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Abstract

The “gypsy” figure has been popular in popular culture for hundreds of years – certainly since the 1600s. The figure can embody wanderlust, difference, bold sexuality, freedom, danger, and criminality. In 19th-century France, the figure’s trendiness was apparent in literature. Writers such as Victor Hugo, George Sand, Charles Nodier, and Prosper Mérimée profited from using these figures in writing. Most criticism of these works focuses on the origins of the tales or critical analyses of the narratives themselves. This research expands upon the extant scholarship to develop an overview of the usage of this figure as it moved throughout the 19th-century. Rather than being an incidental trend, the “gypsy” figure was a key literary tool used to explore national identity politics. Specifically, it was used to explore what it means to be French in an unstable political landscape. The figure itself became a literary, linguistic tool.

Though the figure functioned well as a linguistic tool to explore French identity, it is a dual-sided coin with implications for Romani populations. Because the figure was reduced to stereotypes, it reified societal discrimination against the Roma. The last chapter of this dissertation looks at how one Romani author, Matéo Maximoff, built upon the extant French literary corpus to rewrite Romani stereotypes. In doing so, he translated some of his community’s folklore not only from Romany into French but from oral to written. His writings provide the basis for a study on cultural reappropriation and folklore.

Ultimately, this research finds that the French relationship with the tzigane literary figure is complex. It contributes to the nationalistic dialog of the 19th century; it allows for literary boundary pushing; and finally, it is being reappropriated by Romani authors today.
Introduction

Roma, Bohemians, and the cultural imaginary

People across the globe share a similar image of a gypsy, while most have never heard the words Roma, Romani, or Manouche? The figure of the Gypsy is international, to say the least. With a word, one can easily picture a dark-haired woman dancing with castagnettes, living in a caravan, or even a group of colorfully-dressed beggars and thieves. People often associate gypsies with occult practices - necromancy, hydromancy, cartomancy, magical spells, and curses. The overall image conjures thoughts of free-spirited souls who eschew social systems. The idea of wanderlust often comes to mind as well. However, most people are unaware that the word Gypsy itself is a slur used to describe the Roma.¹ In this research, I use this term as it relates to the imagined figure and not members of the Roma - an ethnic group whose roots are in India but who have migrated across the globe. The imagined concept of the Gypsy has eroded perceptions about the Roma.

Society is full of magical explanations for mundane things; the literary trope of the Gypsy is just one example. However, because the legendary character of the Gypsy blurs the line between reality and fiction, fact and myth, history and story more than perhaps any other mythological creation, real-life damage and harm have been caused. The Roma face high rates of discrimination, harassment, and violence.² I examine only a tiny facet of how this erosion of fiction and reality occurred. In 19th-century French literature, the tzigane or Gypsy became a

¹ I explain the differences in terminology in Appendix 1.
² The Council of Europe has more information on this discrimination here: https://www.coe.int/en/web/roma-and-travellers/anti-gypsyism-/discrimination. The European Roma Rights Centre (ERCC) maintains current records of violence and discrimination on their home page http://www.erc.org
popular literary figure. Because, as Manfred Beller explains in “Perception, Image, Imagology,”
figures influence our real-world perceptions of different nationalities, the popularization of this
figure contributed to our global (mis)understanding of who the Roma are. Novels, and other
fictional texts, have created this false image of the Roma which is broadly accepted as truth.

My research is threefold. First, it shows how authors used the \textit{tzigane} figure to develop
discourses around French identity. This discourse used the othered figure of the \textit{tzigane} to
expose fears and weaknesses surrounding French identity. Second, it shows how the \textit{tzigane}
was used as an intentional literary figure that allowed authors to push the boundaries of
literature. Finally, drawing from Matéo Maximoff’s 20\textsuperscript{th}-century writings, my research shows
how Romani authors refigure this stereotypical character to write well-rounded Romani
characters. These characters, who simultaneously embody and refuse elements of the \textit{tzigane}
figure, also develop an identity dialectic and challenge writing. Whereas French authors used
the \textit{tzigane} in a way that reified the negative societal beliefs regarding the Romani, Maximoff’s
reappropriation educates his readership about the realities of Romani life while reimagining the
language structure of a novel.

Prosper Mérimée, Victor Hugo, and George Sand use the \textit{tzigane} character to explore
concepts of French identity, which was in flux in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century (see Appendix 3 for an
overview of the complex political, social, and economic history of France during this period). As
the French political pendulum swung between royalism and republicanism, the response to the
question of Frenchness shifted as well. Within the works of Mérimée, Hugo, and Sand, the
\textit{tzigane} played the paradoxical roles of the other and insider. \textit{Tziganes} were dangerous
caracters who threatened “French” society. The reader could safely interact with these
characters through the page. Rather than directly facing the faults and weaknesses of society, the reader can infer them from a distance through the *tzigane* characters. The *tzigane* character — usually female — provided a safe space for exploration. She represented concerns, hopes, dreams, and worries while functioning as a symbolic scapegoat upon which authors and readers could cast prevailing anxieties. The character reveals the dark, hidden features of society and the self. It is what Jung, in *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, calls the shadow-self. As a symbol for this shadow-self, she loses all connection to reality. As Baudrillard discusses in *Poetics of Space*, the Gypsy becomes a pure simulacrum, or the last-stage symbol. However, this simulacrum was not merely the reduction of an object, but that of an entire ethnic group.

Though the texts explored in this dissertation fall within the short 23 years from 1830 to 1853, I do not treat these texts in chronological order. Instead, the approach resembles the growth of a tree, moving in multiple directions. The seed, the stereotypical image of the *bohemian*, had been planted well before these writings. It had germinated during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries through the rise of bohemian characters in literature, sending its roots deep into the soil of contemporary French culture.\(^3\) This moment in literary history shows the beginnings of the branches forming - simultaneously growing and strengthening while moving in multiple directions.

Chapter 1 examines Victor Hugo’s use of the stereotype through his character Esmeralda, in *Notre-Dame de Paris*. Esmeralda acts as a temporal buffer in his novel, allowing for a backward-looking critique of modern French society. Esmeralda, born to a French aristocrat but

\(^3\) Some literature to consider would be Molière’s *L’Étourdi ou les Fourberies de Scapin* and George de Scudéry’s *La Belle Égyptienne*. However, these texts remain outside the scope of this work.
kidnapped and raised by itinerant tziganes, represents a question mark in identity politics. She has French blood, but the Parisians cannot see her as French, a fact that ultimately leads to her killing. Her character allows the reader to anachronistically explore the concept of French citizenry – who is French, and what makes them so? By having the Church misread her identity, the novel also questions the roles of religion and secularism. These questions were prevalent at the time of the novel’s publication under the Napoleonic regime. What role, if any, does the Church play in defining French identity? Literally, the narrator uses western mythology and popular beliefs about the occult to describe and explain how the other characters of the novel perceive Esmeralda as an outsider. Esmeralda is compared to a strygis, a vampire-like creature, and seen as a demonic sorceress. The French men of the novel, therefore, feel that they cannot control themselves in her presence. The story defines her non-Frenchness through a particularly French lens. For the Parisians of the text, Esmeralda is not French because the national imagination classifies her as an outsider. Ultimately, the novel does not provide any clear answers to questions of French identity. The reader sees that the Parisians have a flawed view of Esmeralda. If Parisians can misread French identity, could real-life institutions do the same? The relationship between Parisians and Esmeralda requires the reader to confront such questions with a critical eye.

Chapter 2 explores Prosper Mérimée’s use of the exotic Carmen to continue this critique of the development of French identity. The novella accomplishes two principle things: (1) it allegorizes the socioeconomic shifts in France; (2) and, like Notre Dame de Paris, it defines outsiders through a decidedly French lens. Other critics have noticed the political undertones of the novella. For example, Corey Cropper and Antonya Fonyi explore the pro-monarchy leanings
and conservatism of Carmen. I expand upon their arguments, showing that Carmen demonstrates extant fears regarding socioeconomic shifts under the Napoleonic regime. Mérimée codifies these fears in his characters Don José and Carmen. Don José who represents the old elite loses his identity as he falls in love with Carmen. Once a Christian nobleman, he becomes a wandering criminal as he chases Carmen. Carmen embodies a poisonous geographic uncertainty which camouflages her identity to manipulate those around her. Ultimately, as this poison becomes more threatening to the men around her, they become more violent in attempt to control it. This leads to her Carmen’s death and that of Don José. The combination of these characters allegorizes the dangers of not knowing one’s origins and heritage.

The novella codifies Spain through historical and literary references. This codification defines outsiders through a French lens. The novella relies on historic warfare to do so. The geographic reference points found throughout the novella parallel the battle sites of the French occupation of Spain. I outline these in detail within the chapter. Literarily, Mérimée relies on intertext to describe a particularly French version of Spain. He uses references and citations from Corneille, Brantôme, Pantagruel, and Hugo. These references allow the reader to conjure up a particular image of Spain, one that has been translated through the French imagination. Mérimée’s reader can thus interpret two categories: French and not-French. However, French conceptualizations define both groups.

Carmen blurs the lines between reality and fiction through intertext and war history. Within this liminal space, readers can explore and pose questions of identity. Like Notre Dame de Paris, Carmen does not provide answers to these questions. Instead, the novella functions as a dialectic tool for such explorations. The blurring of fiction and reality, mapped onto a female
body, creates a safe space for this exploration. Remaining in pure reality denies the consumer this safety.

Chapter 3 continues the discussion on identity politics but focuses more on the 19th-century usage of the tzigan as a driving force of the novelesque, or romanesque, in Sandian terms. The chapter examines Charles Nodier’s *L’Histoire du Roi de Bohème et de ses sept châteaux* alongside two of George Sand’s novels, *Consuelo* and *La Filleule*. Nodier’s work *L’Histoire du Roi de Bohème et de ses sept châteaux* (henceforth referred to as RBSC) is a nonsensical text primarily characterized by its total lack of plot and setting. The text is mostly a series of pastiches and plagiarisms. Per Nodier’s own explanation, it is an attempt at literary novelty through form rather than content. This section explores how authors can challenge the concept of literature through the realm of “Bohemia.” Ultimately, this challenge ends in a commercial failure. It nevertheless allows for an exciting exploration of how Bohemia expands literary borders.

Sand also uses Bohemia and tziganes to explore literary concepts (though in a more restrained manner). The narrators of both *Consuelo* and *La Filleule* constantly remind the reader that they are reading literature. Sand refers to this self-awareness within the novels as the romanesque or novelesque in English. By doing this, Sand covertly criticizes elements of French society such as the Church, national decline, and capitalism, all while avoiding censorship. *Consuelo* and *La Filleule* create spaces in which the reader can grapple with the concept of literature. The attentive reader can also continue to explore notions of national identity. Unlike Mérimée and Hugo, Sand’s critiques point to more definitive observations about French identity. For example, Sand explores how capitalism damages French cultural
productions. Overall, Nodier and Sand turn to Bohemia as a creative space where they can test ideas, critique socio-politics, and interrogate aristocratic standards.

My final chapter skips about one hundred years of history, landing in the mid-twentieth century. As Romani literature relies primarily on oral tradition, written texts by Romani authors before this point are rare. However, Matéo Maximoff, a French Rom, took up the work of autoethnographer and novelist, creating one of the first written histories of Romani culture. His works reappropriate the stereotypes found within French and pan-European literature. He deconstructs the gypsy myth to create a balanced literary view of the Romani people. This deconstruction allows Maximoff to integrate the same tools used by Mérimée, Sand, and Hugo. He uses intertext to clarify Romani cultural elements. At times, he uses the same stereotypes which these French authors employed; however, when he does so, he presents more well-rounded characters who are not limited to these stereotypes. Like Sand, he presents social criticism through literature. Like Nodier, Maximoff uses his fictional space to challenge writing norms. Like Hugo, Sand, and Mérimée, he uses literature as a space to explore his own culture. Within the fictional realm he creates, Maximoff accomplishes a double translation. He translates from Romany to French and from oral to written text. This imaginary space allows Maximoff’s writing to function as both pure literature and pedagogical tool. The two elements are critically intertwined as the reader cannot completely consume the text without acting as a student. The text requires an active readership willing to learn about and from Romani culture. Despite Maximoff’s outsider status and relative literary obscurity, he continues the tradition of French national literature. He is a direct literary heir of the 19th-century tropes employed in canonical works.
Bohemia as a space in geopolitics and culture

As a space, Bohemia functioned in a variety of ways. As such, authors placed discourses on identity and literature within Bohemia. Therefore, it is crucial to understand its 19th-century conceptualization. In Bohème sans Frontière, Jerrold Seigel defines the separate yet intertwined spaces labeled “Bohemia.” As shown in Figure 1, Bohemia was a complicated place situated in both real and fictional spaces. Overall, all the occupants of “Bohemia” were outsiders, or at least wanted to be perceived as outsiders. Interestingly, this outsiderness provided a communal aspect. It also provided clear “us versus them” imagery. Seigel explains:

This communal side of Bohemia must be given its full weight, but we need to guard against what is often assumed to be a corollary of doing so, namely that this dimension of Bohemia cleanly separates it from the bourgeois life around it. The claim that it does has often been advanced of course, rooted partly in the language of students and ateliers, partly in socialist theory, both of which insistently contrast their communal and humanitarian perspectives with what they proclaim to be the crass and unrestrained individualism of the bourgeoisie. And to be sure it is easy to cite examples of bourgeois who were willing to cut their ties with others in pursuit of ambition or profit. But a general equation of bourgeois values and practices with such individualism simply cannot stand up to scrutiny, certainly not in the France that first gave birth to Bohemia (Paragraph 8).

The attraction to Bohemia was a rebellious political response.
As we can see from Figure 1, the Roma only occupied a small portion of Bohemia. Using *bohémien* to identify Romani people had two impacts. On the one hand, the term *bohémien*, when imposed on Roma as an exonym, implies that the Roma are originally from Bohemia, the former duchy of Great Moravia and nation in the Habsburg empire. In her work *Gypsies and other Bohemians*, Mary Brown explains that this exonym is particularly harmful because the Church and state enslaved Roma in this region for centuries (5). On the other hand, as the term *bohémien* began to take on different meanings, such as those in Figure 1, it became
synonymous with “outsider.” The terms separated mainstream society from counterculture.

Patrick Williams notes that using this lexicon to refer to Romani people is necessarily exclusionary.

Ce que ces noms ont en commun alors, à travers la bigarrure des horizons auxquels ils renvoient, c’est d’indiquer l’extériorité : les hommes et les femmes que nous appelons ainsi ne sont pas de chez nous.

Therefore, across the diverse backgrounds from which they come, what these names have in common is that they mark exteriority: the men and women who call us such names aren’t from our community (197).

The language created and used through the literature othred all groups who fall under the category of “bohémien.” Because of “bohemia’s” broad definition, Roma exclusion became more concretized in popular perceptions.

Beyond the Roma, who were the inhabitants of Bohemia according to Seigel’s map? In short, rebels. Voluntary inhabitants of Bohemia were attempting to define themselves in contrast to the bourgeoisie’s political and social expectations. In the aftermath of the Bourbon Restoration’s collapse, Seigel notes how micro-movements within Bohemia rebelled against these expectations. Seigel uses Henri Murger as a case study of such members, explaining how Murger, a member of the “water-drinkers” (so-called because they abstained from alcohol and refused bourgeois life) profited from his failed attempt at inhabiting Bohemia.

Whereas the Water-Drinkers, like Murger himself, came from the lower reaches of the bourgeoisie or the upper tier of artisans, these amateurs had more solid and comfortable backgrounds. They chose Bohemia partly out of a sense of solidarity with other young people, and partly in order to declare at least a temporary independence from their families, and from their beckoning bourgeois destinies. For them la Bohème served as what Erik Erikson would later call a moratorium, a time of experimentation and deferral. Pleasure and self-indulgence were part of this moratorium, including the sexual experimentation made possible for bourgeois provincials in Paris by the presence of young working-class women such as the models for Mimi and Musette, to whom middle-class men could offer favors and support (17).
Murger, author of *Scenes de la vie de Bohème*, is often seen as an example par excellence of a bohemian. Murger at least presented himself that way as a social outcast despite being raised by parents on the fringe of the bourgeoisie. His family was comfortable but not wealthy. His parents worked to give him opportunities to be richer than they were, encouraging him to pursue law. Murger tried to fulfill his parents’ wishes “until a friend convinced him that he was hopelessly untalented as a visual artist. [Murger’s] response was to turn his attention wholeheartedly to the poetry he had already begun to write” (34). Murger rejected the path his parents had chosen for him. Instead of entering the world of the bourgeoisie, Murger entered what would eventually become known as *la Bohème*. Murger exemplifies the rejection of bourgeois life that Bohemia embodied.

Murger’s participation in Bohemia and rejection of mainstream society eventually “gave Murger the chance to join established society” (44). Ironically, the success of his writings, highly influenced by his life in Bohemia, removed him from that space and lifted him out of poverty, returning him to bourgeois comforts. Seigel summarizes, “Bohemia performs as the antithesis to the hedonistic Parisian lifestyle. Bohemia is a celebration of poverty. [Whereas] Paris [is] the definition of luxury and indulgence” (55). Murger makes himself *not-bohemian*, or a member of acceptable French society, by essentializing and fictionalizing bohemian lifestyles. This flipping of the script, so to speak, is recurrent during this period and contributed to the success Sand, Mérimée, and Hugo enjoyed for their novels that featured *tzigane* characters. Their success came not through being *bohémien* but through appropriating the *bohémien*. 
Of course, there were less conventionally successful members of Bohemia. Seigel’s description of these other members reminds us of the exclusionary function of the space of Bohemia:

Explorers recognized Bohemia by signs: art, youth, the underworld, the gypsy lifestyle. To Henry Murger, the most influential mapper, Bohemia was the realm of young artists struggling to surmount the barriers poverty erected against their vocations [...] [Artists] lived in Bohemia because they could not - or not yet- establish their citizenship anywhere else (3-4, Bohemian Paris, emphasis mine).

Members of Bohemia, by choice or by a lack thereof, were refused inclusion into national identity or “citizenship.” Of course, this is not a question of legal citizenship, at least not for most of the members of Bohemia. However, when looking to define Frenchness, Bohemia provided a clear counterexample. Bohemia embodied what France was not.

Bohemia acted as a reference location in literature to discuss these fringe points. Lou Charnon-Deutsch does an excellent overview of the literary archetype of the Gypsy in European literature in The Spanish Gypsy. After exploring the historical ideologies and contemporary trends in social sciences, Charnon-Deutsch argues, “it is not difficult to recognize the influence of French racial thought in tracing the evolution of Gypsy descriptions in French culture from 1700 to 1900” (47). He continues;

Generally the ‘discovery’ of the Spanish Gypsy by French travelers and writers coincided with the racialized theories of Gobineau and his mid-nineteenth century followers. In summarizing their voyages to Spain, eighteenth-century French travelers had largely ignored what would later become the major tourist attractions of the Gypsy quarters of cities such as Seville and Granada. Their mission, as Manuel Bernal Rodriguez summarizes it, was scientific and cultural rather than anthropological. If they mentioned Gypsies as a race, it was usually to dismiss their importance altogether, to denigrate them as did Jean-François Bourgoing, or, like the traveling soldier Nicolas Massias, simply to identify them as descendants of the Moors (ibid).
Charnon-Deutsch highlights the importance race played in writings about “Spanish Gypsies.”

The “discoverers” focused on the difference between Europeans (mainly the French and Spanish” and the gypsies).

As Charnon-Deutsch has explained, “the Gypsy became a quaint and colorful symbol for a forgotten lifestyle that should be preserved as a mirror for what more developed societies had left behind” (58). In the “Gypsies” section of Imagology, Jean Krommers explains how the otherness of “gypsies” was used as a specific literary tool acting as this mirror:

But whether they are defined culturally, mostly by stressing their occupations and trades, or in racial terms by pointing at their physical traits as well as their mental character, gypsy-images are always related to - to alterity. This is, of course, clear in demonizing portraits, dominated by elements of threat, crime and ugliness. In popular images, gypsies were (and sometimes still are) mostly represented as thieves and imposters, as lazy, as immoral, and even as cannibals. As a rule, these pictures are in absolute contrast with the social and cultural ideas cherished by non-gypsies themselves, by the gaje. Oppositions between images of gypsies and self-images comprise elements that are strongly symbolic and that are part of semantic fields related to the opposition ‘wild’-‘civilized,’ which is deeply embedded in European cultural history (171, emphasis mine).

The stereotype’s othering factor was potent; so much so, in fact, that, it virtually erased the people it represented. Krommers continues,

Gypsies exist through images and images create gypsies. This is not to say, of course, that gypsies can be reduced to images, for such a reduction could result in ignoring social practices that marked - and often disfigured - the lives of many people up to our times [...] The major study on the subject, Willems’ In Search of the true Gypsy (1997), analyses the textual construction of the Gypsy in scientific literature that resulted in ‘the Gypsy’ as fata morgana: ‘elusive, because non-existent’ (172-173).

This is reminiscent of Edouard Said’s Orientalism which also reveals the dichotomy of hatred and fascination related to figures of the “Orient.” Said argues that the “Orient” does not exist; Krommers demonstrates that the Gypsy doesn’t either. In the public consciousness, fictitious
narratives that supported racialized hatred replaced understandings of the real, lived lives of the Roma.

The tendency to exoticize the unfamiliar also supported this erasure. Jerrold E. Seigel underscores the French Romantic tendency to use the figure of the Bohemian as an exotic character par-excellence. He observes,

attention to gypsies and vagabonds was also encouraged by the Romantic fascination for the exotic, the uncivilized, the unclassifiable, the attempt to invoke the deeper levels of human nature, which reason could not grasp, nor organized life satisfy (24, Bohemian Paris).

According to Seigel, the Bohemian was used as a figure of escapism. Marilyn Brown argues this same point. She also notes that confining the figure to the literary made it a safe means of exploring the exotic. For example, Brown writes, “in the salons of the 1830s, Bohemians were removed to Spain, the provinces, and other exotic lands, or to a historically remote and Romantic past [...] Gypsies were safely confined to artistic legend” (42). The Gypsy, as a literary trope, protected the reader and author from the harm such explorations could bring.

Understanding this stereotype is critical as literary stereotypes feed and are fed by social worldviews. The critical survey *Imagology: The cultural construction and literary representation of national characters* explains how stereotypes of national characters serve literary aims. In an introductory article entitled “Perception, Image, Imagology,” Manfred Beller explains how these characters “predetermine our perception, generate projections, identifications and idealizations” (13). Literature defines, in part, a given societies beliefs. In this same critical survey, Joep Leerssen notes a tendency to characterize nations by “temperament,” which began with Julius Caesar Scaliger’s treatise *Poetics libri VII*. Scaliger’s 16th-century treatise attributes moral characteristics to different people groups (65). In Leerssen’s analysis, we find that “[t]he
poetical formalization and systemization of human types-by-character serves to programme the European imagination, the way of looking at the world” (65-66). A culture’s worldview is, at least to some extent, predetermined by that culture’s pre-established literary canon.

My research relies on these understandings of Bohemia and the tzigane. While questioning how authors used and defined these terms during the 19th-century, I focus on their functionalities. My dissertation explores how these figures influenced and were influenced by the sociopolitical contexts of the 19th-century. The novels I discuss sprung from the ideals of the Revolution, the Napoleonic regimes, the Bourbon Restoration, the July Monarchy, and then eventually the events of 1848. Amid these shifts and transitions, it became difficult to define “Frenchness.” Different social groups and political leaders attempted to answer the question of national identity through legislation, economic policy, and social resistance. These attempts had varying degrees of success. The popularity of the Bohemian figure in 19th-century French literature embodied the countercultural movements of the time.

Overall, in this dissertation, I argue that gypsy literature, or narratives containing gypsy characters, was used to develop nationalistic and literary discourses in the 19th century. Though the gypsy literature of any period promotes racialized stereotypes that harm Romani communities, I have chosen the 19th century because of its obsession with the tzigane. The figure was a trope with which the audience was familiar and which allowed authors to explore a variety of ideas, concepts, symbols, and styles. My work shows how each author drew on the trope with different outcomes in this brief period. Concentrating within the years 1830-1855, these texts allow for a deep dive into the cultural societal consciousness of the moment. Because of their position relative to the Revolution, Empire, Restoration, and republicanism,
these two decades reflect a broader public self-interrogation around identity. A century later, Maximoff challenged the impacts of this usage, writing a corpus of works worthy of further academic study. I hope the final chapter of my dissertation will be a launch point for such research.
Chapter 1. The Histoire of the Tzigane: Victor Hugo Reframes History

The word histoire can be translated two ways in English – history and story. The role of the tzigane has a rich histoire in France. Looking at their history from a socio-geographical standpoint, the Roma arrived in France in the 14th-century. From a political perspective, they have undergone periods of expulsion, indifference, and acceptance in varying degrees since this time.4 Throughout these historical moments, the presence of the Roma in France has influenced the imaginative image of the tzigane. Literature has encapsulated these images within various narratives. Victor Hugo’s Notre-Dame de Paris embodies this histoire by presenting the fictitious image of the ‘tzigane’ within a historical perspective that blends truth and fiction.

This chapter focuses on Esmeralda, though she is not the novel’s central focus. Despite other characters playing more prominent roles, when the story is retold, Esmeralda often takes center stage. She is not a particularly novel portrayal of a Romani woman as a character. Her story ticks most of the stereotypical boxes: kidnapping, seemingly overt sexuality, dancing for money, practicing magic, tempting men, fortune-telling, etc. In this way, Victor Hugo’s writing of her embodies the traditional perspective held by the French literary memory since the mid-17th-century.

Notre Dame de Paris follows Esmeralda and how Parisian men relate to her, which ultimately seal her fate of an untimely death by hanging.5 The novel begins with the Feast of

---

4 See the introduction for more on their history in France.
5 The novel also concentrates on the importance of historical architecture and the cityscape of Paris as it impacts the lives of its citizen and retains historical memory. Except for the ways in which the history and story of Esmeralda function as symbols for one another, this dissertation focuses on the role of Esmeralda in the narrative.
Fools. Esmeralda is performing for the crowds who adore her dancing and intelligent goat. It is here that we first see men attracted to her. Gringoire, a poet, follows her home. Claude Frollo becomes obsessed with her, despite his religious chastity. Later, she meets Phoebus, an engaged man. She becomes enamored with Phoebus, who is only looking for a fling. She refuses his advances to retain her purity but remains in love with him throughout the novel. Claude Frollo’s obsession becomes stronger. Alongside it, he convinces the city that Esmeralda is an evil witch. The city folk who once adored her turn on her, and she is eventually killed because of this. Throughout the novel, Esmeralda is continuously misunderstood, misread, and misperceived. Her character is quite complicated, but through it, I explore how the *tzigane* myth functions even amid evidence to the contrary.

**Bohemia as spectacle**

Let us begin with understanding the contemporaneous understandings of who *bohemians* were. During the 19th-century, being *bohemian* had three distinct definitions. First, a Bohemian could be a person from the region of Bohemia, part of the Habsburg empire at this time. Second, being bohemian could refer to a Rom or Romani person, a status conferred by heritage. Third, it could refer to an upper-class person leading a “bohemian lifestyle” by superficially leaving behind wealth and leading a countercultural way of life. This lifestyle was a chosen state of being. For the French artistic bohemian movement, the link between them and the Romani of Paris was positive. In “Bohemian Artists and ‘Real Bohemians.’ Life as Spectacle in Hugo’s *Notre-Dame de Paris* and Gautier’s *Les Jeunes-France,*” Karen Turman argues that “the confusion of [Esmeralda’s] race and origin puts into question the validity of the myth of the

---

6 Chapter 3 examines the region of Bohemia and its relation to *bohemianness.*
Gypsy figure” (102). She also states that such a transformation from a French citizen “is a hopeful statement for the artistic counterculture” (ibid), demonstrating how birth does not determine identity. However hopeful this was for the artistic bohemians, this also meant the Roma would always be outsiders. Because of these variances, a precise definition of bohemian is somewhat evasive. Even in a precise context, the term’s meaning could be vague. For example, if referring to the ‘vagrant bohemians of Paris’, we could be referring to the artists who chose to present themselves as a vagrant lifestyle or to the Roma who were perceived by the public to be doing so. The varying definitions of bohemian allowed it to function as a symbol for counter-culturalism and a literal term for social stratification and exclusion.

As demonstrated by the link between counter-culturalism and bohemianism, the dominant culture feared and rejected this lifestyle. Bohemians, both types, embodied a feared difference and rejection of French social norms. Simultaneously, this fear illuminated weaknesses in France’s societal and political structures. Esmeralda embodies these countercultural elements and fears, reflecting these weaknesses to the reader. The confusion of Esmeralda’s origins illuminates the perceived dangers that outsiders pose - the possibility of contaminating French identity and French culture. This falsified identity created through mythology further stigmatizes and others the Roma, making them targets of xenophobia.

Let’s first explore the elements of the imagined of the Parisian underworld as it relates to the public’s association of it with the tzigany. This Bohemia, as it is often named, existed as a spectacle. Henry Murger was a well-known author and member of Parisian Bohemia, who profited from his bohemianness but was most certainly not Roma.7 Whereas Victor Hugo had

7 More information on Murger can be found in the introduction to this dissertation.
success writing on a multitude of topics, Murger’s only success was in writing about Bohemia.

Jerrold Seigel dedicates an entire chapter of his book *Bohemian Paris* to the life and writings of Murger. In this chapter, Seigel states,

> Bohemia for Murger was the self-conscious prolongation of an aroused state of passion and excitement, a loosening of the reins that life in respectable society placed on the free movement of fantasy. In Bohemia, life itself served as the spur his otherwise immobile imagination required. [...] The desire to claim a real artistic identity made him regard *la Bohême* as a temporary stage imposed by mere external, economic necessity, but in reality, its hold on him was internal and lasting (51)

Taking Murger’s relationship to Bohemia as an example, we can say that the 19th-century French Bohemia found its genesis and life force in spectacle. Bohemia as a “place” existed through performance and could only be acknowledged through observation.

Let’s explore how Bohemia existed through performance with *Notre Dame de Paris*. The novel opens with Pierre Gringoire’s play being performed at Notre-Dame cathedral. Gringoire is an unsuccessful poet who continuously tries to force his art to succeed. The secular festivities overshadowing his religious play reveal his impotence as a poet. It is the *Fête des fous*, or the Feast of Fools, a holiday in which the public would mock the church by “electing” false clergy. As such, the Parisians were performing the roles of both audience and actor. They fulfilled the role of the audience by watching – or rather ignoring – Gringoire’s play. Simultaneously, they were actors in their own spectacle, that of the festival. The novel's beginning portrays an interactive spectacle highlighting the false dichotomy between observer and participant.

By allowing participants to be both actor and audience, the Feast of Fools provided a chance to live an escape from reality rather than to remain an observer. Moving further into this spectacle, Esmeralda steals the spotlight within the festivities, dancing and performing tricks with her goat Djali’s. Scripted spectacle is less appealing to the public than an entertaining
reality, particularly when they can both consume that reality as spectacle and participate in it.

The true spectacle for the public is not scripted theater but unscripted participation in the carnivalesque.

At this point, it would be prudent to examine the Bakhtinian concept of the Carnivalesque.

Lynn Franken has previously written an excellent article on this topic, “Carnival of Silence: Bakhtin and Hugo’s *Notre Dame de Paris.*” Franken states that Bakhtin’s analysis of the novel indicates Hugo’s failure to see the *regenerative force* of laughter for the folk, decrying the folk’s laughter to be a degenerative, negative force (111). Though Bakhtin himself saw Hugo’s carnival as incomplete, Franken understands the utility of exploring the link between the philosophical idea and the novel. For Franken, “the impotence of the carnivalesque in his [Hugo’s] novel stands out with particular clarity” (ibid). She continues to underscore the nuance that Hugo brings to light,

At issue is the problem of reconciling the responsible individual who must speak and be answered with the all-sufficient and immortal body of the folk, whose laughter robs death (and life) of its terrors. The idea I develop in this essay as that the terms of this latter-day struggle to construe a unified Bakhtin gloss a tension in *Notre-Dame de Paris* between carnival promise and a dialogic imperative made present through absence. In a novel I characterize as massively silent, Hugo plays off the apparent freedoms of carnival against a utopian vision of language as dialogue” (ibid).

The folk are to bear the weight of carnival success. Whereas Bakhtin’s Carnival allows for a utopia, Hugo “provides an interestingly nuanced interrogation” of this optimistic vision (115).

The complicated natures of spectacle, performance, carnival, and the grotesque within the novel allow for a more complex reading of the “folk,” or *peuple,* and, more specifically, of Esmeralda than simply a utopic view of liberty often offered by the *tzigane* trope.
In contrast to utopian ideals, public punishment is another theme in the novel. Throughout history, crowds have gathered to watch public executions and punishments worldwide. Michel Foucault examined the social importance of these spectacles. According to Foucault, the crowd’s participation served an essential role. Their witness and participation led credence to the proceedings. In part one of *Discipline and Punishment*, he observes that

The function of the public torture and execution was to reveal the truth; and in this respect it continued, in the public eye, the work of the judicial torture conducted in private. It added to the conviction the signature of the convicted man (Trans. by Alan Sheridan, 44).

Participation allowed for spectacle to be made true. Participating even in the carnivalesque would lend truth and reality to the pretend and imaginary.

Pierre Gringoire, a failed poet who falls in love with Esmeralda, stumbles upon the “cours de miracles,” or the court of miracles because he stalked Esmeralda. After his disastrous play performed during the *fête des fous*, his focus is only on her. In reality and the novel, the court of miracles was the home base for the Parisian bohemians. It was where the underclass lived, called so because as the beggars returned, it seemed as if miracles had been performed. Those who had been “blind” now could see. Those who were “lame” could walk. The court of miracles reified the belief that those begging were doing so under false pretenses. The beggars were performers. Thus, as observed by Gringoire, the court of miracles lifted the curtain to unveil the mechanisms of spectacle. It was a backstage area where the actors shed their costumes.8

Upset at having an outsider discover the inner workings of this underworld, the members of the court of miracles wish to kill Gringoire. He must perform to save his life. He must prove that

---

8 It should be noted here that analyzing these characters as actors choosing their position as outcasts is limited and artificially reduced from the complexities that have led them to become members of this group such as limited potential for economic stability and the social caste systems that were extant at that time.
he, too, is a performer and criminal, not an outsider. He begins his performance as a poet, becoming a spectacle himself. He must perform as a *bohemian*. In his performance, he argues all writers are criminals (Hugo, 166) and belong to the court of miracles (167). Here the definition of bohemianness relies on acting and spectacle. When poetry fails to convince the court of his criminality, Gringoire must successfully and properly pickpocket a mannequin to join this society and avoid being hanged. He fails –

Voyant qu’il n’y avait ni reprit, ni sursis, ni faux-fuyant possible, il prit bravement son parti; il tourna son pied droit autour de son pied gauche, se dressa sur son pied gauche, étendit le bras...; mais au moment où il touchait le mannequin, son corps, qui n’avait plus qu’un pied, chancela sur l’escabeau, qui n’en avait que trois; il voulut machinalement s’appuyer au mannequin, perdu l’équilibre, et tomba lourdement sur la terre, tout assourdi par la fatale vibration des mille sonnettes du mannequin, qui, cédant à l’impulsion de sa main, décrivit d’abord une rotation sur lui-même, puis se balança majestueusement entre les deux poteaux (173).

