontée par lui-même, au tribunal de César, d'Alexandre et de Frédéric, 4 vols (Paris: Anselin, 1827).
The Mémoires begin with an explicit reference to Plutarch, and the parallel he establishes between Caesar and Alexander:

Il s'agit du plus grand homme qui ait paru dans le monde depuis César. Et même si le lecteur s'est donné la peine d'étudier la vie de César dans Suétone, Cicéron, Plutarque et les Commentaires, j'oserai dire que nous allons parcourir ensemble la vie de l'homme le plus étonnant qui ait paru depuis Alexandre, sur lequel nous n'avons point assez de détails pour apprécier justement la difficulté de ses entreprises. (p.19)

This new trio of Alexander, Caesar and Napoleon replaces the Vie's longer list of Alexander, Caesar, Hannibal, Turenne, Frederick II and Napoleon. Yet the Vie had originally also been conceived in terms of the parallel between Napoleon and Caesar. In a letter to Stendhal of 9 June 1815, Silvio Pellico had accused Napoleon of being a tyrant for his part in destroying the achievements of the French Republic. In his reply, Stendhal writes: 'j'abhorre Napoléon comme tyran, mais l'abhorre tout juste, les pièces à la main. Napoléon condamné, j'adore politiquement et raisonnablement une chose si extraordinaire: le plus grand homme qui ait paru depuis César. [...] Voilà ce que prouvera The Life' (p.407). However, when Stendhal came to write the Vie, he decided to discuss Napoleon's possible descent from the tyrants of Treviso in an attempt to point to a rival line of genealogy, this time to the Caesars of the Renaissance (VN, p.4). The Vie de Henry Brulard had similarly established the Gagnons' possible descent from the crimes of a putative seventeenth-century Italian assassin, a certain Guadagni or Guadaniamo, seeking refuge in Papal Avignon as part of a Legate's retinue (OI, p.603). The Mémoires also refer to the specifically Italian component of Napoleon's character, contrasting his 'âme', 'caractère' or 'nature italienne' to the qualities of the Epaminondian Lafayette: 'j'entends par ce mot, peu intelhgible pour qui n'a pas séjourné en Italie, une âme absolument contraire aux âmes raisonnables et sages de Washington, de Lafayette, ou de Guillaume III' (MN, p.170).

---

Napoleon inherits his ardour from his mother: 'c'est par le caractère italien de madame Létilia, qu'il faut expliquer celui de son fils' (p.34). She is in turn related to early-Roman traditions of heroism, and their historical echoes:

La mère de Napoléon fut une femme comparable aux héroïnes de Plutarque, aux Porcia, aux Cornélie, aux madame Rolland [sic]. Ce caractère impassible, ferme et ardent, rappelle encore davantage les héroïnes italiennes du moyen âge, que je ne cite point parce qu'elles sont inconnues en France. (p.34)

Porcia is not a mother, but rather the daughter of Cato and wife of Brutus (*Life of Brutus*), presumably included in this list because she manages to commit suicide, despite being placed under constant surveillance, by snatching live coals from a fire, swallowing them, and then refusing to open her mouth, so suffocating to death (*MR*, p.269). Cornélie is almost certainly Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi (both assassinated as a result of their attempts to reform Rome by means of a dictatorship) and heroine of both the *Life of Tiberius Gracchus* and the *Life of Gaius Gracchus*. A possible alternative would be Cornelia, the wife of Pompey (*Life of Pompey*), also a character in Thomas Corneille's *Pompée*. However, the latter Cornelia is of a more nervous and timorous disposition, and alone of the women so far mentioned fails to respond either philosophically or dramatically to the fall of her beloved son, or in this case husband. Mme Roland is unique to Stendhal's list in that she takes centre-stage, outshining her husband's fall from power through her own.

All the above women display an early-Roman ethos, associated both by Plutarch and by Stendhal with primitive society, construed in terms of social anarchy. It is hardly surprising, then, that Stendhal should immediately make the link between his heroines and the Italy of the Middle Ages. Admirable though Létilia Bonaparte's character, defined in these terms, may appear to Stendhal, he nonetheless acknowledges that its irrational and anarchic components (quixotry), once transplanted to her son Napoleon, work to make him a flawed Caesar, that is to say a Cesare Borgia:

Suivant moi, on ne trouve d'analogue au caractère de Napoléon que parmi les condottieri et les petits princes de l'an 1400, en Italie: les Sforza, les Piccinino, les Castruccio Castracani, etc., etc. Hommes étranges, non points profonds politiques, dans le sens où on l'entend généralement, mais, au contraire, faisant sans cesse de nouveaux projets, à mesure que leur fortune s'élève, attentifs à saisir les circonstances et ne comptant d'une manière absolue que sur eux-mêmes. (*MN*, p.34)
Napoleon, however, owes his victories and his political triumphs less to his 'Italian' qualities of self-reliance and imagination than to his competing ability to calculate under pressure in the interests of limitless ambition. Napoleon's Italian soul quixotically undermines the execution of political and even military strategy (p.47). At the same time, this soul favours tactical improvisation, reminiscent not only of Caesar and Alexander, but also of Epaminondas, and through him the Stendhal of the *Souvenirs*.

In the *Mémoires*, Stendhal again establishes a grid of references around the figure of Julius Caesar. This time, however, such references are designed to mediate between Stendhal and Napoleon as well as Caesar and Napoleon. As we have seen, Napoleon is explicitly compared to the emotive (quixotic) Italian Caesars of the fifteenth-century, as well as to Machiavelli's similarly flawed Prince, Cesare Borgia (p.35). Stendhal goes on to provide Napoleon with another equally explicit role-model: a modern Italian Caesar, nonetheless still the product of a primitive society, governed only by 'la loi admirable du coup de fusil' (p.24). He is the Corsican general and adventurer, Pascal Paoli, chosen by Stendhal as a modern pair for Napoleon.

Paoli fut comme le type et l'image de toute la vie future de Napoléon.

Il débute, à vingt-neuf ans, par commander en chef, il a sans cesse à la bouche les noms et les maximes des Plutarque et des Tite-Live, qui sont le catéchisme de Napoléon.

Paoli fait en Corse et en petit, tout ce que Napoléon devra faire parmi nous, lorsqu'il aura succédé au plat gouvernement du Directoire. D'abord la conquête, puis l'organisation. (p.30)

Stendhal goes on to enumerate further striking parallels between the two lives. However, the above passage is the most important because it explicitly traces both Paoli and Napoleon back to Plutarch and Livy and then justifies Napoleon's coup in terms of the military attributes of conquest and organization, presenting Paoli's government by means of a militia (a brotherhood of great souls) as superior to the *fripon* government of the *Directoire*.

Paoli is Napoleon's prophet, a St John to his Jesus, a Sulla to his Caesar:

Ce fut probablement à cette époque [1793] que voyant le jeune Bonaparte organiser son bataillon, il dit ce mot célèbre en Corse:
'Ce jeune homme est taillé à l'antique; c'est un homme de Plutarque.' (p.63)^5

When some of his advisers said that there was no point in killing a boy like him [Caesar], Sulla replied that they must be lacking in intelligence if they did not see that in this boy there were many Mariuses. (FRR, p.244)^6

Paoli's prophecy is realized through Napoleon's self-education in the humanities, limited to the work of Plutarch and Brulard's unhypocritical mathematics, perhaps in an effort on Napoleon's part to construct his own personality around the military virtues of heroism and logic: 'excepté les mathématiques, l'artillerie, l'art militaire et Plutarque, Napoléon ne savait rien' (MN, p.47).

Stendhal finally provides Napoleon with Danton as a third exemplar. The heroic Napoleon of the Italian Campaigns is to some extent still the product of Danton's Republic, with its emphasis on patriotism and honour divorced from all ambition. Napoleon's France is a dictatorship, yet 'cette Dictature n'est pas exercée par un seul homme, mais par ce qu'il y a de plus énergique dans tous' (p.61). Danton's tyranny therefore also takes the form of a brotherhood, providing Napoleon with a second model, after Paoli's militia, for the organization of his own armies. Danton first elevates the people of France to his own level by rousing them to anger (p.104). However, once the immediate danger is over, the people's anger (passion) fades: 'l'époque d'énergie va cesser avec le besoin qu'on avait de l'énergie' (p.70). Stendhal concludes that the ardour inspired by anger is unreliable because exclusively spontaneous (p.104). Napoleon, by contrast, leaves nothing to chance, calculating his every move (p.300) and refusing to let danger provoke him into any sign of emotion, whether it be fear or anger (p.92, 193). Napoleon therefore turns the spontaneous anger associated with self-preservation into the habitude of his quest for glory, seen as the motor force of Napoleon's armies at least until 1805 (p.246). It is in this context that Stendhal chooses to remember his own career as a young soldier occupying Milan.

On the one hand, the army prior to 1805 represents a continuation of Danton's Republic with its conflation of philosophical and military greatness. Danton's organization of

^5 Stendhal is here paraphrasing the Mémorial de Sainte-Hélène (p.52). Las Cases goes on to report Paoli exclaiming: 'O Napoléon! tu n'as rien de moderne! tu appartiens tout à fait à Plutarque!' (p.276).

^6 Caesar's aunt had been the wife of Marius the Elder, which made him the cousin of Marius the Younger.
resistance in 1793 is described in the following terms: 'ce moment est le plus beau de l'histoire moderne' (p.61). Napoleon's battles of Arcole, Lonato and Lodi (p.193, pp.138-40) and the latter's occupation of Milan (MN, pp. 143-44; CP, pp.5-18) are treated as moments of equal sublimity, each on a par with, and therefore related to Stendhal's own joy in Milan: 'aucun, je pense, quelque prosaïque, ambitieux et cupide qu'il ait pu devenir par la suite, n'a oublié le séjour à Milan. Ce fut le plus beau moment d'une belle jeunesse' (MN, p.167). On the other hand, Napoleon refines Danton's model by replacing its quixotic emotivity (anger) with habitude (calculation). Napoleon the young general, by virtue of his emulation of Julius Caesar, therefore shows Stendhal how to cure himself of his quixotic flaws as they have been presented in the Vie de Henry Brulard. Napoleon the Emperor, however, eventually becomes a tyrant on the Italian model, thereby bringing about his own downfall through a return to quixotry, paralleled by Stendhal's similar decline in the Souvenirs.

3. Vie de César

Stendhal chose to underline the parallels between Caesar and Napoleon, himself and Plutarch by binding the manuscript of the Mémoires with Plutarch's title, Vie de César, printed down the spine. In his literary journals Stendhal mentions this work without even specifying Plutarch as the author, so confident is he in the transparency of his allusion (JL, I, 63). More generally, Stendhal frequently uses César as code for Napoleon. He is unlikely, however, to be using the word César exclusively in its metaphorical sense of emperor. Indeed, when La Bruyère uses the word in this way to refer to a German Emperor, Stendhal misreads it as a reference to Julius Caesar (p.59).

Caesar and Napoleon, and for that matter Alexander and Julien Sorel, are all physically frail. In the Mémoires, Stendhal relies on a description of Napoleon as he was in 1795, attributed to the duchesse d'Abrantès: 'c'était bien l'être le plus maigre et le plus singulier que de ma vie jeusse rencontré' (MN, p.90). The duchess goes on to poke fun at Napoleon's clothes and haircut, in the process foreshadowing Stendhal's favourite symbol of Republican heroism, the soldier in rags. However, she goes on to make two important comparisons, first claiming that Napoleon possessed 'le regard singulier et souvent un peu sombre des Italiens' and later remembering that 'je trouvais que son regard ressemblait à celui de J.-J. Rousseau' (p.90). His regard, conventionally the window to the soul, reveals elements of an âme italienne as well as of a grande âme. The young Napoleon of the Mémoires, in the manner of Stendhal's youthful fictional heroes, turns out to be something
of a hybrid (an âme ardente). Whatever the blend of souls in the years prior to Napoleon's first successes, he will reveal himself in the Italian campaigns as primarily an âme de feu whose strength is derived from the force of his single-minded ambition.

One of Napoleon's first acts in the Italian wars is to move his headquarters from comfortable Nice to front-line Albenga. Napoleon amazes his soldiers by deciding to share their hardships, living in penury and travelling along difficult mountain tracks (p.121). Even when he is ill, he stays with his army, proclaiming:

D'ailleurs, qu'est-ce qu'un homme quand il est privé de sa propre estime? Et, tandis que tant de braves grenadiers se font tuer avec gaîté, que sera-ce qu'un général en chef qui, parce qu'il a mal à l'estomac ou à la poitrine, va se coucher dans quelque place sur les derrières? (p.290)

Caesar similarly surprises his men with his endurance:

They were amazed at the way he would undergo hardships which were, it seemed, beyond his physical strength to endure. For he was a slightly built man, had a soft and white skin, suffered from headaches and was subject to epileptic fits. [...] Yet so far from making his poor health an excuse for living an easy life, he used warfare as a tonic for his health. By long hard journeys, simple diet, sleeping night after night in the open, and rough living he fought off his illness and made his body strong enough to resist all attacks. (FRR, p.260)

Caesar and Napoleon both display physical courage (MN, p.74, FRR, p.260). More importantly, they also know how to elicit such courage from their men. Plutarch describes Caesar as doing everything in his power to inspire and cultivate bravery in his troops. First he refuses to make personal use of the spoils of war, treating them instead as a 'fund open to all for the reward of valour' (FRR, p.260). Second, as we have already seen, he shares the dangers and hardships of his men alike. Finally, he manages to make his troops share his visions of glory, and in the process associates his reputation with that of the army as a whole (p.259). Stendhal had already noted this last strategy in 1802: 'ne pas oublier l'amour de la dixième légion pour César, ni cette politique de s'attacher des corps impérissables au lieu de particuliers sujets à la mort et au changement. Politique imitée de nos jours par B[onaparte]' (JL, i, 63).

7 In the Vie, Stendhal uses almost identical terms:

Cette âme si forte était liée à un petit corps pâle, maigre et presque chétif. L'activité de cet homme et sa force à soutenir les fatigues avec un physique si mince paraissaient à son armée sortir des bornes du possible. Ce fut un des fondements de l'incroyable enthousiasme qu'il inspirait au soldat. (VN, p.31)
However, in the *Mémoires*, Stendhal dwells at greater length on such manipulation, for it is the root not only of military success, but also of political power. We have already seen how Stendhal attributes a civilizing function to the creation of the Legion of Honour. He also gives prominence to this event by listing it in his rather brief *Table Chronologique*, next to Napoleon's Caesarist appointment as 'Consul à vie' (*MN*, p.314). However, the creation of the Legion of Honour represents the culmination of a long process of analysis by Napoleon, similar to the studied approach of his pair. Even as a child, Napoleon is allegedly taught by his mother how the Corsican national guard defeated a much larger French professional army: 'dans cette lutte, toute la gloire est pour le citoyen qui résiste; le soldat n'est qu'un vil mercenaire qui gagne sa paie' (p.32). A few pages on, Stendhal notes the military advantages, as well as political disadvantages, of such an education:

En fait de gouvernement, il ne comprenait que celui d'un général qui fait agir ses troupes:

Par enthousiasme pour la patrie,
Par point d'honneur,
Par crainte du châtiment,
Par amour-propre ou intérêt de vanité,
Par intérêt d'argent.

On voit que, parmi ces *motifs d'action*, aucun n'a sa source dans les habitudes de croire ou d'agir de celui qui obéit, ni dans l'opinion qu'il peut avoir de la légitimité des ordres de celui qui commande.

En un mot, Napoléon sut se faire obéir comme général, mais il ne sut pas commander en roi, et j'attribue l'imperfection de son génie en ce point uniquement à l'absence totale d'éducation première. (pp.49-50)

Napoleon does not command in the manner of a King because his orders are designed to appeal to the self-interest of his troops rather than to their respect for authority. Stendhal suggests Napoleon defines such self-interest in descending order of merit. Thus, Napoleon's appeal to pecuniary self-interest constitutes a first step in the militarization of his subordinates, culminating in an appeal to the self-interest of *enthousiasme pour la patrie*, that is to say self-interest defined in terms of fraternity and glory (the spirit of Paoli's militia and of Danton's armies). Napoleon's ability to feel the pulse of his troops is again reminiscent of Caesar, who always turns the state of their morale to his advantage (*FRR*, p.262). Thus, Napoleon understands before the battle for the bridge at Lodi that his men have been sufficiently militarized to wish to prove their valour in the pursuit of glory. As a result, he launches an offensive designed more as a bravura performance than as a pragmatic military manoeuvre (*MN*, p.138). In return, the bravest among his troops
meet to elect him to the unofficial rank of corporal, hence the epithet _petit caporal_ by which he is thereafter known in the army (p.129). Napoleon is equally capable, however, of translating his troops' loyalty into more prosaic efficiency, as for instance in the battle of Rivoli, when Stendhal suggests that his army deploys itself even more rapidly than Caesar's legions (p.285).

Napoleon and Caesar are both aware that they themselves need to be seen to be brave in order to foster loyalty and boost morale. They are both great actors (MN, p.69, 209; FRR, p.264). However, the loyalty of their troops ultimately depends on the respective commanders' ability to make correct choices under pressure: 'pour un général en chef, la guerre est un jeu d'échecs' (MN, p.208). Or put another way:

> L'art militaire, si l'on veut être de bonne foi et le dégager des grands mots, est bien simple à définir; il consiste, pour un général en chef, à faire que ses soldats se trouvent deux contre un sur le champ de bataille.

> Ce mot dit tout; c'est la règle unique; mais souvent l'on n'a que deux minutes pour l'appliquer. (ibid.)

Thus the Austrian general Wurmser is praised by Stendhal for his physical courage, only then to be dismissed for his intellectual shortcomings (p.204). By contrast, Stendhal characterizes Napoleon as an instinctive strategist: 'il pensait avec force; il avait la logique la plus serrée' (p.45). It is Napoleon's ability to calculate under pressure, eschewing all emotion, which singles him out from among his contemporary generals:

> Sa supériorité gisait tout entière dans la faculté de trouver des idées nouvelles, avec une promptitude incroyable, de les juger avec une raison parfaite et de les mettre à exécution avec une force de volonté qui n'eut jamais d'égale. (p.47)

These powers of imagination, evaluation and execution come naturally to an âme de feu such as Plutarch's Caesar, 'who more than any man was gifted with the power of making the right use of every factor in warfare and particularly of seizing the right moment for action' (FRR, p.269). However, Napoleon holds an advantage over Caesar in that his comparative youth favours rapid decision-making:

> C'est en général vers l'âge de vingt-deux ans, que l'homme a le plus la faculté de se décider en deux minutes sur les plus grands intérêts. L'expérience de la vie diminue cette faculté, et il me semble évident que Napoléon était moins grand général à la Moscowa, et quinze jours avant la bataille de Dresde, qu'à Arcole ou à Rivoli. (MN, p.210)
In this important respect, Napoleon's life reads more like that of Alexander, who loses his initial analytical powers as he grows older and more powerful.

Stendhal suggests that Napoleon's ability to analyse events dispassionately constitutes a new form of courage: 'l'étrange fermeté de caractère dont Napoléon fit preuve à deux reprises différentes, en ne se mettant pas en retraite avant Lonato et avant Arcole, est peut-être le plus beau trait de génie que présente l'histoire moderne' (p.193). This fermeté de caractère is later explicitly compared to the qualities of Hannibal, Caesar and Alexander. Napoleon's genius consists in not letting himself be confused by fear or emotion:

Remarquez que ce ne fut point le coup de désespoir d'une tête étroite; mais la résolution d'un sage, auquel l'imminence d'un danger extrême n'ôte pas la vue nette et précise de ce qu'il est encore possible de tenter. (p.193)

In an article written on 3 April 1835, Stendhal had already referred to this new form of courage, again contrasting Napoleon with the ancients:

La force individuelle, qui était tout dans l'antiquité, n'est presque plus rien au milieu de notre civilisation moderne. [...] La force que nous admirons, c'est celle de Napoléon visitant l'hôpital de Jaffa, ou s'avancant avec simplicité vers le premier bataillon des troupes royales, sur les bords du lac de Laffrey (mars 1815); c'est la force de l'âme. (OC, XLIX, 62)

Napoleon at Arcole and at Jaffa disproves Stendhal's theory, originally derived from the work of Biran, that 'les qualités, les vertus, sont les habitudes de l'âme; or, tout ce qui est habitude disparaît dans les moments de passion' (ibid.). The âme de feu, in the manner of Caesar at Alesia (FRR, pp.270-71), retains its disciplines of habituation regardless of outside pressures and the passions they typically arouse.

Both Caesar and Napoleon find their falls foreshadowed by attempted assassinations, and both show sympathy for their failed assassins. They share many other characteristics: both hate the maladministration of fripons, both have contempt for the tottering republics they ultimately sweep aside, both distrust intellectuals and both are primarily military commanders who leave behind a legacy of successful civil reforms (Caesar's calendar, Napoleon's legal codifications). Finally both men are undermined by ill-disciplined lieutenants. These similarities in behaviour and career-paths are, however, only pointers

8 One of Napoleon's would-be assassins is presented in the Vie as a student, carrying a volume of Schiller in his hand. Napoleon is credited with trying to spare him (VN, p.121).
to the more important parallel between their respective âmes de feu. So far we have noted some of the heroic attributes of âmes de feu, and the success such attributes foster. However, âmes de feu also display counter-balancing flaws, driven as they are by a limitless, single-minded, egotistical, and ultimately criminal ambition.

4. Ambition

Caesar was born to do great things and to seek constantly for distinction. His many successes, so far from encouraging him to rest and to enjoy the fruits of all his labours, only served to kindle in him fresh confidence for the future, filling his mind with projects of still greater actions and with a passion for new glory, as though he had run through his stock of the old. His feelings can best be described by saying that he was competing with himself, as though he were someone else, and was struggling to make the future excel the past. (FRR, p.298)

Caesar's ambition, like that of Napoleon, takes the form of self-mastery. In the end, their shared aim will be to achieve an absolute form of glory, emulating and surpassing Alexander in his quest to conquer the world. Both renounce literary glory early on in their careers (MN, p.46; FRR, p.246), in order to focus on the 'champ de bataille' as a means of emulating their exemplars.

Ce livre, je le sens, présente trop souvent des récits de bataille; mais comment éviter ce défilé, si notre héros a commencé par là, si le plaisir d'acquérir de la gloire en commandant à des soldats et de vaincre avec eux a formé son caractère? (MN, p.207)

Napoleon's attitude to Caesar, as well as the attitudes of Julien, Lucien and other Stendhalian heroes to Napoleon, can all be traced back to Caesar's attitude to Alexander:

'Don't you think [...] that I have something worth being sorry about, when I reflect that at my age Alexander was already king over so many peoples, while I have never yet achieved anything really remarkable?' (FRR, p.255)

In 1793, the year in which Paoli first proclaims him a Plutarchian hero, Napoleon's ambition is tempered only by his emotivity:

Que se passait-il alors dans cette âme ardente? J'y vois:
1° La conscience de ses propres forces;
2° L'habitude d'être incapable de distraction;
3° La facilité d'être profondément ému par un mot touchant, par un présage, par une sensation;
4° La haine de l'étranger. (MN, pp.63-64)
He is undermined by the quixotry of his emotions, which at one point leads him to abandon thoughts of glory for the rival passion inspired by Josephine (p.260), as well as by his very Roman belief in auguries (pp.94-95). Nonetheless, his âme de feu holds sufficient sway for Stendhal to write the following: 'un homme de vingt-quatre ans désire deux cents choses par an; Napoléon n'en désirait qu'une: l'amour de la gloire!' (p.63).

Caesar and Napoleon crave glory rather than fame or riches because they are intent on measuring their achievements by the absolute criteria of posterity. Thus Caesar hesitates before crossing the Rubicon because 'he thought of the sufferings which his crossing of the river would bring upon mankind and he imagined the fame of the story of it which they would leave to posterity' (FRR, p.276). As for Napoleon, 'vivre dans la postérité avait été la passion constante de cette vie singulière' (MN, p.260). Indeed, Stendhal has it from his relative, comte Daru, that one of the Emperor's chief pleasures was 'celui de s'égarer dans le roman de l'avenir' (p.51). In the manner of Caesar, Napoleon is worried how his lust for power will appear to posterity:

Napoléon aimait assez à donner des ridicules à la République, importuné, non par sa gloire actuelle, tout le monde la calomnie, mais par sa gloire future, qui donnera un peu l'apparence du clinquant à la gloire de l'Empire. (p.84).

Caesar finally allows the ambition of his âme de feu to triumph over the ethics of his grande âme. He takes his chances with the judgement of posterity:

Finally, in a sort of passion, as though he were casting calculation aside and abandoning himself to whatever lay in store for him, making use too of the expression which is frequently used by those who are on the point of committing themselves to desperate and unpredictable chances, 'Let the die be cast', he said, and with these words hurried to cross the river. (FRR, p.276)

Napoleonic government is initially shown as exemplary because it also briefly allows passion to triumph over calculation, replacing the mediocrity of the directoire with the meritocracy carefully preserved in the Italian armies. Brulard's enthusiasm for Napoleon's suppression of the Republic is therefore justified because Napoleon's dictatorship, like that of Danton, offers the prospect of a dictatorship of the people (a brotherhood of great souls). However, the long-term consolidation of Napoleon's power eventually forces him to suppress both his own generous instincts and those he has prompted in his people. In retrospect, Stendhal takes the handover of the newly conquered Venetian Republic to Austria (the representative of social reaction) to have signalled, unbeknownst to the young Brulard, the official end to Napoleon's heroic period:
Thereafter, especially once he becomes confused as to who his real enemies might be (Stendhal notes his paranoia with regard to Jacobins), Napoleon begins to employ deceit, violence and even friponnerie indiscriminately.

Stendhal insists on Napoleon's hatred for the fripons who seek to make a financial profit out of his campaigns (p.227, 257), even suggesting that such hatred might have been excessive (p.256). However, Napoleon's ambition prompts him to enter into a compact with fripons which eventually leads to his downfall, not least by reducing his efficacy as a general:

L'Empereur périt par deux causes:

1° L'amour qu'il avait pris pour les gens médiocres, depuis son couronnement.
2° La réunion du métier d'empereur à celui de général en chef. Toute la soirée qui précéda la journée du 18 juin 1813 à Leipsick, fut prise par le métier d'empereur; il s'occupa à dicter des ordres pour l'Espagne, et non les détails de la retraite du lendemain, qui manqua faute d'ordre. (p.307)

Stendhal suggests that the Empire increasingly conforms to the principles of modern fripon government as it seeks to manipulate the reward-systems of society in order to promote mediocrity. Napoleon's ambition therefore reduces him to the juste milieu of a Louis-Philippe in his successful attempt to subvert latter-day Republican zeal. Thus Fouché is given the explicit task of undermining 'l'enthousiasme vertueux' of the Jacobins through an appeal to their vanity and cupidity (p.304). Napoleon underlines this reversal of meritocratic policies by attempting to reproduce the empty ceremony of the court of Louis XIV and thereby foreshadowing the restoration of Louis XVIII.

Napoleon goes on to subvert public education: 'Bonaparte lui-même eut peur de l'Ecole polytechnique et ne se détermina à la visiter qu'après le retour de l'île d'Elbe' (p.105). Thus he begins a process that culminates in the pitiful state of modern schools:

Aujourd'hui, l'on enseigne aux enfants qu'equus veut dire cheval; mais on se garde bien de leur apprendre ce que c'est qu'un cheval. Les enfants, dans leur curiosité indiscrète, pourraient finir par demander ce que c'est qu'un magistrat, et bien plus ce que doit être un magistrat. On cherche
Napoleon finds that he can best maintain his position by undermining the political resolve of his subjects. In the process, he abandons the political basis of Danton's dictatorship. Napoleon ultimately fails to militarize civil society; instead, civil society finally succeeds in corrupting his army, replacing fraternity with egoism, courage with vanity.

Napoleon is driven into an alliance with mediocrity by his fear of idealism. In this respect, Napoleon is again echoing Caesar, who famously remarks: 'I'm not much afraid of these fat, long-haired people. It's the other type I'm more frightened of, the pale thin ones.' (FRR, p.302). Caesar nonetheless overcomes his fear sufficiently to promote Brutus, thereby recognizing and recompensing the qualities of a superior soul rather than seeking to repress them. Napoleon shows less nobility of spirit in his attempt to preserve power, doing his utmost to eliminate potential political threats through a systematic promotion of mediocrity within the Empire, symbolized by the career of Louis-Alexandre Berthier, Napoleon's chief of staff, and the future prince of Neuchâtel. Berthier is initially accused of having corrupted the republican spirit of the army: 'nous verrons plus tard combien il contribua à gâter l'armée vers 1805, et à substituer, dans le cœur des officiers, l'égoïsme à l'enthousiasme de la gloire' (MN, p.246). Stendhal later reintroduces this charge obliquely by means of an anecdote.

A young French landscape painter, Biogi, then on a sketching tour of Lake Garda, finds himself caught in the fighting, and distinguishes himself in the exchanges at Gavardo. Napoleon makes his acquaintance at a time when he is already 'environné de jeunes gens qui jouaient l'enthousiasme ou exagéraient celui qu'ils éprouvaient réellement' (p.287). Stendhal notes: 'il était une chose que Napoléon exécrait alors par-dessus tout, c'étaient les rapports entachés de gasconisme et qui peignent tout en beau' (p.287). Stendhal is clearly implying through his use of 'alors' that Napoleon will soon lose this distaste. Indeed, the process appears to have already started, for Napoleon's instinct is to try and buy the painter's company once he discovers that he enjoys the honesty of his conversation. Berthier serves as Napoleon's accomplice, repeatedly insinuating that the painter has only to attach himself to the Emperor's entourage, accept a military rank for which he is in no way qualified, and his fortune will be assured (p.287, 289). Biogi replies coolly that his ambition is to be a painter, amazing Berthier and stimulating Napoleon with his obstinate
disregard for self-advancement. Biogi discusses all subjects openly with Napoleon, even at the risk of provoking the latter's displeasure, and refuses to compromise his independence by offering the kind of unequivocal political support Napoleon typically demands. When Biogi asks Napoleon whether he is afraid of being poisoned, Berthier signals that he must change the topic of conversation (p.289):

Mais au grand étonnement du chef d'état-major (qui, dans le tête-à-tête, était traité par son général comme un petit commis et n'osait dire son avis que quand on le lui demandait bien expressément, ce qui était fort rare), Napoléon se mit à traiter le sujet philosophiquement et à fond. (pp.289-90)

The reply Stendhal attributes to Napoleon is meant to illustrate the general's continued capacity not only to admire great souls such as Biogi, but also to win their respect. Napoleon still shares the ardour of his troops, even though it is being undermined by men such as Berthier: "'Au fait", disait-il [Biogi], en 1837, "c'étaient les officiers que je n'aimais pas, le général en chef et les grenadiers me plaisaient fort"' (p.294).

At the battle of Leipzig in 1813, Berthier refuses to take military decisions, even though the Emperor's apathy has produced a decision-making vacuum (p.307). Berthier has both contributed to the enervation of Napoleon, and eliminated any rival sources of authority. Even in defeat, Berthier maintains his hostility towards potential savours: 'on ne distinguait d'autre mouvement, dans cette âme dépourvue de toute activité, qu'une aversion bien prononcée pour les généraux qui montraient du caractère et de l'énergie' (p.308). Stendhal claims the authority of an eye-witness in his most damning indictment, not only of Berthier, but incidentally of Napoleon himself:

Nous l'avons vu à cette époque, homme totalement usé, fort occupé comme son maître de son nouvel état de prince, craignant d'en compromettre les privilèges, en étant trop poli dans la forme de ses lettres. Ce prince était tellement usé et fatigué, que lorsqu'on allait lui demander des ordres, on le trouvait souvent renversé dans son fauteuil, les pieds appuyés sur sa table et sifflant, pour toute réponse. (ibid.)

Napoleon is no longer an âme de feu. Instead, he is motivated by 'vanité puérile' (p.229). He has substituted the quasi-absolute values of posterity for the relative values of his new peer group. Thus he acts 'pour se montrer digne du noble corps des Rois, dans lequel il venait d'entrer' (pp.229-30). Although Berthier is blamed for 'une bonne moitié des

9 Biogi's rejection of Napoleon's patronage echoes that of Canova in the Promenades (VIT, p.879).
malheurs de l'armée française' (p.309), Stendhal notes that by the end, Napoleon is just as much at fault as his chief of staff. Napoleon surrounds himself with 'chambellans à manières élégantes, fournis par le faubourg Saint-Germain', whereas Berthier prefers 'jeunes officiers qui affectaient une élégance de costume, et qui connaissaient profondément toutes les nuances de l'étiquette' (p.309). Napoleon's predilection for the old aristocracy is easily explained by one of his own sayings: 'ces gens là sont les seuls qui sachent servir' (p.305). Napoleon no longer commands through the respect or fear he inspires, but through a deadening system of etiquette and manners. He has completed his transition from the successful emulation of Caesar to the hollow imitation of Louis XIV. Napoleon's military defeat is henceforth inevitable.

Napoleon's fall, in the manner of Stendhal/Brulard's own fall of 1814, allows the hero to renounce coquinerie and once more take up the idealism of the imagination. Caesar and Napoleon teach their troops, including the young Stendhal, that self-transcendence is possible through fraternity. The tyrant (Caesar) therefore stands in the same relation to the tyrannicide (Brutus) as fraternity to liberty. Caesar and Brutus are both âmes ardentes, both criminal in their attempt to transcend themselves and so place their ardour above the positive law that governs the society in which they live. In his fiction, Stendhal follows Alfieri and Schiller in suggesting that common criminals best emulate the achievements of Caesar and Brutus in a modern, fripon society. The Vie de Henry Brulard and the Mémoires sur Napoléon show the need for such emulation by presenting Stendhal's autobiography in terms of his interaction with Danton's Republic, Napoleon's armies, and the liberated Italian cities of the north, particularly Milan. Each constitute short-lived examples of passionate society, founded on a spontaneous enthusiasm for liberty and fraternity.
4

HISTORIETTES ROMAINES

'Sixte-Quint, pape en 1585, à soixante-huit ans, régna cinq ans et quatre mois; il a des rapports frappants avec Napoléon.'

(CI, 1, 20)

1. Singularity

Stendhal never used the title Chroniques Italiennes himself (CI, 1, lxxv), although in May 1833 he did envisage publishing a collection to be entitled Historiettes romaines. Rome vers 1600. These Historiettes were to be based on a series of original Italian manuscripts purchased by Stendhal at the end of February 1833. His first instinct had been to turn the two manuscripts relating the story of Vittoria Accoramboni into a full-length novel: 'I though [sic] in march [sic] 1833 of making of this story as of that of Julien' (p.xxxii). However, Stendhal appears to have abandoned this idea on the grounds that the manuscripts' interest lay precisely in their historical authenticity (p.xxxv). The Historiettes were therefore intended to take the form of edited translations rather than works of fiction. As a result, Vanina Vanini (1829) and San Francesco a Ripa (1831) could not have been included among the Historiettes as they are works of fiction set in early-nineteenth- and eighteenth-century Rome respectively. Similarly, L'Abbesse de Castro (1839), along with the unfinished Trop de faveur tue (1839) and Suora Scolastica (1839-42), are each substantially works of fiction. However, Vittoria Accoramboni, Les Cenci (both 1837) and La Duchesse de Palliano (1838) are each free translations of Stendhal's original late-sixteenth-century manuscripts and so constitute a belated realization of the Historiettes romaines.¹

Stendhal's decision in early 1837 finally to undertake his projected translations of the Historiettes' original manuscripts follows logically from the historiographical method he had been developing since December 1836 in the Mémoires sur Napoléon. The latter text was designed as a commentary on Napoleon's own accounts of his campaigns as

¹ Massimo Colesanti argues in favour of the title Historiettes romaines in his Stendhal: le regole del gioco (Milan: Garzanti, 1983), pp.239-60, and uses it for his edition of the stories (Milan: Mursia, 1962). Colesanti accepts that the title can only properly be applied to Vittoria Accoramboni, Les Cenci and La Duchesse de Palliano (Le regole, p.252).
found in Las Cases, Jomini and Gourgaud's *Mémoires de Napoléon*. Stendhal intended to insert substantial extracts from these works after his own 'récit raisonnable' of Napoleon's heroism (*MN*, p.v). Similarly, Stendhal provides each of the three *Historiettes* with an interpretative introduction, a *récit raisonnable* which attempts to make sense of the story that follows. In a note to himself, Stendhal specifies the projected scope of Napoleon's own texts within the *Mémoires*: 'ne take le texte de Napoléon que pour les *récits militaires* (p.338). Similarly, the translated texts of the three *Historiettes* serve to provide the reader with a variant of the *récit militaire*, namely the 'récit sincère' of *Vittoria Accoramboni* (*CI*, I, 5). Stendhal describes the original narrator of *Vittoria Accoramboni* in the following terms: 'il ne juge jamais un fait, ne le prépare jamais; son affaire unique est de raconter avec vérité' (p.4). Thus Stendhal ascribes a level of truthfulness to his narrator previously also attained by Napoleon 'par enthousiasme pour le beau idéal militaire' (*MN*, p.14). Stendhal goes on to associate the narrator's truthfulness with both clarity and a lack of hypocrisy, military virtues already identified in the *Mémoires* (*MN*, p.8, 207). Finally, Stendhal admits that his narrator's style is occasionally 'souverainement obscur' (*CI*, I, 4), again in the manner of Napoleon: 'supposant, comme les gens passionnés, que tout le monde devait le comprendre à demi-mot, quelquefois il est obscur' (*MN*, p.6).

The *Historiettes* follow on from the *Mémoires sur Napoléon* thematically as well as methodologically. The *Mémoires* had proposed, without fully exploring, a possible parallel between Napoleon and the condottieri or princes of the Italian Renaissance. Stendhal develops this parallel in the *Historiettes*, explicitly comparing Napoleon to Sixtus V (*CI*, I, 20 [*VA*]). More importantly, Stendhal adduces the *Historiettes* as evidence in support of a complicated cultural model which implicitly serves to elucidate the origins of both Napoleon's virtues and flaws. Stendhal is at pains to distinguish, in the *Historiettes*, between the Italian passion (*virtù*) which links Renaissance Italians (and therefore Napoleon) to the traditions of Greek and Roman virtue (Livy and Plutarch), and other influences such as Spanish conceptions of honour and French vanity which threaten to sever this link. Indeed, in the *Historiettes* as well as in *L'Abbesse de Castro* and *Trop de faveur tue*, Stendhal appears to posit sixteenth-century Italy as the microcosm of an unfolding historical continuum which was eventually to produce not only Napoleon (Caesar) but also the French Revolution (Brutus) and the *fripon*, juste-milieu monarchy of Louis-Philippe. Stendhal had already formulated this idea in his literary journal: 'nous parviendrons enfin à peindre les âmes italiennes en étudiant profondément le Moyen Age, qui a tant d'influence sur nous, et dont nous ne sommes qu'une continuation, et en exploitant le Moyen Age à la manière de Shakespeare et de Schiller' (*JL*, III, 127 [1818]).
In *Trop de faveur tue*, he again makes this point explicitly: 'mon désir [...] est de faire connaître les hommes simples et passionnés du XVᵉ siècle desquels provient la civilisation actuelle' (CI, i, 251). Nineteenth-century society is deemed to originate among the passionate (singular) men of the Italian Renaissance.

Stendhal systematically plays with narrative convention in the *Historiettes* in order to emphasize the twinned themes of singularity and originality. Thus he states unambiguously that the *Historiettes* are each merely translations, knowing that his protestations would be widely interpreted by contemporary readers as forms of mystification of the kind he was later to employ in *L'Abbesse de Castro, Trop de faveur tue* and *Suora Scolastica*. However, the *Historiettes* go on to frustrate the nineteenth-century reader's expectations of historical fiction, defined by Stendhal in terms of the 'émois entraînantes' of a novel by George Sand (p.5 [VA])2 or the 'grandes passions' of Ann Radcliffe's *The Italian* (p.90 [DP]). Instead, the *Historiettes* present the reader with what he or she least expects, namely the ostensibly anti-literary examples of aberrant human behaviour promised in the introductions, and justified in terms of their intrinsic anthropological value: 'quand par hasard, courant la poste seul à la tombée de la nuit, on s'avise de réfléchir au grand art de connaître le cœur humain, on pourra prendre pour base de ses jugements les circonstances de l'histoire que voici' (p.5). Stendhal is once again distinguishing between imagination and calculation, *passion* and *habitude*, Rousseau and Napoleon.

Lexically, the *Historiettes* appear to offer relatively few surprises. Long passages of the translations are surprisingly close to their originals, with the occasional important word or phrase cited in the original Italian for added accuracy and authenticity. Nevertheless, Stendhal makes no attempt to capture the regional and archaic registers of the Italian, or for that matter its idiosyncratic spelling (a feature of Stendhal's own unpublished writings), even though, in his introduction to *La Duchesse de Palliano*, he acknowledges the presence of these features in the original manuscripts (pp.88-89). Furthermore, Stendhal frequently takes over from the original narrator, sometimes surreptitiously, in order to simplify or explain an obscure point or reference. In the process, he dilutes the idiosyncrasy and historical accuracy of the original still further. However, Stendhal tries

---

2 Stendhal remarks that 'ce grand écrivain eût fait un chef-d'œuvre avec la vie et les malheurs de Vittoria Accoramboni' (CI, i, 5 [VA]), perhaps in a self-mocking reference to his own discarded plan of March 1833 to write just such a masterpiece based on this same story.
to compensate by exaggerating the already marked lexical coherence of the original texts' descriptions of their protagonists.

Stendhal repeatedly imposes the adjective *singulier* both in the translations (p.9, 20, 21 [VA], 55 (twice), 58, 79 [LC], 95 [DP]) and in the introductions (p.45, 46 [LC], 87, 89, 91 [DP]). He also systematically multiplies the use of its cognates *extraordinaire*, *étonnant* and *étrange*. The first paragraph of *Vittoria Accoramboni* serves as a particularly striking example. The Italian original already refers to the beauty of Vittoria as *rara* and *extraordinaria* (translated as *rare* and *extraordinaire*). The text goes on to describe either her person or her various attributes as *maraviglioso*, *straordinario* and *prodigioso*, translated by Stendhal as *remarquable*, *extraordinaire* and *qui tient du prodige*. However, Stendhal chooses further to emphasize Vittoria's singularity by inserting the adjective *extraordinaire* an additional two times in the space of the paragraph. Thus we are told in the space of a few lines that Vittoria's beauty (twice), qualities and charm are all extraordinary. The effect of these statements is to suggest not that Vittoria's attributes are extraordinary, but rather that extraordinariness is her universal attribute. As the *Historiettes* unfold, Stendhal introduces further cognates such as *inouï* (p.10 [VA]), *inconcevable* (p.69 [LC]), *frappant* (p.20 [VA]) and *particulier* (p.62 [LC]) to complement adjectives such as *incroyable*, *remarquable* and *rare* already present in the original in their Italian equivalents. Similarly, Stendhal introduces terms such as *bizarrie*, *monstre*, *pressentiment* and *miracle* to complement the concept of *le prodige* already present.

This stress on singularity serves to frustrate the reader's desire to recognize stock characteristics and so predict the protagonists' actions; a desire ironically articulated by Stendhal in his introduction to *La Duchesse de Palliano*: 'moi, jeune Français, né au nord de Paris, suis-je bien sûr de deviner ce qu'éprouvaient ces âmes italiennes de l'an 1559?' (p.91). However, this frustration paradoxically affords the reader an insight into the problems faced by the sixteenth-century protagonists, for it replicates their own apparent inability to understand and predict each other's thoughts and actions. Each of the main protagonists possesses 'la passion italienne' (CI, 1, 88 [DP]). Each is therefore singular, that is to say free from social conventions of behaviour and taste. Stendhal underlines this point by picking up on another element contained within the Italian texts, namely the protagonists' occasional perverse deference to social conventions at the most inappropriate times. Thus the original text of *Vittoria Accoramboni* notes that the female relatives of the murdered Félix adopt the social behaviour appropriate to 'quello, che portano le morti
comuni nelle case ben composte di uomini saviamente disciplinati' (CI, II, 94), translated as 'ce qui a lieu, dans les familles les plus réglées, pour les morts les plus prévues' (CI, I, 11). The added double use of plus allows Stendhal to emphasize the extraordinariness of the relatives' ordinariness. He uses the same procedure to describe the public reaction of the victim's uncle, Cardinal Montalto (the future Sixtus V) to a meeting with Orsini, the man presumed responsible for the murder: 'personne ne put observer rien d'extraordinaire. Le cardinal Montalto se conforma à tout ce que prescrivaient les convenances de la cour; il donna à son visage une teinte d'hilarité fort remarquable, et sa façon d'adresser la parole au prince fut remplie d'affabilité' (pp.14-15). Montalto conforms to court convention by adopting an expression of hilarity which is remarkable in absolute terms as a manifestation of affability. Montalto is not even showing signs of Julien's 'hilarité farouche'. Rather the remarkableness of his hilarity points once again to the extraordinariness of his ordinariness. The conversational tone used by Béatrix Cenci while undergoing torture (CI, I, 71; II, 144) constitutes a further example of this procedure, as does Stendhal's invented description of the tone adopted by the Duchess of Palliano immediately before her execution by strangulation: 'la chose se passa, de la part de la duchesse, absolument sur le ton d'une conversation ordinaire' (CI, I, 114). Similarly, Louis Orsini dies by strangulation 'fort bien disposé' (p.37 [VA]) while Cardinal Carafa prepares for the same death by maintaining a gloomy silence, prompting Stendhal to remark: 'le cardinal montra une grandeur d'âme supérieure à celle de son frère, d'autant qu'il dit moins de paroles; les paroles sont toujours une force que l'on cherche hors de soi' (p.117 [DP]). Even though the rope breaks twice: 'le cardinal regarda le bourreau sans daigner prononcer un mot' (p.118).

Jefferson has developed Shoshana Felman's discussions of madness (defined by Stendhal as pre-social or even anti-social isolation within society)\(^3\) and 'la parole solitaire' (p.162). In the process, Jefferson notes the importance of singularité, particularly as Stendhal applies the term to Mathilde and Julien (p.128), suggesting that Stendhal uses the notion of singularity to indicate his heroes' and heroines' 'failure or [...] inability to comply with the reigning convenances' (p.121). For their part, the Historiettes represent singularity as being at the same time exceptional (individual) and original (human), that is to say, paradoxically, both singular and characteristic. The Historiettes are like the anecdotes of 'M. F***', a Roman visiting Genoa in the Voyage en France: 'M. F*** sait une quantité

---

\(^3\) Shoshana Felman, La 'Folie' dans l'œuvre romanesque de Stendhal (Paris: Corti, 1971), pp.134-44.
d'anecdotes, non pas plaisantes à la française, mais caractéristiques et qu'on n'oublie plus, comme celles de Plutarque' (*VFR*, p.540). The *Historiettes* are both characteristic (the true representation of a shared humanity) and unforgettable (a unique manifestation of that same humanity). This paradox (the exceptionalness of representativeness) is clearly related to that just discussed (the extraordinariness of ordinariness). Stendhal solves the new paradox by showing the workings of an 'original' society founded on the open expression of individual desires rather than the stratagems (doxa) of *friponnerie*: 'la vanité n'enveloppait point toutes les actions des hommes d'une auréole d'affectation; on croyait ne pouvoir agir sur le voisin qu'en s'exprimant avec la plus grande clarté possible' (*CI*, I, 4).

Stendhal's Renaissance Italians recognize their singularity in the rival singularity of their friends and enemies. This point is formally underlined in the *Historiettes* by the way the stories introduce and then discard a series of apparent chief protagonists.

Stendhal describes *La Duchesse de Palliano* in the following terms: 'ce récit, que j'abrège beaucoup, à mon grand regret (je supprime une foule de circonstances caractéristiques), comprend les dernières aventures de la malheureuse famille Carafa, plutôt que l'histoire intéressante d'une seule passion' (pp.90-91). The interaction of rival passions within an extended family allows Stendhal to present his reader with a polyphonic text. Jefferson has taken Mikhail Bakhtin's concept of polyphony and applied it with particular reference to *De l'amour* (p.60), *Le Rouge et le Noir* (p.100) and the representation of politics in *La Chartreuse de Parme* (pp.174-80). 'Fiction is [...] a thoroughly polyphonic affair which, in citing the different discourses of its day, seeks to heighten its readers' sense of those differences' (p.60). Jefferson's choice of text prompts her to concentrate on the citational aspects of nineteenth-century polyphony. *La Duchesse de Palliano*, however, presents not so much the polyphonic discourses of a given society (*la civilisation actuelle*) but rather the ur-polyphony of singular voices (Felman's *parole solitaire*) within a family (the original social unit). The polyphony of the *Historiettes* proposes an almost infinite dialogism, where there are as many dialects or languages as there are singular individuals. This fragmentation of language (absence of socio-economic or socio-political linguistic conventions) stems from the asocial nature of individual desire (*passions*), which precludes the development of dominant social discourses and with it hypocrisy: 'personne ne songeait à être aimable par la parole' (p.4). Stendhal's epigraph from the first book of *Le Rouge et le Noir*, 'la parole a été donnée à l'homme pour cacher sa pensée' (p.130), previously also inserted in the dialogue of *Armance* (*A*, p.217), does not yet apply to a world without cant (*CI*, I, 42 [LC]). 'On ne disait point encore: "Je mourrai aux pieds de Votre Majesté", au moment où l'on venait d'envoyer chercher des chevaux de poste pour
prendre la fuite; c'était un genre de trahison qui n'était pas inventé (CI, 1, 4-5 [VA]).

Stendhal has found a world without fripons and therefore without dupes. The word represents an attempt to 'agir sur le voisin' through clarity rather than deceit. As a result, 'on parlait peu, et chacun donnait une extrême attention à ce qu'on lui disait' (CI, 1, 5 [VA]):

Le don Juan romain s'est bien gardé de la maladresse insigne de donner la clef de son caractère, et de faire des confidences à un laquais, comme le don Juan de Molière; il a vécu sans confidant, et n'a prononcé de paroles que celles qui étaient utiles pour l'avancement de ses desseins. (p.49 [LC])

Vittoria Accoramboni is formally the most polyphonic of the Historiettes, and it is perhaps to preserve this polyphony that in March 1833 Stendhal resolved to translate the story rather than write a novel presenting Vittoria as a foregrounded passionate heroine. Stendhal's notes show his awareness that the structure of the story confuses the reader by presenting a series of protagonists as though they were each the heroine or hero of the story as a whole. Thus on 26 April 1833 Stendhal notes: 'dans cette nouvelle l'intérêt voyage, ici l'intérêt de curiosité il est vrai passe au [cardinal]' (CI, II, 94). Stendhal goes on to observe: 'l'intérêt voyage: passage au prince Orsini' (p.96). In fact, Vittoria, Cardinal Montalto, Paul Orsini, Vittoria again, Louis Orsini and the Venetian government of Padua each take their turn as centres for the text. This 'voyage of interest' belies the title Vittoria Accoramboni, just as Stendhal's 'aventures de la malheureuse famille Carafa, plutôt que l'histoire intéressante d'une seule passion' (CI, i, 90-91) belie the title La Duchesse de Palliano. Vittoria Accoramboni in particular, by abandoning the monologic hero or heroine of narrative convention, forces the reader to recognize the singularity of each successive chief protagonist. The Historiettes go on to present such singularity as evidence of the generalized singularity of the human heart (CI, 1, 5 [VA]), a concept which undermines conventional notions of narrative and, more importantly, society.

Stendhal shows original society forming around the notion of a genuine common interest (the social contract), opposed to the concept of an artificial common interest (the interest of a corps) imposed by fripon society. Ernest Dévelroy describes this process in Lucien Leuven: 'si ton indépendance donne de l'humeur au monde, il saura bien trouver quelque prétexte pour te percer le cœur. [...] Alors tu sentiras la nécessité d'être quelque chose, d'appartenir à un corps qui te soutienne au besoin' (LL, 1, 99). Fripon government seeks

---

4 Louis Orsini's claim to have 'pris pour dupe' (CI, 1, 29) or 'corbellato' (CI, II, 108) the chief magistrate of the Paduan corte proves overly optimistic.
to promote the common interest of an élite corps (frigons) which uses behavioural norms (cant or hypocrisie) in order to extend the concept of society to areas which do not properly concern it, governing for the sake of governing, and cheating the dupe of his or her remaining pre-social rights. Stendhal proposes the Christian priesthood as the classic example of such a corps, 'absolument séparé du reste des citoyens et même ayant des intérêts opposés': 'ce corps fit son unique affaire de cultiver et de fortifier le sentiment religieux; il inventa des prestiges et des habitudes pour émouvoir les esprits de toutes les classes, depuis le pâtre inculte jusqu'au vieux courtisan blasé (CI, I, 44 [LC]). Implicit to this argument lies Stendhal's radical idea that human beings in a sovereign community require relatively little in the way of government (OI, II, 103 [J, 1829]). The vast majority of human actions relate only to the clash of individual interests which original government at no stage sought to regulate. Society is therefore deemed original if, as in ancient Athens, it allows the individual maximum freedom within the terms of a still equitable social contract: 'le gouvernement seul parlait de s'abstenir; il défendait les choses qui pouvaient nuire à la patrie, c'est-à-dire à l'intérêt bien entendu de tous, et non ce qui peut nuire à l'individu qui agit' (CI, I, 42 [LC]).

Athenian citizens voluntarily cede a part of their freedom in the interests of the common good. Thus, there is no need to suborn their remaining freedom by means of either social convention or organized religion:

La religion était une fête, elle exhortait les hommes au plaisir; comment aurait-elle flétri des êtres qui faisaient d'un certain plaisir leur unique affaire? (p.42)

Tout homme qui avait du goût pour les femmes et beaucoup d'argent pouvait donc être un don Juan dans Athènes, personne n'y trouvait à redire; personne ne professait que cette vie est une vallée de larmes, et qu'il y a du mérite à se faire souffrir. (ibid.)

It is not until the triumph of Christianity that the individual learns to suppress his or her desires in accordance with criteria wholly divorced from social utility:

C'est sans doute cette religion qui enseigna au monde qu'un pauvre esclave, qu'un gladiateur avait une âme absolument égale en faculté à celle de César lui-même; ainsi, il faut la remercier de l'apparition des sentiments délicats; je ne doute pas, au reste, que tôt ou tard ces sentiments ne se

---

5 Stendhal refers to French Restoration society as 'cette civilisation si avancée qui pour chaque action, si indifférente qu'elle soit, se charge de vous fournir un modèle qu'il faut suivre, ou du moins auquel il faut faire son procès' (A, p.211).
This broad-brush approach to history appears to have pleased Stendhal, who on 17 January 1842 wrote 'Style de Machiavel' against this passage (p.44). The concept of spiritual equality, preached by a self-serving clerical élite, is designed to eradicate singularity. The individual is no longer to be judged on the basis of actions, and their social utility (usefulness to the patrie), but rather on intangible moral qualities. Hence Stendhal's fury in the Vie de Henry Brulard at Félix Faure's attempt to judge the men and women of the French Revolution by a sentimental conception of morality:

Tous les ménagements, quand il s'agit de la patrie, me semblent encore puérils.

Je dirais criminels, sans mon mépris sans bornes pour les êtres faibles. (Exemple M. Félix Faure, pair de France, premier président, parlant à son fils, à Sain-Ismier, été 1828, de la mort de Louis XVI: Il a été mis à mort par des méchants. (OI, II, 635)

This change in values results in society necessarily encroaching into all areas of an individual's activities in an attempt to discover his or her true character. Such inquiries must necessarily lead either to the abandonment of singularity or else to its disguise through hypocrisy. Society seeks to limit individual freedom (the pursuit of a singular passion) in an attempt to socialize and normalize the individual, not in the interests of utility but in the self-interest of fripon groups within society.

Stendhal sees the rise in Christianity as either responsible for, or contingent with, the decline of the Roman Empire. By contrast, the barbarism of the Middle Ages sees a return to the ancient conception of society. Thus Leo X and his courtiers of 1506 'suivaient à peu près les principes de la religion d'Athènes' (CI, I, 45 [LC]). This return is by no means confined to Italy. Stendhal accepts that France enjoyed some of the benefits of societal originality up until the Renaissance (hence Mathilde de la Mole's obsession with her sixteenth-century forebear, Boniface de la Mole). Nonetheless, these benefits are already being distorted by the vanity implicit in d'Aubigné's concept of parestre (CI, I, 41; VTT, p.625 [PR]). Stendhal dates the resurgence of hypocrisy to the Counter-Reformation (CI, I, 45 [LC]), and its mission to suborn individuality, embodied by the practices of the Jesuit order. Thus Christianity is held responsible for the emergence of the don Juan in

6 Stendhal still broadly accepts Alfieri's division of literature as either energetic and honest (the barbaric masculinity of a Homer) or supine and dishonest (the civilized effeminacy of Virgil).
particular (p.42) and perversion in general (p.43). This new criminality is characterized by the *don Juan*'s love for 'la corruption pour elle-même' (ibid.), itself a reaction against the normalizing pressures of the Counter-Reformation and thus a perverse attempt to recover 'la liberté de penser et d'agir dont on avait joui du temps de Léon X, qui nous fut enlevée en 1513, et sous Paul III, mort en 1549 [around the time when François Cenci started making a name for himself]' (p.55). Thus, Stendhal defines the figure of the *don Juan* as 'celui qui ne cherche à se conformer à aucun modèle idéal, et qui ne songe à l'opinion du monde que pour l'outrager' (p.52). The *don Juan* represents an extreme form of singularity at a time when such singularity is under unprecedented attack.

2. *Rome vers 1600*

The three *Historiettes* investigate the Renaissance origins of Napoleon's virtues (Roman *virtù*) and flaws (French vanity). Despite Stendhal's apparently wayward sense of historical dates, a chronology of sorts can be established. The *Vie de Napoléon* suggests a possible link between Napoleon and the tyrants of Treviso, deposed in 1389 by the Venetian Republic, itself one of the protagonists of *Vittoria Accoramboni* (p.39). In the *Mémoires sur Napoléon*, Stendhal compares Napoleon both to the tyrants of 1400 (Sforza, Piccinino and Castracani) and to Cesare Borgia, Machiavelli's prince of around 1500 (*MN*, pp.34-35). Finally, the *Historiettes* focus on *Rome vers 1600*.

*Trop de faveur tue*, subtitled *Histoire de 1589*, begins with Stendhal's acknowledgement of his 'désir qui est de faire connaître les hommes simples et passionnés du XVᵉ siècle desquels provient la civilisation actuelle' (*CI*, i, 251). Del Litto suggests this reference to the fifteenth-century constitutes a 'lapsus' (p.493). Alternatively, Stendhal may deliberately be referring to the fifteenth century, a century that encompasses both Sforza and Borgia and influences the events not only of 1589, but also of the early-nineteenth century. *Vittoria Accoramboni* dates the decline of Italian originality to the period between the Spanish seizure of Florence in 1530 and 1600 (p.3 [*VA*]). Yet two paragraphs later, Stendhal makes the same apparent mistake as in *Trop de faveur tue*, claiming that the manuscripts on which he is working 'montrent les mœurs de l'Italie vers l'an 1500' (p.4). Two sentences later, Stendhal assures us that 'je sais l'histoire du XVIᵉ siècle en Italie et je crois que ce qui suit est parfaitement vrai' before finally locating his story correctly around the year 1585. It is possible that Stendhal does indeed know his history, and that he believes his heroes and heroines of the late-sixteenth century illustrate aspects of Italian *mœurs* in the fifteenth. Stendhal may be positing an historical continuum.
of diminishing returns, which would explain why Italian originality next manifests itself in the exceptional environment of uncivilized Corsica, first in the form of Pascal Paoli and then of Napoleon.

Stendhal uses *Les Cenci*, subtitled 1599 to *describe* the reasons for this decline, citing the *don juanisme* (a form of *espagnolisme*) of Francesco Cenci, born in 1527, the year of Charles V's sack of Rome, as an example of the growing foreign influence on the *mœurs* of Leo X's pontificate. Such *don juanisme* is further associated with the rise of Christianity and the French influence of 'la monarchie à la Louis XV' (p.43). *La Duchesse de Palliano*, set in 1566, finally establishes a definitive chronology for Italian originality:

> Ce qu'on appelle la passion italienne, c'est-à-dire la passion qui cherche à se satisfaire, et non pas à donner au voisin une idée magnifique de notre individu, commence à la renaissance de la société, au XIXe siècle, et s'éteint, du moins dans la bonne compagnie, vers l'an 1734. (p.89)

Within this broader time-frame, Stendhal again dates the beginning of the Spanish influence to 1530:

> Je sais bien que l'on peut dire que, dès l'époque de Charles-Quint (1530), Naples, Florence, et même Rome, imitèrent un peu les mœurs espagnoles; mais ces habitudes sociales si nobles n'étaient-elles pas fondées sur le respect infini que tout homme digne de ce nom doit avoir pour les mouvements de son âme? Bien loin d'exclure l'énergie, elles l'exagéraient. (p.88)

This Spanish influence, although contrary to societal originality, is nonetheless still characterized as singular (p.46 [*LC*], p.91 [*DP*]), particularly in its form of the 'don Juan pur (celui qui ne cherche à se confronter à aucun modèle idéal, et qui ne songe à l'opinion du monde que pour l'outrager)' (p.52). The French influence, by contrast, centres on the importance of 'parestre' and so accords itself ideally with the Jesuitry of the Counter-Reformation. *Vittoria Accoramboni* and *La Duchesse de Palliano* provide a representation of the interplay between the Italian originality (*virtù*) of the fifteenth-century and the growing *espagnolisme* of the sixteenth. *Les Cenci* deals instead with the dilution of Italian originality, primarily as the result of French influence. Stendhal uses his introductions and footnotes to present this process of dilution in terms of the changing relationship between individual citizens and the workings of the law.

Stendhal suggests that the rule of law ought properly to concern itself with the interests of the *patrie* (p.42 [*LC*]). This Catonic approach is contrasted to the positive law of Louis XV's monarchy, which encourages the criminal to expose hypocrisy (p.43). The French
don Juan eventually finds 'une volupté exquise à braver les opinions qui lui semblent à lui-même justes et raisonnables' (ibid.). This love for 'la corruption pour elle-même' (ibid.) constitutes a form of direct revolt against the Christian introduction of 'sentiments délicats' (p.44). Thus, Stendhal implies a general rule: the more society seeks to regulate the legitimate freedoms of the individual through a process of normalization, the more the individual is likely to react by taking back his or her full range of pre-societal freedoms:

François Cenci se sera dit: 'Par quelles actions parlantes, moi Romain, né à Rome en 1527, précisément pendant les six mois durant lesquels les soldats luthériens du connétable de Bourbon y commirent, sur les choses saintes, les plus affreuses profanations; par quelles actions pourrais-je faire remarquer mon courage, et me donner, le plus profondément possible, le plaisir de braver l'opinion? Comment étonnerai-je mes sots contemporains? Comment pourrai-je me donner le plaisir si vif de me sentir différent de tout ce vulgaire?' (p.48)

In the original text, this desire to offend the normalizing dictates of society is symbolized by François Cenci's incestuous relationship with Béatrix, as well as by his heretical claim that the eventual children of this relationship will be born saints (CI, II, 138).

The tyranny of society also engenders a second form of criminal revolt. Stendhal notes in L'Abbesse de Castro: 'on peut dire en général que [les] brigands furent l'opposition contre les gouvernements atroces qui, en Italie, succédèrent aux répubhques du Moyen Age' (p.119). In a society where government in the common interest has been supplanted by government in the interests either of an individual or a corps, the only alternative to the denial of society is to reimpose a form of society which is either legitimate (the Gesellschaft of a Sixtus V, to use Max Weber's terminology) or consensual (the Gemeinschaft of brigand bands or other military corps, such as Paoli's militia or Napoleon's armies). Stendhal's notion of the corps is similar to the late-Republican Roman concept of the factio, which stands in the same relative position to the res publica as the Gemeinschaft to the Gesellschaft. Thus Caesar notes that 'in Gaul there are factions, not only in every state and every village but practically in each individual household as well' (The Gallic War, p.125).

Stendhal explores this second form of revolt more fully in L'Abbesse de Castro and La Chartreuse de Parme. In the Historiettes, he contents himself with noting that under ineffectual Popes, such as Gregory XIII (p.10 [VA], 55-56 [LC]), the government can no longer impose the rule of law through the corte (p.10, 18 [VA]). Society as Gesellschaft (a unified politico-juridical entity) finds itself supplanted by the spontaneous emergence of
smaller societies (*Gemeinschaften*), based on affective relations of patronage centred around powerful families such as the Orsini (*VA*) and the Colonna (*AC*). These societies, based as they are on voluntary submission and competition with other groups, prove necessarily much less prescriptive than society as a whole. As a result, the individual has a much greater freedom to negotiate and determine his or her relations with the outside world. Thus, Stendhal tells the reader in his introduction to *Vittoria Accoramboni* that among the many manuscripts he consulted, he found a number of 'lettres de défi' and 'traités de pacification entre des nobles voisins' (pp. 3-4). Individual quarrels both within and across *Gemeinschaften*, and even disputes between *Gemeinschaften* as a whole, are therefore frequently settled by direct action, including assassination (pp. 10-11), or else by direct negotiation, in either case without recourse to the *Gesellschaft*. Under weak Popes, the individual citizen (Marcel Accoramboni, Mancino, César Palantieri) can repudiate the *Gesellschaft* simply by stepping outside the jurisdiction of the *corte*, essentially limited to the area within Rome's city walls (p. 10, 15, 16, 18 [VA]). Indeed, the *Historiettes* go so far as to suggest that in periods of papal interregnum, the *Gesellschaft* ceases to exist even in this limited sense (p. 19 [VA], pp. 111-12, 115 [DP]). Furthermore, the *Gesellschaft* frequently falls into the hands of an individual *Gemeinschaft* as in *La Duchesse de Palliano*, when the election of Paul IV (Carafa) results in the Papal States being governed despotically by his various nephews (p. 94). Similarly, in *Vittoria Accoramboni*, Gregory XIII issues arbitrary *precetti* on his personal authority (p. 18). Hence Stendhal's praise for Cardinal Montalto when he turns into Sixtus V: 'il avait déjà quitté les façons de penser convenables à un moine, et monté son âme à la hauteur du grade dans lequel Dieu venait de le placer' (p. 19). Sixtus seeks to reaffirm the dignity of the *Gesellschaft* (as opposed to his purely personal dignity) as well as reassert its rightful jurisdiction, without in the process seeking to promote the particular interests of his own *Gemeinschaft*. Sixtus states this position explicitly in his reported conversation with Paul Orsini, the presumed assassin of his nephew, Félix Peretti: 'lui, prince, pouvait être assuré d'une chose, à savoir, que tout ainsi qu'il lui pardonnerait volontiers ce qu'il avait pu faire contre Félix Peretti et contre Félix, cardinal Montalto, jamais il ne lui pardonnerait ce qu'à l'avenir il pourrait faire contre le pape Sixte' (p. 20). Sixtus accepts that such a reaffirmation of rights ought not

---

7 Stendhal implicitly compares the Carafa *Gemeinschaft* to the Tarquins by alluding to 'la chaste Lucrèce' (p. 94), thereby contrasting it to the *Gesellschaft* of the Republic founded by Junius Brutus, ancestor of Marcus Brutus.

8 Stendhal notes on the second manuscript of *Vittoria Accoramboni*: 's'il [Orsini] eût manqué de respect au pape, il serait mort, ce me semble, ou pour longtemps en prison' (*CI*, II, 125).
to result in the mass prosecution of old crimes, committed in the reigns of ineffectual Popes, but rather concentrate on the prevention of new offences. Stendhal's otherwise odd comparison of Sixtus and Napoleon in the text of *Vittoria Accoramboni* (CL, 1, 20) can therefore be explained by his private note on the original manuscript: 'digne de Napoléon. Si l'on s'était mis à punir les crimes commis sous le faible Grégoire XIII, c'était à n'en plus finir' (CL, II, 101). Orsini, 'accoutumé de tout temps à être craint des papes' (CL, 1, 21) is so shocked that he disbands his retinue of outlaws and immediately leaves the territories of the Pope.

The Italian propensity to settle disputes without reference either to *Gesellschaft* or to public opinion is shown to be exaggerated rather than diminished by the growing Spanish influence in the sixteenth century (p.88 [DP]). Thus, Stendhal twice adds to the text of *Vittoria Accoramboni* a reference to the fact that the Italian Paul Orsini had his first wife executed for infidelity with the consent of her brother, the Spanish-installed Grand Duke of Tuscany (p.16, 24): 'telles étaient les lois de l'honneur apportées en Italie par les Espagnols. Les amours non légitimes d'une femme offensaient autant ses frères que son mari' (p.16). Stendhal again refers to the execution of Orsini's first wife in *La Duchesse de Palliano* (p.116), explicitly comparing it to that of the eponymous heroine, Violante de Cardone, a Neapolitan noblewoman of Spanish extraction (pp.94-95) who marries the Duke of Palliano, one of the nephews of Paul IV. Stendhal stresses in his introduction that the Duke's court adheres to the strictest rules of Spanish etiquette (p.91). Violante's eventual infidelity therefore results in her execution by strangulation at the hands of her brother, the comte d'Alife. The text makes clear that the Duke himself would be willing to let Violante live (p.107), particularly given his own repeated infidelities (p.112). Indeed, his anger manifests itself chiefly in the savage murders of Violante's lover, Marcel Capece (p.110) and confidante, Diane Brancaccio (p.111), the latter having first encouraged Violante's infidelity, and then revealed it to the Duke. The Duke's anger towards these two characters reflects his sense of being trapped by the Spanish laws of honour which both his brother and brother-in-law prove determined to apply to his (pregnant) wife (p.107).10

---

9 This version of events is flatly contradicted by the narrator of *Les Cenci*, who suggests that Sixtus punished crimes that had been confessed to him up to ten years earlier (p.56). Sixtus's long memory is implicitly compared with that of François Cenci, who regularly sends assassins to avenge him of offences committed months earlier (p.57).

10 Alife tells the Duke: 'vous savez que je dois aller à Rome, et je ne veux pas y paraître avec ce masque sur le visage (avec cet affront non vengé)' (p.115).
The Duke's murder of Marcel and Diane still belongs to the Italian rather than Spanish tradition:

Il [the Duke] se jeta sur Marcel et lui donna trois coups de poignard qui lui ôtèrent la vie. (p.110)

Il [the Duke] la [Diane] prit par les cheveux et lui scia le cou avec un couteau. (p.111)\(^1\)

The formal execution of Violante belongs instead to the Spanish tradition. Alife replicates the ceremonial of an official execution, even allowing the presence of monks as both comforters and witnesses. Alife seeks to elevate the Gemeinshaft to the status of Gesellschaft, replacing the (natural) laws of the land with the (positive) etiquette of honour.\(^12\) The Duke initially goes along with this strategy, agreeing to serve as one of Marcel's three judges in a mock-trial (p. 107), complete with professional procedures of torture similar to those described in Les Cenci. However, the Duke's vengeful, spontaneous murders show him using his status within the Gemeinschaft to challenge the authority of the Gesellschaft in a different way. The Duke subverts the attempt to impose a rival judicial system, preferring instead to deny the right of any system to limit his freedom of action. Both the Duke and the Count are in turn tried and executed under the authority of a new Pope. The new trials represent in part the triumph of the Gesellschaft over both forms of challenge to its authority. At the same time, the Gesellschaft is itself exposed as fraudulent, executing both the Duke and the Count as much for political reasons as to uphold the rule of law within the Papal states.

The French influence will eventually substitute vanity for honour and so allow the Gesellschaft to impose its will by means of hypocrisy (p.89 [DP]). In the meantime, the Gesellschaft is faced with the twin challenge of Italian and Spanish lawlessness. Stendhal notes on the manuscript of Vittoria Accoramboni that government officers must therefore act with extreme caution: 'prudence nécessaire alors. Le g[ouvernemen]t bien moins

\(^{11}\) See Crouzet, 'Stendhal et le coup de poignard italien', in Stendhal, Roma, l'Italia: atti del Congresso Internazionale Roma, 7-10 novembre 1983, ed. by Massimo Colesanti and others (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1985), pp.163-238. In one of his additions to the original text of Les Cenci, Stendhal particularly associates François Cenci with the 'coup de poignard' (p.57).

\(^{12}\) Alife's strategy can be compared with that of Pius V, who is described in Les Cenci as imposing 'une foule de pratiques minutieuses absolument étrangères à cette morale simple qui n'appelle vertu que ce qui est utile aux hommes' (CI, 1, 47). Pius therefore seeks to supplant the Gesellschaft of the corte with the Gemeinschaft of the Inquisition.
puissant que de nos jours; il n'avait que la force pure et nullement l'assentiment' (CI, II, 113). Without the binding agent of hypocrisy, government can only create a sense of *Gesellschaft* if it learns to transcend factional interests and deliver natural justice. *Vittoria Accoramboni* suggests that Sixtus V succeeds in transforming the Papal States into a *Gesellschaft*, challenging the power of the Orsini and other princes and restoring the credibility of the corte. The *Historiettes* go on to present two exemplary trials, those of Louis Orsini in Venetian controlled Padua and Béatrix Cenci in the Rome of Clement VIII. Stendhal uses these trials to demonstrate the workings of the law in a period when the *Gesellschaft* had only minimal power to intervene in the affairs of individual citizens. Stendhal contrasts the behaviour of both judges and accused to their modern counterparts, the products of civilized society's largely successful attempts to normalize its citizens.

The legal system described in the manuscripts of *Historiettes* makes no attempt to reform or re-educate the criminals it convicts. Furthermore, it displays no interest in determining motivation with a view to entertaining pleas of mitigation. Instead, court proceedings are confined to establishing whether or not a crime has been committed. The discovery of circumstantial evidence against the defendant allows the investigating magistrate to use prescribed degrees of torture in the pursuit of a confession: 'donc il fallait une certaine probabilité pour faire donner la torture' (p. 143). Once a confession has been obtained, the accused is condemned to an automatic sentence. Punishment, particularly execution, is designed to inflict levels of pain and mutilation appropriate to the specific offence, and at the same time to present the general public with a spectacle, designed to deter future offenders, reassure the citizenry that offences will be punished and prove that government is fulfilling its primary task of maintaining security. Whenever appropriate, the punishment re-enacts the original crime (a procedure referred to as *le talion*). Thus Count Paganello, the presumed assassin of Vittoria Accoramboni, is stabbed in the heart by the executioner and then allowed slowly to bleed to death in a recreation of her murder, itself an example of *le talion*. Paganello stabs Vittoria in the chest, twisting the knife and asking her repeatedly whether he is now touching her heart (CI, I, 27). Paganello is referring to her heartless sacrifice of her first husband and her mercenary motives in marrying her second husband. Similarly, François Cenci is assassinated by having nails driven into his throat and one of his eyes. The nail in the eye suggests an attempt to symbolize his criminal lust for his daughter in an echo of the oedipal myth (p. 66). Stendhal notes that 'la loi du talion semble innée dans le cœur de l'homme' (CI, II, 114).
The certainty of punishment in excess of, and incorporating, the suffering of the victim, turns the criminal act into a form of duel of the kind openly tolerated in a *Gesellschaft* which seeks only to ensure the security of the general population. Stendhal, without advocating the return of torture as an investigative tool, notes the positive effect its regular use has on the *mœurs* of sixteenth-century Italians. Thus Béatrix Cenci's reactions to being tortured are held up as exemplary: 'voir le traité *De Suppliciis* du célèbre Farinacci, jurisconsulte contemporain. Il y a des détails horribles dont notre sensibilité du xixiéme siècle ne supporterait pas la lecture et que supporta fort bien une jeune Romaine âgée de seize ans et abandonnée par son amant' (*C/, I, 71*). Béatrix withstands torture (she is suspended by the hair) in order to protect the honour and reputation of her family (ibid.), giving in to the judge only once others have confessed. Béatrix is then at pains to give a scrupulously exact confession:

'Détachez-moi', leur dit-elle, 'et qu'on me lise l'interrogatoire de ma mère, j'approuverai ce qui doit être approuvé, et je nierai ce qui doit être nié.'

Ainsi fut fait; elle avoua tout ce qui était vrai. (pp.71-72)

Stendhal also notes the strength of character displayed by ordinary criminals under interrogation by torture (Marzio in *Les Cenci*). He is further impressed by the efficiency of investigating magistrates whose only aim in turn is to extort the truth. Hence his remarks with regard to the draconian investigation of Marzio and Olimpio, the accomplices of Béatrix: 'quelle rapidité de raisonnement et d'exécution! C'est le siècle de Borgia' (*C/, II, 142*). The approving reference to Machiavelli's *Prince* returns us once again, by a typically circuitous route, to the subject of Napoleon's *virtù*. Indeed, this comparison between the qualities of an investigating magistrate in the sixteenth century and a Caesar helps explain Stendhal's otherwise curious decision to retain the original ending to *Vittoria Accoramboni* (p.115), despite the anonymous historian's obvious flattery when summarizing the role played by government in bringing Louis Orsini and his men to justice. The historian, having described a bloodbath involving the execution of

---

13 In *Vittoria Accoramboni*, Louis Orsini is so certain of the court's eventual verdict that he exhorts his forty men to resist arrest and fight against the entire assembled Paduan militia, arguing that it is better to die 'd'un coup d'arquebuse que de la main du bourreau' (p.32).

14 The last sentence is an addition by Stendhal. He further emphasizes Béatrix's candour in a footnote to the text, describing passages from Béatrix's confession as being 'd'une simplicité touchante' (p.72).
thirty-nine men, which left the public 'comme en agonie pour avoir vu tant de morts' (CI, 1, 38), concludes as follows:

Personne ne se souvient, même parmi les plus âgés de cette ville de Padoue, que jamais, par une sentence plus juste, on ait procédé contre la vie de tant de personnes, en une seule fois. Et ces seigneurs (de Venise) se sont acquis une bonne renommée et réputation auprès des nations les plus civilisées. (p.39)

Stendhal is well aware of the change in attitudes that separates the penology he describes from that only just beginning to evolve from the works of Beccaria and Bentham. The difference, Stendhal suggests, lies in the increased role society has taken upon itself in the attempt to suppress singularity. The medieval legal system Stendhal describes in the Historiettes, and in the pages devoted to Gilles de Retz in the Mémoires d'un touriste, seeks to proscribe certain categories of offences, without wishing to prescribe generalized norms of behaviour. Medieval society feels pity for criminals precisely because they are guilty and about to be executed (CI, II, 149) rather than because they are presumed innocent and so deserving of a pardon. Civilization's drive to reform rather than punish the criminal is shown by contrast to be part of a wider attempt to control non-criminal behaviour. Questions of motivation and degrees of responsibility are introduced in court in an attempt to turn the sixteenth-century 'patient' (the accused in the process of being either tortured or executed) into the patient of Bicêtre, the Parisian sometime prison and mental hospital. As a result, the door is opened to hypocrisy: investigations are pursued not in the interests of justice or clemency, but rather in an attempt to secure the public conversion of the criminal to the norms of socially acceptable behaviour prescribed by a fripon society. Thus, crimes of passion (including political crimes) are dealt with more harshly than fripon (venal) crimes, even though the introduction of concepts such as mitigating circumstances (presumably introduced in order to prevent the kind of miscarriage of justice which results in the execution of Béatrix Cenci) is clearly designed to achieve the opposite effect. As a result of these developments, clearly identified in the Historiettes, Stendhal plays with the idea that passionate criminals, willing to acknowledge their crimes in open court, become political criminals to the extent that they are defending a right to singularity fraudulently denied them by fripon society. Julien Sorel's trial can therefore be compared to Brutus confronting the Roman people with his assassination of Caesar.

15 See Michel Foucault, Surveiller et punir (Paris: Gallimard, 1975) for an account of these changes.
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VOYAGES EN FRANCE

'J'étais absorbé dans la contemplation des temps héroïques où Mme Roland a vécu. Nous étions alors aussi grands que les premiers Romains.'

(VFR, p.74 [MT])

1. Gilles de Retz

Stendhal uses the *Mémoires d'un touriste* further to develop his concept of the *don Juan*. In *Les Cenci*, he had already noted that Molière's *don Juan* is an 'homme de bonne compagnie' (*CI*, 1, 41), whereas Byron's version of the same character is no more than 'un beau jeune homme insignifiant, et sur lequel se précipitent toutes sortes de bonheurs invraisemblables' (p.46). Stendhal's *don Juan*, François Cenci, proves a monstrous figure by comparison. He is opposed to his daughter Béatrix, a patricide (tyrannicide) in the tradition of Brutus. In the *Mémoires d'un touriste*, Stendhal reintroduces the figure of François Cenci (*VFR*, pp.260-61) when analysing Gilles de Retz (more commonly Rais):

J'étudie le caractère du maréchal de Retz, parce que cet homme singulier fut le premier de cette espèce. François Cenci de Rome ne parut qu'en 1560. Il faut, pour que le caractère de don Juan éclate, la réunion d'une grande fortune, d'une bravoure extraordinaire, de beaucoup d'imagination et d'un amour effréné pour les femmes. Il faut, de plus, naître dans un siècle qui ait eu l'idée de prendre les femmes pour juges du mérite. Du temps d'Homère, les femmes n'étaient que des servantes; Achille, si brillant, ne songe pas du tout au suffrage de Briséis; il lui préfère celui de Patrocle. (p.261)

Stendhal's historical analysis of this extraordinary (p.260) and singular (p.263) *don Juan* refers to *Les Cenci's* Alfierian distinction between the masculine barbarism of a Homer and the effeminate civilization of a Virgil (*CI*, 1, 44). Stendhal thereby prepares the ground for the questioning of hitherto absolute gender-distinctions, introducing Gilles, born in 1396, as one of Joan of Arc's young generals of 1429 (*VFR*, p.260 [MT]). Gilles abandons his orthodox 'male' career in 1432, when the already large fortune brought by an earlier marriage is increased by an inheritance on the maternal side: 'se voir à trente-six ans à la tête d'une aussi belle fortune, avec le premier grade de l'armée et une belle réputation

---

1 The crimes of regicide and parricide were closely associated in French law of the period, until 1832 uniquely carrying the additional penalties of *le poing coupé* and the wearing of a black veil during execution (Foucault, p.20).
militaire, c'était un fardeau trop fort pour une imagination ardente' (p.261). Gilles's imagination has been aroused to ardour not only by the money, but also by the example of women: 'remarquez qu'il n'y a jamais de don Juan sans un penchant invincible pour les femmes. Ce penchant est l'imagination elle-même; il n'y a donc rien de singulier à ce qu'un don Juan finisse par croire à la magie [Joan's alleged crime], à la pierre philosophale, à toutes les folies' (p.260). Joan has taken the masculine concepts of war and glory to their limits, in the manner of an Alexander or Caesar. Gilles is therefore tempted to pursue an alternative route, perhaps suggested by Joan's own crossing of the gender divide: 'le jeune maréchal ne s'occupa plus de guerre; que pouvait-elle lui offrir de neuf? Il chercha à conquérir des femmes, et à se présenter à elles couvert du respect et de l'admiration des hommes, ses contemporains' (p.261).

Gilles seeks to gratify his lusts (the product of his enflamed imagination) through the open transgression of sexual, hierarchical and legal norms of social behaviour:

Par son faste, il prétendit éclipser celui des souverains; mais à ce métier il mangea bien vite cette fortune de douze cent mille francs de rente. Les historiens racontent qu'il avait une garde de deux cents hommes, des pages, des chapelains, des enfants de chœur, des musiciens. La plupart de ces gens-là étaient agents ou complices de son affreux libertinage. Bientôt, lassé des voluptés ordinaires, il prétendit les rendre plus piquantes par un mélange de crimes. (p.261)

Gilles seeks to shock society with his display and therefore impress his new intended female audience. He enters into open competition with sovereign authority, indulges his 'feminine' imagination and vanity, and finally turns to the woman's entourage of chaplains, boys and musicians for the satisfaction of his 'female' sexual desires. Once he has tired of such transgression, Gilles will inevitably turn to crime, thereby bringing to a dramatic conclusion his emulation of Joan's career from religious innocent to condemned criminal:

Le don Juan pousse [la chevalerie] jusqu'à l'excès; il adore les femmes, et veut leur plaire en leur faisant voir jusqu'à quel point il se moque des hommes. Cette idée sur ce curieux effet de la chevalerie, fille de la religion, m'a occupé toute la soirée. (p.260)

Gilles's antagonistic stance towards the society in which he lives is founded on an aesthetic rejection of positive morality, even though in the fifteenth century such morality is still largely defined in terms of utility (ibid.).

Gilles is attempting to found a rival form of heroism by challenging positive law (hence his instinctive attraction for powerless women and children, reduced to the role of servants in
barbaric society). Gilles fights a war against the Gesellschaft of fifteenth-century France just as he had earlier fought a war against the English. Thus, Stendhal shows Gilles storming the castle at Lude in 1427 and putting its commander to death with the full sanction of the Gesellschaft (p.260); he then shows Gilles storming the stronghold of Saint-Etienne-de-Malemort which he had earlier sold to his liege-lord, the Duke of Brittany (p.264). Gilles is now attacking both civil law and feudal authority, prompting Stendhal to remark:

Le besoin d'argent, qui se fit sentir vers la fin de sa courte carrière, forçaît le maréchal à ces sortes d'actions, bien plus dangereuses pour lui que les crimes privés. Il fut condamné à mort, ainsi que ses deux complices, par un tribunal dont Pierre de L'Hôpital, sénéchal de Bretagne, était président. (p.264)

Gilles's public attack on authority must be punished; at the same time, the Duke's Seneschal (an interested party) is making sure that his master's property is shown to be inviolable. Stendhal is therefore commenting ironically on the importance placed by positive law on the tutelage of private property and the defence of privilege as opposed to the safeguarding of the public interest: Gilles is condemned to death in the first instance for his illegal seizure of the Duke's property rather than for the murder of hundreds of children.

Gilles does not, however, limit himself to challenging the details of positive contract and seigneurial law: 'en sa qualité d'homme à imagination, la religion jouait un grand rôle dans sa vie' (p.261). Gilles begins by surrounding himself with chaplains, then appoints a personal bishop and finally petitions the Pope for the right to be preceded everywhere by a servant carrying a cross (ibid.). Dissatisfied, Gilles stages mysteries with devastating effects on the local population, unaccustomed to such spectacles (p.262). Gilles is experimenting with the limits of respectable behaviour within the Church; limits he quickly exceeds, hiring François Prelati to practise satanic rituals as part of his experiments in alchemy. Yet, 'par une bizarrerie bien digne d'une âme passionnée, tandis qu'il [Gilles] cherchait à établir des rapports avec cet être tout-puissant, ennemi du vrai Dieu, il continuait ses exercices pieux avec ses chapelains' (p.262). Gilles finally brings this contradiction to the public's attention by turning his own execution into yet another of his beloved religious processions, this time led by the Bishop of Nantes. Gilles goes to the scaffold preaching repentance and promising to meet his fellow prisoners in heaven (p.264).
Gilles's ability to push the contradictions and hypocrisies inherent within his position to their extremes is credited to his ardent imagination: 'toujours on le voit obéir à une imagination bizarre et singulièrement puissante dans ses écarts' (p.264). Stendhal describes Gilles as an 'être esclave de son imagination' (p.263), by turns brave and cowardly (incapable of withstanding the thought of torture). His imagination leads him from orthodox Christianity to Satanism (p.260), from the mundane triple-stabbing of social inferiors (pp.262-63) to the mass murder of children. Gilles is eventually arrested in order to put an end to the all too public scandal of his crimes (p.263). However, the authorities show little desire to investigate the crimes of a maréchal and important landowner. Stendhal observes that our knowledge of events is obscured by the 'phrases emphatiques de petits juges hėbètés' (p.263). Indeed, we learn that the manuscript records of Gilles's trial are still secret in the France of 1837 (p.263):

Il y aurait du danger à publier le procès de cet homme singulier. Dans ce siècle ennuyé et avide de distinctions, il trouverait peut-être des imitateurs.

Mais du reste, ce procès arrangé en récit rappellerait les Mémoires de Benvenuto Cellini, et ferait mieux connaître les mœurs du temps que tant de déclamations savantes qui conduisent au sommeil. (p.265)

Official attempts to erase Gilles's memory prove futile, his legend finally mutating into the Barbe-Bleue of popular culture (p.260). It is this popular culture, with its myths of criminals and tyrants, murders and massacres, which defeats official attempts to guarantee public safety at the expense of political and artistic freedoms (p.151). This at least is the message of opening pages of the Mémoires d'un touriste. When he first sees Essonne, the Tourist remarks 'voici peut-être le bourg du monde où le gouvernement fait le moins de mal aux gouvernés, et leur assure le mieux la sûreté sur la grande route, et la justice quand ils prennent envie de se chamailler entre eux' (p.4). A few paragraphs later, the Tourist qualifies this praise: 'c'est à Essonne que Napoléon fut trahi en 1814' (p.6). Stendhal is echoing Mérimée's preface to the Chronique du règne de Charles IX. Mérimée notes that modern civilization has brought about 'la décadence des passions énergiques au profit de la tranquillité et peut-être du bonheur' (p.36). Thus 'ce qui est crime dans un état de civilisation perfectionné n'est que trait d'audace dans un état de civilisation moins avancé, et peut-être est-ce une action louable dans un temps de barbarie' (ibid.). Stendhal's

---

Historiettes, along with the chronicle of Gilles de Retz, prompt the reader into reaching similar conclusions:

A Autun, quel contraste! Le caractère d'un brave Gaulois furieux contre les Romains de César, et le caractère du bourgeois montant la garde en biset devant la porte d'Arroux!

Et cependant le soixantième ancêtre de ce bourgeois piteux était un Gaulois citoyen de Bibracte! Voilà, il faut en convenir, un résultat bien glorieux de notre civilisation moderne! Elle produit le diorama et des chemins de fer; on moule admirablement, d'après nature, des oiseaux et des plantes; en vingt et une heures un Parisien verra Marseille; mais quel homme sera ce Parisien?

En nous ôtant les péris de tous les jours, les bons gendarmes nous ôtent la moitié de notre valeur réelle. Dès que l'homme échappe au dur empire des besoins, dès qu'une erreur n'est plus punie de mort, il perd la faculté de raisonner juste et surtout celle de vouloir. (p.69)

2. Valence

Stendhal repeats his trick of the Promenades, using the Voyages en France to reintroduce ideas from previous works. Not only does he use the story of Gilles de Retz further to analyse his concept of the don Juan (Les Cenci), he similarly uses the stories of Joan of Arc, the Black Prince, Duretête (leader of a Bordeaux revolt), Casaux and Daix (instigators of a putative Marseilles Republic), Lesdiguières, Mme Roland, Barnave, M. Robert and the duchesse de Berry to discuss various aspects of Republican (Vie de Henry Brulard) and Imperial (Mémoires sur Napoléon) heroism. He also analyses the Tourist's espagnolisme and misanthropic secession from society (Souvenirs d'égotisme) and announces the planned 1839 publication of his (ideal and unrealized) biography of Napoleon, to be entitled the Vie de Napoléon (p.400 [MT]) as well as the posthumous publication of his (equally ideal and unrealized) autobiography, the Histoire de mon temps (p.686, 735 [VMF]). The most important external reference in the Voyages is, however, to Caesar's Commentaries, and in particular the first seven dealing with the Gallic War, in turn commented on by Napoleon (pp.42-46 [MT]).

The Tourist first turns to the Commentaries in Nevers (Noviodonum) in order to refresh his 'imagination fatiguée et impatiente par les raisonnements biscornus qui vous arrivent de tous les côtés' (p.15). He then repeatedly refers to Caesar's text in the Voyages,

3 Similarly, the Tourist decides to read the Commentaries as an antidote both to a prior conversation with a fat and to the poverty of the landscape by the banks of the Indre (p.201).
thereby underlining the equivalence between Caesar and Napoleon already established in the Mémoires sur Napoléon and repeated explicitly in the Mémoires d'un touriste (p. 81). Caesar's text also serves to satirize modern French society (p. 291-92), divide the French people into three distinct racial groups (p. 95) and suggest an alternative, more heroic form of leadership than that provided by mere kings: 'César est plus connu des paysans de France que tous les souverains obscurs qui, dix ou quinze siècles plus tard, ont régné sur eux' (p. 292). The Commentaries finally serve to link the past with the present, barbarism with civilization, eras of Republicanism and Caesarism with the juste milieu of the 1830s. The Tourist's travels through the French provinces are also travels through the sixty nations of ancient Gaul, endowed with the energy of barbarism and about to be converted to the reason of civilization. Caesar's task is therefore not unlike that of nineteenth-century government, the Roman metropolis not unlike modern Paris. How will Paris civilize the provinces without extinguishing their qualities, and in particular their passionate attachment to freedom? Perhaps by finding a sublime juste milieu between the institutional framework (Gesellschaft) of Republican Rome or Revolutionary France and the loyalty (sense of Gemeinschaft) inspired by Caesar or Napoleon.

The Mémoires d'un touriste (1838), their unpublished second volume, the Voyage en France, and the unfinished Voyage dans le Midi de la France are each ostensibly drawn from the travel-diaries of an itinerant iron merchant. The published text of the Mémoires offers no introduction other than two summary paragraphs apparently designed to suggest that the reader has been duped by the title of the purchased work. The unnamed tourist, a practical man of business, explains that his Tour consists of no more than a series of business trips, his Mémoires of no more than a hastily written journal (p. 3). He has decided to publish in order to plug a potential gap in the market with the minimum of effort and expense. Although Stendhal begins by implying the fraudulent nature of his enterprise, he proceeds to deliver exactly the kind of book his title appears to promise: a highly personal and literary memoir of a tour through France deliberately undertaken as research for the book eventually published.

Nonetheless, the Mémoires and their suite, the Voyage en France, are both made up of entries which only sometimes refer the reader to places Stendhal has visited, are only sometimes dated to when he actually visited them and only sometimes written in his own words. Stendhal is equally happy describing places he has never seen, transposing the dates of his travels and plagiarizing from a wide variety of texts, most notably Aubin Louis Millin's Voyage dans les départements du Midi de la France (1807-11) and Mérimée's
Notes d'un voyage dans le Midi de la France (1835), Notes d'un voyage dans l'Ouest de la France (1836) and Essai sur l'architecture religieuse (1837), the latter three texts possibly with their author's consent (p.xxx). The picture of social and economic change which emerges from Stendhal's three voyages nonetheless proves remarkably detailed. The Tourist flaunts his expertise in the iron industry, noting shifts between charcoal- and coke-production of pig-iron in the period. He also provides his reader with relatively sophisticated analyses of the Lyons silk-trade, the deindustrialization of the South-West and the decline of the Atlantic ports of Bordeaux and Nantes relative to Le Havre.

Del Litto notes that Stendhal skilfully disguises his plagiarisms, 'd'autant que les références à Millin et à Mérimée qui figurent ici où là en notes de bas de page laissent croire à une honnête mention de sources' (p.xxix). Stendhal follows the same technique of elliptical acknowledgement when he refers to Lawrence Sterne and Xavier de Maistre in the first few pages of the Voyage en France (p.430). The Mémoires and the Voyage en France often abandon the journey-form's attempt to refer to places at all, instead imitating the digressive tradition of Sterne's A Sentimental Journey (1768) and Maistre's Voyage autour de ma chambre (1794).^ Stendhal appears temperamentally suited to Maistre's approach to travel writing. The Voyage autour de ma chambre, as its title suggests, takes the form of an imaginary journey, undertaken without the inconvenience of having to leave one's room, as a way of passing the time while serving a forty-two day confinement to quarters for having fought a duel. The Tourist similarly writes his journal in an effort to escape his provincial confinement. Thus, he notes that the countryside between Chaumont and Langres is so ugly that he will stop looking at it and instead write the story of his life (p.49 [M7]), while rain in the Nivernais ("se figure-t-on quelque chose de décourageant comme la pluie à verse qui tombe à grand bruit sur le pavé d'une laide ville de province, à sept heures du soir?") prompts him to take refuge in the composition of a history of architecture (p.171). At other times, the Tourist escapes his surroundings by reading books: 'lire au lieu de regarder, c'est sans doute mal faire le métier de voyageur; mais que devenir pourtant dans les moments où les petitesses de la province font mal au cœur?' (p.207). In the Voyage dans le Midi de la France, the traveller cites Henri Gagnon: 'par la lecture on échange les moments d'ennui que l'on a dans la vie contre des moments agréables' (p.600). Finally, the
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4 Stendhal had reviewed the 1825 edition of Xavier de Maistre's Œuvres (OC, XLIX, 149-58).
Tourist introduces the theme of the happy prison: 'à Genève on dit: "Un tel fut mis en prison, dès lors il jouit de la liberté" ' (p.458 [VF]).

The Tourist's horror of other people risks affecting his politics. He confesses to a basic shyness: 'j'adore de n'être pas obligé de parler' (p. 18 [MT]). By the time he reaches the Nivernais, he is moved to exclaim: 'quand serai-je assez riche pour n'avoir plus de rapports forcés avec aucun homme?' (p.170). The roots of this misanthropy can be found in the Tourist's disgust for money (p.76) and le vulgaire (p.284; p.595 [VMF]). In the Voyage dans le Midi de la France, the Tourist bemoans his inability to turn such disgust to his advantage:

Ces scènes laides me font mal, ce qui prouve que je ne suis ni un philosophe comme Swift, ni un ambitieux, ni un poète comique. Dans les romans ou drames que j'admire ou que je relis, je saute les scènes odieuses; je voudrais pouvoir oublier le laid de la vie. (p.673)

The Tourist's instinct is to disengage from any form of negotiation (p.666) and to reject the dupe/fripon paradigm which underpins such exchanges (p.336 [MT]).

The Voyage dans le Midi de la France nonetheless suggests that Stendhal's main impulse as a writer is to focus on 'ces choses si tristes qui paraîtront dans l'Histoire de mon temps', namely, the ugliness, venality and hypocrisy of contemporary society as represented by the figure of the magistrate (p.735). The Tourist characterizes this alternative, darker urge as satirical in its aims: 'si je me laissais aller à imprimer de telles choses on croirait ce voyage écrit par Juvénal' (p.735). The Tourist is prevented from realizing his potential as a satirist by the distractions of his âme, closely associated with both duperie and espagnolisme:

Eh bien! je voudrais presque redevenir une dupe et un nigaud dans la réalité de la vie, et reprendre les charmantes rêveries si absurdes qui m'ont fait faire tant de sottises, mais qui seul, en voyage, comme ce soir, me donnaient des soirées si charmantes et qui, certes, ne pouvaient porter ombrage à personne. (p.695)

The Tourist goes on to use courtship as an example. Now that the Tourist knows the rules of this particular game, he stands a much better chance of winning than when he was younger and, implicitly, more attractive. Yet, 'depuis que je sais faire un peu cette guerre, je dédaigne souvent d'entrer en campagne' (p.695). Similarly, the sight of a squabble over money sends the Tourist off to contemplate the stars, a favourite refuge of Maistre in the Expédition nocturne autour de ma chambre (1825). The Tourist's horror for le laid de la
vie or la réalité de la vie (the two terms are interchangeable) therefore defines his political attitudes:

Je remonte en voiture en me demandant si l'habitude des élections, qui réellement ne commence en France que cette année, va nous obliger à faire la cour à la dernière classe du peuple comme en Amérique. En ce cas, je deviens bien vite aristocrate. Je ne veux faire la cour à personne, mais moins encore au peuple qu'au ministre. (p.5)

The Tourist is falling into the same error as the hero of the Vie de Henry Brulard. Thus, the Tourist suffers from a comically exaggerated sense of honour (p.325, 409). In the Midi, he nevertheless manages to limits on this honour, perhaps in deference to l'état de barbarie' (p.53) and capacity for singularity (p.142) displayed by its inhabitants. The spirit of the Midi, first encountered in Valence, is described as l'antipode de la politesse de Paris' (p.147). It therefore bears marked similarities to that of sixteenth-century Rome: 'chacun ici [in Valence], en prenant la parole, songe à satisfaire le sentiment qui l'agite, et pas le moins du monde à se construire un noble caractère dans l'esprit de la personne qui écoute' (ibid.). Thus, in Valence, the Tourist is offered some unsolicited and in his opinion, extremely rude advice. He controls himself, reasoning that:

Ce gros garçon de trente ans aurait été bien étonné si je lui eusse répondu:

'Gardez, monsieur, les qualifications offensantes pour les choses que vous faites vous-même. Je vous rends grâce de vos avis; mais je vous prie de les garder pour vous, ou de me les donner en d'autres termes.'

Je me suis fait homme du Midi, et en vérité je n'ai eu grand-peine. J'ai dit tout simplement que je profiterais du conseil, et après dîner j'ai offert à mon nouvel ami des cigares tels que personne peut-être n'en eut jamais de semblables à Valence. Il accepte avec joie, mais bientôt il m'avoue qu'ils lui semblent bien faibles. (p.151)

The Tourist's forbearance is first vindicated by the incident of the cigar, which demonstrates that his interlocutor's outlook is made up of sincerely held, regionally-determined standards which the Tourist cannot hope to share. Secondly, it is rewarded by the interlocutor proceeding to discuss Mandrin, a smuggler executed in Valence: 'ce brave contrebandier ne manqua ni d'audace ni d'esprit, et, à ce titre, sa mémoire vit dans le cœur des peuples, quoique immoral. C'est que les peuples veulent être amusés pour le moins autant que servis: voyez la gloire des conquérants' (p.151).
3. Generosity

The Tourist notes that:

Le peuple n'est supérieur à la bonne compagnie que lors des grands mouvements de l'âme; il est capable, lui, de passions généreuses. Trop souvent les gens bien élevés mettent la gloire de leur amour-propre à être un peu Robert Macaire. Qu'est-il resté, disent-ils, aux grands personnages de la Révolution qui n'ont pas su ramasser de l'argent? (p.5)

The implicit contest between manners and generosity is one of a series, all ultimately unequal, between the agréable and the sublime, the eighteenth century and the Renaissance, France and Italy, Voltaire and Rousseau, monarchy and republic, grâce and force, worldliness and revolt. La bonne compagnie is made up of ludic fripons (Robert Macaires), boasting not of their integrity but rather of their worldly ability to see through any such concept. The final opposition is therefore shown to be between aristocrats, proud of knowing how to play the fripon game in Restoration and juste milieu France, and the heroes of the French Revolution, whose disinterested patriotism leaves them penniless and therefore powerless in the new France.

Stendhal allows for exceptions to the above class-based analysis. In particular, he repeatedly praises the duchesse de Berry for her doomed Legitimist uprising of 1832 in the Vendée (p.74, 225, 234 [MT]), admiring 'le courage d'une jeune femme, d'autant plus singulier qu'elle avait reçu la plate éducation des cours' (p.225). Stendhal goes so far as to compare the duchesse to Mme Roland while distinguishing her from the fripon 'dames de la Restauration, qui allaient entendre la messe au Sacré-Cœur pour faire leurs maris préfets' (p.74). The shared passion of their respective revolts transcends their ideological incompatibility. Stendhal goes on to explain both Berry's support and the regional monarchist traditions she draws on (the Vendée uprising against the Revolution) in terms of the 'passions généreuses' of a still barbarous and ignorant Vendée (p.266). Even though it is misguided, such popular heroism is seen as the antithesis of self-interest: 'j'admire ces pauvres paysans versant leur sang pour qu'il y eût à Paris des abbés commendataires, jouissant du revenu de trois ou quatre grosses abbayes situées dans leur province, tandis qu'eux mangeaient des galettes de sarrasin' (p.233). Stendhal similarly delights in the story of a Vendéen who fights the armies of the Revolution in the mistaken belief that the new law on divorce will oblige him to desert his wife (p.266, 287). The duchesse de Berry embodies and promotes the barbarous force of the Middle Ages, rather than the grâce and
concomitant hypocrisy of civilization. She can therefore be compared to Joan of Arc, that 'produit singulier du Moyen Age, expression de ses folies comme de ses passions les plus héroïques' (p.344).