Perceiving that no respite, nor reprieve, nor subterfuge was possible, he bravely decided upon his course of action; he would wound his right foot around his left leg, raised himself on his left foot, and stretched out his arm: but at the moment when his hand touched the manikin, his body, which was now supported upon one leg only, wavered on the stool which had but three; he made an involuntary effort to support himself by the manikin, lost his balance, and fell heavily to the ground, deafened by the fatal vibration of the thousand bells of the manikin, which, yielding to the impulse imparted by his hand, described first a rotary motion, and then swayed majestically between the two posts (trans. By Isabel Hapgood).

Gringoire’s performance is insufficient. His body fails him, and the court does not find that he belongs. The leaders of the Court of Miracles plan to hang him.

However, another form of spectacle saves him. Esmeralda agrees to marry him, preventing his death. This marriage is a pure mirage. Grigoire’s infatuation is unrequited, and this is a marriage in name only. They never consummate the union, and the two have minimal contact after this marriage. In the underground realm, things can only exist through deception and performance. However, the reader should not dismiss this performative nature. As is the case
in begging for food and the marriage between Gringoire and Esmeralda, performance and spectacle are life-giving, survival mechanisms.

Survival as an outcast relies on moving from observer to performer. This is a transition from passive to active. For the members of this underground group, spectacle allows them to earn money, shelter, and food, as demonstrated through Esmeralda’s street performances. Her dances and Djali’s magic tricks allow her to make money. For other members of the underground community, fake injuries help them receive alms while begging. The existence of the Court of Miracles itself relies on performance, for it could not exist without the erasure of such performances.

Because it functions as a symbol for Bohemia, we can look at how the Court of Miracles functions as a place. The Court of Miracles, and therefore Bohemia, exists not because of its particular location but through its nature. The Court of Miracles would cease to be such once the act of performance is removed. Bohemia stops being bohemia once the performative aspect is removed as well. Bohemia, however, is one step removed from the Court of Miracles. Whereas we can locate the physical space of the Court of Miracles, we cannot cartograph Bohemia. Therefore, Bohemia is an atopic topos - a place without place. Bohemia is not a point on a map but a locus for action (or acting). Bohemia, to exist, must be seen and performed. Otherwise, one cannot access it.

Placing Bohemia outside of traditional spaces has an othering effect on the Roma. As summarized in *Imagology*, for the French public, “Gypsies are antipodal to ‘us,’ at the same

---

9 To be absolutely clear, this othering effect is imposed by a linguistic choice of non-Roma. That is to say, the link between Roma and Bohemia was imposed upon the Roma and not a choice the Roma made themselves.
time they are spatially nearby” (Beller and Leerssen, 171). The *tzigane*, despite residing in the same place as members of the dominant society, is necessarily distanced from the dominant culture for the dominant culture. It is not acceptable for the *tzigane* to be French and *bohémienne* simultaneously. The *bohemian or tzigane* earns a living through the performance of this identity. This performance is often illicit - overtly sexual dancing, use of magic, association with the demonic, thievery, etc. However, the economic vitality of such performances depends upon the interest of the dominant society. The performative aspect exists because of the dominant society’s interest in it.

Geographical uncertainty drove fear. For example, in *Notre Dame de Paris*, an aristocratic woman watching Esmerald dance notes, “[o]n ne sait pas d’où lui vient cette horreur des zingaris et des égyptiens / No one knows whence comes [this] horror of the gypsies and Egyptians” (Hugo, 326; Hapgood, Tome I, 228). This woman places a geographical uncertainty on the fear of *zingaris* and *égytien*s. The inability to locate the origins of the fear mirrors the failure to locate the origins of the Roma. This geographical uncertainty thus also highlights concerns about finitely locating France and Frenchness. Where is France?

The presence in France of smugglers and vagabonds, characters often labeled as *zingaris* or *égytien*s, demonstrated that the French borders were porous. If anyone could penetrate the borders, what made one French? How could French culture protect itself from contamination if its borders were insufficient?

The narrator and characters of the novel continue to wrinkle geography and time. There is continued uncertainty about where and when people are. When the narrator is describing

---

10 In the introduction, the link between Roma performance and French consumption is explored more thoroughly.
Pierre Gringoire’s love for Esmeralda, he gives the following anachronism, "S’il avait eu le Pérou dans sa poche, certainement il l’eût donné à la danseuse ; mais Gringoire n’avait pas le Pérou, et d’ailleurs l’Amérique n’était pas encore découverte” (137). Esmeralda provokes both an anachronism and an anatopism. The narrator says Gringoire would have given her Peru. While this is undoubtedly the temporally-distanced-narrator placing his views on the circumstances, it also demonstrates confusion. The analogy is problematic for three reasons: (1) Peru did not exist. As the narrator states, America had not yet been “discovered.” As a nation-state formed well after the “discovery” of the Americas, Peru didn’t exist. There was no conception of it. Therefore, there were no boundaries or borders distinguishing it from other nation-states, and it was a relational impossibility. (2) If we were somehow able to ignore the anachronism of the nation-state of Peru and assume that the narrator was only referring to a distant space of land, Gringoire could not have communicated this idea. Linguistically speaking, “Peru” would have had no meaning. (3) For the same reason, Pierre Gringore couldn’t have understood this statement. While reasons two and three may seem the same, they point to the opposite sides of the same coin.

Throughout the narrative, when the narrator mentions Gringoire and Esmeralda, there is a failure of understanding and confusion caused by the illogical existence of Esmeralda. She is both mortal and immortal, myth and human. Esmeralda is both within time and place and a rejection of this logic. In sum, she is the embodiment of dichotomy and defies relational understanding.

Esmeralda’s dichotic nature reflects the uncertainty of shifting social structures within the 19th-century. By having the people gain new rights, the aristocracy lost certain privileges.
Jerrold Seigel notes that after the Revolution, “[s]ociety was reconstructed around individuals, not intermediate groups. All activities were, in principle, open to all citizens” (Bohemian Paris, 9). It was no longer possible to understand the social structure in terms of social relationships and hierarchies. The former meanings of social relationships were being replaced, requiring people to navigate unknown spaces. It was now necessary to understand citizenry to create meaning through social relationships. Through citizenship, not social class, one could navigate inclusion and exclusion. Therefore, it was essential to understand legally, morally, and philosophically what made one a French citizen.

The debate on whether or not Esmeralda merited the haven she found within Notre Dame embodies the need for this definition. Being sought for arrest, Esmeralda finds refuge in the cathedral because one could not be arrested within the confines of the church. The question becomes should Esmeralda benefit from this haven negotiated between the church and state? Is it a question of citizenship or religious affiliation?

Let’s explore some philosophical questions surrounding citizenship. Is citizenship a birthright? Though it was unknown to any of the characters throughout most of the novel, Esmeralda was born to a French woman. Does living in France confer citizenship? The novel implies that she has been in Paris for a lengthy time. Does adherence to cultural norms, which we call naturalization today, grant these rights? Esmeralda, despite her social position, aligns herself morally with the French social standards throughout the text.

---

11 This is a philosophical exploration because the novel is set in the 15th-century, well before citizenship as a concept existed. However, these were questions that were becoming more and more relevant around the time of the novel’s publication.
Esmeralda, however, gives us a unique perspective on states’ needs. Benedict Anderson determines that patriotism defines itself through ideas of family and land. Nationalist poetry relies on “the vocabulary of kinship (motherland, Vaterland, patria) or that of home […] earth and water” (Imagined Communities, 143). Literally then, to be French is to belong to the French family and within the nation’s frontiers. Esmeralda, however, describes her place in the world outside the realm of states and nations. Trying to convince Phoebus to love her, she pledges

Je serai ta maîtresse, ton amusement, ton plaisir, quand tu voudras, une fille qui sera à toi […] nous autres égyptiennes, il ne nous faut que cela - de l’air et de l’amour (Hugo, 435).

I will be thy mistress, they amusement, thy pleasure, when thou wilt; a girl who shall belong to thee […] We gypsies need only air and love (Hapgood, Tome II, 73)

In her pledge, Esmeralda abases herself to Phoebus. Her other identities would fade away. She does not ask for the protection of marriage, though she had done so earlier (434), promising only to be his mistress. She also pledges to exist for his benefit and not her own. Using the simple future tense, rather than the conditional, she declares that she will be his. Her other identities would fade away. She does not mention the benefits for herself from this connection - a home, the protection a husband could have provided at this time, a family, or food. Instead, she proclaims, she, and the other “Egyptians,” need only air and love.

Air and love oppose themselves to the concepts of earth, water, and family. The existence of the latter implies the presence of the first. When we think of earth and water, we assume that air also surrounds them. When we think of family, we assume familial love also exists. However, this is a red herring. Land and water are somewhat stagnant - their boundaries are geographically finite. Air has no such limitations. Land and water can be possessed; Air cannot.
Similarly, family can exist without love and love without family. The state can control land and water. The government legislates the rights to land ownership, provide a home, produce food, and likely to produce an income. The state also legislates marriage, patrilineage, and inheritance. However, air and love are difficult to legislate and defy the restraints of the state and thus the reach of the nation, defying the necessity of the state and threatening the definition of Frenchness.

Furthermore, there is the declaration that “on est l’Égypte / we are Egypt” (331, translation mine). Using transitive logic, we can determine from this short sentence that people and place, for the égyptiens are the same. The indefinite pronoun on is defined as Egypt, a geographical and metaphorical place. Simultaneously, Égypte is defined by the people who occupy it. This tautology locates the égyptiens in an unlocatable place that can exist anywhere they do. In this way, Égypte is the toposification (the spatial equivalent of personification) of statelessness. In Foucault’s terms, Égypte could be considered a heterotopia. It is a real space and a “counter-site[], a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites [...] are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted” (Of Other Spaces). It is a real space, but this real space does not embody the Égypte of the bohémiens. It is “outside of all places, even though it [is] possible to indicate [its] location in reality” (ibid). As a heterotopia, Égypte “presupposes a system of opening and closing that both isolates them and makes them penetrable” (ibid). For Esmeralda, this means she is isolated from the outside world, trapped in Égypte. For Gringoire, he can penetrate the barriers of the space. For the rest, Égypte represents a porous threat, about to consume them at any moment.
Esmeralda’s existence is thus beyond the limits of France and Frenchness. This statelessness renders her unworthy of legal protections. According to the character King Louis XI, Esmeralda is a sorceress and therefore does not merit the sanctuary she found by hiding in the cathedral (Hugo, 622). People who sought refuge in churches could not be arrested so long as they remained inside the church. However, because Esmeralda occupied a space outside the state, she no longer had this national privilege.

Ultimately, according to the novel's crux, Esmeralda dies because it is her fate. The reader is aware of all of the truths hidden behind the public's beliefs. The reader knows that Esmeralda is not only innocent but of French descent. Despite this, she meets her untimely death.

What’s real and what’s fake?

In the 19th-century, the French public was far more interested in what seemed real than what actually was. The public was interested in life-like performance, which the Court of Miracles and Tzigane provided. In The Spectacular Past, Maurice Samuels demonstrates that the 19th-century French public was primed and ready to both read and perceive creative images of the past as true and accurate. Speaking specifically of 1831, “the past had never seemed more alive, more real” (Samuels, 82, emphasis his). According to Samuels, the returned popularity of the diorama was “but one of a host of new spectacles made popular in France around the time of the Revolution that turned history into entertainment” (ibid). Simulacra entertained the French public, and the image of the tzigane fulfilled this desire dutifully.

This desire for simulacra coincided with the rise in Orientalism. The French not only wanted to consume convincingly real fictions but also to translate the foreign into digestible content. The scientific fascination bolstered interest in Orientalist fads with raceology. This fascination
gave rise to more defined classifications of persons and characters as Others. As such, this temporal moment created the perfect backdrop for the paradox in *Notre Dame de Paris*.

Esmeralda must perform as both spectacle and prisoner - visible yet invisible. She must exist as historical fact yet also recede into the pages of fiction. The desire to see and watch her was juxtaposed against the public's desire to rid society of her. The public's enthrallment could only exist to the point in which it became a real threat. Once the Other became more than an object of spectacle, society wanted to rid itself of the Other it had created and defined.

Esmeralda allows us to examine the point at which this happens. She is the Other. Once beloved for her spectacle, she is eventually killed for the attraction she inspires in others. Parisian society adores her street performances. Despite the sexual feelings aroused in men in her presence and the blame they place on her, Esmeralda remains sexually and morally pure throughout the novel. She does not steal, protects the lives of others, and refuses to sleep with a man outside the covenant of marriage. She even refuses sex within the covenant of marriage, for it is a performative wedding and not one of love. The narrator describes a pious woman. The other characters are blind to her piety. Or, perhaps better stated, they refuse to accept it. Instead, the crowd and other characters define Esmeralda by how they wish to see her. She is defined through a male gaze that refuses to take responsibility for its wants and desires. She is no more than a sexual object whose performances threaten men's moralities for the Parisians. Ultimately, she is killed for how her presence makes men feel, not for any legal or moral crime. The perceptions and feelings of the leaders of the dominant society, Paris, lead to her death, not the reality of her own actions.
Threats to Christian piety and the social norm

These perceptions define her bohemianess within the novel. For example, Phoebus, a soldier, is physically attracted to her but is engaged and has no romantic feelings toward her. Esmeralda, on the contrary, falls in love with him. “Phoebus reduces Esmeralda to her potentiality to fulfill his sexual desires and fantasies. Because she is tzigane, he assumes her willingness to perform in a way that pleases him sexually – and then to disappear. Her tzigany nature effaces her humanity in his eyes. He cannot comprehend her romantic affinity for him and expects her to fulfill carnal desires enthusiastically at a moment’s notice. Despite her refusal to sleep with him, he blames her magical nature for his corporal desires. He refuses culpability for his masculine desires. According to the narrator, Phoebus

entrevoiyait dans cette histoire beaucoup plus de magie que d’amour, probablement une sorcière, peut-être le diable ; une comédie enfin, ou, pour parler le langage d’alors, un mystère très désagréable où il jouait un rôle fort gauche, le rôle des coups et des risées (Hugo, 481).

perceived in all these incidents much more magic than love, probably a sorceress; perhaps the devil; a comedy in short, or to speak in the language of that day, a very disagreeable mystery, in which he played a very awkward part, the role of blows and derision (trans. by Isabel Hapgood).

His desires originate either from Esmeralda’s occult prowess, which is Esmeralda never demonstrates, or from some other malign force, not himself. Perception, or an imposed spectacle, defines Bohemianness.

Within this citation, there are several elements of bohemianness to analyze. Firstly, there is magic. Phoebus believes himself to be under the spell of some witch. It was common to believe
that the *tziganes* possessed magic powers to seduce men for gain, be it financial or otherwise.\(^\text{12}\)

Phoebus then escalates his point of view. Perhaps she is not only a witch but the devil. Being the devil implies a dark magical force stronger than simply being a witch. Phoebus concludes that he must then be in a comedy or a mystery, in the theatrical senses of the terms. For Phoebus, his attraction to Esmeralda could only be something constructed by an author’s hand. Ultimately, Phoebus possesses no agency for his actions. Instead, he sees himself as playing a role meant to entertain the audience at his demise.

Phoebus is not the only man to refuse accountability for his thoughts towards Esmeralda, blaming her perceived supernatural powers. Claude Frollo, a clergyman with an uncontrollable sexual passion for her mixed with unquenchable hatred, also blames her magical powers for his weaknesses. While pleading for her love, he also presents himself as under some sort of spell. He complains, “[[j]’avais su que tu étais égyptienne, bohémienne, gitane, zingara. Comment douter de la magie? / I had learned who you were; an Egyptian, Bohemian, gypsy, zingara. How could I doubt the magic?” (Hugo, 469; Isabel Hapgard, Tome II, p. 108). He had tried to find remedies for his passion, searching for any means to have her. He tried to kidnap her, but Phoebus foiled his plan. He turned her into the officials hoping that he could rescue her from prison (469). However, she evaded him at every attempt. Frollo could only explain his passion and failure through her magic. Like Phoebus, he does not claim any personal responsibility in this situation.

\(^{12}\) This is reflected in the character of Carmen in Mérimée’s work. It is also reflected in the expectations of the female characters in Sand’s work. I explore these in the succeeding chapters.
Claude Frollo uses this viewpoint and stereotype to justify his inability to control his own sexual desires. Frollo’s attempts to rid his psyche of the temptation he perceives as caused by Esmeralda reveals the tension he holds within. Unwittingly, he compares Esmeralda and saintly women. He reads an excerpt from Manou who explains the importance of female names, "Le nom d’une femme doit être agréable, doux, imaginaire ; finir par des voyelles longues et ressembler à des mots des bénédictions (Hugo, 397) / The name of a woman should be agreeable, sweet, fanciful ; it should in long vowels and resemble words of benediction" (Hapgood, Tome 1, 38). Then, he has the following thoughts, "Oui le sage a raison ; en effet, la Maria, la Sophia, la Esmeral... -Damnation ! toujours cette pensée (ibid) / Yes, the sage is right; in truth, Maria, Sophia, la Esmeral... Damnation! Always that thought! (ibid). His uncontrollable thoughts lead him to an impasse. Esmeralda, as a name, simultaneously fits into the list of saintly women. However, the idea of Esmeralda is also a distractor from his religious work. Frollo cannot concentrate without being distracted by her. Unwilling to take personal responsibility, he blames her.

The perspectives of Frollo and Phoebus refer to the performative nature of being a tzigane, albeit an imposed performance. They hold Esmeralda responsible for their desires because they believe that she is supposed to play the role of the seductress, aligning with the expectations of the dominant culture. Phoebus, driven by his own sexual desires, feels forced to perform outside his normal social position. In turn, he blames these desires on Esmeralda’s influence, refusing personal responsibility. Frollo, too lacks the self-awareness to understand he is culpable, not Esmeralda. As he feels himself drawn away from his religious obligations and drawn toward her, he blames her for tempting him, despite her repeated refusal of his
advances. In these instances, the blame mirrors the failures of members of the dominant culture to fulfill their social expectations. Phoebus cannot faithfully uphold his commitment to his fiancée. Frollo cannot uphold the pious expectations of the church. While Esmeralda is not actually to blame, she is held culpable. The men impose their expectations of her performance to her demise.

If we take the relationships between Phoebus and Esmeralda and Frollo and Esmeralda as allegories, we can read Phoebus as French, Frollo as the church, and Esmeralda as the outsider. The non-Bohémien characters perceive her non-existent magical powers as threats to their abilities to maintain appropriate social boundaries. Though these men are responsible for their actions, they refuse responsibility. Instead, they find a scapegoat – the outsider.

Hugo provides relief to this negative viewpoint through Quasimodo, another outsider and the hunchback who lives in Notre-Dame Cathedral. Unlike Frollo, Quasimodo loves Esmeralda in a non-sexual way. She aided him during his public beating by offering him water. For Quasimodo, she is the only person to have seen and treated him as human. Even the narrator juxtaposes his monstrosity against her fragility,

*C’eut été partout un spectacle touchant que cette belle fille, fraîche, pure, charmante, et si faible en même temps, ainsi pieusement accourue au secours de tant de misère de difformité et de méchanceté (354)*.

*It would have been a touching spectacle anywhere, this beautiful, fresh, pure and charming girl, who was at the same time so weak, thus hastening to the relief of so much misery, deformity, and malevolence (Hapgood, 255).*

Interestingly, Esmeralda’s piety is seen most purely in comparison to something diabolical, and her sexuality is best seen through the lens of the church.
The viewpoints of Quasimodo and Claude Frollo point to the religious dichotomy posed by Esmeralda. France is and was historically catholic, though secularism was on the rise at this point in the 19th-century, a result of the French Revolution. On the one hand, Esmeralda was pious and pure, representing the ideal woman. On the other hand, the public assumes she practices witchcraft and paganism because they see her as tzigane. She is perceived as the harlot and as a threat to the church's power.

Esmeralda herself experiences tensions between French catholicism and the superstitions from her childhood. While she is hiding in the church, she worries about dangers in the night.

Toute cette scène lui fit l’effet d’une mystérieuse bataille engagée entre les fantômes du sabbat et les monstres de pierre de l’église. Imbue dès l’enfance des superstitions de la tribu bohémienne, sa pensée fut qu’elle avait surpris en maléfice les étranges êtres propres à la nuit (Hugo, 629).

This whole scene produced upon her the effect of a mysterious battle between the phantoms of the witches’ sabbath ad the stone monsters of the church. Imbued from her very infancy with the superstitions of the Bohemian tribe, her first thought was that she had caught [surprised] the strange beings peculiar to the night (Hapgood, 262).

In wanting to evade these threats, she turns to the Christian god and to a Christian saint in prayer for safety, “[q]uoique égyptienne, idolâtre, et païenne, elle s’était mise à demander avec sanglots grâce au bon Dieu chrétien et à prier Notre-Dame son hôtesse / although a gypsy, an idolater, and a pagan, she began to entreat with sobs, mercy from the good Christian God, and to pray to our Lady, her hostess” (Hugo, 630; Hapgood, Tome II, 262). Esmeralada straddles the space between the holy and the profane, much like France in the wake of the Revolution, moving from traditional Catholicism to more modern secularism.
The novel is full of instances in which Esmeralda is presented as a danger to Catholic
tradition because of her association with the occult. An aristocratic woman explains this while
discussing *Egyptian* customs,

> On ne douta plus que les égyptiens n’eussent fait le sabbat dans cette bruyère et qu’ils
>n’eussent dévoré l’enfant en compagnie de Belzébuth, comme cela se pratique chez les
>mahométans (Hugo, 334).

There was no longer any doubt that the Egyptians had held their Sabbath on that heath, and
that they had devoured the child in company with Beelzebub, as the practice is among the
Mahometans (Hapgood, Tome II, 236)

In this citation, the narrator associates Esmeralda’s assumed religion with naturism, Islam, and
the demon Belzébuth which seem to justify cannibalism. The presence of *égyptiens* threatens
the church and risks children’s lives. This presence also embodied and confused a variety of
disconnected threats to the church. Anything not-Catholic was deemed demonic.

**Mythological translations**

Her carnal threat to the church also mirrors a carnal threat to being French. In the novel,
the public and narrator describe Esmeralda as having Andalusian skin and feet, large black eyes,
and black hair. She is playing a basque tambour and dancing on a Persian rug. Overall, she
seems “surnaturelle” (134). Her Andalusian characteristics define her foreignness, and her
Persian rug connects her to the “Orient.” Simultaneously, as she dances, she looks like a
“nymph” or a “baccante du mont méinaléen,” (134) comparing her to Greek mythological
creatures. Her ability to fit Western molds partially hides the qualities that label her an
outsider. Her threat increases because of her ability to fulfill Western desires.
The image of the bacchante is fascinating. According to E.M. Berens in his book *The Myths and Legends of Ancient Greece and Rome*, the Bacchantes were known for their frenetic dancing,

[the Bacchantes] assembled by night on the mountain sides, some carrying blazing torches, others thyrsi, and all animated with religious enthusiasm and frenzy. They shouted, clapped their hands, danced wildly, and worked themselves up to such pitch of excitement and fury that in their mad frenzy they tore in pieces the animal brought as a sacrifice to Dionysus (198-199).

Esmeralda is described as a wild woman, out of control of her body and actions. However, she is safely held within the confines of western mythology. This imagery, however, is negated quickly by the fact that she is *bohémienne*. When Gringoire realizes who she is, he proclaims, “Hé non! [...] c’est une bohémienne / Oh, non [...] she’s a *bohémienne*” (135) The narrator agrees “[t]oute illusion avait disparu / all illusion had disappeared” (ibid, translation mine). Her existence as anything Western could only be but an illusion.

The novel translates her danger through western mythology. Later, Esmeralda is compared to another Greek mythological creature, the strygis, a sort of proto-vampire who consumed men.13 During her trial for witchcraft, the prosecutor accidentally uses a hand signal which triggers one of Djal’s tricks. Of the crowd’s reaction, the narrator states,

La bohémienne, cette ravissante danseuse qui avait tant de fois ébloui les passants de sa grâce, ne fut plus qu’un effroyable stryge (448)

The *bohémienne*, this ravishing dancer who had many times dazzled passersby with her grace, was no longer anything but a horrifying *stryge* (translation mine).

This mundane act transmutes Esmeralda’s image from a benign street performer to a dangerous witch.

13 The term stryx is a synonym.
This comparison to the stryge does many things, but firstly it concretizes the connection between Esmeralda and the church's architecture. One of Notre Dame cathedral’s gargoyles is a stryge. The church, which will later protect Esmeralda, cannot be unraveled from its connection to her. The narrator describes how the public's perception of Esmeralda changes. She is doubly dehumanized compared to a statue and a mythical creature.

Secondly, this comparison reminds us of her perceived threat to men. In 1845, R.A. Davenport, in his work *Sketches of Imposture, Deception, and Credulity*, examined the role of the strygis in French history. On exploring the roots of vampires, he notes:

A more congenial origin [of vampires] may perhaps be found in the Strygis, of which Ovid makes mention; and this origin appears the more probable when we consider that, in the middle ages, the Strygis had an established place among the demon tribe; and, in the shape of suspected males and females, was often burnt, among other sorcerers and magicians, by the Lombards and Germans. There is extant a capitulary of Charlemagne, which shows how prevalent the belief was in the existence of the Strygis, and how strong a resemblance the fiend bore to the Vampyre of modern times. It enacts that ‘if any person, deceived by the devil, shall believe, after the manner of the pagans, that any man or woman was a Strygis, or Stryx, and was given to eat men, and for this cause should burn such person, or give such person’s flesh to be eaten, or should eat such flesh, such man or woman should be capitaly punished (208-209).”

The strygis have shape-shifting abilities, allowing them to go unnoticed until they strike. They can blend in with others who remain unaware of the threat, much as the myth portrays *tzigane* as hiding in plain sight. Davenport continues stating that the Strygis’s attack is not confined to a single person, but extends throughout the family, unless it is arrested by cutting off the head, or opening the heart [...] It is singular, however, that though the Vampyre himself might thus be rendered edible, he was imagined to communicate an infectious quality to whatever he fed on (209).

---

14 This refers to point 6 of the “Capitulary for Saxony 775-790”
This comparison endows Esmeralda with a fatal and contaminating power. Not only can she suck the life out of the men she infects, as seen in the downfall of Frollo, but her contamination can spread throughout the family – all of France. By hiding in plain sight, the tziganes can infect the French populous. In turn, those contaminated become bloodsuckers, as seen by the fact that the public kills her.

The strygis also has deadly powers. Their vampiric quality is also mirrored in the popular belief that the Roma were cannibals. Esmeralda’s mother makes reference to this belief when she is seeking vengeance for the abduction of her daughter:

On m’a pris mon enfant ; on m’a volé mon enfant ; on m’a mangé mon enfant [...] Je te dis que ce sont des égyptiennes qui me l’ont volée, entends-tu cela ? Et qui l’ont mangée avec leurs dents [...] Aujourd’hui, c’est mon tour ; je vais manger l’égyptienne. Oh ! que je te mordrais bien si les barreaux ne m’empêchaient. J’ai la tête trop grosse ! (Hugo, 646-647)

They took my child from me; they stole my child; they ate my child [...] I tell you that ‘twas the gypsies who stole her from me, do you hear that? And who ate her with their teeth [...] today, it is my turn; I am going to eat the gypsy. Oh! I would bite you well, if the bars did not prevent me! My head is too large! (Hapgood, Tome II, 279).

She seeks revenge by wanting to eat Esmeralda, whom she does not yet know is her own daughter. This non-metaphorical fear shows concern about protecting the future generations of France from meeting an untimely end.

Continuing the theme of the Strygis, there was a real fear that the Roma would steal their children and eat them. Maria Sierra-Alonso explores this fear in “Cannibals Devoured: Gypsies in Romantic Discourse on the Spanish Nation.” According to Sierra-Alonso, the concerns of cannibalism directly result from the dehumanization of the Romani people.

[I]t was understood that the Gypsies were an archaic people, or fossil race, that had not evolved over time [...] This prehistoric race, which still lived in caves even, as could be observed in Spain, would remain close to the distinctive animal nature of primeval man, with all the good and bad that implied. So, those accounts that took cannibalism among the
Gypsies for granted were just the most extreme examples of a gaze that was ready to be horrified at what it classified as licentious morality, especially in the sexual space (195).

Within the context of the 19th-century, scholars were repeating these beliefs as fact. In her article “Eighteenth and Nineteenth-Century Sources for Bram Stoker’s Gypsies,” Mary Burke explores the influences found in connection to Stoker’s Dracula. I cite this at length as she explores pan-European beliefs:

The living conditions of Gypsies lent themselves to comparisons with the bloodsucker of European folklore mined by Bram Stoker’s Dracula (1897); the Gypsies of Bucharest were described in one nineteenth-century article as ‘tawny wild figures dwelling by preference like ghouls in the graveyards [...]’. In Turkey and Albania, folk belief suggested that Gypsies commonly dug up graves and ate corpses, while in Hungary in 1782, two hundred Gypsies were charged with cannibalism and confessed to the abominations under torture, leading to lurid newspaper accounts of ‘European cannibals’ throughout central Europe. Eighteen women were decapitated, and twenty-three men executed before a commission of Emperor Joseph II discovered that the individuals allegedly eaten were still alive. Grellman’s updated 1787 edition of the Dissertation acknowledges that the commission found the remainder of the accused guilty of no more than theft but cannot resist stating that Gypsies are capable of cannibalism. A British ‘Gypsy reformer’ gives credence to the discredited accusation as late as 1843, if only as a practice common amongst ‘foreign’ Gypsies [...] The Gypsy figure of European tradition had, since at least the eighteenth century, been associated with discourses of ‘blood contagion,’ and earlier accusations of cannibalism gradually transmuted into fears of racial degeneration by the Victorian period (56).

Academic pursuits had falsely supported a belief in the child-stealing cannibal myth, showing that this belief extended beyond popular lore.

**Fate, or inescapable identities**

Fate plays a crucial role in the narrative. The first sentence of the preface proclaims,

Il y a quelques années qu’en visitant, ou, pour mieux dire, en furetant Notre-Dame, l’auteur de ce livre trouva, dans un recoin obscurs de l’une des tours ce mot, gravé à la main sur le mur: ΑΝΑΓΚΗ (53).

A few years ago, while visiting or, rather, rummaging about Notre-Dame, the author of this book found, in an obscure nook of one of the towers, the following word, engraved by hand upon the wall: ΑΝΑΓΚΗ” (Hapgood, Tome 1, iii).
ἀνάγκη here, according to Hugo, means fate or the personification of fate. Hugo’s translation is slightly incorrect. Instead, ἀνάγκη is more closely translated to “necessity.” In the second chapter of The Feminine Symptom, Emanuela Bianchi explains that ἀνάγκη is “often figured as a goddess in Greek mythology and tragedy” and goes on to explain how Aristotle defined the typologies of necessity as embodied by the idea and goddess ἀνάγκη (51). First, there is a teleological necessity, or that which “describes what must pertain in order that a given telos may be fulfilled [...] to get this result, these things are required” (52). The second is considered “simple necessity” (ibid). According to Bianchi, this necessity is often oversimplified as the “physical necessity that gives rise to rainfall and unexpected storms [...] the necessity of automaton” (ibid). Bianchi claims this is an oversimplification but does not delve further into a more detailed explanation. The third categorization is the one which could have led to the confusion presented by Hugo. Necessity is “that which cannot be otherwise” (53). Bianchi explains further, “[w]hat in essence cannot be otherwise, simply and without qualification, is eternal, possesses no matter, no potentiality, and enters into no motion or change: the definition of the necessary as such thus reflects the reality of the prime mover itself” (55). This definition of necessity, though similar to fate, is much darker. The controlling force over the novel lacks vitality. Rather, it is an inescapable inertness that would seem to erase all possibility of agency for the novel’s primary victim – Esmeralda.

This ἀνάγκη extends beyond Esmeralda to the architecture of Paris, particularly the structure of Notre-Dame cathedral. Hugo expresses a primary concern for the cathedral’s fate, which had fallen into significant disrepair by the 19th central. As Esmeralda becomes further
enmeshed into a metaphor for the cathedral, questions of French culture and value and the control society holds over it become evident.

АНАГК становится центральным вопросом в контроле Французской национальности. Что необходимо для сохранения национальной традиции, или существует ли это сила? Бенедикт Андерсен полагает, что национализм превращает “случай в судьбу” (12). Если мы применим эту идею к определению Французской национальности в Notre Dame de Paris, отвержение культурной иной, которое происходит случайно, обосновано в таком случае, как оно объединяет нацию.

Эрнест Ренан также обращается к национализму в первом разделе своего 1882 года речь о национализме в Сорбонне. Ренан, философ, ученый, религиозный и политический критик, чьё скандальное полемическое произведение La Vie de Jésus обозначало остроту с Бонапартами и католической церковью (Посмотрите “Памятник Ренан” от Уэльс Фэйли для более информации о Ренан). В своей речи о национализме, Ренан анализирует, как национальность может существовать только через забывание, ассимиляцию, и разрушение других наций. Наконец, “unité se fait brutalement” (3). Чтобы объединиться в француз, французы должны забыть жестокие массовые убийства их истории. В то время как Notre Dame de Paris не явно поддерживает этот насилийный взгляд, это представляет собой сложности, которые возникают, когда космополитизм сталкивается с национализмом. Текст Notre Dame de Paris утверждает, что автор приглашает читателя к размышлениям о сложностях космополитизма в Европейских городах и нациях.

Таким образом, оба Ренан и Гюго используют фигуры non-West для контраста идеи о французском человеке. Ренан подчеркивает, что “нации” являются модным конструктом, который был неизвестен в прошлых обществах. В упрощении “non-Western” обществ, он заявляет, что l’antiquité не имели концепции наций: “l’Égypte, la Chine, l’antique Chaldée ne furent à
aucun degré des nations. C’étaient des troupeaux menés par un fils du Soleil, ou un fils du Ciel.
Il n’y eut pas de citoyens égyptiens, pas plus qu’il n’y a de citoyens chinois [...] Il n’y eut jamais de patriotes assyriens ; l’Empire persan fut une vaste féodalité” (Part I). Much like the French perception of Frenchness as seen in *Notre-Dame de Paris* relies on a contrast of non-Frenchness, the conception of “nation” requires contrasting “non-nations.” Ultimately, the creation of national unity can only be achieved by forgetting: “Aucun citoyen français ne sait s’il est burgond, alain, taïfale, Visigoth; tout citoyen doit avoir oublifié la Saint-Barthélemy, les massacres du Midi au XIIe siècle” (ibid). Interestingly, the characters of *Notre Dame de Paris* enact this forgetting as the Parisians are united as one people against the “foreigner” Esmeralda.