The Tourist offers the further exception of Mme de Nintrey, a rich noblewoman described as both 'singulière' and as possessing 'une grâce charmante' (p.269). There can be no question of her being 'un peu Robert Macaire':

Mme de Nintrey [...] n'oppose qu'une simplicité parfaite et véritable à la profonde et immense politique qui compose le savoir-vivre de la province, surtout parmi les gens qui ont dix mille livres de rente et un château, et qui aspirent à doubler tout cela. [...] Mme de Nintrey ose faire à chaque moment de la vie ce qui lui plaît le plus dans ce moment-là. Ainsi tous les sots l'exècrent, eux qui n'ont pour tout esprit que leur science sociale. (pp.269-70)

She foils a Jesuit plot to marry her off in the interests of the Church by making the unexpected choice of 'un M. de Nintrey, qui n'avait rien. C'était un pauvre officier licencié de l'armée de la Loire' (p.270). Not only is Nintrey penniless, he is also scandalously energetic. Nintrey's battalion is disbanded after the fall of Napoleon, prompting him to declare himself the equal of his former soldiers, now his fellow 'citoyens français'. Nintrey asks these soldiers whether they feel they have been treated fairly ('pleine justice vous a-t-elle été rendue?'). Although they answer in the affirmative, he replies that he has heard accusations against him of 'friponnerie' and insists on fighting a duel against the best swordsman in the battalion. Nintrey wins and then gives away twenty-one of his forty remaining *louis* to pay for the soldier's medical costs. Nintrey then considers starting a guerrilla war against the invaders in the forests of Compiègne.

Mme de Nintrey, sur le récit de ce trait et presque sans le connaître, épousa le brave officier. Sur quoi grande colère et prédictions fatales. Toute la haute société de la province destinait pour mari à la richissime Mlle de R*** un jeune adepte qui écrivait déjà d'assez jolis articles dans les journaux de la congrégation, (pp.270-71)

Mlle de Nintrey judges her husband by moral rather than economic or social criteria, in the manner of the distinguished Mme du Colombier from Valence (the home of Midi singularity) who befriends another penniless army officer, the young Bonaparte (pp.147-48). Mme de Nintrey later advises her daughter, beautiful and rich in her turn, to feign poverty in order to avoid marrying a *fripon* (a topos familiar from Stendhal's fiction). Thus mother and daughter retire to a ruined Gothic castle, far from civilized society, in an apartment decorated with the 'portraits de tous nos révolutionnaires' (p.272). *Fourberie*
ludique may be superior to the vilenie of friponnerie, it is nevertheless inferior to the generosity (duperie) of Plutarchian great souls.

The Tourist’s objections to democracy must be seen in the above context. Thus, in Saint-Malo, he is disgusted by the definition of liberty peddled by his interlocutors: ‘ils se sont mis à louer bêtement la liberté et de façon à en dégoûter, la faisant consister surtout dans le pouvoir d’empêcher leurs voisins de faire ce qui leur déplait. Il y a eu là-dessus entre eux des discussions d’une bassesse indicible’ (p.320). Fripon democracy offers no moral advantages over other fripon forms of government. All other factors being equal, the Tourist therefore prefers the polite manners engendered by inherited privilege:

Pour l’agrément de ma route, quelle différence si j’avais eu affaire à cinq légitimistes! Leurs principes n’auraient pas pu être plus absurdes et plus hostiles au bonheur commun, et, loin d’être blessé à chaque instant, mon esprit eût goûté tous les charmes d’une conversation polie. (p.320)

The Tourist, however, contrasts fripon and generous forms of government, whether republican or imperial:

Les peuples furent électrisés par Napoléon. Depuis sa chute et les friponneries électorales et autres qui suivirent son règne, les passions égoïstes et vilaines ont repris tout leur empire: il m’en coûte de le dire, je voudrais me tromper, mais je ne vois plus rien de généreux.

Chacun veut faire fortune, et une fortune énorme, et bien vite, et sans travailler. (p.53)

The Tourist accepts that Napoleonic government differs from its republican counterpart in its aims, even though its effects are ultimately similar. Indeed, he repeats an important conclusion from the Mémoires sur Napoléon (p.304): ‘Bonaparte profita pour ses commencements de l’enthousiasme créé par la Révolution. Une des grandes affaires de sa vie fut ensuite d’y substituer un enthousiasme personnel, pour lui, et le vil intérêt’ (VFR, p.45 [MT]). Thus the Tourist appears to formulate a definitive judgement on Napoleon:

Souvent, l’amour que ce grand cœur avait pour le beau l’emporta sur son intérêt comme roi. On vit bien cela après le 18 Brumaire: souvent le mépris se peignait sur ses lèvres si fines, si bien dessinées, à l’aspect de ces sujets fidèles et obéissants qui se pressaient au lever de Saint-Cloud. N’est-ce donc qu’à ce prix que je puis devenir empereur du monde, semblait-il se dire? Et il encourageait la platitude. Quand plus tard il punissait les généraux qui avaient de l’âme, Delmas, Lecourbe, etc., et les jacobins, son sentiment était différent, il avait peur. (p.401)

Napoleon’s love of beauty allows him to transcend his role as absolute sovereign (MN, p.81; MT, p.410) through the display of nobility and a lingering attachment to the truth.
As a result, he retains an element of integrity, here signalled by his physical beauty. Hence the Tourist's insistence on the shape of Napoleon's mouth, implicitly contrasted to that of a greedy man in an echo of the *Promenades* (*VIT*, p.721): 'y a-t-il rien d'aussi laid que les contours de la bouche d'un banquier qui craint de perdre' (*VFR*, p.325 [*MT*]).

Napoleon is implicitly contrasted to the *fripon* government of the *juste milieu* and its attempts to encourage 'les passions égoïstes et vilaines' through the systematic abuse of power (p.53). The Tourist notes in his discussion of Russian politics that 'd'ordinaire les souverains absolus savent qu'ils ne se soutiennent qu'en partageant avec leur noblesse le plaisir de jouir des abus' (p.266). The Russian system is of course as outdated as that of the French Restoration monarchy, swept away as a result of its attempt to restrict opportunities for the abuse of power to the nobility. *Juste milieu* France is founded instead on the understanding that the third estate will be actively encouraged to participate in such abuses. The spread of corruption creates a climate of unremitting mediocrity in public life (p.5, p.83 [*MT*]; p.669 [*VMF*]). Thus, the Tourist notes sourly that Sieyès, Mirabeau and Danton have been replaced by 'les pygmées actuels' (p.9 [*MT*]), while the spleen that afflicts him in the Nivernais prompts him to recall the words of a Mme d'Arsac to her daughters: 'Mesdemoiselles, il ne faut jamais croire au très (au très beau, au très méchant; il n'y a que du médiocre en ce monde)' (p.169). Stendhal's abandoned introduction to the *Mémoires* makes the same point even more bluntly: 'mon père disait qu'en ce siècle de laisser-aller, tout tend à faire des hommes médiocres' (p.756). Similarly, the Tourist remarks in the *Voyage en France*: 'c'est une fatalité: le manque de physionomie semble s'attacher à tout ce qui est moderne; tout nous précipite, comme à l'envi, dans le genre ennuyeux' (p.507). Finally, the *Voyage dans le Midi de la France* bemoans the fact that the Tourist is living in 'une époque de transition, c'est-à-dire de médiocrité' with only the arts and the thought of Napoleon's campaigns to console him (p.694). The Tourist suggests that young men in particular settle for mediocrity as a result of their *fripon* desire to make quick fortunes, a desire paradoxically encouraged by the example of Napoleon:

Les jeunes gens passent leur vie au café, à brûler des cigares et à parler entre eux de projets de fortune; il la leur faut brillante et rapide. La fortune d'un certain lieutenant d'artillerie a rendu fous tous les Français pour un demi-siècle au moins. (p.36 [*MT*])

These young *fripoms* hope to make their fortunes by taking advantage of either the forthcoming elections or the financing and construction of railway lines. As a result, it is implied that they do not properly understand the importance of Napoleon and his legacy.
Indeed, Stendhal shows himself to be aware of just how absurd the Napoleonic myth can become. The Tourist, observing some statues decorating the porch of the church of St Peter in Vienne, remarks:

Il est curieux de voir le point extrême des grandes réputations. Virgile qui, dans le Moyen Age, passait pour un grand magicien, est, dit-on, l'auteur de ces figures.

Le shah de Perse, qui régnait en 1809, demandait à M. Morier, ambassadeur anglais, si le fameux général Bona-pour ou Bonda-Pour se battait pour ou contre les Français. (p.140)

Similarly, Stendhal notes that a particularly feeble painting of Hannibal crossing the Alps on horseback should be sent to a parish in the country where it would easily be mistaken for a religious painting, depicting the martyrdom of a saint (p.729 [VMF]).

The Tourist recognizes that political myths are endlessly malleable. As a result, he is heartened by the possibility that France's glorious past will one day be revived: 's'il s'élevait un Mirabeau ou un Danton, son éloquence pourrait les conduire aux plus grandes folies; car au fond ils s'ennuient' (p.36 [MT]). Once the 'pygmies' have been replaced by more heroic leaders, French youth will rediscover its latent sense of generosity and grandeur. The French people are bored by corruption and the lethargy such corruption induces. However, in order to rise from this debased state, the people must first be roused to anger (p.440 [VF]), a task the Tourist assigns not only to a new Danton or Mirabeau, but also to a new Cato (p.439), and even to writers such as himself.

4. Satire

The Tourist is ostensibly a loyal Orleanist. He suggests that 'le gouvernement royal est préférable à la meilleure des républiques' (p.221 [MT]). Even the worst king, Ferdinand VII of Spain for instance, would cause less trouble than 'les républicains au pouvoir. Ils y arriveraient, je le crois, avec des intentions raisonnables; mais bientôt ils se mettraient en colère, et voudraient régénérer' (p.222). The best of republics would prove unacceptable to the Tourist because it would seek to raise the moral standards of the population. The Tourist continues in the same ironic vein: 'si la révolution de 89 a réussi, c'est que tous les plébéiens qui avaient un peu de cœur étaient animés d'une haine profonde pour des abus atroces. Où sont aujourd'hui les abus atroces?' (p.222). The Tourist goes on to explain that contemporary Frenchmen, bereft of energy and patriotism, should concentrate on doubling the wealth of the nation and forget about rioting in the streets. This position is
an obvious nonsense in the light of the Tourist's otherwise consistent admiration for the French Revolution, the Revolution of 1830 and the Lyon riots of 1831 and 1834.

The ironic question 'où sont les abus?' is repeated in the *Voyage en France* (p.465) and then reformulated: 'il n'y a plus de choses capitales à corriger en France; il n'y a donc plus de grands bouleversements à espérer ou à craindre; donc, plus de grandes fortunes à faire' (p.559). Having explained the impossibility of revolution, the Tourist goes on to prove the impossibility of war: 'les rois sentent que le premier coup de canon peut ébranler leurs trônes' (ibid.). Only Nicholas of Russia is stupid enough not to realize this important fact. Yet he cannot afford to go to war: 'pour que nos jeunes ouvriers chapeliers pussent devenir maréchaux, ducs, comtes, etc., il faudrait que l'empereur de Russie trouvât une montagne d'or pur aussi grosse que Montmartre' (pp.559-60).

In a world without abuses of power, there is no need for revolution. Yet without such abuses, there is equally no possibility of making the quick fortunes craved by a rapacious class of young bourgeois *fripons*, whose unrealistic expectations are founded on the example of Napoleon's meteoric rise (p.36 [*MT*]; p.560 [*VF*]). This class must find an outlet for its crazed ambition or else it will take the lead in a new revolution (p.36 [*MT*]) or war (p.134), either of which would sweep Orleanism away. The *juste milieu* system therefore seeks to extend opportunity, encouraging abuses of power through government patronage (p.37, p.53), elections and major financial operations (p.36), in particular canal, road and railway construction. This alternative strategy again leads either to war or revolution. Indeed, the Tourist suggests Orleanism cannot even rely on the loyalty of *fripons*, the system's principal beneficiaries.

Orleanism defines beauty in terms of relative standards ('ce qui est vanté dans le journal') and economic gain (p.71) rather than absolute values and self-sacrifice. French youth, instead of embracing its inglorious destiny as part of this new system, hankers instead for the glory of its Revolutionary and Napoleonic forebears: 'au lieu *d'inventer* sa destinée, elle voudrait la *copier*; elle voudrait voir recommencer, en 1837, le siècle qui commença en 1792 avec Carnot et Dumouriez' (p.560 [*VF*]). French youth hopes to acquire the glory of their forebears by copying rather than inventing, imitating rather than emulating. It cannot yet understand that these achievements were glorious only in so far as they reflected a renewal of moral grandeur. It is thus perfectly possible for Mme Roland to revive the virtue of the first Romans (p.74 [*MT*]) or for Napoleon to revive the *virtù* of a Caesar or an Alexander (p.81).
Stendhal concludes that the attempt merely to copy history is doomed to failure:

C'est un torrent qui s'est précipité de la montagne dans la plaine, par une cascade admirable; à une demi-lieue de là, il voudrait encore avoir une cascade qui fit de nouveau l'admiration du monde. Mais c'est précisément parce qu'il a atteint cette plaine, d'un niveau si inférieur à la montagne sur laquelle il coulait, qu'une nouvelle cascade est devenue impossible. (p.560 [VF])

The corruption of French youth prevents it from engineering a 'nouvelle cascade'. However, Orleanism cannot hope to corrupt the entire country: 'on corrompt pour une élection avec des croix et des places, mais on ne peut acheter les masses; c'était la ressource des empereurs romains; maintenant c'est trop cher' (p.572). The system is shown to be top-heavy. Thus, when the Tourist is told by a disillusioned salesman in Tours that there are more marchands than there are acheteurs, he remarks: 'c'est là le grand inconvenient de la civilisation actuelle: plus de médecins que de malades, plus d'avocats que de procès, etc.' (p.202 [MT]). There are more aspiring fripons than there are dupes. The masses, bearing the weight of a system which has to provide for ever increasing numbers of fripon beneficiaries, yet themselves excluded from its rewards, plainly constitute a threat to the system's continuing survival. This threat is exacerbated by the relative lack of sophistication (duperie) of the masses, particularly in the provinces, who fail to derive proper pleasure from the spectacle of corruption:

Le ministère donne-t-il la croix à un sot bien notoirement inepte, nous rions à Paris; et il n'y aurait pas à rire si la croix était donnée au mieux méritant: le ministère prend soin de nos plaisirs. En province, on s'indigne à un tel spectacle, on se désaffectionne profondément. Le provincial ne sait pas encore que tout en ce monde est une comédie. (p.54)

Orleanism hopes to silence its critics by obfuscating the truth behind criminal proceedings, pushing through a miscarriage of justice against Emile de la Roncière in a manner reminiscent of General Lally's conviction under Louis XV (p.3). Similarly, a portrait of the Revolutionary hero, Barnave, is excluded from an official gallery dedicated to famous Dauphinois: 'la médiocrité se venge des grands hommes après leur mort' (p.394). Scandal and mediocrity, however, leave Orleanism vulnerable to caricature (p.3). Hence, the long list of satirists who make their appearance in the course of the three voyages. Early in the Mémoires, the Tourist tells his reader that he is singing a (satirical) song by Pierre Béranger (p.49). He goes on to credit Béranger and the satirical pamphleteer Paul-Louis Courier with having prepared the ground for the 1830 Revolution (p.152), visits Béranger's home (p.204) and passes through the area where Courier was murdered
In the *Voyage dans le Midi de la France*, Stendhal compares himself with both Swift (p.673) and Juvenal (p.735), in each case disclaiming his own satiric intent. Yet he clearly believes that satire is required to expose the political and financial abuses masked by the hypocrisy of ministers: 'le sang politique ne coule pas sous Louis-Philippe. Mais si les mœurs de 1816 revenaient, ces gens que je ne nomme pas feraient couler le sang, comme ils font des friponneries, en parlant vertu et moralité' (p.735).

Indeed, the Tourist suggests that *Le Charivari*, the most important satirical journal in France from its foundation in 1832, plays a crucial role in limiting both despotism (p.135 [*MT]*) and fraud (p.572 [*VF*]), not least, although the Tourist never states this explicitly, through its publication of Daumier's *Robert Macaire* caricatures (1836-38). However, satirists are impeded more by the complexity of the financial scandals they ought to be exposing than by any press laws enacted by a worried government:

Les épigrammes de la presse ne viendront point stimuler la paresse des gens payés pour s'occuper des chemins de fer; le sujet *est trop ennuyeux à expliquer*, et l'esprit amusant des journalistes n'a jamais la patience d'exposer clairement les diverses friponneries que peut occasionner un chemin de fer. (p.137 [*MT]*)

The Tourist returns to this idea in the Touraine (the region in which Courier was murdered): 'les voleries difficiles à raconter survivront à toutes les autres; on craint d'ennuyer en cherchant à soulever contre elles l'opinion publique' (p.211). This time, however, the Tourist's remarks serve as a prologue to just such an attempt to recount a volerie. An engineer, M. Wambrée, 'encore jeune et honnête' (p.213) is shown struggling against a cartel of contractors who have rigged the public tender for a road-construction contract with the tacit complicity of the acting 'préfet' and the corrupt head of the 'bureau des Ponts et Chaussées' (pp.211-14). Given the constraints of the Press Laws, Stendhal strives to adopt a conciliatory tone, deploying his usual array of *paratonnerres*: 'quant à moi, je me tiens pour ami très sincère du gouvernement du roi, et je crois très sincèrement aussi aux voleries sans nombre. Ce n'est pas l'argent que je regrette, c'est l'habitude de la friponnerie' (p.211). The authority of the government is in no way compromised by flagrant abuses of power because such abuses are accepted as an integral part of the game. Yet the Tourist immediately contradicts himself with the following transparent disclaimer: 'comme je ne veux pas parler de ce qui se passe en France, je vais raconter ce qui a eu lieu dernièrement dans un Etat voisin' (p.211). It is possible that the recounting of abuses.

---

5 The *Gazette des tribunaux* (p.13, 305 [*MT*]; p.526 [*VF*]) also functioned as a sort of satirical journal through its reporting of cases involving fraud and corruption.
might after all be perceived as criticism of the established order. Perhaps this is why 'Robert Macaire, la comédie de l'époque, est prohibé en France. M. le maire de Nantes ne veut pas qu'on joue Robert Macaire, on a peur apparemment que le public ne se moque des fripons et n'apprenne à les reconnaître' (p.128).

Stendhal's narrative ludism allows him to introduce the theme of l'habitude de la friponnerie. The Tourist variously illustrates this theme through the dramatization of an attempt by a Dutch Prefectoral 'chef de division' to extract a bribe payable in local cheese (p.22) or the story of a daughter's attempt to manipulate the corpse of her father into a show of assent to a new will in her favour (pp.22-26). The Tourist pronounces himself dissatisfied with these anecdotes (p.26, pp.214-15) on the grounds of length. There is also the question of good taste to be considered. The Tourist does not wish to 'nommer les masques et faire du scandale' (p.216). Instead, he aims to discuss moral laideur (l'habitude de la friponnerie) in general terms, as part of a wider lesson in morality. In the process, Stendhal hopes to influence the moral development (habitudes) of his readers, ostensibly without provoking them to la haine impuissante. The reader is encouraged to adopt the Tourist's reluctant approach to the uncovering of grim political realities:

Je ne sais si le lecteur sera de mon avis; le grand malheur de l'époque actuelle, c'est la colère et la haine impuissante. Ces tristes sentiments éclipsent la gaieté naturelle au tempérament français. Je demande qu'on se guérisse de la haine, non par pitié pour l'ennemi auquel on pourrait faire du mal, mais bien par pitié pour soi-même. Le soin de notre bonheur nous crie: 'Chassez la haine, et surtout la haine impuissante.' (p.295)

The careful study of human shortcomings is best conducted in the provinces: 'le sublime serait d'avoir un procès avec quelqu'un' (p.93). Such study allows the Tourist to uncover what he refers to as the 'être social' (p.175), the product of the chaos and barbarism of the tenth century: 'le malheur et le désordre général arrivèrent à ce point que la société nuisait plus aux hommes qu'elle ne leur servait. Quelques sages esprits retirés dans les cloîtres s'aperçurent de cet abus' (ibid.). Brittany, a region which maintains the independent traditions of barbarism, is still capable of perceiving such abuses:

Aussi tard que 1720, ce me semble, elle [la Bretagne] a eu l'honneur de voir quatre de ses enfants monter sur l'échafaud en qualité de rebelles, et y laisser leurs têtes. Je les blâmerais fort si Louis XIV n'avait violé le contrat social passé avec les Bretons. (p.313)

6 Maine de Biran's concept of habitude is again key: 'un buste doit rendre les habitudes de l'âme, non la passion du moment' (p.538 [VT]).
The rights of both governments and citizens are bound by mutual obligations, as in the Marseilles Republic prior to Caesar's conquest (p. 500 [VF]) or the constitutional monarchy established by the Black Prince in fifteenth-century Bordeaux (p. 645 [VMF]). The Tourist professes hostility to the concept of socially-imposed obligations (p. 500 [VF]), ostensibly adopting an anti-Republican perspective, but actually stating his belief in the dissolubility of the social contract. The Tourist's explains his (admittedly limited) admiration for Rousseau's theories of society while reporting a conversation with an impoverished Genevan clock-maker, 'qui avait une mauvaise édition des œuvres de Rousseau et les comprenait' (p. 436), and who occupies Rousseau's maison natale: 'nous parlâmes une heure du Contrat social, dont le principal mérite, suivant moi, consiste dans le titre' (ibid.). The notion of a contract, through its evocation of the possibility of dissolution in the event of non-compliance by either party, not only serves to legitimize revolution and tyrannicide but also individual secession. Indeed, society is shown to be held together by largely fraudulent 'liens moraux' (p. 424), closely connected in Stendhal's fiction to the concept of patriarchy and political metaphors of the family: 'la société se fait tous les jours tellement hypocrite, qu'il est permis de trouver que ses gênes l'emportent sur ses agréments' (p. 189 [MT]). The Tourist, in the manner of the four Breton rebels of 1720, finds himself repelled by the inequity of a fraudulently maintained social contract. However, the Marseilles plague of 1720-21 and Paris cholera of 1832 allow the Tourist to formulate a new and equitable conception of the social contract, diametrically opposed to the inequities of monarchical government.

The need to contain the outbreak of contagion imposes a duty of collaboration on the citizens of Marseilles (p. 510 [VF]). The Tourist goes on to note that the citizens of Paris showed the same public spirit, and with less vain self-congratulation: 'ce qui était de l'histoire en 1720 s'est trouvé tout simple en 1832, en présence de la presse qui menaçait de révéler toutes les faiblesses. Ceci montre que la moralité de la France s'est élevée de 1720 à 1832' (ibid.). Revolution and Empire have educated the French people in their duties as citizens. Ignorance and charlatanism, by contrast, continue to bedevil government. Thus, the arbitrary rules of quarantine (familiar to Stendhal in his capacity as French Consul to the malarial port of Civitavecchia) are imposed with scant regard for either reason or utility (p. 511), yet look set to be abolished altogether as the result of a rival absurdity, namely the claim that 'la peste et plusieurs autres maladies fort connues ne sont pas contagieuses' (p. 512). The Tourist goes on to reintroduce the opposition of absolute as against relative standards of truth: 'en France il n'y a point de vérités; il n'y a que des modes; il est donc parfaitement inutile de démontrer qu'il est utile de faire telle ou
telle chose' (ibid.). Useless though such demonstrations may prove, the Tourist nonetheless strives in the course of his travels to determine the truth in matters of common utility or 'le bien public' (p. 12 [MT]). Thus, the Tourist's satire of nineteenth-century utilitarianism, defined in terms of fripon greed, are balanced by a new endorsement of true utilitarianism (the pursuit of the common good), seen as an absolute ideal in the service of an equitably constituted society of consenting individuals.

The social contract proves necessary after all because there are limits to what individuals can achieve on their own. Thus, the Tourist uses not only epidemics, but also road-improvement (pp.12-13, 29, 135, 146, 211-15, 388 [MT]; p.428 [VF]), railway-construction (pp.136-37, 277 [MT]; p.578 [VMF]), and the defence of the environment, whether natural (p.6, 200, 389 [MT]; p.508 [VF]; p.580 [VMF]) or built (p.41 [MT]; p.678 [VMF]), to demonstrate the need for decisions to be taken collectively, in accordance with an absolute conception of the common good, defined in terms of both public utility and aesthetics. The Tourist proposes two models for such collective decision-making: the civilian, Republican model of the Gesellschaft (Brutus) and the military, Imperial model of the Gemeinschaft (Caesar). Both models depend for their survival not only on reason and taste but just as importantly on the consent, enthusiasm and faculté de vouloir of individual citizens or soldiers, a point made in the course of the Tourist's discussion of General, later President Andrew Jackson and his Napoleonic defence of New Orleans:

Y a-t-il encore en Europe des hommes à la Jackson? On trouverait sans doute des Robert Macaire très braves, et beaux parleurs. Mais, dans les circonstances difficiles l'homme sans conscience manque de forces tout à coup; c'est un mauvais cheval qui s'abat sur la glace, et ne veut plus se relever. (p.252 [MT])

---

7 See the Tourist's discussion of the Pont du Gard (pp.364-65 [MT]) as an example of 'le peuple-roi' fusing utility and aesthetics in architecture. See also his discussion of the Milanese 'commission de l'Ornato', 'chargée d'empêcher la création du laid en architecture' (p.678 [VMF]).

8 See the Tourist's discussions of Mme Roland (p. 74 [MT]), republican Marseilles (pp.494-95 [VF]), the Bordeaux revolt of 1548 (pp.653-54 [VMF]) and his unexpected praise for the government of the Grande-Chartreuse (pp.417-18 [MT]).

9 See the Tourist's discussions of the later Caesars (p.157 [MT]), Lesdiguières's military rule in the Dauphiné (pp.374-75, 386-88) and the Black Prince's governance of fourteenth-century Bordeaux (pp.645-46, 649-51 [VMF]).
Distinction is to be found in the alliance of beauty and truth, heroism and philosophy, generosity and ambition, **passion** and **habitude**. Thus Plutarch observes that Brutus sought to combine philosophy with action to construct a temperament 'almost ideally balanced to pursue a life of virtue' (*MR*, p.223). Stendhal's fiction will go on to foreground great souls who manage to combine the attributes of Brutus and Caesar, Mme Roland and Napoleon:

Pour faire un homme distingué, il faut à vingt ans cette chaleur d'âme, cette duperie, si l'on veut, que l'on ne rencontre guère qu'en province; il faut aussi cette instruction philosophique et dégagée de toute fausseté que l'on ne trouve que dans les bons collèges de Paris. (p.37)
III
FICTION
1

LE ROUGE ET LE NOIR

'Julien jeune provincial, élève de Plutarque et de Napoléon'

(RSN, p.161 [MV])

1. Restoration

Stendhal uses the binary structure of Le Rouge et le Noir to draw parallels between Julien's experiences in the provinces and in Paris. At the same time, Stendhal deliberately creates parallels between his new protagonists and those of his previous novel, Armance, while also preparing the ground for future parallels between the protagonists of Le Rouge and those of Lucien Leuwen, La Chartreuse de Parme and Lamiel. Furthermore, Stendhal's heroes consistently look to, or find themselves compared to historical and literary exemplars. Thus Julien is compared to Hercules, Homeric heroes in general, Caesar, Brutus, Jesus, Julian the Apostate, Charles the Bold, Sixtus V, Machiavelli, Catherine de' Medici, Boniface de La Mole, the courtiers of Henri III and Charles IX, Richelieu, Tartuffe, Mephistopheles, Rousseau, Lafayette, Washington, Mirabeau, Mme Roland, Danton, Carnot, Napoleon, Murat and Ney.¹

Mme Roland famously remarked that Plutarch's Parallel Lives serve as the pasturage of great souls; Stendhal's fiction is similarly intended as the pasturage of the 'Happy Few', a modern collection of Parallel Lives using the polarities between Brutus and Caesar as a template for parallel inquiries into the nature of heroism in a society increasingly dominated by the liberalcapitalist orthodoxies already so vigorously denounced in D'un nouveau complot contre les industriels (1825).

Le Rouge et le Noir (written between October 1829 and July 1830, and published in November 1830), Vanina Vanini (written between 1827 and 1829, published in December 1829) and Mina de Vanghel (written between 1829 and 1830, and published posthumously) together represent Stendhal's initial solution to the problems posed both by Armance (1827) and the very notion of a Restoration hero. For all Octave's

¹ The reference to Brutus is indirect, coming in the epigraph to chapter 15 of the second book, entitled Est-ce un complot?: 'Ah! que l'intervalle est cruel entre un grand projet conçu et son exécution! Que de vaines terres! que d'irrésolutions! Il s'agit de la vie. - Il s'agit de bien plus: de l'honneur!' (RN, p.318). The epigraph is credited to Schiller, but is actually a free translation of a speech by Brutus in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar (II, 1). See Jules C. Alciatore, 'Stendhal, Shakespeare et deux épigraphes du Rouge et le Noir', Stendhal Club, 6, (1960), 185-88.
disapproval of Restoration France, earnestly conveyed to Armance in the course of their private conversations, he can do no more than drift silently away from its constraints and contradictions, ostensibly towards a barely-glimped 'terre des héros' (A, p.261), but actually into the gentle deliverance of admixed opium and digitalis. Armance alone suspects that Octave, perennially 'en contradiction avec les événements de la vie réelle' (p.52), has finally decided to commit suicide; an act which signals both Octave's refusal to accept the vulgar reality of Restoration life (a life of impotence) and his sense of the impossibility of realizing apparently anachronistic ideals of heroism and glory.

Yet the reader is aware that life by the side of an Armance 'enivrée de bonheur, et se pâmant dans ses bras la veille de son départ' (p.260) does indeed constitute a viable alternative, both literally and metaphorically, to Octave's life of impotence. She is the exception to vulgar reality he is looking for, as signalled by her ability to reconcile him with society (p.120). Indeed, by helping Octave conquer his misanthropy, Armance offers him the possibility of realizing his ideals and ambitions. Thus, the narrator notes that Octave's path to glory lies not in conquering Turkish-occupied Greece but rather his own misanthropic prejudices: 's'il y fût parvenu, une ambition sans bornes l'eût précipité au milieu des hommes et dans les lieux où la gloire s'achète par les plus grands sacrifices' (p.209). The cause of Greek independence he eventually pretends to champion cannot allow him to realize his ideals because it represents an escape rather than a challenge, a failure rather than a test of courage. Furthermore, the cause itself embodies many of the contradictions of Restoration society. Even though contemporary Greece is seen as a Plutarchian 'terre des héros', in the same way that modern Rome is seen as the city of Caesar and Brutus, Octave's war against the Turks turns out to be ideologically confused, simultaneously a liberal, progressive struggle for liberation, an aristocratic, reactionary crusade and a vainglorious, imitative (Byronic) display of sham heroics. In any case, Octave's enthusiasm for Greek independence depends entirely on his feelings for Armance:

Loin d'elle, il ne pouvait voir aucune action qui valût la peine de vivre. Rien ne lui semblait digne de lui inspirer le moindre intérêt. Tout lui paraissait également insipide, l'action la plus noble comme l'occupation la plus vulgairement utile: marcher au secours de la Grèce, et aller se faire tuer à côté de Fabvier, comme faire obscurement des expériences d'agriculture au fond d'un département.

Son imagination parcourrait rapidement toute l'échelle des actions possibles, pour retomber ensuite avec plus de douleur sur le désespoir le plus profond, le plus sans ressource, le plus digne de son nom; ah! que la mort eût été agréable dans ces instants! (A, p.164)

In Le Rouge, Mathilde pours scorn on the suitors who share Octave's bathetic dilemma:
C'était toujours la passion la plus profonde, la plus mélancolique.

'Ils sont tous le même homme parfait, prêt à partir pour la Palestine', disait-elle à sa cousine.
"Connaissez-vous quelque chose de plus insipide?' (p.294)

Octave's despair stems from a failure of the imagination which renders him incapable of heroically seizing the initiative within his immediate society, that is to say increasing the number of 'actions possibles' available to him at any given point in time by cultivating his gift for l'imprévu. Only time spent with Armance would cure him of his misanthropy and so allow him to assert his personality and thereby develop his ambitions (his faculté de vouloir). Yet Octave appears too frightened of his love for his cousin (frightened of his own potential) to pursue such a course. Octave therefore abandons his personal ambitions, sketched out in openly Napoleonic terms in the opening paragraph (p.51), replacing them with a familial conception of devoir at odds with these same ambitions. Indeed, Octave can see no way of honourably bridging the gap between the duperie of youth and the friponnerie required of him if he is to shoulder his family responsibilities as a Restoration aristocrat. Octave's inability to perpetuate the family line through procreation can therefore be seen as a subconscious protest against his family's increasingly ignoble attempts to increase, and even multiply, their parasitical fortune. Octave's fear of asserting himself leaves him with no form of revolt other than a series of self-negating escape-fantasies (p.75, 148, 152-53, 164) culminating in the elaborate charade that ends with his suicide. The following description of Julien by the narrator of Le Rouge can therefore more accurately be applied to Octave:

Il était encore bien jeune; mais, suivant moi, ce fut une belle plante. Au lieu de marcher du tendre au rusé, comme la plupart des hommes, l'âge lui eût donné la bonté facile à s'attendrir, il se fut guéri d'une méfiance folle... Mais à quoi bon ces vaines prédictions? (RN, p.442).

Indeed, the narrator's predictions, in so far as they concern Julien, prove not so vain after all. The tendre of his initial affair with Louise de Rénéal, having made way for the rusé of his affair with Mathilde, finally resurfaces as the bonté facile, cured of all méfiance folle, of his prison relationship with Louise. However, these same predictions, similar in tone to the 'brillant horoscope' traced for Octave by the 'prince de R***' (A, pp.208-09), prove vain when applied to the hero of Armance. Octave remains a figure of unrealized (unrealizable?) potential, almost wilfully trapped between the tendre and the rusé, between duperie and friponnerie, precisely because his refusal to pursue his ambitions prompts him to fall back on his méfiance folle rather than develop a bonté facile. Octave's failure of ambition is directly linked to his failure of generosity.
Thus, Octave and Julien pursue opposite strategies in their efforts to preserve singularity. Despite Octave's affectation of both reprehensible (pp.121-22) and criminal (p.213) behaviour, as well as his periodic psychotic episodes (pp. 72-73, 233), his final rejection of friponnerie (Armance's apparently mercenary pursuit of a husband) takes the form of a deliberate return to duperie, portrayed not in its sublime form of generosity, but in its base form of méfiance folle, entailing Octave's pathetic submission to the vile aspirations and stratagems of Soubirane and the chevalier de Bonnivet. Octave allows himself to be duped by a forged letter, never quite summoning the courage to confront Armance with the evidence of her alleged lack of love, a love that alone, through the then fashionable mechanism of reversibility, can atone for Octave's lack of virility. Octave's refusal to confront Armance can be seen as evidence of his status as the first in a series of Stendhalian moutons, whose various failings can all be traced back to an impotence of the imagination. Thus, Octave confines himself to proclaiming: 'je me suis trompé; il ne me reste qu'à mourir' (A, p.254). His only concern is to die honourably, foreshadowing the two moutons of Le Rouge: 'ils étaient braves, et voilà tout. Et encore, comment braves? se disait-elle [Mathilde]: en duel, mais le duel n'est plus qu'une cérémonie. Tout en est su d'avance, même ce que l'on doit dire en tombant' (RN, p.313). Julien reacts very differently to another 'forged' letter, this time dictated to Mme de Rênal by her confessor. Although he is taken in - the letter is after all in Mme de Rênal's own hand, even if written more carefully than usual (p.431) - Julien chooses to reject both friponnerie (any attempt to repair the damage to his prospects inflicted by Mme de Rênal) and the charge of friponnerie (contained in her letter) through a violent and criminal rejection of duperie. Thus he refuses simply to accept that he has allowed himself to be outmanoeuvred by Mme de Rênal's letter. As a consequence, Julien fulfils Mathilde's prophecy that,

---

2 Armance writes several letters in a 'ton d'angélique bonté', expanding on her desire to take upon herself and thus help repair Octave's crimes (p.247). She also declares her recurrent desire to commit a crime equal to that of Octave 'pour mériter que tu ne me craignes plus' (p.258). Similarly, Louise de Rênal sees her child's illness in terms of a just and terrible God (RN, p.169) visiting her crimes on the innocent: 'Dieu me punit, [...] il est juste: j'adore son équité; mon crime est affreux, et je vivais sans remords!' (p.108). She goes on to tell her husband: 'il faut que je me perde et m'humilie moi-même; peut-être ce sacrifice apaisera le Seigneur' (ibid.). An admiring Julien ('voilà de la grandeur dans les sentiments' (ibid.)) responds by expressing the wish he suffer in the place of young Stanislas (p.110), prompting Louise to exclaim in turn: 'Ah! si je pouvais prendre sur moi ton péché, comme tu m'offrais si généreusement de prendre la fièvre ardente de Stanislas!' (p.111).

3 See also RN, p.298, 313, 356. Croisenois eventually dies in a duel defending Mathilde's honour (p.484).
unlike the *moutons* of polite society, he will prove willing to take vigorous action in order to defend himself (p.298). Julien's solution is to defend his honour by committing a crime on a par with Mme de Rênal's perceived betrayal. Julien's vengeance can be compared to Armance's reversibility, the two concepts sharing a sense of morally mathematical (unhypocritical) symmetry (equity between the respective pairs of lovers). Indeed, reversibility can be seen as an extension of *générosité*, the sublime form of *duperie*, whereas vengeance (seen as *atroce* and therefore biblical) can be related to ambition, the sublime form of *friponnerie*.

2. Reaction and Revolt

The eponymous heroines of *Vanina Vanini* and *Mina de Vanghel* both find ways of revolting against the elegant mediocrity imposed on Restoration society by duty and convention. Such mediocrity is typified in *Le Rouge* by the figure of Croisenois, a *mouton* who eventually dies in a duel to defend Mathilde's indefensible honour: 'rien ne manque à Croisenois, et il ne sera toute sa vie qu'un duc à demi-ultra, à demi-libéral, un être indécis toujours éloigné des extrêmes, et *par conséquent se trouvant le second partout* (pp.295-96). Stendhal's interest in extremes prompts him to incorporate the more radical values of the reactionary right within the space of his fiction. Stendhal's twinning of the themes of vengeance and reversibility owes much to Joseph de Maistre whose work Julien learns by heart (p.20, 164, 179, 243). Stendhal repeatedly appears to dismiss Maistre's ideas as barbaric anachronisms, yet his writings on François Cenci and Gilles de Retz show that barbarism and anachronism often function as positive

---

4 Julien initially sees Louise as 'un ennemi avec lequel il va falloir se battre' (p.50). His attempts at interlocutory discourse therefore often take violent forms, for instance when he resolves to seize the hand of Louise or else blow his brains out in order to keep their relationship alive (p.51).

5 Julien writes to Mathilde: 'la vengeance a été atroce' (p.435). Elsewhere, he refers to the Biblical God as 'un despote, [...], rempli d'idées de vengeance' (p.466) and a 'petit despote cruel et plein de la soif de se venger' (p.481). The narrator also associates the concepts of atrocity and vengeance with the Terror. Thus, Julien responds to a criticism of his conduct by Mme Derville with a look that the narrator informs the reader expresses 'comme un espoir vague de la plus atroce vengeance. Ce sont sans doute de tels moments d'humiliation qui ont fait les Robespierre' (p.54). Similarly, Julien's features are later contorted by his *méfiance folle* in the hôtel de La Mole: 'il faut en convenir, le regard de Julien était atroce, sa physionomie hideuse; elle respirait le crime sans alliages. C'était l'homme malheureux en guerre avec toute la société' (p.310). Mathilde similarly refers to Julien's crime as 'une noble vengeance qui me montre toute la hauteur du cœur qui bat dans cette poitrine' (p.444).

6 In the *Promenades*, Stendhal acknowledges that some of his political ideas make him pass 'pour un homme de l'extrême-droite' (*VIT*, p.757).
values in his work. Indeed, Stendhal continues to see progress as both inevitable and regrettable (p. 275, 340). The triumph of modern civilization will bring with it democracy and economic development but also elevate le dieu dollar as the sole measure of utility, thereby reducing the individual to the roles of buyer and seller, dupe and fripon. Reactionary revolt, whether in the form of the Luddism espoused by Byron, the anti-industrialism of D'un nouveau complot, the Vendée uprisings of the duchesse de Berry or indeed the counter-civilizing apostasy of the first Julian, is seen as doomed to failure and even undesirable in purely political and economic terms. Yet, in moral and aesthetic terms, reactionary ideas help preserve elements of perverse anti-utilitarianism (l'imprévu) which allow the individual to use his or her imagination to escape from the conformity of civilization, and in particular the dupe/fripon trap: 'quelle est la grande action qui ne soit pas un extrême au moment où on l'entreprend?' (p. 296). In Le Rouge, Stendhal will eventually adapt aspects of Maistre's reactionary radicalism to suit both a Republican and a Napoleonic agenda, thereby creating an alliance of extreme positions that would have horrified the Savoyan Count. In Vanina Vanini, however, we see Stendhal experimenting with the opposition of Pietro Missirilli's unimaginative Carbonarism (an inflexible worship of utility) and the imaginative egoism of Vanina's passions, exercised at the very heart of the Papal government advocated by Maistre in Du pape. Vanina Vanini therefore manages to serve both as a satire on the anachronisms of theocratic barbarism and the limitations of utilitarian civilization. Thus Pietro defines his mission in terms of the 'devoir de délivrer l'Italie des barbares' (RSN, p. 59 [V]), in what the narrator informs us is a reference to Petrarch, as well as to Pope Julius II, Machiavelli and Alfieri. Ostensibly, Pietro means the expulsion of foreign troops from Italian soil; in practice, he also means the elimination of the barbarism Vanina exemplifies.

Vanina is clearly a prototype (Plutarchian pair) for Mathilde, as signalled by her father's name, Asdrubale Vanini, a brother of sorts to the La Moles, who in the male line each bear the name of Annibal Coconasso, companion to Boniface de La Mole (RN, p. 287). Pietro's escape from his captors prompts Vanina to compare him to her aristocratic suitor: 'au moins celui-là a fait quelque chose de plus que de se donner la peine de naître' (RSN, p. 47 [V]). Vanina thereby foreshadows Mathilde's assessments of the merits of, on the one hand, Julien and, on the other, Croisenois and Norbert:

7 Similarly, the narrator notes on the occasion of Julien's missed duel with Amanda Binet's lover that the former's imagination is 'toujours dans les extrêmes' (p 157).
8 Lucien draws the same criticism from Ernest Dévelroy (LL, 1, 104-05).
Siècle dégénéré et ennuyeux! Qu'aurait dit Boniface de La Mole, si, levant hors de la tombe sa tête coupée, il eût vu, en 1793, dix-sept de ses descendants se laisser prendre comme des moutons, pour être guillotinés deux jours après? La mort était certaine, mais il eût été de mauvais ton de se défendre et de tuer au moins un jacobin ou deux. Ah! dans les temps héroïques de la France, au siècle de Boniface de La Mole, Julien eût été le chef d'escadron, et mon frère le jeune prêtre aux mœurs convenables, avec la sagesse dans les yeux et la raison à la bouche. (RN, p.313)

Pietro, however, is no Julien, patently failing to live up to Vanina's inflated estimation of his worth: 'tu es un grand homme comme nos anciens Romains' (RSN, p.56 [VV]). In particular, Pietro fails as a lover, consistently privileging his utilitarian ideals, even to the point of giving himself up to the authorities in a sheeplike show of solidarity with his captive co-conspirators. Vanina's elaborate schemes to secure Pietro for herself prove too imaginative for Pietro, shocked by the audacity and ruthlessness of Vanina's passion. The story ends with Vanina's confession that she had earlier betrayed the carbonari in order to put an end to Pietro's conspiracy. Although Pietro is nominally the revolutionary in that he is fighting the government, he is nonetheless more of an establishment (liberal orthodox) figure than the resolutely unorthodox Vanina. Indeed, the narrator makes it quite clear that he finds Vanina's monstrous refusal to conform preferable to Pietro's rather insipid and unimaginative rendering of the role of Brutus. Pietro is aesthetically inadequate, as evidenced by the predictability of his turning to religion in prison. He fails to live up to Vanina's radical expectations; Julien will eventually exceed those of Mathilde.

Stendhal's solution to the problems of Restoration fiction takes its most schematic form in the unexpanded novella Mina de Vanghel. Stendhal, in yet another of his parallels, explicitly compares Mina not to Mathilde but to her fellow non-Parisian, Julien, in a marginal note to the text: 'Mina étrangère d'un pays où l'on philosophe; Julien jeune provincial, élève de Plutarque et de Napoléon' (RSN, p.161 [MV]). Clearly, these outsiders will bring a fresh and unpredictable perspective to bear on the stultifying capital of Charles X. Both Mina and Julien are enacting fantasies of escape; Octave, by way of contrast, never fulfils his similar fantasies of a life spent in the army (A, p.51), in a draper's office (p.75), in charge of a canon or a steam-engine (p.148), as a chemist (ibid.), frequenting liberal salons (ibid.) or conducting agricultural experiments in Brazil (p.164). Octave's most developed fantasy takes the form of assuming a false-identity (that of Pierre Gerlat, the lackey he throws out of his mother's window in one of his psychotic attacks), coarsening his fine hands with dilute acid and

9 A sentiment echoed by the narrator of Le Rouge: 'les vraies passions sont égoïstes' (RN, p.128). Similarly, the narrator later remarks that 'toute vraie passion ne songe qu'à elle' (p.223).
becoming a manservant in Geneva or Lyon to some passing English aristocrat (pp.152-53). This last fantasy is of course eventually enacted not by Octave but by Mina, who uses chemicals to disguise her appearance (as will Lamiel) and so transforms herself into the maid Aniken, finding employment in Aix-les-Bains with the family of the man she loves.

In a further parallel, the Parisian Alfred de Larçay, Mina's ultimately inadequate lover, is for his part implicitly compared to Octave, both men seen as little more than honourable variants on a Restoration type. Alfred's over-developed sense of duty pushes him, in the manner of Octave before him, to take up the Greek cause (RSN, p.170) as a temporary way out of the contradiction between the chivalric ideology and pecuniary aspirations (fripon parasitism) of the aristocracy in Restoration France; a contradiction seemingly embodied by Alfred's marriage to 'la femme la plus riche et la plus aimable du pays' (p.169). Alfred's character is described as 'inflexible, froid, positif, assez enjoué, mais dénué d'imagination' (p.170). He is another edition of Octave's equally unimaginative 'devoir incarné' (A, p.52), only more fatuous as evidenced both by his marriage and his crude attempts on the virtue of Mina, in her disguise as Aniken (RSN, p.182). Unlike Octave, Alfred seems unaware of his own essential impotence (an impotence of the imagination), his merit resting solely on his bravery and simple manners (p.170). Neither quality bears comparison with the greatness of Mina's soul: 'Mina n'était nullement agitée par les idées de devoir ou par la crainte du ridicule. Ces idées de prudence humaine étaient bien au-dessous d'elle' (p.178). Not only are Mina's assaults on Restoration social conventions grander and more original than Alfred's timid latter-day crusading, she also displays a surer sense of equity, noting that he can hardly expect his wife to remain faithful to him once he himself has transgressed:

'Vous l'abandonnez et renoncez au droit de tenir son âme occupée; vous la laissez barbarement à l'ennui naturel à une femme de trente ans riche et sans le plus petit malheur. N'a-t-elle pas le droit d'avoir quelqu'un qui la désennuie? Et c'est vous qui me dites que vous m'aimez, vous plus criminel qu'elle, car avant elle vous avez outragé votre lien commun, et vous êtes fou; c'est vous qui voulez la condamner à un éternel ennui!'

Cette façon de penser était trop haute pour Alfred; mais le ton de la voix de Mina lui donnait de la force. Il admirait le pouvoir qu'elle avait sur lui, il en était charmé. (pp.201-02)

---

10 Mme de Larçay can be seen as the opposite of Mme de Nintrey (VFR, pp.268-75 [M7]). Mina is astonished by the disparity between Mme de Larçay's reputation and her actual character, seen as both 'commun' and 'prosaïque': 'dans sa douleur, car le désappointement du beau est une douleur pour les cœurs allemands, Mina cessa de regarder Mme de Larçay' (RSN, pp.169-70).
Inevitably, Alfred's love for Mina turns out to be less passionate and above all less unconditional than hers for him: 'Mina s'accoutuma à l'idée qu'Alfred était destiné par sa nature à aimer moins passionnément qu'elle. "Fût-il moins tendre encore", se disait-elle, "mon sort est de l'adorer. Je suis bien heureuse qu'il n'ait pas de vices infâmes. Je sens trop que les crimes ne me coûteraient rien, s'il voulait m'y entraîner" '(pp.210-11). Alfred, like Octave, Pietro Missirilli and for that matter Sénece from *San Francesco a Ripa* (1831), fails to respond to this desire for reciprocity; a desire related both to reversibility (as above) and revenge (for example, Campobasso's decision to have Sénece murdered). Mina's eventual, inevitable confession that she staged Mme de Larçay's 'infidelity' with M. de Ruppert in order to persuade Alfred to leave his wife meets with the following po-faced response: 'ce trait est infâme [...] L'illusion cesse, je vais rejoindre ma femme. Je vous plains et ne vous aime plus' (p.211). Alfred rejects the infamy that Mina is happy to heap upon herself in response to his pathetic plea: 'trouvez un moyen raisonnable pour nous réunir et je suis prêt à tout faire' (p.193). First Alfred's inability to see through Mina's stratagem, and then his inability to accept it, point to a failure of imagination and passion on a par with that of Pietro in *Vanina Vanini*. Thus Alfred and Pietro both fail the scenes of confrontation (triggered by Mina and Vanina respectively), seizing the opportunities provided to end relationships they now find threatening.

For her part, Mina ostensibly reacts to her lover's betrayal in the manner of Octave, but actually more in that of Julien:

'Voilà à quoi les grandes âmes sont exposées, mais elles ont leur ressource', se dit Mina en se mettant à la fenêtre et suivant des yeux son amant jusqu'au bout de la rue. Quand il eut disparu, elle alla dans la chambre d'Alfred et se tua d'un coup de pistolet dans le cœur. Sa vie fut-elle un faux calcul? Son bonheur avait duré huit mois. C'était une âme trop ardente pour se contenter du réel de la vie. (pp.211-12)

Mina's inability to resign herself to the 'réel de la vie', an inability shared of course by Octave (*A*, p.52), is ascribed to her ardour rather than Octave's primarily comic mal-du-siècle cocktail of melancholia, madness and misanthropy (his méfiance folle). It can therefore be related to Julien's 'état d'imagination renversée': 'il entreprenait de juger la vie avec son imagination. Cette erreur est d'un homme supérieur' (*RN*, p.343).¹¹ Mina's suicide is much messier than Octave's elaborate mystification, sharing the theatrical elements of Julien's crime and subsequent defence in court, itself a form of legal suicide (p.476). The way out of the French Restoration for great souls such as

---

¹¹ Similarly, Julien later tells Mathilde that 'les passions sont un accident dans la vie, mais cet accident ne se rencontre que chez les âmes supérieures' (p.453).
Mina can only lie in the barbarism of love and revolt, reversibility and vengeance, themes about to be explored in *Le Rouge et le Noir*.

3. **Chronique de 1830**

The aristocratic principle of hereditary authority implies a counter-balancing measure of responsibility, summed up by Octave's dictum *noblesse oblige!* (A, p. 171). The relationship between a nominally paternalistic aristocracy and its client-base may well be portrayed as something of a sham in *Le Rouge*, it is nonetheless more complicated than the relationship between rich and poor, *fripon* and *dupe* that governs Valenod's relations with his subordinates. The marquis de La Mole develops this theme in the conspirators' discussion in *Le Rouge* (pp. 364-65), again drawing attention to the ultimately unsustainable contradiction between the aristocracy's chivalric claim to legitimate authority and its parasitic aspirations. The Revolution of 1830 will eventually seek to free the aristocracy from this contradiction, thereby splitting it into the Orleanist and Legitimist camps. Under 'le plus fripon des *Kings*', Guizot's slogan 'enrichissez-vous!' serves not only to encourage the disenfranchised to redouble their economic efforts (only 200-franc taxpayers were entitled to vote), but also to sweep aside any lingering aristocratic inhibitions with regard to commerce, industry and more particularly corruption. The triumph of the *juste milieu* results in an *ordre inverse* wherein thieves and charlatans are handed power in an effort to suppress political ideologies inimical to the further expansion of economic production. At the same time, it transforms the position of an Octave de Malivert from reluctant beneficiary of an ignoble system to unpredictable and potentially radical ideological opponent of the newly-constituted political authority.

Remarkably, *Le Rouge* foreshadows the 1830 Revolution, not only showing the potential impact of plebeian energy suddenly unleashed on Paris (the revolutionaries of July), but also depicting the shift in power from Restoration notions of automatic privilege (held by M. de Rénéal) to the *juste-milieu* politics of bourgeois Orleanism (represented by Valenod). This shift is made inevitable by the contradictions implicit in M. de Rénéal's precarious position as first citizen of Restoration Verrières: 'depuis 1815, il rougit d'être industriel: 1815 l'a fait maire de Verrières' (p. 5). Ostensibly elevated to mayoral rank in deference to his Spanish lineage (ibid.), his power is actually based on the *fripon* acquisition of wealth: 'le talent de cet homme-là se borne à se faire payer bien exactement ce qu'on lui doit, et à payer lui-même le plus tard possible quand il doit' (p. 4). Furthermore, such power can only be maintained through an ongoing, ostentatious display of wealth, for example M. de Rénéal's uneconomic
acquisition of land, acquired through the profits of his noise-polluting nail-factory (pp.3-4) and his embarrassing efforts in the 'commerce du fer' (p.5), a trade later taken up by Stendhal's Tourist. Hence perhaps his sense of insecurity: 'tout tend dans ce siècle à jeter de l'odieux sur l'autorité légitime. Pauvre France!' (p.138). The money M. de Rénal gains through his commercial friponneries is frittered away in the duperies of his social vanity, nonetheless necessary if he is to consolidate his social position. Thus, M. de Rénal is twice cheated by 'le vieux Sorel', first over the enlargement of his garden (pp.5-6) and then over the terms of Julien's employment (pp.20-22). In return, Sorel defers to M. de Rénal by referring to his house as a 'château' (p.22). Social mobility in the provinces is by now entirely predicated on the acquisition of money. Hence the development of a cynical dupe-fripon culture to replace the more courtly culture of manners and taste.

Le Rouge provides the scene of the battle for Charles X's impending succession, a battle between Julien and Valenod, the energy that sparks the impending Revolution and the corrupting mediocrity that will defuse its radicalism. The marquis de La Mole will be no more than a passive spectator, despite his fighting talk to his fellow conspirators. M. de Rénal, for his part, is already busy reinventing himself as a liberal (p.267). The barbaric anachronisms of Carlist neo-feudalism cannot compete against the financial inducements offered by a juste-milieu culture based on the friponnerie of l'ordre inverse:

M. Valenod avait dit en quelque sorte aux épiciers du pays: donnez-moi les deux plus sots d'entre vous; aux gens de loi: indiquez-moi les deux plus ignares; aux officiers de santé: désignez-moi les deux plus charlatans. Quand il avait eu rassemblé les plus effrontés de chaque métier, il leur avait dit: régnons ensemble. (p.139).

Le Rouge, in the manner of Armance before it, therefore serves as a satire on doomed Restoration society and government. Stendhal's purpose is the same as that of Courier and Béranger, even if he hopes to avoid the price of their free-thinking, outlined by Altamira:

12 Fouqué ironically echoes this reactionary lament: 'Quoi! même au séminaire, des libéraux!' s'écria Fouqué. "Pauvre France!" ajouta-t-il en prenant la voix hypocrite et le ton doux de l'abbé Maslon' (p.170).

13 Similarly Julien reminds himself that he can be thrown in jail 'avec toute justice et équité de la part des juges, tenir compagnie dans Poissy à MM. Fontan et Magallon' (p.309). Fontan and Magallon were the editors of the satirical journal, L'Album; the
The narrator has already noted the rules of "la bonne compagnie":

Pourvu qu'on ne plaisantât ni de Dieu, ni des prêtres, ni du roi, ni des gens en place, ni des artistes protégés par la cour, ni de tout ce qui est établi; pourvu qu'on ne dit du bien ni de Béranger, ni des journaux de l'opposition, ni de Voltaire, ni de Rousseau, ni de tout ce qui se permet un peu de franc-parler; pourvu surtout qu'on ne parlât jamais politique, on pouvait librement raisonner de tout. (p.242)

Thus 'la bonne compagnie', made up of young men such as Norbert de La Mole, Caylus and Croisenois, is portrayed as a group willing, more as a result of ignorance than of malice, to sanction the judicial abuses inspired by a Jesuit-dominated clergy (the congrégation which tries to manipulate juste milieu forces in an effort to sustain notions of privilege, yet eventually fails in this attempt as signalled by Valenod's final betrayal of Frilair). Thus, Altamira again explains to Julien and the eavesdropping Mathilde:

'Je vous disais que j'ai une sœur mariée en Provence; elle est encore jolie, bonne, douce; c'est une excellente mère de famille, fidèle à tous ses devoirs, pieuse et non dévote.'

Où veut-il en venir? pensait Mlle de La Mole.

'Elle est heureuse!', continua le comte Altamira; 'elle l'était en 1815. Alors j'étais caché chez elle, dans sa terre près d'Antibes; eh bien, au moment où elle apprit l'exécution du maréchal Ney, elle se mit à danser!'

'Est-il possible?' dit Julien atterré.

'C'est l'esprit de parti', reprit Altamira. 'Il n'y a plus de passions véritables au XIXe siècle: c'est pour cela que l'on s'ennuie tant en France. On fait les plus grandes cruautés, mais sans cruauté.'

'Tant pis!' dit Julien; 'du moins, quand on fait des crimes, faut-il les faire avec plaisir: ils n'ont que cela de bon, et l'on ne peut même les justifier un peu que par cette raison.' [...].

'Vous avez raison', disait Altamira; 'on fait tout sans plaisir et sans s'en souvenir, même les crimes. Je puis vous montrer dans ce bal dix hommes peut-être qui seront damnés comme assassins. Ils l'ont oublié, et le monde aussi.'

former was also the author of the satirical pamphlet Le Mouton enragé. M. de Rénal is terrified by the prospect of the return to Besançon of the former editor of Falcoz's banned newspaper, whom he had helped remove from a 'place de six cents francs' (pp.120-21). The maréchale de Fervaques similarly pursues an already indigent author of satirical verse, claiming the status of a martyr for exposing herself in this way to the possibility of his targeting her further (p.381).

The congrégation is consistently shown rewarding, and thereby corrupting its supporters (pp.143-44). M. de Rénal assumes he will be protected by the congrégation if he murders Julien and his wife (p.120).
Plusieurs sont émus jusqu'aux larmes si leur chien se casse la patte. Au Père-Lachaise, quand on jette des fleurs sur leur tombe, comme vous dites si plaisamment à Paris, on nous apprend qu'ils réunissaient toutes les vertus des preux chevaliers, et l'on parle des grandes actions de leur bisaïeul qui vivait sous Henri IV. Si, malgré les bons offices du prince d'Araceli, je ne suis pas pendu, et que je jouisse jamais de ma fortune à Paris, je veux vous faire dîner avec huit ou dix assassins honorés et sans remords.

Vous et moi, à ce dîner, nous serons les seuls purs de sang, mais je serai méprisé et presque hâi, comme un monstre sanguinaire et jacobin, et vous méprisé simplement comme homme du peuple intrus dans la bonne compagnie.' (pp.279-80)

These exchanges foreshadow the major themes of the novel's dénouement: the corruption and hypocrisy of justice, the confused attitudes of the society in whose name such justice is ostensibly administered, the unique status of crime as a public statement of revolt and expression of individual will. Thus, Julien will feel contempt both for his prosecutor, with his 'pathos en mauvais français sur la barbarie du crime commis' (p.462) and for his jurors, the 'bourgeois indignés' who seek to judge him (p.463). Similarly, he will first feel 'une pitié philosophique pour cette foule d'envieux qui, sans cruauté, allaient applaudir à son arrêt de mort' (p.460) as well as amazement at the 'pitié tendre' he actually inspires in the crowds that gather to see his trial (p.461). Finally, Julien will stand by his crime and the pleasure it procures him, both directly and indirectly.

Ironically, Julien will be condemned, in the manner of Béranger before him, for the honesty of his crime. Thus, when Tanbeau seeks to make his mark in the salon of the marquis de La Mole, he calls for Béranger to be dealt with summarily: 'c'est dans un fond de basse-fosse qu'il faut confiner les reptiles; on doit les faire mourir à l'ombre, autrement leur venin s'exalte et devient plus dangereux' (p.249). Tanbeau goes on to ask: 'quand la mort nous délivrera-t-elle de cette vieille pourriture? C'était dans ces termes, d'une énergie biblique, que le petit homme de lettres parlait en ce moment du respectable lord Holland' (ibid.). The reader has already been made well aware that Tanbeau is a careerist charlatan. His anathemas can therefore be dismissed as both dishonest and inane, cruelties without cruelty. The barbaric language of vengeance is no more than a self-serving pose, the consequences of which Tanbeau's lack of imagination, earlier shared by the money-grubbing seminarians of Besançon, prevents him from ever questioning. Such intellectual dishonesty (l'esprit de parti) on the part

---

15 Similarly, the epigraph to chapter 29 of the second book, attributed to Girodet, reads as follows: 'se sacrifier à ses passions, passe; mais à des passions qu'on n'a pas! O triste dix-neuvième siècle!' (p.398)

16 Julien's barbaric language of revolution (p.281), on the other hand, prompts Mathilde to describe his appearance as that of 'une espèce de prophète de Michel-Ange' (p.284).
of Tanbeau is contrasted to the intellectual honesty of Béranger, just as Valenod's is later contrasted to that of Julien:

Voilà pourtant, pensa-t-il [Julien], les enfants perdus du parti dont le marquis est un des chefs! Et cet homme illustre [Béranger] qu'il [Tanbeau] calomnie, que de croix, que de sinécures n'eût-il pas accumulées, s'il se fût vendu, je ne dis pas au plat ministère de M. de Nerval, mais à quelqu'un de ces ministres passablement honnêtes que nous avons vus se succéder? (p.249)

4. 'Faut-il voler, faut-il se vendre?'

Stendhal's satire both on the floundering Restoration and the rising tide of juste-milieu Orleanism consists largely in the observation not only that virtue will go unrewarded, but that honesty is likely to be punished. The only obvious alternative to Tanbeau's friponnerie appears to be the duperie of good faith (Tanbeau's outburst causes Julien to shed 'larmes généreuses' (p.249)). This point is again made through the experience of Altamira, unsuccessful in his revolution for want of ruthlessness, that is to say cruelty and dishonesty:

'Notez que la révolution à la tête de laquelle je me suis trouvé', continua le comte Altamira, 'n'a pas réussi, uniquement parce que je n'ai pas voulu faire tomber trois têtes et distribuer à nos partisans sept à huit millions qui se trouvaient dans une caisse dont j'avais la clef. Mon roi, qui aujourd'hui brûle de me faire pendre, et qui, avant la révolte, me tutoyait, m'eût donné le grand cordon de son ordre si j'avais fait tomber ces trois têtes et distribuer l'argent de ces caisses, car j'aurais obtenu au moins un demi-succès, et mon pays eût eu une charte telle quelle... Ainsi va le monde, c'est une partie d'échecs.' (p.280)

Julien at first misunderstands Altamira's point, noting that if the latter were to have his revolution again, he would be more successful:

'Alors', reprit Julien l'œil en feu, 'vous ne saviez pas le jeu; maintenant...'

'Je ferais tomber des têtes, voulez-vous dire, et je ne serais pas un Girondin comme vous me le faisiez entendre l'autre jour?... Je vous répondrai', dit Altamira d'un air triste, 'quand vous aurez tué un homme en duel, ce qui encore est bien moins laid que de le faire exécuter par un bourreau.'

'Ma foi!' dit Julien, 'qui veut la fin veut les moyens; si, au lieu d'être un atome, j'avais quelque pouvoir, je ferais pendre trois hommes pour sauver la vie à quatre.' (p.281)

Altamira (high aim) is a Girondin (Brutus) as defined in the Promenades (VIT, p.852). Cruelty and theft strike Altamira as ugly (laid); they must therefore be hostile to utility, defined not in terms of political institutions but rather in terms of civic and personal morality. Julien disagrees, not from the ludic perspective of a chess-player, posited by Altamira, but rather from the Caesarist perspective of a coquin (VIT, p.852 [PR]).
Julien, 'l'œil en feu', responds by expounding a Machiavellian, crudely utilitarian doctrine of the end justifying the means ('qui veut la fin veut les moyens') eventually associated with Caesarism. Julien will only modify this perspective once he has shot Mme de Rénal (as opposed to Altamira's duellist). Altamira is again articulating the position of Marcus Brutus, criticized by the young Stendhal for seeking the moral high ground, and thereby losing out to Mark Anthony, by refusing to manipulate the Roman crowds in the manner of his opponent (JL, ii, 341-42).

Julien's exchange with Altamira causes him to analyse and question both Caesarism and republicanism in greater depth:

Que serait Danton aujourd'hui, dans ce siècle des Valenod et des Rénal? pas même substitut du procureur du roi...

Que dis-je? il se serait vendu à la congrégation; il serait ministre, car enfin ce grand Danton a volé. Mirabeau aussi s'est vendu. Napoléon avait volé des millions en Italie, sans quoi il eût été arrêté tout court par la pauvreté, comme Pichegru. La Fayette seul n'a jamais volé. Faut-il voler, faut-il se vendre? pensa Julien. Cette question l'arrêta tout court. Il passa le reste de la nuit à lire l'histoire de la Révolution. (pp.282-83)

Napoleon would have been 'arrêté tout court' had he not stolen; yet is Julien really willing to emulate his hero? Henceforth, Julien will see himself not so much in terms of duperie and friponnerie, but rather generosity (Brutus) and ambition (Caesar). Lafayette offers an example of idealistic, unplanned and therefore aimless heroism, on the model of Epaminondas. Yet is it likely, in Restoration, let alone Orleanist France, that occasions for heroism will simply present themselves? Julien therefore returns to the vexed question of bloody revolution, thundering out the following considerations to a frightened Mathilde:

'Danton a-t-il bien fait de voler?' lui dit-il brusquement et d'un air qui devenait de plus en plus farouche. Les révolutionnaires du Piémont, de l'Espagne, devenaient-ils compromettre le peuple par des crimes? Donner à des gens même sans mérite toutes les places de l'armée, toutes les croix? Les gens qui auraient porté ces croix n'eussent-ils pas redouté le retour du roi? Fallait-il mettre le trésor de Turin au pillage? En un mot, Mademoiselle, dit-il en s'approchant d'elle d'un air terrible, l'homme qui veut chasser l'ignorance et le crime de la terre doit-il passer comme la tempête et faire le mal comme au hasard?" (p.284)

17 Julien's justification of the hanging of three men to save the lives of four is later used by Stendhal to exonerate Napoleon from his military executions in the Italian campaigns:

Il est un devoir dont il semblera cruel même de parler. Un général en chef doit faire fusiller trois hommes, pour sauver la vie à quatre; bien plus, il doit faire fusiller quatre ennemis, pour sauver la vie à un seul de ses soldats. (MN, pp.168-69).
Much of Stendhal's satire of contemporary France in *Le Rouge* consists in showing the restricted nature of the opportunities available to Julien; one of the reasons perhaps that it has become famous as a novel of frustrated ambition even though its hero rises in the space of a couple of years from a state of indigence to the rank of aristocrat, diplomat, co-conspirator in an aristocratic attempt to overthrow the *charte* and possessor both of a *croix* and an army commission, the latter two distinctions obtained *sans mérite* as in the passage above just cited.^{18}

In the preface to *Armance*, Stendhal shows Napoleon embarking on the Russian campaign while singing an extract from Paisiello's opera, *La Molinara*:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Si batte nel mio cuore} \\
\text{L'inchiostro e la farina.}
\end{array}
\]

Stendhal translates these verses as 'Faut-il être meunier, faut-il être notaire?' (*A*, p.48). They are the *frépon* equivalent of the *coquin* 'faut-il voler, faut-il se vendre?'. In the opera, the hero, a notary, is in love with a miller-wife. Stendhal changes the sense of the extract, suggesting that, in the century that began 'vers 1815' (*A*, p.48), the choice between the professions of miller and notary is all that is available to 'bien des jeunes gens qui ont à la fois de la naissance et de l'esprit' (ibid.). Stripped of proper ambition and generosity, these two archetypal careers can be seen leading a whole generation towards the *laideur* of either *duperie* or *fréponnerie*. Hence Julien's anguish in the Besançon seminary: 'la tâche des grands hommes a été facile; quelque terrible que fût le danger, ils le trouvaient beau; et qui peut comprendre, excepté moi, la laideur de ce qui m'environne?' (p.177).^{19} Even the partnership that Fouqué offers Julien (p.70) smacks of 'la triste prudence', and is therefore seen as antithetical to heroism (p.79). Fouqué predicts that Julien's ambition will eventually result in him selling himself to the government: 'c'est par ta honte que j'aurai de tes nouvelles' (pp.204-05). Julien, however, decides that settling for a life of commerce, however honourable or profitable, will prevent him from realizing his full potential, not least because it will force him pay court to 'frépons subalternes' and so extinguish 'le feu sacré avec lequel on se fait un nom' (p.71). As a result, Julien doubts himself in the manner of the young Stendhal (*OI*, 1, 697 [*J*, 1811]):

---

^{18} Julien has already noted that his *croix* should have gone to Gros, transplanted from Grenoble: 'c'est lui qui méritait la croix, c'est moi qui l'ai, et je dois agir dans le sens du gouvernement qui me la donne' (p.267).

^{19} Similarly, Julien exclaims: 'O Napoléon! qu'il était doux de ton temps de monter à la fortune par les dangers d'une bataille; mais augmenter lâchement la douleur du misérable!' (p.134).
Comme Hercule, il se trouvait non entre le vice et la vertu, mais entre la médiocrité suivie d'un bien-être assuré et tous les rêves héroïques de sa jeunesse. Je n'ai donc pas une véritable fermeté, se disait-il; et c'était là le doute qui lui faisait le plus de mal. Je ne suis pas du bois dont on fait les grands hommes, puisque je crains que huit années passées à me procurer du pain ne m'enlèvent cette énergie sublime qui fait faire les choses extraordinaires. (RN, p.71).

Julien's desire to join a Plutarchian band of 'grands hommes' needs to be sustained by periods of solitude, reflection and contemplation of nature, particularly from his vantage-point, overlooking the mountains, at the mouth of the cave where he is eventually buried. The sight of these mountains (symbolizing Rousseau) and birds-of-prey in flight (symbolizing Napoleon) stimulate both his generosity and ambition (p.60, 71). However, such solitude offers no more than a temporary release from the ugly reality of life.

5. 'Marcher du tendre au rusé'

The opening of Le Rouge presents the reader with a picture of normative juste-milieu civilization, founded on the squalid negotiations that lie at the heart of the dupe-fripon paradigm. Only the sight of the hills on the horizon allow the putative traveller to forget l'atmosphère empestée des petits intérêts d'argent dont il commence à être asphyxié' (p.4). The traveller quickly learns that the local population divides into bonnes and mauvaises têtes, that is to say, into the winners ('le vieux Sorel') and losers (M. de Rénal) of any given negotiation (pp.5-6). The narrator signals that these values represent an inversion of those he himself holds by suggesting that the accumulated wisdom of 'gens sages et modérés' can be equated to a 'tyrannie de l'opinion' which he qualifies as 'bête' and contrasts to the more liberal mores to be found in 'cette grande république qu'on appelle Paris' (p.6). Thus, Stendhal shows M. de Rénal, perennially obsessed with striking the best possible deal (ibid.), reacting with horror to his wife's suggestion that Julien's zeal be rewarded by a modest 'cadeau de linge':

'Quelle duperie!' répondit-il. 'Quoi! faire des cadeaux à un homme dont nous sommes parfaitement contents, et qui nous sert bien? ce serait dans le cas où il se négligerait qu'il faudrait stimuler son zèle.'

Madame de Rénal fut humiliée de cette manière de voir; elle ne l'eût pas remarquée avant l'arrivée de Julien. (p.34).

Mme de Rénal is increasingly appalled by the provincial squalor of her husband's values. Stendhal introduces her as a woman exempt from both 'coquetterie' and 'affectation' (p.13). She is therefore 'une de ces femmes de province que l'on peut très bien prendre pour des sottes pendant les quinze premiers jours qu'on les voit' (p.35). Possessing an 'âme délicate et dédaigneuse', she pays no attention to the 'actions des
personnages grossiers au milieu desquels le hasard l'avait jetée' (ibid.) and in particular to the advances of Valenod: 'ce qui avait jeté un éclat singulier sur sa vertu; car ce M. Valenod, grand jeune homme, taillé en force, avec un visage coloré et de gros favoris noirs, était un de ces êtres grossiers, effrontés et bruyants, qu'en province on appelle de beaux hommes' (p.13). Mme de Rênal lives in isolation as a result of her instinctive sense of aesthetics, which proves incompatible with provincial standards of beauty, exclusively defined in terms of crude material utility (pp.8-9). She therefore spurns: 'les plus belles occasions de se faire acheter de beaux chapeaux de Paris ou de Besançon' (p.14), instead, focusing all her energy on her children. Mme de Rênal only becomes aware of the possibility of adult beauty when she meets Julien, first noting 'l'extrême beauté' of his person (p.28), and then linking this physical beauty to the qualities of his soul:

Elle trouva qu'il valait la peine de l'écouter [Julien], même quand on parlait des choses les plus communes, même quand il s'agissait d'un pauvre chien écrasé, comme il traversait la rue, par la charrette d'un paysan allant au trot. Le spectacle de cette douleur donnait son gros rire à son mari, tandis qu'elle voyait se contracter les beaux sourcils noirs et si bien arqués de Julien. La générosité, la noblesse d'âme, l'humanité lui semblaient peu à peu n'exister que chez ce jeune abbé. (p.36)

Mme de Rênal admires Julien for his generosity rather than for the energy and ambition with which he is later credited by Mathilde. Mme de Rênal herself becomes more generous as a consequence of her growing love for Julien (p.55). She also admires him for his sense of equity (p.33), which he tries to impart to his absurdly-named charges, Adolphe and Stanislas-Xavier, for instance when he seeks to teach the latter 'qu'il ne fallait pas se servir de ce mot dupe, qui, employé dans ce sens [the loser in a financial transaction], était une façon de parler de laquais' (p.137). Julien's 'justice sévère' (p.147), prompts Mme de Rênal to question her ambitions for her children, unimaginatively suggested by her husband (careers in l'épée, la magistrature and l'Eglise (p.14)). Julien teaches Mme de Rênal to despise provincial materialism; hence her desire that he, rather than M. de Rênal, supervise her children's moral development (p.147, 149) and her increasingly extreme reactions to evidence of moral corruption: 'souvent, au milieu du récit de quelque friponnerie savante, à l'occasion d'un chemin ou d'une fourniture, l'esprit de Mme de Rênal s'égarait tout à coup jusqu'au délire' (p.92).

Despite his generosity, Julien remains at times obsessed with avoiding duperie (p.164, 305) and practising tromperie (p.32, 44, 79, 147, 210). Julien eventually gives these

---

20 Adolphe is the eponymous hero of the liberal Benjamin Constant's novel, incidentally about a young man falling in love with an older woman. Stanislas-Xavier are the second and third names of Louis XVIII.
obsessions a free rein in the 'hôtel de La Mole', where he must dominate and deceive Mathilde if she is to be seduced. Thus the jealousy engendered by Julien's simulated courtship of the maréchale de Fervaques succeeds where sincerity of sentiment has earlier failed:

Ce qui l'étonnait [Mathilde] surtout, c'était sa [Julien's] fausseté parfaite; il ne disait pas un mot à la maréchale qui ne fût un mensonge, ou du moins un déguisement abominable de sa façon de penser, que Mathilde connaissait si parfaitement sur presque tous les sujets. Ce machiavélisme la frappait. Quelle profondeur! se disait-elle; quelle différence avec les nigauds emphatiques ou les fripons communs, tels que M. Tanbeau, qui tiennent le même langage! (p.396)

As it happens, Julien's supposed profondeur fails to deceive the maréchale: 'quoique notre héros fît tout au monde pour bannir toute espèce de bon sens de la conversation, elle avait encore une couleur antimonarchique et impie qui n'échappait pas à Mme de Fervaques' (p.395). Mathilde, however, needs to exaggerate her lover's qualities, in the manner of Vanina before her, because she can only imagine love in terms of the master-slave relationship (a variant on that between fripons and dupes). She first expresses this idea after Julien has made as if to attack her with a sword: 'il est digne d'être mon maître, puisqu'il a été sur le point de me tuer' (p.334). Julien's subsequent uninvited visit to her bedroom is greeted with the words: 'tu es mon maître, je suis ton esclave, il faut que je te demande pardon à genoux d'avoir voulu me révolter' (p.344). She repeats herself when Julien leaves, calling herself his servant and announcing: 'je renonce à l'exercice de ma raison, sois mon maître' (p.345).

The narrator contrasts Julien's first rendez-vous in Mathilde's room with his meetings with Louise, suggesting that 'le plus vif bonheur d'ambition' has taken the place of 'cette volupté de l'âme qu'il avait trouvée quelquefois auprès de Mme de Rênal' (p.326). This volupté with Louise is due to the desire for equality that governs their relations, in clear contrast to the domination required by Mathilde. Thus Julien later notes that: 'même dans ses moments les plus heureux, Mme de Rênal doutait toujours que son amour fût égal au sien. Ici, c'est un démon que je subjugue, donc il faut subjuguier' (p.408). Julien enters the Rênal household already obsessed by the issue of equality, as evidenced by his unwillingness to eat with servants (p.20)\(^{21}\) and his refusal to sign a two-year contract with M. de Rênal: 'un engagement qui me lie sans vous obliger à rien n'est point égal, je le refuse' (p.32). Mme Derville later teaches him a verse from Corneille:

---

\(^{21}\) This reluctance is bizarrely ascribed to Julien's (mis)reading of Les Confessions.
L'amour
Fait les égalités et ne les cherche pas. (p.79)

Julien's sense of inferiority (p.86) leads him to hold this verse against Louise in her absence. Julien realizes through the interlocutory evidence of an embrace that her love is sufficiently strong to abolish all differences between them (p.111). Indeed, rather than feel any sense of class superiority over Julien, Louise is primarily worried that she might herself be too old for Julien (p.86). Thus Louise, like Armance before her (A, p.120, 260), is capable of soothing, if only temporarily, the misanthropic suspicions and sensibilities of her lover. The superstitious attachment of Armance and Louise to the notion of reversibility similarly testifies to the essential generosity of their natures (their sublime duperie). As a result, they bring out the idealism and generosity (le tendre) latent in Julien and Octave. Mathilde, by contrast, represents love in the form of subjugation through emotional and physical violence (vengeance). Sublimely egotistical, Mathilde brings out Julien's latent violence (energy) and cunning (le rusé), thereby satisfying his ambition and lust for power, and prompting him to conclude: 'chacun pour soi dans ce désert d'égoïsme qu'on appelle la vie' (p.308).

Julien's generosity, however, places limits on his méfiance folle. Thus, when Julien suspects Mathilde of setting a trap for him, he initially takes precautions against the La Moles, preparing a pamphlet describing his relations with the family. His paranoia is cut short, however, by the following consideration: 'quoi! Je suis reçu dans une maison, et pour prix de l'hospitalité que j'y reçois, des bontés dont on m'y accable, j'imprime un pamphlet sur ce qui s'y passe! j'attaque l'honneur des femmes! Ah! mille fois plutôt, soyons dupes!' (p.322). Julien is finally delivered of le rusé by the bonté facile of his prison relations with madame de Rénal, which eschew the petty considerations that had clouded his judgement in the earliest days of their affair:

La vie de Julien se composait [...] d'une suite de petites négociations; et leur succès l'occupait beaucoup plus que le sentiment de préférence marquée qu'il n'eût tenu qu'à lui de lire dans le cœur de Mme de Rénal. (p.40)

Julien's obsession with negotiation is the product of his passage from the tendre to the rusé, occasioned by the realization that his dreams of military heroism are incompatible with the realities of life in Verrières. Julien also faces the problem that his dreams are themselves contradictory, at the same time Republican and Bonapartist, altruistic and egotistical. This contradiction is implicit in his idolization of both Rousseau (Brutus) and Napoleon (Caesar), a contradiction inherited from the Jacobin and Bonapartist
chirurgien-major (p.8). The latter teaches Julien to venerate le beau militaire, as exemplified by the Italian campaign of 1796 of which he was a veteran. Thus Julien is captivated by tales of Lodi, Arcole and Rivoli (p.22), later the subjects of the Mémoires sur Napoléon. Julien learns to value military courage above all other virtues; hence his delight in imagining himself the patient in the most painful of surgical procedures; procedures he inadvisably describes to Mme de Rénal in the course of their first attempt at general conversation (p.40). The narrator goes on to inform the reader that, up until this point, Julien's only sincere conversations have been with the chirurgien-major (ibid.), who teaches Julien to regard all books other than the Confessions, the Bulletins de la grande armée and the Mémorial de Sainte-Hélène as 'menteurs, et écrits par des fourbes pour avoir de l'avancement' (p.20). The narrator notes that Julien is willing to die for these three books (ibid.) and that he fortifies his resolve 'par la lecture du livre inspiré qui retrempait son âme [the Mémoires]' (p.50). Julien's coran gives him a sense of devoir (p.49) based not on what he owes to the petty ambitions of his family, as in the case of Octave, but rather on what he owes to his own absolute ambitions of glory.

6. 'Savoir-vivre'

Altamira not only prompts Julien to question Caesarism, he also offers the following criticism of French heroism: 'votre société vieillie prise avant tout les convenances... Vous ne vous élèverez jamais au-dessus de la bravoure militaire; vous aurez des Murat et jamais de Washington. Je ne vois en France que de la vanité' (p.282). In the Mémoires sur Napoléon, Stendhal refers to Murat as a general comparable in talent to Masséna (MN, p.245), yet issuing from an even lower social class. Thus:

Si Louis XVI eût continué à régner, Danton et Moreau eussent été des avocats; Pichegru, Masséna et Augereau, des sous-officiers; Desaix, Kléber, des capitaines; Bonaparte, Carnot, des lieutenant-colonels ou colonels d'artillerie; Lannes et Murat, des marchands chapeliers ou des maîtres de poste. (p.65).

Murat is therefore an exemplar of working-class energy and talent. Yet he lacks the philosophy required to become another Washington (a Cincinnatus). Thus Altamira sets up an opposition between the egotism of Caesarist ambition, to some extent endorsed by the ludic marquis de La Mole, and the balancing idealism (generosity/duperie) required if Julien is to attain true heroism.

22 M. de Rénal later contradicts himself on this point, suggesting that he had in fact 'signé non pour l'empire' (p.12).
The marquis initially credits Julien with the ludic ability required to travel 'cent lieues sans être dépisté'. Yet, to the marquis's shock, he suddenly realizes that Julien is furthermore just as capable of dying for a cause as his unremarkable son (RN, p.356). This realization throws the marquis off-balance, first because it forces him to re-examine his prejudices with regard to birth (resolved by re-inventing Julien as the illegitimate son of an aristocrat, a myth later subscribed to by both Pirard and Julien) and second because it casts a new light on Julien's imprévu:

L'on ne peut refuser à Julien une singulièr e aptitude aux affaires, de la hardiesse, peut-être même du brillant [...]. Mais au fond de ce caractère je trouve quelque chose d'effrayant. C'est l'impression qu'il produit sur tout le monde, donc il y a là quelque chose de réel (plus ce point réel était difficile à saisir, plus il effrayait l'âme imaginative du vieux marquis). (p.425)

Similarly, the narrator notes, when reviewing Mathilde's fear of Julien, that 'la profondeur, l'inconnu du caractère de Julien eussent effrayé, même en nouant avec lui une relation ordinaire' (p.314). This inconnu appears to consist in the contradiction between Julien's determination to pursue his ambitions through the ludic practice of deception and his willingness to die for the three books that together form a coran of indeterminate ideological status. Julien remains ideologically unpredictable, variously espousing the ideological positions of Joseph de Maistre and Robespierre, that is to say the full range of political radicalism. Thus Julien is described as willing, for an instant, to fight on behalf of the inquisition itself (p.104). Neither the marquis, Mathilde, nor for that matter Julien, are sure whether the latter is a ludic careerist, a 'plébéien révolté' (p.289), or a 'jeune lévite, dévoué à notre sainte cause' (p.360). Indeed, Mathilde sees him variously as a Danton (p.298), a Roland to her Mme Roland (p.339) and a subordinate in her imagined monarchist rebellion in the Vendée (p.295). Mme de Rénal, for her part, appears naively convinced of Julien's attachment to the causes of monarchy and religion (p.93).

Pirard appears to sense Julien's ideological indeterminacy and radicalism when he issues him with the following warning: 'avec ce je ne sais quoi d'indéfinissable, du moins pour moi, qu'il y a dans votre caractère, si vous ne faites pas fortune, vous serez persécuté' (p.226). Julien will either succeed as a sublime fripon or be persecuted as a sublime dupe: he will become either a Napoleon or a Rousseau, a Caesar or a Brutus, a leader or a martyr. Pirard's warning is therefore essentially aimed at curbing Julien's Caesarist ambition, a source of concern not only to Altamira but also to Chélan (p.43, 130), Mme de Rénal (p.92, 149) and Fouqué (pp.204-05). Pirard offers Julien an alternative to careerism, both in its ludic (Tartuffe) and egotistical (Caesar) forms, namely the self-sacrificing idealism of a Brutus this time equated with the calvary of Jesus Christ.
Throughout Le Rouge, Stendhal posits the religious model proposed by Chélan (Gallicanism) and Pirard (Jansenism) as an alternative both to le beau militaire and to the pragmatic cynicism preached by the chirurgien-major. Thus, Chélan, the venerable curate of Verrières, demonstrates the potential of both virtue and inflexible moral principle as forms of heroism in a society geared towards compromise in the interests of financial expediency. The epigraph to the third chapter of the novel, makes this point explicitly: 'un curé vertueux et sans intrigue est une Providence pour le village' (p.10). Chélan possesses both 'un caractère de fer' (ibid.) and 'ce feu sacré qui annonce le plaisir de faire une belle action un peu dangereuse' (ibid.). Chélan's heroic sacrifice of his own position in Verrières in order to expose conditions in the local prison to the Parisian inspector, M. Appert, serves as a lesson to Julien. Chélan's stand against the misrule of M. de Rénal and Valenod is practical and therefore more impressive than that of the chirurgien-major, who limits himself to remonstrating over the mutilation of the 'beaux arbres' of Verrières (symbols of liberty and fraternity) by means of vigorous pruning twice a year (p.8). Chélan actively exposes the hypocrisy of 'public servants' who claim charitable motives for lining their own pockets. In a prime example of such hypocrisy, M. de Rénal protests to his wife against M. Appert's tour of inspection: 'tout cela nous distrait et nous empêche de faire le bien' (p.9). Louise de Rénal innocently assumes that her husband has nothing to worry about, 'puisque vous administrez le bien des pauvres avec la plus scrupuleuse probité' (ibid.). Her naivety is as inflexible as Chélan's condemnation. Neither admit embezzlement by the very rich of funds destined to alleviate the conditions of the very poor as falling within the spectrum of acceptable (and therefore to Louise possible) moral behaviour. Similarly, Louise's apparently naive high opinion of Julien as an exemplar of generosity can be related to Chélan's moral aspirations for his pupil, aspirations later shared by Pirard.

Julien consciously sets out to dupe both Louise and Chélan: 'qui eût pu deviner que cette figure de jeune fille, si pâle et si douce, cachait la résolution inébranlable de s'exposer à mille morts plutôt que de ne pas faire fortune!' (p.23). Julien's entire purpose in pursuing a career in the Church is to rise in the world, conquering it not with his sword (le mérite militaire) but with the prayer-book. His efforts, however, are finally undone not so much by his thirst for military glory, but rather by his dominant sense of justice, both generous and vengeful, which finally turns him into the martyr of an unjust society. Julien makes good the promise shown by his early fantasy

---

23 Chélan appears to be based on Antoine Chélan, a priest praised by Stendhal in the otherwise anticlerical Vie de Henry Brulard (OJ, II, 581-82).
of one day becoming mayor of Verrières: 'comme j'enlèverais le vicaire, M. Valenod et
toutes leurs friponneries! comme la justice triompherait dans Verrières!' (p.90). Thus
Julien finally heeds Madame de Rênal's parting injunction: 'adieu, Julien, soyez juste
envers les hommes' (p.169). In the same way that Julien is shown to be more
intellectually honest than the Valenods and Tanbeaus who cause him to shed generous
tears (p.133, 249), so he is shown to be more Christian than either the Jesuit
congrégation or his fellow seminarians; hence Stendhal's parallels between Julien and
Jesus (p.130, 479). Julien finally turns out to be a stranger first and foremost to
himself, and not at all to Louise, who is vindicated in her assessment of him as an
exemplar of generosity. Despite his ambition, Julien instinctively recoils from alliances
with the fripon winners in late-Restoration society (Maslon, Frilair) and instead offers
his support to the losers (Chélan, Pirard). He therefore rises more as a result of his
spontaneous generosity, whether to Chélan (p.130), Chas-Bernard (p.183) or Pirard
(p.195, 227), than as a result of his rather transparent attempts at hypocrisy (p.44).

Chélan, Pirard and Louise de Rênal each possess a private income, modest in the case
of the two men, more substantial in the case of Louise, which allows them to adopt an
independent and therefore generous position, in open opposition both to the squalor of
provincial values and the ludism of polite society. Julien is offered the chance of
attaining such independence through Fouqué's repeated suggestion that he become a
partner in the latter's business (p.70, 205). Yet, Julien can see no reason why he
should accept a life of relative poverty rather than the prospects offered by
employment with the marquis:

Il allait enfin paraître sur le théâtre des grandes choses. Le bonheur d'aller à Paris, qu'il se
figurait peuplé de gens d'esprit fort intrigants, fort hypocrites, mais aussi polis que l'évêque de
Besançon et que l'évêque d'Agde, éclipsait tout à ses yeux. (p.205)

Julien's meetings with the Bishops of Agde (pp.100-02) and Besançon (pp.196-98)
confirm him in his estimation of the ludic possibilities held out by the priesthood. The
young Bishop of Agde is an actor, rehearsing his benedictions in front of a mirror
(p.100) and contriving to look older than his years when the occasion demands:
'reéllement, il était parvenu à se donner l'air vieux; l'admiration de notre héro n'eut
plus de bornes. Que ne fait-on pas avec de l'adresse! pensa-t-il' (p.102). This lesson is
underlined by the elderly Bishop of Besançon, who prizes elegance and good manners
above doctrine. Thus Julien wins the Bishop's favour by displaying the very same
knowledge of worldly literature (Horace) which trips him up in his theological exams.
Similarly, the Bishop admires Pirard not for his rectitude but rather for the bien joué of
securing a rich parish (p.200). The Bishop introduces Julien to the seductive idea that
life can be reduced to a question of personal amusement. Julien is therefore extremely impressed by the luxury on display when he arrives in Paris (p.229), despite having earlier understood 'toute la laideur du luxe de M. le maire' (p.719 ['Projet d'article']), to say nothing of that on display in Valenod's household: 'tout y était magnifique et neuf, et on lui disait le prix de chaque meuble. Mais Julien y trouvait quelque chose d'ignoble et qui sentait l'argent volé' (p.133). The narrator therefore suggests that Julien is now guilty of an error in taste: 'jamais la mode et le beau n'ont été si loin l'un de l'autre' (p.228). Julien equally risks being taken in by the refinement of the people he meets, just as he had earlier been deceived by Pirard's physical ugliness (pp.161).24 Thus, when he attends the ball given by M. de Retz, he finds himself: 'ravi à son insu par la musique, les fleurs, les belles femmes, l élégance générale, et, plus que tout, par son imagination qui rêvait des distinctions pour lui et la liberté pour tous' (p.281).

Stendhal suggests that this delicate balance between success and liberty, self-interest and civic duty, turns on the way Julien's judgement is affected by his surroundings. Thus, Julien next exclaims: 'quel beau bal! [...], rien n'y manque', immediately receiving Altamira's correction: 'il y manque la pensée' (ibid.). Julien is being seduced away from generosity by the possibilities ludic careerism offers to his vanity and egoism. Thus, despite his teachings to Stanislas-Xavier, Julien comes to see Chélan and Pirard as dupes for believing that anything might come of their respective stands against Maslon and Frilair. Julien therefore renounces such duperie, introducing Valenod to the marquis (p.267), asking that his own penny-pinching father be placed in charge of the 'dépôt de mendicité' and proposing M. de Cholin, 'ce vieil imbécile', for the vacant post at the head of Verrière's 'bureau de loterie' (ibid.). Julien intends this last proposal as a joke, which the marquis de la Mole predictably finds extremely amusing. Julien is responding to the latter's lessons: 'il faut s'amuser [...] ; il n'y a que cela de réel dans la vie' (p.262). The marquis is similarly delighted by Julien's request on behalf of his father: 'A la bonne heure", dit le marquis en reprenant l'air gai; "accordé; je m'attendais à des moralités. Vous vous formez" ' (p.267). However, Julien is immediately made to confront the consequences of his new ludism:

A peine M. de Cholin nommé, Julien apprit que cette place avait été demandée par la députation du département pour M. Gros, le célèbre géomètre: cet homme généreux n'avait que quatorze cents francs de rente, et chaque année prêtait six cents francs au titulaire [of the 'bureau de loterie'] qui venait de mourir, pour l'aider à élever sa famille.

Julien fut étonné de ce qu'il avait fait. Ce n'est rien, se dit-il, il faudra en venir à bien d'autres injustices, si je veux parvenir, et encore savoir les cacher sous de belles paroles sentimentales: pauvre M. Gros! C'est lui qui méritait la croix, c'est moi qui l'ai, et je dois agir dans le sens du gouvernement qui me la donne. (p.267)

---

24 Julien is at times aware of this potential pitfall (p.248). Pirard warns him against the 'faiblesses' of 'trop de sensibilité aux vaines grâces de l'extérieur' (p.165).
Julien has, however reluctantly, abandoned the generosity and justice of Gros, Chélan and Mme de Rénal for the honours and injustices of modern government, just as Napoleon had forsaken the equitable ideals of the French Revolution for the Caesarism of Empire. He has apparently completed his passage from the *tendre* to the *rusé*, encouraged by the fallacy that his 'coquineries *nécessaires* will, thanks to his new position within an elegantly ludic *bonne compagnie*, henceforth be '1° plus rares, 2° moins ignobles' (p.416). Julien has therefore ignored Chélan's warning, delivered on the occasion of Julien's refusal of Elisa in marriage:

> Si vous songez à faire la cour aux hommes qui ont la puissance, votre perte éternelle est assurée. Vous pourrez faire fortune, mais il faudra nuire aux misérables, flatter le sous-préfet, le maire, l'homme considéré, et servir ses passions: cette conduite, qui dans le monde s'appelle savoir-vivre, peut, pour un laïc, n'être pas absolument incompatible avec le salut; mais, dans notre état, il faut opter; il s'agit de faire fortune dans ce monde ou dans l'autre, il n'y a pas de milieu. (p.43)

Pirard offers his seminarians a similar warning, refusing to make allowances for ludic half-measures between vice and virtue. He thus refutes all forms of Jesuitical casuistry, framing the *dupe-fripon* debate in the absolute terms of eternal salvation and damnation:

> 'Voulez-vous les honneurs du monde,' leur dit-il, 'tous les avantages sociaux, le plaisir de commander, celui de se moquer des lois et d'être insolent impunément envers tous? ou bien voulez-vous votre salut éternel? les moins avancés d'entre vous n'ont qu'à ouvrir les yeux pour distinguer les deux routes.' (pp.199-200)

Pirard, like Chélan before him, eventually loses his post as a result of his refusal to compromise with the self-serving and self-indulgent ludism of Frilair and the Bishop of Besançon respectively. Pirard's closing declaration to his friends that he leaves his post with only 520 francs of savings is met with cries of admiration and utter disbelief: 'ces amis l'embrassèrent en pleurant, et se dirent entre eux: le bon abbé eût pu s'épargner ce mensonge, il est aussi par trop ridicule' (p.200). It is assumed that he is a *fripon*, for how could he be such a *dupe* as to practise what he professes: 'le vulgaire, aveuglé par l'amour de l'argent, n'était pas fait pour comprendre que c'était dans la sincérité que l'abbé Pirard avait trouvé la force nécessaire pour lutter seul pendant six ans contre Marie Alacoque, le Sacré-Cœur de Jésus, les jésuites et son évêque' (p.201). The addition of the Bishop of Besançon to this list of Pirard's antagonists points once again to the inadequacies of ludism in Stendhal's work. Such ludism is ultimately seen as a form of passionless egoism and is therefore implicitly related to Altamira's concept of cruelties without cruelty and Julien's concept of the passionless crime. This view is underlined by Pirard's reaction to the marquis's exposition of his ludic philosophy:
Je soigne en grand la fortune de ma maison, je puis la porter loin; je soigne mes plaisirs, et c'est ce qui doit passer avant tout, du moins à mes yeux,' ajouta-t-il en surprenant de l'étonnement dans ceux de l'abbé Pirard. Quoique homme de sens, l'abbé était émerveillé de voir un vieillard parler si franchement de ses plaisirs. (p.202)

This episode appears to prompt Pirard's subsequent warning to Julien: 'c'est [the marquis] un homme qui n'agit que par caprice, c'est là son défaut; il luttera d'enfantillages avec vous' (p.224). The ostensibly ludic narrator takes a more tolerant tone, observing: 'les hommes riches qui ont le cœur haut cherchent dans les affaires de l'amusement et non des résultats' (p.254). This focus on amusement rather than results, however, leads to the marquis finding himself caught unawares by Julien, his own pupil, to whom ironically he gave employment in order precisely to have more time to dedicate to the supervision of his family (p.202). Baffled by Mathilde's revelations of her affair with Julien, the marquis can think of no remedy to the situation other than a return to friponnerie: 'sa mémoire et son imagination étaient remplies des roueries et des faussetés de tous genres qui étaient encore possibles dans sa jeunesse. Céder à la nécessité, avoir peur de la loi lui semblait chose absurde et déshonorante pour un homme de son rang' (p.421). The marquis assumes, as of right, 'les honneurs du monde, [...] tous les avantages sociaux, le plaisir de commander, celui de se moquer des lois et d'être insolent impunément envers tous.' The marquis's path clearly leads to damnation. As a result, Pirard becomes Julien's ally, whereas the La Moles turn to the marquis's arch-enemy, Frilair. Stendhal therefore recasts the battle between greatness of soul and the savoir-vivre of fourberie ludique as the battle between Jansenism and Jesuitry, Gallicanism and Ultramontanism, equity and egoism, generosity and hypocrisy.

7. The Trial

Julien abandons his briefly held ludic position when he reads the letter Louise sends to the marquis, denouncing his ludic careerism. The marquis, now the victim of his pupil, seeks to espouse the moral absolutism of a Pirard: 'renoncez, franchement à un homme vil' (p.431). There can be no question of a bien joué when it comes to the marquis's immediate interests, and in particular his 'rêveries enchantées [...] sur l'avenir de cette fille chérie' (p.421). Thus, when Julien is denounced as a fripon, he responds not as a fripon (seeking to secure his financial future) nor even as a ludic fourbe (viewing Louise's letter as a battle lost in a longer war), but rather as a monstre, the epithet Chélan assigns to him in the course of his prison meeting with Julien (p.440). Chélan is appalled at
Julien's behaviour because from his perspective it constitutes the wrong form of heroism. Chélan interprets Julien's gesture as a denial of generosity. He therefore offers to return the 500 francs Julien had given him for charitable causes, collapsing once Julien refuses to take the money back. The encounter leaves Julien badly shaken:

Cette apparition laissa Julien plongé dans un malheur cruel et qui éloignait les larmes. Tout lui paraissait triste et sans consolation; il sentait son cœur glacé dans sa poitrine.

Cet instant fut le plus cruel qu'il eût éprouvé depuis le crime. Il venait de voir la mort dans toute sa laideur. Toutes les illusions de grandeur d'âme et de générosité s'étaient dissipées comme un nuage devant la tempête, (pp.440-41)

Julien is experiencing the problem foreseen by Mathilde in her earlier assessment of heroism: 'on brave le danger à la tête d'un escadron tout brillant d'acier, mais le danger solitaire, singulier, imprévu, vraiment laid?' (p.313). He cannot find the strength required to face the squalor of his situation within himself; instead, he finally draws strength from Louise, whose forgiveness (p.471) and willingness to share in Julien's guilt heralds Julien's final transition from the instinctive generosity of the tendre and the ambition of le rusé to the virtue of la bonté facile. Julien therefore completes the passage from vengeance to reversibility, barbaric Old Testament God to forgiving Fénélonian God (p.466, 481). At the same time, he completes the transition from Murat to Washington, the combined exemplar of Bonapartism and Girondism. Perhaps Julien is now capable of understanding Altamira's combination of 'la dévotion et l'amour de la liberté' (p.253).

It is in this context that Julien is put on trial before a fripon jury dominated by Frilair and Valenod. Frilair hopes to take advantage of this trial, not only by securing a Bishopric through the influence of the La Moles, but also by manipulating Julien to serve the interests of Jesuitry. Thus, Frilair lays bare the hidden agenda of trials in Restoration France: 'ce Julien est un être singulier, son action est inexplicable, pensait M. de Frilair, et rien ne doit l'être pour moi... Peut-être sera-t-il possible d'en faire un martyr...' (p.443). Julien's trial will hinge not on whether he is guilty of a premeditated attempted murder, but rather on why he has sought to commit such an act, and how this act can best be presented to the general population in the interests of established power. Such trials, Stendhal suggests, constitute a step backwards even from the

25 Pirard has already warned Julien that an excessive regard for his honour will lead him into both error and crime (p.165).
26 Louise tells Julien: 'je sens pour toi ce que je devrais sentir uniquement pour Dieu: un mélange de respect, d'amour, d'obéissance... En vérité, je ne sais pas ce que tu m'inspires. Tu me dirais de donner un coup de couteau au geôlier, que le crime serait commis avant que j'y eusse songé' (p.472).
barbarism of the sixteenth-century judicial procedures analysed in the *Historiettes romaines*, let alone the equity of a 'Dieu juste, bon et infini'. Julien denies the possibility of this latter abstraction ever being translated into the human administration of justice at the same time as he formally repudiates the ludism of *la bonne compagnie*:

A mesure que j'aurais été moins dupe des apparences [...] j'aurais vu que les salons de Paris sont peuplés d'honnêtes gens tels que mon père (*fripons*), ou de coquins habiles tels que ces galériens. Ils ont raison, jamais les hommes de salon ne se lèvent le matin avec cette pensée poignante: Comment dînerai-je? Et ils vantent leur probité! et, appelés au jury, ils condamnent fièrement l'homme qui a volé un couvert d'argent parce qu'il se sentait défaillir de faim.