However, Hugo does somewhat complicate this division. Throughout the novel, the cathedral and Esmeralda function as symbols one for the other. The narrator, comparing the architecture of different regions, demonstrates that “*Notre -Dame de Paris n’est pas de pure race romane, comme les premières, ni de pure race arabe, comme les seconds / Notre-Dame de Paris isn’t of the pure Roman descent, like the first, nor is it of pure Arab descent, like the buildings which followed “* (196, translation mine) much like Esmeralda is neither entirely Western myth nor Oriental threat. Despite this nuance, if we take Renan’s definition of nation-building, the violence purported against Esmeralda is a violence that could be justified but should be forgotten. It was a violence that promoted homogenization to build national unity. However, the narrator, in presenting Esmeralda’s tomb and death bed, evokes feelings of awe and pity.
Esmeralda’s relationship with the public reflects this dichotomy. Esmeralda may take advantage of the church’s sanctuary, which indicates a complicated relationship with the French public. In “A Fresh Look at Medieval Sanctuary,” William Chester Jordan explains the rules surrounding sanctuary:

By the thirteenth century, despite looser earlier practice one could only seek general sanctuary for felonies (for nearly all felonies, despite misgivings about some in canon law), crimes that could upon conviction have incurred the death penalty (21). Jordan explains that people who committed felonies in a church could not claim sanctuary as it was sacrilege. Minors also could not claim sanctuary because they could not be found culpable. According to Jordan, “other categories of people ineligible for sanctuary included Jews, serfs, excommunicates, and heretics” (ibid). People who successfully claimed sanctuary were exiled (23). However, those found ineligible for sanctuary “lost protection and were liable for criminal process and judgment” (ibid). Townsfolk worked to prevent “lynch mobs’ and overzealous lay officials’ attempts to violate sanctuary” (ibid). Esmeralda’s sanctuary embodied the tensions held by the Parisians – Did she have this right?

Esmeralda believed the public supported her. While Esmeralda seeks refuge in Notre Dame cathedral to avoid being hanged, she hopes that the public will rescue her. According to the narrator, “Elle avait songé à la possibilité d’une mutinerie populaire pour l’arracher de son asile/she had dreamed of the possibility of a popular mutiny to tear her from her asylum” (Hugo, 630; Hapgood, Tome II, 262). Being “arrachée” would have two outcomes: she would face a criminal trial and be condemned to death or find her freedom. In either case, she would avoid exile. Optimistic, Esmeralda believed in achieving her freedom.
Esmeralda sees herself as having been beloved by the public - they adored her performances even if they had contradicted the church and the state. However, she fails to see herself for the spectacle that she is for the public. Even in her death, she remains an object to be watched rather than a person to be pitied. As Turman notes, “the Gypsies created an impact in the public eye of France as object of the spectator’s ‘curious’ gaze” (96). the entertainment factor she provides diminishes her hopes for rescue.

Removing the Other

The narrative underscores this inability to escape this gaze. Even the one character passionately in love with Esmeralda fails to see her due to the veil of spectacle. When Gringoire, who had been in love with her, hears that someone is to be hanged, he is more interested in watching it happen rather than knowing who it is that shall die,

Allons! Dit notre philosophe, nous allons voir tous ces gens de robe manger de la chair humaine. C’est un spectacle comme un autre (442).

“Come!” said our philosopher, “we are going to see all these magistrates devour human flesh. ‘Tis as good a spectacle as any other” (Hapgood, Tome II,78).

Esmeralda becomes pure spectacle even to someone who values her humanity in the prospect of her death. This transformative act makes the object of the spectacle, who is indeed a person, become anonymous even to those who love him/her.

For the public, Esmeralda, and more broadly all tziganes and bohemians are forms of public entertainment. Gervaise, one of the aristocratic women watching Esmeralda dance, declares the eccentricity and exoticism of the égyptiennes, “Vous êtes venue ici pour voir les curiosités de Paris. Vous avez vu hier les flamands; il faut voir aujourd’hui l’égyptienne / You are come hither to visit the curiosities of Paris. You saw the Flemings yesterday ; you must see the
gypsy today” (Hugo, 325; Hapgood, Tome 2, 228). Gervaise continues to describe them as “ces vagabonds d’Égypte qui tambourinent et disent la bonne aventure au public / these vagabonds of Egypt who play the tambourine and tell fortunes to the public” (326; Hapgood, ibid). She reduces égyptiennes to their ability to entertain through spectacle, music, and fortune telling. They exist as a thing to consume. This transformative act makes erases the humanity of the person who is the object of the spectacle.

The character of Esmeralda is presented as complex, as it was historically. She is an Other of which society needs to rid itself, but she is also an enthralling spectacle who provides much-needed amusement. Beyond this, the omniscient narrator presents her as a pious, French woman. Through the narrator’s observations, we ultimately learn the truth about Esmeralda. A Romani tribe abducted Esmeralda, causing her mother to become a religious hermit. Her mother, too, finally realizes that she is indeed her daughter. However, this realization comes far too late, on the heel of Esmeralda's death. Her mother has spent far longer hating her for being a tzigane. The complicated images of Esmeralda reflect the aforementioned complexities of what it means to be bohemian. Esmeralda is simultaneously attractive and repulsive. Despite her French heritage, from which her true nature is derived, the public can only see her as an outsider, sealing her fate.
Chapter 2. Mérimée Explores a New Language: A Sociopolitical Analysis of Carmen

The story of Carmen is a story of uncertain movement. The novel begins with our narrator on a hunt for the location of the Battle of Munda. Early in his journey, he encounters the infamous bandit, Don José. Don José recounts his dark romance with Carmen, a gitano. Carmen is a thieving, sultry woman who defies the constraints of men. Ultimately, her refusal to bow to the whims of men leads to Don José killing her. The narrative moves across Spain, and even Europe, with fluidity. The titular character, Carmen, embodies this free-spirited geography Carmen-as-character is a roaming smuggler, crossing borders and moving from city to city to commit illicit acts as well as, at least implicitly, from man to man as her romantic interests shift. The narrative, reflecting Carmen’s nomadism, moves from place to place in Spain within Mérimée’s original version. The story itself is migratory. Through its numerous adaptations, the story has moved across the globe. The movement is so constant that location has become one of the main preoccupations of study related to the novella.

The movements present in the novella allow for a mapping of the dialectics of French identity in the 19th-century. This mapping is an extension of an already extant corpus of research focused on the geography of Carmen. David R. Ellison states in his article “The Place of Carmen,” “To pronounce the title Carmen is to open up an area of referential uncertainty” (73). Ellison notes that both the sheer number of adaptations and the geographic imprecision found within the novella cause confusion. Expanding upon Ellis’s analyses of imprecision and confusion, I examine the contrast between explicit and implicit geographic and literary references within the novella. To explore this referential realm, I blend geocriticism with
intertextual theory. This approach creates a liminal space between the geographic reality and textual fictions in which Carmen resides. I contend that Mérimée intentionally used cartographic, political, and literary references to produce a text with layers of symbolism that further developed the Bohémienne of the French imagination.

Where did it all begin?

Much of the research on Carmen focuses on place and the etiology of not only the novella but also of the Roma and of “Gypsy tales.”\textsuperscript{15} The etiology of the bohémienne has been an ongoing fascination in writing and criticism. Etiology, here, is the study of the origins of myths. In the context of 19\textsuperscript{th}-century France, this means exploring the extant myths, beliefs, and stereotypes surrounding Romani persons and understanding the unique circumstances that have buttressed the writings of new stories. 19\textsuperscript{th}-century texts set in fictional Bohemia were preoccupied with the etiology, and there continues to be a preoccupation today.

Many scholars today explore why Mérimée may have written Carmen, relying mainly on geographical influences. Their search for the Mérimée’s inspiration has led to several conclusions. First, some scholars have concluded that the story was inspired Mérimée’s expeditions to Spain. Ninotchka Devorah Bennahum, in her book Carmen, A Gypsy Geography, argues that Mérimée was inspired by an evening in Spain with the Scottish countess Doña Mañuela and her husband, Don Cipriano de Montijo. This meeting took place 15 years before he wrote Carmen. Bennahum notes that

Doña Mañuela had read in a Madrileño newspaper the tale of a jacquerie from Malaga who had murdered his mistress - a Gypsy - for having ‘devoted herself to the public’ and having refused to be in his company exclusively. Mérimée altered Montijo’s populist story,

\textsuperscript{15} This refers to the international collective of fictional stories which include “gypsies” as characters. This does not refer to Romani folklore.
conceived as an intimate study of Andalusian *gitana* rather as a passionate love affair that ends in violent murder and transformed it into a character study (15).

This view on the genesis of the narrative demonstrates a focus on the act of writing. Rather than just recounting a tale that he had heard, Mérimée experiments with how he can develop a specific character (that of Carmen) within a specified context. It transforms the story from a simple folktale or reportage into an academic pursuit of writing. Anna Hamling argues that Pushkin’s poem “Tsygany” inspired Mérimée.16 If this is true, Mérimée translated a Russian tale for French consumption. Conversely, David Lowe concludes that such statements about the tale’s origins can only be pure “conjecture” (76) and have little evidence. We also have Mérimée’s admiration for George Borrow, an English scholar who wrote many books about Romani populations in Europe. Mérimée even cites one of Borrow’s works within *Carmen* in his proto-ethnographic addendum, Chapter IV. In this chapter, he makes references to Borrow’s works on the Roma, giving him credit as a missionary who “avait entrepris de [les] convertir / took it upon himself to convert them” (113-114). This influence has been highly discussed in studies about the novella by scholars such as Lowe (74), A.A. Tabrizi (55), and José F. Colmeiro (134). In any case, we can see that international influence is a topic of interest.

In addition to foreign influences, scholars have also noted French influences. Tabrizi dispels the commonly perceived parallels between the novella and *Manon Lescaut*, a novel written by Antoine François Prévost in 1731, in his article “Carmen de Prosper Mérimée, parodie de Manon Lescaut?” Adrien Goetz, who wrote a critical preface to the novella, also points to influences from Alfred Musset, noting that Mérimée had heard the “première lecture en public

---

16 This poem is about a gadjo (non-Romani man) who joins a tribe because he has fallen in love with a woman from their group. His moral decline somewhat parallels the journey taken by Don José.
The first public reading of L’Andalusie” (Mérimée, 10). The reality is that we likely cannot identify a single source of inspiration for the novella.

The continuous search for a “source” for the text is curious. We do not seek a “source” for most other stories, so why is it so important for Carmen? As I delve into the sociopolitical history surrounding the novella, we can see that there was an extant preoccupation with belonging, national identity, and lineage. Who belongs in France? Who is French? As the political landscape shifts between monarchies and republics, what role does lineage play? As these political shifts take place, how is property ownership impacted? In their essence, these questions are tied to the political impacts of sedentary society and how movement challenges the beliefs associated with it. In a way, these, too, are questions of origin. Through Carmen, we can see the web of influences on ideologies and threats against a cohesive national identity expanding within and beyond France.

Perhaps Carmen allows for such explorations of etiology because gadji (or non-Romani people) perceive the Roma as lacking an origin and a history. This perception of Carmen allows for a dialectic exchange that removes social and political boundaries. As Alaina Lemon argues in her book on Russian Romani history and mythology, Between Two Fires: Gypsy Performance and Romani Memory from Pushkin to Post-Socialism, the image of the gypsy is intrinsically tied to a lack of origin story. She states, “Gypsies are usually depicted not only as people ‘without history’ but as indifferent to recollection, living in an ‘eternal present’” (2). Much like the origins of Carmen, the lack of origin story is inherent to the image of the gypsy. The gypsy as fiction cannot be from or belong to any place.
Similarly, the writing, and re-writing, of *Carmen* cannot claim one genesis. Instead, it is like a river with many tributaries and distributaries. The narrative is fed from its sources - a pan-European collaboration – and branches off into different paths (See Peters-Hill for more information on mapping adaptations of *Carmen*). Mérimée’s *Carmen* is a product of exchange, and through readings, interpretations, and adaptations, the narrative continues to be exchanged and transformed. In short, the narrative is continually rebirthed through a web of dialogs.

**Blurring reality and fiction**

In the context of 19th-century France, authors tried to plant their *gypsy narratives* in reality by using historical reference points based in the extant myths, beliefs, and stereotypes surrounding the Roma. Authors chose what they deemed *scientific facts*, or what they presented as such, to do this. The authors presented these ideas as truths to lend credence to their narrators. Mérimée uses this narrative tool as well. The narrator of *Carmen* is in search of the archeological site of a Roman battle, the Battle of Munda. This hunt was based on a perceptibly true reality and reflected actual Mérimée’s political responsibilities. Links to reality were a part of a literary trend in which the author places fictional narrative within the context of the “real” by using real or falsified etiologies.

Mérimée was personally and professionally interested in the Battle of Munda. This real-life interest grounded the novella in a certain reality. Or, better yet, it blurred the lines between

---

17 We can see this in the beginning of *Notre Dame de Paris* in which the narrator focuses on the historical accuracy of the narrative he is going to tell, rooting it in the archeology and architecture of not only the Notre Dame cathedral but the entire city of Paris, and by extension, France. For example, as discussed in the previous chapter, Hugo begins his novel with the discovery of the etching of “ἈΝΑΓΚΗ” discovered within the contemporaneous structure of the church of Notre-Dame de Paris. The narrators in George Sand’s *La Filleule* and *Consuelo* also consistently refer to how they discovered letters or saw something happen firsthand to lend credence to their tales.
fact and fiction. In his *Lettres à une inconnue*, published posthumously in 1880, Mérimée remarks his professional interest in this topic:

> Je me suis engagé témérairement à traduire à Sa Majesté un mémoire espagnol sur l’emplacement de Munda, et je viens de m’apercevoir que c’est d’une lecture terriblement difficile (178).

I foolheartedly committed to translating a Spanish memoir on the placement of Munda for His Majesty, and I came to understand that it was a terribly difficult reading.

Mérimée was the Inspector of Historical Monuments, a position within the cabinet of Louis Phillipe. As Inspector, he was to translate the *Bellum Hispaniense*, a classic Roman text written about Caesar for the king. However, this translation was never finished, in part because the translation was quite difficult. I examine this text more later. For now, it shows how Mérimée blended his own life into his novella, confusing reality and fiction.

Mérimée’s interest in the battle of Munda extended beyond his duties as the Inspector of Historical Monuments. He was also academically interested in its history. In his article “Examen d’une dissertation,” Mérimée critiqued M. A. Delgado’s use of artificial analysis (267). In 1847, Delgado attempted to state that a relic found in Estramadure had come from Constantinople.

Mérimée challenged Delgado’s proposition:

> Le docte académicien de Madrid se borne à remarquer que ces lettres grecques indiquent probablement que le disque a été fabriqué à Constantinople

> The erudite academic from Madrid limits himself to remarking that these Greek letters probably indicate that the disk was made in Constantinople (Ibid.).

Mérimée actively sought answers to such questions of Western history professionally and personally.

Furthermore, as Singh Brinkman explains, Mérimée was also publishing travel essays about Spain *Revue des deux mondes*, a travel journal that permitted its readers a glimpse into outside
worlds (362). Mérimée originally published *Carmen* in this journal, a choice that continued to blur reality and fiction. Singh-Brinkman concludes that:

The mid-nineteenth century [French] public would have easily read Carmen as a ‘*verité vécue*’ [...] By publishing Carmen in a journal that purported to reveal the actuality of primitive cultures and by framing his story with scholarly propositions and observations, Mérimée covered his tale of adventure and passion with a veneer of authority and truth (362).

The reader, it seems, is to trust the narrator/Mérimée. After all, he has spent time in Spain and knows the local culture per his own publications in journals such as the *Revue des deux mondes*. He has met a group of *gitanos* and is familiar with their language. Therefore, he should be a trustworthy source.

The concept of storytelling can explain this blending of fiction and reality. Storytelling, which relied upon an extant corpus of myths and stereotypes, allowed deeper conversations and reflections on truths. Storytelling used fiction to examine truth. As Corey Cropper states in “Haunting the Nouveaux Riches: Bohemia in Mérimée’s ‘Vénus d’Ille’ and ‘Carmen’,

“Mérimée’s fiction (and his academic discourse, for that matter) underscores the very inability of so-called experts (himself included) to comprehend and explain the deep, shocking truths of human nature - truths that can only be expressed by telling a story” (194).

Carmen-as-narrative and Carmen-as-character became simply narrative devices to navigate truths about France. Mérimée, as Cropper states, has already allegorized the French state under the Louis-Philippe regime in *La Vénus d’Ille*. As we delve into textual analyses, I explain how *Carmen* is a dialectic tool that continues Mérimée’s conversation.

**Carmen in dialog**

To examine the function of these dialogs, we must explore the historical context surrounding the first publication of *Carmen*. The novella, as noted earlier, was first published in
the *Revue des deux mondes* in 1845. The story was the first text within this edition of the journal. As was typical for this journal, this edition of the *Revue des deux mondes* included several political commentaries, literary reviews, and other short stories. Included in these contributions are “Il faut qu’une porte soit ouverte ou fermée. Proverbe / A door must be opened or closed. Proverb” by Alfred Musset and “Études sur l’antiquité - les Satires de Luciles / Studies on Antiquity – the Lucilian Satires” by Charles LaBitte. The first of these two entries is a short play critiquing the mixing of classes within Parisian society; the second is a satire of Roman society. Inclusion in this particular edition places the novella in dialog with sociopolitical commentaries on immigration and Western culture.

Noting the sociopolitical context of 1830s France, Cropper explains how Mérimée used storytelling to allegorize what he saw as threatening shifts within France. Cropper justifies his position by explaining Mérimée’s political roles and awareness through his role as an Inspector of Historical Monuments. According to Cropper, Mérimée became keenly aware of how Orleanist policies transformed the country’s social and economic power structure” and Mérimée was most concerned about the “rise of a certain bourgeois morality that reinforced this emerging power structure by putting money ahead of love, chastity ahead of freedom, the social *dité* over real charity and virtue, and by preferring rigid moral absolutes to human complexity (183).

Though not explicitly stated in either novella, Cropper argues that both *Carmen* and *Vénus d’Ille* portray the tensions between the upcoming middle class and the growing “bohemian” populations in Paris. By “bohemian,” Cropper means the counter-cultural art movement, not to Romani populations. According to Cropper, Mérimée “expose[s] the hypocrisy and fraudulence of French middle-class morality during the July Monarchy” (183). Cropper provides excellent documentation to support this argument. While, in contrast to Cropper’s idea, Mérimée’s
political life demonstrates a more centrist view. *Carmen* does support some more conservative views, likely because Mérimée was working for Louis Philippe’s government when he wrote and published the work. As I explore later, his duties as the Inspector of General Monuments under this regime had a significant influence on the writing of the novella.

Geography, which is at the forefront of the novella, also embodied conservative views. The novella begins:

> J’avais toujours soupçonné les géographes de ne savoir ce qu’ils disent lorsqu’ils placent le champ de bataille de Munda dans le pays de Bastuli-Poeni, près de la moderne Munda, à quelque deux lieues au nord de Marbella (39).

I had always suspected the geographical authorities did not know what they were talking about when they located the battlefield of Munda in the county of the Bastuli-Poeni, close to the modern Monda, some two leagues north of Marbella (Translation by Lord Mary Loyd).

Though this phrase itself seems benign, the implication changes once we take sociopolitical circumstances into account. According to H. A. Collingham in *The July Monarchy*, “Many legitimists [those who believed that the throne should be inherited], deprived of the fruits of power, contented themselves with agriculture, restricting their public role to membership of a farming society or an archeology or local history association.” (118). By making the narrator an archeologist, Mérimée alludes to legitimist beliefs.

Alongside social fears came economic worries. Mérimée was able to write about French concerns of capitalism through the tool of displacement. Antonya Fonyi concludes that the Spain of *Carmen* looked similar to the France Mérimée saw as his homeland. She states that the author

> a toujours refusé de voir l’importance qu’y prend l’évolution capitaliste - telle qu’il l’a méprisée pour sa tendance à substituer l’ordre à la force et pour l’accueil qu’elle a fait aux aspirations égalitaires de la bourgeoisie afin de supprimer l’inégalité naturelle entre
individus, et pourtant, le danger de désordre que provoquèrent les initiatives des hommes énergiques (47).

always refused to see the importance of the capitalist evolution – as much as he despised it for its tendency to substitute force with order and for its welcoming to the egalitarian aspirations of the bourgeoisie by suppressing the natural inequality of individuals, and furthermore, the danger of disorder which provoked energetic men to action.

In line with Fonyi’s observation, it is important to note just how critical Mérimée was of republicanism and capitalism. Of an election in 1846, Collingham observed, “Bad wine is drunk, glasses clink, speeches are made, meanwhile several stagger to the dunghill to relieve themselves of all that embarrasses them. I am horribly aristocratic when I see democracy and it’s disgusting manners” (Trans. from Collingham, 77-78). Through this quote, we can see Mérimée’s centrist views.

Concerns for the ever-shifting political landscape could sum up the social and economic fears. Fonyi notes that Don José functions as a symbol of political danger. Carmen’s killer has two names - his Basque name, José Navarro, and the one he has taken because he had the right by birth, “Don.” As Fonyi notes, using the name Don José represents tension within the character himself — José Navarro represents his firm link to his Christian heritage in Navarre while the Don represents his noble roots (40). However, as Don José abandons his aristocratic roots, he becomes “mi-civilisé, mi-sauvage / half-civilized, half-savage” (50). Political uncertainty is no place to rest.

Don José’s dichotomy reflects the monarchy who positioned itself somewhere in the middle rather than taking political sides. The Louis Philippe regime was neither a pure monarchy nor a pure republic, failing to meet the populace’s demands. As Collingham explains, this monarchy

---

18 I have been unable to locate the direct source for this quotation.
was a compromise between Revolutionaries and Legitimists but not one from mutual desire. It was unable to create a balance between the conflicting demands placed upon it. Therefore, the “juste milieu was an Orleanist illusion” (108). By allegorizing the pitfalls of the constitutional monarchy within the novella, Mérimée is putting this illusion under the microscope.

Building upon the analysis of these sociopolitical changes, let’s also examine the role of legal changes within proprietorship traditions. *Carmen* is first and foremost a book about geography, or land, if we are to take the narrator’s original intent into account. Though the narrator quickly abandons his search for the location of the battle of Munda, the quest to which we earlier referred, the rest of the novel is still highly focused on place. The novella consistently names cities and regions across Spain such as Cordoba, Andalusia, Seville, Navarre, etc. I examine these locations at length later. Additionally, the Gitano characters’ primary means of earning money is smuggling, an act that requires trespassing, illicit border crossings, and other forms of transgressing land boundaries. These transgressions threatened the non-gitano characters as they risk losing their personal property, such as when Carmen stole the narrator’s watch. After the narrator spends the afternoon with Carmen, he notices his watch is missing – “je m’apperçus que ma montre me manquait / I noticed my watch was gone” (64). While waiting to be hanged, the Dominican guarding him returns the watch to Don José (Ibid). Presumably, Don José had gotten the watch from Carmen. Property was unstable around Carmen and could be lost at any moment.

The dialog on Frenchness was not limited to literature. I also address the question of identity in Chapter 1 with references to Benedict Andersen and Ernest Renan. Here, we return to Renan’s analyses as it provides insight into the concept of nationhood. Ernest Renan gave a
conference entitled “Qu’est-ce qu’une nation” on 11 March 1882 at the Sorbonne. Despite giving this speech 40 years after the publication of Carmen, Renan’s backward-looking perspective allows us to situate meanings of nationality within the temporal context. Renan argues that throughout history, humans have sought to group themselves. They have formed communities based on religious ties, empires based on the reach of the head of state, confederations, and nations (Introduction). However, according to Renan, the creation of the nation relied on false assumptions. In particular, the creation of a nation assumed that the functions of smaller municipalities could be applied to the larger scale of a nation.

However, there were more assumptions made throughout this process. According to Renan, the worst error is the confusion of race and nation:

De nos jours, on commet une erreur plus grave : on confond la race avec la nation, et l’on attribue à des groupes ethnographiques ou plutôt linguistiques une souveraineté analogue à celle des peuples réellement existants

We commit an even more grave error during our time: we confuse race with the nation. To ethnic groups, or more so to people who speak the same language, we attribute a sovereignty analogous to that of peoples who really exist (introduction).

Here, the word peuple refers to the claimed members of a nation, similar to the word Volk. By confusing linguistic similarities or ethnicities with nationalities, one risks the possibility of dividing nations into smaller and smaller chunks that cannot function as nations can.

Connection to the land-space is more significant than ethnic heritage or language spoken.

This viewpoint explains one of the concerns posed by the idea of the Bohémien. The Bohémien has the potential capacity to be held within the constraints of one extant nation, such as France, per Renan’s analysis. Their linguistic and ethnic differences do not preclude them. However, in the eyes of nationalists, nomadism implies a lack of loyalty to the land and
thus to the nation. In a time when France is recovering from and/or undergoing governmental upheaval after governmental upheaval, disloyalty to the idea of *Frenchness* is threatening.

**Remapping France’s social landscape**

Within France, under the July Monarchy, there was also insecurity surrounding property. The monarch was making it easier for non-aristocrats to become property owners. Though Cropper focuses on the moral downfall seen under the July Monarchy, he also notes that Louis-Philippe’s government refused to establish a tax on landowners, which thus “protected the bourgeoisie’s income and thereby strengthened their social influence in the provinces” (184).

The lack of a land tax affected two things: first, the bourgeoisie could grow in size. If the tax was not a burden, it was simpler to become a landowner with all its privileges. Decreasing taxes would increase the size of the landowning, non-noble class threatening the historical balance of classes. Secondly, it distances land ownership from loyalty to the monarchy, promoting instability. Much like the *Bohémien*, the nouveau-riche landowner was less loyal to the state, encouraging the possibility of instability and thus further insurrections.

As this demonstrates, the population of landowners in France was undergoing intense shifts. In *Geographies of Exclusion*, David Sibley argues that land management allows for suppressing certain people groups, promoting an increased distinction in social stratification. He states, “Power is expressed in the monopolization of space and the relegation of weaker groups in society to less desirable environments” (ix). During the July Monarchy, the aristocratic monopoly on space was challenged. Society was shifting from the traditional sovereignty of the crown to a more democratic system. Simultaneously, the economic system was moving toward a laissez-faire capitalist system, which had the potential to be more disruptive. Whereas the
previous system protected the upper echelons of the social ladder, capitalism had the potential to disrupt social stratification.

Suddenly, the middle class had more power to buy land and participate in politics. If new landowners came to be, property boundaries had the potential to shift. Collingham argues that “the doctrine of laissez-faire, the financial struggle of capitalism, as opposed to the idea of property as a moral force in society, which the legitimists claimed to believe” (118). Shifting geographies implied shifting moralities. The character of the Bohémien embodied both concerns. Carmen, immoral as a character, embodies these changes, which are then translated as immoral as well. The narrative challenges the traditional social rules surrounding property ownership.

One strong critique of the constitutional monarchy was its laissez-faire approach to a capitalist economy. Collingham expands,

According to [Vicomte de Bonald], the bourgeoisie had moved from the rightful place in the state to dominate society, they had proletarianized the population in search for industrial wealth, and had materialized modern civilization. The doctrine of laissez-faire, the financial struggle of capitalism was opposed to the idea of property as a moral force in society, which the legitimists claimed to believe (118).

If we release the constraints of the economic definition of laissez-faire, we can apply it to the moral downfall feared by opponents of the monarchy. Much as laissez-faire capitalism caused shifts in social structures, laissez-faire morality caused shifts in customs and traditions. There was a need to be warned of the temptations of laissez-faire in the eyes of the legitimists.

Carmen symbolizes the laissez-faire attitude. The threatening power of this symbol translates into other representations of Romani women. Romani populations are thus seen as criminal threats and as a root cause of moral decline within a dominant population. George
Sand’s works *La Filleule* and *Consuelo*, which I study in the next chapter, further examine how the symbol of the Bohemian critiques capitalism.

**Mapping the Occupation of Spain**

The political boundaries also influenced the sociopolitical map of France. In particular, the border with Spain acted as a permeable, cultural space, particularly during the Napoleonic occupation. France had close cultural ties with Spain, particularly amongst the elite and nobility. The occupation, and battles that were part of it, shaped Franco-Spanish relations. Intentionally or not, Mérimée effectively maps important battle sites of the occupation within *Carmen*. This mapping creates opposing cartographies and reflects different cultural values. Don José, the narrator, and Carmen embody these distinct cartographies. We see this by comparing the narrative to how historians mapped the battles in real life.

First, we should note that this occupation was not typical of previous entanglements. Spaniards relied on a new form of warfare that the Napoleonic forces could not defeat – *guerrillisme*. The occupation began in February 1808, and by 1811 Napoleon’s commander Bessières was considering abandoning Spain altogether because French troops could not defeat the guerrilla fighters (Tone, 355). According to Tone’s essay “Napoleon’s Uncongenial Sea: Guerilla Warfare in Navarre during the Peninsular War, 1808-14,“

Spain’s guerrilla war taught Europe that, under the right circumstances, popular forces could be as effective as regular troops. The guerrillas wiped out armies through attrition and small victories. They denied France regular access to the resources of the Spanish countryside. Above all, the guerillas absorbed hundreds of thousands of French troops that might have overwhelmed the Spanish, British, and Portuguese regular forces (356).

Guerilla warfare redefined a significant category of European culture and challenged the idea of the supremacy of French knowledge. The French military ways were unsuccessful against the
new warfare. Because of these failures, many French fighters defected to join the guerilla fighters. This experience was not limited to Napoleonic expeditions in Spain. Similar failures can be examined in north Africa and the expeditions to Russia. However, these experiences are outside the scope of this dissertation. Shifting military beliefs challenged tradition.

To delegitimize the guerilla fighters, the French categorized them as uncivilized. First, they were declared to be bandits (Tone, 357). Then, French leaders such as Marshal Soult considered the Spanish “an inferior people too benighted to understand that the Empire was for their own good” (Tone, 357). In a summation of French writers, Tone concludes that the French saw the guerilla war against France [as] reduced to another episode in the leyenda negra of Spanish inferiority, cruelty, and resistance to modernity rather than a chapter in the formation of modern Spain and the destruction of the Bonaparte dictatorship (358).

The usage of this propaganda reinforced the French narrative that France remained superior to Spain and other “oriental” countries. The French narrative refused to see itself as failing to succeed at its occupation of Spain. Instead, the Spanish guerilla fighter is cast in a similar light to all the peoples that the Empire sought to colonize. The French saw them as inferior and in need of the French to save them. France's resistance and ultimate defeat in Spain proved this to be an incorrect view.

The French narratives about the war informed their war tactics and reified French internal belief systems. For example, the French believed that religious persons populated the guerilla forces. Therefore, the French troops targeted religious institutions.

Monasteries and convents were closed by government order and defrocked regulars sent home. Priests, always suspected of preaching against the government, were special targets of repression. In Navarre, the French arrested, exiled or executed approximately 300 priests during the war (Tone, 361)
While these attacks and efforts perhaps inspired some resistance amongst the Navarrese, the accounts of the guerilla fighters do not support the idea that their forces were made of clergymen (361-2). However, the Spanish reality did not mean much for the French perception. Rather, the image of the uncivilized guerilla as a religious fanatic would have supported the French turn toward secularism. The French also viewed the guerilla fighters as royalists. However, “Navarrese sources do not mention the defense of the nation at all, and only one document refers to the restoration of the Bourbons [in Spain] as an object worth a fight” (Tone, 362). Declaring the guerilla fighters to be royalists supported the idea that the French political system under Napoleon was superior to the old regime. French narratives wrote history and defined French superiority despite their untrue nature.

Navarre held a particular space in the French conception of Spain. It was neither part of nor apart from the rest of the country. This liminal space was a chimera. Bon Gourlez de la Motte, or Bon de la Motte, a 19th-century writer, wrote an overview of Spain entitled L’Espagne, tableau politique, civil, religieux [...] de la péninsule suivi d’une description détaillée des provinces vasvongades et de la Navarre. By this title, we can see that Navarre was included within Spain yet merited special treatment outside of the Spanish context. Legally speaking, Navarre followed two sets of laws:

La Navarre espagnole, en se soumettant aux lois générales du pays, n’en conserva pas moins sa constitution et les formes de son ancienne administration (160).

In submitting to the general laws of the country, Spanish Navarre still maintained its constitution and original forms of administration.

The inhabitants of the Montaña benefited from these legal perks because they had maintained their local government structures founded upon fueros, or “constitutional laws [...] which
afforded the Navarrese protection from many taxes, some military services, high Castilian custom duties, and other inconveniences” (Tone, 371-372). The Navarrese had many reasons to resist the French. However, resistance to “civilized” life, as portrayed by many French writers, was not a reason. The region of Navarre had developed a highly civilized and structured society which they eagerly sought to protect.

Linguistically, the region also challenged hegemony. Bon de la Motte speaks of the language as follows:

La langue est un mélange de castellan, de Catalan, de basque et de français. On n’y parle pas le basque aussi que dans la Navarre française et dans la Biscaye (156).

The language is a mix of Castilian, Catalan, Basque, and French. They do not speak Basque there as well as in French Navarre and the Biscay.

Bon de la Motte’s framing is interesting. The language spoken in the Spanish Navarre region is read as impure, whereas that spoken in French Navarre is pure. As seen from this viewpoint, the mixing of cultures is not a benefit but a detriment. Such belief promotes the French image of a European social hierarchy in which France remains at the top.

In reality, “the most common explanations [given by the guerilla fighters] for the resistance given in the sources are the character of the Navarrese, the defence [sic] of local privileges and, above all, the byzantine cruelty of the French and their exorbitant taxes” (Tone, 362). The majority of the fighters were peasant-landowners. Mina himself was a wealthy farmer (368). Within Navarre, “those who leased land [...] paid such low rents that they were virtual co-proprietors” (ibid). Access to land ownership reflected a particular economic situation that the guerilla fighters were keen to protect. As demonstrated by Mina’s life, the Navarrese could independently find economic advancement no matter the socioeconomic status into which
they were born (369). Noting a “sketchy” survey conducted by Frenchmen, Tone notes that the “average age [of a guerilla fighter] was 29 years, and none had been outside the valley [...] all 15 were listed by the French as independent proprietors, and one was labeled a hacendado, or big landowner” (369-370). Those living in the Montaña of Navarre benefited from historic economic policies which allowed them financial freedom. In addition to these economic policies, the Navarrese benefited from a large number of communal properties such as “community pastures, wood lots, [and] game preserves” (371). Communal farmland contrasted with most of Europe, where communal land was being sold for commercial usage (Ibid). The French imposed new taxes, which limited that freedom, giving the guerillas a considerable reason to fight. They were defending their homes and their livelihoods.

In Chapter IV, Bon de la Motte explores “l’état social” of Spain by defining and describing specific aspects such as literature, medicine, the press, education, language, and more. Interestingly, the last four subsections are entitled contrebande, mendiants, escopeteros, and guerillas. According to the section on contraband, this crime “était devenue un art, une profession / had become an art, a profession” that became trendy in mass culture through music and literature (125). According to popular culture, contrebandistas had a “vie aventureuse [...] toute d’amour, de combats, d’indépendance / adventurous life, full of life, battles, and independence” (ibid). However, General Riera had recently decreased the frequency of this crime (ibid). Vagrancy was another issue that Spain faced. The government sought to minimize this issue by establishing “un dépôt de mendicité” called San-Bernardino near Madrid (ibid). For those not begging, armed theft was another crime of choice. For people traveling Spanish routes, there was no protection from these voleurs except paying a “prime”
for their voyage. In addition to murders and theft, these criminals interrupted communication routes and limited how information traveled across Spain (ibid). The *escopeteros*, often translated as gunmen, protected travelers from thieves and bandits. *Escopeteros* were former thieves who had left this life and began working for the government as informants or accompanying travelers (ibid). Lastly, the *guerillas* “à qui les circonstances politiques seules mettent les armes à la main / for whom only political circumstances had caused them to take up arms” (ibid). War was never-ending for the country folk, particularly those in Navarre, as they fought to protect their traditions and cultures from being obstructed by changing governments.