Mais y a-t-il une cour, s'agit-il de perdre ou de gagner un portefeuille, mes honnêtes gens de salon tombent dans des crimes exactement parçils à ceux que la nécessité de dîner a inspirés à ces deux galériens....

Il n'y a point de *droit naturel*: ce mot n'est qu'une antique niaiserie bien digne de l'avocat général qui m'a donné chasse l'autre jour, et dont l'aïeul fut enrichi par une confiscation de Louis XIV. II n'y a de *droit* que lorsqu'il y a une loi pour défendre de faire telle chose, sous peine de punition. Avant la loi, il n'y a de *naturel* que la force du lion, ou le besoin de l'être qui a faim, qui a froid, le *besoin* en un mot... non, les gens qu'on honore ne sont que des *fripons* qui ont eu le bonheur de n'être pas pris en flagrant délit. L'accusateur que la société lance après moi a été enrichi par une infamie... J'ai commis un assassinat, et je suis justement condamné, mais, à cette seule action près, le Valenod qui m'a condamné est cent fois plus nuisible à la société. (p.479)

Julien insists on his guilt, refusing to submit to strategies of public atonement (pp.474-75) which would help ensure his acquittal. Instead, he seeks the private forgiveness of his victim, necessary if he is to find the strength required to endure his just punishment. Julien therefore becomes a rather different martyr from the one intended by Frilair: a Jesus Christ in conversation with two common criminals (pp.478-79), mourned by two very different women (pp.487-88) and buried in a shrine (p.488). Julien dies an exemplar of generosity and ambition, a martyr to *friponnerie* and the mediocrity of *l'ordre inverse*.
2

LUCIEN LEUWEN

'Il n'est pas fait pour son siècle [...] et ne sera jamais qu'un plat homme de mérite'
(LL, II, 213)

1. 'Inachèvement'

Stendhal appears to delight in the humiliations and failures he visits on the eponymous hero of Lucien Leuwen, thereby echoing the malicious joy felt by Lucien's fellow officers when he is drenched in filthy water (LL, I, 124). Gilbert Durand therefore argues that the novel should be seen as an anti-roman, ipso facto doomed to failure: 'c'est échouer à l'avance que de vouloir romancer l'échec'. Durand cites 'l'inachèvement de Lucien Leuwen' as proof of such failure; a 'fiasco' all the more humiliating given that the novel 'vient chronologiquement s'insérer entre ces deux éclatantes réussites que sont le Rouge et le Noir et la Chartreuse de Parme' (p.201). Durand's article further seeks to demonstrate the failed status of the novel by insisting on the various ways in which it transgresses his conception of mythical heroic archetypes (p.202). Durand concludes that: 'l'insuffisance et le renversement des thèmes héroïques ne peut déboucher que sur l'insuffisance romanesque et l'échec psycho-social du roman' (p.225).

Michel Crouzet, in the introduction to his edition of the novel, dismisses the wider critical orthodoxy of the novel's inachèvement, thereby dealing with Durand's first argument (LL, I, 17-20). Crouzet identifies two 'légendes' that have emerged from this orthodoxy: first that the novel is unfinished because Stendhal abandoned its sometime projected third book, second, that the manuscripts of the two books of Lucien Leuwen have come down to us in a state of near chaos. I shall begin by discussing my reasons for rejecting these two critical assumptions. In the process, I hope to demonstrate Stendhal's ever clearer conceptualization, in the course of writing Lucien Leuwen, of his literary project as a series of modern parallel lives. It is perhaps this conceptualization which then encouraged him to re-examine Plutarch in the Vie de Henry Brulard and the Mémoires sur Napoléon.

1 Gilbert Durand, 'Lucien Leuwen ou l'héroïsme à l'envers', Stendhal Club, 3 (1959), 201-25 (p.201).
Crouzet is surely right in suggesting that the decision not to write the third book of *Lucien Leuwen* should be seen as a conscious artistic choice on Stendhal's part rather than as evidence of his intention to abandon the project as a whole. Indeed, it seems unlikely that Stendhal would have bothered beginning the final revision of the first book had he not first completed his draft outline for the entire projected novel. In fact, Stendhal could only have adhered to the originally planned tripartite structure of the novel had the first two books fulfilled his early ambition to write a comic novel in the light, digressive, polyphonic manner of Fielding's *Tom Jones* rather than in what he perceived to be the 'dry', excessively 'Roman', monophonic manner of *Le Rouge et le Noir* (*LL*, I, 406; II, 576).

Stendhal was forced to concede, however, that the drafts of the first two books had frustrated these intentions:

La grande différence entre Fielding et Dominique [Stendhal], c'est que Fielding décrit à la fois les sentiments et actions de plusieurs personnages, et Dominique d'un seul. Où mène la manière de Dominique? Je l'ignore. Est-ce un perfectionnement? Est-ce revenir à l'enfance de l'art, ou plutôt tomber dans le genre froid du personnage philosophique? (*LL*, II, 583)

In the light of this return to 'la manière de Dominique', Stendhal clearly could not risk further lengthening the novel by introducing a new array of secondary characters, none of whom could hope to hold the reader's attention in the monophonic novel Stendhal describes. Stendhal solves his problem not by rejecting the novel as a failure, but rather by accepting Lucien's dominance in the text, remodelling *Lucien Leuwen* precisely on the previously maligned *Le Rouge*. This shift in emphasis is reflected in Stendhal's final resolution of his uncertainties with regard to the title of the novel.

The neutral *Lucien Leuwen* and *Leuwen* appear to enjoy the same shorthand status as *Julien*, frequently used as an alternative title for *Le Rouge* even after publication, for instance in the marginal note of 13 May 1834 (*LL*, I, 406). The early title, *Les Bois de Prémol*, referred to the scene of the planned dénouement at the end of the third book. Stendhal therefore discarded it in favour of *Le Chasseur vert* when he came to correcting his draft, presumably on the assumption that the final reconciliation of Lucien and Bathilde would now take place at the *café-hauss* of the same name in the woods outside Nancy. Stendhal appears to be building up to this reconciliation throughout the second book (*LL*, II, 99-100, 106, 311, 407, 412), preparing the ground still further by making it contingent

2 Stendhal had in any case noted, in the *Promenades*, with regard to books in three volumes: 'c'est trop de moitié dans ce siècle qui n'a qu'une passion: établir un bon gouvernement.' (*VIT*, p.494)
on a return to the *Chasseur vert*, having Bathilde swear to Mme de Constantin that she will not speak to Lucien again unless she has first been back to the *café-hauss* \( \text{p.121} \). At the very last moment, however, Stendhal appears to change his mind, frustrating the expectations of a reconciliation and resorting instead to the kind of compressed, disjointed ending he so favours. Thus, by the time he set out on his final revision, Stendhal was already aware that his title, *Le Chasseur vert*, only accurately referred to the first book.

It is of course possible that Stendhal chose the title for the novel as a whole in a deliberate attempt to mislead his reader. Equally, it is worth considering the possibility that *Le Chasseur vert* is a subtitle to the first book alone and that Stendhal likewise finally intended to give the second book a separate subtitle. Just as *Le Chasseur vert* refers to the first book, so the titles *L'Orange de Malte* and *Le Télégraphe* each refer exclusively to events in the second book. There is no conclusive evidence that Stendhal considered using either title as a subtitle for the second book, although the third manuscript volume (which coincides with the beginning of the second book) bears the title *L'Orange de Malte*. This last title was first chosen on the grounds of euphony (after a play by Fabre d'Eglantine) as the title for the entire tripartite novel \( \text{OC, x, 323} \). However, Stendhal later remembered that Fabre's play features an act of procurement similar to that of François Leuwen for his son \( \text{LL, II, 483} \). The title was eventually discarded on the peculiar grounds that oranges had passed from fashion and that the title is more grammatically correct with an indefinite article \( \text{p.591} \). *Le Télégraphe*, explained as an allusion to the 'fraponnerie de de Vaize' \( \text{ibid.} \), namely his speculation on the *Bourse* based on information gleaned from ministerial telegrams, also failed to meet with Stendhal's approval, this time on the grounds of insufficient euphony \( \text{ibid.} \). No mention of either title is made in the revised manuscript \( \text{Le Chasseur vert} \).

Neither *Le Chasseur vert* nor *Le Télégraphe* could solve Stendhal's problem with regard to finding a suitable title for the novel as a whole. Thus, in a note written in early 1835, Stendhal returns to the anodyne *Lucien Leuwen* before proposing the alternative of *L'Amarante et le Noir* \( \text{LL, II, 586} \). This transparent allusion to *Le Rouge et le Noir* is finally discarded in favour of either *Le Rouge et le Blanc* or *Le Bleu et le Blanc*. Stendhal added the title *Le Rouge et le Blanc* to the verso of the first folio of *Le Chasseur vert* as opposed to the recto, suggesting that Stendhal intended to leave the latter as a subtitle to the first book rather than replace it outright. This first use of *Le Rouge et le Blanc* appears underneath the 'Première préface' of 28 September 1836. However, Henry Debraye dates 'au mois d'octobre 1835 l'invention du titre Rouge et Blanc (ou Bleu et...
Stendhal's final title for his novel implies an intention further to develop the existing parallels between Julien and Lucien, parallels, as we have seen, he was originally eager to avoid. These parallels are, however, already quite marked. For example, F.W.J. Hemmings points out that Julien and Lucien, according to best calculations, are both born in 1808 (p. 139). Furthermore, _Lucien Leuwen_ in its final, unrevised and allegedly unfinished form, closely mirrors the bipartite structure of _Le Rouge_. Thus the events of the first books (set in Verrières and Nancy respectively) are re-enacted in the second (both set in Paris). Furthermore, both novels are given two endings. _Le Rouge_ first ends with Julien acquiring a fortune through his prospective marriage to Mathilde, then a second time when he is executed. Conversely, _Lucien Leuwen_ first ends with his rejection of Mme Grandet and the bankruptcy of his father's estate, then a second time when he finds himself reborn in Italy. Prévost argues that Stendhal's double endings follow a similar pattern, 'la première selon le rêve, et la seconde selon les forces extérieures' (p.363). He goes on to argue that _Lucien Leuwen_, seul de tous les livres de Stendhal, devait finir selon le rêve et c'est peut-être pourquoi il n'est point fini' (ibid.). As a result, Prévost fails to acknowledge that the ending 'selon les forces extérieures' (the bankruptcy) has uniquely preceded the dream ending. Indeed, the double ending of _Lucien Leuwen_ conforms to a pattern of systematic inversion that emerges from the comparative study of _Le Rouge_ and _Lucien Leuwen_.

Prévost seeks to distinguish between the two novels by suggesting that, unlike _Le Rouge_, _Lucien Leuwen_ is structured around events the hero cannot control: 'ce roman [Lucien Leuwen] risquait d'être moins solidement groupé autour du héros que le Rouge et le Noir

---

4 See Jean Prévost, _La Création chez Stendhal_ (Paris: Mercure de France, 1951). Prévost argues that _Armance_ (p.232), _Le Rouge_ (p.232, 269) and _La Chartreuse_ (p.363) all have double endings.
ne l'est autour de Julien. Non qu'il soit moins souvent en scène, mais sa volonté crée moins souvent les événements du récit; il subit plus qu'il n'agit' (p.306). Hemmings convincingly rejects this argument, pointing out that Lucien has no less control over the events of his life than Julien, in the process also rebutting a number of the points made by Durand (pp.159-60). Julien and Lucien both finally fail in their aspirations, as do Octave, Fabrice and Lamiel. Stendhal therefore appears more interested in the manner than the fact of such failure.

Prévost is on surer ground when he observes that: 'si le Rouge développait la morale de l'énergie, *Lucien Leuwen* développe une morale de la conscience' (p.295). Thus, the two chief protagonists develop opposing, but, it should be stressed, equally valid forms of heroism. As a consequence, they lead parallel, even though inverted lives: Lucien as a rich man who finally finds freedom in relative poverty and anonymity, Julien as a poor man who, mistakenly, seeks freedom in wealth and position. This opposition is prefigured in rival definitions of the superior man advanced in the *Promenades*. The superior man of action will inevitably be drawn from 'cette classe ouvrière qui, grâce à sa pauvreté, n'a pas le temps de songer à l'opinion du voisin et aux convenances' (*VIT*, p.318). In order to achieve superiority in the arts, however, 'il faudra naître très riche et très noble, on se trouvera ainsi au-dessus de toutes les petites tentations' (p.273). This opposition finally resolves itself in *Lucien Leuwen* through the evolution of a new definition of distinction (eventually articulated in the *Mémoires d'un touriste*) as at the same time emotive and rational, generous and ambitious. Put another way, Julien is a Caesar to Lucien's Brutus, the latter constructing his personality in order to lead what Plutarch calls the 'life of virtue' (*MR*, p.223). Both *Le Rouge et le Noir* and *Lucien Leuwen* (*Le Rouge et le Blanc*) show their heroes finally failing not only in their aspirations but also in their attempts to emulate their chosen exemplars. In each case, this failure leads to a final synthesis of a 'morale de l'énergie' and a 'morale de la conscience'.

Stendhal goes out of his way in *Le Chasseur vert* to signal the relationship between Lucien and Julien. Thus, when Lucien discovers himself to be 'horriblement triste' after his first duties on the parade-ground, the narrator observes: 'n'eût-il pas mieux valu être fou de bonheur, comme l'eût été, dans la position de Lucien, un jeune homme de province, dont l'éducation n'eût pas coûté cent mille francs?' (*LL*, 1, 147). This transparent reference to Julien's joy when learning of his commission as the chevalier Julien Sorel de la Vernaye (*RN*, p.427) was not included in the first draft of what was to become *Le Chasseur vert* (*OC*, X, 71). Similarly, in the revised text, Théodelinde de Serpierre guesses that Lucien
would be shocked by her father's decision to refer to him, no more accurately than in the case of Julien, as a chevalier \((LL, \textit{i}, 253)\), a detail once again absent from the first draft \((OC, \textit{x}, 204)\). Lucien is a Julien à l'envers. It is in this context that it makes sense for the novel to peter out, uniquely, with its hero still very much alive and prepared (unlike the average Frenchman of the Promenades) to open up his soul to the 'sentiment des arts' \((LL, \textit{ii}, 436)\): \textit{Lucien Leuwen} must end 'a little in the air for most tastes' (Hemmings, p.137) if it is to invert the brutal finality of \textit{Le Rouge}.

2. 'Romancer l'échec'

Crouzet goes on to tackle Durand's central thesis directly \((LL, \textit{i}, 30-31)\), criticizing the latter's insistence that novels meet the rigidly defined criteria of a 'registre épique et mythique indispensable' (p.31). Instead, Crouzet argues that Lucien represents a new type of paradoxical bourgeois hero, 'qui ne peut pas être héroïque, et qui pourtant le devient peut-être à partir de cette négation première de sa destinée' (p.31). Thus, Crouzet suggests that Lucien does not so much fail in his attempts to conform to heroic archetypes as renew them ('il renouvelle l'archétype du héros de roman') by describing the 'parabole, ou paradoxe de l'héroïsme moderne' (p.32).

The above debate obscures the fact that \textit{Lucien Leuwen}, unique among Stendhal's novels, begins with the chief protagonist already an orthodox hero and ends with this heroism both re-affirmed and perfected. Lucien has already risked his life in a revolt against injustice when the reader is first introduced to him and the novel ends with him sacrificing his fortune and position at the altar of probity and honour. Importantly, these two heroic episodes together represent a 'degree zero' of heroism as defined in the novel by François Leuwen, the ostensible apostle of \textit{fourberie ludique}. Lucien is nevertheless initially presented to the reader as something of a failure. This failure is not so much one of heroism as of logic and philosophy. Lucien starts as a hero, but not yet as a man of distinction. He must therefore complete his education, uniting the generosity of a Brutus (sublime \textit{duperie}) with the ambition of a Caesar (sublime \textit{friponnerie}). Yet this quest for ultimate distinction risks undermining Lucien's original heroism: by learning how to become a \textit{coquin}, Lucien runs the risk of losing his equally sublime \textit{duperie}. Thus, Lucien's re-affirmation of his heroism at the end of the novel, despite his greater

---

5 See also Raymond Giraud, \textit{The Unheroic Hero in the Novels of Stendhal, Balzac and Flaubert} (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1957), pp.60-72.
experience of the world, constitutes a considerable victory. Lucien has successfully conquered his misanthropy and mortified his vanity. At the same time he has learned how (badly) the affairs of the world are managed and arrived at a proper understanding of his own relative worth. Lucien Leuwen is therefore a novel of heroism perfected rather than Durand's heroism inverted (relentless social humiliation and failure) or Giraud's persevering heroism (mortification without reward).

Durand highlights many of Lucien's apparent humiliations and failures in the course of his argument. Lucien does indeed appear to botch his relationships with women. He further compromises himself politically in the Kortis affair, is pelted with mud in Blois, loses an important election from which his father, embarrassingly, emerges elsewhere as an unlikely winner. All these episodes are symbolized by Lucien's repeated accidents. Lucien is uniquely clumsy among Stendhal's heroes, twice falling from his horse in front of Mme de Chasteller (LL, 1, p.125, 235), and almost contriving to drown her in four feet of water in the course of a boating expedition (p.254). Yet at other times Stendhal informs the reader that Lucien is particularly dextrous, for instance when he gives a riding-display in the streets of Nancy after his purchase of the fiery Lara (pp.140-41) and again when he shows up his Colonel on the parade-ground (p. 146). Thus, Lucien appears justified in cursing his luck after his second fall below the window of an onlooking Mme de Chasteller: '"On dirait que c'est un sort!", se dit-il en remontant à cheval, ivre de colère; "je suis prédéstiné à être ridicule aux yeux de cette jeune femme" ' (p.235). Lucien is jinxed, throughout the novel doomed to fail irrespective of his talents and (often heroic) best efforts.

Mlle de Serpierre ironically compares Lucien's falls with the fall of Saint Paul on the road to Damascus (LL, 1, 253). The Christian theme of mortified pride is certainly present in all three of Stendhal's major novels. Lucien's apparent failures can equally be compared to those of heroes from antiquity, often the helpless playthings of the gods (Achilles, Ajax and Hector all suggest in their different ways that Homer was one of the first authors to 'romancer l'échec'). Even the coquin Napoleon eventually fails in his Promethean struggles against the god of mediocrity (John Bull).

At the beginning of the novel, Lucien still needs to learn how best to deal with failure. Thus his first misadventure (the failure of the uprising in which he participates) leaves him confused and unprepared for the challenges ahead. Lucien therefore immediately assumes that he has been humiliated when he first falls from his horse:
Notre héros subissait les conséquences de cette éducation de Paris, qui ne sait que développer la vanité, triste partage des fils de gens riches. Toute cette vanité avait été sous les armes pour débuter dans un régiment; Lucien s'était attendu à quelque coup d'épée; il s'agissait de prendre la chose avec légèreté et décision; il fallait montrer de la hardiesse sous les armes, etc., etc. Loin de là, le ridicule et l'humiliation tombaient sur lui du haut de la fenêtre d'une jeune femme, la plus noble de l'endroit, et une ultra enragée et bavarde, qui saurait draper un serviteur du juste milieu. Que n'allait-elle pas dire de lui? (p.137)

Stendhal signals the error of Lucien's analysis in two ways. First, he makes it clear that Lucien's distress is the product of vanity. Second, he makes Lucien's sense of humiliation dependent on his (inaccurate) postulation of Mme de Chasteller's perceptions. Stendhal is again equating the overdevelopment of vanity with the election of attractive women as arbiters of (superficial) merit. Mme de Chasteller appears to qualify as just such an arbiter; yet her true role, in her capacity as a great soul, will instead be to act as the arbiter of genuine distinction.

Lucien soon recognizes that Mme de Chasteller's second role as arbiter far outweighs the importance of her first, helpfully taken over by the resolutely pretty Mme de Hocquincourt. Stendhal makes the relative importance of the two roles clear from the outset by showing Lucien's fears to be misplaced:

'Son amour-propre se rappelle sans doute', pensa-t-elle, 'que je l'ai vu tomber de cheval le jour de l'arrivée du régiment de lanciers.' Ainsi Mme de Chasteller ne faisait aucune difficulté d'admettre que Lucien était timide à cause d'elle. Cette défiance de soi-même avait de la grâce dans un homme jeune et placé au milieu de tous ces provinciaux, si sûrs de leur mérite et qui ne perdaient pas un pouce de leur taille en dansant. Ce jeune officier, du moins, n'était pas timide à cheval; chaque jour il la faisait trembler par sa hardiesse, et une hardiesse si souvent malheureuse, ajoutait-elle presque en riant. (pp.263-64)

Mme de Chasteller surprisingly concludes: 'décidément ce joli Parisien n'est bien qu'à cheval; en se mettant à pied, il perd la moitié de son mérite' (p.264). Similarly surprising is her recollection of Lucien's unfortunate boating accident: 'il avait été brave en conduisant la barque sur l'étang de la Commanderie, mais c'était de cette bravoure froide que peut avoir un homme de cinquante ans' (p.263). Mme de Chasteller emerges as silent, apolitical, generous in spirit and consequently isolated: 'personne à Nancy n'avait deviné ce caractère' (p.259). Lucien will prove his distinction when he alone recognizes her for who she is, just as she confirms such distinction by responding to his love.

Lucien lies to everyone in Nancy except Mme de Chasteller. Stendhal makes this clear when describing their first proper conversation:
Dans la simplicité noble du ton qu'il osa prendre spontanément avec Mme de Chasteller, il sut faire apparaître, sans se permettre assurément rien qui pût choquer la délicatesse la plus scrupuleuse, cette nuance de familiarité délicate qui convient à deux âmes de même portée, lorsqu'elles se rencontrent et se reconnaissent au milieu des masques de cet ignoble bal masqué qu'on appelle le monde. Ainsi des anges se parleraient qui, partis du ciel pour quelque mission, se rencontreraient, par hasard, ici-bas. (pp. 267-68)

Mme de Chasteller serves as Lucien's heroic double. She correctly perceives Lucien's failings as qualities, the obverse of the ignoble attributes required to succeed in the ordre inverse. Stendhal similarly blames Lucien's failures on the limitations imposed by Orleanism. Thus, Lucien reflects on the impossibility of acquiring glory in the service of a monarch who conserves power 'en écrasant ou escamotant la révolution de Juillet' (LL, II, 192). In the process, he imagines being judged by another great soul:

'Tout au plus je serai tué comme Pyrrhus, par un pot de chambre (une tuile), lancé de la fenêtre d'un cinquième étage, par une vieille femme édentée! Quelle gloire! Mon âme sera bien attrapée lorsque je serai présenté à Napoléon dans l'autre monde.

'Sans doute, me dira-t-il, vous mouriez de faim pour faire ce métier-là'

'Non, général, je croyais vous imiter.'

Et Lucien rit aux éclats... (LL, I, 103)

Stendhal is raising the problem of imitation as opposed to emulation, that is to say Lucien's awareness of the disjunction between outward signs and reality, the uniform and the man. This problem is further complicated by the continuing presence of fallen heroes from Napoleon's campaigns: the toy soldiers Lucien plays with when recreating the battles of the Republic (pp.162-64) prove more convincing symbols of military glory than the officers (Filloteau, 'le général comte N****) who actually fought in those battles.

3. 'La peau de la statue'

René Girard makes the point that desire is always imitative, praising Stendhal for revealing this 'vérité romanesque' through his frequent use of 'mediators' (Mensonge romantique, pp.14-18). There can be little doubt that Stendhal frequently 'mediates' notions of both love and heroism by invoking models or exemplars drawn from the myths and legends of literature and history. It is important, however, to focus on the distinction Stendhal draws in Lucien Leuwen between three types of 'mediation', the emulative (sublime), imitative
(ridiculous) and ironic (ludic). Lucien is himself well aware of these distinctions, acknowledging that he has not become a new Napoleon simply by pulling on his French military uniform. Similarly, he realizes that Mme Grandet has not become the new Mme de Staël by dint of spouting opinions (LL, II, p.181).

Mme Grandet is forever displaying her 'grâces imitatives' (p.148):

Pour son cœur, il était à peu près l'opposé de ce que l'on se figure comme étant le cœur italien. Le sien était parfaitement étranger à tout ce que l'on appelle émotions tendres et enthousiasme, mais elle passait sa vie à jouer ces sentiments' (p.179).

She is desperately keen to imitate the aristocracy or else carry off a famous role from history and is therefore alternately tormented by the thought of the English aristocrats who disdain her and the exemplars (Chevreuse and Longueville) who surpass her. Mme Grandet limits herself to the aping of emotions associated in her imagination with the concept of aristocracy, emotions which are invalidated by the process of imitation (p.182). She thereby inevitably falls short of emulation (the attempt to equal or surpass a given model). The problem may well lie in her choice of exemplars: 'elle était riche comme une Rothschild, et voulait être une Montmorency' (p.210). Thus Mme de Théminges urges Mme Grandet to look to Louis XIV's bourgeois ministers, Colbert and Séguyier, or else to the Rothschilds and the Leuwens who unashamedly dominate Orleanist France (p.183). Mme Grandet should play to her strengths (the energy of her ruthless ambition and greed) rather than her weaknesses (her lack of generosity). Put another way, 'c'était une femme attentive au réel de la vie' (p.373), the antithesis of Mina de Vanghel, 'une âme trop ardente pour se contenter du réel de la vie' (RSN, p.212).

An insulted Mme Grandet proves incapable of taking or even understanding Mme de Théminges's advice. Thus, in the wake of M. Leuwen's attempt to procure her for his son, she immediately asks herself: 'Mesdames de Chevreuse ou de Longueville y eussent-elles consenti?' (LL, II, 371). Mme Grandet decides they would, before observing:

Ce qui les place au-dessous de moi sous le rapport moral, c'est qu'elles consentaient à ces sortes de démarches par une sorte de demi-passion, quand encore ce n'était pas par suite d'un penchant moins noble. Elles pouvaient être séduites, moi je ne puis l'être. (Et elle s'admira beaucoup.) Dans cette démarche, il n'y a que de la haute sagesse, de la prudence; je n'y attache certes l'idée d'aucun plaisir. (pp.371-72)
Stendhal notes in the margin of this passage: 'elle se glorifie de ce qui fait la pauvreté de son âme' (p.524). In other words, she has found a way of imitating the actions of her exemplars without in any way emulating the passion and fermeté de caractère that impelled such actions. Stendhal therefore implicitly relates Mme Grandet's willingness to prostitute herself to the theme of crime without pleasure already developed in *Le Rouge*.

Mme Grandet initially despises crime: 'il s'agissait de devenir une Montmorency sans rien se permettre que l'on ne pût avouer' (p.180). Her eventual willingness to prostitute herself constitutes a pleasureless violation of this guideline prompted by a barely dissembled ambition. Indeed, M. Leuwen intuits not only the strength of Mme Grandet's ambition, but also the identity of her absurdly inappropriate 'mediators':

Mme de Chevreuse, la duchesse de Longueville, toutes les femmes qui ont laissé un nom dans l'histoire et, ce qui est plus réel, qui ont établi la fortune de leur maison, ont eu quelquefois des entretiens avec leur médecin. Eh! bien, moi je suis le médecin de l'âme, le donneur d'avis à la noble ambition que cette admirable position a dû placer dans votre cœur. (p.383)

M. Leuwen therefore seeks to confirm Mme Grandet's confusion of nobility (generosity) and ambition, ideals and reality. This confusion, however, ceases once Mme Grandet actually falls in love with Lucien. Thus, one of Stendhal's later plans for the end of the novel reads as follows: 'dès qu'elle [Mme Grandet] a une passion, le chagrin d'amour-propre d'être laissée, les crimes ne coûtent plus rien' (p.550). Mme Grandet finally emulates her exemplars by heedlessly humiliating and abasing herself in the service of her jealousy (pp.421-25); in other words by embracing, rather than rejecting, pleasure as the motive of crime.

M. Leuwen is correct in identifying not only Chevreuse and Longueville, but also 'toutes les femmes qui ont laissé un nom dans l'histoire' as the 'mediators' of Mme Grandet's ambition. The latter category provides an ever more incongruous list of thoughtlessly appropriated exemplars. Thus Lucien stumbles on Mme Grandet self-consciously holding court around a bust of Cleopatra:

L'expression de la reine d'Egypte était simple et noble. Toutes ces figures faisaient des phrases et l'admiraient.

---

6 Mme Grandet and her husband similarly refer to 'grands hommes' in general (p.390), Richelieu (ibid.) and Colbert (p.394) in particular, as the models for M. Grandet's shambolic attempts at securing a ministry.
'Elle illumine leur air commun', se dit Leuwen. 'Toutes ces grosses mines à cheveux grisonnants ont l'air de dire: Oh! quels bons appointements j'ai!'

Un député du centre complaisant, attaché à la maison, proposa une poule au billard. Lucien reconnut la grosse voix qui, à la Chambre, est chargée de rire quand, par hasard, on fait quelque proposition généreuse. (p.199)

The abyss that separates Cleopatra (representing an ideal of nobility and generosity) from the present company (representing only the squalid hypocrisy of Orleanist France), foreshadows Stendhal's handling of an even more absurd juxtaposition. Thus, Mme Grandet's first thoughts on hearing M. Leuwen's indecent proposal are presented as follows:

Jamais ambitieux tourmenté par dix ans d'attente n'a désiré le ministère comme elle le souhaitait en ce moment.

'Quel rôle à jouer que celui de Mme Roland au milieu de cette société qui se décompose! Je ferai toutes les circulaires de mon mari, car il n'a pas de style.' (p.370)

Mme Grandet goes on to consider the satisfactions of vanity that will accrue to her once her husband becomes a minister, prompting the narrator to remark:

Ce n'étaient pas précisément ces pensées-là qui enflammaient la grande âme de Mme Roland à la veille du ministère de son mari. Mais c'est ainsi que notre siècle imite les grands hommes de 93, c'est ainsi que M. de Polignac a eu du caractère; on copie le fait matériel: être ministre, faire un coup d'État, faire une journée, un 4 prairial, un 10 août, un 18 fructidor; mais les moyens de succès, mais les motifs d'action, on ne creuse pas si avant. (p.371)^

Stendhal notes in the margin: 'source de comique, mais en finissant, faisant la peau de la statue: une telle comédienne être Mme Roland' (p.523). Stendhal's metaphor, 'la peau de la statue', serves to link a series of otherwise disparate elements in his characterization of Mme Grandet. Thus, the scene set around the statue of Cleopatra leads to a game of billiards which allows Mme Grandet to play the role of Cleopatra by taking advantage of the game's 'cent occasions de se placer dans les poses les plus gracieuses' (p.200). Mme Grandet is literally turning herself into a series of statues, prompting Lucien's acid assessment of her as 'cette âme de femme de chambre hôte d'un si beau corps' (p.201). Mme Grandet is further obsessed by her skin, and in particular by the perennial freshness of her complexion. Thus she habitually prolongs parties into the early hours of the morning precisely in order to triumph over her wilting rivals (p.179). Mme Grandet is all

^ Stendhal notes at this point: 'en finissant, développer ce contraste' (p.524).
surface, in Mme Leuwen's phrase, 'une copie continue' (p.377). Lucien's task, by way of contrast is to 'creuser', learning that to emulate is to diverge rather than to copy:

La force individuelle, qui était tout dans l'antiquité, n'est presque plus rien au milieu de notre civilisation moderne. Le moine qui inventa la poudre à canon, modifia la sculpture; la force n'est plus nécessaire qu'aux subalternes. Personne ne s'avisera de demander si Napoléon et Frédéric II surent bien appliquer un coup de sabre. La force que nous admirons, c'est celle de Napoléon visitant l'hôpital de Jaffa; ou s'avavançant avec simplicité vers le premier bataillon des troupes royales, sur les bords du lac de Laffrey (mars 1815); c'est la force de l'âme. Les qualités morales qu'il s'agit de rendre sensibles, ne sont donc plus les mêmes: c'est ce que beaucoup d'artistes ne voient pas, mais c'est ce qu'ont vu Michel-Ange et Canova. (OC, XLIX, 62 [1835])

Lucien's apparent sincerity in his dealings with women makes it extremely difficult to identify his 'mediators'. Mme de Chasteller initially concludes: 'j'ai affaire ici à un de ces hommes adroits, aimables, et profondément dissimulés, que l'on voit dans les romans' (LL, i, 269). Lucien is recognized as a master of intrigue precisely because his exterior reveals none of the signs of this art. Fascinated, Mme de Chasteller sets about answering Mme de Constantin's eventual question: 'ton M. Leuwen [...], est-il un Don Juan terrible pour nous autres pauvres femmes, ou est-ce un enfant sans expérience?' (LL, ii, 115). Lucien's extraordinary confession that he no longer loves Mme de Chasteller on account of Mlle Bérard's baleful presence as an improvised duenna, finally prompts her to decide: 'il y a de l'honnêteté dans ce cœur-là [...] la passion pour le travail, l'éducation presque militaire et le franc parler de l'Ecole polytechnique lui avaient valu une absence totale d'affectation. Il songeait dans chaque moment à faire ce qui lui plaisait le plus au moment même, et ne pensait point assez aux autres' (LL, i, 97). As a result, Lucien, in the manner of Napoleon, is free to emulate rather than imitate, create rather than copy. Thus Lucien, again in the manner of Napoleon (MN, p.51), allows himself to be 'transporté dans le roman de la vie'

---

8 This passage can be related to Coffe's anecdote about the cardinal de Retz, 'un homme comparable aux anciens', who nevertheless proves too weak to defend himself against a beating administered by a furious servant (LL, ii, 230).
Lucien writes his own novels: it is for this reason that Mme de Chasteller is correct in noting that Lucien is not 'un nigaud qui a lu des romans' (p.115).

The 'mediators' of Lucien's desire turn out, of course, to be the cluster of great souls who find their pasturage, in Mme Roland's famous phrase, in the works of Plutarch. The three main Plutarchian schools of hero are again represented. Thus Lucien affiliates himself to the pairing of Caesar and Napoleon: 'les récits du jeune général Bonaparte, vainqueur au pont d'Arcole, me transportent; c'est pour moi Homère, le Tasse, et cent fois mieux encore' (LL, I, 157). Lucien even sees his courtship of Mme de Chasteller in military terms. Thus, in a reference to Hannibal, another Caesar, Lucien notes: 'un serrement de main est une ville de Capoue pour moi' (LL, I, 293). Lucien also affiliates himself to the tradition represented by Stendhal's pairing of Epaminondas and Lafayette. Thus M. Leuwen's association of Lucien's duperie with that of Lafayette finds its echo in Lucien's Epaminondian statement: 'J'agirai au jour le jour', se dit-il enfin, "me jetant à chaque moment à l'action qui me fera le plus de plaisir'' (p.304). Finally, Lucien is a Brutus, at one point explicitly comparing himself to this exemplar: 'Me voilà faisant pour le général Fari ce que Brutus n'aurait pas fait pour sa patrie!' (LL, II, 342). More generally, Lucien is forever repositioning himself in the debate between republicanism and privilege alluded to in the title Le Rouge et le Blanc. The final word in this debate comes late in the second volume, at a time when Lucien is beginning to emancipate himself from his father. Lucien reprises the theme from Le Rouge: 'si vous vous damnez, damnez-vous au moins pour des péchés aimables!' (p.406). He goes on to discuss his emancipation from M. Leuwen's fourberie ludique by using the image of an awakening: 'la boue de Blois même n'a pas pu me réveiller. Qui te réveillera donc, infâme? Attends-tu le soufflet personnel?' (p.406). He later returns to this theme, exclaiming: 'il est temps de se réveiller' (p.406).

Lucien's return to republicanism is coupled with a rejection of his father similar to Brutus's similar return to the values of the Roman Republic (coupled with a parricide) when he finally responds to the question he finds pinned to the tribunal upon which he sits as Caesar's Praetor: 'Brutus, are you asleep?' (MR, p.231). In a further series of links, modern republicanism is itself explicitly associated with the name of Brutus when a group of Republican officers writes to Lucien using Roman pseudonyms, including that of 

---

9 Durand explicitly denies Lucien's status as a Brutus (p.213). It is unclear, however, from the context whether Durand is referring to Junius or Marcus Brutus.

10 Fari is himself considered a Brutus by Lucien: 'il [Fari] a encore tout l'honneur que l'on a à vingt-cinq ans, le monde ne l'a point corrompu' (p.339).
French Republicanism is in turn associated with Lucien's feelings for Mme de Chasteller, albeit in a less straightforward way. Thus it is revealed that M. Leuwen had fought in a campaign or two in 1792, 'et le nom de République française était pour lui le nom d'une maîtresse autrefois aimée, et qui s'est mal conduite' (LL, ii, 350). In other words, he thinks of the French Republic in the same way that Lucien thinks of Mme de Chasteller. Indeed, through a process of transference between these associated ideas of the Revolution and Mme de Chasteller, one could say that M. Leuwen blames the French Revolution for what is actually a false pregnancy (the violence of the Terror, the corruption of the Directory, the rise of Napoleon). The Revolution, in its female personification, stands wrongly accused of infidelity. We are once again dealing with the nexus of ideas that emerge from the tree-shooting incident in the Vie de Henry Brulard.

Lucien's austere personality smacks sufficiently of Republicanism for Lucien to be misidentified as a 'proche parent de Robespierre' (LL, i, 201). On the other hand, he is later accused (in bad faith) of being a spy for Louis-Philippe (LL, ii, 62). Similarly, Coffe is simultaneously accused of being a Republican and a spy for Henry V (p.196). This process of misidentification can be malicious, as for instance when Riquebourg announces that the candidate Malot is on the verge of bankruptcy (pp.241-42). It can also be used for ironic effect, as when the elderly ladies of Nancy pretend not to recognize the gallant troops of Louis-Philippe: 'Mmes de Marcilly et de Commercy, qui étaient fort âgées, affectèrent, en voyant ces messieurs entrer dans leur salon, un sentiment d'effroi, comme si elles eussent vu paraître des agents de la terreur de 1793' (LL, i, 168). This last ironic invocation of 'mediation' finds its fullest expression in the ludic role-play of François Leuwen. The latter consistently disconcerts his conversational partners by making a display of his insincerity, thereby satirizing the equal insincerity of conventional role-play. The scene between M. Leuwen and Louis-Philippe, 'le plus fripon des Kings', can be seen as a masterclass in ludic role-play of this kind.

M. Leuwen immediately recognizes the parts that have been assigned: 'je vais jouer le rôle si connu de Samuel Bernard promené par Louis XIV dans les jardins de Versailles' (p.349). He therefore simulates 'un sang-froid parfait en apparence' (p.350) prompting Louis-Philippe to abandon his first role in favour of 'la franchise à la Henri IV' (p.352). M. Leuwen responds with an ironic frankness of his own, referring directly to Louis-Philippe's practice of trading on inside information. The interview leaves M. Leuwen 'excité par l'idée d'avoir réduit le roi à être presque sincère avec lui' (p.353). This new climate of frankness allows M. Leuwen, at a later meeting, to mock Louis-Philippe's prior
invocations of Louis XIV and Henri IV as well as Orleanism's colonial pretensions in Algeria by in turn invoking the less appealing legend of Napoleon: 'Il faut aux bonnes têtes de ce pays du prestige, comme Bonaparte revenant d'Egypte, ou de l'esprit.' (A ce nom redouté, le roi fit la mine d'une jeune femme nerveuse devant laquelle on a nommé le bourreau.)' (p.355).

M. Leuwen continually draws attention to the masks being worn, naming them as he goes along in his conversations with Lucien, for instance sequentially referring to himself in the roles of naive do-gooder and père noble (p.97), or else making ironic reference to his son's rebelliousness by playing the role of Augustus in Corneille's Cinna (p. 192). Lucien is therefore forced to acknowledge his father's multiple role-play, even though he himself eschews such ludism. The difference in approach is underlined by Stendhal's two invocations of the Misanthrope. In the first, an entirely passive Lucien is compared to 'le Misanthrope' when 'outré de fatigue et de dégoût', he sits silently in a dark corner of his mother's salon (p.125). Lucien is forever trying to abandon the stage his father provides. In the second, M. de Pontlevé seeks to mask his squalid designs on his daughter's fortune by adopting 'le ton et les gestes d'Alceste indigné' (LL, I, 246). M. de Pontlevé is a ludic hypocrite, comparable to Sanréal in the role of 'spadassin' (LL, II, 71) or Vaize in the role of Corneille's Horace (p.156).

M. Leuwen's unexpected political ambitions finally force him to abandon multiple role-play, at least in his public appearances. Instead he chooses to mediate his image through the legends of Talleyrand (p.139, 385) and Mirabeau (p.324). Filloteau similarly teaches Lucien to keep his public image simple:

'Vous faites de la dépense; trois chevaux achetés en trois jours, je ne critique pas cela, bien! bien! très bien! mais que vont dire ceux de vos camarades qui n'en ont qu'un, de chevaux, et encore qui souvent n'ont que trois jambes', ajoute-t-il en riant d'un gros rire. 'Savez-vous ce qu'ils diront? Ils vous appelleront républicain; c'est par là que le bât nous blesse', ajoute-t-il finement, 'et savez-vous la réponse? Un beau portrait de Louis-Philippe à cheval, dans un riche cadre d'or, que vous placerez là, au-dessus de la commode, à la place d'honneur, sur quoi, bien du plaisir, honneur!' (LL, I, 153-54)

An equestrian portrait of Louis-Philippe is an absurdity. Yet Filloteau can see how such absurdity can be turned to the advantage of the ludic individual through a process of brazen appropriation. Thus, Lucien concludes:
Cinquante-quatre francs de cadre et cinq francs de lithographie ont fait l'affaire; voilà ce qu'il faut pour ces gens-ci; Filloteau en sait plus que moi. C'est la vraie supériorité de l'homme de génie sur le vulgaire; au lieu d'une foule de petites démarches, une seule action claire, simple, frappante, et qui répond à tout. (p. 155)

This lesson in *fourberie ludique* is repeated again and again. Ernest Dévelroy and François Leuwen tease and taunt Lucien for his inability to control his public image, that is to say his inability to present society with 'la peau de la statue'. There is therefore an important opposition between Stendhal's narrative voice and the patriarchal voice of M. Leuwen. The narrator suggests Lucien should dig beneath the surface; M. Leuwen insists his son should restrict himself to playing with surface. The narrator compliments Lucien for avoiding the excesses of Parisian vanity and duplicity; M. Leuwen chides his son for not being enough of a *gamin de Paris* (p. 154). This opposition between depth and surface helps the reader to evaluate M. Leuwen's strategy of occupying Lucien's time in frivolous amusement and exhausting bureaucracy, ostensibly in order to disprove the charges of either Saint-Simonianism or fanatical religiosity levelled at all those who are serious in Orleanist France. M. Leuwen claims to be concerned with Lucien's surface. In actual fact, it gradually emerges that he is more concerned to subvert what lies beneath the surface, namely Lucien's political and personal generosity (*duperie*), his propensity to love either in the abstract or in the particular: 'car la première des duperies, c'est d'aimer' (LL, II, 186).

4. *Un homme distingué*

The novel begins as follows:

Lucien Leuwen avait été chassé de l'Ecole polytechnique pour s'être allé promener mal à propos, un jour qu'il était consigné, ainsi que tous ses camarades: c'était à l'époque d'une des célèbres journées de juin, avril ou février 1832 ou 34.

Quelques jeunes gens assez fous, mais doués d'un grand courage, prétendaient détrôner le roi, et l'Ecole polytechnique, pépinière de mauvaises têtes (qui est en possession de déplaire au maître des Tuileries), était sévèrement consignée dans ses quartiers. Le lendemain de sa promenade, Lucien fut renvoyé comme républicain. Fort affligé d'abord, depuis deux ans il se consolait du malheur de n'avoir plus à travailler douze heures par jour. Il passait très bien son temps chez son père, homme de plaisir et riche banquier, lequel avait à Paris une maison fort agréable. (LL, I, 95)

Stendhal's narrative voice is typically unstable. Thus the first paragraph adopts a euphemistically ironic tone, with the apparent aim of mocking the government of Louis-
Philippe. The second paragraph appears simultaneously to perpetuate this tone, adopt a new tone of sincerity and reverse the polarity of the original irony employed, now used to mock Lucien and his fellow students.¹¹

The first sentence of the second paragraph is particularly hard to read in the context of the novel as a whole. Does Stendhal mean the term 'fou' positively or negatively, and is he using it in order to quote the opinions of others, for instance official government sources or even François Leuwen? The rioters might be 'mad' in the sense that they choose heroically to risk their lives in the wider political interests of the French nation. In other words, they are the same 'madmen' who brought about the Revolutions of 1789 and 1830, their 'madness' taking the form of a generosity at odds with the egotistical norms of sanity commonly upheld by the fripon society of the juste milieu (LL, I, 221-22, 262, 272, 328; II, 20, 51, 396). This interpretation would appear to be reinforced by the ironic charge of the first paragraph, designed to underline the chasm between the altruistic idealism of the Journées de juillet and the repressive egoism of the July monarchy it produced. Stendhal appears to be using the tactics he later employs in the Mémoires d'un touriste, encapsulated in the repeated ironic question: 'où sont les abus?'. At the time of writing, Stendhal himself expected Louis-Philippe to fall in the relatively near future. Many of his hopes for eventually publishing Lucien Leuwen therefore rested precisely on the eventual success of the periodic riots alluded to in the first paragraph.

Alternatively, the narrator might mean precisely what he appears to be saying. The rioters are mad to think they can dethrone 'le plus fripon des Kings' simply by taking to the streets of Paris in a spontaneous protest against injustice. They can even be seen as dupes caught in a government trap, the victims of pre-meditated, on occasion even provoked massacres, designed to frighten wavering supporters of Orleanism into greater loyalty to a regime willing to act in order to protect their interests.¹² In this reading, Lucien's duperie and heroism are both accentuated: he falls into a trap, but a trap set for the expendable working classes rather than the sons of rich bankers. Thus, Lucien refuses to stand by

¹¹ See also Kenzo Furuya, 'Autour de la phrase d'attaque de Lucien Leuwer', Etudes de langue et littérature françaises, 10 (1967), 72-87. Furuya in particular contextualizes Stendhal's ironic use of 'promener'.

¹² François Leuwen senses that the King wishes to provoke a massacre of workers and so compromise the bourgeoisie (LL, II, 349-50). The Kortis affair illustrates government use of agents provocateurs (pp.152-53), while Lucien suspects Fléron of arranging for a gun to be fired in the hope of provoking the army into a massacre of striking workers (p.16-17).
while the government sets out to make an example of the working classes. He takes a stand on principle, the principle of 'le sang', also secretly espoused by M. Leuwen.

The rioters actually demonstrate a sublime form of duperie, akin to that later described in the *Mémoires d'un touriste* as constituting the first virtue of a distinguished man (*VFR*, p.37). Ironically, however, the rioters appear to lack 'cette instruction philosophique et dégagée de toute fausseté que l'on ne trouve que dans les bons collèges de Paris' (ibid.), even though many of them attend the Ecole Polytechnique, the very best Paris college. How then are we to read the statement that the Ecole is a 'pépinière de mauvaises têtes'? Is it failing in its primary purpose by turning out 'madmen', that is to say illogical dreamers (Girondins)? Or is the narrator reverting to irony, advancing the idea that any criticism of Orleanism should be seen as the product of a skewed education? Such irony would once again appear to be directed at a government which is forced to anathematize the teachings of reason in order to protect its interests.

A final possible reading appears to offer a way out of these problems of interpretation. The narrator is, as so often, 'speaking the language of the enemy' (*Jefferson*, p.104), in this case the coalition of forces determined to minimize both the riots themselves and Lucien's part in them. Using this interpretation, the novel's opening can be seen as a preliminary lesson in the art of reading. The opening two paragraphs are neither ironic nor sincere, but rather distorted, sanitized versions of a truth which Stendhal considers in this instance to be momentarily unavailable rather than unattainable of itself. Indeed, in the course of his later electoral mission, Stendhal appears to subscribe to the possibility of objective reportage. Lucien takes great pains over his reports to Paris (*LL*, II, 265, 270), reproducing dialogue exactly (p.273), and going out of his way to include other opinions (p.269), even though Paris is clearly not interested in learning the truth (p.264, 270). Similarly, he insists on allowing Coffe to give a second, 'objective' account of the electoral mission to M. Leuwen, so desperate is he to know whether he has acted well (*LL*, II, 306, 312, 316-17).

---

13 The narrator notes that: 'à l'Ecole polytechnique, un travail ardu et de tous les instants, l'enthousiasme de la science, l'amour pour la liberté, la générosité naturelle à la première jeunesse, neutralisaient les passions haineuses et les effets de l'envie' (p.163). Lucien later acknowledges that 'l'éducation de Paris empêche de sentir; cela est possible, mais, par compensation, elle apprend à y voir clair' (*LL*, II, 20). This education is implicitly contrasted to the illogical, morally squalid lessons in l'art de tromper les autres' and other 'singuliers mensonges' devised by the Jesuit Sacré-Cœur (*LL*, I, 283, 312; II, 21).
At the beginning of the novel, however, Lucien so distrusts his own voice that he makes no attempt to formulate his own version of events. Instead, he allows his heroism to be trivialized by interested third-parties. First, the government needs to present the rioting students (as opposed to the more dangerous workers) as mere hot-heads, youthful extremists not to be taken seriously. Whereas the government seeks to maximize aristocratic and bourgeois fears of rampaging sans-culottes, it cannot afford to be seen as standing in opposition to the liberal bourgeoisie it claims primarily to represent. Second, François Leuwen needs to support this analysis, citing his own son as the particular example of the government's theory, in order to protect Lucien from the potentially serious consequences of his actions. Hence the use of euphemisms ('s'être allé promener mal à propos', 'sa promenade') presumably designed to turn Lucien's treason into a joke everyone, Lucien included, can eventually share. The reader is soon confirmed in this theory:

Ces [M. Leuwen's] amis avaient dit au ministre régnant que Lucien n'était point un Hampden, un fanatique de liberté américaine, un homme à refuser l'impôt s'il n'y avait pas de budget; mais tout simplement un jeune homme de vingt ans, pensant comme tout le monde. (LL, I, 101)

Finally, M. Leuwen needs to convince Lucien himself of the truth of the government's analysis if he is to prevent him from persisting in his Republicanism and so quieten the fears of Mme Leuwen (LL, II, 132, 188), fears which, in a parallel with Mme de Malivert in Armance centre on Lucien's occasionally suicidal gloominess (LL, I, 174, II, 99, 191, 233, 395). This last motive is signalled by the end of the second paragraph of the novel. The narrator appears to lose all interest in his young hero, switching his attention instead to the supremely ludic figure of M. Leuwen, precisely to emphasize the latter's role both in managing the crisis triggered by his son's political idealism and in dampening that idealism. In the process, the narrator appears to encourage the reader to share M. Leuwen's assessment of his son's activities as errors to be rectified; an assessment apparently shared by the now indolent Lucien.

Lucien appears to have conceded the argument, allowing himself to be convinced by his father's superior savoir-vivre. As a result, Lucien immediately loses his early status as hero. In accepting the interpretation of his own actions as being somehow 'mad', Lucien

---

14 Lucien is still unsure of the rules of savoir-vivre during his time in Nancy (LL, II, 43) and wishes he possessed his father's knowledge in these matters (p.21, 41).
himself colludes with the official version of events. This is the only version that Lucien, as an Orleanist officer, is allowed to entertain (LL, I, 109), even though it is rendered absurd by the likely prospect of Orleanism's fall from power. Thus Louis-Philippe's own minister for war informs Lucien that his government pension ought to last four or five years but probably no longer before informing him that the King himself knows that he is a Jacobin: 'c'est le roi qui m'a dit que vous étiez jacobin, c'est un beau métier, et qui vous rapportera gros' (LL, II, p.434).

One must read between the lines in order to establish that Lucien's duperie at the time of the Paris riots is actually 'chaleur d'âme'. The government which rejects such duperie in its own ranks naturally turns to friponnerie instead (p.202, 217, 321). Two later episodes, both pendants to Lucien's opening participation in mass insurrection, further serve to illustrate this inversion of values. The first, Lucien's absurdly uneventful involvement in the suppression of a strike in a small industrial town, ends with the following narratorial intervention: 'pour les détails militaires, stratégiques, politiques, etc., etc., de cette grande affaire, voir les journaux du temps. Le régiment s'était couvert de gloire, et les ouvriers avaient fait preuve d'une insigne lâcheté' (p.17). The second, the anti-government riot and mud-pelting in Blois, prompts Coffe to observe: 'cette boue, c'est pour nous la noble poussière du champ d'honneur. Cette huée publique vous comptera, ce sont les actions d'éclat dans la carrière que vous avez prise' (p.225). Unfortunately, Lucien finds it impossible to glory in his humiliation in the manner of a Du Poirier, 'fier de ses façons basses et familières; c'est ainsi que le cochon se vautre dans la fange avec une sorte de volupté insolente pour le spectateur' (LL, I, 183). Instead, appalled by Orleanism's halte dans la boue (p.102), he is forever looking for a way out of its bourbier sans issue (LL, II, 227): 'mais comment sortir de la boue où je suis plongé au moral comme au physique?'

Coffe despises Lucien for his distress after the Blois incident: 'le voilà qui souffre de son absurdité: il prétend réunir les profits du ministériel avec la susceptibilité délicate de

---

15 Du Poirier exposes the absurdity of this argument:

L'homme que le feu du canon prussien ne fait pas sourciller ne peut point être un hypocrite de bravoure; tandis que tirer le sabre contre des ouvriers qui se défendent avec des fusils de chasse, et qui sont quatre cents contre dix mille, ne prouve absolument rien, que l'absence de noblesse dans le cœur et l'envie de s'avancer. Remarquez l'effet sur l'opinion: dans cet ignoble duel, l'admiration pour la bravoure sera toujours, comme à Lyon, pour le parti qui n'a ni canon ni pétard. (LL, I, 186)
l'homme d'honneur. Quoi de plus sot!' (p.228). Coffe goes on, however, to concede that 'l'on peut dire à sa décharge qu'il n'y a peut-être pas un de ces coquins d'agents du ministre qui souffre par ce mécanisme. Cela fait son éloge...' (ibid.). Lucien and Coffe are attacked because they are misidentified as the authors of Torpet's political pamphlet. Lucien is therefore forced to submit to the just punishment of another man's crime and then hear the words: 'voyez comme il est sale; vous avez mis son âme sur sa figure!' (p.222). It is only at this late stage of the novel, at a moment of maximum humiliation, that Stendhal chooses after all to give the reader the 'objective' description of Lucien's original ill-advised stroll through the streets of Paris. Again, the 'objective' voice belongs to Coffe, admired by Lucien for his superior skill in mathematics (pp.230-31, 307), that is to say his 'instruction philosophique et dégagée de toute fausseté'.

Coffe echoes the narrator by again pointing out that the rioters were both heroic and absurd. However, he is much more rigorous in his analysis of this absurdity:

Faute de calcul ridicule, surtout chez les mathématiciens: nous étions deux cent cinquante jeunes gens, le gouvernement nous a opposé 12 000 paysans incapables du moindre raisonnement et que cette chaleur de sang qui anime tous les Français à l'aspect du danger font excellents soldats. Nous sommes tombés dans la même erreur que ces pauvres seigneurs russes en 1826. (LL, II, 231)

Lucien's folly, along with that of the other rioters, consists not in wanting to overthrow the government (indeed resisting such an overthrow becomes the folly of the brave but ignorant peasant soldiers, whose 'chaleur de sang' is presumably a déclassé version of the distinguished man's 'chaleur d'âme'), but rather in the Girondin self-delusion of thinking that such an overthrow can be effected without first establishing military superiority. The rioters of Blois choose a more suitable target, thereby winning the approval of Coffe, one of their victims (p.228, 231). Lucien himself will eventually be won around to Coffe's philosophical detachment. Thus, in the course of his second electoral mission, Lucien approves of the threatening crowd that gathers in the town:

Leuwen, qui se promenait hardiment partout, ne fut point insulté ce jour-là; il remarqua que cette foule sentait sa force. A moins de la mitrailer à distance, aucune force ne pouvait agir sur elle.

'Voilà le peuple vraiment souverain', se dit-il. (p.301)
Lucien's early attempt at applied Republicanism, like that of 'ces pauvres seigneurs russes en 1826' (the Decembrists), had come close to achieving distinction in Stendhalian terms: uniting the duperie of courage and generosity.

Courage is twice lauded in Lucien Leuwen as the only exception to the Orleanist rule of mediocrity (LL, I, 186; II, 255). Elsewhere, however, M. Leuwen cites the generalship required to win a battle as a further exception (LL, II, 105). By this measure, Lucien's revolt against Orleanism stands condemned. Lucien's 'faute de calcul' is reminiscent of Brutus's over-estimation of the Roman masses, an error replicated by Lucien who reports his father's following assessment of his shortcomings: 'toï, tu crois les affaires et les hommes plus grands qu'ils ne sont, et tu fais des héros, en bien ou en mal, de tous tes interlocuteurs. Tu tends tes filets trop hauts, comme dit Thucydide des Béotiens' (LL, I, 155).

A more practical education will be required to drive out such error and so allow popular insurrection to succeed in the face of well-organized government resistance. It is in this context that we should read the narrator's description of the otherwise level-headed Coffe, former star pupil of the Ecole Polytechnique, as a 'garçon fort silencieux, taciturne, qui avait voulu être fabricant et qui, parce qu'il avait les connaissances supérieures, avait cru avoir les inférieures' (p. 195). It is Stendhal's appreciation of the myth of Brutus that allows him to understand the difference between possessing on the one hand a superior soul (the combination of generosity and courage) and on the other the practical skills (habileté) required to establish durable government.

5. 'Le sang et la banqueroute'

M. Leuwen and his carefully selected friends are introduced as follows at the beginning of the second chapter:

C'étaient, avant tout, de ces hommes d'esprit et de plaisir qui, peut-être, le matin, s'occupent sérieusement de leur fortune; mais, le soir, se moquent de tout au monde, vont à l'Opéra et surtout ne chicanent pas le pouvoir sur son origine; car, pour cela, il faudrait se fâcher, blâmer, être triste. (LL, I, 101)

Coffé later tells Lucien: 'vous tendez vos filets trop haut' (LL, II, 247).
Stendhal is contrasting M. Leuwen's subservience to Orleanism, or indeed any
government, with Lucien's principled stand in the previous chapter. M. Leuwen, however,
clearly sees himself in a heroic light. Thus, when he later suggests good generalship as an
exception to otherwise universal hypocrisy, he chooses to associate it with another quality:
the ability to 'amuser quelqu'un dans la conversation' (LL, ii, 105). M. Leuwen is
genuinely affronted by Lucien's idealism because it turns the latter into a dreary
conversational partner. Lucien's tendency to 'se fâcher, blâmer, être triste' is held in almost
as low a regard as the fear and hatred of Republicans that drives conversation in the salon
of Mme Grandet, seen as a mirror-image of M. Leuwen's own (p.202).

Yet M. Leuwen's role in this apparent opposition between pragmatism and dogma, ludism
and idealistic principle, turns out, like so much else in his life, to be no more than a
complicated bluff. M. Leuwen finally lacks the ambitions he tries to simulate (p.384),
ever knowing what to do with the power he cannot help himself acquiring (p.357). In
Mme Leuwen's phrase: 'vous ne pouvez pas prendre votre glace, et vous avez peur qu'elle
ne se fonde' (pp.363-64). She had earlier suggested her husband adopt an alternative
course:

'Mais ne serait-ce pas un beau rôle que de faire le bien et de ne rien prendre?' dit Mme Leuwen.

'C'est ce que notre public ne croira jamais. M. de Lafayette à joué ce rôle pendant quarante ans,
et a toujours été sur le point d'être ridicule. Ce peuple-ci est trop gangrené pour comprendre ces
choses-là. Pour les trois-quarts des gens de Paris, M. de Lafayette eût été un homme admirable
s'il eût volé quatre millions.' (p.358)

M. Leuwen initially can think of no way out other than to plead ill-health and leave the
country (p.359). He eventually hits upon the Grandet couple as the solution to all his
problems. Assuming Mme Grandet were to become Lucien's mistress, all Paris would
believe that M. Leuwen had used his power to advance the interests of his bank by
appointing the cuckold husband to a ministry. M. Leuwen would therefore escape the
ridicule Paris attaches to probity and idealism. Lucien would escape similar ridicule by
virtue of his scandalous adultery. Finally, M. Leuwen would subvert a regime he
obviously despises first by imposing an absurd candidate, and second by arranging for the
public cuckolding of the new minister. These last aspects of M. Leuwen's plan form a
natural continuation of his tactics at the head of the Légion du Midi, designed to make a
mockery of parliamentary procedure.
M. Leuwen makes his maiden speech in defence of an absurdity (p.322), then achieves success with a second speech entirely lacking in common sense and (symbolically) scrawled on the back of a playing card (p.324). M. Leuwen likes to think that he is satirizing the prevailing order, as if he were speaking in his salon (p.357). In reality, he is forced to speak the language of the enemy, appropriating the impudence and charlatanism he finds so annoying in others (p.185). Thus M. Leuwen's salon is disbanded to make way for the entertainment of his legionaries, implicitly contrasted to their Roman and Napoleonic counterparts. Having first bribed his deputies with the offer of free food - he entertains his new guests by explaining the price of every fish devoured (p.320) - M. Leuwen goes on to offer them political advancement: 'M. Leuwen pensa qu'il devait profiter de la faiblesse de ces bonnes gens, auxquels l'esprit seul manquait pour être méchants' (p.356). M. Leuwen is playing a dangerous game of bluff, as later with the equally bloodthirsty Grandet.

At the beginning of the novel, Lucien's father is presented as follows: 'M. Leuwen père, l'un des associés de la célèbre maison Van Peters, Leuwen et compagnie, ne redoutait au monde que deux choses: les ennuyeux et l'air humide' (LL, I, 95). Yet Stendhal eventually informs the reader that M. Leuwen's capricious ludism has to compete against a sense of duty entirely consistent with Lucien's heroism and idealism. M. Leuwen's insistence that his life be governed purely with a view to pleasure (in the manner of the marquis de La Mole) is flatly contradicted by the narrator's statement: 'il n’était peut-être que deux choses auxquelles il n'eût jamais consenti: le sang, et la banqueroute' (LL, II, p.353). Thus it emerges that M. Leuwen himself withdrew from a promising entry at the court of Louis-Philippe, greatly envied by M. Grandet (p.389), precisely in order to disassociate himself from a government intent on murdering its citizens (pp.349-50). M. Leuwen seeks to disguise the moral basis for his decisions, even to himself. Thus he claims to abhor the idea of spilling blood on the grounds of good taste (p.350). Similarly, he refuses all subsequent invitations to dine with ministers 'sous prétexte qu’ils étaient ennuyeux' (ibid.). Yet M. Leuwen, for all his ludic bluster has conserved minimum moral standards, perhaps as a result of his 'campagne ou deux' in the Republican army of 1792. He shares both Lucien's distaste for Orleanism and the latter's scruples with regard to the massacre of civilians. M. Leuwen also brings this probity into his business dealings. Thus he refuses to avenge himself on Vaize in his capacity as banker (p.318) and is thrown into

---

17 This introduction is later repeated: 'il ne craignait que deux choses au monde: les ennuyeux, et l'air humide' (LL, II, 185).
despair by Mme Grandet doubting his word as a businessman (p.402). M. Leuwen's principled rejection of bankruptcy, shared by Coffe, further proves atypical of the banking community at large. Thus, in the course of the novel's dénouement, the reader is informed that even Van Peters, M. Leuwen's partner, had formerly filed for bankruptcy in New York (p.430). M. Leuwen's probity is Lucien's honour, the two qualities united at the end of the novel when Lucien insists on paying M. Leuwen's creditors in full rather than file for the bankruptcy urged on him by his father's former colleagues.

M. Leuwen's relationship with his wife underlines the secret seriousness that underpins M. Leuwen's apparent ludism. The reader is initially given a rather false impression of this relationship: 'le but unique de Mme Leuwen était d'amuser un mari qui avait vingt ans de plus qu'elle et passait pour être fort bien avec les demoiselles de l'Opéra' (LL, I, 97). It emerges, however, that M. Leuwen is in fact wholly reliant on his wife: 'M. Leuwen ne disait jamais la vérité qu'à sa femme, mais aussi il la lui disait toute; elle était pour lui comme une seconde mémoire à laquelle il croyait plus qu'à la sienne propre' (LL, II, 186). Indeed, only when he begins to develop political ambitions does he begin to hide a part of the truth from his wife (p.332). Mme Leuwen, however, is always open with her husband:

Notre lecteur s'étonnera peut-être qu'une femme qui, à quarante-cinq ans, était encore la meilleure amie de son mari, fût sincère avec lui. C'est qu'avec un homme d'un esprit singulier et un peu fou, comme M. Leuwen, il eût été excessivement dangereux de n'être pas parfaitement naïve. Après avoir été dupe un mois ou deux, par étourderie, par laisser-aller, un beau jour toutes les forces de cet esprit vraiment étonnant se seraient concentrées, comme le feu dans un fourneau à réverbère, sur le point à l'égard duquel on voulait le tromper; la feinte eût été découverte, moquée, et le crédit à jamais perdu. (p.375)

M. Leuwen's relationship with his wife is founded on sincerity, the very quality he affects to despise. His marriage is therefore a model for Lucien's own relationship with Mme de Chasteller. Just as Mme Leuwen appears jealous of the hold Mme de Chasteller has acquired on the heart of her son (p.177, 410, 428), so M. Leuwen appears jealous of the sincerity and fidelity of Lucien's affections:

La vieillesse n'est autre chose que la privation de folie, l'absence d'illusion et de passion. Je place l'absence des folies bien avant la diminution de la force physique. Je voudrais être amoureux, fût-ce de la plus laide cuisinière de Paris, et qu'elle répondît à ma flamme. Je dirais comme saint Augustin: Credo quia absurbum. Plus ta passion serait absurde, plus je l'envierais. (p.191)

M. Leuwen's insistence that Lucien court either Mme Grandet or an actress from the Opéra can therefore be seen as an attempt to undermine his son's capacity for the duperie
of love, a duperie M. Leuwen shares, although in a form weakened by his flirtation with paid mistresses drawn from the same theatrical corps. M. Leuwen's motives thus exposed, it is clear that Lucien must resist his father if he is to avoid becoming, in Durand's terminology, no more than a 'héros mal né, qui, dès la fin du premier livre se réfugie dans les jupes de Jocaste, et qui, au second livre, abandonne son destin entre les mains expertes d'un indulgent Œdipe!' (p.224).\(^{18}\)

6. 'Je serai un coquin'

Lucien is already a misanthrope when he arrives in Nancy. Thus he exclaims on receiving a letter from the Republican officers in his regiment:

Publius! Vindex! pauvres amis! vous auriez raison si vous étiez cent mille; mais vous êtes deux mille, peut-être, répandus dans toute la France, et les Filloteau, les Malher, les Dévelroy même, vous feront fusiller légalement si vous vous montrez, et seront approuvés par l'immense majorité. (LL, I, 156-57)

Lucien's distrust of 'l'immense majorité' prompts him to conclude: 'comment peut-on estimer assez les hommes, cette matière sale, pour être de l'opposition' (LL, II, 203). It is the failure of opposition to Orleanism which prompts Lucien to despair of his fellow citizens. As a result, France, and in particular Nancy, strike him as unremittingly ugly (LL, I, 124, 149). Lucien's political disappointments also prompt him to shun his fellow officers, the Republicans for their absurdity, the rest for their narrow egoism (p.163). Lucien will be similarly unforthcoming with his colleagues in the interior ministry: 'Lucien était, comme toutes les âmes tendres, au désespoir: tout lui était indifférent; il ne choisissait pas les hommes et se liait avec ce qui se présentait' (LL, II, 146). Lucien's indifference results in a predictable unpopularity. Thus Mme Leuwen remarks: 'on voit trop dans les façons de Lucien que la présence des hommes l'importune et l'irrite. C'est le genre de misanthropie que l'on pardonne le moins' (p. 146). Similarly, Vaize goes on to advise Lucien: 'n'oubliez pas surtout, mon cher Leuwen, que le plus vil coquin a de la vanité, et de l'honneur à sa manière. Aperçoit-il le mépris chez vous, il devient intraitable' (p.151).

Lucien is a misanthrope on the model of Coffe, 'par trop aimer les hommes' (p.319). Such misanthropy, however, again precludes the kind of active life Lucien needs to lead if he is

\(^{18}\) Durand presumably here means Laius, father of Oedipus and husband of Jocasta.
to learn his worth. Thus Lucien's models among his own generation live on the fringes of Orleanist society. Gauthier, again transparently modelled on Gros (LL, 1, 164), 'vivait tout juste de son métier d'arpenteur attaché au cadastre. Quant à son journal l'Aurore, il lui coûtait cinq ou six cents francs par an, outre les mois de prison' (p.165). Coffe, for his part, formulates the following maxim:

Quand on a le malheur de vivre sous un gouvernement fripon et le second malheur, fort grand à mon sens, de raisonner trop juste et de voir la vérité, on s'aperçoit que sous un gouvernement tel que le nôtre, pourri par essence, et plus que les Bourbons et Napoléon, car il trahit constamment son premier serment, l'agriculture et le commerce sont les seuls métiers indépendants. (LL, II, 232)

Lucien cannot accept such a peripheral role, partly because he feels the need to measure his worth, partly because he is initially too vain to resist an argument put forward by Du Poirier:

Un homme naît duc, millionnaire, pair de France; ce n'est pas à lui à examiner si sa position est conforme ou non à la vertu, au bonheur général et autres belles choses. Elle est bonne, cette position; donc il doit tout faire pour la soutenir et l'améliorer, autrement l'opinion le méprise comme un lâche ou un sot. (LL, I, 221-222).

Du Poirier is Lucien's fripon mentor, a Sansfin to Lucien's Lamiel. Stendhal underlines Du Poirier's friponnerie by embedding Louis-Philippe's satirical emblem, the poire (p.116) in his name. It is therefore little surprise to find out that Lucien is right to suspect him of secretly collaborating with Orleanism at the expense of his Legitimist masters (LL, I, 305, 307; II, 36, 333). Du Poirier's defence of privilege is contrasted to Gauthier's analysis:

Les privilèges sont chèrement achetés dans ce siècle, et Gauthier avait raison d'avoir pitié d'un homme qui s'appelle prince. J'avoue cette opinion à peu de personnes, ajoutait Gauthier, on y verrait l'envie la plus plate. Voici ses paroles: en 1834, le titre de prince ou de duc chez un jeune homme moins âgé que le siècle emporte une crise de folie. A cause de son nom, le pauvre jeune homme a peur, et se croit obligé d'être plus heureux qu'un autre. (LL, II, 311)

This fallacy, which recurs in La Chartreuse, is constantly promoted by M. Leuwen, for instance in his insistence that Lucien have the most beautiful woman in Paris for a mistress, or the most important possible job in government. The Blois incident serves to

19 Stendhal repeats this sentiment in Le Rose et le Vert, attributing it to Duclos: 'je n'ai pas fait l'abus, il était avant moi; ne pas en profiter quand il m'est favorable, ce serait montrer un cœur pusillanime' (RSN, p.284). M. Leuwen elsewhere states: 'pas de démission, mon ami, il n'y a que les sots qui donnent leur démission' (LL, II, 98).
alert Lucien to this process. Lucien asks Coffe whether he would have accepted his part in the electoral mission if he had 1,200 francs a year. Coffe answers: 'si j'avais 300 francs de rente seulement, je ne servirais pas le ministère, qui retient des milliers de pauvres diables dans les horribles cachots du Mont-Saint-Michel et de Clairvaux' (p.225). The novel will of course end with Lucien accepting no more than a 'pension viagère de 1 200 francs', along with a capital sum, as the inheritance from his father (p.432).

Lucien's misanthropy, like that of Octave, can be defused only by the unexpected discovery of love. Thus, a later outburst ('l'âme de l'homme est comme un marais infecte: si l'on ne passe pas vite, on enfonce') prompts the narrator to intervene:

Un mot de Mme de Chasteller eût changé ces idées philosophiques en extases de bonheur. L'homme malheureux cherche à se fortifier par la philosophie, mais pour premier effet elle l'empoisonne jusqu'à un certain degré en lui faisant voir le bonheur impossible. (p.51)

Lucien's recovery is therefore finally dependant on the success of his relationship with Mme de Chasteller:

Il n'avait rencontré dans sa vie qu'une ressource contre ce malheur, ridicule et si rare en ce siècle, de prendre les choses au sérieux: être enfermé avec Mme de Chasteller dans une petite chambre, et avoir d'ailleurs l'assurance que la porte était bien gardée et ne s'ouvrirait pour aucun importun qui pût paraître à l'improviste. (p.412)

It is for this reason that the misanthropy Lucien feels in the wake of his unsuccessful participation in the Paris riots is finally aggravated by Mme de Chasteller's 'betrayal'.

M. Leuwen suggests Lucien occupy his time by taking up a post in Vaize's Ministry of the Interior. This suggestion is twice couched in Mephistophelian terms:

'Serez-vous assez coquin pour cet emploi?'

Lucien tressaillit; son père le regarda avec le même air gai et sérieux tout à la fois. Après un silence, M. Leuwen père reprit:

'Oui, monsieur le sous-lieutenant, serez-vous assez coquin? Vous serez à même de voir une foule de petites manœuvres; voulez-vous, vous subalterne, aider le ministre dans ces choses, ou le contrecarrer? Voudrez-vous faire aigre, comme un jeune républicain qui prétend repétrir les Français pour en faire des anges? That is the question.' (LL, II, 96)

And again:
'Et que désirez-vous que je sois?' demanda Lucien d'un air simple.

'Un coquin', reprit le père, 'je veux dire un homme politique, un Martignac, je n'irai pas jusqu'à dire un Talleyrand. À votre âge et dans vos journaux, on appelle cela être un coquin. Dans dix ans, vous saurez que Colbert, que Sully, que le cardinal Richelieu, en un mot tout ce qui a été homme politique, c'est-à-dire dirigeant les hommes, s'est élevé au moins à ce premier degré de coquinerie que je désire vous voir.' (p.97)

M. Leuwen hopes to eradicate the last traces of Lucien's *duperie* (Girondism). Thus when Mme Leuwen observes that Lucien appears still to have a high opinion of Vaize's talents as an administrator, her husband replies:

C'est là notre seule ressource; c'est une admiration qu'il faut soigneusement entretenir. Cela est capital pour nous. Mon unique ressource, après avoir nié tant que je pourrai le coup de canif donné à la probité, sera de dire: Un ministre de ce talent est-il trop payé à 400 000 francs par an? Là-dessus je lui prouverai que Sully a été un voleur. Trois ou quatre jours après, je paraîtrai avec ma réserve, qui est superbe: le général Bonaparte, en 1796, en Italie, volait. Auriez-vous préféré un honnête homme comme Moreau, se laissant battre en 1799 à Cassano, à Novi, etc. Moreau coûtait au trésor 200 000 francs peut-être, et Bonaparte trois millions... J'espère que Lucien ne trouvera pas de réponse, et je vous réponds de son séjour à Paris tant qu'il admirera M. de Vaize. (p.133)

M. Leuwen hopes to fool Lucien into thinking that he will be emulating Napoleon, when actually he is far more likely to end up imitating a Talleyrand or a Martignac. M. Leuwen does not know, however, that Lucien only accepts his offer after identifying with Edgar, the hero of a philosophical 'portrait détaché' (a pastiche of Vauvenargues) which serves as a *mise en abyme* for the novel as a whole:

Qu'est-ce qu'un jeune homme qui ne connaît pas les hommes? qui n'a vécu qu'avec des gens polis, ou des subordonnés, ou des gens dont il ne choquait pas les intérêts? Edgar n'a pour garant de son mérite que les magnifiques promesses qu'il se fait à soi-même. Edgar a reçu l'éducation la plus distinguée, il monte à cheval, il mène admirablement son cabriolet, il a, si vous l'exigez, toute l'instruction de Lagrange, toutes les vertus de Lafayette, qu'importe! Il n'a point éprouvé l'effet des autres sur lui-même, il n'est sûr de rien ni sur les autres ni, à plus forte raison, sur soi-même. Ce n'est tout au plus qu'un brillant *peut-être*. Que sait-il au fond? Monter à cheval, parce que son cheval n'est pas poli et le jette par terre s'il fait un faux mouvement. Plus sa société est polie, moins elle ressemble à son cheval, moins il vaut. Laisse-t-il s'enfuir ces rapides années de dix-huit à trente ans sans *se colletter avec la nécessité*, comme dit Montaigne, il n'est plus même un *peut-être*; l'opinion le dépose dans l'ornière des gens communs, elle cesse de le regarder, elle ne voit plus en lui qu'un être comme tout le monde, important seulement par le nombre de billets de mille francs que ses fermiers placent sur son bureau. (pp.101-02)

Lucien exchanges the *duperie* of generosity (Girondism) for the energy of ambition, exclaiming: 'je serai un coquin' (p.102). Lucien's decision to compromise his ideals
therefore springs from a desire to put these ideals to the test. How can he know if he is a
distinguished man (a combination of Lagrange's 'instruction philosophique' and Lafayette's 'chaleur d'âme') if he passes his time in privileged leisure?

M. Leuwen's hopes are therefore frustrated. Yet these hopes (that Lucien become a vulgar *coquin* on a par with his contemporaries) turns out to be yet another bluff. Thus when Lucien and his father are discussing Ernest Dévelroy's latest scheme for obtaining a place in the ironically named *Académie des Sciences morales*, François Leuwen drops his guard. Ernest has offered to accompany an elderly academician to the waters at Vichy, emulating Frilair's tactics at the side of the elderly Bishop of Besançon in *Le Rouge*. M. Leuwen comments that Ernest will spare himself four years of waiting as a result of his 'campagne' in Vichy:

'Ne vaudrait-il pas mieux pour vous, mon père, avoir un tel fils?' dit Lucien presque attendri.

'Troppo aiuto a sant'Antonia', dit M. Leuwen. 'Je t'aime encore mieux avec ta vertu. Je ne suis pas en peine de l'avancement d'Ernest, il aura bientôt pour 30 000 francs de places, comme le philosophe N... . Mais j'aimerais autant avoir pour fils M. de Talleyrand.' (p.145)

7. 'Un cœur tout d'une pièce'

M. Leuwen wishes to transform Lucien into a person he himself is not. This rather complicated position is revealed at various points in the text, for instance when the narrator shows M. Leuwen worrying that Lucien should be more like M. Torpet, and implicitly less like the Girondins (including Brutus and Crescentius) out of step with their respective centuries:

Lucien continuait à se croire philosophe, et il ne voyait pas que, tout simplement, il avait l'impudence en horreur. C'était cette qualité poussée à l'extrême par M. de Torpet, et si indispensable au succès, qui lui donnait un dégoût si voisin de la colère. Cette horreur pour une qualité nécessaire était le symptôme qui alarmait le plus M. Leuwen père sur le compte de son fils.

'Il n'est pas fait pour son siècle', se disait-il, 'et ne sera jamais qu'un plat homme de mérite.' (pp.212-13)

The reader could be forgiven for thinking that M. Leuwen would prefer to have M. de Talleyrand for a son after all, were it not for the narrator's earlier description of M.
Leuwen: 'il faisait assez peu de cas de la société qui s'appelle bonne. L'imudence et le charlatanisme, sans lesquels on ne réussit pas, l'importunaient' (p.185).

François and Lucien Leuwen share a distaste for the qualities necessary for advancement in a fripon world. They similarly share a defensive aggressiveness summed up in Lucien's phrase: 'si l'on me taquine, on me trouvera' (LL, I, 231). Thus Lucien's declarations of war against Malher (p.256), Beausobre (II, 170-72) and Séranville (pp.265-67) are mirrored by his father's similar declarations against Beausobre (p.173), Vaize (p.323-24) and the minister of Finance (p.330).

François Leuwen seeks to (over)protect Lucien in part because he shares Ernest Dévelroy's belief that Lucien cannot hope to live separate from society, in part because he proves jealous of his son's lingering capacity for passion. When Lucien restates his antipathy to the charlatanism of Orleanist society, M. Leuwen makes it clear that Lucien will not be allowed simply to withdraw from his social obligations (p.189). Lucien will have to occupy himself with the business of winning what is essentially a social game. He must rid himself of his duperie (se dérousseauiser in Stendhal's terminology of 1811) and so become a fripon, whether vulgar (Torpet) or ludic (M. Leuwen). Yet M. Leuwen's interference proves finally more destructive than constructive in its aims, a point made ever more apparent as Lucien begins to prove himself as an administrator.

M. Leuwen is surprised by the skill Lucien shows in managing the affairs of state. Thus M. Leuwen ends a conversation with his wife, which again reveals the ancillary aim of his interference ('je compte avoir tout à fait chassé Mme de Chasteller de ce cœur-là'), by remarking:

Il faut que vous sachiez que Lucien a un travail admirable. J'ai d'admirables nouvelles de lui par le vieux Dubreuil, sous-chef de bureau depuis mon ami Crétet, il y a vingt-neuf ans de cela. Lucien expédie autant d'affaires au ministère que trois chefs de bureau. Il ne s'est laissé gâter par aucune des bêtises de la routine que les demi-sots appellent l'usage, le trantran des affaires. Lucien les décide net, avec témérité, de façon à se compromettre peut-être, mais de manière aussi à ne pas avoir à y revenir. Il s'est déclaré l'ennemi du marchand de papier du ministère et veut des lettres en dix lignes. Malgré la leçon qu'il a eue à Caen, il opère toujours de cette façon hardie et ferme. Et remarquez que, comme nous étions convenus, je ne lui ai jamais dit mon avis net sur sa conduite dans l'élection de M. Mairobert. Je l'ai bien défendue indirectement à la Chambre, mais il a pu voir dans mes phrases l'accomplissement d'un devoir de famille. (p.377)
Lucien has developed his own judgement and so learned to trust it. Thus the narrator amplifies M. Leuwen's earlier approbation:

Depuis quelques mois, notre héros était devenu beaucoup plus hardi, il avait vu de près les motifs qui font agir les hommes chargés des grandes places. Cette sorte de timidité qui à un œil clairvoyant annonce une âme sincère et grande n'avait pu tenir contre la première expérience des grandes affaires. S'il eût usé sa vie dans le comptoir de son père, il eût peut-être été toute la vie un homme de mérite, connu pour tel d'une personne ou deux. Il osait maintenant croire à son premier mouvement, et y tenir jusqu'à ce qu'on lui eût prouvé qu'il avait tort. (p.407)

M. Leuwen cares only for the satisfactions of game-play, whether administrative or social in character. He therefore takes no interest in showing Lucien how to manage the relatively dull affairs of the family bank. Indeed, it is clear that these affairs were formerly managed by M. Leuwen's partner, Van Peters, and allowed to drift after the latter's death. M. Leuwen therefore finally despises success as it is defined by Orleanist society. Instead, he prizes the concept of distinction (which he defines in terms of the *bien joué* of *esprit*).

Lucien is of course eager to earn his father's approbation and at the same time to establish some sort of measure for his practical talents. He therefore acts throughout his electoral mission in a manner designed to reveal once and for all his qualities of generalship (pp.272-73, 282). On his return to Paris, Lucien asks his father to act as judge of his efforts according to Caesarist criteria (pp.316-18). Crucially, however, Lucien needs his father's judgement (in any case deliberately withheld) to be counterbalanced by that of a *grande âme*: 'que dirait Mme de Chasteller si je lui racontais ma conduite?' (p.302).

Lucien has managed to retain the idealistic *duperie* of a Brutus despite acquiring the calculating decision-making talents of a Caesar. While in Nancy, Lucien notes:

Jusqu'ici je me suis principalement estimé parce que je n'étais pas un égoïste uniquement occupé à bien jouir du gros lot qu'il a reçu du hasard; je me suis estimé parce que je sentais avant tout l'existence de ces devoirs envers la patrie et le besoin de l'estime des grandes âmes. Je suis dans l'âge d'agir; d'un moment à l'autre la voix de la patrie peut se faire entendre; je puis être appelé; je devrais occuper tout mon esprit à découvrir les véritables intérêts de la France, que des fripons cherchent à embrouiller. (*LL*, 1, 248)

Lucien develops this sense of self-esteem by eschewing the role-play of an Ernest Dévelroy in favour of allowing his soul to roam in 'les espaces imaginaires' later explored in *La Chartreuse*: 'il jouissait vivement de sa liberté et de sa générosité, il ne voyait que de grandes choses à faire' (p.112). Lucien finally reveals himself a hero by retaining this
youthful perspective, despite the fact that his father is forever encouraging him to 'tuer la partie la plus noble de son âme' (*LL*, ii, 362). This source of conflict between father and son is finally articulated as follows:

Dans cette crise ministérielle vint se joindre à ce sujet de tristesse le remords cuisant de ne pas avoir d'amitié ou de tendresse pour son père. Le *chasme* entre ces deux êtres était trop profond. Tout ce qui, à tort ou à raison, paraissait sublime, généreux, tendre à Lucien, toutes les choses desquelles il pensait qu'il était noble de mourir pour elles, ou beau de vivre avec elles, étaient des sujets de bonne plaisanterie pour son père et une duperie à ses yeux. Ils n'étaient peut-être d'accord que sur un seul sentiment: l'amitié intime consolidée par trente ans d'épreuves. A la vérité, M. Leuwen était d'une politesse exquise et qui allait presque jusqu'au *sublime* et à la reproduction de la réalité pour les faiblesses de son fils; mais, ce fils avait assez de tact pour le deviner, c'était le sublime de l'esprit, de la finesse, de l'art d'être poli, délicat, parfait. (p.362)

The harshness of Lucien's critique of his father is further put in perspective a few pages later when Lucien remarks to himself as follows: 'comment parler de la vraie vertu, de la gloire, du beau, devant des sots qui comprennent tout de travers et cherchent à salir par de bonnes plaisanteries tout ce qui est délicat?' (p.366)

M. Leuwen appears, for his part, alternately aware and oblivious of this chasm. Thus Lucien's Machiavellian explanation of his projected seduction of Mme Grandet draws the following response from his father: 'le pauvre Lucien sera toujours dupe de toutes les femmes qu'il aimera. Je vois dans ce cœur-là du fonds pour être dupe jusqu'à cinquante ans...' (p.149). Similarly, M. Leuwen accuses his wife of having brought Lucien up to have 'un cœur si constant' or again 'un cœur tout d'une pièce' (p.133). Yet M. Leuwen makes the mistake of thinking that Lucien's new competence in affairs of state must have caused him to forget both about Mme de Chasteller and his idealistic need to be judged by the standards of a Plutarchian alliance of great souls, the standards of a Brutus and a Mme Roland as well as those of a Caesar and a Napoleon. This mistake prompts M. Leuwen to reveal his bargain with Mme Grandet to his son: 'M. Leuwen croyait parler à un homme politique, et commettait lui-même une lourde gaucherie' (p.403). It is at this point that M. Leuwen's spell is broken; Lucien revolts against the wishes of his parents and is immediately freed from their influence.

*Lucien Leuwen* ends with a decisive rejection of *friponnerie* and an affirmation of distinction, defined both in terms of 'chaleur d'âme' (*duperie*) and the *fermeté* that comes from an 'instruction philosophique'. At the beginning of the novel, Lucien makes an heroic choice to act, but at the wrong time. His heroism serves only to teach him that more is
required of him if he is to perfect his character. Lucien's frequent mishaps serve to mortify his vanity whereas his experiences as an administrator allow him to reassess his misanthropy. Lucien can therefore finally construct his personality around his instinctive generosity and acquired philosophy, and so pursue the life of virtue. At the end of the book, the timing of Lucien's heroism is forced on him by his father's unexpected death, a death which coincides with the final failure not only of M. Leuwen's banking business but also of his plans once more to emasculate his son. Indeed, at the time of M. Leuwen's death, Lucien has already rejected both his father's scheme to secure for his son the sexual favours of Mme Grandet and also his mother's interference in his affairs (p.89), as symbolized by her hatred for Mme de Chasteller (p.410, 428). Thus 'tout le plan de M. Leuwen est barbarement renversé' (p.590).

Lucien Leuwen is not so much a novel about survival, as mischievously suggested by Hemmings (p.138), but rather about the cultivation of the hero's integrity. Lucien's reward takes the form not of a reconciliation with Mme de Chasteller, but rather of liberty. The bankruptcy of François Leuwen's estate, and Lucien's insistence on discharging his debts in full rather than offer a settlement of even 90%, leaves Lucien free of his father's influence in the manner so ardently desired by both Mina de Vanghel and Mina Wanghen. Lucien is finally allowed to leave the social stage, to travel, to live not as a millionaire (a man who believes himself to be 'obligé d'être plus heureux qu'un autre') but rather in the anonymity afforded by the modest income Lucien consistently craves. Lucien travels to take up his post in Italy, not in the manner of the young Henry Brulard entering the army, but rather in the manner of Roizand in Une position sociale: a man equipped, through a combination of experience, philosophy and chaleur d'âme, with the 'sentiment des arts' (p.436) denied to the vast majority of his compatriots. Lucien is a hero in an unheroic world, condemned to social failure yet privileged in the eyes of his fellow grandes âmes.
3

**LA CHARTREUSE DE PARME**

'L'admiration pour ces âmes d'élite est supposée faire épigramme contre les gens au pouvoir.'

(De, p.429)

1. **A-Imagination**

The oppositions of Brutus and Caesar, Rousseau and Napoleon, presuppose an opposition between imagination (often associated with *dukerie*) and *le réel* (associated with *frignonnerie*). Although Stendhal consistently plays with this nexus of ideas in his fiction, this opposition is treated most schematically in *A-Imagination*, an embryonic sketch for a novel written between 1 and 3 August 1838. It describes the early career of Robert, son of Alexandre Macaire. The sketch therefore invokes Antier and Lemaitre's stock *frigon*, also taken up by Daumier and Charles Philippon in the course of the 1830s. Del Litto follows Crouzet in suggesting that the timing of Stendhal's renewed interest in the *frigon* archetype may have been influenced by the publication of Balzac's *César Birotteau* in December 1837.1

*A-Imagination* can be related to a number of Stendhal's other works of fiction, most notably the unfinished sketches *Le Juif* (1831) and *Don Pardo* (1840). *A-Imagination* furthermore stands in obvious opposition to the story told in *Le Chasseur vert*, 'par forme d'épisode', of the lancer Jérôme Ménuel (*L.L.,* 1, 178-82), described parenthetically as 'un homme à imagination' (p.181). Similarly, it stands in opposition to the re-exploration of German imagination in *Le Rose et le Vert* (1837), in part a reprise of *Mina de Vanghel* (1829)2, as well as to Stendhal's project of analysing the Don Juan through François Cenci (in *Les Cenci* of 1837) and Gilles de Retz (in the *Mémoires d'un touriste*, published on 30 June 1838). Finally, Crouzet has noted that *A-Imagination* was composed at a time when Stendhal was thinking about *La Chartreuse*. Indeed, Stendhal describes Fabrice as an inversion of Robert Macaire:

2 Robert Macaire represents 'l'attention au réel' (*OC, XLI*, p.75) as opposed to Mina's rejection of the 'réel de la vie' (*RSN*, p.212 [MV]).
Dans ses moments de loisir, son âme s'occupait avec ravissement à goûter les sensations produites par des circonstances romanesques que son imagination était toujours prête à lui fournir. Il était bien loin d'employer son temps à regarder avec patience les particularités réelles des choses pour ensuite deviner leurs causes. Le réel lui semblait encore plat et fangeux. (CP, p. 168)

Crouzet suggests the dual-composition of *A-Imagination* and *La Chartreuse* represents an 'étonnant carrefour stendhalien: d'une part cette imagination des minuties basses ou baroques, de l'autre celle des temps héroïques' (*OC*, XLIX, 379). This 'carrefour' is inscribed in the first lines of *A-Imagination*: 'l'âme passionnée, le jeune Jean-Jacques, s'attache aux prédictions de son imagination. Robert ne fait cas que de ce qu'il voit' (p. 74). Having re-introduced the notion of Rousseau's *duperie* as an ideal, Stendhal goes on to locate the origins of its careerist opposite: 'on a souvent pensé à faire un jeune homme montant vers la fortune à travers les circonstances d'un monde de telle époque, par exemple le monde de 1811: Cambacérés, le Conseil d'Etat, la cour des Tuileries, etc., etc.' (ibid.). Stendhal is looking back at his own brief abandonment of *passion* in favour of the enviable career-progression represented by his 1810 appointment as an 'auditeur' to the Conseil d'Etat. In other words, Stendhal is looking back at his decision to *se dérousseauiser*. Thus Stendhal compares (and perhaps implicitly contrasts) himself with a fictional careerist of his own creation: 'l'auteur voulait, il [y] a dix ans, faire un jeune homme tendre et honnête, il l’a fait ambitieux, mais encore rempli d'imagination et d'illusion dans Julien Sorel' (ibid.). This distinction between the unimaginative friponnerie of a Robert Macaire and the imaginative friponnerie of the Caesarist Julien is again raised by Stendhal ironically conferring the name *César dans les Gaules* to the shop of the 'marchand bonnetier', Alexandre Macaire (pp. 75-76).

Stendhal determines to 'Mettre *my imagination* à peindre l'absence d'imagination. Me dire: "Que sentirais-je à sa place?" et lui faire sentir le contraire' (p. 74). The author therefore 'prétend faire Robert absolument sans imagination autre que celle qui sert à inventer des tours pour parvenir à la fortune, mais il ne s'amuse pas à se figurer la fortune et ses plaisirs. L'expérience lui a déjà appris que ces imaginations-là ne se réalisent point; *alors comme alors*, dit-il; c'est sa maxime favorite' (ibid.). Del Litto has noted that the rigid schematism evident in *Le Rose et le Vert* marks a return to Stendhal's 'poétique établie trente ans auparavant: l'opposition systématique et raisonnée des passions, des liens et états sociaux. Si à un an et demi de là, il n'y avait pas eu *La Chartreuse de Parme*, on serait autorisé à penser que la vocation de Stendhal pour le roman est une légende!' (*Le
Rose et le Vert, p.509). This attempt to distinguish between Stendhal's 'unsuccessful' schematic works and his 'successful' spontaneous works eventually led Del Litto to offer similar criticisms of Lucien Leuwen.\(^3\) Le Rose et le Vert of course echoes Lucien Leuwen thematically, for instance in the heroine's desire to rid herself of an oppressive parental fortune, echoed by that of (Napo)Léon Malin-La-Rivoire, a most Lucien-like hero.\(^4\)

Similarly, it echoes Lucien Leuwen in points of detail, for instance through the reappearance of 'ces tables de bois peintes en vert qui garnissent le Chasseur-Vert (grünner Jäger), jardin anglais, situé à un quart de lieu de Kœnigsberg [as opposed to Nancy]' (RSN, p.231) or the renewed anecdote relating to the introduction of 'le poing coupé' as a punishment under the new law of sacrilege (LL, ii, 120; RSN, p.307). It is worth remembering, however, that Léon can be compared to Fabrice as well as to Lucien. In particular, Léon's double affiliation to General Malin-La-Rivoire, Duke of Montenotte, and his godfather, Napoléon, prefigures Fabrice's double affiliation to the lieutenant Robert, later a general on the field of Waterloo (CP, p.53), and the Emperor.

Stendhal never abandons his overtly schematic approach to fiction. Julien, Lucien, Fabrice and Lamiel are each supremely artificial creations, their behaviour illustrative of rigidly defined qualities and attributes in the manner of Plutarch's exemplars. Del Litto's qualitative concerns with regard to Le Rose et le Vert reflect not so much Stendhal's reliance on schematic as opposed to 'spontaneous' plotting, but rather the relative crudity of its schematism. This crudity resulted in Le Rose et le Vert, unlike Lucien Leuwen, being abandoned before it reached the second stage of composition. Its status as an unrevised draft therefore reveals the schematic opposition of passions, liens and social classes that underpin all his fiction (OI, ii, 877 [VHB]). Hence the parallels between Julien, Lucien and Fabrice, respectively proletarian, bourgeois and aristocratic heroes. The schema, however, must be sufficiently developed to allow for complexity, variation and dramatic tension. Only then can Stendhal's oppositions be integrated within a process of 'spontaneous' re-writing.\(^5\)


\(^4\) See especially RSN, pp.284-90 on the problems faced by this former student of the Ecole polytechnique.

\(^5\) See for instance Crouzet's discussion of this process in his introduction to Lucien Leuwen, (1, 22-24). Crouzet explicitly distinguishes between Lucien Leuwen and other 'abandoned' works such as Le Rose et le Vert (p.24), suggesting that the latter works suffered from a lack (as opposed to Lucien Leuwen's surfeit) of ideas.
The schematism of *A-Imagination* recalls that of early fragments such as *Les Deux hommes* and *Le Vigneron Jean-Louis*. Robert is the pure manifestation of friponnerie. He therefore shares Du Poirier's maxim, 'alors comme alors' (*LL*, 1, 81, 333), the maxim of a 'cool head' (*OC*, XLIX, 74 [*A-Imagination]*)). Du Poirier is finally, however, a more nuanced character. Thus he is portrayed as a physical coward, tortured by his imagination on this one point: 'sa profonde science médicale s'était mise au service d'une lâcheté rare en France, son imagination lui représentait les suites chirurgicalement tragiques d'un coup de poing ou d'un coup de pied au cul bien assenés' (*LL*, 1, 335). Jérôme Ménuel, despite showing bravery in the course of numerous duels, also discovers himself to be a coward once in battle, his imagination greatly overestimating the danger he faces (*LL*, 1, 180).

This theme recurs in the *Mémoires d'un touriste*: Gilles de Retz, 'cet être esclave de son imagination', breaks down immediately under the thought (rather than the experience) of torture (*VFR*, pp.263-64). Robert Macaire is therefore the opposite of the Don Juan: 'il faut, pour que le caractère de don Juan éclate, la réunion d'une grande fortune, d'une bravoure extraordinaire, de beaucoup d'imagination et d'un amour effréné pour les femmes' (p.261). Implicitly, he therefore stands in opposition also to François Cenci and, by a process of association, the great souls of the Italian sixteenth century again investigated between 1837 and 1838. Indeed, *A-Imagination* was written in the gap between the composition of *La Duchesse de Palliano* in July 1838 and its publication on 15 August of the same year. More importantly, perhaps, it was written at a time when Stendhal was thinking about *L'Abbesse de Castro*, published in two parts in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* of 1 February and 1 March 1839.

2. *L'Abbesse de Castro*

A note written in 1833, forming the basis of a preface to the *Historiettes romaines*, points ahead to the opposition of this group of stories to *A-Imagination*: 'les crimes fondés sur l'argent ne sont que plats, et l'on en trouvera bien peu ici' (*CI*, 2, 43). The hero of *A-Imagination* is contrastingly described as follows: 'Robert, à quatorze ans, est un petit coquin complet, quant au cœur. Il vole des bonbons aux étalages des petits marchands avec Carière, son camarade âgé de seize ans' (*OC*, XLIX, 75). Stendhal expects nineteenth-century readers to find sixteenth-century heroism rather hard going. Stendhal notes in his introduction to *A-Imagination*: 'le jockey [member of the then fashionable Jockey-Club] lisant un roman ordinaire est choqué de l'imagination qui le fatigue, et même, s'il a un peu d'esprit, lui inspire de l'envie. Ici, il est frappé de l'attention au réel et ne peut refuser son
The narrator of *L'Abbesse de Castro* is sufficiently wary of the modern reader for him to refuse to give details of the career of the brigand Marco Sciarra: 'L'histoire détaillée de cet illustre brigand serait incroyable aux yeux de la génération présente, en ce sens que jamais on ne voudrait comprendre le motif de ses actes' (*CI*, 1, 125). It is presumably as a result of this incapacity that the nineteenth-century reading public has allowed itself to be taken in by the Gothic novel's descriptions of Italian brigands:

Le mélodrame nous a montré si souvent les brigands italiens du XVIe siècle, et tant de gens en ont parlé sans les connaître, que nous en avons maintenant les idées les plus fausses. On peut dire en général que ces brigands furent l'opposition contre les gouvernements atroces qui, en Italie, succédèrent aux républiques du Moyen Age. (p. 119)

Stendhal is again making the point that modern representations of heroism (in this case brigandage) from a previous age concern themselves purely with surface ('la peau de la statue'). Having after all identified 'le motif' of brigandage as political opposition to tyranny, the narrator goes on to explain himself even more clearly:

Lorsque, par malheur pour la félicité publique, pour la justice, pour le bon gouvernement, mais par bonheur pour les arts, les républiques du Moyen Age furent opprimées, les républicains les plus énergiques, ceux qui aimeraient la liberté plus que la majorité de leurs concitoyens, se réfugièrent dans les bois. (p. 124)

This tyrannicidal definition of brigandage clearly recalls the legends of Brutus and Crescentius, identified by Stendhal as men who loved liberty more than the majority of their fellow citizens (*VIT*, pp. 851-52 [PR]). Stendhal drives this point home by opting for the same strategy already employed in the *Promenades dans Rome* and the *Vie de Henry Brulard*, grounding his story among the ruins of ancient Rome. Thus the narrator's opening treatise on brigandage locates 'le dernier théâtre des exploits de Marco Sciarra'

6 The narrator makes a similar point when he reveals that Hélène has received an education in the major poets (Virgil, Petrarch, Ariosto and Dante).

Les vers qu'on lui faisait apprendre parlaient d'amour, et d'un amour qui nous semblerait bien ridicule, si nous le rencontrions en 1839; je veux dire l'amour passionné qui se nourrit de grandes sacrifices, ne peut subsister qu'environné de mystère, et se trouve toujours voisin des plus affreux malheurs. (p. 132)
(p.125) in the forest of la Faggiola, 'le quartier général d'un gouvernement \(\textit{Gemeinschaft}\) ennemi de celui de Sa Sainteté' (p.129). Through the forest, the triumphal road used by the first Kings of Rome (p.127) runs to the summit of Monte Cavi, former site of 'le temple de Jupiter Férétrien, où les peuples latins venaient sacrifier en commun et reserrer les liens d'une sorte de fédération religieuse' (p.126). From this summit, also site of the ruins of Alba ('la mère de Rome'):

L'œil distingue les moindres détails de ce pays sublime qui pourrait se passer d'illustration historique, et cependant chaque bouquet de bois, chaque pan de mur en ruine, aperçu dans la plaine ou sur les pentes de la montagne, rappelle une de ces batailles si admirables par le patriotisme et la bravoure que raconte Tite-Live. (p.127)

Jules Branciforte lives outside the modern town of Alba, alone among the ruins of the ancient city. Jules's Roman heritage is therefore signalled both by his surroundings and by his father's profession. There is, however, some doubt as to whether 'le capitaine Branciforte' is a brigand (p.154) or a 'soldat d'aventure' (p.147). Jules, as his name signals, therefore draws not only on the legend of Brutus (exemplar of brigandage as opposition to tyranny) but also on that of Caesar (exemplar to all \(\textit{condottieri}\)). Thus Marco Sciarrà can be seen not only as the heir to Brutus through his opposition to an absolutist established order, but also as the heir to Caesar in his organization of a successful \(\textit{Gemeinschaft}\). Caesar's legacy is invoked by the military techniques employed by Jules's commander, Fabrice Colonna. His forest ambush of enemy troops (p.162), decision to hang all captured prisoners (p.166) and practice of burning villages with the men and women trapped inside (p.192) all recall Caesar's methods in \textit{The Gallic War}. This impression is reinforced by Colonna's pagan references when issuing his orders: 'l'ombre du brave capitaine Ranuce paraîtra bien accompagnée devant Pluton. J'ai donné l'ordre que l'on pende aux branches des arbres tous ces coquins de prisonniers' (p.166).