For many of these fighters, it was a means of cultural survival and defense. According to le Bon de la Motte,

dès que les événements l’autorisent, elle [la classe qui fait la guerre] se livre à ses fureurs avec toute l’ardeur d’une sauvage indépendance, toute la force des traditions, toute la conviction d’un devoir à remplir.

as soon as circumstances allowed, the warring class surrendered to its furor with all the ardor of a savage independence, all the force of tradition, and all the conviction of a duty to be fulfilled (ibid).

These fighters fought with passion and caused a scene in the areas they visited. Alan Forest explains that 18th-century Europeans were familiar with this brigandage.

The connection between brigandage and the soldiery was one that would have required no explanation to an eighteenth-century audience [...] Soldiers were reviled as being drunken, violent, and - particularly when on foreign soil - gratuitously dangerous. Nor did they necessarily improve their behavior when they ceased to be employed in the armed service of one or other of the European monarchs. The entry on ‘brigands’ in the *Encyclopédie* quite specifically makes a direct connection between soldiers and banditry. A brigand, it declares, is a ‘vagabond who makes use of military campaigns to plunder and rob travelers. The name is sometimes given to undisciplined soldiers who devastate the countries in which they are fighting and never stay around to fight the enemy’ (28).
Brigands were familiar to a 19th-century audience. Therefore, when French readers encountered Don José, they likely recalled this image to mind. The idea of the brigand had a particular political slant. Forrest explains that it was a complex construction which blended both the anti-revolutionary and the anti-social [...] [T]he spread of brigandage was taken by the émigré press to demonstrate the social and moral degradation that resulted from the Revolution’s new morality’ (31).

The negative image of the brigand was a particularly conservative one. By the 19th-century, the term *brigand* identified any person who behaved outside the French norm. Forrest continues,

This use of the term ‘brigand’ had by 1812 become a commonplace of French imperial usage, a means of distinguishing between the proper and honourable French way of doing things and the underhand stratagems that were reported by their opponents” (33).

With this knowledge, we can see that Don José was also a discursive tool that Mérimée used to discuss alterity and identify otherness.

Geography continued this conversation. By 16 January 1809, the French military under Joseph Napoleon had expanded its military occupation to Estramadure and Andalusia, winning battles at “Andujar, Grenade, Cordoue, Séville, Jaën, Malaga, Xérès, etc.” (Tone, 21). By 1809, however, the Spaniards had proven that they could hold their ground in cities like Baylen and Saragosse (ibid). Valencia was the last city captured by Napoleonic forces on 9 January 1812 (23-24). France quickly experienced losses at Gironne, Ciudad-Rodrigo, and Arapiles (24).

Joseph returned to France, and Napoleon gave power back to Ferdinand, though he required him to take the title of Count of Barcelona (ibid). There was a second occupation in 1823, and Ferdinand VII was ousted (42-43).

Let’s now examine Spain’s mapping within the novella compared to actual battle sites of the occupation. Because guerillas fought the war, it would be difficult to highlight all of the battle sites across Spain. However, major events contributed to shifting the course of the war. For the
reader's convenience, I have included two maps (figures 2 and 3). You may notice that the cities and regions cited in Carmen are at times quite distant from one another. At other times, the actors seem to be moving in illogical directions. These inconsistencies aid in creating an imaginary Spain by defying geographical constraints. Using Tone, cited at length, I highlight the battle locations mentioned in Carmen. I follow each Tone citation with citations from Carmen which mention the same places(s).

The most notorious collaboration occurred in Andalusia. There Joseph Bonaparte raised urban militias and counter-guerillas and discovered many friends among the elites of the Guadalquivir valley. Pockets of resistance in the region certainly existed. In Ronda, in the Alpujarras and in the Sierra Morena small guerilla parties never stopped harassing the French, but against the collaboration in important cities like Séville, Córdoba, and Granada, these insurgents could make little headway. The people of La Mancha also remained, for the most part, quiescent, when they did not openly collaborate with the French (emphasis mine, Tone, 365).

The narrator replies to Don José’s request to deliver a medal to his mother and to tell her that he had died,

Oui, je passerais certainement par Vittoria ; mais il n’est pas impossible que je me détourne pour aller à Pampelune (emphasis mine, 67).

"Yes," I said, "I shall certainly pass through Vittoria. But I may very possibly go round by Pampeluna” (Lloyd, emphasis mine).

The narrator states, "Il y avait alors en Andalousie un fameux bandit nommé José-Maria / At that time, there was a famous brigand in Andalusia, of the name Jose-Maria" (Mérimée, 46; trans. By Lloyd, emphasis mine). The narrator also states,

On m’avait indiqué certain manuscrit de la bibliothèque de Dominicains, où je devais trouver des renseignements intéressants sur l’antique Munda. Fort bien accueilli par les bons pères, je passais les journées dans leur couvent, et le soir je me promenais par la ville. À Cordoue, vers le coucher du soleil, il y a quantité d’oisifs sur le quai qui borde la rive droite du Guadalquivir (55, emphasis mine).
I had been told of a certain manuscript in the library of the Dominican convent which was likely to furnish me with very interesting details about the ancient Munda. The good fathers gave me the most kindly welcome. I spent the daylight hours within their convent, and at night I walked about the town. At Cordova, a great many idlers collect, toward sunset, in the quay that runs along the right bank of the Guadalquivir (Trans. by Lloyd, emphasis mine).

The narrator continues

Je terminai mon travail sur le manuscrit des Dominicains et je partis pour Séville. Après plusieurs mois de courses errantes en Andalousie, je voulus retourner à Madrid, et il me fallut repasser par Cordoue (64, emphasis mine).

I finished my work on the Dominican manuscript and went on to Seville. After several months spent wandering hither and thither in Andalusia, I wanted to get back to Madrid, and with that object I had to pass through Cordova (Trans. by Lloyd, emphasis mine).

The narrative path highlights the regions where battles between the French rulers and local Spanish rebels occurred. These locations were places both where the French monarchy had success, such as Cordova, Seville, and Granada, in addition to places where the rebels had strongholds, such as the region of Navarre.
Figure 2. CIA Map of Spain. Source: Wikimedia.
Figure 3. Las Provincias Españolas en 1850. Source: Wikimedia
When we look at this from the perspective of guerilla warfare, the mapping tends to focus on Don José. Guerilla warfare was a military tactic that refuted the French cultural norms of battle, much as Don José and Carmen challenged cultural norms. Let us look at the locations noted by Tone in reference to guerilla fighting:

[G]uerilla country lay in a wide band along Spain’s northern littoral, from Upper Aragon, through Navarre, Soria, and parts of the Basque country, to Santander, Léon, and for a time, Asturias and Galicia. [...] Navarre gave birth to the guerilla army of Mina (emphasis mine, 366)

It was the mountainous northern half of the province [of Navarre], known as the Montaña, that sustained the guerillas, while the communities of the Ebro river valley, or Ribera, remained on the sidelines of the struggle. Almost all of the fighting took place in the Montaña [...] Much of Spain is mountainous, but guerillas were not present in every mountainous region. [...] What the guerillas required were mountainous regions with a dense population and particular social, economic, and political profile. The area that met this profile lay in northern Spain, especially in the Montaña of Navarre (emphasis mine, 367).

The novella shows that Don José is from the same region as these guerilla fighters.

Carmen feigns this origin as well. When Don José meets Carmen, he introduces himself as follows:

Je suis d’Elizondo, lui repondis-je en basque, fort ému de l’entendre parler ma langue. -Moi, je suis d’Etchalar, dit-elle (75).

‘I belong to Elizondo,’ I answered in Basque, very much affected by the sound of my own language. ‘I come from Etchalar’ said she (trans. by Lloyd).

Elizondo and Etchalar are both towns in the Navarrese region of the Basque country. Whereas Don José’s origin story is true, Carmen lies. Carmen can feign a connection to Don José because of her deep knowledge of Spanish cities. Cartographies are malleable, but only Carmen has mastered the skill of map manipulation.

When Don José meets the narrator, he introduces himself slightly differently:
Je m’appelle don José Lizzarrabengoa, et vous connaissez assez l’Espagne, Monsieur, pour que mon nom vous dise aussitôt que je suis Basque et vieux chrétien [...] j’aimais trop jouer à la paume, c’est ce qui m’a perdu. Quand nous jouons à la paume, nous autres Navarrais, nous oublions tout (68, emphasis mine).

My name is Don José Lizzarrabengoa, and you know enough of Spain, sir, to know at once, by my name, that I come of an old Christian and Basque stock [...] I was too fond of playing tennis, and that was my ruin. When we Navarrese begin to play tennis, we forget everything else (Trans. by Lloyd, emphasis mine).

Per the analysis of Forrest, the French reader would have been familiar with the brigandry that took place in this region and could have connected the rebellious, anti-royalist nature of Don José. Whereas Carmen can move freely about Spain, Don José is trapped by the cartography of the Basque militia, and the narrator is bound to French cartography. Her identity can change to match a locale. Yet, Don José cannot escape the bounds of his origin, even as it means his downfall.

The war cartography of the novella was not limited to the Napoleonic occupations, however. Let us remember the Battle of Munda. It was the final battle to be fought in the Hispanic Wars in 45 B.C. It was the last fight of a civil war fought between the Caesarian factions and those of Pompei. Additionally, it was the final conflict fought before Rome shifted from a Republic to an Empire (Majerczyk, “Fractured Friendship at the Battle of Munda”). The inverse was happening in France, where the government was shifting back and forth between regimes.

This archeological search was not simply a fun attempt at proving geographers wrong across Europe, nor was it only a narrative device to make the narrator more credible. Rather, this was framing the story within European politics. More specifically, it linked one of the largest and most influential European cultures in context with France. Like Rome, France had to make
important decisions about its identity and political structure. Not unlike Rome, there remained much tension in France related to these regime changes even after the battles. By referring to this battle, Mérimée placed France at the forefront of the West while simultaneously highlighting the difficulty.

The story of the battle was only recounted within the *Bellum Hispaniense*, which is a rather illegible document. Hirtius, who was assumed the author of this text in the 19th-century, was seen as “une grande médiocrité” according to C. Romy, a contemporary of Mérimée (131).

Romy argues that the story Mérimée is trying to translate is

sans force, étendu outre mesure, sans ordre, sans enchainement, sans logique. Au milieu des faits qu’il rapporte confusément, la vérité ne se démèle qu’avec fatigue (Ibid.)

Without force, extended without measure, without order, without sequence, without logic. In the middle of the facts he confusingly reports, the truth only reveals itself with great effort

Translation of this document was no easy feat. Mérimée intended to write a treatise on this battle, but he never completed it. Instead, he wrote an essay on the “social wars,” referring to the Hispanic Wars, in which he critiques the social pitfalls of republicanism.

Mérimée’s interest in the Roman Empire expanded beyond the Battle of Munda. Mérimée also wrote an essay for the Revue Archéologique in which he analyzed several urns found in the city of Baena, Spain. These urns had inscriptions of several Romans, including the infamous Pompei. Mérimée analyzed the inscriptions to determine each deceased person's Roman or non-Roman heritage. Though these archeological essays do not clarify the answer to the question that *held all of Europe in suspense*, per the opening paragraph of the novella, it does help explain why this is an important question. By exploring what it means to be Roman or not Roman, we explore what it means to be Western.
By placing Carmen within this context, Mérimée has placed his political critique within the Greats of Europe, implying France is part of those legacies. He is also exploring what it means to be Western and European as opposed to being “Oriental” as the expansionism of Napoleon meets the Empire of Louis-Philippe, a moment in which Frenchness comes face to face with alterity. Spain embodies this encounter as it is painted throughout literature. Spain is simultaneously Western, European, Eastern, and Southern. It is a space of cultures clashing. In a fictitious realm, it can function as a space to sort out the impacts of these clashes as they are dealt with in real-time.

**Intertext as a Tool of Identity Politics**

As he blends history by placing the Battle of Munda in conversation with the Napoleonic occupation of Spain, Mérimée disturbs linear temporality. He also does this through intext, citationality, and auto-citationality. He moves from ancient Rome to 16th- and 17th-century France, to pre-July Revolution France, to contemporary France, to atemporal imagined Spain, and even foreshadows his future writings. Temporality cedes itself to locality. Locality within the novella prefers imagined cartographies to reality.

The novella repeatedly relies on Western history and mythology, as seen through the reference to Munda. Returning to the moment when the narrator first sees Carmen, the narrator refers to the Greek myth of Diana and Acteon. Watching, from a distance, the female factory workers bathe, the narrator compares his experience to that of Acteon,

Cependant ces formes blanches et incertaines qui se dessinent sur le sombre azur du fleuve, font travailler les esprits poétiques, et, avec un peu d’imagination, il n’est pas difficile de se représenter Diane et ses nymphes au bain, sans avoir à craindre le sort d’Actéon (56).

Yet the white uncertain outlines perceptible against the dark-blue waters of the stream stir the poetic mind, and the possessor of a little fancy finds it not difficult to imagine that Diana
and her nymphs are bathing below, while he himself runs no risk of endling like Acteon (Translation by Lloyd).

and calls the bathing women “les nymphes de Guadalquivir / the nymphs of Guadalquivir,”

transmuting the location of the baths from ancient Greece to 19th-century Spain (56). Alongside
the Munda reference, the Greek connection differentiates the “moral” French reader from the
characters in the novella, exotic and tempting. It creates a divide between occident and orient.
This divide shows a pattern in Mérimée’s writing that would be evident to his loyal readers and
which would have prepared them to be hunting for such intertextual references.

Mérimée uses three significant types of textual references to develop a champ littéraire, or
a literary backdrop, that informs the narrative. These references are implicit and explicit. First,
there are citations from canonical French sources. Second, there are references to his own
writings. Third, Mérimée also refers to Greco-Roman sources. I argue that each source-type
functions to establish a French image of Spain and develop the French-based definitions of
Bohémien and Bohemia.

This blurring happens through a dialectic exchange. The dialectic exchange on Frenchness
functions not only as a creative force but also as an objectifying one. In Nirmala Singh-
Brinkman’s article “Present and Poison: Gift exchange in Prosper Mérimée’s Carmen,” she
argues that Carmen, like text, story, and character, is constantly in exchange. Carmen is thus
constantly in the state of being possessed by someone or something. Whether it is the
exchange through adaptations or between Don José and the narrator, Carmen plays the role of
the object — cultural object, sexual object, scholarly object, and dialectical object. Similarly, the
concept of Frenchness needs a possessor to exist. Each group or theorist who participated in
this dialog also maintained a definition of Frenchness unique to them.
This objectification of *Carmen* begins with the novella’s frame - archeological research. Prosper Mérimée began his novella by harshly critiquing geographers; he sought to prove them wrong on his expedition. I cite this passage again:

J’avais toujours soupçonné les géographes de ne savoir ce qu’ils disent lorsqu’ils placent le champ de bataille de Munda dans le pays de Bastuli-Poeni, près de la moderne Munda, à quelque deux lieues au nord de Marbella (39).

I had always suspected the geographical authorities did not know what they were talking about when they located the battlefield of Munda in the county of the Bastuli-Poeni, close to the modern Monda, some two leagues north of Marbella (Translation by Lord Mary Loyd).

Singh-Brinkman explains that Mérimée also ends his novel within this erudite framing through his proto-ethnographic essay about the Romani language (361-2). Such framing necessarily promotes exchange as scholarly exploits rarely exist in a vacuum. Singh-Brinkman argues that the character of Carmen resists both scholarly and sexual objectification, claiming her agency and independence to her death:

By signaling the impossibility of forcing her to act against her will, Carmen in fact reframes her role in the story and transforms herself from object of men’s exchanges to subject, doer, performer of her own actions. Moreover, in her choice to refer to herself in both the first and third persons, Carmen shows that the object can also be the subject and the gift can also be the giver (371-2).

Carmen has a duality that is present in most “gypsy-tales.” She has an appearance of total agency juxtaposed against the reality in which she has none. This paradox feeds into the Romantic obsession with the Roma and reflects anti-romanyism. One can dream of having the supposed freedoms of the Roma so long as the Roma do not actually possess it.

Though Carmen-as-character may resist the objectification of which Singh-Brinkman speaks, it is important to note exchanges of information and what information is exchanged. In the story of Carmen, it is almost always a dominant culture exchanging beliefs about a minority
culture, as demonstrated in Mérimée’s novella. This form of dialectic exchange has critical impacts. It promotes the erasure of the minority cultures in favor of promoting stereotypes and mythification. Ultimately, such forms of dialog can silence minority voices.

To understand this more fully, we need to explore how intertextuality functions within the text. In *Desire in Language: A semiotic approach to literature and art*, Julia Kristeva examines Bakhtin’s view of intertextuality. She defines intertextuality as “writing as both subjectivity and communication” (39). As such, the text becomes ambivalent, where “the term ambivalence implies the insertion of history (society) into a text and of this text into history; for the writer, they are one and the same” (39). Using Kristeva’s definition of “intertextuality,” we can say that *Carmen* is an intertextual text par excellence. The novel demonstrates both *dialogue* and *ambivalence* and is inextricable from its social context. Kristeva states, “Dialogue and ambivalence are borne out as the only approach that permits the writer to enter history by espousing an ambivalent ethics: negation as affirmation” (39). Using a pre-established symbol, the *bohémien*, Mérimée succeeds in participating in a clear dialogue on the ever-changing definitions of French society. He paints France in the negative space of the images of Spain and Bohemia. The immoral weights became heavier as *Carmen* became an even more comprehensible discursive tool through time and adaptation.

It is also important to remember that the references to these moral shifts are based upon changes within proprietorship traditions alongside the land transgressions committed by the smugglers and Carmen within the novella. In other words, place is key both for the narrative

---

19 There are some adaptations which break this mold. For example, the Czech version *Muzikál Carmen* produced by Frank Wildhorn.
structure of the novella and the political and moral allegory presented. Mark Juvan, in his
*History and Poetics of Intertextuality*, argues that intertextuality functions within *spatial* realms.

According to Juvan’s reading of Kristeva, intertextuality functions to “locate the text (author,
subject) in tradition and [a] sociohistorical context” (12). By referencing both canonical and
lesser-known texts, Mérimée defines and localizes France, Bohemia, and Spain as they relate to
the West. Mérimée simultaneously defies understandings of spatial relations by using illogical
or erroneous geographic references. By using established French texts by Corneille and Molière
alongside the Brantôme text, which is lesser-known and quite bawdy for its time, Mérimée’s
reader is clearly French.

Mérimée’s citations of canonical French works reinforce the French construct of the
*Bohémienne*. In doing so, his novella creates ambivalence, in Kristeva terms, within the text.

Juvan defines this type of intertextuality as *citationality*. According to Juvan, citationality is
simultaneously both the easiest type of intertext to locate and the easiest to lose meaning over
time:

> Writers can exploit citationality as a device, and readers also recognize it as such. Citationality
(i.e., specific intertextuality) is for this reason not a constant category: in changed sociohistorical or
cultural contexts it can dissolve into unidentifiable, latent intertextual interweaving (Juvan, 48).

From this definition, we can discern that citations serve an intended purpose and are not
employed haphazardly. They evoked a specific image. Additionally, citationality implies that
Mérimée wrote the text for a particular audience - the mid-nineteenth-century French reader.
The text creates a specific time and location due to this. However, *Carmen* did not remain in its
sociohistorical context. Therefore, we must also recognize that the citations Mérimée chose
could be lost to any reader not from this pre-defined readership. Let us begin by examining citationality as a writing device in its intended context.

Mérimée uses multiple direct citations within the novella. This analyses focuses on: *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac* by Molière, *Le Cid* by Pierre Corneille, *Discours sur le sujet qui contente le plus en amours; ou le toucher, ou la veue, ou la parole* by Brantôme, and *Pantagruel* by Rabelais. These four texts are striking in their use of place as key markers of difference, but they also function differently within the novella. Though Mérimée does not cite the aforementioned texts at length, he gives the reader enough information to recall the text easily or recognize its cultural significance.

For example, when the narrator first sees Carmen in the novella, he brings to the reader's mind Corneille’s *Le Cid*:

> *En arrivant auprès de moi, ma baigneuse laissa glisser sur ses épaules la mantille qui lui couvrait la tête, et, à l’obscur clarité qui tombe des étoiles, je vis qu’elle était petite, jeune, bien faite et qu’elle avait de très grands yeux* (57, emphasis mine - this is the cited portion of the text).

> Coming near me, my bather let her mantilla, which covered her head, fall on her shoulders, and, *from this dark light which falls the stars*, I saw that she was small, young, well-made, and that she had very large eyes (translation mine, emphasis mine).

*Le Cid*, like *Carmen*, takes place in exoticized Spain and comes from the pen of a French author. *Le Cid*, too, is about forbidden love and fatal revenge. In this passage, Don Rodrigue has gone off to war, bringing victory to Spain over the Moors. Don Rodrigue thus becomes a national hero. Despite his heroic feat, Chimène cannot forgive him for having killed her father out of revenge. She then proposes a duel between Don Rodrigue and a “champion,” pledging herself

---

20 The spelling of this Brantôme’s name varies greatly. I am using Mérimée’s spelling here.
in marriage to the winner. Don Rodrigue defeats his opponent, and the two wed. In reflecting upon this play, the reader of Carmen would immediately have images of Moorish Spain as seen through the French lens, forbidden love, and duels. If the reader had seen the play performed on stage, vivid visuals would also come to mind of elaborate stage costuming and settings. Through a short phrase, Mérimée paints a portrait of Spain as seen through the French imagination.

For the more discerning reader who is more intimately familiar with Corneille, a more specific image would come to mind. For context, I cite Corneille here at length:

> Nous partîmes cinq cents; mais par un prompt renfort
> Nous nous vîmes trois mille en arrivant au port,
> Tant, à nous voir marcher avec un tel visage,
> Les plus épouvantes reprenaient du courage !
> J’en cache les deux tiers, aussitôt qu’arrivée,
> Dans le fond des vaisseaux qui lors furent trouvés
> Le reste, dont le nombre augmentait à toute heure,
> Brûlant d’impatience autour de moi demeure,
> Se couche contre terre, et sans faire aucun bruit,
> Passe une bonne part d’une si belle nuit.
> Par mon commandement la garde en fait de même,
> Et se tenant cachée, aide à mon stratagème ;
> Et je feins hardiment d’avoir reçu de vous
> L’ordre qu’on me voit suivre et que je donne à tous

_Cette obscure clarté qui tombe des étoiles_

> Enfin avec le flux nous fait voir trente voiles ;
> L’onde s’enfile dessous, et d’un commun effort
> Les Mores et la mer montent jusques au port.
> On les laisse passer ; tout leur paraît tranquille ;
> Point de soldats au port, point aux murs de la ville.
> Notre profond silence abusant leurs esprits,
> Ils n’osent plus douter de nous avoir surpris ;
> Ils abordent sans peur, ils ancrent, ils descendent,
> Et courent se livrer aux mains qui les attendent.
> Nous nous levons alors, et tous en même temps
> Poussons jusques au ciel mille cris éclatants.
> Les nôtres, à ces cris, de nos vaisseaux répondent ;
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Il paraissent armés, les Mores se confondent,
L’épouvante les prend à demi descendus ;
Avant que de combattre, ils s’estiment perdus.
Ils couraient au pillage, et rencontrent la guerre
(Acte IV, Scène III).

Under me the troop advanced,
Displaying all its manly confidence.
We were five hundred, but with swift support
Grew to three thousand as we reached the port,
So that seeing us marching to that stage,
Those most terrified found new courage!
Arriving, I hid quiet two-thirds of the men
In the holds of the vessels there, and then
The rest, whose numbers now increased hourly,
Devoured by impatience, gathering round me,
Lay down on the ground, where in silence
The best part of the fine night was spent.
At my command the guards did the same,
And, staying hidden, helped my stratagem;
Then I boldly feigned to owe you
The orders they and I would then pursue.

_The faint light cast from every distant star_
Showed thirty ships now crossing the bar;
The waves beneath, and their effort
Brought the tide-borne Moors within the port.
We let them pass; all appearing tranquil;
No soldiers at the port, the city still.
The calm we maintained deceived their eyes.
They, believing they’d achieved surprise,
Fearless, closed, anchored, disembarked,
And then they ran against us in the dark.
We leapt upon the instant, copious cries
Uttered by our troops, rose to the skies.
Others echoed from our anchored fleet;
Thus the Moors’ amazement proved complete.
Terror seized them just as they were landing.
They knew defeat, prior to any fighting.
They thought to pillage, but met with slaughter.
(Acte IV, Scène III - emphasis mine; translation by A.S. Kline).
Here, Don Rodrigue is recounting to the King how he defeated the Moors with wartime trickery. Don Rodrigue hid his soldiers and made it seem to the enemy that they were unaware of the Moors’ arrival, leaving a village open to pillaging. The Moors fell for this trick, running into the town. In the words of Don Rodrigue, “Ils couraient au pillage et rencontrent la guerre / they thought to pillage, but met with slaughter” (Acte IV, Scène III; translation by Kline).

In all of this, the stars gave Rodrigue’s army an advantage. Similarly, the literary figure of the Bohémien does the same for the reader: Danger is lurking just ahead; prepare yourself. Carmen, like those ships, comes out of the darkness in sparkling beauty. However, the reader, and Don José, must be quick to defend.

The citation of Monsieur de Pourceaugnac functions similarly as a narrative tool, bringing about a similar effect on the reader as the Corneille citation. As Don Rodrigue’s words called attention to Spanish exoticism, the accent of the words spoken by the Dominican holding Don José, quoted from a Swiss guard from Monsieur de Pourceaugnac, drew attention to difference. The text reinforces a background of alterity by further defining the reader as French with a knowledge of French understandings of alterity.

Let’s begin with the implications of the accent and then move to the narrative parallels. Mérimée reuses Molière’s exact words, maintaining the grammatical and spelling variants: “petit pendement pien choli”. As Walter Haas notes, the “p” corresponds to the French “b,” and the “ch” corresponds to the French “j,” evoking a Swiss accent (192). When spoken aloud, this linguistic analysis becomes evident. Spoken in a French accent, with correct spelling employed, this phrase would become “petit pendement bien joli.” As the words refer to Don José who is to
be garroted or to Monsieur de Pourceaugnac who is to be hanged, we can assume that "pendement" is a derivative of the verb "pendre," making both characters ill-fated.

In the context of the 19th-century, foreign mercenaries had become connected to legitimist points of view. In *Napoleon's Mercenaries: Foreign Units in the French Army Under the Consulate and Empire, 1799-1814*, Guy C. Dempsey states that foreign mercenaries also posed a risk as the French believed they had “a potential for counter-revolutionary attitude[s]” (Dempsey, Overview). According to Dempsey, from 1791 onward, the reliance on foreign forces decreased as the mercenaries deflected and returned home. Dempsey notes that “the Swiss regiment Watteville declined to renew its contract and returned to Switzerland. Such developments deepened distrust and dislike of all the mercenaries” (Ibid). This distrust even led to a massacre of Swiss mercenaries on 10 August 1792. By the end of that month, no Swiss military units remained in France (Ibid).21 Mérimée’s use of this Swiss accent is critical when placed in its sociohistorical context. By having the guard discuss the right of the garotte and by having a Swiss accent, *Carmen* takes yet an even more conservative tone.

Just before this citation, when the reader learns that Don José will lose his life because of his crimes, Mérimée explains the subtle difference between hanging and garroting. At first, the Dominican tells the narrator that Don José is to be hanged. He then clarifies himself

Oh ! N’ayez aucune inquiétude ; il est bien recommandé, et on ne peut pas le pendre deux fois. Quand je dis pendre, je me trompe. C’est un hidalgo que votre voleur ; il sera donc garrotté après-demain sans rémission (65, emphasis Mérimée’s).

Oh! Don’t worry! He’s done for, and he can’t be hanged twice. When I say hang, I’m mistaken. He’s a hidalgo, your thief; he’ll be *garroted* the day after tomorrow without absolution (Trans. by Lloyd, emphasis Mérimée’s).

---

21 This book is a detailed description of each of the military units. The only analytical portion is found in the Overview.
Mérimée draws attention to the reader through typology, employing italics, indicating a definite difference between the two forms of capital punishment.

Mérimée also writes a footnote to draw attention to the changes brought about in France:

“En 1830, la noblesse jouissait encore de ce privilège. Aujourd’hui, sous le régime constitutionnel, les vilains ont conquis le droit au garrote. / In 1830, the noble class still enjoyed this privilege. Nowadays, under the constitutional regime, commoners have attained the same dignity” (65, emphasis Mérimée’s, Translation by Lloyd). Michel Pertué notes that, historically speaking, fears of further revolutions drove the shift from reserving the garrote for use only on the nobility to being used equally amongst the populace. In “La Révolution Française et l’abolition de la peine de mort,” Michel Pertué reviews arguments made for and against the guillotine in the late 19th-century. Pertué notes that Liancourt, a member of the National Assembly, briefly brought up the garotte as a possible solution. In either case, the garotte or the guillotine, the National Assembly did not want to maintain hanging. He explains,

Et ce n’est pas parce que la décapitation était un mode d’exécution réservé aux nobles et non-infamant que l’Assemblée se décida finalement en sa faveur, mais parce que Liancourt lui rappela que la pendaison avait servi aux vengeances populaires au début de la Révolution.

And it wasn’t that decapitation was a mode of execution reserved for nobles or that the Assembly infamously decided in favor of the guillotine, but that Liancourt had reminded them that hanging was a means of popular vengeance at the beginning of the Revolution (24).

During the Revolution, as a response to inequality, commoners hanged noblemen. To ensure the noblemen maintained the right of the garrote, they made it accessible to everyone. Though these arguments were made decades after the writing of Carmen, we can see the worries that might have surfaced. Mérimée wrote this footnote about the garrote with
intention. As Mérimée set the novel in 1830, he points to the regime change. By naming them *vilains*, Mérimée highlights a viewpoint that directly criticizes the social changes that have taken place under the regime. Though it is difficult to determine if this is Mérimée’s viewpoint or that of the Dominican, it highlights the opinion that there is a degradation of class distinction within France. Of course, in Mérimée’s somewhat contradictory writing style, this is opposed by the idea that Don José becomes more heroic as he descends the social ladder.

Let’s continue to examine the “petit pendement pien choli.” If we return to Molière’s play, the man to whom the Swiss guard refers is innocent, pledged in marriage to a well-known woman who is in love with another man. Monsieur de Pourceaugnac, however, is from Limousin and rather detested. The town rallied together to claim that Monsieur de Pourceaugnac had committed a crime so that the man would be hanged, preventing his marriage to Julie. Here we read an inverse parallelism. Though Pourceaugnac was to be hanged despite his innocence, Don José has committed several crimes along the course of his life and fallen further into criminality through his love for Carmen. Despite their differences in guilt and innocence, a woman leads both men to their downfall. I explore this trope more when examining the reference to Mérimée’s earlier text, “Une femme est un diable”.

Mérimée also chooses to cite Brantôme directly. Unlike the citations from *Le Cid* and *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac*, Mérimée does not expect the reader to be able to identify this citation without some assistance. Or perhaps the reader is expected to feign ignorance. Unlike Corneille and Molière, Brantôme is not a cultural reference that one should be proud of understanding. The full text is essentially a treatise on how to arrange meetings for extra-marital sex without being caught. To align the writing of *Carmen* with the proper social
protocols and morals of mid-nineteenth-century France, the narrator gives more clues to the reader about the text. Even if this text resides within the reader’s encyclopedic literary knowledge, it should not be there. Mérimée calls the reader to look this up on their own saying “voyez Brantôme pour le reste” (60). The reader who can understand this reference already resides outside the bounds of the moral society within which he lives.

Narratively speaking, the citation functions the same way as the two previously discussed. When the narrator first sees Carmen, he begins to describe her striking beauty. She is not only beautiful, but she has a beauty that seems to defy her “race” and “nation” (Carmen, 59-60). The narrator then explains what is beautiful according to Spanish standards: “Pour qu’une femme soit belle, il faut, disent les espagnols, qu’elle réunisse trente si, ou, si l’on veut, qu’on puisse la définir au moyen de dix adjectifs applicables chacun à trois parties de sa personne. Par exemple, elle doit avoir trois choses noires: les yeux, les paupières, et les sourcils; trois fines, les doigts, les lèvres, les cheveux, etc. Voyez Brantôme pour le reste” (60). The reader is not expected to readily know from whence this list of threes came, but by withholding the title of Brantôme’s text, Mérimée expects the reader to be able to navigate texts well enough to find the source. They may have even had heard rumors about the text. They could have read the text. However, due to the nature of Brantôme’s prose, the narrative requires name-dropping where it was not necessary for neither Corneille nor Molière. By bringing Brantôme into the dialogue, the image of the Bohémienne becomes sexually charged within the French imagination.

This list of threes to which the narrator refers comes from Discours sur le sujet qui contente le plus en amours; ou le toucher, ou la veue, ou la parole. In this original text, Brantôme first
cites the list in Spanish and then provides the translation in French. This heterolingual, or mixed language, text gives the reader an air of insider information. The reader can feel more knowledgeable about the culture than if the author had translated the text. Any reader familiar enough with this text or brave enough to seek it out to read for themselves would face a visual and linguistic differentiation - a striking difference between the French and Spanish. Yet again, Mérimée uses citationality to create French inclusion by excluding a defined other.

Though the Pantagruel citation functions similarly to Le Cid and Monsieur de Pourceaugnac as a writing device, it has a different narrative role. This citation is from Chapter 4 of Carmen, which pretends to have abandoned the fictional narrative in aims for a more scientific, and thus a seemingly truthful, text. Similar to the Brantôme reference, the narrator of the fourth chapter gives explicit clues to the reader to know that a specific cultural reference is being made, guiding this reader into a specific viewpoint. The narrator explains to the reader how to recognize “Bohémien.” After describing their physical appearance, he describes their disposition:

L’audace et la timidité s’y peignent tout à la fois, et sous ce rapport leurs yeux révèlent assez bien le caractère de la nation, rusée, hardie, mais craignant naturellement les coups comme Panurge (113, emphasis Mérimée’s).

It is full at once of boldness and shyness, and in this respect their eyes are a fair indication of their national character, which is cunning, bold, but with “the natural fear of blows” like Panurge (Lloyd)

Panurge is a character within the 16th-century text Pantagruel, or more completely, Les horribles et épouvantables faits et prouesses du très renommée Pantagruel Roi des Dipsodes by

---

22 By original, I mean the text to which Mérimée is referring. Brantôme does not claim ownership to this list. Rather, he credits it to a Spanish woman: “une dame espagnole me dit une fois dans Tolède” (Art. III)
François Rabelais. This citation comes from a chapter entitled “Comment Panurge fut amoureux d’une haute dame de Paris, et du tour qu’il lui fit / How Panurge Became Enamored with an Upper-Class Woman in Paris and the Trick He Played” in which Panurge tries to woo a married woman who continually refuses his misogynistic and at times violent advances. At the end of the chapter, upon being rejected yet again, Panurge shows the woman his “longue braguette/long codpiece” exclaiming, “voicy maistre Jean Chouart qui demande logis; et après la vouloit accoler / Here is Mr. Jean Chouart who demands abode; and after wanted to stick it in her” (430). 

The woman begins screaming, and, fearing punishment, he runs away. As he escapes, he threatens her, “mais, par Dieu, je vous feray chevaucher aux chien: et, ce dit, s’enfout le grand pas de peur des coups, lesquels il craignoit naturellement / My God, I’ll make you ride a dog: and, this said, he fled in fear of the beatings he naturally feared” (430). In the following chapter, Panurge gets his revenge by collecting the vaginal secretions of several dogs in heat and throwing the fluids on the dame, causing her to be viciously humped by several male dogs.

Re-reading the sentence with this context in mind, we can see how Mérimée presented bohémiens as troublemakers afraid of punishment but cunning enough to find ways to escape and exact revenge upon those who defy their wills. Bohémiens, according to this text, transgressed social standards and norms of the dominant society with fear of punishment but

---

23 Jean Chouart is used to refer to the phallus.
24 To be fair, this reference is far more risqué than that of Brantôme. However, there is a large difference between these two texts. Rabelais’ text is a work of fiction in which Panurge is clearly in the wrong. Brantôme’s text is essentially a treatise on how to defy French customs and morality without being caught.
without regret or remorse. This analysis is without exploring the explicit violent sexual undertones linked to this textual reference.

_Carmen_ has lots of parallels with one of Mérimée’s earlier texts. In 1828, Mérimée published a collection of short stories entitled _Théâtre de Clara Gazul_. One of these texts, “Une femme est un diable,” features a female character, Mariquita, who seems to be a proto-Carmen. Dancing, singing, and playing the castagnettes, Marquita uses her charms to persuade men into doing what she wishes. Musical talent and linguistic camouflaging skills bring the women both pain and freedom. Marquita is accused of being a witch for having sung an English song that she had learned and is taken to prison. Her knowledge of a foreign language must come from magical powers. Similarly, Carmen, headed to prison for having attacked another factory worker, convinces Don José to let her go by imitating a Basque accent and speaking the language. Antonio dies in a duel to win Marquita’s love, and Marquita escapes hidden in his clothes. Don José faces his duel of sorts, stabbing Carmen while trying to convince her to be faithful to him. The parallels would be striking for any avid reader of Prosper Mérimée without implicit reference. However, the narrator ensures the clarity of this parallel without self-plagiarism. Carmen declares to Don Jose: “Tu as rencontré le diable, oui, le diable / You’ve met the devil, yes, the devil” (85), a not-so-subtle reference to the title from the _Théâtre de Clara Gazul_ by Mérimée.

_Hernani_ plays the role of another in-text. Victor Hugo’s play is a complicated love story about three men clamoring to be the lovers of Doña Sol. The narrator in _Carmen_ imitates the words of Don Carlos, a man enamored with Doña Sol: “Serait-ce l’écurie où tu mets d’aventure le manche du balais qui te sert de monture / It could be the broomcloset where you keep your
broom for flying” (Hugo, Acte 1, Scène 1). In Hernani, Don Carlos is trying to convince Doña Sol’s maid to allow him to hide in her room, so he can spy on Doña Sol, who will be welcoming another suitor. However, the maid is unaware of his identity.

Carmen makes a broom reference after her fight at the tobacco factory when she slings an insult at the other woman:

Tiens, dit Carmen qui avait une langue, tu n’as donc pas assez d’un balai ? -L’autre, blessée du reproche, peut-être parce qu’elle se sentait véreuse sur l’article, lui répond qu’elle ne se connaissait pas en balais, n’ayant pas l’honneur d’être bohémienne ni filleule de Satan (73, emphasis mine)

‘Why,’ said Carmen, who had a tongue, ‘can’t you do with a broom?’ Stung by this taunt, it may be because she felt herself rather unsound in that particular moment, the other girl replied she knew nothing about brooms, seeing she had not the honor of being either a gipsy or one of the devil’s godchildren (Lloyd, emphasis mine).

Though the influence is not explicit, it is clear enough that Goetz notes the possible allusion in a footnote (73). Frankly, it is up to the reader to determine if the broom symbol functions as an intext. It is highly possible that the reader could think of Hernani and thus images of exoticized Spain. Or the reader could remain unaware. In either case, this is an example of mixing the occult with the stereotype of the bohémienne.

Let us now turn to citations from Mérimée’s writings as they are the most numerous and the closest to the writer’s heart. By referring to his own writings through the narrator’s voice, Mérimée blends two voices. It is impossible to define where Mérimée-author ends, and the voice of the anonymous narrator begins. Mérimée’s self-citations within Carmen blur the lines between temporality, fiction, and history. Mérimée not only refers to his past writings but also foreshadows his future publications. For example, Mérimée would go on to write a critical introduction to the Oeuvres complètes de Branthôme, published about a decade after Carmen.
When the narrator first speaks with Carmen and discovers who she is, he is astonished that he is speaking with *une sorcière*, according to the rumors he had heard. Not wanting to miss out on the excitement of a new adventure, the narrator declares, “En voyage il faut tout voir / when traveling you must see everything” (59). Spending time with Carmen, he justifies to himself, would allow him to explore the occult mysteries, which he was previously interested in. Similarly, in Lettre II of his *Lettres d’Espagne*, Mérimée takes up the task of describing Spanish executions. Though it is an unpleasant sight, he declares, “En pays étranger, on est obligé de tout voir / when in another country, one is obligated to see everything” (432). Though not his only example of auto-citation, references to his *Lettres d’Espagne* are the most abundant and perhaps the most significant. Having been published previously in the *Revue de Paris*, avid fans of Mérimée would be familiar with his personal image of Spain. More interestingly is the layering of intertextuality that comes about by reading both *Carmen* and the letters, as Mérimée has the same tendency within the letters to use French references to paint an exotic image of Spain.

In both instances, being a French foreigner in an exotic context excuses one from betraying French morals and tastes. Additionally, by pointing to the fact that these are sights one would not see in France, these statements function as markers of difference. Carmen represents the danger of the occult. Spain remains in a more respectable past. However, it is more interesting that both phrases mark an impending death as if looking outside of France welcomes an early grave.

---

25 Mérimée’s self-reference reinforces the idea presented by the potential reference to *Hernani*. 
Additionally, Mérimée uses French imagery to paint Spain as a place stuck in the past within his first Lettre. He describes Spanish architecture as follows:

Il y a des cirques (plazas) dans presque toutes les grandes villes d’Espagne. Ces édifices sont très-simplement, pour ne pas dire très-grossièrement construits. Ce ne sont en général que de grandes baraques en planches, et l’on cite comme une merveille l’amphithéâtre de Ronda, parce qu’il est entièrement bâti en pierre. C’est le plus beau de l’Espagne, comme le château de Thunderten-Tronkh était le plus beau de la Westphalie, parce qu’il avait une porte et des fenêtres (415-416).

There are circuses (plazas) in almost all large, Spanish cities. These buildings are, not to be vulgar, very simply constructed. They are generally just large wooden barracks, and we describe the amphitheater of Ronda as a marvel because it was built entirely from stone. It’s the most beautiful in Spain, like the Thunderten-Tronkh Castle was the most beautiful of Westphalia because it had a door and windows.

Here, Mérimée uses Voltaire’s château de Thunderten-Tronkh to demonstrate Spain’s backwardness and mark its difference from the European world. Candide is raised to believe that his father’s castle is magnificent, a belief that is destroyed by his exposure to the outside world. These plazas are extravagant because of their context. However, a French person would recognize them as inadequate relics compared to the modern architecture of France. The denigration of foreign architecture shows a pattern in Mérimée’s writing that creates a hierarchy between France and Spain.

Because acknowledgment of intertextuality relies upon the reader’s recognition of other texts, I argue that intertextuality causes a ripple in linear temporality. Intertextuality is not only backward-looking but also forward-looking. It implicates both past and future textual interactions. The reader of Carmen today cannot read the text without the influences of the innumerable adaptations of the text. The first readers of the text could not read it without the context of 1830 in the back of their minds. Future readers must also confront the innumerable references which have been made since the novella’s publication, such as Mérimée’s post-
Carmen writings, theatrical performances, and advertisements that use the image of Carmen. The seemingly limitless references to and within Carmen not only give the novella popular endurance but also cause readings to shift and evolve.

Ultimately, as character and story, Carmen fulfills a discursive role for the dominant culture. This discursive tool leverages geography, political symbology, and the literary canon. Carmen is both a way for non-Romani people to communicate a shared, common, knowable history, which establishes the dominant culture as more civilized than that of the Roma, as well as a safe way to explore an imagined, unknowable desire. It remains safe because it remains fiction.

While material evidence underlines the history of the dominant European cultures, Romani history, culture, and even language seem to escape empiricism. As it evades empiricism, knowledge cannot be entirely constructed and thus is relegated to the realm of myth, narrowing the scope in which the image of the Roma may fit. The symbols within the novella become part of the linguistic tool case used to define the exotic and the Other. It indeed becomes part of the literary dictionary upon which one can call to define “gypsy” as stereotype and myth. In doing this, it silences the voices of the Roma and erases their actual lived experiences. This leverage allows the novel to create a discourse on Frenchness, even if the definition is never positively defined.
Chapter 3. Boho Writing:
Nodier and Sand Rewrite the Rules of Literature

As shown through Carmen and Notre Dame de Paris, bohémien functioned as symbolic tools during the 19th-century. George Sand and Charles Nodier continued this tradition. However, they expanded their scope by using bohémien as tools to challenge the hegemony of writing. This chapter examines how Sand and Nodier manipulated the French image of the Bohémien, which previous canonical works such as Carmen and Notre Dame de Paris had established. Through this manipulation, Sand and Nodier challenged the preconceived notions of the novel. Because of the adaptable nature of fictional bohémien, Sand and Nodier challenged hegemonic forms of writing by returning to the Fantastic and focusing on the novelesque, which Sand and Nodier refer to as the Romanesque. By concentrating on literary form, Sand, in particular, covertly criticized contemporary social structures. Conversely, Nodier was able to upend the extant definitions of civilized society. Ultimately, these challenges and criticisms form a liminal space that functions as a container for Bohémien characters.

This chapter examines three texts: George Sand’s novels La Filleule (1853) and Consuelo (serial publication 1841-1842, novel published in 1856) and Charles Nodier’s novel L’Histoire du roi du Bohème et de ses sept châteaux (1830). La Filleule follows the life of a young bohémienne, Morena, an orphan raised by a single, catholic mother. As an adult, she leaves her...

26 This chapter talks of both the fictional realm of la Bohème inhabited by the fictional tziganes as well as the historic country of Bohemia. As such, the italicized, I use the French terms bohémien(ne) and Bohème indicate fictional realms and characters. I use the unitalicized, English terms Bohemia and Bohemian to refer to the historic realm, located approximately in modern day Czechia, and its inhabitants. Where appropriate, I use the term Roma to describe actual people of Romani heritage.
27 This is not to be confused with the Romanesque literary movement nor the exploration of Hellenic cultural roots. These references are discussed further in depth later in the chapter.
28 From here forth, this novel is referred to as RBSC to save space.
French upbringing to become a traveling musician with her *bohémien* husband. *Consuelo* recounts the story of the eponymous Italian opera star, who seems to be *bohémienne* from all accounts, and leaves the stage to live with an eccentric family in Bohemia. Consuelo, pious throughout the text, brings salvation to an ailing Count but ultimately returns to the stage. *RBSC* challenges all the expectations of a novel. Though the novel is about a student writing his dissertation, it lacks any straightforward plot, and the reader is easily lost. These three texts also highlight the act of writing, forms of writing, and the social function of books.

Using *bohémien* characters allowed Sand and Nodier to challenge literary norms and explore new writing forms. Through their writings, we can see that the *bohémien* underwent a metamorphosis from symbolizing external things through writing to serving as metaphors for writing itself. Because of the paradoxical nature of the *bohémien* character, in which the traditional form of the character is stable only in its instability, writers were able to explore the limits of writing fiction. This shift is explored more in-depth in the textual analyses. It is important to note that this metamorphosis required an original self-awareness concerning writing. Since Sand and Nodier focused on writing itself, their writing was self-aware.

The act of writing returns thematically in all three works. I call these texts Proto-metafictional based on Robert Scholes’ definition of metafiction.

Metafiction assimilates all the perspectives of criticism into the fictional process itself. It may emphasize structural, formal, behavioral, or philosophical qualities, but most writers of metafiction are thoroughly aware of all the possibilities and are likely to have experimented with all of them [...] it attempts, among other things, to assault or transcend the laws of fiction (105-106).

The metafictional text self-reflexively uses critical approaches to abolish the laws of fiction.

Expanding upon this definition, I posit that the proto-metafictional text works to challenge
contemporaneous constraints within the extant rules of fiction. The proto-metafictional text remains self-aware of form to challenge preconceived structures. Additionally, it may or may not assimilate contemporary criticism. As proto-metafiction, the three novels are necessarily rebellious. They refuse literary norms.

By refusing literary norms, Sand and Nodier can use fiction and literariness to critique the culture of France. Their writings become self-aware, never allowing the reader to forget these are works of literature. Nodier, in particular, attempts to redefine a genre, the Romantic, by inventing a new literary form. His commercial failure made this an unsuccessful revolution, however. For Nodier and Sand, the focus on writing played an essential role in bringing notoriety to the works and authors. This focus on writing was also a challenge to historical norms of writing and social structures.

Functionally, the authors challenged these historical norms through an assault on the mainstream ways in which previous authors had crafted texts for consumption. In a way, it altered the language of books because new language had to be adapted to challenge these structures. In his chapter “Social Memory,” discussed in Chapter 1 of this dissertation, Paul Connerton describes this linguistic ineptitude for dealing with social ruptures and rebirths. He explains how the French Revolutionaries adopted the language of the monarchy who had appropriated the language of the church (9). As Revolutionaries adopted the language of the monarchy, writers of the Fantastic and the Romantic borrowed the languages of past literatures. Connerton expands on literary innovation, explaining that

---

29 Even in instances in which literary criticism is incorporated, it is not the type of criticism to which Scholes refers. In his purview, the metafictional text incorporates structural, formal, and behavioral criticisms which arose in the 20th-century, well after these texts were published.
[t]o read or compose a text as literature, and as belonging to a particular genre of literature, is not to approach it without preconception; one must bring to it an implicit understanding of the operations of literary discourse which tells one what to look for or how to set about composing” (11).

Connerton explains that reading is also dependent upon these socially agreed-upon preconceptions (11-12). However, what happens when a writer wants to up-end those notions? How can one “invent” a new genre?

**An attempt at a new genre**

Let’s explore the concept of *RBSC* more thoroughly. Though there are characters, it is at times difficult to understand who is speaking or acting. The actions are random and disconnected. In one chapter, the narrator discusses how to title his novel. In another, he explores entomology, listing hundreds of subspecies of butterflies. There is no overarching narrative. Instead, form, through typography, takes precedence over function. Anne-Marie Christin, a scholar on the links between writing and images, describes the novel as follows:

“Disorder? Insolence? Such is the essential law of the game that underlies the *Roi de bohème* [RBSC]: to disturb norms, to upset categories. This is the price of creativity” (471). Linguistic functionality becomes useless. Style, through typography, takes precedence over function to present a new literary form.

As language becomes useless, Nodier effectively attempts to invent a new genre in *RBSC*. Nodier’s novel is the “first French Romantic illustrated book” (Christin, 462). The words, written in different fonts and sizes, are placed methodically on the page. There are numerous sketches to accompany the texts. The writing is almost plastic, in the sense that Nodier molds it for visual consumption. Christin notes of Nodier’s writing style,
Writing, and especially typography, makes the word an assertive unity completely apart, supported by something other than the spoken word, a support richer and more ambiguous because it is of a spatial nature and not simply determined by temporal continuity (477). Whereas typical narrative form follows some sort of temporal continuity, Nodier’s experimental novel eschews such structure. Below, you find images of pages from this work. I have copied them here because simply describing these pages in words would be inadequate and would not capture the essence of what happens when a reader encounters the text. For Nodier, the imagistic takes precedence over the linguistic.

20th- and 21st-century scholars such as Anne-Marie Christin, Nassif Amir Farhat, and Caroline Raulet-Marcel have also remarked on Nodier’s linguistic innovation. Overall, critics find the text to be a true disrupter of literature. According to Amir Farhat, the novel presents a particular paradox - it is both a pastiche and the end of pastiche as Nodier copies the linguistic forms and narrative patterns of many previous French authors, notably Rabelais. However, Nodier annihilates their meanings, producing an illogical, illegible text. According to Raulet-Marcel, Nodier mocks common journalistic forms through imitations of journalistic form, mocking journals such as the Moniteur, and satirizing the inutility of the “journaliste officiel” (RBSC, 110-112). Ultimately, according to Christin, the work challenges the notion of western languages, critiquing their logical fallacies, and proposes the need for a more visual and universal language.

The inventiveness of Nodier’s work provides a breadth of avenues to explore through literary criticism, particularly in the 20th and 21st centuries. Sadly, for Nodier, it was written about one hundred years too early to benefit from these critical tools, which may (or may not) have allowed for an audience capable of decoding the text. Though much can be gleaned from
the text using modern critical theory, it is also interesting to examine the text from Nodier’s time.

His visual approach led to poor reception, both commercially and critically. Because he focused on visual form rather than narrative, the text was not readable. Because it lacked a reading audience, it was “a commercial failure, and it even bankrupted its publisher, Delangle” (Christin, 462). Champfleury, in 1838, called the book “un livre qu’on regarde mais qu’on ne lit pas / a book one looks at but doesn’t read” (305). He also declared that “Nodier voulait être lu […] il se trompa / Nodier wished to be read […] he was mistaken” (Champfleury, 306; Christin, 462). The public did not enjoy this attempt at a new genre.

Nodier used form to disrupt the standards of literature. As Farhat notes, the work was mostly a series of plagiarisms or pastiches. Despite this apparent nature of the text, the narrator denies his plagiarism (RBSC, 115; see figure 4). However, pastiche or not, the words are not what matters. Imagery does. Nodier denies plagiarism by noting his innovative manner to “disposer lettres dans un order si NOUVEAU / place letters in an order so NEW” (Ibid, emphasis Nodier’s). He plays with the way the reader consumes the text as he does this. The narrator uses recent advancements from the printing press to vary the font and placement of his words. On the page, he inconsistently lines up certain letters and sounds. At first, it seems that he is following some sort of writing rules even within his novel approach. The word “ou” falls below the sound “ou” in nouveau. However, it is repeated under the sound “eau” the second time, negating this sound equivalency. He “tortures” (Ibid.) the words for visual appeal, evading any perception of repetition or rule-following. He visually demonstrates his
“hétéroclites” or incongruous writing. In the view of the narrator, changing the format changes the essence of a text. Form is the only way novelty can exist, not through content.

Because content is irrelevant, pastiche and plagiarism are not problematic. Rather, these literary devices are commonplace literary methods. One of the central arguments of this work
is that all literature is but a pastiche of old literature and that originality only exists through copying previous works. On the mock title page (figure 5), the narrator informs the reader that this work will be nothing new. In fact, it is found in bookstores that “ne vendent pas de nouveautés / sell nothing new.” On page 129 (figure 6), the narrator copies lines from Pierre Corneille. The narrator does not hide this plagiarism. He draws attention to it through typography as he did with his sarcastic rebuttal to the accusation of plagiarism. Through the narrator's lens, pastiche or outright plagiarism are necessary to writing.
Nodier’s attention to plagiarism seems to be inspired by Horace. On the mock cover, Nodier copies a line from Horace’s *First Epistle*, written around 10 B.C.E.: “O Imitatores, servum pecus.” This line is often translated as “Oh imitators, what a slavish herd you are.” Since my knowledge of Latin is functionally non-existent and my understanding of the context of the ancient world
nearly as limited, I am relying on Warren S. Smith Jr.’s interpretation and contextualization of the epistle. In the text, Horace is with other poets who participate in “a ‘party game’ in which the poets compete in performance mimicry” (256). According to Smith, Horace compares most poets to drunken partygoers who are “aggressive and combative” (256). Of these drunken, literary brawlers, Smith notes that, through imitation, they are “seeking to obey the ‘law’ [but] are drawn into the lawless activity of brawling all night” (261). Rather than writing texts equal in valor to those they imitate, they fall short because they cannot fully emulate the original text or author. Ultimately, Smith deduces that the epistle “give[s] us a visual picture of the ludicrous nature of imitation” (262). Nodier challenges the idea of pure imitation by adding a visual element to his plagiarisms. When form is changed, does the text stay the same?

As we have seen above, formatting is one way in which Nodier challenged form. Imagine you were a reader in the 19th-century when printers employed consistent fonts. You turn the page of your novel and see the bold-faced, large text saying, “Qu’est-ce que cela me fait? / What does this make of me?” (see figure 7). This would have been jarring and impacted your reading of the preceding text. This typography continues to impact our readings today. The chapter in which this citation is found, entitled “Conversation,” discusses the philosophies of the great French writers. The narrator comments on the greats: Montaigne said, “Que sais-je/what do I know;” Rabelais said “peut-être/maybe;” forty-ish men said “à l’immortalité!/ to immortality!”, and so forth (137). Breloque, the character writing his dissertation, declares his great statement would be “Qu’est-ce que cela me fait ? / What does this make of me?” With its unique typography, this certainly would stick with the reader. However, Breloque has placed his statement within a ridiculous situation using an inappropriate font. Simply by changing the font
of one sentence and setting it amongst the thoughts of the greats, Nodier has changed how we read numerous French authors.

138
HISTOIRE
BRELOQUE.
J'aime mieux : ni oui ni non. Et je serais graver celle-là sur mes lambrequins si je n'en avais pas une autre.

THÉODORE.
Comment, Breloque vous avez une devise?

BRELOQUE.
Eh ! qui en doute, monseigneur ! Vous n'avez donc pas vu mon portrait emblématique dans votre galerie de tableaux ? J'ai le pied droit appuyé sur la nacelle d'un aérostat, et le pied gauche sur la proue d'un bateau plongeur. Je tiens d'une main une grosse touffe de boutons de roses, et de l'autre un pavot sec. Un papillon éblouissant caresse mes oreilles et mes cheveux de ses ailes bigarrées. Une chauve-souris énorme les bas de ses noires membranes, toutes prêtes à se replier autour de son corps velu. A ma dextre est mon écu d'armes, mi-parti, sur azur et sable, d'un phénix d'or et d'un chien noyé. Et au-dessous de tout cela, ma devise en lettres ultracapitales :

QU'EST-CE QUE CELA ME FAIT?
Additionally, through this “conversation,” Nodier complicates the imagology of France as a cultural construct. Alongside his grand philosophy, Breloque would be drawn with his right foot in the basket of a hot air balloon and his left foot on the bow of a submarine. These symbols refer to France’s technological advancements in the past century through the invention of hot air balloons and man-powered submarines. In his right hand, Breloque would be holding a tuft of rosebuds, in his other hand, a dried poppy. According to Claude Gilbert-Dubois, the poppy has a literary history of symbolizing “le bas peuple” while the rose is “sans aucun doute une fleur aristocratique” (9-10). A colorful butterfly would be caressing Breloque’s ear and hair, a traditional symbol of metamorphosis, reflecting the continual political shifts of 19th-century France. His coat of arms—a golden phoenix and a drowning dog on a background of black (sable) and azure—would be near his right hand.30 The tinctures of sable and azure represented mourning and sublimity respectively (Widlak, 49). I would argue that the drowning dog and the phoenix function similarly. France is reduced to a jumble of complex, at times contradictory symbols. Is the country in mourning or rising from the ashes? Is it an aristocracy or a republic, a nation of the people? In this Nodian context, what is certain is that literature cannot decide or interpret. Symbolic literature, or poetry, falls flat as a system of illegible contradictions.

---

30 Despite numerous sketches within the book, this image was sadly not rendered into a visual element.
HISTOIRE

« fait ordinairement la semelle des pantoufles, quot » est probandum. »

— Eh! qui en doute, m'écriai-je, en repoussant du pied un vieux tabouret de paille défoncé qui n'avait pas besoin de ce dernier échec.

Que m'importe, à moi, l'origine et le sens de pantoufle, ajoutai-je en m'arrachant brusquement de cette chaise longue que j'ai acquise à l'encan de Matana-sius, et en m'élancant vers la porte pour me soustraire au démon qui me crucifiait impitoyablement à sa sotte étymologie.

Je serais vraiment bien fou, dis-je en ramenant les deux battants sur moi, de me faire du mauvais sang pour savoir lequel de tophos ou de phellos est entré élémentairement dans la construction du nom d'une pantoufle!

Et s'il me plaît de m'ennuyer ce soir, pensai-je en traversant le carré, n'est-ce pas jour de Bouffes et séance à l'Athénée? D'ailleurs, repris-je en descendant les sept rampes de l'escalier.

— D'ailleurs, la semelle de Popocambou n'était pas de liège. Elle était de cabron.

Que dit monsieur? demanda le portier en ouvrant son vasistas, ou was ist das de verre obscurci par la

Figure 8. Page 152 of RBSC
On page 152 (figure 8), the narrator forces the reader to act the words with their eyes, descending the steps of the stairs alongside the narrator. Though this is somewhat commonplace today, this was quite a novel concept at the novel’s publication. This melding of reading and acting blurs the lines between reality and fiction. The page no longer traps the action of the narrative. Instead, it leaps from the page to the reader. The reader acts their reading.

On pages 215 and 216 (figures 9 and 10), the narrator uses 32 adjectives to describe puppets. Many of these adjectives are synonyms, antonyms, or neologisms. For example, he uses *étriquées* followed by *détriquées*. *Étriquées*, meaning tight, is immediately negates by adding the suffix *dé*- to create the neologism *détriquées*. Following the adjective *antiquées* with *gothiquées*, another neologism, blurs temporal boundaries. The narrator effaces all meaning from the words by mixing synonyms, antonyms, and neologisms. The reader cannot truly grasp what the puppets are like. Language becomes a toy. The repetition of adjectival endings creates an entertaining sound that negates Polichinelle’s monotone story (216). Language experimentation supersedes linguistic utility.

---

31 Nodier claims that this is an essential part of the Fantastic. I explore this later in this chapter.
leur cours, au lieu de le remonter jusqu'à la porte du teinturier.

Les successeurs de Brioché étaient donc en possession consacrée de faire parler Polichinelle, quand Girolamo parut.

Il est vrai de dire que Girolamo n'inventa rien, car on n'a jamais rien inventé depuis qu'on a inventé Polichinelle.

Mais le théâtre de Brioché était si ridiculement étroit (Polichinelle le franchissait d'une enjambée !) — Les planches de Brioché étaient revêtues de lambeaux si usés, à peine rajeunis de siècle en siècle, comme le vaisseau ravisseur d'Énée, par des lambeaux si disparates, et d'une si hurlante assimilation. — Les marionnettes de Brioché étaient si fatiguées,

Si tronquées,
Si pratiquées,
Si critiquées,
Si attaquées,
Si antiquées,
Si gothiquées,
Si mastiquées,
Si impliquées,
Si compliquées,
Si déloquées,
Si déplaquées,
Si disloquées.
Si interloquées.
Si embreucoquées,
Si imbriquées,

Figure 9. Page 215 of RBSC
Si intriquées,
Si étriquées,
Si détriquées,
Si défriquées,
Si défoquées,
Si détraquées,
Si patraquées,
Si pelues,
Si trépelues,
Si velues,
Si farfelues,
Si pollues,
Si solues,
Si dissolues,
Si moulues,
Si vermoulues!

L’histoire de Polichinelle était si monotone —
Le jeu du bâton de Polichinelle était si connu —
La grande machine du diable qui emporte tous les personnages, quand on n’en a plus besoin, était si passée de mode —
Brioché d’ailleurs était si bien mort, et Girolamo si puissamment vivant !...

Mais j’ai promis de ne rien décider entre Girolamo et Brioché.
Ce qu’il y a de certain, c’est que le théâtre de Girolamo est tout neuf;
C’est que le devis en est neuf;
C’est qu’il est construit à neuf;
Rénumération.

Cependant le bon Popocambou, jaloux de récompenser magnifiquement Mistigri, car il fut naturellement plus généreux et plus reconnaissant qu'on n'incline à l'être d'ordinaire en ce gentil métier d'autocrate, lui octroya le droit de blazonner son écu d'armes d'une tête à perruque, ce qui était tenu et réservé dans les constitutions hérédiques de Tombouctou pour faveur hyperbolique et royale:

Et, en outre, la chasse libre, exclusive et privilégiée dans toute l'étendue de son empire, de toute espèce de volatiles farfallésques et culiciformes, portant bouches, dents, pinces, crochets, mâchoirs, mandibules, pompes, trompes, sucoirs, rostres, proboscides, aiguillons, langues, ligules, palpes, lèvres, spires, ou autres instruments instus-susceptifs, lesquelles bestioles sont vulgairement désignées sous le nom de papillons de jour ou de nuit, de mouches urbaines, rurales, paludivagues ou silvaticques, savoir:

Sphynx,
Phalènes,
Noctues,
Noctuelles,
Bombyces,
Pyrales,
Zygènes,
Alucites,
Sésies,
Hépiales,
Teignes,
Ptérophores, qui ont les ailes mignardement empen-
nées, comme ailes d'oiseaux, et découpées en menus
rameaux, à la façon de l'éventail de nos bachelettes;
Libellules,
Demoiselles,
Ascalaphes,
Hémérobes,
Myrmiléons,
Éphémères : vous en avez pu voir au fleuve Hy-
panis;
Semblides,
Phryganes,
Perles,
Panorpes,
Tenthredons,
Ichneumons à queues bifides et trifides, qui sont
vampires de Chenilles, larves, nymphes, chrysalides et
aurélies;
Évanies,
Typhies,
Scolies,
Guêpes,
Chrysides,
Leucospes,
Andrènes,

Figure 12. Page 237 of RBSC
On pages 236 to 244, the narrator lists insects. Figures 11 and 12 show two of these pages. Other than being a personal interest of the narrator, the insects play no role in the story. Furthermore, it is unlikely that anyone other than an entomologist would be able to identify all these insects offhand. The list format makes it easy for the reader to gloss over the terms, acknowledging the context and content without needing to read each word. Nodier completely changed how the reader interacts with the text and does so within the context of *la Bohème*. Reading no longer requires processing each word. The reader thus enacts a transformation of the reading process.

Though this is but a small sample of the unusual passages found in *RBSC*, these excerpts demonstrate how Nodier challenged the concepts of poetry and literature. First, literature is not necessarily something to be read, but something to be seen, acted out, and consumed. The meanings of words can easily be effaced or manipulated. Second, originality comes not from the text itself but from the form in which it is presented. Canonical authors have no more authority than any other author, and their power is arbitrary. Writers who can simultaneously imitate and innovate can also co-opt this power. Third, symbology is somewhat useless as the interpretations can change based on context and consumer. Finally, what is most interesting for this study, *bohemia*, is the realm in which authors can carry out these literary experiments.

**Working within literary and political constraints**

*La Filleule* by George Sand is not as experimental or absurd as *RBSC*. However, its structure and writing tools still disrupt traditional writing methods through the realm of *bohemia*. The novel has three narrators: (1) Stéphen Rivesanges, (2) an anonymous editor, and (3) the eponymous filleule, Morena. Stéphen and Morena narrate the story through their personal
diary entries, and the editor fills in the gaps they do not address in their writings. Stéphen and Morena also add letters written by others to complement their writings.

Sand manipulated literature through the realm of Bohemia. However, Sand extended her exploration of bohemia into personal and humanitarian spaces. The concept of les bohémiens inspired Sand in both her writing and her personal life. Sand even claimed that her mother was a bohémienne in a letter she wrote to Charles Poncy in March 1844:

Moi je n’ai rien de bourgeois dans le sang. Je suis la fille d’un patricien et d’une bohémienne, comme le jeune Zdenko de mon roman [Consuelo]. Je serai avec l’esclave et avec la bohémienne et non avec les rois et leurs suppôts.

I have no bourgeois blood. I am the daughter of a patrician and a bohémienne, like the young Zdenko in my novel [Consuelo]. I am with the slave and the bohémienne and not with the kings and their henchmen (emphasis mine).

Sand saw more value in the life of the bohémien than of the bourgeoisie. Additionally, she used these characters to show her criticisms of the bourgeoisie through innovative writing techniques.

Sand also knew that bohémien characters were a profitable writing tool. The narrator of La Filleule notes, "à l’époque où je faisais cette rencontre ils [les bohémiens] étaient à la mode en littérature" (28). As such, Sand produced multiple works with bohémien characters. In fact, an entire dissertation could be written solely about her works which include bohémiens. Pascale Auraix-Jonchière’s article “Les Portraits croisés de la bohémienne dans La Filleule et Les Beaux messieurs de bois doré [...]”, explores what the bohémien represented as an overarching theme of Sand’s works.

Le personnage de la bohémienne présente en outre une intéressante particularité : il peut être convoqué non seulement dans des environnements géographiques divers en raison de sa nature migratoire, mais aussi dans des contextes historiques variés. En effet, il s’agit aussi d’un type littéraire qui traverse les époques. Si de façon générale les types sociaux différent
en fonction de lieux, des temps, et des milieux, il n’en va pas vraiment de même de la bohémienne (ou du bohémien), dont l’image reste assez peu évolutive entre les XVIIe et XIXe siècles. C’est pourquoi, quel que soit le temps de l’histoire dans les romans de George Sand, la description de ce personnage - son portrait - constitue un lieu particulièrement sensible de l’écriture, révélateur des rapports de l’écrivain au stéréotype, au genre littéraire et à la réflexion sur l’art du roman.

Furthermore, the character of the bohémienne presents an interesting defining feature: She can be summoned not only in diverse geographic environments because of her migratory nature, but also in various historic contexts. In effect, she is a literary figure who can traverse epochs. If, in general, social types differ in function of place, time, and contexts, it doesn’t apply the same way to the bohémien or bohémienne, which the depiction changes very little between the 17th and 19th centuries. It’s why, no matter the setting of the stories in George Sands’s novels, the description of this character constitutes a particularly sensitive place in the writing, revealing connections between the writer and the stereotype, the literary genre, and her reflection on the art of the novel (152).

The image of the Bohémien allowed Sand to focus on the literary, but at what cost?

Auraix-Jonchière also explores the intersection of Romani stereotypes and literary writing in “La Bohémienne, figure poétique de l’errance aux XVIIIe et XIXe siècles”. For her, the bohémien as a fictional character is inherently literary:

Le Bohémien [...] semble relever d’un hors temps comme d’un hors lieu ; en cela, il s’apparente à un matériau romanesque diffus, ce que ne manque pas de souligner l’écrivain en renvoyant explicitement à la littérature.

The bohémien [...] seems to come from outside time and outside space. In this, he seems like a vague romanesque material, one which doesn’t lack emphasizing the writer, explicitly sending him back to the literature (156).

According to Auraix-Jonchière, the figure of the Bohémien has remained unchanged as a fictional figure throughout time, and a novel’s setting has little impact on the portrayal of the Bohémien. Therefore, authors can easily use the character as a literary tool. She examines how this works through Sand’s description of Morena, which Auraix-Jonchière argues serves a strictly literary, and not social or political, role. This viewpoint aligns with the political
constraints of the time. As Annabelle Rea summarizes, Sand’s contract with *Le Siècle*, for whom she wrote *La Filleule*, required that her works be “exclusivement littéraire” to avoid Louis Napoleon’s censors (285).