Jules appears to share his commander's ruthlessness. He pre-empts Colonna's orders just cited, exclaiming to the men of his company: 'sabrons ces coquins de sbires qui s'enfuient de toutes parts' (p.165). After the battle, Jules kills one of his own soldiers for having dared to doubt his command on the grounds of his relative youth (p.166). This last act recalls his father's murder of a 'mauvais plaisant' (p.146). Yet, elsewhere in the text, Jules finds himself subdued by his love for Hélène. Thus he informs her that he has forgone murdering her father, despite the latter's calculated insults (pp.136-37). Ranuce, the old

---

7 See \textit{VIT}, p.606 [\textit{PR}] and \textit{OI}, ii, 531 [\textit{VHB}] for similar invocations of Livy.
companion of capitaine Branciforte, declares himself disgusted with this decision (p.149). He makes two speeches to Jules, similar in content to those of Ernest Dévelroy ('comme tu gaspilles une admirable position', *LL*, i, 98) and François Leuwen ('la ressource la plus douce qui reste, c'est de se brûler la cervelle ou, si l'on n'en a pas le courage, d'aller se jeter à la Trappe', *LL*, ii, 188) respectively:

'Il faut que tu sois fou', lui dit-il, 'et de plus bien dupe, pour vivre auprès d'Albano comme le dernier et le plus pauvre de ses habitants, tandis qu'avec ce que je te vois faire et le nom de ton père tu pourrais être parmi nous un brillant soldat d'aventure, et de plus faire ta fortune.' (p.147)

And again, on the discovery that Jules is down to his last two écus:

'Je te conseille de te faire moine', dit-il à Jules, 'tu en as toutes les vertus: l'amour de la pauvreté, en voici la preuve; l'humilité, tu te laissez vilipender en pleine rue par un richard d'Albano; il ne te manque plus que l'hypocrisie et la gourmandise.' (p.150)

Hélène's father informs the reader that 'le capitaine Branciforte', 'au milieu de tous ses crimes, fut brave et généreux, généreux au point d'enrichir plusieurs de ses soldats et de rester pauvre lui-même' (p.156). This perhaps explains Ranuce's fondness for Jules, and accounts in part for the latter's own instinctive generosity, admittedly finally contrasted with the behaviour of his father. Thus the narrator notes of Jules that, 'avant d'aimer Hélène, et sans savoir pourquoi, il adorait la guerre, mais il avait de la répugnance pour le pillage, qui, aux yeux de son père le capitaine et de Ranuce, était comme la petite pièce destinée à faire rire, qui suit la noble tragédie' (p.147). A Caesar in his love of war, Jules is also a Brutus in his generosity and equity. The narrator goes on to comment on Jules's singularity in this respect, again in relation to his love for Hélène:

La joie qu'il [Jules] eut d'acheter de beaux habits avec les doublons que Ranuce lui avait donnés était cruellement altérée par cette idée bien extraordinaire pour son siècle, et qui annonçait les hautes destinées auxquelles il parvint dans la suite; il se disait: 'Il faut qu'Hélène connaisse qui je suis'. [i.e. that he is a brigand] Tout autre homme de son âge et de son temps n'eût songé qu'à jouir de son amour et à enlever Hélène, sans penser en aucune façon à ce qu'elle deviendrait six mois après, pas plus qu'à l'opinion qu'elle pourrait garder de lui. (pp.150-51)^

This intervention on the narrator's part again bears comparison to the *Promenades*:

---

^ The narrator returns to this theme a few pages later: 'il [Jules] comprit qu'avec une âme scrupuleuse comme la sienne il ne pouvait trouver de bonheur durable, tant qu'il n'aurait fait à sa maîtresse cet aveu terrible qui eût semblé une si lourde sottise à ses amis de Rome' (p.154).
Comme le marquis de Posa de Schiller, comme le jeune Brutus, Crescentius n'appartenait pas à son siècle; c'était un homme d'un autre âge. Notre Révolution s'est chargée de fournir un nom à cette espèce d'hommes généreux et malhabiles à conduire les affaires: c'était un girondin. Pour agir sur les hommes, il faut leur ressembler davantage; il faut être plus coquin. Peut-être faut-il être au moins aussi coquin que Napoléon. (VIT, p.852)

Jules Branciforte certainly lacks such coquinerie. Even in military matters, Jules is a dupe. Thus, the narrator notes that 'il avait cru, ainsi que les peuples enfants [for instance the Gauls Caesar describes in The Gallic War], que la guerre ne consiste qu'à se battre avec courage' (p.171). Fabrice Colonna quickly disabuses him of this and many other foolish ideas. Colonna protects himself by always denying his part in illegal actions, even when discussing these actions with the subordinates who received and carried out his instructions. This practice leaves Jules in a state of great astonishment (p.172). His 'innocence' prompts Colonna to explain the policy that Jules will henceforth be expected to observe:

Ne dire jamais la vérité sur rien de ce qui a rapport à moi ou à mes soldats. Si, dans le moment où vous êtes obligé de parler, vous ne voyez l'utilité d'aucun mensonge! dites faux à tout hasard, et gardez-vous comme de péché mortel de dire la moindre vérité. (p.173)

Jules reacts in a way which wrong-foots the cynical Prince:

Jules fut attendri par ces conseils paternels, venant d'un homme ordinairement si grave. D'abord le prince sourit des larmes qu'il voyait rouler dans les yeux du jeune homme; puis sa voix à lui-même s'altéra. Il tira une des nombreuses bagues qu'il portait aux doigts; en la recevant, Jules baisa cette main célèbre par tant de hauts faits. (pp. 173-74)

Colonna's 'hauts faits' consist largely in the indiscriminate massacre of civilians. Yet Jules judges Colonna according to the virtues most prized in a Gemeinschaft: loyalty and valour. Colonna in turn values Jules as an exemplar of these virtues. Jules transcends his apparent status as soldier of fortune (mercenary) by affiliating himself to the patriarchal Colonna. In other words, Jules uses his imagination to transcend the considerations of narrow self-interest that determine the conduct of Robert Macaire in A-Imagination and so becomes the ideal lieutenant. This imaginative process comes to its final fruition when Jules is forced into exile in Spain:

Le vieux prince Fabrice parlait souvent et avec transports des traits de bravoure surhumaine du colonel Lizzara (Jules Branciforte) qui, tout à fait semblable aux héros des vieux romans,

9 Lucien similarly wrong-foots his father by throwing himself into the alleged cynic's arms (LL, II, 193).
cherchait à se distraire par de belles actions de l'amour malheureux qui le rendait insensible à tous les plaisirs. (p.219)

Stendhal's choice of Spain as the country of exile further emphasizes the parallels with Don Quixote in any case evident from his reference to 'vieux romans', that is to say the romances that prompted the knight from La Mancha to live in his imagination.

The triumph of imagination in the military career of Colonel Lizzara is contrasted to the fate of Hélène de Campireali. The narrator echoes Le Rouge by announcing that 'l'on pourrait terminer ici son [Hélène's] histoire' (p.214). He chooses, however, to continue a story he clearly finds painful:

Nous allons, en effet, assister à la longue dégradation d'une âme noble et généreuse. Les mesures prudentes et les mensonges de la civilisation, qui désormais vont l'obséder de toutes parts, remplaceront les mouvements sincères des passions énergiques et naturelles. (ibid.)

Hélène's decline starts from the moment she chooses to reject the role of dupe: 'voici assez de temps que je suis agneau dans ce couvent, il faut être loup' (p.221). This rejection prompts her to embark on a new kind of relationship, founded not on equity but rather the mutual subjugation that also characterizes the relationship of Julien and Mathilde, and, to a lesser extent, Lucien and Mme Grandet. Thus Cittadini, Bishop of Castro and Hélène's new lover, defines his attraction to her as follows: 'ailleurs je commande, et, je l'avoue à ma honte, j'y trouve quelque plaisir; auprès de vous, j'obéis comme un esclave, mais avec un plaisir qui surpasse de bien loin celui de commander ailleurs' (p.227). Hélène's pleasure in giving orders, whether to the nuns of her convent or to her powerful new lover, cannot compensate her for the pleasures offered by the loyalty and courage that characterized her relationship with Jules. She therefore finally reflects negatively on her appointment as Abbess:

Cette place ne fut, pour moi, qu'une source d'ennuis; elle acheva d'avilir mon âme; je trouvai du plaisir à marquer mon pouvoir souvent par le malheur des autres; je commis des injustices. Je me voyais, à trente ans, vertueuse suivant le monde, riche, considérée, et cependant parfaitement malheureuse. (p.247)

Hélène's 'dégradation' is symbolized in the text by the episode of her secret pregnancy, an inversion of Mme de Chasteller's false pregnancy in Lucien Leuwen. It is signalled by her reluctance to comply with an oath freely sworn before the Madonna, this time an inversion
of Clélia's refusal to break a similar oath in *La Chartreuse.*\(^\text{10}\) This reluctance results from a conflict of loyalty. Hélène allows her passion for Jules to be shaken by her sense of obligation and gratitude towards the mother who returns her love-letters claiming she has not even read them (the same gratitude Julien shows to Mme de Rénal for retrieving his portrait of Napoleon without looking to see what it is): 'Hélène rentra dans sa chambre, fondant en larmes; il lui semblait que, depuis ces paroles de sa mère, elle n'aimait plus Jules' (p.143). Hélène reaches the opposite conclusion only once Jules has almost been killed in the failed siege of the convent: 'j'ai eu la faiblesse de dire un mot à ma mère et le sang de Jules a coulé; il pouvait perdre la vie dans cet assaut sublime où son courage a tout fait' (p.208). Thus, 'il lui sembla qu'elle n'aimait plus du tout sa mère' (p.209). The narrator picks up the theme of overly-prescriptive parenting where *Lucien Leuven* left off:

Nous verrons que c'est Victoire Carafa, la mère d'Hélène, qui, par une suite de moyens adroits et fort savamment combinés, amena la mort cruelle de sa fille si chérie, après avoir fait son malheur pendant douze ans, triste résultat de la manie de régner. (p.215)

Victoire Carafa (presumably a relation of the Carafas featured in *La Duchesse de Palliano*) is helped in her plans by Fabrice Colonna. Together they conspire to smuggle Jules to Spain (pp.216-17) and to discourage Hélène from finding him (pp.217-18). They manage between them to persuade Jules that Hélène is married and Hélène that Jules is dead (pp.219-20). The consequence of this interference is to undermine the foundations of virtue.

*L'Abbesse de Castro* subscribes to the Alfierian notion, already advanced in the prefatory notes intended for the *Historiettes romaines* (*CI*, ii, 23, 73) that the relative brutality of sixteenth-century life helped free language and manners from the evils of hypocrisy and vanity (*CI*, i, 120, 123, 133). This brutality finds its ultimate articulation in 'la main de fer de la justice' (*CI*, i, 23). The narrator therefore criticizes Gregory XIII for his reluctance to inflict the death penalty (*CI*, i, 128-29). Stendhal shows the prospects of execution, assassination and torture serving as stimuli to the imaginative love Fabrice Colonna and Victoire Carafa hope to suppress. Thus Hélène views the apparently voluntary absence of Jules as 'le pire des supplices' (p.144) because she herself is braving constant danger (p.143). Similarly, Hélène associates herself with the dangers run by Jules: 'cette fille, si simple jusqu'ici et qui semblait un enfant à la vivacité de ses mouvements, avait changé de caractère depuis qu'elle aimait. Elle savait que la moindre imprudence compromettrait la

\(^{10}\) Jules's killing of Fabio de Campireali similarly prefigures Fabrice's killing of Giletti.
vie de son amant' (p.139). Sixteenth-century government has institutionalized this mechanism for building the character of its citizens through the powers of torture it confers to the courts. Trials can be bought in sixteenth-century Rome (p.159) just as they can be bought in nineteenth-century Parma (CP, pp. 186-87, 261, 483, 485) and Orleanist France (LL, II, 276). However, the criminal trial that convicts Hélène and her lover, Cittadini, provides another model of sixteenth-century jurisprudence in action, similar to that already lauded by Stendhal in Les Cenci and Vittoria Accoramboni. The accumulation of circumstantial and testimonial evidence results in Cittadini's final torture leading to the incontrovertible emergence of the truth. The 'patient' is allowed to preserve his dignity through a show of courage, yet at the same time serves as a deterrent to future crime, acting on the imagination of the Pope's subjects in the same way that the thought of the Austrian Spielberg haunts Fabrice's imagination. Such practice tends to the elimination of the crimes without pleasure denounced both in Le Rouge and Lucien Leuwen, leaving only the exemplary, passionate and imaginative crimes of Stendhal's great souls.

3. 'Générations décroissantes'

Stendhal first made use of the Italian manuscript Origine delle grandezze della famiglia Farnese in a brief adaptation which Romain Colomb entitled La Jeunesse d'Alexandre Farnese.  

Il ne faut chercher ici ni la gravité ni la certitude historiques, mais des habitudes et des usages, suivant lesquels on cherchait le bonheur en Italie vers l'an 1515, à l'époque où ce beau pays comptait parmi ses citoyens l'Arioste, Machiavel, Raphaël, Michel-Ange, le Corrège; le Titien et tant d'autres.

Quelques personnes prendront peut-être la liberté de croire que cette civilisation-là valait celle qui fait notre orgueil au XIXème siècle. Mais nous avons de plus deux bien belles choses: la décence et l'hypocrisie. (CI, II, 234)

This sixteenth century is made up of exemplars, each subsequently invoked in La Chartreuse. Durand and Pearson have written on Stendhal's use of epic archetypes drawn from Ariosto. Similarly, Coe and Philippe Berthier have written on Stendhal's

---

11 Colomb also established the date of 27 August 1832 for this adaptation. Scholars now accept that it was in fact written in late 1838 (CP, p.568).

evocations of Correggio. The opposition of Raphael and Michelangelo, familiar from the Promenades, is doubled by that of Ariosto (generosity and imagination) and Machiavelli (ambition and realism). Already in L'Abbesse de Castro, Jules is subjected to the competing influences of Ariosto (a formative influence on Hélène) and Machiavelli (Fabrice Colonna is a most Machiavellian Prince). In La Chartreuse, Fabrice will again be caught between these two influences, oscillating between the duperie of a Don Quixote and the coquinerie of Mosca.

Stendhal's list of exemplars ends with an ironic comparison of sixteenth-century and contemporary civilizations which introduces what Durand refers to as the 'thème des générations décroissantes' (Le Décor, p.40). This apparently simple manoeuvre will eventually be complicated in La Chartreuse. Fabrice lives in an inverted world, where the heirs of Vespasien del Dongo and Borso Valserra wear powdered wigs and worship the honours bestowed on them by remote absolute monarchs. By contrast, in the world of La Jeunesse, 'la vanité et le qu'en dira-t-on naissaient à peine; et, par exemple, on ne prenait point au sérieux les honneurs décernés par les princes' (CI, II, 235). Stendhal concludes that 'le monde était jeune' (ibid.). It is perhaps for this reason that: 

Toutes nos vertus momièrnes eussent semblé complètement ridicules aux contemporains de l'Arioste et de Raphaël; c'est qu'alors on n'estimait dans un homme que ce qui lui est personnel, et ce n'était pas une qualité personnelle que d'être comme tout le monde; on voit que les sots n'avaient pas de ressource. (ibid.)

It is this world that is recreated in the famous opening chapter of La Chartreuse. The youthfulness of the French army restores Milan to its natural state of 'volupté', formerly evident under the Visconti and the Sforza (CP, pp.10-11). Thus Napoleon's entry in Milan symbolizes a return to the sixteenth century; it also symbolizes a return to the glories of the ancient world: 'le 15 mai 1796, le général Bonaparte fit son entrée dans

---

13 Richard N. Coe, 'From Correggio to Class Warfare: Notes on Stendhal's Ideal of "la grâce"', in Balzac and the Nineteenth Century: Studies in French Literature Presented to Herbert J. Hunt, ed. D.G. Charlton and others (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1972), pp.239-54 and Philippe Berthier, 'Stendhal et le clair-obscur', Aurea Parma, 51 (1967), 158-74. The contours of Hélène's mouth are compared to a drawing by Correggio (CI, I, 131), just as Borda later credits Fabrice with 'une physionomie à la Corrège' (CP, p.98). Stendhal famously declared in his reply to Balzac's article on La Chartreuse that 'tout le personnage de la duchesse Sanseverina est copié du Corrège (c'est-à-dire produit sur mon âme le même effet que le Corrège)' (OC, xxv, 525).
Milan à la tête de cette jeune armée qui venait de passer le pont de Lodi, et d'apprendre au monde qu'après tant de siècles César et Alexandre avaient un successeur' (p.5).

The return to Caesarism is, however, simultaneously a return to Republicanism. Thus the French Republican army, at first seen as a 'ramassis de brigands' (ibid.), awakens a valour explicitly associated with the Lombard Republicanism of the Middle Ages (ibid.). This valour is symbolized by Vespasien del Dongo, Fabrice's exemplary ancestor from the Latin genealogy the Marquis del Dongo insists he study. Vespasien is sent by Galeazzo Sforza to deliver a letter to a castle on Lake Como. On his way, he decides to read the letter and discovers that it is his own death warrant. Vespasien writes new instructions in a gap Sforza has left between the warrant and his signature, suppresses the head of the letter, takes command of all the castles on the lake, throws the previous commander down a well and declares war on Sforza (pp.188-89). This show of independence eventually results in the grant of extensive lands around Grianta, still the basis of the family's fortune in the nineteenth century. Thus the origins of the grandeur of the del Dongo family lie not in an act of prostitution, as in the case of the Farnese family (Cl, II, 233), but rather in an act of secession from tyranny. The 'volupté' of Sforza's court, recreated at the court of Prince Eugene, brings with it a 'bravoure' inimical to established power and the rule of law. Ironically, in nineteenth-century Parma, such power is invested in the direct heirs of two further exemplars, Alessandro Farnese and Crescentius.

Ranuce-Ernest IV is a Farnese, descended from Pierluigi, the son of Alessandro mentioned at the end of Origine delle grandezze (p.232). Clélia's husband, the Marquis Crescenzi, is for his part descended from Crescentius. Indeed, as part of the wedding festivities, the Marquis arranges for this aspect of his family's history to be commemorated:

---

14 The Farnese family also appears in Suora Scolastica, an unfinished companion-piece to L'Abbess de Castro, loosely based on Le Couvent de Batiano. The genetic trace reveals itself primarily in 'le grand nez des Farnèse' (Cl, I, 351). The name Ranuce appears to be a throwback to Ranuccio Farnese, the younger son of Alessandro, created a Cardinal by his father on the latter's accession to the Papacy (Cl, II, 232).
Ranuce-Ernest, the legitimate heir to Alessandro Farnese, is brought face-to-face with the latter's spiritual heir, Fabrice del Dongo. Indeed, he even imprisons the latter in the 'tour Farnèse', a prison on the model of the Castel S. Angelo from which Alessandro Farnese makes his escape. Similarly, Crescenzi finally marries the spiritual heir to Crescentius, the liberal Clélia Conti. Fabrice and Clélia are both exceptions to the rule of 'générations décroissantes', the former as a result of his illegitimacy, the latter as a result of the liberal ideals with which she is imprudently inculcated by her hypocritical father. Elsewhere, this rule appears to hold ever more true. Thus, Ascanio del Dongo proves an infinitely baser version of his father, just as Ernest V proves even less worthy of the power entrusted to him than Ernest IV who has at least led a column into battle.

These striking degenerations from father to son can be explained by the historical accident which allows first the French Revolution and then Napoleon to emulate the Roman Republic and Julius Caesar respectively. Even Ernest IV is forced to display character in such heroic times. His son, by contrast, thinks himself a hero merely for holding his nerve in the course of Ferrante Palla's insurrection. The young Prince is initially modest in his letter to Gina:

Le comte [Mosca] dit, madame la duchesse, qu'il est content de moi; le fait est que j'ai essuyé quelques coups de fusil à ses côtés et que mon cheval a été touché: à voir le bruit qu'on fait pour si peu de chose, je désire vivement assister à une vraie bataille, mais que ce ne soit pas contre mes sujets. (p.439)

Alessandro Farnese does not of course have a legitimate heir: the Farnese of Parma lost power in 1749. By the time the action of La Chartreuse is meant to take place, Parma was ruled by Marie-Louise, Napoleon's widow. Ernest IV is obviously modelled on Francesco IV of Modena.

Castel S. Angelo figures prominently in the Promenades. Stendhal makes great play on the idea that this tower was in origin Hadrian's mausoleum, establishing yet another link between the sixteenth-century and ancient Rome. It also briefly carried the name of Crescentius (PR, p.851).

Clélia's marriage to Crescenzi is an inversion of Napoleon's marriage to the, in Stendhal's eyes, unworthy Marie-Louise.

In Suora Scolastica, Stendhal notes of the son of a Baron de Salerne: 'ce fils prit au sérieux les sentiments libéraux dont son père faisait parade, au moyen de quoi il fut pendu en 1792' (CI, 1, 370).
Mosca's initial enthusiasm soon evaporates: 'j'étais exalté ce jour-là: par exemple, je le voyais un grand homme, parce qu'il n'avait point trop de peur au milieu des premiers coups de fusil qu'il entendit de sa vie' (p.442). Ernest V falls back into the pattern of 'la monarchie ordinaire du dix-huitième siècle'. In particular, his valet tells him 'qu'il doit être plus heureux qu'un autre parce que son profil va se trouver sur les écus. A la suite de cette belle idée est arrivé l'ennui' (ibid.). This last fallacy, familiar from Lucien Leuwen, prompts the young Prince to extort Gina's promise that she sleep with him in return for saving Fabrice.

Le lendemain de cette grande journée, la plus remarquable de sa vie, le prince se croyait un petit Napoléon; il avait lu que ce grand homme avait été bien traité par plusieurs des jolies femmes de sa cour. Une fois Napoléon par les bonnes fortunes, il se rappela qu'il l'avait été devant les balles. Son cœur était encore tout transporté de la fermeté de sa conduite avec la duchesse. La conscience d'avoir fait quelque chose de difficile en fit un tout autre homme pendant quinze jours; il devint sensible aux raisonnements généreux; il eut quelque caractère. (p.482)

The Prince, 'cet être si pusillanime' (p.505), mistakes himself for a Napoleon as a consequence of another fallacy outlined in Lucien Leuwen: he has confused imitation with emulation, surface ('la peau de la statue') with depth. It is in this state of confusion and vanity that the Prince finds himself at a second crossroads. He has already chosen, somewhat reluctantly, to burn Rassi's evidence of a conspiracy rather than compromise his political reputation by authorizing political executions (pp.460-61). He now must choose whether to hold Gina to the promise he has extracted from her. In other words, he must decide whether to complete his triumph or else cede to the duperie of his new-found susceptibility to 'raisonnements généreux':

Le prince, qui avait l'âme délicate, ne pouvait se résoudre ni à user de son droit, ni à laisser partir la duchesse. On lui avait dit qu'après le premier moment obtenu, n'importe comment, les femmes reviennent. Chassé par la duchesse indignée, il osa reparaître tout tremblant et fort malheureux à dix heures moins trois minutes. A dix heures et demie, la duchesse montait en voiture et partait pour Bologne. (p.508)

Gina therefore follows in the footsteps of Origine delle grandezze's Vandozza/Vannozza. She does not, however, become a 'c[atin]' in order to make her family's fortune (Cl, II, 233), but rather to save Fabrice from poison.
Gina is given a Roman as well as sixteenth-century affiliation, signalled by her second name, Cornelia (p.270) as well as by the Roman origins of Sanseverina, the title she acquires through her sham marriage (p.439). It is presumably this Roman connection which preserves Gina from the vanity typically exhibited by the aristocracy. Furthermore, Gina, through her marriage to the ardent Pietranera, participates in the reawakening of sixteenth-century Italy (emulation of Ancient Rome) outlined in the first chapter of La Chartreuse. Gina is twelve when the French enter Milan; Fabrice is born soon after, making him some ten years younger than both Julien and Lucien. Gina is marked by the Republican beginnings of the Napoleonic adventure; Fabrice by the very last days of Empire. Both have stood upstream of the 'torrent qui s'est précipité de la montagne dans la plaine' (VFR, p.560 [MT]). As a result, they share the amalgamated virtues of Caesar, Vespasien del Dongo and Napoleon. In addition, they find themselves attracted by the virtues of a Brutus, incarnated in Ferrante Palla and Clélia Conti. This attraction represents Stendhal's most important departure from the outline provided by his source material. Alexandre, as his name implies, is a Caesar. Stendhal brings this theme out in La Chartreuse by placing Fabrice under the star of Napoleon (‘César et Alexandre avaient un successeur’). Stendhal, however, decides to introduce the rival theme of generosity (duperie) in his characterization of Fabrice.

4. 'Don Quichotte'

The epigraph to the first book of La Chartreuse is drawn from Ariosto. Fabrice, however, makes for an unconvincing Orlando. Instead, it becomes increasingly clear that he is actually a Don Quixote, his imagination over-stimulated not so much by historical romances as by the moral education imparted from a modern Cornelia (Gina), comparable in this respect to Elisabeth Gagnon and Laetitia Bonaparte. Thus, when Fabrice recounts

---

19 Cornelia is cited as a pair for Laetitia Bonaparte in the Mémoires sur Napoléon. The Prince points out the Roman origins of the title Sanseverina in his letter to Gina. This detail is contradicted by the narrator's earlier assertion that Sanseverina's origins can be traced no further back than a tax-farmer grandfather (p.114).

20 No equivalent to Ferrante Palla can be found in either Origine delle grandezze or La Jeunesse. Clélia Conti is clearly based on Cleria, Alessandro's lover in Origine, about whom no details are given.

21 Ariosto and Cervantes are together mentioned as major literary influences in the Vie de Henry Brulard. Thus, Brulard notes that 'L'Arioste forma mon caractère' (OI, II, 619), whereas his discovery of Don Quixote constituted 'peut-être la plus grande époque de ma vie' (p.618). Such enthusiasm compares to that shown for Plutarch (C, I, 84).
the anecdote of the imaginative and impulsive Vespasien del Dongo, Mosca offers the following observation:

C'est un beau coup de tête que vous nous racontez là, mais ce n'est que tous les dix ans qu'on a l'occasion amusante de faire de ces choses piquantes. Un être à demi stupide, mais attentif, mais prudent tous les jours, goûte très souvent le plaisir de triompher des hommes à imagination. C'est par une folie d'imagination que Napoléon s'est rendu au prudent John Bull, au lieu de chercher à gagner l'Amérique. John Bull, dans son comptoir, a bien ri de sa lettre où il cite Thémistocle. De tout temps les vils Sancho Pança l'emporteront à la longue sur les sublimes don Quichotte. (CP, p.189)

Mosca helpfully reprises the theme of *A-Imagination* before going on to develop the idea of imagination as antithetical to prudence, industry and, by implication, the American democracy that has been allowed to develop in place of the American Republic of a Washington or Lafayette. Importantly, Mosca chooses Napoleon as an exemplar of imagination, noting in particular the latter's citing of Themistocles, the Plutarchian hero and rival of Aristides (an exemplar along with Brutus to the Rousseau of the *Confessions*). Thus the opposites of ambition (Caesar) and generosity (Brutus) can increasingly be reconciled in Stendhal's texts as two aspects of the same sublime imagination. Caesar and Brutus are both finally quixotic because they seek to draw on values extrinsic to their society, imaginatively emulating (as opposed to imitating) their chosen exemplars, Alexander and Junius Brutus respectively. It is in this sense that Mosca places Napoleon, a calculating Caesar, in opposition to John Bull, the personification of calculating greed. It is as a result of his imagination that the sublime Napoleon must inevitably be brought down by the vile representatives of industrial democracy. Mosca goes on to explain his fear that Fabrice will similarly fail as a consequence of his imaginative generosity, revealed by his refusal to kill a valet while stealing the latter's horse in order to ensure his own safe exit from the Austrian states:

'Si vous voulez consentir à ne rien faire d'extraordinaire, je ne doute pas que vous ne soyez un évêque très respecté, si ce n'est très respectable. Toutefois, ma remarque subsiste; votre excellence s'est conduite avec légèreté dans l'affaire du cheval, elle a été à deux doigts d'une prison éternelle.'

---

22 Napoleon's letter of 14 July 1815 requesting asylum in Britain contained the phrase: 'je viens, comme Thémistocle, m'asseoir sur le foyer du peuple Britannique' (*OC*, XXIV, 409). Plutarch holds Themistocles out as an exemplar of ambition (*RFA*, p.81, 94). The opposition of Themistocles and Aristides (pp.79-80) can be compared to that of Brutus and Caesar.
Ce mot fit tressaillir Fabrice, il resta plongé dans un profond étonnement. Etait-ce là, se disait-il, cette prison dont je suis menacé? Est-ce le crime que je ne devais pas commettre? Les prédictions de Blanès, dont il se moquait fort en tant que prophéties, prenaient à ses yeux toute l'importance de présages véritables.

' Eh bien! qu'as-tu donc?' lui dit la duchesse étonnée; ' le comte t'a plongé dans les noires images.'

'Je suis illuminé par une vérité nouvelle, et, au lieu de me révolter contre elle, mon esprit l'adopte. Il est vrai, j'ai passé bien près d'une prison sans fin! Mais ce valet de chambre était si joli dans son habit à l'anglaise! quel dommage de le tuer.' (pp.189-90)

Durand has noted that the two books of the novel represent 'la peur de la prison' and 'la prison heureuse' respectively (Le Décor, p.138). This last passage therefore serves as a hinge for the novel. Fabrice, having successfully eluded incarceration in the Spielberg by escaping from the Austrian states, now finds himself consoled by his fatalist philosophy. Fabrice's horror of the Spielberg has hitherto been magnified by his imagination (pp.204-06). It is now reduced to a more proper dimension by the imaginative sublimation of his fears, prefigured by his relatively happy confinement in Blanès's tower and prompting his renewed belief in augury.

Fabrice's imagination has hitherto paralysed his reason: 'la présence du danger donne du génie à l'homme raisonnable, elle le met, pour ainsi dire, au-dessus de lui-même; à l'homme d'imagination elle inspire des romans, hardis il est vrai, mais souvent absurdes' (p.206). Thus Fabrice reasons as follows while his false passport is being inspected by a policeman:

Si je le tuais, se disait Fabrice, je serais condamné pour meurtre à vingt ans de galères ou à la mort, ce qui est bien moins affreux que le Spielberg avec une chaîne de cent vingt livres à chaque pied et huit onces de pain pour toute nourriture, et cela dure vingt ans; ainsi je n'en sortirais qu'à quarante-quatre ans. La logique de Fabrice oubliait que puisqu'il avait brûlé son passeport, rien n'indiquait à l'employé de police qu'il fût le rebelle Fabrice del Dongo. (ibid.)

Suddenly this same imagination releases him from both fear and its concomitant absurdity by allowing him to accept prison as the ineluctable realization of portents and prophecies. Fabrice, in the manner of Blanès before him, places himself at the centre of a system of

23 This horror is of course founded on the experiences of Stendhal's acquaintance, Silvio Pellico, author of the celebrated Le mie prigioni (1832). Pellico is directly invoked by Stendhal in a reference to Milan's police-headquarters (p.83). Political repression is more generally alluded to through references to the bouches du Cattaro (pp.13-14) and the murder of Count Prina (p.23).
magical thinking which bears a striking similarity to Plutarchian notions of parallelism and emulation.

The abbé Blanès has just predicted that Fabrice will be imprisoned and then delivered by a criminal act (CP, p.172). Blanès warns Fabrice not to commit this crime himself:

'Ne tombe jamais dans le crime avec quelque violence que tu sois tenté; je crois voir qu'il sera question de tuer un innocent, qui, sans le savoir, usurpe tes droits; si tu résistes à la violente tentation qui semblera justifiée par les lois de l'honneur, ta vie sera très heureuse aux yeux des hommes..., et raisonnablement heureuse aux yeux du sage', ajoute-t-il, après un instant de réflexion; 'tu mourras comme moi, mon fils, assis sur un siège de bois, loin de tout luxe, et détrômpé du luxe, et comme moi n'ayant à te faire aucun reproche grave.' (ibid.)

Fabrice, having elected not to kill the valet, wonders whether he has thereby followed Blanès's instructions correctly (p.191). At the beginning of the next chapter, Fabrice is attacked by Giletti. Fabrice eventually kills Giletti for the same reason that he spares the valet, namely his instinctive horror of physical disfigurement. The narrator thus explains that Fabrice's 'cœur ne pouvait s'accoutumer à l'image sanglante du beau jeune homme [the valet] tombant de cheval défiguré' (p.191). In the course of the later combat Giletti manages to stun Fabrice by striking him in the face with the pommel of a sword. It is only at this point that Fabrice goes on the offensive:

Le combat semblait se ralentir un peu; les coups ne se suivaient plus avec la même rapidité, lorsque Fabrice se dit: A la douleur que je ressens au visage, il faut qu'il m'ait défiguré. Saisi de rage à cette idée, il sauta sur son ennemi la pointe du couteau de chasse en avant. (p.200)

On both occasions, Fabrice's actions are governed neither by reason nor by calculation, but rather by an instinctive, imaginative and aesthetic response (Giletti's physical ugliness is emphasized throughout, just as the valet's physical beauty is repeatedly referred to earlier). Fabrice's actions are apparently amoral, yet actually an atavistic expression of sixteenth-century values. Thus, in L'Abbesse de Castro, Jules successfully deters Ranuce from killing Hélène's brother by arguing they should kill her absent father instead: 'il ne faut pas tuer un jeune homme qui peut devenir quelque chose et se rendre utile, tandis qu'il y a un vieux pécheur plus coupable que lui, et qui n'est plus bon qu'à enterrer' (CI, 1, 150). Fabrice's judgement of utility, by comparison, proves predictably misguided. He falls prey to the same aristocratic error that undermines Henry Brulard: he imagines that physical beauty can simply be equated with moral beauty. In the process, Fabrice forgets that Giletti is himself a former soldier of Napoleon's Italian army.
Stendhal emphasizes this point in a preliminary note for what was to become *Lamiel*, written on 16 May 1839, just over a month after the publication of *La Chartreuse*.

Stendhal's list of characters includes: 'Marc Pintard: (bilieux) voleur et assassin, homme énergique, horriblement couturé de petite vérole, fort laid, cheveux noirs et crépus, mais homme hardi' (p.212). Giletti is similarly described as l'être le plus laid et le moins fait pour l'amour: démesurément grand, il était horriblement maigre, fort marqué de la petite vérole et un peu louche' (pp.160-61). Stendhal's note goes on to sketch a romance between L'Amiel and Pintard, 'le voleur énergique, l'homme qui tue':

L'Amiel agit ainsi par véritable amour ou simplement par l'effet d'un caprice violent réveillé par l'énergie véritable qu'elle découvre dans Pintard. Ce qui lui plaît dans cet homme fort laid, c'est qu'il ne s'efforce pas dans les moments de repos, sûr qu'il est de se trouver au moment de l'action; cette particularité est un des traits les plus frappants du caractère de L'Amiel. (p.215)

Pintard is contrasted to Pierre Varaize, 'voleur, joli homme blond, amour passion pour Amiel; du reste pas d'énergie pour les grands crimes' (p.212). Pintard is reminiscent of Giletti, not only on account of their shared ugliness, but also their courage and energy. Thus Giletti attacks Fabrice 'en homme de cœur' (p.198), certain to find himself at the moment of action: a certainty that Fabrice, in the manner of Julien and Lucien before him, initially does not possess.

Fabrice has failed to act on Blanès's advice; as a result, he must first expiate his sin in prison, then await the double-redemption of trial by ordeal (his prison escape) and trial by poison. His redemption is further earned by Gina through a perversion of the mechanism of reversibility. Gina sacrifices her youth (pp.303-04, 419), her soul (ordering the assassination of Ernest IV) and her honour (prostituting herself to Ernest V) in order to expiate Fabrice's sin. Thus the assassination of one of Napoleon's soldiers is redeemed in part through the assassination of a tyrant, simultaneously the criminal act of an amoral Caesar (Gina) and the gesture of a profoundly moral Brutus (Ferrante Palla).

Gina is of course trying to reassert her fading claims over Fabrice by sacrificing herself in his cause. Jefferson has analysed the operatic 'two-voicedness' of Fabrice and Clélia's prison romance, noting the extraordinary nature of the means of communication employed (Jefferson, pp.211-16). This romance is indeed remarkable precisely because communication is achieved largely through the successful projection of the lovers' imaginations, each capable of deciphering the other's every gesture and signal. The lovers
each remain in doubt only as to the strength of the other's affections (as in *Lucien Leuwen* and *L'Abbesse de Castro*). By way of contrast, Gina's attempts to contact Fabrice go unanswered for a period of four months, even though she arranges for the same, rather pathetic message to be flashed every night in the most conventional of codes (p.362). Gina may well be thinking of Fabrice, yet it is clear that he has not been thinking of her. Their direct line of communication has been interrupted, despite all Gina's efforts, both practical and imaginative. Fabrice's powers have instead been redirected towards Clélia.

Ever since his earlier epiphany ('je suis illuminé par une vérité nouvelle'), Fabrice has had ever greater powers to control reality with his imagination. Fabrice understands Clélia and makes himself understood by her through the power of thought, just as Jules makes Hélène and her father understand that he loves her simply by passing repeatedly in front of her house (*CI*, I, 133). It is thanks to this power that Fabrice experiences prison as a joyful release from the iniquities of life at court: 'tous les intérêts si compliqués de cette petite cour méchante m'ont rendu méchant...' (*CP*, 176). Fabrice's incarceration therefore represents Stendhal's successful reproduction of the theme that had first attracted him to Xavier de Maistre's *Voyage autour de ma chambre*: the control of environment (*le réel*) through the exercise of the imagination.

The successful articulation of this theme allows Stendhal to integrate portents and prophecies within the structure of *La Chartreuse* in a departure from the *mises en abyme* of *Le Rouge* and *Lucien Leuwen*. The 'Louis Jenrel' episode in *Le Rouge* is little more than an exercise in Sternian or Diderotian ludism, a sly acknowledgement of the *fait divers* origins of the novel. *Edgar, ou le Parisien de vingt ans*, allows Lucien to re-think his predicament but does not reveal his future. Blanès's prophecies in *La Chartreuse* are of a different order. Stendhal could have inserted *La Jeunesse d'Alexandre Farnèse* as a proleptic analogue of the type employed in *La Princesse de Clèves* (a consistent model for Stendhal's fiction). Instead he eschews the use of documents ostensibly extrinsic to the text proper. As a result, Fabrice is shown constructing himself through the power of his imagination.

The relationship between Stendhal and his three principal heroes, Julien, Lucien and Fabrice, features a constant play between what Stendhal knows must happen and what ought to happen. Within this play, individual characters can appear to acquire a curious autonomy from their author. Brooks has analysed this phenomenon with regard to *Le Rouge* (*Reading for the Plot*, pp.62-89), noting in particular that 'Stendhal makes
curiously non-retrospective use of narrative' (p.77). Thus, Lucien (and for that matter Octave) are characterized as *peut-être*, while Julien 'ever eludes fixed definitions in favour of constant becoming' (ibid.). This relationship between author and hero, which Brooks equates to the father-son relationship, finds new expression in the relationship between Blanès and Fabrice ('L'abbé Blanès était son véritable père', p.170), comparable to the relationship between Plutarch and his subjects.

Stendhal had already made use of prophecies and portents in *L'Abbesse de Castro*. Furthermore, the vows of Hélène and Clélia to the Madonna can clearly be related to Stendhal's use of prophecy in that both procedures constitute an attempt to imagine and so determine the future. Plutarch's work is similarly replete with the magical thinking of augury.24 The lives of Caesar and Brutus both feature portents and prophecies revealed through dreams: Plutarch was, after all, a Delphic priest (*VT*, p.739 [PR]). Stendhal merges this Delphic function with Catholic superstition of the Middle Ages. Thus the prophecy that affects the Campireali is made by 'un saint moine du couvent de Monte Cavi, qui souvent avait été surpris, dans sa cellule, élevé à plusieurs pieds au-dessus du sol, comme saint Paul, sans que rien d'autre que la grâce divine pût le soutenir dans cette position extraordinaire' (*CI*, l, 130). Blanès, Grianta's highly unorthodox priest, is atavistically inclined to these syncretic practices, more interested in astrology than Catholic dogma, and feared by his parishioners 'comme un grand magicien' (*CP*, p.20). Initially, he fails to communicate 'sa science assez difficile' to his young charge (p.21). Fabrice retains only *l'habitude des présages*: 'c'était là le fruit qu'il avait retiré des études astrologiques de son ami l'abbé Blanès, aux prédictions duquel il ne croyait point' (ibid.). It is only after his epiphany, in the course of his conversation with Mosca about the merits of sparing the valet, that Fabrice begins to believe in the fatalism that underpins Blanès's prophecies, seen not just as predictions of individual events, but rather as overarching narratives through which to imagine one's life. Such prophecies can therefore be compared to other Stendhalian narratives of this kind, for instance Julien's 'coran', with all

---


25 Stendhal follows Biran in viewing superstition as a particularly powerful instance of how *habitude* can exalt, rather than deaden, the imagination (*Influence de l'habitude*, pp.187-88).
its implied fatalism *(RN, p.35)*. The *Parallel Lives* can be seen as the model for this kind of narrative. Plutarch subordinates the details of his exemplars' lives to his overall plan. Thus, the exemplars are always paired, the later exemplar often modelling himself explicitly on the earlier, as in the case of Caesar and Alexander. Plutarch's purpose in arriving at this method is two-fold: first to bind the Greek civilization he represents to the Roman civilization he is forced to serve, and second to encourage his readers to emulate the virtues of his exemplars. To the man without imagination, however, the Plutarchian project can only appear Quixotic: the imaginative emulation of virtues now seemingly hors nature. Indeed, were it not for the examples set by Napoleon and the heroes and heroines of the French Revolution, the virtues of a Caesar or a Brutus might themselves appear as remote to nineteenth-century France as those of non-European (the Riccaras) or Homeric heroes (Achilles and Agamemnon), contrasted to the more current, Plutarchian virtues of the sixteenth-century in one of Stendhal's fragmentary prefaces to the *Historiettes romaines* *(CI, II, 21-22).*

5. Caesar and Brutus

The moral degeneration of Italy that follows the return to absolutism of 1813 is even more pronounced than that of France, still a nation state as opposed to Italy's patchwork of despotisms and foreign colonies, a land of rival laws and jurisdictions, passports and customs officials. Ernest IV dreams of becoming the constitutional monarch of a united northern Italy, that is to say recreating an Italian Kingdom on the Napoleonic model. Hence perhaps the value he places on the magnificence of his court, intended to rival not only the splendours of Louis XIV, the monarch he seeks to imitate, but also the Lombardo-Venetian court of the Viceroy Prince Eugene (hence also his fascination for Gina, widow of General Pietranera, one of Prince Eugene's most prominent officers). Ernest never successfully resolves the contradiction between these chosen exemplars. As a result, his absolutism is made to look increasingly absurd by his dreams of constitutionalism and vice versa. This absurdity results in Ernest keeping Mosca on as his *ultra* Prime Minister, at the expense of the 'liberal' faction, for reasons of 'liberal' policy: Mosca alone can hope to negotiate the arch-liberal project of union with Lombardy. Ironically, Ernest also values Mosca for having fought in Spain for Napoleon. He assumes, as it turns out correctly, that Mosca will prove a more effective Prime

---

26 The public statue to Ernest, damaged in the Republican uprising following on from Palla's tyrannicide, absurdly represents him in the *jupon à la romaine* of a Caesar *(p.463).*
Minister in the event of an uprising than any of his generals. The Prince's assumption applies in particular to General Fabio Conti, again the imitator of contradictory exemplars according to Mosca:

Figurez-vous un original qui a été à la guerre un jour peut-être en sa vie, et qui part de là pour imiter la tenue de Frédéric le Grand. De plus, il tient aussi à reproduire l'affabilité noble du général Lafayet. et cela parce qu'il est ici le chef du parti libéral (Dieu sait quels libéraux). (CP, p. 120)

These contradictions of seeking to imitate both Louis XIV and Napoleon, Lafayette and Frederick the Great, mirror the initially unarticulated contradiction of Gina admiring both the Army of 1796 and Napoleon, the Republic and Empire. Gina's marriage to Pietranera, an impoverished liberal aristocrat, fails to produce a new Mme Roland. Instead, Gina allows herself to be seduced by the 'amiabilité' of court life. In the process, she unwittingly conspires with her brother and ideological opponent, the Marquis del Dongo, in sabotaging Fabrice's education. Thus Fabrice is educated by Jesuits at his father's insistence, yet regularly withdrawn from school by his aunt once she acquires a certain position at court as the wife of a Divisional General (Gina also arranges for Fabrice to become a page-boy at the court of Prince Eugene, although the Marquis del Dongo refuses to sanction the appointment). Fabrice therefore learns nothing at school (nonetheless acquiring a series of first prizes as a consequence of his teachers' attempts to ingratiate themselves with Pietranera). Fabrice is very different from Julien and Lucien who, in the manner of Napoleon, receive an education, heavily skewed towards Plutarch (Julien) and mathematics (Lucien). As a consequence, he will never be a distinguished man in the French sense. Fabrice's support for Napoleon is entirely emotional: an unthinking sense of feudal allegiance to his 'King', as irrational as Henry Brulard's loyalty to a Napoleon pictured in his imagination as the colonel in a comic opera. Fabrice will never recover from his education, his illogic perfected by theological studies in Naples suggested by Mosca (Mosca's ludism has by this time replaced Gina's aristocratic frivolity as the ally of Jesuit obscurantism).

---

27 Pietranera's own acquiescence can be contrasted to the experiences of the chevalier Foscarini, presented in the last chapter of the novel as being 'parfaitement honnête homme; aussi avait-il été un peu en prison sous tous les régimes'. Foscarini had been a deputy in 'cette fameuse chambre des députés qui, à Milan, rejeta la loi de l'enregistrement présentée par Napoléon, trait peu fréquent dans l'histoire' (p. 522).
This education leaves Fabrice singularly ill-prepared in the art of reasoning, even with regard to the religion in which he has been instructed. Thus his penitential prayers in Bologna's San Petronio, after his killing of Giletti and successful flight from the state of Parma, display a muddle-headedness to which the narrator draws attention:

Si on lui eût proposé de donner cent louis pour devenir premier grand vicaire de l'archevêque de Parme, il eût repoussé cette idée avec horreur; mais, quoiqu'il ne manquât ni d'esprit ni surtout de logique, il ne lui vint pas une seule fois à l'esprit que le crédit du comte Mosca, employé en sa faveur, fut une simonie. Tel est le triomphe de l'éducation jésuitique: donner l'habitude de ne pas faire attention à des choses plus claires que le jour. Un Français, élevé au milieu des traits d'intérêt personnel et de l'ironie de Paris, eût pu, sans être de mauvaise foi, accuser Fabrice d'hypocrisie au moment même où notre héros ouvrait son âme à Dieu avec la plus extrême sincérité et l'attendrissement le plus profond. (p.219)

Fabrice is the male equivalent of those surprisingly generous products of the Sacré-Cœur, Louise de Rénal and Bathilde de Chasteller. He is the distinguished nobleman (as opposed to the distinguished man of the Mémoires d'un touriste), representing the aristocratic virtues enunciated by Gina in the course of her proposal he go to Naples:

Avant tout il convient à un homme de ton nom d'être un grand seigneur, noble, généreux, protecteur de la justice, destiné d'avance à se trouver à la tête de son ordre... et dans toute sa vie ne faisant qu'une coquinerie, mais celle-là fort utile. (pp.130-31)

Fabrice's coquinerie consists in finally accepting his position of privilege, unlike the more analytical polytechniciens, Lucien and Léon. Thus he generates an argument already put to Lucien and Léon by Du Poirier and Miossince respectively in order to justify his social status:

Fabrice éprouva un sentiment de malaise profond; le bel enthousiasme de vertu qui naguère venait de faire battre son cœur se changeait dans le vil plaisir d'avoir une bonne part dans un vol. Eh bien! se dit-il enfin avec les yeux éteints d'un homme mécontent de soi, puisque ma naissance me donne le droit de profiter de ces abus, il serait d'une insigne duperie à moi de n'en pas prendre ma part. (p.167)

Fabrice becomes passive and reactive after his return from Waterloo, an Epaminondas on the model of the Souvenirs d'égotisme, a 'grand seigneur' in the tradition of a Lafayette: 'M. de La Fayette est extrêmement poli et même affectueux pour tout le monde, mais poli comme un roi' (OI, p.456 [SE]). This sense of aristocracy prompts Fabrice to exhibit not only the generosity of a Brutus (the âme noble par excellence) but also an instinctive sense of justice. These qualities of course find their echo in Clélia Conti, 'une âme généreuse'
According to the narrator (p.360), although, in an interesting reversal of the principal relationships in both *Le Rouge* and *Lucien Leuwen*, it is she rather than Fabrice that brings with her a developed political ideology:

Clélia était une petite sectaire de libéralisme; dans sa première jeunesse elle avait pris au sérieux tous les propos de libéralisme qu'elle entendait dans la société de son père, lequel ne songeait qu'à se faire une position; elle était partie de là pour prendre en mépris et presque en horreur le caractère flexible du courtisan: de là son antipathie pour le mariage. (p.338)\(^{28}\)

Clélia's horror of the courtier's flexibility is tantamount to a horror of her father, or for that matter the ludic Mosca.\(^{29}\) This horror results in Clélia taking an extreme view when she hears the rumour that Fabrice is about to be assassinated at the Prince's behest:

Demain peut-être le jour fatal! avec les monstres qui nous gouvernent, quelle chose au monde n'est pas possible! Quelle douceur, quelle sérénité héroïque dans ces yeux qui peut-être vont se fermer! Dieu! quelles ne doivent pas être les angoisses de la duchesse! aussi on la dit tout à fait au désespoir. Moi j'irais poignarder le prince, comme l'héroïque Charlotte Corday. (p.338)

It is at this point that Clélia acquires a moral advantage over Gina, who eventually uses a secret poison rather than Corday's dagger to assassinate the tyrant Prince.\(^{30}\) Gina is only interested in vengeance, admittedly the error of a superior soul according to the narrator: 'je croirais assez que le bonheur immoral qu'on trouve à se venger en Italie tient à la force d'imagination de ce peuple; les gens des autres pays ne pardonnent pas à proprement parler, ils oublient' (p.398). Clélia, by contrast, is interested in virtue. Her propensity to tyrannicide is further underlined by her principled betrayals of her father (head of her *Gemeinschaft*) in the wider interests of justice (an idealized conception of the *Gesellschaft*). These betrayals are dramatically related to Brutus's betrayal of Caesar, his patron and father-double. Clélia's status as a Brutus is of course finally underlined by her marriage to Crescenzi, the descendant of Crescentius.

\(^{28}\) Fabrice's education leads him to view liberalism as 'une *hérésie* qui passera comme les autres' (p.146). He nevertheless makes an effort to obtain copies of banned Parisian newspapers (ibid.).