However, I disagree with Auraix-Jonchière that this aim was maintained and achieved. I argue that there are political undertones to the character of Morena, as I discuss at the end of this chapter. Secondly, though many facets of the *bohémienne* remain unchanged – such as her ability to learn languages and her seductiveness – the transmutable nature of the *bohémienne* allows her to shift with each appearance in literature. Her key characteristic is her ability to *embody the entirety* of otherness, highlighting different aspects in different roles. Her consistency lies in her inconsistency.

Though *La Filleule* was to be purely literary, it contains representations of both Otherness and Frenchness that are potentially critical of 19th-century France. According to Dina Roginsky, this is a common unifying tactic in nationalist discourses.

While [the dominant culture is] attracted to what is perceived as exotic, primitive and sensual, national modern identity constructs itself as the opposite: civilized, rational, modern and male. In this way, the three Others of this study outline the boundaries of the national project, apparently integrated in it but in reality, marginalized and depoliticized by it (238)

This usage of *bohémiens* as foils to national identity was not and is not unique to French culture. In Risto Blomster and Kati Mikkola’s article “Inclusion and Exclusion of Roma in the Category of Finnish Folklore: The Collections of the Finnish Literature Society from the 1800s to the 2000s”, they observe that

Roma are typically presented in Gypsy anecdotes as the antagonists of ethnic Finns. The anecdotes one-sidedly present and assess the cultural differences between Roma and non-Roma from the perspective of the non-Roma. Roma behavior is stereotypical, determined solely by their ethnicity. The setting for Gypsy anecdotes is commonly a farmhouse, where
the Roma arrive to engage in trade or to ask for food or lodging. In the anecdotes, Finns play tricks on Roma, who are unable to retaliate because they depend on the goodwill of their hosts. The anecdotes justify and explain the humiliating treatment of the Roma with a bundle of stereotypes, often contradictory: suspicious yet gullible, devious but also childish, not to mention, superstitious, dirty, and lazy (27).

While the contexts of these folktales are undeniably Finnish, this supports the idea of a pan-European view concerning the Romani people. Across Europe, non-Roma saw the Roma as a dangerous enemy to the citizens of each country, an uncivilized threat to civilization.

Louis Charnon-Deutsch, in a chapter entitled “The Discovery of the Romantic Spanish Gypsy,” supports this idea. He states, "The imaginary Gypsy had evolved into a symbol of decadence by the mid-nineteenth century” (67). The Centre National des Ressources Textuelles et Lexicales (CNRTL) defines decadence as the “état de ce qui commence à se dégrader et évolue progressivement vers sa fin ou sa ruine/ state of things as they begin to degrade and progressively evolve to their end or their ruin” using a citation from Flaubert as its basis (Decadence). The CNRTL also defines it as the "période de l’histoire correspondant à une régression sur le plan politique et/ou artistique / period of history corresponding to a political or artistic regression” (Ibid). Indeed, the “imaginary gypsy” was a tool used to explore how French society experienced decadence. Charnon-Deutsch notes that the “imaginary gypsy” was influential for the character’s “sensual appeal [... and] incestuous nature of Gypsy sexuality [which was] a common belief among missionaries, ethnologists, and even contemporary encyclopedists” (67). Interestingly, the culture-setters of France, the literati and the church, defined the Roma as a threat to French society. The role of the *bohémien* was critical in highlighting the shadowy fears of France.
Interestingly, this perceived decadence was a charade, a performance made on behalf of the Roma to fulfill the desires of the dominant European cultures. The performative nature may have been well-known but ignored Charnon-Deutsch explained how many Romantic writers, such as Dumas, ignored these performative aspects by convinc[ing] themselves of the originality and spontaneity of the performances they [Romani people] arranged in Seville and Granada, when in fact Calé entertainers, wise to the price that the market would bear for an imagined peek at authentic Gypsy ritual, were only too happy to stage a performance of their “passion” (70).

The image of the bohémien was a mirror of what its creators wanted to see.

The “imaginary gypsy” was also a symbol of many other things besides decadence. This character embodied nearly any threat to the nation-state and culture of France beyond those that could be considered forms of decadence. Decadence can be limited or stopped, through assimilation and conversion, politically or religiously. Both assimilation and conversion require forward-thinking action. The Bohémien, however, also represents how being trapped in the past can lead to ruin. Avoiding this ruin involves self-reflection. Furthermore, the issue cannot be solved through forced assimilation or conversion because it is the French national who risks being stuck in the past. The bohémien required its audience to occupy a liminal space – looking inward and outward to refine Frenchness.

The Romanesque, or what it means to seem like a novel

Sand explores this liminal space through the character of Morena within La Filleule. In La Filleule, a gitana33 dies while giving birth to a daughter. Stéphen, who had helped the gitana find shelter as she labored, decides to find the orphaned girl a home. He places her with Anicée,

32 See the chapter on Carmen to explore this idea in depth.
33 This is another term for a bohémienne commonly used in Spanish contexts.
his love interest and a divorcée who dreams of being a mother. She takes in the girl, who they name Morena, after the inscription on a bracelet her mother was wearing. Notably, the reader later learns that this was not a bracelet but a dog collar that her mother had stolen from her biological father. The young girl was named after a dog, dehumanizing her beyond the other stereotypical aspects common in the 19th-century. Morena grows up in this French household, yet, per the narrator, she can never escape her Bohémien blood. She ultimately marries a gitano and tours Europe as a musician.

Morena’s story allows for the exploration of the importance of genetic heritage. Morena was the child of an illicit affair between a French nobleman and a gitana. Morena lost her biological connections when her mother passed away. Her mother’s Romani husband wanted Morena dead because she was the evidence of her mother’s infidelity. Her biological father, a Frenchman, did not acknowledge her because she proved his unacceptable triste with a gitana. Though her adoptive mother adores her, Morena remains an outcast. Anicée hoped that raising her in a French, Christian home would save Morena from a life of misery. However, her heritage proves to be an impediment. Other stories like those of Esmeralda, Carmen, and la Gitanilla by Cervantes repeat this trope: a tzigane cannot escape her heritage.

The family consistently worries about the influence of her Romani blood and hopes that a Christian upbringing will nullify its influences. La mère Floche, adoptive grandmother to Morena, expresses this concern after her friend, M Roque, brings up her “mulâtre” nature:

Je m’imaginais que la mère et le garçon s’étaient noircis au soleil de leur pays ; mais voilà qu’au grand jour la petite en tient aussi, et je crains bien que ce ne soit une race de diables/ I imagined that the mother and the boy had darkened their skin under the sun of their country; but look, in the daylight, the little girl is dark as well. I fear that she is from a race of demons (26-27).
M. Roque retorts, “M. le curé va Blanchir tout ça / The vicar will whiten all of that” (27), implying that the church can erase Morena’s heritage.

Despite her religious upbringing, Morena cannot conform to French, Christian cultural norms. As an adolescent Morena is unable to obey her adoptive mother despite her desire to do so: “Maman m’a fait pleurer […] Pourquoi ai-je tant de peine à lui obéir? / Mom made me cry […] Why do I have such trouble obeying her?” (131). She cannot maintain the mother-daughter relationship with her adoptive, French mother. Other people continue to see her as a demonic force. Jealous of her husband’s affair, the wife of Morena’s biological father calls the young *bohémienne* “jolie comme un démon / pretty like a demon” (162). Like other *bohémienne*, the characters assume that Morena cannot control her sexuality. At a party, one noblewoman remarks, “Une gitana rester fille! […] il n’y a pas de risqué et le mariage est bien le moindre de leurs soucis / A gitana remain a girl [read: virgin]! […] There’s no risk of that, and marriage is the least of their concerns” (200). For the other characters, her heritage limits who and what Morena can be.

After recovering from the comment made by the noblewoman, Morena decides that she will take advantage of the sexual assumptions others make about her. She performs the role society expects, much like the Romani of whom Charnon-Deutsch spoke. The narrator explains how Morena decided to be “coquette, mais avec âprete, avec tyrannie, avec une malice profonde et cruelle dans l’occasion / coquette, but with severity, with tyranny, with a profound and cruel malice in the occasion” (206). She learns to use her flirtatious nature, which is assumed to be linked to her *gitana* heritage, to manipulate men,

*Morenita, dont le premier mouvement avec lui [Clet, un homme auquel elle était fiancée] avait été sincère, voyant qu’elle ne pouvait le décider à seconder son plan, revint à la fourbe*
féminine dont elle croyait avoir le droit d’user dans ses détresses. Elle feignit de se raviser ; elle fut coquette

Morenita, for whom the first movement with him [Clet, a man to who she was engaged] had been sincere, saw that she couldn’t go along with his plan, going back to her feminine deceit which she felt she had the right to use under this distress. She faked reconsidering; she played the coquette (234).

Finally, Morena profits from her performativity, simultaneously unable to escape her

bohémienne destiny:

Hier soir, Morenita lui [à Anicée] a écrit de Vienne, où notre jeune couple d’artistes fait fureur. Sa lettre était charmante. Elle y parle de sa gloire au moins autant que de son bonheur, ou plutôt elle confond ces deux choses. À chacun sa destinée !

Yesterday, Morenita wrote to her [Anicée] from Vienna, where our young, artistic couple is all the rage. Her letter was charming. She spoke of her fame at least as much as her happiness, or more likely, she confuses the two. To each his own destiny! (265)

Morena is raised in a circumstance that should produce the ideal French child. Her image and actions should have reflected the standard French customs for the period. However, her heritage overrides her upbringing. French culture and parenting are insufficient influences for assimilation.

Let us move on to the literariness of the text. Structurally, Sand divides La Filleule into two parts: “Anicée“ and “Morenita” (Morenita is Morena’s nickname). “Anicée“ is primarily narrated by Stéphen. However, there are multiple moments in which an anonymous narrator retells the story. It is sometimes difficult to know whether it is the anonymous narrator or Stéphen speaking, causing some distrust of the narration. “Morenita” is narrated only by Morena, lending more credence to the narration. The two parts divide the novel temporally and by point of view. “Anicée“ recounts the story of Morena’s birth and how she came to be
adopted by Anicée. “Morenita” skips to her adolescence and allows the reader to experience life from Morena’s point of view.

In certain ways, the two parts parallel one another. The two parts function to continually remind the reader that the book is a work of fiction. In the first part, we learn that Anicée is widowed and not keen on the idea of remarrying. Despite her unwed status, she strongly desires to become a mother and, through adopting Morena, proves herself to be the ideal mother, challenging the idea that one must be a good wife to be a good mother. Anicée falls in love with Stéphen, who is enamored by how much she resembles his own deceased mother. The two secretly wed, hiding their union from the public at large for around 15 years. In the second part, Morena meets Rosario, whom she believes to be her brother. The two secretly meet over several years, during which time Rosario makes an effort to educate Morena about her Romani culture. He teaches her the language, dances, and songs. Over time, the two fall in love. In a “romanesque,” or novelesque, moment, Morena discovers that Rosario is not her brother. The two marry and leave to begin a career in performance across Europe. Morena lives out her fantasy, a book-like ending to her life. As the three narrators recount the story, they remind the reader of the romanesque/novelesque nature of the plot. In both parts of the novel, a woman finds herself in an unusual circumstance that leads to her marrying the man she loves despite the odds against them.

Auraix-Jonchière notes that in Sand’s writing, the novelesque is privileged; the metaliterary is not (155). That is to say, social and political commentary are secondary to the narrative. Sand seemingly supports this theory in her own writings. In her letter to Charles Edmond, for instance, Sand states, “Le ‘roman Romanesque’ privilégie l’imagination et s’ouvre volontiers au
conte, au fantastique, voire à la veine rocambolesque / the Romanesque novel favors the imagination and willingly opens itself to tales, the fantastic, to things of the extraordinary” (13 juin, 155). Certainly, La Filleule and Consuelo fall under the category of the “roman Romanesque.”

By focusing on its novelesque nature, La Filleule continually reminds the reader of its position in literary history, that this is a “histoire,” and its French literary heritage. The text is set firmly in a fictitious world, informed by other works of fiction. In chapter III, Stéphen, as narrator, is contemplating adopting both Morena and Rosario, himself believing the two to be siblings. Because Stéphen has read about “les Bohémiens,” he becomes fascinated by Rosario, who Stéphen reduces to an object of curiosity:

Bohemians are a race defiled by misery and abandon. Without a doubt, their strange sort and their mysterious origin lend to poetry. And, at the time when I had this encounter, they were in fashion in literature. But I had read enough of everything to know the reality of things and to see, beyond this quaint charm we tend to see in them, the well-founded disdain that they inspire in nations that know them and who suffer from their pillages, their filth, their schemes, and, in a word, their abjection. For me, the child [Rosario] quickly became an object of physiological curiosity, of natural pity, and nothing more. (Sand, 28)

As Sand points out, knowledge about bohémiens was gained through literature, such as Carmen and Notre Dame de Paris.

In a refreshing twist, Sand rejects the idea that the French canon is an ultimate authority by presenting Morena as a more complex character than previously seen in the canon. Despite this
rejection of tradition, Morena remains a literary object. She, like Rosario, is something to observe and be watched. Due to literary constraints, the character of Morena is trapped within the walls of the French imagination.

Though Bohémiens remain objectified within the Sandian literosphere, Sand subversively attempts to accomplish humanitarian aims. Through these characters, she exposes inequalities in the French political system. Interestingly, this tactic also allows her to avoid the critical eye of the censors. Auraix-Jonchière, continues on this note:

Les portraits de bohémienne sont porteurs d’une réflexion critique qui a l’avantage de contourner les discours engagés à l’heure où la censure exige des ficitions pures, dénuées de considérations politiques et sociales. Le portrait est riche de subversions et Sand en joue habilement en transmutant la matière romanesque et le recyclage des topoï de sorte à produire un ‘sous-texte’ critique perceptible par le seul lecteur attentif

The depiction of bohémienne carries a critical reflection that has the advantage of skirting the social and political discourses at a time when the censors demanded pure fictions, devoid of political and social considerations. The depiction is rich in subversions, and Sand plays with these skillfully by transmuting the quixotic [romanesque] material and recycling the topoï which produce a critical ‘subtext’ perceptible only to the attentive reader (168).

Despite the probable good intentions of Sand, I argue that this objectification of people as a literary device to avoid censorship does little to remedy the injustices the Roma faced and continue to face. On the contrary, because the subtext which addresses these injustices is noticeable only to the “attentive reader,” what happens is that the stereotypes are simply reinforced for most readers and not challenged.

Nodier certainly wished to challenge his readers. Remember, at its original publication, RBSC was unreadable. When Nodier republished the text, he added texts which contemporary readers could approach more traditionally. He included his critical essay Du Fantastique and a short story called The Four Talisman which preceded the unchanged text of RBSC. This
republication was titled *Les Sept chateaux du Roi de Bohème*, a notably less verbose title. The titular text, *RBSC*, retained its original title, form, and length. It remained unedited. However, before arriving at this text, the reader had encountered eighty-eight pages of traditional texts. Nodier gave the reading audience texts they could read.

In his republication, Nodier tries to address the social function of storytelling in literature in his essay *Du Fantastique*, first published in the *Revue de Paris* in 1830. In this essay, he outlines the history of literature, demonstrating that the Fantastic has existed throughout time and functions as a key part of society. He examines how society impacts a text and how a text impacts society. Storytelling is a key social function for Nodier.

Over 100 years later, authors are drawing the same conclusion. If we look at the differences between storytelling and reading from Lynne Sharon Schwartz's perspective, we can also see how the delivery method impacts a text's social function. As Schwartz noted in her book *Ruined by Reading* in 1996,

> There was life before reading. Not until the sixteenth century were manuscripts even available, except to monks and royalty. What could it have been like? There was life before language too - grunts and grimaces, tears and laughter (yet how much laughter, without language?), shrieks and groans and commiseration; all of that is easy to imagine. But to have language and no books? What to do after the corn is ground and the water hauled and the butter churned? Keep your mind free, as Mr. Cha [a writer who denounced reading after becoming Buddhist and inspired Schwartz] suggests? Without stories to free the mind, emptiness might be true emptiness, like Freud’s proverbial cigar. Well, there were storytellers, the old woman sitting at the fireside entrancing the family, or the troubadour chanting verses near the fountain in the piazza while women walked from the village oven with warm breads on boards balanced on their shoulders. But that is a social experience. With books there are no fellow listeners, no fleshy storyteller, none of the exertions of fellowship (16)
Based on this astute observation of the differences between books and storytelling, we can see that the experience is quite different. Reading is solitary; storytelling is social. The text loses a social aspect by moving a narrative from an oral format to a written one.

The Fantastic, in Nodian terms, allows us to explore this unique space between the social and the solitary. Based on Nodier’s treatise, the Fantastic could be read as a blend between reading and storytelling, a mix of the social and the solitary. The Fantastic text, like folklore, translates social understandings and codes it onto pages.

As Nodier understands his contemporaries, literary critics believed that the French canon’s heritage came not from France itself but the Orient. Literary critics of the 19th-century saw the Orient as the motherland of fantasy and place of the “rêves les plus délicieux de la pensée / most delicious dreams of thought” (Nodier, VIII; Ginsburg, 544). Nodier understood these critics to believe that the Orient birthed creativity that could not have been adequately nourished in Western lands. The creativity found in the Orient had a life-giving and revitalizing force. Furthermore, according to Nodier, anyone trapped in the “ennui” of life must have never read Thousand and One Nights (Ibid). Building on this argument, Nodier explains how what he calls “theogonies of the Orient” (here he is mainly referring to Hinduism) inspired the great classical writers of Rome and Greece:

Là, tout se ressent du système d’invention des Orientaux ; tout manifeste l’exubérance de ce principe créateur qui venoit d’enfanter les théogonies, et qui répandait abondamment le superflu de sa polygénésie féconde sur le vaste camp de la poésie, semblable à l’habile sculpteur qui, des restes de l’argile dont il a formé la statue d’un Jupiter ou d’un Apollon, se délasse à pétrir sous ses doigts les formes bizarres mais

---

34 From here forward, the usage of the term Orient is used as Nodier understood it. I recognize that this is a very loaded term today. Unfortunately, it is used specifically and explicitly in this treatise, requiring its usage in my discussion of the origins of the Fantastic.
naïves et caractéristiques, d’un grotesque, et qui improvise, sous les traits difformes de Polyphème, la caricature classique d’Hercule (Ibid).

In the Odyssey, everything is touched by the Oriental system of invention. Everything manifests the exuberance of the creative principle that had just given birth to theogonies and that lavishly spread the overflow of its fecund polygenesis across the entire field of poetry, like the skillful sculptor who relaxes by using the clay left over from a statue of Jupiter or Apollo to shape bizarre, naive, or grotesque forms and improvises a classical caricature of Hercules (Ibid).

While the great classics had some creative power, most of their creative forces got their energy from outside their own cultures. By making this comparison, Nodier is also inverting the typical East-West hierarchy. The great canon comes not from Latin or Greek texts but Sanskrit ones.

According to Nodier, his contemporaries fail to see the influence of Hinduism on Latin and Greek mythology because these critics lack appropriate reading skills. When European scholars read Greek and Latin works, they sought to find rules and structures, much like Horace’s Ars Poetica or his Epistles mentioned earlier. However, within the “theogonies of the Orient,” these rules were not what gave the stories their power. The force of the Fantastic did that. Because the power of the Fantastic was forgotten through modern readings of these texts, linguistic rules and structures outlined by critics, grammarians, and etymologists caged writing. Writing lacked this creative force until the Fantastic returned to the French critical eye through fairytales in the 17th-century. Even still, it remained misunderstood, in Nodier’s view.

Upon examining French texts from the peuple rather than the canon, Nodier disagrees with the assumption that the roots of Fantastic literature in France are from the Orient. Instead, Nodier shows that French fairytales are particularly Gallic, finding their origins in the link between people and land rather than political space. That is, these stories remain culturally stagnant despite political shifts. The stories come from the people and their connection to their
physical space. It is important to note here that this is Nodier’s perspective, which is not
substantiated by modern research which notes that the fairytales were written for the nobility.
Through a reading of Charles’s Perrault’s fairy tales, Nodier shows how these tales are
French.

Si l’on peut opposer quelques idéalités plus fraîches encore aux charmes innocents du
Chaperon, aux grâces espiègles de Grisélidis, c’est chez le peuple lui-même qu’il faut
chercher ces poèmes inaperçus, délices traditionnels des veillées du villages, et dans
lesquels Perrault a judicieusement puisé ses récits (Les Sept châteaux du Roi de Bohème,
xxv)

[...] if there are any idealities fresher than [Perrault’s] innocent charm of Red Riding
Hood, the impish grace of Cinderella, or the touching resignation of Griselda, it must be
sought among the people themselves, in their hidden poems, the traditional delights of
village nights, from Perrault judiciously drew his stories (Ginsburg, 550). 35

Nodier demonstrates that Perrault’s texts show a particularly French version of the Fantastic
because the tales came from the peasants of France. The Fantastic is a vessel for
communicating a cultural heritage that can withstand political, linguistic, and social shifts across
time.

According to Nodier, the Frenchness of these tales is both necessary and unavoidable.
He states:

Si le fantastique n’avait jamais existé chez nous, de sa nature propre et intuitive,
abstraction faite de toute autre littérature ancienne ou exotique, nous n’aurions pas eu
de société, car il n’y a jamais eu de société qui n’eût le sien (Nodier, XVII)

If the fantastic had never existed among us, with its own, inventive nature, independent
of any other ancient or exotic literature, we would not have society, for there has never
been a society that has not had its own fantastic literature (Ginsburg, 550)

35 The reference to Cinderella does not appear in Nodier’s text from Les Sept châteaux du Roi de Bohème.
French Fantastic literature comes from the *peuple*. For the *peuple*, folklore, or popular Fantastic stories, meets the need of escapism.

Per Nodier, escapism is the primary social function of storytelling. According to this essay,

Il est l’instrument essential de sa vie imaginative et peut-être même est-il la seule compensation vraiment providentielle des misères inséparables des vie sociale (Nodier, XXIX)

[storytelling] is the essential instrument of imaginative life and perhaps even the only truly providential compensation for the miseries of social life (Ginsburg, 551).

Because storytelling is a way of escaping the mundane structures of society, it is logical that he fantastic breaks the rules created by society. Nodier notes that the fantastic threatened “les belles *formes* du Classique /the beautiful *forms* of classicism” (emphasis mine; Nodier, XXXI; Ginsburg, 552). Nodier is flipping social hierarchies upside down. It is not high literature but common folklore that creates society. It is not the aristocracy or political elite who define what it means to be French, but it is the peasantry or lower classes.

This differentiation between classes and cultural identification continues to be studied by folklorists today. Amongst nationalist discourses, Todorova-Pirgova finds that folklore is a particularly manipulative tool. Folklore helps define who belongs to a nation:

On peut parler de la nation de deux façons, idéologique ou académique. Ces deux façons sont relativement indépendantes l’une de l’autre, elles sont déterminées par la position de l’énonciateur: évoque-t-il “sa” nation ou la nation en général?

One can speak of the nation in two ways, ideologically or academically. These two manners are relatively independent of one another; they are determined by the speaker's position: Is he evoking “his” nation or the nation in general? (287)

Folklore also helps define what characteristics belong to this nation:
De nos jours encore, dans le discours nationaliste de la nation, l’*esprit national* dirige la pensée et l’émotion vers l’établissement du caractère “unique” de “sa” communauté

Still yet today, in the nationalist discourse of the nation, the *national spirit* guides the thoughts and emotions toward the establishment of the “unique” character of “his/her” community (287).

Ultimately, it is the largest ethnic community that often defines what characterizes a national identity and who can claim to belong within it.

C’est la communauté ethnique la plus grande dans l’État-nation, qui acquiert le statut de nation. Les autres groupes ethniques sont marginalisés et, dans le meilleur cas, se voient attribuer un statut de “communautés minoritaires”. Le plus souvent, ils restent sans statut et sont assimilés à la majorité. Seuls ses mythes, qu’ils soient anciens ou nouvellement créées, s’inscrivent dans la mythologie nationale.

It’s the largest ethnic community in the nation-state that determines that nation’s status. The other ethnic groups are marginalized and, in the best case, are given the status of “minority communities.” Most often, they remain without status and are assimilated into the majority. Only their myths [those of the largest ethnic group], whether ancient or newly created, are inscribed within the national mythology. (287)

Using Todorova-Pirgova’s framework in conjunction with Nodier’s cultural observances, we can see that much of the energizing force came from the lower classes, not the upper, as they are a larger force numerically. This power dynamic reflects the socio-political shifts happening as France moved within the spaces between being an aristocracy and a republic.

As more traditional social structures changed, such as movements toward secularization and increased social mobility, between the latter part of the 18th-century and the middle of the 19th-century, it is logical that the Fantastic returned in fashion. As the gap between aristocracy and peasantry shrunk and shifted, literature changed. Nodier notes this parallel between the social and the literary:

On ne comprit pas qu’il y avait encore une forme plus large, plus universelle, plus irréparable, qui allait finir ; que cette forme, c’était celle d’une civilisation usée, dont le classique n’est que l’expression partielle, momentanée, indifférente, et qu’il n’était pas
It was not understood that an irreparable, larger, more universal form was coming to an end: the form of a worn-out civilization, of which the classical is but a partial, momentary, indifferent expression. Nor was it understood that there was nothing surprising about the dissolution of the puerile connection holding together the foolish rhetorical unities as the entire social world was collapsing all around (Ginsburg, 552).

Though the Fantastic was making a popular return, the savants and high society highly criticized it. This criticism, too, reflects tensions. As the aristocracy(ies) died and gave birth(s) to republic(s), so did the classical forms of literature give birth to modern forms. The Fantastic allowed for exploring new forms of literature, exploring different forms of social structures. It allowed a way to write the topsy-turvy social changes France was undergoing.

*Bohémien* seem to capture this essence of the social and literary shifts well as they, too, eschew the constraints of society. *Bohémien* also are part of the French imagination. Remember, they had been used in literature, at this point, for hundreds of years as a trope. Furthermore, the original publication attempted to upend all conventional writing structures, a key feature of the fantastic.

At the end of his essay, Nodier states

> Dieu me garde [...] de transporter une querelle théologique sur le terrain de la littérature, dans l’intérêt de la grâce des féeries et du libre arbitre de l’esprit ! (Les Sept châteaux du Roi de Bohème, XXXIII)

May God save me from transporting a theological quarrel into the terrain of literature in the interest of the grace of fairies and the free will of the mind (Ginsburg, 553).

*Bohémien* characters allow for the uninhibited embodiment of the free will of the mind. He concludes his essay by stating,
What are most difficult to uproot from a people are not the fictions that preserve it but the lies that amuse it (Ginsburg, 554).

*Bohémien* characters allow for the uprooting of social norms while still holding close to the national myths that amuse the French populous. These *Bohémien* characters are not true-to-life, as noted by Mérimée’s rebuttal of his portrayal of Carmen in the fourth chapter of his novella. Yet, this image of the *Bohémien* is a particularly French lie that offers entertainment and an exploration of new social structures, providing both a tool for metaphorizing social shifts and for retaining a sense of normalcy and comfort to the readers.

The Fantastic is very similar to the Romanesque in that it blurs the lines between reality and fiction. Nodier clarifies in his essay *Du Fantastique* that the Fantastic is a refusal of literary tradition. As such, *L’Histoire du Roi* is an object lesson in this refusal. By upending the proscribed literary languages, Nodier produced an illegible text, as we saw above. However, its avant-garde natured limited its effectiveness. Sand attempts a more accessible lesson in the refusal of literary tradition through the Fantastic in her novel *Consuelo*.

Barbara Cooper’s article “L’Envers du décor’: The space of the fantastic in George Sand’s ‘Consuelo’” examines how Sand defines the fantastic in a single paragraph of the novel. Cooper notes that both students and writers of the fantastic tend to be preoccupied with delineating spaces (243). According to Cooper, “The boundaries of the fantastic lying somewhere between the real and the imaginary, it should be no surprise that these images frequently describe an intermediary zone: a frontier, an intersection, a passage” (Ibid). Cooper also notes that the fantastic, specifically Sand’s writings, disrupt the typical point of view from the reader. The
narrator moves the reader from the audience to the stage, giving the reader a peek behind the scenes. This shift in perspective eliminates the “traditional equation of the stage with the world of pure illusion” (245). Within fantastic literature, nothing is pure illusion nor purely real; everything rests in the in-between. Much as *Notre-Dame de Paris* and *Carmen* position themselves in a historical and political middle-ground, *Consuelo* disturbs the literary milieu. In each of these instances, the author chose a bohémienne character precisely for her evasive characteristics.

*Consuelo* looks to the Fantastic, which Nodier defines in his preface to the republication of *RBSC*. The novel begins with the title character, a talented opera singer who has finally become beautiful enough for the stage according to the men in her life. Once she takes the stage, she becomes the most famous singer in Italy. However, fame comes with a cost: her fiancé, Anzoleto, is unfaithful and jealous. To save her from pain and protect her innocence, her music teacher, Proporo, sends her to live with a family near Prague under Habsburg rule. Here she meets Count Albert. Visions of ghosts from Bohemia’s 300 Years War haunt Albert. He is a religious fanatic who despises Catholicism. His disappearances for days at a time cause his family much distress. Consuelo has a mystical ability to soothe Albert, who falls in love with her. The novel concludes with Consuelo and Albert marrying as he dies. Consuelo then returns to the stage, leaving to perform under the patronage of Maria Teresa. The novel confounds reality and fiction. Real-life people, such as Joseph Haydn, Maria Teresa, and Proporo, mingle with the fictitious characters of Anzoleto, Albert, and Consuelo. Throughout the novel, the most absurd visions seem to be proven “true.” Sand uses *Bohémiens* and Bohemians to create a Fantastic
novel par excellence through which she can critique the religious and gender structures of 19th-century France.

Sand begins upending tradition by challenging the notion of the *bohémienne*. Unlike previous incarnations of the *bohémienne*, Consuelo, the lead character of both *Consuelo* and *La Comtesse de Rudolstadt*, is less obviously *bohémienne*.\(^{36}\) Whereas Morena verifiably has *gitane* origins (the reader witnesses her birth), Consuelo’s heritage is less clear. Consuelo describes herself as *zingara* “non de race, mais de condition / not of race, but condition” to Count Albert (Tome II, LVIII). Like the stereotypical tzigane, she is apt at traveling.

Additionally, she needs neither home nor shelter. While hiding from her ex-fiancé, she falls asleep on a rock, and the narrator declares that “[t]out vagabond peut reposer sa tête sur ses pierres / all vagabonds can rest their heads on their stones” (Tome I, xxiv). She ticks most of the boxes for the average reader to recognize her as *bohémienne*. However, she is also prudish and pious. She does not present herself as sexual, nor do the characters do not perceive Consuelo as sexual. Consuelo prizes her virginity and her reputation as a virgin throughout the text. Her piety acts like a cage, trapping her within her purity. Her compulsive piety defies the stereotypes of the French imagination.

Throughout the novel, she is described as “une baume celeste / a celestial balm” (Tome I, XXXII), “une âme mystique / a mystic soul” (Tome I, XXXIV), and “une sainte que Dieu m’envoie [à Albert] / A saint that God sent me [Albert]” (Tome II, XLIV). According to Albert, her connection to God is beyond comprehension: “Vous ne la comprenez pas / You don’t understand her” (Tome I, XXXI). Beyond the prophetic vision of her impending arrival, her voice

---

\(^{36}\) For brevity’s sake, this chapter only focuses on *Consuelo* and not *La Comtesse de Rudolstadt*. 
and character soothe Albert. Albert also declares that, though he has thoroughly studied the
texts of his forefathers, Consuelo possesses divine knowledge and that Albert’s vision of God
continuously inspires her actions:

Mais sache, Consuelo, que tu ne seras jamais ni à lui, ni à moi, ni à toi-même. Dieu t’a
réservé une existence à part, dont je ne cherche ni prévois les circonstances, mais dont je
connais le but et la fin. Esclave et victime de ta grandeur d’âme, tu n’en recueilleras jamais
d’autre récompense en cette vie que la conscience de ta force et le sentiment de ta bonté

But know, Consuelo, that you will never belong to him, to me, or to yourself. God saved you
a separate existence, of which I don’t look for nor know the circumstances, but of which I
know the goal and the end. Slave and victim to the grandeur of your soul, you won’t receive
any other compensation in this life other than the awareness of your power and your good
intentions (Tome II, 60, XLVII)

Si l’on vous a dit que je préférais la réforme des Hussites à celle des Luthériens, et le grand
Procope au vindicatif Calvin, autant que je préfère les exploits des Taborites à ceux des
soldats de Wallenstein, on vous a dit la vérité, Consuelo. Mais que vous i
mporta ma
croyance, à vous qui, par intuition, pressentez la vérité, et connaissez la Divinité mieux que
moi ?

If someone told you that I would prefer the Hussite reform to that of the Lutherans, and the
grand Procope to the vindictive Calvin, or that I
prefer feats of the Taborites to that of
Wallenstein’s soldiers, they told you the truth, Consuelo. But why does my belief matter to
you who, by intuition, senses the truth and knows the Divine better than me? (Tome II,166,
LV)

By making Consuelo as a divine, pious character, Sand challenges the contemporary norms
of the church. By endowing Consuelo with these qualities and complicating the other
characters’ viewpoints, Sand erases the key concept that the bohémienne is a threat to the
pious nature of European men. Consuelo is of God. Sand, therefore, challenges the long-
standing idea of the bohémienne as a danger to national culture and Catholicism.

The Fantastic and the romanesque/novelesque reappear as themes in Sand’s novel
Consuelo. I consider Consuelo to be romanesque in Sandian and Nodian terms because the book
is based on several histoires. It retells Bohemian political history, the stories recounted by
Zdenko, the narratives the family tells themselves about Albert’s illness, the history and stories of Albert’s deceased mother, and the bedtime stories told by Amélie. This novel embodies both meanings of the term *histoire*, as both story and history. It explores what it truly means to be a novel, particularly a fantastic novel.

The word *romanesque* appears eighteen times in the novel, each appearance referring to the more Fantastic features of the text. For example, while Consuelo is searching for Comte Albert in the underground aqueducts that fed the well in his study and presumably led to his secret hideout, she is struck by the fantastical compulsion to search for the count.

Il y avait un voile épais sur toute cette aventure ; et, revenue de l’attrait romanesque qui avait contribué à l’y pousser [à pousser Consuelo], Consuelo se demandait si elle n’était pas la plus folle des trois [d’elle-même, Zdenko, et Comte Albert], de s’y être précipitée dans cet abîme de dangers et de mystères, sans être sûre d’un résultat favorable et d’un succès fructueux.

There was a thick veil over this whole adventure; and, coming back to the *romanesque* appeal that had pushed her there, Consuelo asked herself if she hadn’t been the craziest of the three [herself, Zdenko, and Count Albert], to have hurried into this abyss of danger and mystery, without being sure of a favorable outcome and fruitful success (36-37, Tome II).

Additionally, there is a fairytale-like element when Albert realizes he had provided lodging to Consuelo’s mother.

Ce ne sera pas long, dit Consuelo ; mais c’est une fantaisie que j’ai de dire ici un verset de cantique que ma mère me faisait chanter avec elle, soir et matin [...] L’idée de Consuelo était encore plus romanesque qu’elle ne voulait le dire

‘This won’t be long,’ said Consuelo, ‘but I have a fantasy to sing, here, a verse of a hymn that my mother had me sing with her, morning and night’ [...] the idea was more *romanesque* than she wanted to admit(Tome I, 348).

Consuelo sings the song, which triggers Albert’s memory of when her mother stayed with them.

Albert had, in fact, met Consuelo as an infant.
The *romanesque* qualities are layered. Consuelo, a fictitious character, is aware that what is happening in her life is something out of a novel. Her realization is revealed and reinforced through storytelling. It is both illogical and magical. Events seem preordained or written in advance by another. Consuelo’s awareness of the *romanesque* within the novel is a proto-metafictional element that allows Sand safely to explore potentially dangerous ideas. The reader is constantly aware that this is fiction. Therefore, the predisposition to not take novels too seriously protects the text from criticism.

Consuelo takes the complementary position to Morena. For Morena, other characters are defining and placing value upon the *romanesque*. She remains unconvinced of the romantic, in both its literary and figurative senses, and the imaginative nature of her hopes. Morena sees no barriers to her desire to have a whirlwind romance in which she falls deeply in love. Whether she is swept away by Rosario or in which her crush, Stéphen, finally sees her as the object of his affections, Consuelo believes in a *romanesque* ending to her life. On the other hand, Consuelo is confused by the extraordinary circumstances in which she finds herself. Consuelo, having been the object of spectacle as an opera singer in Italy, now finds herself centered in spectacle. Becoming a spectacle gave Consuelo special privileges as a *bohémienne*, reflecting reality for many Roma within the realm of the Hapsburg empire.

Under Queen Maria Theresa, “[l]ocal authorities restricted Habsburg Roma to their official places of residence” (Crowe, 12). This allowed for easier census taking to collect taxes and inhibit the Roma from changing their names, as they had previously done to avoid paying taxes (ibid). However, sedentary Roma were not implicated in this edict and often “enjoyed
considerable favour in high places” (Ibid). Consuelo would have fit this bill. In fact, Consuelo concludes with her traveling to become a court musician for Maria Theresa.

Music also allowed for a romanesque/Fantastic connection with Albert. Not only did it trigger Albert’s memory of Consuelo’s mother, but when Albert played his violin, it also allowed Consuelo to access the supernatural realm that Albert’s mind so often inhabited. The narrator describes her first time hearing his music as follows:

Toute son âme était attentive ; et ses sens, fermés aux perceptions directes, s'éveillaient dans un autre monde, pour guider son esprit à travers des espaces inconnus habités par de nouveaux êtres. Elle voyait, dans un chaos étrange, à la fois horrible et magnifique, s'agiter les spectres des vieux héros de la Bohème ; elle entendait le glas funèbre de la cloche des couvents, tandis que les redoutables Taborites descendaient du sommet de leurs monts fortifiés, maigres, demi-nus, sanglants et farouches.

Her entire soul was focused; and her senses, closed to direct perception, awoke in another world to guide her spirit toward unknown spaces inhabited by new beings. In this foreign chaos, which was simultaneously horrible and magnificent, she saw ghosts of old Bohemian heroes moving about. She heard the death knell ring from the bells of the convents as the formidable Taborites descended from the peaks of their fortified mountains, thin, half-naked, bleeding, and savage (Tome 2, LV)

Music was a means of historical transcendence. By simply hearing the music, she gained access to historical information outside of her realm of knowledge. Music allowed for the supernatural and the romanesque.

Albert’s music functions as a means of communication with the Bohemian past. Because of Bohemia’s history of Romani serfdom and enslavement, we can consider this music as having both Bohémien and Bohemian influence. Therefore, we can consider both Bohémien and Bohemian music as possessing the power of transcendence. As noted earlier in this chapter, Sand identifies Zdenko as a Bohémien. Within the novel, Zdenko is a songwriter and traditional storyteller. After hearing Zdenko sing a parable about mountains, Consuelo asks Amélie, her
student, what the song meant. Amélie responds, “Qui peut le savoir? [...] Zdenko est un improvisateur inépuisable ou un rapsode bien savant / Who knows? [...] Zdenko is an inexhaustible improvisor or a brilliant rhapsode” (Tome I). Note that he is either excellent at improvising or his knowledge is transcendent, coming from the ancient world. Throughout the novel, his musical genius is debatable, but it does provide Consuelo access to Albert. When Albert has disappeared, Consuelo follows Zdenko to find him. Zdenko tries to keep her from getting to him, but when she repeats his refrain, “Que celui à qui on a fait tort te salue/May the one whom we have wronged may save you,” he gives up his protective act and allows her to pass. She transcends into Albert’s world. Both Bohemian and bohémien music enables people to transcend physical and metaphysical boundaries.

Similarly, the “gypsy music” popular amongst the wealthy non-Roma like Maria Teresa, had multiple functions and allowed for transcendence. (1) It was a means of allowing the Roma to travel and live within Europe. As the courts called upon them to perform, it gave them the right to move from city to city. It allowed them to cross geopolitical borders. (2) The music objectified the Roma as Gypsies. Unable to translate or comprehend the music, the gadji simply listened and looked upon the dancers and performers as objects of entertainment. As such, the gadji hierarchically viewed the performance. The presence of Gypsy performers was at the whim and pleasure of the white courts. It blurred the social, hierarchical limits while simultaneously upholding them. (3) The music allowed for preserving Romani history, culture, and language, despite mainstream desires to rid Europe of bohémiens. (4) In preserving and

---

37 This refrain can also be read as a commentary on religion as it was a pledge to Satan, who was seen to have been wronged by God when he was thrown into hell.
communicating these uniting themes, the music flipped the script on objectification and performativity. The Roma were able to maintain their culture and language despite the dominant culture’s objections because they could use it to appease this culture.

By making parallels between the state of Bohemia and the image of the Bohémien character, Sand is reinforcing the lack of clarity of what it means to be Bohemian/Bohémien. As we can see above, the distinction between Romani people and Bohémien characters lacked clarity. The second functioned only as a performative, created identity. It was a work of fiction. However, Bohemian and Romani people had real, lived experiences. Sand’s novel allows the reader to see and feel that blurred boundary by keeping the distinction between fiction and reality blurred. However, the romanesque nature of the text permitted the blurring of fiction in a way that did not harm the majority culture, that is, French culture. Even though the text highlights harms done to both Romani and Bohemian cultures, the reader is fully aware of the fictitious nature of the text. The reader feels less threatened when encountering minority identities within the novel because it is within the Fantastic space.

The fantastic history of Bohemia

Within Consuelo, both Bohemia and la Bohème function as a particularly Fantastic realm. The characters of Consuelo must balance what they can accept as truth and justify that which seems undeniably false. Count Albert, the inheritor of the castle of Géants who eschews his family’s values and moral structures, is presented as both mad and a genius. Albert will spend weeks without eating or sleeping, driven by some unknown force that impacts his mood. He claims to speak with the dead and can know things that should be unknowable. While some
family members claim that he has a spiritual connection to God, others argue that he must have found some hidden books written by his deceased mother which provide this information.

However, all his visions seem to hold some weight in reality. When Consuelo is traveling to the chateau, she encounters a terrible thunderstorm. Simultaneously, Albert goes into one of his moods. While in this mood, he states, “Il y a en ce moment [...] une âme que l’orage pousse vers nous / There is, These qualities contrast with the other bohémiennes I discuss in this work, like Morena or Carmen this moment, a soul that the storm is pushing to us” (Tome I, 137). No one in the family was aware of Consuelo’s impending arrival, and because of the storm, there was no way that someone could have communicated this to Albert in secret. While having these visions during the storm, he sees a heavily symbolic tree. For decades, this tree has been an omen to the family (198). Albert sees the tree appearing to bleed (138) and eventually falling (139). When Consuelo finally arrives, she recounts to the family how a large tree had fallen (138). Albert is privy to supernatural knowledge sources, but this knowledge is physically and mentally painful. He is “haunted” by visions and ghosts (140). This vision of the tree, too, blurs the lines between fiction and reality. On the one hand, this vision mirrors the thirteenth Canto of Dante’s *Inferno*. On the other hand, it reflects the death of Jan Hus, a real-life Bohemian reformist who the fictitious Count Albert admires.

John M. Klassen has written an in-depth overview of the Hussite Revolution. His book, *The Nobility and the Making of the Hussite Revolution*, explains that the Bohemian Reformist movement began when the Hussites, who were opposed to the council of Constance and preferred a return to the religiosity of the New Testament church, prevented King Sigismund. He aligned himself with the Pope and legitimate heir, from taking the throne after the death of...
King Wenceslas (1). According to Martin Pjecha, in his article “Spreading Faith and Vengeance: Human Agency and the ‘Offensive Shift’ in the Hussite Discourses on Warfare,” this opposition to King Sigismund was precipitated by the burning Jan Hus, their leader, “as an unrepentant heretic at the Council of Constance” (158). When the debate to choose between the Church and the Hussites arose, the nobility found themselves in a difficult situation. Klassen explains, “Hussite ideology offer them, as the secular power, authority over the church and religious matters.

On the other hand, the church represented a stabilizing support to a social and economic structure that had continued to reward the nobility generously. Nobles answered the question individually” (61). Without delving too far into the history of the Bohemian Reformation, it suffices to say that Count Albert was the descendant of both sides of the war. His mother sided with the Hussites. His father and aunt, the Chanoinesse Wenceslawa [Wenceslas], sided with the church. Albert became a devout Hussite, though the story of Consuelo began in the 1720s (Tome I, IX).

Count Albert’s mental decline, caused by either his genetics or his transcendence to a political past, is precipitated by a spree of extreme charity. He welcomes all the impoverished subjects into the Chateau des Géants to feed and clothe them, living a life he felt embodied the virtues of the Hussite movement. He gives away his inheritance at an unsustainable rate while on a sort of religious pilgrimage he designed himself. He considers most religious people to be “les âmes patientes et oisives qui acceptent les injustices du monde / patient and lazy souls who accept the injustices of the world” (Tome I, 212), implying that their patience and laziness do not push them to seek justice for victims. Count Albert’s intense criticism of the church
drives a wedge between him and his family, likely preestablished by his parents’ marriage. His fanaticism for religious asceticism also causes him to unknowingly disappear for days, during which he “holds church” in an underground enclave, studying texts, playing the violin, starving himself, and avoiding sleep. During these unhealthy escapes, Albert is haunt by visions of the past. However, he believes Consuelo to be his saving grace.

As a means of communicating cultural history, Sand relied on Bohemian folklore. The martyrs who Albert admired were remembered symbolically through folklore by future generations, such as his. Marina Sárovcová examines a 16th-century illumination depicting the death of the Kutná Hora miners in front of an oak tree. According to Sárovcová, “the miners’ execution is [historically] compared with the martyrdom of Hus, and the miners are identified with the Bohemian martyrs” (266-267). The miners were killed in 1496 after having asked the nobility for better treatment and for aid in repairing their church (267-74). The myth of a “miraculous oak tree” which appears in numerous folk songs continued the memory of these martyrs (276). This oak tree was mentioned for the first time in writing by “a teacher in Poděbrady, who wrote about the execution of the Kutná miners” (277). This oak tree was part of a somewhat older oral tradition about a memorial oak tree, which had enjoyed a special respect, because its branch was allegedly stained with the blood of the unjustly executed miners (the oak was uprooted by a windstorm in 1777). The branch of the miraculous oak was supposed to bear acorns in the form of miners’ hoods attesting to the innocence of the beheaded miners (277-8).

Albert’s vision transcended the traditional concepts of time and reality. The vision spoke of the impending arrival of Consuelo, the historic murder of the miners as remembered in folklore, and the death of the Hussite martyrs as symbolized through the miners’ deaths.
From a classical literature perspective, the 19th-century French reader (as well as today’s reader) might also notice some parallels between this vision and Canto XIII of Dante’s *Inferno*. In this Canto, Dante enters a forest with speaking trees that the souls of dead men embody. When Dante breaks a branch off a tree, the tree replies, “Why pluck’st thou me?” Then the parallels to Albert’s vision begin:

> Then as the dark blood trickled down its side,
> These words it added: “Wherefore tear’st me thus?
> Is there no touch of mercy in thy breast?
> Men once were we, that now are rooted here.
> Thy hand might well have spar’d us, had we been
> The souls of serpents (Lines 34-40).

In this Canto, the debate of innocence is forefront. According to J. Vanacker’s analysis of the Canto, whether Pier, the man who became a tree, was guilty because he had committed suicide or innocent because he had not committed treachery. Instead, he “destroyed something (the human body[...]) which was sacred to the society to which [he] belonged” (443). Similarly, the miners became something sacred to society. Reality transformed into a myth embodied by a tree. For the reader, this imagology reifies the novelesque nature and blurs the lines between fiction and history.

For Albert’s family, his illness and his clairvoyance seem to be genetic. The Count had no children with his first wife. He had six children with his second wife, the first 5 of whom died. Albert was the 6th. The wife was beautiful and pure Bohemian. Unfortunately, she died of a fever brought on by some mental malady. Albert’s family believes that he inherited this malady which tortures him and contributes to his clairvoyance: “le mal est dans son âme / the evil is in his soul” (*Consuelo*, 155). Historically, his malady aligned with the beliefs of the Hussite movement. According to Klassen,
Fourteenth-century Bohemian pietism was a search after a pure religious life patterned on the New Testament Church. Its adherents took various approaches in pursuit of their goal. They had before them the examples of medieval saints and mystics who, through intense asceticism and mysticism claimed to have union with God (63).

Indeed, Albert’s days without food or sleep align with this ascetic movement, allowing his transcendent connection to God. These two points of view continue to blur the lines between fiction and reality.

**Writing Bohemia, promoting utopia**

Sand’s presentation of the Hussite movement highlights 19th-Century religious reformation movements. By highlighting the historicity of Bohemian religious reform, Sand subtly points toward religious and social reforms in France. The “École saint-simonienne” was established by young, wealthy followers in 1825 (Ralphe Locke, 212). These young utopianists sought to upend France's economy, social structure, and religious institutions. According to Locke,

The movement’s plan [...] called on the leaders of government and industry to try to abolish all ‘privileges of birth’ - most importantly the right of aristocrats to inherit rent-producing lands and thus live off the labor of their peasants - and to end competition (*antagonisme*) among and within the various sectors of the economy, replacing it with a new and more productive principle: cooperation or solidarity (*association*). The most powerful concept in Saint-Simonian social theory, and the one who raised it above pure utopianism, was its insistence on the crucial role of industrial production in these transformations. The saint-Simonians realized that France, in contrast to England, was hamstrung in its industrial development by such remnants of a feudal-aristocratic economy as an archaic banking system, one that was not geared toward providing the capital necessary for building factories and railroads (Locke, 212)

As such, the Saint-Simonians sought to establish a semi-communist society. Between 1828 and 1830, the Saint-Simonians began to see artists and their works as a means of conversion.

---

38 The Saint-Simonians differed from Marx and Engels in that the Saint-Simonians believed “that the interests of industrial workers and their bosses [were] essentially identical” and formed one social class - the ‘industrials’ (Locke, 212)
They were to “persuad[e] individuals, classes, and nations to abandon their traditional rivalries and work together in the spirit of association” (213). Literature was a means of revolution.

While I do not claim that Consuelo and its sequel, The Comtesse de Rudolstadt, were written as Saint-Simonian propaganda or even with direct inspiration from the ideology, the parallels are striking. Though George Sand was familiar with the movement - Lizst discussed it with her in letters in 1835 (Locke, 219) - it is not imperative to know if these works were linked to or inspired by the Saint-Simonian school of thought. Instead, the parallels between the movement and the text point to more extensive criticism of capitalism, religion, government, and social structures. Sand, like the Saint-Simonians, was a proponent of abolishing the barriers that prevented an equal society for men and women of all social classes.

For example, let’s examine how one of the leaders of the Saint-Simonian movement and Sand’s Count Albert viewed the church. In 1831, Barthélemy Prosper Enfantin, a founder of the Saint Simonian school, declared to his disciples that

The new church [...] is also a new theater. The Christian temples are deserted, the playhouses are filled with the faithful, the actor is taking the priest’s place... It is by the regenerated actor that the Christian will be saved (Locke, 209)

Conversely, Count Albert states,

À l’aurore des religions, reprit-il, le théâtre et le temple sont un même sanctuaire. Dans la pureté des idées premières, les cérémonies du culte sont le spectacle des peuples ; les arts prennent naissance au pied des autels ; la danse elle-même, cet art aujourd’hui consacré à des idées d’impure volupté, est la musique des sens dans les fêtes des dieux. La musique et la poésie sont les plus hautes expressions de la foi, et la femme douée de génie et de beauté est prêtresse, sibylle, et initiateur [...] La beauté, la femme, et l’amour, ne pouvaient perdre leur empire. Les hommes leur ont élevé d’autre temples qu’ils ont appelés théâtres et où nul autre dieu n’est venu présider

At the dawn of religions, he responded, the theater and the temple were the same sanctuary. In the purity of the first ideas, the cult ceremonies were the people’s spectacles. Art was born at the feet of these spectacles. Dance itself, this art which is today consecrated
to the ideas of impure delights, was the music of the senses at the gods’ parties. Music and
poetry are the highest expressions of faith, the woman gifted with genius and beauty was
the priestess, sybil, and teacher [...] Beauty, woman, and love could never lose their empire.
Men built them other temples that they called theaters and where no other god has come
to preside (Tome 2, LI).

Count Albert, critical of the arts and the theater, recognizes how theater has taken on the
functions of the church. The theater has become a holy place for the divine nature of women.
Though he sees it as a corrupting force, we must remember that Consuelo is a famous singer
and actress. Though she had left the stage to escape her fiancé and lived with the Rudolstadts,
she eventually returns to the stage. As the genuinely pious character of the novel, even as
recognized by Albert, we can see a link between the stage and religion. As she performs, she
becomes a goddess.

Let’s explore the religiosity of Consuelo as it parallels Enfantin’s views. In 1831, Enfantin
promoted his ideas about “the natural equality of the sexes and about the necessity of
liberating people’s sexual impulses and loving instincts from the rigid constraints of Christian
marriage laws on the one hand, and the debasement of adultery and prostitution on the other”
(Locke, 214). This view caused a significant rift in the school, and many of its followers left,
fearing the public perception of immorality. However, the other Father, a believer in ‘mystical
symbolism’ still put an “empty chair [...] beside his own for ‘La Femme’ - the woman who would
complete the priestly couple, a symbol of the equality of the sexes, and who would speak the
final word on the movement’s sexual doctrines” (215). Though women lacked religious
authority or equality in the dominant culture, the counterculture sought gender equality in the
church.
Similarly, Consuelo is presented as having religious superiority, as noted in the description of her earlier in this chapter. However, her celestial essence was not in line with the constraints of the church. The Chanoinesse, Comte Albert’s aunt, and the family’s priest doubted her purity because of her comportment around the young count. They suspected her of trying to seduce him and make him fall in love with her, abandoning his commitment to his fiancé. Her voice was one of the most beloved in her church choir, where she honed her talents. However, stage performance profaned her musical piety. Refusing the church’s rules for chastity, Consuelo allowed both her fiancé, Anzoleto, and Albert to watch over her while she slept. This broke moral conventions of not allowing a man to be alone with a woman, particularly in her bedroom at night. Finally, Consuelo was also doubtful of her own faith.

Consuelo is devout in her own way, continuously pledging her loyalty to God and proclaiming her righteous motivations, yet her devoutness was unorthodox and nonconformist. While Consuelo guarded her sexual purity or did so to the best of her ability, she certainly saw herself as equal or perhaps even superior to Anzoleto and Comte Albert without being prideful. Consuelo recognized her success on stage as exceeding Anzoleto’s. To preserve Anzoleto’s pride and not diminish his masculinity, Consuelo first denied her greatness. Then, she said that his performance would improve with practice. Finally, she admitted that her superior musical skills were because she had taken her studies seriously. In contrast, Anzoleto had neglected them: “Celles que tu ne sais pas, il faut les apprendre. Si tu avais voulu étudier sérieusement pendant les répétitions... Te l’ai-je dis ? / That which you don’t know, you must learn. If you had wanted to study seriously during rehearsals... What did I tell you?” (Tome I, XVIII). Anzoleto refused to be inferior to his lover and chose to have an affair with her greatest musical rival, Corilla.
Similarly, she recognized Albert’s pitfalls kindly.

Eh bien, que Dieu entende et reçoive cette mutuelle promesse, répondit Consuelo, transportée de joie. Nous reviendrons prier dans votre église, Albert, et vous m’enseignerez à prier ; car personne ne me l’a appris, et j’ai de connaître Dieu un besoin qui me consume. Vous me révélerez le ciel, mon ami, et moi, je vous rappellerai, quand il le faudra, les choses terrestres et les devoirs de la vie humaine

Well then, shall God hear and receive this mutual promise,” responded Consuelo, moved with joy. We will come back to pray in your church, Albert, and you will teach me to pray because no one has taught me how, and the need to know God consumes me. You will show me heaven, my friend, and me, I will remind you, when necessary, of worldly things and the obligations of human life (Tome II, XLVII)

Here, she acknowledges that she lacks religious training and flatters his religiosity. However, this is a trick to get him to show her the way out of the grotto in which they are hidden. Her performance here also grants her a divine quality in the eyes of Albert, convincing him to leave with her.

Leaders of the Saint-Simonian movement promoted the benefits of an egalitarian society that abolished class. The family sees Albert as ill because of his hyper moral fixations. His father believes he is fiscally irresponsible, reminding him that “donner tout dans un jour, c’était s’ôter le moyen de donner le lendemain / giving all today is to lose the ability to give tomorrow” (Tome I, XXVI). The Chanoinesse saw him as anti-government, saying of him:

Albert trouvait monstrueuses ces lois humaines qui autorisent les souverains à faire tuer des millions d’hommes, et à ruiner des contrées immenses, pour les caprices de leur orgueil et les intérêts de leur vanité. Son intolérance sur ce point devenait dangereuses

Albert found abhorrent the human laws that authorized sovereigns to kill millions of men and to ruin immense regions for their prideful whims and the interests of their vanity. His intolerance of this point became dangerous (Ibid).

In both cases, Albert posed a social risk to the family.
Albert and his family viewed finances through different moral lenses. The engagement between Comte Albert and Amélie, his cousin, shows this tension. The family arranged the engagement to preserve the family’s noble status and maintain the family’s wealth. However, there was never any romantic or sexual attraction between the two. They are both repulsed by one another. The family had hired Consuelo to be Amélie’s music tutor and expected her to respect the boundaries of employment. However, through no fault of her own, Albert quickly becomes enamored with this newcomer. Her pious nature is beautiful to him. Unfortunately, in the eyes of the Rudolstadt family, an affair or marriage to Consuelo would be a social and economic disaster for the family. As Sand’s critique of religion underscores the necessity of societal well-being through communal living, it follows that she also presents capitalism as a destructive force.

Should Albert renege on his commitment to Amélie, it would be the end of the family line as it stood. Primogenitor succession was still prominent under Marie-Thérèse, and the marriage of Albert and Amélie served to preserve the family’s dynastic power – socially, economically, and religiously. His religious and social values, which eschewed feudalistic systems in favor of an egalitarian society, fueled his refusal to marry Amélie. He does not want to participate in maintaining the current socio-economic structures that he finds sinful.

Let’s remember that Sand claims to have written La Filleule for purely literary reasons to appease the publishing house who had asked her to do so. In other words, it was to increase consumption. Though Sand does not claim to write Consuelo as a purely literary work, she is cognizant of the problems posed by the demands of capitalist society. In the “notice” she wrote for the book, Sand declares that the rush of capitalism does not allow for the necessary editing
of a novel and asks the reader to forgive any faults in her book. She goes on to state, “La première condition d’un ouvrage d’art c’est le temps et la liberté” (2). However, capitalism does not allow full access to either. In writing La Filleule, she lacked artistic liberties. In writing both Consuelo and La Comtesse de Rudolstadt, she lacked time. Successful, authentic writing requires both time and freedom, characteristics that the bohémienne character embodies as limitless. Therefore, it is logical that Sand related to and relied upon this image in her writing. Trapped in a capitalist and predominantly catholic reality, she could paint a utopia by using characters who eschewed these traditions.

Despite hiding her political criticisms, writing the fantastic was necessarily a political statement. According to Nodier,

Ce n’est pas sur le sol académique et classique de la France de Louis XIII et de Richelieu que cette littérature, qui ne vit que d’imagination et de liberté, pouvait s’acclimater avec succès (Nodier, xxxiii)

There was no way that the fantastic, which lives on imagination and freedom alone, could acclimate with any hope of success to the academic, classical France of Louis XIII and Richelieu (Ginsberg, 549).

The fantastic is a refusal of the aristocracy. How interesting is it that in a novel intended to be purely literary, La Filleule, Sand refers to this work by Nodier? Additionally, in her highly fantastic works of Consuelo and La Comtesse de Rudolstadt, she uses the figure of the Bohémien.

Disturbing the reader

The inability to read the novel is a denial of civility, a denial that Victor Hugo links to literature in his observation of ceci tuera cela. The written word represents a marker of a more
advanced civilization, whereas relying upon the visual exemplifies a less advanced one.

According to Christin,

The printing in question [printing of the novel] is in no way trying to be ‘civilized’: it has taken the image as its guide and seeks in its paradoxes to restore to written expression the poetry that was part of early cultures (471).

Nodier finds beauty and success in returning to a visual language; however, his readership does not find this beauty. Nodier focuses on the visual and not the literary, bucking the French reader from his “civilized” high horse. Nodier refuses the reader the skill of reading which marks his civilized nature, differentiating him from uncivilized societies. The civilized French reader becomes uncivilized.

Both Sand and Nodier focus on challenging the structures of writing and fiction to transcend and even assault the established laws of fiction. Using novel writing devices to criticize society is not unique, nor is the usage of Bohémiens to do so. In Suzanne Crosta’s critical analysis of La Réfugiée by Hédi Bouraoui, she explores how Bouraoui, more than a century later in 2012, uses a novel literary device, which he has named the “narratoème,” or a blend of narrative and poetic approaches. Narratoème “précise la volonté de transcréer, de traverser les frontières de tout ordre : du savoir, des arts, du vivre-ensemble” (56). Bouraoui uses the figure of the errant immigrant to coin the concept of the narratoème. The nomadic character embodies transgression by crossing political, geographic, and cultural boundaries. As Bouraoui chose to use an immigrant as the main character for a new writing style that transgresses previous writing styles, Charles Nodier chose the Bohémiens as the titular character for his novel approach the fantastic. Nodier’s development of the fantastic allowed for the transgressive
writings of George Sand in both La Filleule and Consuelo. By using an errant central figure, the reader is prepared for various transgressions, making literary transgressions more visible.

Similarly, the public perception of Bohémiens allows for the idea of existence outside the typical temporal structures. Whereas people were aware that the Roma arrived in France during the 15th-century fleeing persecution with letters of protection from the King of Bohemia, Bohémiens, in the public imagination, lacked any sort of geographical or temporal origin. Bohémiens seemed to cling to the past while simultaneously knowing the future. They wore tattered clothes and possessed clairvoyance. Just as experimental writing challenged the novel's structure, Bohémiens challenged the most basic concepts of the dominant culture – those of time and space. Whereas readers can visually identify Bohémiens, they could not fully understand the characters. Likewise, Nodier’s novel could be seen but not read, at least not in the traditional sense.

As we can see, Bohemia/la Bohème is an atopic topos. It is simultaneously where the Bohémien tziganes live, the space of the modern-day Czech Republic, the location of historic Bohemia, and a space for creative, rebellious writing. In all instances, it is a liminal space. For the Bohémien tziganes, it is everywhere yet nowhere as their nomadic nature leads them to roam from place to place. For Count Albert, his heritage no longer exists because the Habsburgs had taken it. For Sand and Nodier, it is a space where old writing traditions break way for the new.

In conclusion, Sand and Nodier developed new writing techniques which challenged the meaning of reading. They did so within the realm of la Bohème. For Nodier, innovation in form was more important than narrative novelty. However, this led to producing an unreadable text
which was a commercial failure. His retort to this failure was to return to the Fantastic, grounded in folklore. Sand found a muse in bohémien characters, which allowed her to explore writing as a concept. In La Filleule, she challenged the idea of Frenchness by manipulating traditional characters. In Consuelo, she, like Nodier, used the Fantastic to blur the lines between the literary and reality. Ultimately, Bohémiens continued to serve the aims of the French author as literary objects.

The two Sandian bohemienues, Morena and Consuelo, allow us to see this objectification in action. The characters function oppositely of one another. Morena, the main character of La Filleule, is an othered figure par excellence. She is a bohémienne orphan raised by a French family who cannot fully assimilate into French culture. She remains undeniably Bohémienne. Consuelo, unlike Morena, consistently defies what it means to be bohémienne within the French imagination. Her bohémienne mother raises her, yet she leads a rather pious life. She upholds many French moral standards despite her lack of French roots. Both characters cause the reader to question the influence of French culture on outsiders and the moral consequences (or lack thereof) of being an outsider. The two works parallel by relying upon the explicit and implicit images of la Bohème and its inhabitants to produce, which Sand agreed to make purely literary. These works place writing at the forefront in the eyes of most readers. Because of this veiling, Sand hid political and social critiques within these images to avoid censorship, as Rea notes. However, she hid these so well that the criticisms also became lost to the reader.

However, in a critical reading of the texts, it is tough to ignore the intertwined social and political commentaries. In speaking of her own work in this same letter, Sand states “Ce n’est
Her novel is not defined by a linear temporality but by the overarching influence of a king. This places her writing, intentionally or not, within the political realm. The three novels explored here are highly critical of religious, cultural, and economic norms of the time at the cost of reducing Romani people to the French image of the *bohémien*.

Romani people remained objectified even when the French author was trying to promote an egalitarian society, as is the case of Sand. The novels reduced the Roma to tools for literary creativity, keeping them as scapegoats for criticizing society. However, the symbolic meanings of the *bohémien* were less legible in the texts by Nodier and Sand than they had been in the texts by Mérimée and Hugo. By hiding the symbolism within the subtext, which the reader must actively decode, the inactive reader simply consumes a repetition of stereotypes that code the *bohémiens* as threats to French culture. This reinforced the readers’ own racial belief systems. In the next chapter, I show how Matéo Maximoff reappropriates this writing system to regain agency as a Romani man in Europe.
Chapter 4. Literary Reappropriation:
Matéo Maximoff Rewrites a Stereotype

As we have seen, in the 19th-century, the Gypsy stereotype flourished in French literature, reducing Romani people to literary tools and tropes. These tools allowed for a nuanced exploration of French/European identity(ies) and history(ies). Through the 19th-century, non-Romani people were the only known authorities on writing about the Roma. In reality, many of the observations held by these scholars, such as George Borrow, were biased and held assumptions about the populations they were studying. However, in the 20th-century, Romani voices started to be heard within the academic and literary realms. Matéo Maximoff, one of these voices, is often considered one of the first, if not the first, Romani author.39 He is a prominent author and scholar, whether or not he was the first. His works are worthy of academic study beyond niche categories such as “Romani Studies,” and literary scholars could reference him in broader contexts. His writings are a rebuttal to Romani discrimination and the literary tropes written in the 19th-century.

Who is Matéo Maximoff?

Let’s learn about Matéo Maximoff. Maximoff was born in 1917 in Barcelona. His father was Kaldé rash, born in Russia, and his mother was Manouche, born in France (Rouda, back cover). At the age of three, his family moved to France. As a child, Maximoff taught himself how to read and write as his parents were illiterate (Romarchive). Maximoff had “une enfance difficile” and survived a Nazi concentration camp (Rouda). As an adult, he became a missionary, author, and autoethnographer. Maximoff published over a dozen novels, most of which conserved the

39 I disagree somewhat with this characterization because it ignores the possibility of previous unpublished writers and assumes a knowledge of all literary bodies.
oral stories he learned as a child. He wrote countless articles documenting life as a Romani person in Europe, most published in the Journal of The Gypsy Lore Society, which publishes proceedings today under the name “Romani Studies.” Maximoff also translated the Bible into different Romani dialects. In 1985, French President Jacques Chirac honored him with the title of Knight of the Order of Arts and Literature (RomArchive).

Though Maximoff passed away in 1999, his daughter Nouka Maximoff conserves his legacy and is the sole distributor of his works. She is also active in the Roma community as a storyteller and activist. Other efforts honor and memorialize Maximoff. For example, in Paris, you can visit the Médiathèque Matéo Maximoff / the Matéo Maximoff Multi-Media Library. In 2011, his library was revitalized by the Association d’Études Tsiganes and the Fédération union nationale des institutions sociales d’action pour les Tsiganes (UNISAT). Today, the library continues, like Maximoff, documenting and sharing cultural information produced by and about Romani people. The library has over 5,000 books and articles and over 2,000 audio records (FNASAT.asso.fr). The impact of Maximoff’s works continues to influence Romani studies and cultural conservation efforts today.

Traditionally, Maximoff’s work is mostly appreciated for its ethnographic value, neglecting its literary value. Cécile Kovácsházy, in his article “Matéo Maximoff, romancier: une vie pour la littérature” explored the life of Maximoff and the impact of his writings, underscoring this idea. He concluded that

la destinée fatale des textes de Maximoff est qu’ils ne sont quasi jamais convoqués autrement que pour leur valeur documentaire [...] C’est un peu comme si l’on ne voyait en Marcel Proust qu’un intérêt sociologue à propos de la bourgeoisie et l’aristocratie françaises

---

40 This journal has a mixed history regarding non-biased publications. More recent research tends to have less biases.
du début du XXe siècle [...] De façon générales, les textes littéraires écrits par les Roms sont appréciable à maints égards: avant tout pour leurs qualités littéraires quand c’est le cas, et aussi pour la chance, rare, qu’ils offrent de faire entendre une voix romani, quand dans notre société on entend de façon saturée des discours sur les Roms, souvent très éloignés du réel d’ailleurs [...] mais si rarement des discours par des Roms.

The fatal destiny of Maximoff’s texts is that they are rarely seen for anything but their documentary value [...] It’s a bit like only seeing Marcel Proust’s sociological interest in the French bourgeoisie and aristocracy of the early 20th century [...]. In general, the literary texts written by Romani people should be appreciated in many respects. First of all, they should be appreciated for their literary qualities when that is the case. They should also be appreciated also for the rare chance they offer us to hear a Romani voice, especially when, in our society, we are inundated with discourses on Romani people which are often very far from the truth [...] but we rarely hear discourses by Romani people (77, emphasis his).

I try to avoid this pitfall. As such, this chapter relies on what is often referred to as “low theory” rather than “grand theory.” Whereas grand theory can “transcend particular genres, cultures or settings” (Fine, 47), this chapter does not attempt to transcend the limits of the texts to respect their contexts. In doing so, I hope to treat the ethnographic and literary aspects equitably.

Maximoff’s writings are bound by temporal, cultural, and religious constraints. To apply grand theory would be to ignore some of these constraints. Additionally, to apply non-Romani theorists to the text would be to repeat the harms done by the previously studied novels. Therefore, I rely on Maximoff’s own words. At times, I apply pertinent folklore theory as well.

The use of low theory does not negate the importance of this chapter. Instead, as Kovácsházy points out, it allows us to hear a Romani voice. This chapter explores what the production of that voice looks like and how that production, alongside the societal biases we bring with us, impacts our hearing.

That said, we cannot read these works in a vacuum. Maximoff learned to read and write through the French literosphere, and his career as a missionary certainly impacted his views. As such, French and Christian cultural influences and biases still exist within his corpus. This
context means that we cannot necessarily apply the findings found within this corpus to other writings outside this context. Additionally, it means that we can easily place Maximoff’s works in dialog with the texts treated earlier in this research.