\(^{29}\) Gina refers to Fabio Conti as 'ce vil courtisan' (p.288). A few pages later she notes with regard to Mosca: 'ma sottise a été de croire qu'il restait assez d'âme dans un courtisan véritable pour être capable d'amour' (p.299).

\(^{30}\) See Ernest Abravanel, 'Le thème de poison dans l'œuvre de Stendhal' in *Première journée du Stendhal Club* (Lausanne: Editions du Grand-Chêne, 1965), pp.7-17. Poison is the vile method of assassination, allegedly used by the young Fabio Conti to deliver himself of a rival.
The emergence of Clélia (a Brutus) as Gina's rival brings into focus the latter's inherently contradictory position. Gina is shown finally to be more of a Sanseverina than a Pietranera, more an impetuous and egotistical Caesar on the sixteenth-century model than a philosophical Brutus, political product of the Enlightenment's rediscovery of Republican values. As a consequence, Gina finally sheds her mantle as a potential Brutus, emerging as the Caesarist commander-in-chief of the Sacca Gemeinschaft. At this point in the narrative, the lines of division begin to emerge. Clélia is a Brutus/Corday to Fabrice's Epaminondas/Lafayette; Gina is a Caesar/Napoleon to Mosca's ludic courtier, perhaps a Cicero/Talleyrand. Yet just as Gina disassociates herself from Pietranera's Republicanism, so she reaffirms her instinctive attraction to the Brutus archetype. This attraction is moral rather than political: hence her later refusal to support Parma's insurrection and claim to abhor Jacobinism (p.433). Gina has already shown an instinctive admiration for Clélia's melancholic seriousness, the outward sign of her Republicanism. She now rejects Mosca: 'cette âme vulgaire n'est point à la hauteur des nôtres' (p.298). Instead, Gina concludes a direct alliance with Ferrante Palla, poet, brigand and self-proclaimed tribune of the people of Parma: 'voilà un homme qui comprend mon cœur' (p.393). She compares Palla to Fabrice, once it has been decided that he will assassinate the Prince: '"voilà le seul homme qui m'aït comprise", se dit-elle; "c'est ainsi qu'en eût agi Fabrice, s'il eût pu m'entendre" ' (p.397). Palla reunites the disparate strands of Brutus's cultural legacy: quixotry, tyrannicide, brigandage and republicanism. Clélia associates herself with this alliance for the purposes of freeing Fabrice from his prison. As a consequence, Fabrice is exposed to the influences of both Caesar and Brutus, exhorted to action by Palla's poetry as much as by Gina's instructions and Clélia's supplications. Fabrice will finally remain impervious to these competing influences, 'un héros de Plutarque' in the manner of a Lafayette or an Epaminondas.

Fabrice is therefore ideally placed to win the admiration of both Gina and Clélia, combining as he does justice with heroism, grâce with force. Indeed, Gina and Clélia are brought together by their shared concern for Fabrice at the moment when the former discovers that he has been arrested (p.288). Similarly, Clélia's discernment of Fabrice's

---

31 The resolute peasants of Sacca bear a strong resemblance to those featured in L'Abbesse de Castro: 'les mœurs des républiques du Moyen Age, du temps desquelles on se battait pour obtenir une certaine chose que l'on désirait, avaient conservé beaucoup de bravoure dans le cœur des paysans' (CI, i, 160-61).

32 Gina refers to Clélia as 'cette âme noble et jeune' (p.288). Similarly, she later notes: 'elle a tant d'esprit, ou pour mieux dire tant d'âme' (p.332).
'sérénité héroïque' (p.338) finds its counterpart in Gina's confession to Mosca of her attachment to her nephew:

Je l'aime d'instinct, pour parler ainsi. J'aime en lui son courage si simple et si parfait, que l'on peut dire qu'il ne s'en aperçoit pas lui-même; je me souviens que ce genre d'admiration commença à son retour de Waterloo. Il était encore enfant, malgré ses dix-sept ans, sa grande inquiétude était de savoir si réellement il avait assisté à la bataille, et dans le cas du oui, s'il pouvait dire s'être battu, lui qui n'avait marché à l'attaque d'aucune batterie ni d'aucune colonne ennemie. Ce fut pendant les graves discussions que nous avions ensemble sur ce sujet important, que je commençai à voir en lui une grâce parfaite. Sa grande âme se révélait à moi; que de savants mensonges eût étalés, à sa place, un jeune homme bien élevé! (p.304)

Gina proclaims Fabrice a great soul for having grasped instinctively the test of hypocrisy outlined first by Mathilde and later by Sansfin in Lamiel. Fabrice, in the manner of Lucien before him, realizes that he cannot know himself unless he first proves himself in a battle, or equivalent test of character. Only in this way can he find out whether or not he is a hypocrite, a mere imitator of greatness rather than its emulator. Fabrice's refusal to exaggerate his role at Waterloo emphasizes the parallel with Lucien, equally concerned with the sincerity of his heroism as opposed to the parestre of vanity. Fabrice resolves this question of heroism only once his worst fear is realized, in fulfilment of Blanès's prediction:

Serai-je un de ces grands courages comme l'antiquité en a montré quelques exemples au monde? Suis-je un héros sans m'en douter? Comment! moi qui avais tant de peur de la prison, j'y suis, et je ne me souviens pas d'être triste! (p.332)

Fabrice is of course spurred on in his heroism by his love for Clélia, a Dulcinea to his Don Quixote. Thus when Fabrice begins his descent from the main platform of the tour Farnèse, he first prays to God, 'puis, comme un héros des temps de chevalerie, il pensa un instant à Clélia' (p.410). Fabrice, an Epaminondas surrounded by great souls, whether on the model of Caesar or Brutus, remains on another level both quixotic and Ariostan, the union of Stendhal's principal literary influences.

6. 'Les règles du jeu de whist'

Fabrice and Ernest V share an idealized conception of justice as well as rather naive notions of how justice is administered. Thus when Mosca tells Fabrice that he could arrange for the judges of Parma to put the troublesome relatives of the duc Sanseverina-Taxis in prison, the latter is shocked:
'Eh bien! voilà qui me gâte tout le reste', répliqua Fabrice avec une naïveté bien plaisante à la cour, 'j'aurais mieux aimé les voir condamnés par des magistrats jugeant en conscience.'

'Vous me ferez plaisir, vous qui voyagez pour vous instruire, de me donner l'adresse de tels magistrats, je leur écrirai avant de me mettre au lit.'

'Si j'étais ministre, cette absence de juges honnêtes gens bresserait mon amour-propre.'

'Mais il me semble', répliqua le comte, 'que votre excellence qui aime tant les Français, et qui même jadis leur prêta le secours de son bras invincible, oublie en ce moment une de leurs grandes maximes: Il vaut mieux tuer le diable que si le diable vous tue. Je voudrais voir comment vous gouverneriez ces âmes ardentes, et qui lisent toute la journée l'histoire de la Révolution de France, avec des juges qui renverraient acquittés les gens que j'accuse. Ils arriveraient à ne pas condamner les coquins le plus évidemment coupables et se croiraient des Brutus.' (pp.186-87)

Mosca and Fabrice are reprising Julien's discussion with Altamira ('Faut-il voler, faut-il se vendre?') and François Leuwen's attempts to defend the practice of *friponnerie* to his son on the grounds that even Napoleon embezzled money. Mosca's reference to France reflects both an admiring recognition that this country has produced all the major political exemplars, whether absolutist (Louis XIV), imperial (Napoleon) or republican (Lafayette, Danton, Mme Roland), as well as an ironic commentary on the apparent confusion in Fabrice's own position (in this instance a Brutus who has fought for Napoleon). The opposition between Mosca and Fabrice is here reduced to one of order and justice, expediency and truth. As has already been noted, Gina lists the upholding of justice amongst the qualities and accomplishments required of a distinguished nobleman. She later risks incurring the wrath of Ernest V by questioning the probity of his judges when he suggests that they will discover the truth behind Fabio Conti's attempt to poison Fabrice:

'Mais, mon prince, avez-vous des juges?'

'Comment!' dit le prince étonné.

'Vous avez des jurisconsultes savants et qui marchent dans la rue d'un air grave; du reste, ils jugeront toujours comme il plaira au parti dominant dans votre cour.' (p.483)

Stendhal's own emphasis on the importance of justice as an ideal is mocked in *Lucien Leuwen* when the Interior Minister enunciates the following truisms to Lucien and

33 See also Gina's contemptuous interruption of Ernest IV when he asserts: 'j'ai confié l'instruction du procès à mes meilleurs juges...' (p.261).
François Leuwen: 'M. de Vaize prouva que la justice est le premier besoin des sociétés. De là, il passa à expliquer comment la bonne foi est la base du crédit. Il dit ensuite à ces messieurs qu'un gouvernement partial et injuste se suicide de ses propres mains' (LL, II, 127-28). *Fripon* governments succeed through hypocrisy, that is to say through imposing their interpretation of their actions and motives on public opinion. The Kortis affair and Vaize's insider dealing soon expose this hypocrisy in *Lucien Leuwen*. Louis-Philippe's government finally falls precisely because it fails to control its own image in the face of a hostile press. This failure can be ascribed not so much to the inherent immorality of the government, but rather to its incompetence. Indeed, François Leuwen repeatedly suggests that the French people, and in particular the citizens of Paris, expect their government to be corrupt. On the other hand, they also expect government to entertain, whether through a show of *esprit* or through the acquisition of military glory. Mosca's task in *La Chartreuse* is easier by comparison. Mosca is the Prime Minister of a state where the Prince can be secretly assassinated, where that Prince's son and heir agrees to halt an investigation that risks uncovering this truth for fear of the practical consequences, finally where a Revolution is wished away by a general and tacit agreement that it never took place. Mosca is not so foolish as to allow his Juliens their day in court; indeed, when he is finally given his head, he releases political prisoners.

The flaws in this political model are revealed by Mosca's comic difficulties in finally arranging for Fabrice to be tried fairly. Mosca decides Fabrice should be tried for strategic reasons; Fabrice, for his part, wishes to be put on trial first so that justice can be served and second so that he can return to his prison-cell and resume his relationship with Clélia. When the trial finally takes place, however, it satisfies neither Mosca's strategic requirements, nor Fabrice's desire to be judged objectively:

Une singulière difficulté s'éleva pour le procès de Fabrice: les juges voulaient l'acquitter par acclamation, et dès la première séance. Le comte eut besoin d'employer la menace pour que le procès durât au moins huit jours, et que les juges se donnassent la peine d'entendre tous les témoins. Ces gens sont toujours les mêmes, se dit-il. (p.485)

The moral is clear: justice, and by extension truth, are unattainable ideals. Yet the narrator earlier states this moral even more firmly while choosing to limit its application to the *Fripon* governments of Italian despots: 'dans les cours despolitiques, le premier intrigant adroit dispose de la vérité, comme la mode en dispose à Paris' (p.223). Thus Rassi owes the influence he wields at court precisely to his mastery of such intrigue: 'de quelque sens que pût se présenter une affaire, il trouvait facilement, et en peu d'instants, les moyens fort..."
bien fondés en droit d'arriver à une condamnation ou à un acquittement; il était surtout le roi des finesse de procureur' (p.271). Mosca, a courtier, rejects the role of dupe in favour of a self-conscious friponnerie, defined in terms of aristocratic ludism. Thus Mosca, through Gina, suggests Fabrice never question his teachings at the Neapolitan theological academy: 'crois ou ne crois pas à ce qu'on t'enseignera, mais ne fais jamais aucune objection. Figure-toi qu'on t'enseigne les règles du jeu de whist; est-ce que tu ferais des objections aux règles du whist?' (p. 132). Mosca is forever trying to establish private truths for his immediate (aristocratic) circle. As a result, he effectively colludes with the forces of tyranny and vanity in preclusioning the possibility of public truths being established. Mosca's strategy is therefore finally ungenerous, bearing a striking similarity to that eventually adopted by Sansfin in Lamiel. Furthermore, it is finally unsuccessful in that, again like that adopted by Sansfin in relation to Lamiel, it fails to satisfy the needs of the great souls (Gina, Fabrice) that make up his immediate circle.

Mosca's ludism first fails when he finds himself outplayed by Ernest IV. Mosca loses a hand of whist when he omits the words that alone would have bound the Prince to his signed promise not to pursue Fabrice for his murder of Giletti. The words omitted ('procédure injuste') point of course to Mosca's reluctance not only to offend his master, but also to acknowledge in a public document the private truth that justice cannot be obtained in the state of Parma. This lawlessness again emerges in Mosca's letter to Gina on first hearing of Fabrice's arrest: 'le jeune homme est innocent; mais, fut-il coupable, devait-on l'arrêter sans m'en prévenir, moi, son protecteur déclaré?' (p.302). Mosca is still planning his next hand (on this occasion, a possible resignation). He is therefore stunned to learn that Gina has decided to stop playing the game, turning instead to Ferrante Palla for help in securing Fabrice's escape and assassinating the Prince. Taken together, these two actions risk destroying the game for everyone, as demonstrated by Palla's eventual revolution.

It is Fabrice, however, who finally points to the emptiness of Mosca's ludism. Gina, although she repudiates the courtier's predilection for order and rules (the player's social contract), nevertheless enjoys aspects of the game. She may even be the originator of the advice she attributes to Mosca, foreshadowed in an earlier conversation with the marquise del Dongo:

Une cour, c'est ridicule, disait la comtesse [Gina, comtesse Pietranera] à la marquise, mais c'est amusant; c'est un jeu qui intéresse, mais dont il faut accepter les règles. Qui s'est jamais avisé de
se récrier contre le ridicule des règles du piquet [Chaper: whist] et pourtant, une fois qu'on s'est accoutumé aux règles, il est agréable de faire l'adversaire repic et capot [Chaper: chlemm].

(p.112)34

Fabrice, however, fails to find amusement in a court he recognizes to be 'méchante'
(p.176). Thus he proves entirely insensible to the joys of playing the game. Stendhal dramatizes this insensitivity in a final reference to the game of whist, by now definitively established as the synecdochic equivalent of ludism. Fabrice, now 'coadjuteur avec future succession' to the Archbishop of Parma, is trying to escape from the grand gala hosted by Ernest V's mother:

Fabrice se rapprochait de la porte par une savante manœuvre, lorsque vint éclater à ses dépens un de ces petits riens de cour que la grande maîtresse [Gina] savait si bien ménager: le chambellan de service lui courut pour lui dire qu'il avait été désigné pour faire le whist du prince. A Parme, c'est un honneur insigné et bien au-dessus du rang que le coadjuteur occupait dans le monde. Faire le whist était un honneur marqué même pour l'archevêque. A la parole du chambellan, Fabrice se sentit percer le cœur, et quoique ennemi mortel de toute scène publique, il fut sur le point d'aller lui dire qu'il avait été saisi d'un étourdissement subit; mais il pensa qu'il serait en butte à des questions et à des compliments de condoléance, plus intolérables encore que le jeu. Ce jour-là il avait horreur de parler. (p.497)

Fabrice finds all forms of social contact intolerable following Clélia's marriage to Crescenzi, a point emphasized by the announcement of the newly-weds at the gala. Fabrice resents Crescenzi's presence to the point where it strikes him as an act of tyranny to be countered with the archetypical gesture of the tyrannicide:

'Si j'étais Borso Valserra', se dit-il (c'était un des généraux du premier Sforze), 'j'irais poignarder ce lourd marquis, précisément avec ce petit poignard à manche d'ivoire que Clélia me donna ce jour heureux, et je lui apprendrais s'il doit avoir l'insolence de se présenter avec cette marquise dans un lieu où je suis!' (pp.497-98)35

Fabrice finally plays whist with the Prince, yet all his thoughts are directed towards Clélia. Thus his embarrassment at hearing the voice of his former lover is misinterpreted by the courtiers as the sudden realization that he has overstepped the mark in his show of

34 The original edition referred to the game of whist, but used the wrong terminology at the end of the sentence: repic et capot properly refers to the game of piquet. In the Hetzel edition followed by Antoine Adam (Classiques Garnier), Stendhal corrects the name of the game (piquet instead of whist), in the Chaper edition he corrects the terminology (chlemm instead of repic et capot).

35 Clélia's gift of a dagger can of course be related to her own tyrannicidal fantasies centred around her chosen exemplar, Charlotte Corday.
indifference to the honour bestowed on him by Ernest V: 'on admirait l'indifférence polie et les airs de hauteur avec lesquels il jetait ses cartes, même quand il coupait son altesse' (p.502). Such indifference allows Fabrice to surpass the example of Rousseau, a second implicit evocation of a Brutus after that of Charlotte Corday: 'le seul Jean-Jacques Rousseau a su rester pauvre et gagner aux échecs M. le prince de Conti, tout en étant fou du bonheur de recevoir la visite d'un prince' (VT, p.917 [PR]).

A woman finally emerges as the driving force behind the ostensibly omnipotent and omniscient ludic male. Just as Mme Leuwen sets the agenda for her husband and son, so Gina dominates an unsuspecting Mosca and an initially indifferent Fabrice. Gina appears in many guises, by turns Gina del Dongo, comtesse Pietranera, duchesse Sanseverina-Taxis, an actress in the improvised theatre of the commedia dell'arte, grande maîtresse (presumably intended as a pun on her forthcoming role with Ernest V) and finally comtesse Mosca. She is furthermore both Fabrice's aunt (although not his biological aunt if he is indeed the son of lieutenant Robert) and his suitor. She determines the course of Fabrice's life in accordance with her personal ambitions (her need to play a leading role in the courts of Milan and of Parma), her ambitions for Fabrice (her need to see him elevated, whether as a page to Prince Eugene or as the future Archbishop of Parma) and finally her illicit designs on his person (most notably expressed in her jealousy, which finally prompts her to expedite Clélia's marriage to Crescenzi). Gina's relationship with Fabrice is that of a Caesar with a Brutus. She cannot help admiring Fabrice for qualities that the pursuit of her ambitions prevent her from displaying. Gina therefore exhorts Fabrice to become a 'protecteur de la justice', yet herself finally becomes a criminal. This contradiction finds its expression in Gina's relationship with Ferrante Palla. She admires Palla's passion and sincerity and provides financial support for his tyrannicide and revolution. Yet at no stage does she dupe herself into thinking that she is herself acting as a tyrannicide. Instead she recognizes that she is motivated solely by her criminal desire for revenge. Gina's support for Palla therefore ceases the moment he has assassinated Ernest IV; she returns instead to Mosca, the man who almost single-handedly manages to suppress Palla's revolution.

Fabrice emerges from prison cleansed of his sin (hence his final acquittal by Mosca's court). He is once again a protector of justice, a Quixote and an Epaminondas; Gina, for her part, has finally shed these ideals, represented by her first marriage to Pietranera, a man willing to risk his life in the defence of justice, as exemplified by his attempt to save Prina, Eugene's former minister, from the Milanese mob (p.23). Instead, she has stooped
to the methods of a Conti or a latter-day Farnese. Gina's moral decline is directly linked to her ambition (the distinguishing quality of a Caesar). Indeed, Gina herself identifies this failing when she discovers that Fabrice has been captured:

Quelle funeste étourderie! venir habiter la cour d'un prince absolu! un tyran qui connaît toutes ses victimes! chacun de leurs regards lui semble une bravade pour son pouvoir. Hélas! c'est ce que ni le comte ni moi nous vîmes lorsque je quittai Milan: je pensais aux grâces d'une cour aimable; quelque chose d'inférieur, il est vrai, mais quelque chose dans le genre des beaux jours du prince Eugène!

De loin nous ne nous faisons pas d'idée de ce que c'est que l'autorité d'un despote qui connaît de vue tous ses sujets. La forme extérieure du despotisme est la même que celle des autres gouvernements: il y a des juges, par exemple, mais ce sont des Rassi (p.296).

Gina has plunged Fabrice into the world of the sixteenth century, a world in which brigands (Ferrante Palla) constitute the only opposition to tyrants who are personally acquainted with their (often hostile) subjects (Cl, 1, 119-20 [AC]). Her ambition, shown by her accommodation with the Kingdom (as opposed to Republic) of Italy and to the court of Prince Eugene, leaves her with no option but finally to repudiate the Gesellschaft of Parma in favour of the Gemeinschaft of Sacca. Gina becomes a Caesar on the model of Fabrice Colonna in L'Abbesse de Castro. In the process, she loses her hold over Fabrice, seduced by the values of generosity held out by Clélia Conti, an Hélène de Campireali to his Jules Branciforte. It is for this reason that Fabrice marks his sexual conquest of Clélia (who thinks he has been poisoned) with a confession of the truth raised to the status of an absolute ideal between lovers:

Dans l'enthousiasme de passion et de générosité qui suit un bonheur extrême, il lui dit étourdiment:

'Il ne faut pas qu'un indigne mensonge vienne souiller les premiers instants de notre bonheur: sans ton courage je ne serais plus qu'un cadavre, ou je me débattrais contre d'atroces douleurs; mais j'allais commencer à dîner lorsque tu es entrée, et je n'ai point touché à ces plats.' (p.472)

This admission can be compared to Jules's confession to Hélène that he is a brigand (Cl, 1, 154). Fabrice has rejected the game, whether played with Mosca's respect or Gina's final disrespect for its rules. It is this moment of truth which forms the first ending of La Chartreuse. Yet, as Brutus was to discover, the world does not adhere to the values of truth and justice for very long, and it is finally Caesar (Gina) who sets the agenda by advancing Clélia's marriage to Crescenzi. It is left to Fabrice to live out his final days in isolation and contemplation, in accordance with Blanès's prophecy, and following the
example of Napoleon on Sainte-Helena, reminiscent more of Brutus's end than that of Caesar:

Sa mort près de cette petite rivière aux bords très élevés, en delà de ces grands arbres, sous le ciel très étoilé de la Macédoine [home of Alexander], près de cette grande roche où il s'était assis d'abord, est la plus touchante pour moi de toutes celles que je connais. Elle a quelque chose de divin. Le corps n'y triomphe point. C'est une âme d'ange qui abandonne un corps, sans le faire souffrir. Elle s'envole. (JL, II, 14)

It is in their heroic response to ultimate failure that great souls finally come to resemble each other most.
IV
CONCLUSION
1

**LAMIEL**

'Avec son air doux et gai, elle est l'audace même; elle a le courage, plus qu'humain /que féminin/, de braver votre mépris, et c'est pourquoi elle est inimitable. Regardez-la bien, messieurs, si jamais un caprice vous l'enlève, jamais vous n'en verrez une semblable.'

(*L*, p.200)

1. *Esprit and Passion*

*Lamiel* (1839-42) marks a self-conscious return to France, the land of *esprit*, after Stendhal's lengthy Italian interlude. It can therefore be seen as the fictional equivalent of the *Mémoires d'un touriste*, also because its fragmentary form shows Stendhal returning to previous works for inspiration. The first version of the unfinished novel (on which I shall concentrate) is centred around the eponymous heroine, a working-class girl of doubtful parentage, characterized by the intellectual curiosity that is her sole *passion* (*L*, p.176, 201, 208). She is granted access to the household of the local aristocrat on account of her skill in reading, is mistakenly seen as an ideological ally of her *ultra* host and finally gives herself over to crime. Lamiel is therefore a female Julien; hence the irony when she meets and despises a marquis de la Vemaye. This conjunction of the name Julien takes up on receiving his brief commission in the army and the title of the La Moles suggests that Lamiel is meeting the Julien that Paris would eventually have produced, had he not attacked Louise de Rénal. Lamiel draws attention to la Vemaye's surrender to Parisian manners by suggesting that he be more 'bon enfant et simple':

> Ce mot fit oublier à la Vemaye tous ses compliments /toute sa réserve/ de bonne compagnie. Il oublia sa mémoire et, se trouvant riche de son propre fonds, il dit ce qu'il pensait au moment même, sans s'inquiéter beaucoup des phrases incorrectes /de l'incorrection des phrases/ qui pouvaient lui échapper en improvisant. (p.203)

Lamiel has earlier met Julien in another form, that of the generous abbé Clément, an impoverished priest of humble origins who represents the virtues with which Louise de Rénal, in the end correctly, credits Julien.

Sansfin, by contrast, is drawn from *Lucien Leuwen*. He is the colleague of Du Poirier, a scheming, cowardly, imaginative, clever and professionally competent doctor, forever
manipulating the fears of both his patients and aristocrat masters, whom he simultaneously envies and despises: 'je joue sur leurs terreurs comme Lamiel joue sur son piano' (p.130). Sansfin, in the manner of Du Poirier, effects the transition from provincial doctor to Parisian political player, thereby emphasizing both the friponnerie of government and the sickness of the body politic.

The young duc de Miossens, a student at the Ecole polytechnique, is in turn drawn from Lucien Leuven (although the surname is related to that of Miossince in Le Rose et le Vert). He is prevented by his worried mother from participating in the July Revolution. Pampered and vain, Miossens nonetheless possesses 'noblesse dans l'âme' (p.150) as well as 'infiniment d'esprit': 'la nature avait seulement oublié de lui donner la force de vouloir' (p.151). Miossens is Lucien arrested in his early indolence.

Finally d'Aubigné/Nerwinde represents a conflation of Léon, also the son of a Napoleonic general and the hero of Le Rose et le Vert, and the Jockeys of A-Imagination (L, p.187, 192; OC, XLIX, 75). Lamiel is surrounded by pale copies of Stendhal's great souls: heroes stripped of passion and instead obsessed by the parestre of vanity (hence Stendhal's decision to name the most vain of these copies after Agrippa d'Aubigné). Lamiel herself must find a way of emulating (as opposed to imitating) Julien: hence her relentless quest for l'imprévu and le naturel, for the habitudes of education and the passion of emotion.1

Stendhal's choice of a Norman location (Carville) plunges Lamiel into le réel as opposed to l'imaginaire of Italy's Ariostan luoghi ameni. Stendhal chooses to link this réel to the concept of esprit: 'toutes choses ont de l'esprit en Normandie, et rien ne se fait sans son pourquoi, et souvent un pourquoi très finement calculé' (L, p.42). Even the local stream is credited with esprit (p.42, 58), just as the ruisseau public of Verrières is associated with the materialism of M. de Rênal and 'le vieux Sorel' (IRN, p.5). The narrator reacts to the endless calculation of Norman conversation with the same horror exhibited by the Tourist at various stages of his journeys through France, noting that in the course of his visits to Carville 'j'aurais voulu ne pas savoir le français' (p.42). Thus, 'les finesse, les calculs sordides de ces Normands ne me délassaient presque pas de la vie compliquée de Paris' (p.43).

1 'Les cœurs dominés par la vanité ont une peur instinctive des émotions, c'est la grande route pour arriver au ridicule' (p.192).
The lush Norman countryside nevertheless represents the possibility of an escape from the monotonous boulevards of Paris, offering putative travellers 'quelque pâture à l'imagination' (p.41). The purpose of the novel will be to prove that: 'il y a des bonnes gens partout, même en Normandie, où ils sont à la vérité beaucoup plus rares qu'ailleurs' (p.55). In particular, the novel seeks to prove that even in Normandy it is possible to develop a passionate, Plutarchian great soul.

Sansfin teaches Lamiel to believe that 's'amuser' is 'la seule chose réelle' (p.106). He hopes to turn both Lamiel and the duchesse into his creatures by indulging their natural inclinations. Sansfin is confident that his strategy will work: 'si la nature m'a donné une triste enveloppe, je sais manier la parole et me rendre maître de l'opinion de sots et même, ajouta-t-il avec un sourire de satisfaction, de l'opinion de gens d'esprit' (p.93). Sansfin, however, finds himself étonné de la clarté et la vigueur de cet esprit si jeune [Lamiel]: la tromper était fort difficile' (ibid.). The narrator has already explained that: 'Lamiel était fort éveillée, pleine d'esprit et d'imagination' (p.73). From the outset, Lamiel therefore resolves the opposition of _esprit_ and _imagination_ set up in the first pages of the novel.

Sansfin similarly combines these two qualities: 'ce n'était point un homme sans imagination. Ce qui lui manquait, comme il le prouva du reste par la suite, lorsque la fortune vint frapper à sa porte, c'était une once de bon sens' (p.45). Yet, in the manner of Du Poirier, Sansfin places his imagination exclusively in the service of egotism and envy. Thus Sansfin delights in the death of a young and handsome man in his care (p.67). Similarly, on the occasion of the July Revolution against an order he claims to support, Sansfin's 'imagination s'étendait avec délices sur les humiliations qu'allait souffrir cette maison de Bourbon qui depuis un siècle protégeait les forts contre les faibles' (p. 130). The alliance Lamiel concludes with Sansfin therefore risks perverting (as opposed to destroying) her imagination. The latter teaches her that: 'le monde n'était qu'une mauvaise comédie, jouée sans grâce, par d'infâmes menteurs' (p.105). As a result, Lamiel begins to assume that displays of virtue are at best miscalculations, at worst evidence of the worst kind of hypocrisy. Thus the sous-préfet, a M. de Bermude, after years of political loyalty, is finally sacked for not following party instructions around the time of the recent elections. Lamiel concludes: 'voilà ce qui arrivera toujours à tous ces petits bourgeois qui veulent faire les Romains' (p. 118). Roman virtue is a dangerous anachronism, hence also her later, erroneous comparison of d'Aubigné and Miossens: 'celui-ci n'est point un petit Caton ennuyeux et toujours le même, comme le duc' (p.186). Thus, 'le premier sentiment
de Lamiel à la vue d'une vertu était de la croire une hypocrisie' (p. 118). Stendhal immediately traces the intellectual origins of this unfortunate habitude:

'Le monde', lui disait Sansfin, 'n'est point divisé comme le croit le nigaud, en riches et en pauvres, en hommes vertueux et en scélérats, mais tout simplement en dupes et en fripons. Voilà la clef qui explique le XIXe siècle depuis la chute de Napoléon; car', ajoutait Sansfin, 'la bravoure personnelle, la fermeté de caractère n'offrent point prise à l'hypocrisie. Comment un homme peut-il être hypocrisne en se lançant contre le mur d'un cimetière de campagne bien crénelé et défendu par deux cents hommes? A l'exception de ces faits, ma belle amie, ne croyez jamais un mot de toutes les vertus dont on vient vous battre les oreilles. Par exemple, votre duchesse parle sans cesse de bonté; c'est là, suivant elle, la vertu par excellence; le vrai sens de ses actes d'admiration, c'est que, comme toutes les femmes de son rang, elle aime mieux avoir affaire à des dupes qu'à des fripons; c'est là le fin mot de ce prétendu usage du monde dont les femmes de son rang parlent sans cesse. (p. 118).

Lamiel, however, reacts to this tirade in an unexpected way. She embraces coquinerie in the manner of Lucien, as a means of testing and developing her heroism:

Après le départ du docteur, Lamiel se dit: 'Je ne puis voir la guerre, mais quant à la fermeté de caractère, je puis non seulement la voir chez les autres, mais je puis espérer de la mettre en pratique moi-même.'

Elle ne se trompait point: la nature lui avait donné l'âme qu'il faut pour mépriser la faiblesse; toutefois, l'amour essayait ses premières attaques sur son cœur. (p. 119)

Lamiel accepts that she will not be given the opportunity to fight in a war (an opportunity of course equally denied to Julien and Lucien). She will, however, make an effort to construct her personality through emulation (self-habituation). Thus Lamiel adopts Sansfin's confrontational technique, developing an 'esprit de contradiction' (p. 172) which serves to encourage her in her libertarian pursuit of l'imprévu and le naturel in a world of vanity and manners.

In particular, Lamiel rejects the meaningless rules of religion, tradition and convention. She therefore bridles at the idiocy of her 'aunt' Hautemare's distress at finding that they have eaten bouillon gras on a Friday (pp. 73-74). This episode prepares her for la Merlin's revelation: 'c'est bon comme du pain, les Hautemare, mais c'est bête' (p. 74). Positive rules, to borrow Marxist terminology, are seen as no more than the product of a fripon superstructure's attempts to control a base made up of dupes. Thus when Clément tells Lamiel that love is criminal unless sanctioned by the sacrament of marriage within forty days (pp. 110-11), she responds by deciding to take a lover:
'Eh bien! j'irai me promener au bois avec un jeune homme', se dit Lamiel.

Tel fut le résultat des longues réflexions qui suivirent sa conversation avec l'abbé Clément.

'Je veux savoir absolument', se dit-elle, 'ce que c'est que l'amour. Mon oncle dit que c'est un grand crime, mais qu'importent les idées d'un imbécile tel que mon oncle? C'est comme le grand crime que trouvait ma tante Hautemare à mettre du bouillon gras dans la soupe du vendredi: Dieu en était profondément offensé; et je vois ici Mme la duchesse qui, pour avoir payé vingt francs, fait gras toute l'année.' (p.117)

Lamiel's sexual experimentation springs from her noble aspiration both to flout convention and discover truths about herself and humanity that have been established empirically, without regard for received opinion. This experimentation is perceived as a form of courage, antithetical to the prudent calculations that underpin Norman relationships. Stendhal therefore describes Lamiel as 'une femme honnête' precisely because 'elle avait si peu de vanité, qu'elle se fit offerte à lui [d'Aubigné], au premier moment d'impatience dans lequel il l'eût surprise' (p.188). Similarly, the scandalized Clément, after hearing Lamiel's confession of her affairs and life as a courtesan, concludes that she possesses 'une âme si belle et si noble, malgré ses souillures. Sa tête l'a égarée, mais le cœur est pur' (p.207). Lamiel for her part has learned to reason in the manner of Sansfin: 'ne suis-je pas maîtresse de moi? A qui est-ce que je fais tort? A quelle promesse est-ce que je manque?' (p.208). She is driven by her curiosity to find an answer to a central question in Stendhal's fiction: 'les gens qui font l'amour sont-ils dans la classe des dupes ou des gens d'esprit?' (p.120).

The *dupe-fripon* model Sansfin proposes helps Lamiel solve the enigmas of life in Carville. Yet the very applicability of this model to the inhabitants of Carville turns Lamiel into 'une petite misanthrope' (p.107), depressed by the petty egoism of her 'aunt' (p.139). Lamiel's return to the village after her long stay at the *château* leaves her in despair at finding herself suddenly exposed to 'les idées les plus vulgaires de la prudence normande, exprimées dans le style le plus énergique, c'est-à-dire le plus bas' (p.140).

The narrator comments that Lamiel, in the manner of Lucien before her, needs only to acquire more experience to counteract the misanthropic errors of her imagination: 'c'était un cœur et un esprit romanesques qui se figuraient les chances de bonheur qu'elle allait trouver dans la vie' (p.141). Only the philosophy of experience will allow Lamiel to draw useful conclusions from her experiments. In the meantime, she is still prone to elementary
errors, for instance judging d'Aubigné by his own assessment of himself (pp.184-85). The narrator again intervenes, revealing that Lamiel 'avait beaucoup d'esprit parce qu'elle avait une grande âme, mais ce n'était pas un esprit de comparaison et d'étude; et elle était bien loin de pouvoir juger elle-même et les autres' (p.185). Lamiel is therefore in no position to choose between the self-serving cynicism of Sansfin (finally a *fripon*) and the generosity of Clément. Lamiel's great soul prompts her simultaneously to perceive the truth in Sansfin's explanations of Carville and to sense that she needs an outlet for her native generosity.

Lamiel therefore finds herself drawn to the abbé Clément:

> Quelle différence de sa [Sansfin's] gaieté à celle de cet abbé Clément! Le Sansfin n'est gai du fond du cœur que quand il voit arriver quelque malheur au prochain, le bon abbé, au contraire, est rempli de bonté pour tous les hommes. (p.107)

Lamiel, 'cette âme encore si jeune' (p.108), 'se fût jetée dans la Seine sans balancer pour sauver son oncle ou sa bonne tante qui seraient tombés dans les flots' (p.154). She is similarly described as possessing 'la simple humanité' (p.191) and being 'bonne, simple, enjouée, heureuse, sans malice au fond du cœur' (p.195). Indeed, 'elle se sentait une incapacité complète pour cette hypocrisie de tous les instants sans laquelle il était impossible, suivant le docteur, d'arriver au moindre succès' (p.116). Lamiel nevertheless begins to feel contempt for the self-deception (*duperie*) required to sustain what appears to be the illusion of generosity in others. Thus the thought of Clément's 'bonté pour tous les hommes' leads Lamiel to the following interim conclusion: 'en admirant et même en aimant un peu le jeune abbé, Lamiel avait pitié de lui quand elle le voyait compter sur la même bienveillance de la part des autres' (p.107).

Lamiel will finally return to Clément at the end of the manuscript, her experiences helping her to recover her 'estime pour le caractère et la bonne foi de l'abbé' (p.209). Stendhal implicitly suggests that Lamiel thereby accedes to the 'sentiment des arts' possessed by

---

2 Lamiel similarly compares herself to the duchesse, noting that the latter is happy when the carriage of one of her neighbours spills, whereas 'moi, j'avais les larmes aux yeux' (p.114).

3 The return of Clément can be seen as evidence that Stendhal is losing interest in Lamiel's story, and thinking of curtailing it in order instead to write a comic novel centred on the *fripon* Sansfin. See also Hemmings, 'A propos de la nouvelle édition de *Lamiel*. Les deux *Lamiel*. Nouveaux aperçus sur les procédés de composition de Stendhal romancier', *Stendhal Club*, 15 (1973), 287-316.
Clément, one of the few 'cœurs nés pour les arts' (p.205) to be found in Northern France. In the meantime, Lamiel turns not just to experience but also to books for instruction, seeking to emulate the exemplars who resolve the contradictions between *duperie* and *friponnerie*, generosity and egoism, *passion* and *esprit*, and who therefore allow Lamiel to practice 'la fermeté de caractère'.

2. Emulation and Imitation

Lamiel first discovers the pleasures of reading from a popular romance, the *Histoire des quatre fils Aymon*: 'ce livre, confisqué par Hautemare à un écolier libertin, fit des ravages incroyables dans l'âme de la petite fille. Lamiel pensa à ces grands personnages et à leur cheval toute la soirée et puis toute la nuit' (p.71). Lamiel's reading often takes place at night, as if her books were her lovers. Thus Lamiel will eventually sneak out of the Hautemare's house for secret trysts with *Gil Blas* in the duchesse's Gothic tower (p.143). Hautemare clearly suspects his niece is meeting a man (p. 145). He would presumably be even more horrified by the truth, for despite being a school-teacher, Hautemare has a horror of books (p. 143).

Stendhal links Lamiel's reading with her wish to acquire sexual experience, noting that 'à cette époque de sa vie, le moindre roman l'eût perdue' (p.145). Books, however, give Lamiel a pleasure superior to that eventually afforded her by Jean Berville (p.148): 'elle jouissait des *imagination* qu'ils lui donnaient' (p.72). Although Lamiel is initially attracted to the *Aeneid* 'à cause des amours de Didon' (p.72), she soon finds greater satisfactions in different types of narrative: 'une histoire de guerre, où les héros bravaient de grands dangers et accomplissaient des choses difficiles, la faisait rêver pendant trois jours, tandis qu'elle ne donnait qu'une attention très passagère à un conte d'amour' (p.116). Lamiel's progressive disillusionment with courtly love mirrors her growing obsession with concepts of heroism, and culminates in her declaration: 'Dieu me délivre des amoureux! J'aime mieux ma liberté que tout' (p. 171).

The break between literature and love occurs 'quand la duchesse lui fit lire les romans hypocrites de Mme de Genlis' (p.116):

Lamiel n'était attentive qu'aux obstacles que les héros rencontraient dans leurs amours. Allaien-il rêver aux charmes de leurs belles au fond des forêts éclairées par le pâle rayon de la lune, elle pensait aux dangers qu'ils couraient d'être surpris par des voleurs armés de poignards, dont elle lisait les exploits détaillés, tous les jours, dans *la Quotidienne*. (ibid.)
Lamiel's interest transfers from the ostensible 'héros' of the story to the heroic criminals who attack them. She is not satisfied by the passive role fripon society holds out, particularly to women, but also, in Stendhal's analysis, to the convention-bound male lover. Lamiel wishes instead to put her fermeté de caractère to the test. Thus she is fascinated by the robbers who disrupt the reverie of the lover: a reverie which reduces the heroine to a mere social construct as opposed to the unique cristallisation of the lover's passionate imagination.

Lamiel is searching for exemplars to emulate, finally finding them in 'l'histoire du Grand Mandrin puis celle de Monsieur Cartouche' (p.72). Even la Quotidienne, with its occasional lurid descriptions of criminal heroism, falls short of 'la vie de Mandrin, à ses yeux le livre le plus amusant du monde!' (p.81). Unlike the novels of Mme de Genlis, these texts make no concessions to the cant of literary convention: 'on voit bien que l'Académie française et les prix Montyon n'ont point encore passé par cette littérature-là; aussi n'est-elle pas ennuyeuse' (p.72). Sansfin second-guesses Lamiel's interest in criminals, subscribing to the Gazette des Tribunaux in order to cure Lamiel of ennui: 'les crimes l'intéressaient; elle était sensible à la fermeté d'âme déployée par certains scélérats' (p.87).

Lamiel compares the lives of Mandrin and Cartouche, noting narrative parallels between them and concluding that they are 'grands hommes':

'Un soir, à souper, Lamiel eut l'imprudence de parler de ces grands hommes à son oncle; d'hurteur, il fit le signe de croix.

'Apprenez, Lamiel', s'écria-t-il, 'qu'il n'y a de grands hommes que les saints' (p.72).

Hautemare is so scandalized that he adds a pater to the evening prayers 'pour demander au ciel qu'il préservât sa nièce de penser à Mandrin et Cartouche' (p.72). Importantly, Hautemare is scandalized simply by the Promethean arrogance of elevating ordinary mortals to the status of exemplars. Lamiel is fascinated by this hostility: "Mais pourquoi mon oncle ne veut-il pas que je les [Mandrin and Cartouche] admire?" se disait-elle dans son lit, ne pouvant dormir' (p.73). These reflections lead Lamiel to a breakthrough:

Puis, tout à coup, apparaît cette idée bien criminelle: 'Mais est-ce que mon oncle aurait donné dix écus comme monsieur Cartouche à cette pauvre veuve Renoart des environs de Valence à qui les
gabelous venaient de saisir sa vache noire, et qui n'avait plus que treize sous pour vivre, elle et ses sept enfants?

Pendant un quart d'heure, Lamiel pleura de pitié; puis elle se dit: 'Est-ce que, une fois sur l'échafaud, mon oncle aurait su supporter les coups de la masse de fer du bourreau qui brisait ses bras, sans sourciller le moins du monde comme monsieur Mandrin? Mon oncle gémit à n'en pas finir quand son pied goutteux rencontre un caillou.'

Cette nuit fit révolution dans l'esprit de la petite fille. Le lendemain, elle apporta à l'épicier la vieille traduction de Virgile qui avait des images, elle refusa des figues et des raisins de Corinthe, et reçut en échange une de ces belles histoires qu'on venait de lui défendre de lire. (p.73)

Lamiel is nourishing herself on 'les grands exemples' in the manner of a young Mme Roland. Her great soul is responding to Cartouche as an exemplar of generosity and Mandrin as an exemplar of courage. Hautemare's fears are realized: the choice of lay exemplars constitutes a first step towards singularity. The second step is to adopt the 'esprit de comparaison' which flows from Plutarch's parallelism. Thus the parallel study of Mandrin and Cartouche prompts Lamiel to make her first tentative comparison between Cartouche and Hautemare. Lamiel responds to her ardent criminals in the same way that Henry Brulard responds to Gros: 'voir un homme sur le modèle des Grecs et des Romains et vouloir mourir plutôt que de n'être pas comme lui ne fut qu'un moment' (OI, II, 861 [VHB]).

Initially, however, Lamiel's 'esprit de comparaison' is not sufficiently well-developed for her to distinguish between emulation and imitation. This failing can in part be explained by Lamiel's own instinctive rejection of imitation. Thus the duchesse is pleased with her precisely because she makes no attempt to play the aristocrat: 'ce qui surtout faisait la conquête de la grande dame, c'est que Lamiel n'avait point l'air d'une demoiselle' (p.81). Similarly, Lamiel wins back the good opinion of Carville when she immediately reverts to the local costume on her return from the château (p.137). Caillot, a young actress from the Variétés, whose 'esprit' and 'imprévu' are reminiscent of Mlle Raimonde in Lucien Leuwen, nevertheless offers Lamiel the following advice: 'vous n'avez qu'un écueil à fuir: éblouie par les transports de gaieté que je fais naître quelquefois, ne cherchez pas à m'imiter. Si le cœur vous en dit, osez être le contraire de ce que vous me voyez' (p.198). Caillot wishes to make sure that Lamiel understands the difference between imitation and emulation. She then goes on to stress Lamiel's own inimitability: Lamiel has emulated her 'grands hommes' by constructing her personality around their virtues (habitudes de l'âme). She is therefore unpredictable because single-minded in the pursuit of her forceful (ambitious) and principled (generous) passion for distinction: 'avec son air doux et gai,
elle est l'audace même; elle a le courage, plus qu'humain /que féminin/, de braver votre mépris, et c'est pourquoi elle est inimitable. Regardez-la bien, messieurs, si jamais un caprice vous l'enlève, jamais vous n'en verrez une semblable' (p.200).

Lamiel is already beginning, at this stage, to realize her mistake with regard to d'Aubigné/Nerwinde, described as 'une copie de ces jeunes grands seigneurs dont les derniers sont morts de vieillesse sous Charles X' (p.185). He is forever acting out a role, for instance speaking to the servants who despise him 'en se rappelant Firmin, des Français (rôle de Moncade)' (p.181). D'Aubigné/Nerwinde is imitable precisely because he himself can only imitate passion. Nevertheless, he declares that l'amour n'est point une plaisanterie pour moi: c'est une passion véritablement terrible; c'est l'amour des chevaliers du moyen âge qui porte aux grandes actions' (p.184). He similarly lays claim to 'le caractère de mes aieux' (p. 184), a claim doubly false given that his family's distinction is owed exclusively to his father's campaigns as a General under Napoleon, and not to the remote ancestors (a Périgueux hatter) to whom he alludes. Lamiel, forever exalting her passions in her quest for distinction, is initially taken in by such a brazen appropriation of her values (p.185). She gradually perceives, however, that d'Aubigné/Nerwinde is actually passionless. Thus the narrator observes:

Si elle eût eu à cette époque le talent de lire dans son propre cœur, elle eût dit au comte:

'Vous me plaisez, mais à condition de ne me jamais parler le langage de la passion.' (p. 187)

A 'M. de Menton' finally dismisses d'Aubigné/Nerwinde: 'c'est un joueur d'échecs cauteleux que la bêtise du public prend pour un poète' (p.194). The narrator goes on to claim that 'le comte de Nerwinde eût dû être l'aide de camp d'un prince, dont les droits ne sont reconnus certains. L'étiquette était son fort' (p.198). In other words Nerwinde, the product of d'Aubigné's parestre, would have proved the ideal aide de camp to Louis-Alexandre Berthier, prince de Neuchâtel. Thus Nerwinde betrays the memory of his father by imitating the man held responsible in the Mémoires sur Napoléon for emasculating Napoleon, precisely by encouraging him to imitate Louis XIV rather than emulate Caesar.

This emasculation of Caesarism also features in Stendhal's characterization of the young duc de Miossens, briefly given the name César. Stendhal is using the same tactics

---

4 Stendhal gives Sansfin the same name once he has sold himself to the Parisian congrégation (p.135).
employed in *A-Imagination* when he gives Alexandre Macaire's shop the name *César dans les Gaules* (*OC*, xl, 75-76). In *Lamiel*, however, Stendhal's use of the name César proves particularly fruitful. The narrator delights in absurd phrases such as 'César tremblait comme la feuille' and 'le pauvre César' (p.168). He further revels in the relationship between the young Duke and Duval, his indispensable *fripon* servant (p.121), noting for instance that: 'César finit donc par se rendre, mais à contre-cœur, aux exhortations de son tyran Duval' (p.150). The use of 'tyran' is doubly ironic, echoing Lamiel's contempt for this 'beau petit César' (p.156) who allows all his thinking to be done for him (p.154, 158, 173), and also pointing once again to modern civilization's emasculation of tyranny. Such irony reaches its climax when Lamiel pronounces the sententious, rather Roman-sounding decasyllables: 'ils savent que leur nièce parle à César. Leur nièce ira loger avec César' (p.155).

César finally admits to Lamiel that: 'quand je n'ai plus Duval, je ne sais rien faire' (p.167). Lamiel's response refers both to Caesar and Napoleon: 'et moi, je ne veux plus de Duval, je ne veux pas d'un roi fainéant; je veux vous voir agir par vous-même' (ibid.). Caesar and his modern pair both become kings as a consequence of their achievements; they are therefore the opposites of a 'roi fainéant', forever harking back to the actions of his ancestors. Caesar and Napoleon are doubly exemplars in that they both show what it is possible to achieve in one's own right through the emulation (as opposed to imitation) of their own exemplars (Alexander and Caesar respectively). Lamiel seeks to emulate exemplars in her turn, hoping not only to admire 'fermeté de caractère' in others, but to put it into practice herself. Those that would be her companions must realize that she expects no less of them: hence Lamiel's projected love for Valbaire, a criminal openly at war with Orleanist society (p.242).

3. Parallel Lives

*Lamiel* posits an alliance of great souls. Thus the marquise (*sic*) de Miossens fears a 'révolte des jacobins unis aux bonapartistes' (p.52). Lamiel similarly expects revolution in Carville to take the form of a mob crying out 'vive Napoléon ou vive la République!' (p.126). Stendhal is resolving his Hegelian tragedy of good (the Republic) competing against incompatible good (Napoleon). Yet Stendhal finally knows that Napoleon was the only possible winner of this struggle, just as Caesarism, if not Caesar himself, finally triumphed over Brutus's Republicanism: 'la mémoire de Napoléon est sacrée parmi le
peuple qui n'a gardé aucun souvenir de la République, car en l'absence du luxe, il n'y a point de grands pour lui' (p.182).

Stendhal's elision of the Republic and Empire is facilitated by his return to Alfieri's ardent criminals, the inheritors of Roman greatness. Mandrin and Cartouche, Lafargue and Lacenaire, Pintard and Valbaire are each exemplars of energy, ambition and generosity. Tyrannical in their ruthlessness, they are also tyrannicides in a perverted society that accommodates the greed of fripons at the expense of the dupé majority. These criminals unite passion and philosophy, generosity and ambition, emotion and reason, 'le sentiment des arts' with 'la faculté de vouloir'. As a result, they become exemplars for Stendhal's readers, transcending Sansfin's categories of duperie and friponnerie.

Stendhal's texts show their heroes and heroines transforming themselves into great souls through the emulation of Plutarchian exemplars. Stendhal's autobiographical writings follow Rousseau, Mme Roland and Alfieri in framing the life of the subject around virtues found in the Parallel Lives. Stendhal's fiction, and in particular his lives of Julien and Lamiel, Lucien and Fabrice in turn constitute two sets of modern parallel lives. The former pairing chiefly represents the energetic virtues of ambition (associated by Plutarch with Caesar), the latter, the noble virtues of generosity (associated with Plutarch's portrait of Brutus). Crucially, the exemplars of ambition and generosity are finally drawn to each other. Thus Caesar and Brutus each seek to incorporate the virtues of the other in their own personalities. Caesar deliberately furthers Brutus's career despite the danger he represents (FRR, pp.301-02). Brutus, on the other hand, 'took pains to moderate his natural instincts by means of the culture and mental discipline which philosophy gives, while he also exerted himself to stir up the more placid and passive side of his character and force it into action, with the result that his temperament was almost ideally balanced to pursue a life of virtue' (MR, p.223). Stendhal's fictional exemplars are similarly drawn to their counterparts, as shown particularly by the relationships of Julien and Louise, Fabrice and Clélia. Thus Caesar and Brutus, and through them Julien, Lucien, Fabrice and Lamiel, finally come to resemble each other, each great souls ready to join Mme Roland, Lafargue and Napoleon on Stendhal's esoteric list of exemplars.
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