Though Maximoff has written several novels, I have chosen to focus on two of those works: *Vinguerka* and *Les Ursitory*. I chose these novels because they explicitly address the connection between Romani and Gadji cultures. I have also chosen these books as I was able to access them. Sadly, French production of many of Maximoff’s novels has ceased, making it increasingly difficult to access the works. I had to purchase *Les Ursitory* from a collector in Sweden, whereas I could only access *Vinguerka* through interlibrary loan. This copy came from a library in Turkey, to which one of Maximoff’s friends had donated a collection of Maximoff’s work. *Savina* is another work that I have been able to access. This novel is an excellent study on heterolingual texts, Romani languages, and Romani justice systems. However, *Les Ursitory* and *Vinguerka* allow for a more focused study on the confluence of the novelesque and ethnographic recordings in spaces shared by the Roma and non-Roma.

These works blend fiction and historicity similarly to the works previously discussed. However, they do so from a critically different perspective. These novels demonstrate how the novelesque can build on extant beliefs amongst the dominant society to relieve some of the societal pressures and problems these beliefs create. In other words, they reappropriate and redefine stereotypes without sacrificing their novelesque nature.

**Writing justice**

To begin, let us start with a summary of the novel *Vinguerka*. The story starts with the marriage of two Roma adolescents - Sonia & Drago. After their union, they run away to the
forest to escape Dmitri, a gadjo and Russian prince, who wants Sonia for himself. A few years later, Dmitri finds Sonia and her baby boy alone in the woods, just having bathed. Seated on his horse, Dmitri forcefully picks up Sonia to kiss her and then drops her to the ground. The fall kills her. Dmitri claims it was an accident but laughs at her death. After killing Sonia, he kidnaps her and Drago’s child. To prevent Drago from exacting a just revenge, Dmitri has him imprisoned. In prison, the ghost of Sonia haunts Drago, whom he does not know is dead. He fears he is going insane. While in prison, his friend Xitro is arrested and placed in the same cell. After this arrest, Dmitri and his men massacre the people living in Drago and Xitro’s village. The rest of the novel explains how Dmitri and Xitro seek to avenge these deaths at the hands of Dmitri. In the end, Drago kidnaps who he thinks to be Dmitri’s son to avenge his wife and son, whom he believes are both dead. Justice turns full circle. Drago has kidnapped his own child and returned him to his proper family. Dmitri’s final wish is that the people of his country would leave the “tziganes” alone. The final line of the book is Dmitri’s declaration, “Laissez les tziganes tranquilles! / Leave the tziganes alone!” (256) which reads as Maximoff’s maxim.

Structurally speaking, the novel is cyclical. Maximoff tells the same story three times, more or less. He begins the novel by telling the reader about injustices faced by Romani people who are being murdered, unjustly accused of crimes, and not given fair trials to prove their innocence. We explore these examples later. Then, he tells the fictitious story summarized above, alternating between the perspectives of Dmitri and Drago. The reader reads the story from the perspective of current events, from the standpoint of a gadji, and from that of a Rom. In each of these retellings, a non-Romani person commits a crime. Yet, the offense is blamed on a Roma person who is punished for it.
Repetition, as is used in this novel, is a key component of folklore. In studying the role of repetition in oral literatures, Bennison Gray concludes that repetition, though often considered a sign of the less sophisticated nature of folk literature, is just a facet of the genre. He states, “Repetition is prevalent in folk and primitive literatures because these are both oral literatures and repetition is a direct consequence of their oral nature” (290). Furthermore, Gray states that “the repetition of incidents” is one of two “specific kinds of repetition within literary works that most distinguished oral literature from written” (296). The example above relies on repetition of incident. The other kind of repetition is that of formula, which is used less in Vinguerka. It is logical that in moving from oral traditions to the written, Maximoff would continue this trait. It also translates an oral story to written text while maintaining the characteristics of its traditional state. Maximoff translates not only language but also culture.

Looking at the first act of this repetition of incidents, Maximoff uses a narrative tool similar to what Mérimée used. Both authors cement their fictitious stories in reality. Whereas Mérimée uses the lighter context of his search for the location of the Battle of Munda (not the battle itself), Maximoff contextualizes his work in a darker reality. Chapter 1 of the book examines the current political state and recent atrocities committed against the Romani people. They faced murders, criminal accusations, police brutality, injustice, and inequality. For example, Maximoff recounts the true story of a Rom murdered in Germany shortly after the Holocaust. After jumping in line at the butcher shop, some people begin complaining.

Entendant le tumulte, un homme sort de sa boutique. Il porte un tablier blanc taché de sang. Il comprend que les femmes protestent contre le comportement du ‘Zigeuner’. Il tient à la main son hachoir car il est boucher. Quand il se rend compte que le fauteur de trouble est un Tzigane, il lui assène un coup. Un seul ! C’est un habile connaisseur. Le Rom gît à

41 That is the state of affairs in 1987 when the novel was published.
terre, mort. Il n’a poussé un seul cri. Les Nazis ont été vaincus par les Alliés, mais pas ce boucher allemand.

Hearing the ruckus, the man came out of his shop. He wore a white apron stained with blood. He understood that the women were protesting the ‘Zigeuner’s’ behavior. He held in his hand his meat cleaver, because he was a butcher. When he knew that the troublemaker was a Tzigane, he struck him once with the cleaver. One time! What an expert! The Rom lay on the floor, dead. He didn’t let out a single cry. The Allies vanquished the Nazis, but not this German butcher (*Vinguerka*, 12)

Another tragedy occurred in Spain,


The bus was full. At the station, a Gitan bumped into some travelers while getting off the bus. There was an officer there, a career military man, in his brand-new uniform. He let the Gitan come down the single step. Then, he pulled out his revolver and pulled the trigger. Once. The Gitan died. When the officer appeared at the trial, he was acquitted... and congratulated. This was during the time of General Franco (12)

In this chapter, Maximoff recounts four more stories like this – in which Romani people are innocently killed or imprisoned for a crime they did not commit. The ones I have chosen are representative of the other atrocities committed. The stories take place in Spain, Germany, France, and England. After these individual stories, he talks about the atrocities more broadly. These stories give the reader a painful, real context for the novel they are about to read. The narrative repetition that follows feels more life-like, holding more gravitas.

Whereas Mérimée remains in this quasi-real, quasi-fictitious realm. Maximoff refuses this literary trickery. Instead, Maximoff reminds the reader that they are about to encounter a work of fiction, at least as he is aware. After recounting the real-life details of the harsh realities faced by Romani people, he concludes the first chapter with this paragraph: “Mais comme on
That which shall follow is only a novel, but I’m not at all sure it isn’t true” (17). The effect of this paragraph lands the reader in a realm somewhere between the reading experiences created by Mérimée and Sand. Maximoff’s statement is reminiscent of the novelesque aspects of Sand’s works, in which she reminds us of the fact we are reading a work of fiction and not reality with her consistent references to the *romanesque*. We are critically aware of the novelesque nature but blending reality with fiction reminds the reader that the novelesque is not necessarily untrue.

By working in this middle ground, Maximoff can shift how we perceive reality and fiction, both of which needed and still need a makeover when it comes to the perception of Romani people. Maximoff blends in extant stereotypes and challenges them. He can introduce new cultural information to the reader in an accessible way. In short, he can bring a Romani voice to a pre-existing literary champ that profited off the discrimination of people like him, reappropriating the literary motif for the benefit of himself and other Romani people. The following pages examine examples of how he did this in the text.

Maximoff does not eschew or avoid the extant stereotypes. Rather, he develops them further, showing that event characters who fulfill the stereotype are more complex than the stereotype allows. He also shows how some imagery linked to stereotypes has a deeper cultural meaning or context. For example, the title character, Vinguerka, is a dancer. We have seen the Bohemian dancer cliché in the characters of Esmeralda, Carmen, Morena, and other texts not examined within this dissertation. Unlike the other characters, we are given more context into dancing culture. Vinguerka, or Sonia as is her given name, earns this nickname because of her
mastery of the Vinguerka dance. We first read about the Vinguerka when the young girl dances this dance for the Russian nobility. It’s worth noting that Dmitri is in the audience.

Son père, qui joue de la balalaïka se lève et lui demande :
-Tu veux danser ?
De la tête, elle fait signe que oui.
-Qu’est-ce que tu veux danser ?
Alors, toute fière d’elle-même, elle crie
-Vinguerka !
La plus belle des danses de la troupe, mais aussi la plus gracieuse et la plus difficile. Celui qui dirige la troupe se lève à son tour, son archer à la main, et ordonne aux musiciens :
-Vinguerka !

Her father, who played the balalaïka, got up and asked her, ‘Do you want to dance?’ She nodded her head yes. ‘What do you want to dance?’ Proud of herself, she yelled, ‘Vinguerka!’ It was the troupe’s most beautiful dance. It was also the most graceful and the most difficult. The troupe’s director got up in turn, bow in hand, and ordered the musicians “Vinguerka!” (27)

Young Sonia has an innate talent for dance. Russian and Romani alike were amazed by her skills

“En effet, la petite fille danse à la manière d’un papillon autour d’une flamme. Les Russes ne sont pas moins extasiés / As a matter of fact, the young girl danced like a butterfly around a flame. The Russians were no less raptured by her” (Ibid). The young Russian prince, Dmitri, is so mesmerized that he asks his father to buy her, “Papa, lui demande son fils, achète-la moi ! / ‘Daddy,’ his son asked him, ‘buy her for me!’” (28). Her own mother was impressed, too. “Elle vient de perdre une petite fille, mais elle a gagné une étoile / She just lost her little girl, but she gained a star” (28).

From this scene, we can deduce two concepts. First, dancing is an integral part of Romani culture. There are learned dance routines that vary in difficulty and that dancers practice to master. One should be proud to learn, know, and master these routines. Second, the Russian court pays to consume Romani culture. Because the Russian court is essentially buying people,
like chattel, performance comes at a great cost to Vinguerka and, by extension, the Roma. Profitability depends upon the performativity of Romani identity. As demonstrated in my chapters on Hugo, Mérimée, Sand, and Nodier, the dominant culture only recognizes the tzigané through the performance of the stereotype. As Maximoff shows her, this cultural performativity is complicated. On one hand, it can diminish cultural significance by modifying tradition to appease outsiders. On the other hand, it is a profitable act in which one can choose to participate.

Lauren Swayne Barthold examines this paradox in “True Identities: From Performativity to Festival” by expanding upon Judith Butler’s theory of performativity and Hans-Georg Gadamer’s concept of festival. Vinguerka has agency when she performs, though this agency is restricted by the audience’s gaze. This is a particular form of agency that Barthold describes as “not one dependent upon a pre-established subject defined by intentions or will” (812). Vinguerka does not determine the will of the audience but is able to choose how she relates to it. Because of her agency, this performativity has the capacity to be subversive. As Barthold explains, “[p]erforming effects social change by reforming and refiguering past practices” (813). The agency of her performance allows her to perform authentically, not only for the audience’s gaze. However, this subversive power is limited, particularly for the Roma. Barthold reminds her reader that “the experience of power comes only as a result of belonging to history” (814). The Roma character’s ability to change the power dynamic is minimized by dominant society’s exclusion of them from history.42

42 Barthold concludes her essay by noting that “festival helps us understand that winning, dominating, and/or excluding can never be the goals of a viable community” (821). The liberty to express true identity functions to unite society rather than divide it.
This cultural product is profitable, and the Roma can capitalize on its performance.

According to Maximoff, the Roms Kalderash, a specific group of Romani people, expect young people to learn a musical skill and another trade, which is typically in metalwork. Of children, he states:

Dès son enfance, il a aidé son père dans son travail. Pas aux champs, mais à la forge. Chez les Roms Kalderash, qui sont des chaudronniers, on dit qu’un bon travailleur est né avec un marteau et un burin dans les mains. Mais il y a un second métier, celui qui se pratique habituellement le soir. Chaque jeune doit apprendre à faire quelque chose : danser, chanter, ou jouer d’un instrument de musique. (33)

From childhood, he helped his father in his work. Not in the fields, but at the forge. Amongst the Roms Kalderash, who are metalworkers, we say that a good worker is born with a hammer and a burin (chisel) in his hands. But there is a second profession, one that is usually practiced in the evening. Each young person must learn to do one of these: dance, sing, or play an instrument (33).

Romani people make a living through metalwork during the day and profit from performance in the evening. Sonia is very aware of this money-making venture. When her father asks her to dance again, in the presence of her family...

She highlights the internal risk of monetizing cultural performances. The performance could lose its inherent value, reducing it to something to be consumed by those who do not fully understand it.

In general, the gadjo, or non-Romani, pays to consume this performance -- a dangerous exchange. As the experience with Dmitri shows, non-Romani persons try to take advantage of this capitalization. Rather than respecting performance limitations, the non-Romani prince thinks that his capital can purchase the right to watch the performance and the people...
performing. Through this capitalization process, there is a risk that the spectator will confound performance and performer, thinking he has the right to consume both.

Literarily, Maximoff, through the recalling of the dancing Tzigane, reappropriates the French literary trope to further his novel. While certainly, the objectification of this young girl merits a feminist critique, it also does positive work for the narrative and the reputations of Romani women. Sonia is not only a dancer for the Gayzi; she uses her agency to dance. She is not only an object of desire for the Gayzi; she is a well-rounded person. She gets married; she has a child; and, sadly, Dmitri murders her. Because of this, the stereotype is no longer a stereotype. She does not just check a box for the narrative. Additionally, Maximoff profits from the images of characters like Esmeralda and Carmen to present a novel using his Romani voice.

Another stereotype is that of the kidnapper. This theme is abundant within the novel. If you remember, a significant crux of the denouement is that Drago re-kidnaps his child, who Dmitri had stolen. Maximoff makes it clear that this stereotype is quite absurd. In his introduction to the novel, he states,

Pratiquement dans tous les pays mais surtout en Europe court une légende tenace au sujet des Roms : ce sont des voleurs d’enfants [...]. On se demande d’ailleurs comment ils l’auraient pu, car s’il y a des gens particulièrement surveillés par la police, c’est bien eux.

In practically all countries, but especially in Europe, there is a tenacious legend about Roms: they steal children [...]. We must ask ourselves how they could. If there is a group of people particularly surveilled by the police, it’s the Roms (45).

As we saw in the introduction, governments have consistently surveilled the Roma. Instead, Maximoff argues that it’s not Roma kidnapping other children, but it’s non-Roma stealing Roma children:

Un peu d’histoire, voulez-vous ? Si nous avons dit qu’il est difficile à un Rom de voler un enfant étranger à sa race, le contraire est très facile, parfois de la manière la plus officielle.
Would you like a bit of history? If we have said it’s difficult for a Rom to steal a foreign child, the opposite is very easy, sometimes in the most official ways (45-6).

This contrasts with what Hugo did in *Notre-Dame de Paris*. In Hugo’s work, the *tziganes* kidnapped Esmeralda which erased her French identity. The kidnapping mirrors how the dominant society views the Roma as an actively dangerous threat. However, Maximoff teaches the reader that the inverse is true: The state is an active threat against the Roma. Police remove Roma children from their parents because they have different hair colors or eye colors and are assumed to be kidnapping victims. These children are more at risk of trafficking.

I cite Huub van Baar’s account of this at length because he does a great job of highlighting how the state uses language and stereotypes to justify the legal kidnapping of a child.

On 16 October 2013, policemen ‘discovered’ a blonde girl in a Romani ghetto in the Greek town of Farsala. They were suspicious and took the child pending further investigations. The girl’s discovery generated sensationalist headlines in many parts of the word, the implication being from the outset that ‘the blond angel’ could not be a Romani child. Images and stories of this ‘blonde angel Maria’ - as she was dubbed by the media - were traveling the world as being about a child who had probably been stolen by the local Roma. [...] In the same week that police discovered Maria, two similar cases made news elsewhere. In Dublin and Athlone in Ireland, the police took two ‘blonde’ children from Irish Romani families after neighbors expressed concerns about the familial links of these children with the elders of the households [...] In all three of these cases, the authorities drew upon DNA testing to ascertain genetic links between the children and elders in the households in which they lived. The children in Ireland turned out to be the natural offspring of the couples from whom they were taken. The Greek Maria had been born to Bulgarian Romani parents who had given her up in a case of informal adoption due to their poverty (28-29).

These cases point to the widespread suspicions held regarding Romani children. Furthermore, these cases must have been highly traumatic to the children and parents involved. As Maximoff points out, Romani children can be taken “in the most official of ways” (46).

Rather, this myth seems to come from a threatening fable repeated by non-Romani parents to keep their children in line. Maximoff quotes this maxim, “Il arrive qu’un Gayzio fasse peur à
gosse en le menaçant: ‘Si tu ne manges pas ta soupe, je te donnerai aux Bohémiens! / A Gadji wants to scare his kid by threatening him, ‘if you don’t eat your soup, I’ll give you to the Bohemians!’ (Vinguerka, 47). Just like there is probably no witch in the woods feeding you candy to cook you and no wolf dressed as grandma to trick you, the Romani are not there to kidnap you. Instead, they simply functioned as scapegoats.

There are many cases in which non-Roma justify hate crimes against the Romani using this myth. Van Baar notes that this myth “re-emerges repeatedly, often in times of crisis,” although “there are no known cases in which Roma have demonstrably been involved in kidnapping” (29). Instead, it is easy for non-Roma to become angry at or blame the Romani people living there when trouble arises. Blaming Romani people for kidnapping justifies atrocious acts committed against them. Van Baar cited a 2008 case when a Romani woman in Italy was accused of kidnapping, “though no evidence was presented to prove the allegation” (ibid).

However, the issue became politicized, and a “few days later, some 60 Italian citizens assaulted a Romani housing settlement housing around 400 Roma in Ponticelli near Naples in retaliation for the alleged kidnapping. Molotov-cocktails were thrown into the ghetto, resulting in its complete destruction” (ibid). In 2013, in response to the aforementioned cases, “Serbian skinheads attempted the violent abduction of a ‘blonde’ Romani boy from his parents” (Ibid).

These examples demonstrate what Maximoff has narrated: Dominant society uses untrue stereotypes to justify harming the Roma.

However, Maximoff uses fiction to rewrite reality and how Romani people are read in novels. In Vinguerka, he flips the script on reality and fiction. His fictional book does not rely on the limits of canonical myths but the realities faced by Roma. It is the Romani child who is
kidnapped, not the gadjo. In a fateful reversal of the status quo, the victim receives justice. In reality, the Roma rarely receive justice and must live in an unjust society.

Drago exacts a sort-of justice ordained by destiny. Drago did kidnap the child of the prince out of vengeance. Unlike most kidnapping tales, Drago sought revenge for what a Gadjo had done to him - to inflict the same suffering upon Dmitri. If Dmitri had not been “on the hunt” for Vinguerka, if he hadn’t killed both Drago’s wife and son, if the justice system had been just, if Dmitri had been held accountable for his action, Drago would not have committed this crime. Additionally, the child Drago took was his own child - not Dmitri’s. Dmitri had replaced his dead child with Choukar, Drago’s son.

Because of this, Dmitri did not pursue Drago for having committed this crime.

Drago croir avoir enlevé mon fils ; il ignore que c’est le sien et je veux qu’il l’ignore toujours. Je ne veux ni poursuite ni arrestation. Drago n’a pas enlevé un enfant ; il n’a fait que récupérer le sien, mais il ne le sait pas. Dites-vous bien que le voleur d’enfant c’est moi.

Drago believes he kidnapped my son. He’s oblivious that he is his own son, and I want him to remain oblivious. I don’t want him followed or arrested. Drago didn’t kidnap a child; he only retrieved his own, but he doesn’t know it. Know that I am the kidnapper (256).

In a rare twist of events, Dmitri, the Gadjo, admits his crime.

Non, Drago n’est pas vengé, mais je reconnais que Dieu me punit. Ainsi, mes amis, c’est le dernier repas que nous prenons ensemble. Par la volonté de Dieu et pour obtenir son pardon, j’ai décidé de me retirer du monde pour vivre en moine dès que la princesse sera morte. J’ai fait le nécessaire pour que ce domaine et tous mes biens soient partagés entre mes nombreux cousins. L’église recevra aussi une bonne part. Mon dernier désir sera :
Laissez les Tziganes tranquilles !

---

43 The reader may notice here that a comparison might be drawn between Choukar, Drago’s son, and Sand’s Morena. Both children were raised by prominent members of the national society. However, Maximoff does not provide enough information about the Choukar’s time with Dmitri to draw these comparisons. Choukar was kidnapped as an older infant or younger toddler, but a precise age was not given. Furthermore, it is not entirely clear how long he was with Dmitri. It seems to be 1-2 years based on the actions of the plot, but Maximoff does not provide this information.
No, Drago didn’t get revenge, but I realize that God is punishing me. So, my friends, this is the last meal we will have together. By God’s will and to be forgiven, I have decided to retreat from the world and live as a monk as soon as the princess dies. I have already arranged for the kingdom and all of my belongings to be divided amongst my numerous cousins. The church will also receive a good part. My last desire is this: Leave the Tziganes alone! (256)

This last line is vital. It is a beckoning call. Maximoff is begging for his people to have the space and freedom to exist, something which the European penal system and social spheres did not, and still do not, allow.

Of this justice system, even within the fictitious realm, Maximoff shows that it has two sides.

Si Dmitri n’était pas un prince, n’importe quel tribunal l’aurait condamné pour ce meurtre. Malheureusement, il y a deux justices : une clémente pour ceux qui détiennent l’autorité et une qui est dure et sans pitié pour les malheureux de notre espèce

If Dmitri wasn’t a prince, any court would have condemned him for this murder. Sadly, there are two justice systems – a lenient one for those who have authority and one that is stern and without pity for miserable people like us (248)

And within this justice system, all autonomy and equality for the Roma are erased. Maximoff reinforces this idea throughout the novel. For example, Drago, who was imprisoned by Dmitri, declares “Mon crime? C’est d’avoir été le rom [mari] d’une très belle femme / My crime? It’s having been the rom [husband] to a very beautiful woman” (127). Later, the narrator reminds us, “Que veux-tu, le monde est ainsi fait, il y a les puissants et il y a les faibles. Le destin a voulu que nous, les Roms, soyons des faibles / What do you want? The world is like that. There are the strong and the weak. Destiny decided that we, the Roms, are weak” (246).

Maximoff also takes the time to recount the legal history of anti-Romanyism. In Spain in 1560,
Les enfants des Gitans sont envoyés aux galères dès l’âge de quatorze ans, pour la simple raison que les rassemblements de plus de deux personnes sont interdits par la loi, ou encore parce que les petites filles sont vêtues ‘en Gitanes’. Les adultes, eux, étaient purement et simplement condamnés à mort.

Gitan children were sent to the galleys at fourteen years old for the simple reason that gatherings of more than two people were illegal or even because the young girls were dressed as ‘Gitanes.’ The adults, they were simply condemned to death (46).

A royal ordonnance in Sweden in 1637 forbid the

clergé de baptiser ou d’enterrer des Roms. Et si les nomades s’opposaient à l’application de cette loi, les hommes étaient pendus, les femmes et les enfants expulsés du royaume

clergy from baptizing or burying Roms. And if the nomads opposed the carrying out of this law, the men were hanged. The women and children were deported (ibid).

In France in 1862,

Les enfants roms sont enfermés dans des hospices simplement parce que ce sont des descendants de ‘Bohémiens’. Sans doute les aurait-on jetés en prison n’était leur jeune âge

The Romani children were confined in hospices simply because they were the descendants of ‘bohemians.’ Without a doubt, they would have thrown them in prison if it weren’t for their young age (ibid).

Frederick the First, in 1700 Germany,

sans autre forme de procès et seulement parce que ce sont des nomades, ordonne par édit d’envoyer les hommes aux travaux forcés et de marquer les femmes au fer rouge après les avoir fait fouetter

without another form of trial and only because they were nomads, ordered by edict to send all men to work camps and to mark the women with a hot iron after whipping them (ibid).

Maria Theresa, of whom Sand made mention, also enforced cruel legislation. She

a ordonnée de bâtonner les parents tziganes et d’enlever leurs enfants sous prétexte qu’ils vivent nus. Ces enfants se verront confiés à des familles paysannes qui les éléveront

ordered that the Tzigane parents be beaten with a baton and that their children be taken under the pretext they lived nude. These children were sent to peasant families who raised them (ibid).
This was not the only legislation Maria Theresa enacted regarding the Roma. However, Maximoff chose one, highlighting the systematic kidnapping of Romani children. Charles VI, emperor of Moravie, ordered, in 1721, that

les Roms et les Romnia soient purement et simplement tués. Les enfants, eux, seront envoyés dans des hospices pour y être éduqués

The Roms and Romnia were purely and simply killed. The children were sent to hospices to be educated (ibid).

Five years later, he modified this law. The men were to be hanged while the women and children under ten years old “auront l’oreille coupée pour qu’on puisse les identifier facilement / have the ear cut so they can be easily identified” (ibid). As Maximoff’s retelling shows, historically speaking, the Roma had to fear being kidnapped or killed and not the inverse. These factoids reinforce and repeat the kidnapping in the narrative. It was not a Romani person kidnapping a non-Romani child but a Romani child being kidnapped. The novesque and reality act as mirrors, reflecting truths in one another.

**Maximoff as teacher**

Maximoff uses intertextuality as self-reference, returning to narrative strategies, as Mérimée used it within Carmen. Whereas Mérimée’s intertexts establish a pan-European backdrop within which Mérimée is situating himself, Maximoff’s usage often serves a more pedagogical role. For example, Chapter IV of Part IV of *Vinguerka* explores the marriage rites and culturally held beliefs surrounding marriage. Maximoff explains to his reader

Dans certaines tribus, on fiançait les enfants avant leur naissance, à condition évidemment que l’un soit un garçon et l’autre une fille. L’auteur a raconté une telle scène dans son roman *Savina*. Heureusement que ces pratiques ont aujourd’hui totalement disparu. Chez les Roms Kalderash, la demande en mariage, les fiançailles et le mariage se déroulaient selon des coutumes que l’auteur a déjà décrites dans d’autres ouvrages ainsi que dans la revue *Les Études Tziganes*. L’enlèvement de la jeune fille se pratique surtout chez les
Manouches, mais maintenant aussi chez les Roms. Dans ce cas, on ne célèbre pas le mariage puisqu’il a déjà eu lieu entre les jeunes. Mais la Kris condamne souvent le père du garçon à payer une amende symbolique au père de la jeune fille. La jeune fille qui se laisse enlever par un Gayzio n’est plus reçue dans sa tribu à moins qu’elle n’y ramène son Gayzio. Celui-ci devient alors un Rom ; ainsi ses enfants le seront aussi, tant il est vrai que chez les Roms, comme aussi dans d’autres tribus, l’enfant est roi. On pardonne toutes les fautes de ses parents à cause de lui.

In certain tribes, parents arranged their children’s marriages before birth, obviously on the condition that one would be a boy and the other a girl. The author tells of such a story in his novel Savina. Thankfully these practices have completely stopped today. Amongst the Roms Kalderash, the marriage proposal, engagement, and wedding go according to the customs that the author has already described in other works as well as the journal Les Études Tziganes. The taking of young girls happens primarily amongst the Manouches, but also amongst the Roma today. In this case, there is no marriage celebration because the marriage has already happened between the young couple. But the tribunal will often require the boy's father to pay a symbolic fine to the father of the girl. The young girl who lets herself be taken by a gadjo will no longer be welcomed in her tribe unless she brings her Gayzio back with her. This boy then becomes a Rom, as well as their children. It is very much true that amongst the Roma and other tribes, the child is king. We pardon all the parent’s errors because of him (218).

In this excerpt, Maximoff presents information both directly and indirectly. He clearly explains what happens in the case of premarital sex. He explains what happens when a young girl has relations with a non-Roma person. He describes the criminality and punishments involved and more. However, he does not write a complete explication of marriage rites. Instead, he puts the onus on the reader.

Intertext gives the reader tools for learning. By referring to himself in the third person - the author/auteur - he requires the reader to reflect on who is writing this text, a Rom. By referencing his contributions to Les Études Tziganes, he establishes his academic authority and gives the reader another tool for research beyond Maximoff’s own writings. He names another research tool by citing one of his other novels, Savina. In naming this novel, he also reminds the reader that the text they are reading is not only a work of fiction but a source of information on
Romani culture. He also informs the reader that there is an extant corpus of Romani literature. Intertext requires the reader to work.

The editorializing here is reminiscent of the fourth chapter of Carmen. Though Mérimée attempts to bring an unbiased view of the Romani, he fails. While Mérimée concludes the chapter by stating “En voilà bien assez pour donner aux lecteurs de Carmen, une idée avantageuse sur mes études sur le Rommani / I have surely said enough to give the readers of Carmen a favourable idea of my Romany studies” (Mérimée, 106; trans. by Mary Loyd), his studies are quite shallow. He focuses on his perception. He states “lorsqu’on en a vu un seul, on reconnaîtrait entre mille un individu de cette race / once you’ve seen you, you can recognize one person of this race from a crowd of a thousand” (99). He goes on to focus on how he perceives them as beautiful or ugly, criminal, and threatening. Maximoff’s writing challenges Mérimée’s approach. Maximoff certainly allows space for the reader to react. He describes a cultural practice that he understands is quite repulsive, but he does so in a way that acknowledges that Romani culture is not stagnant. Like all cultures, it shifts and changes. Mérimée treats the culture as an inanimate object, Maximoff presents it as a living thing.

Narratively speaking, Maximoff’s section on marriage also serves to move the story along. At the end of this excerpt, there is a page break. After the page break, the author-narrator returns to the story. His friend, Sherkano, offers Drago his sister, Melcho, as a bride, as Drago was now a widower and free to remarry. This was difficult for Drago to accept as he was still mourning. The author recounts,

Drago qui connaît toutes ces coutumes n’est donc pas particulièrement étonné quand Sherkano lui offre Melcho. Ce n’est pas la première fois qu’il voit cela. Mais à lui, on n’avait jamais offert de femme car on le savait fiancé à Vinguerka. Et lui, n’avait-il pas donné sa
soeur à son ami Xitro [...] Le jeune Rom ne sait que dire ni que faire [...] Le souvenir de Vinguerka est encore très vivace en lui.

Drago, who knew all of these customs, wasn’t particularly surprised when Sherkano offered him Melcho. It wasn’t the first time he had seen this. But no one had ever offered him a wife because they knew he was engaged to Vinguerka. Had he not himself given his sister to his friend Xitro? [...] The young Rom didn’t know what to say or do. The memory of Vinguerka was still very much alive in him (220).

This scene shows a difference between knowledge of customs and the emotions they invoke.

For Drago, it was difficult, but he understood the cultural context which allows for such demands – the culture Maximoff just explained. Secondly, it will enable the reader to decode additional cultural information regarding marriages. For example, women are given in marriage by the men in their families. Maximoff demonstrates pedagogical awareness through this chapter: He explains the topic, notes resources for additional research, and then gives an object lesson from which the student (reader) can decode further information. Intertext functions to move the narrative along.

*Les Ursitory*, the other novel of interest in this chapter, also functions pedagogically but in a less overt way. A synopsis of the story will follow; however, it is not necessary for understanding the pedagogical tool Maximoff employs. Within *Les Ursitory*, Maximoff does not rely on intertext. Instead, he uses footnotes to incorporate Romani terms legibly. Here are just a couple of examples of this from page two of the novel:

les Roms se groupèrent dans la plus grande chéra (1) pour décider l’ordre de la cérémonie [...] les Romnia leur servaient l’eau-de-vie, pendant que les borayas (2) chantaient et dansaient [...]  
Footnotes:  
(1) Tente. Pluriel : cheri  
(2) Les jeunes femmes

The Roms gathered in the largest chéra (1) to decide on the order of the ceremony [...] the Romnia served them brandy while the borayas (s) were singing and dancing.
Footnotes:
(1) Tent. Plural: cheri
(2) Young (unmarried) women

Maximoff introduces Romani vocabulary in culturally significant situations. In the first, the tent is a sacred place for discussing religious ceremonies. In the second instance, the married women (Romnia) perform a different role in these ceremonies than unmarried women (borayas).

To make this a genuinely pedagogical function, Maximoff expects the reader to learn and understand these terms as he later uses them without footnotes. For example, a few pages later, we read of a character visiting another character,

pour la première fois depuis les fêtes, une femme, Malilina, belle-soeur de Frinkelo, se présenta à la chéra de Dunicha

for the first time since the holidays, a woman, Malilina, Frinkelo’s sister-in-law, showed up at Dunicha’s chéra (8).

The reader must rely on their previous learning to understand the context. Maximoff places the onus on the reader rather than repetitively on himself.

In the above example, Maximoff uses what Mikhail Bakhtin calls *heteroglossia*, or “a diversity of social speech types (sometimes even diversity of languages)” (1078). While Bakhtin’s terminology defines linguistic diversity as differences of dialects, registers, and tones, here I focus on the language difference. Linguistic unity is not natural. He explains that “A unitary language is not something given (dan) but is always in essence posited (zadan)” (1084). A singular language is imposed on the speaker. Therefore, when heteroglossia is employed, it is always rebellious. The use of a unitary language defends national identity at the expense of
others. By refusing linguistic diversity, it leads to the exclusion of exterior world views (1084).

By using the Romani language, Maximoff expands the limits of French identity.

As Suresh A. Canagarejeh explains in Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations, using two languages in dialogue (which reading is a form of dialogue) creates an inclusive space. Like I stated above, this act also requires active participation.

Canagarejeh notes a humorous encounter between a fruit salesman and a tourist to demonstrate this. Neither participant speaks the other's language fluently. They negotiate a space in-between. The interlocutors use both languages and hand gestures to negotiate a price on bananas and complete a sale (35-36). Passivity would not have allowed the exchange. Both had to participate actively, trying new words in a foreign language, decipher unknown words in said language, and occasionally become physically active to mime ideas and concepts. The introduction of Romani words creates a new space in which non-Roma and Roma can communicate clearly, but only if the parties actively work together.

The force of the supernatural

Unlike Vinguerka, Les Ursitory is a fairytale, albeit of a very dark variety. The novel begins on Christmas eve and focuses on three main characters: Dunicha, Téréina, and Arniko. Dunicha is a feared witch. Téréina is her daughter and recent widow. Arniko is Téréina’s son. On Christmas eve, Téréina gives birth to her son, Arniko. Téréina is fearful that Arniko will die young from a painful death, much like her deceased husband. Her mother, Dunicha, reassures her daughter and tells her how she has once communed with the Ursitory.\(^\text{44}\) Dunicha tells Téréina that she

\(^{44}\) The Ursitory, according to Maximoff, are three fairy-like creatures who appear three days after a child is born to determine the child’s fate.
listened to the fate the Ursitory decided for her daughter on the third day after she had given birth. Téréina was to live to age forty, so long as she married by age twenty and had a son by age twenty-one. In giving birth to Arniko, Téréina fulfills this prophecy, guaranteeing her life until she turns forty. Téréina wants to know her son’s fate, though Dunicha warns against it. Téréina is persistent, and Dunicha agrees. When Arniko is three days old, the two women listen to the Ursitory.

Unbeknownst to Dunicha, earlier that day, she had cut firewood from a tree growing from a man’s grave. She was burning this log for heat. The Ursitory decide someone should pay for the dishonor committed against the dead man. However, the Ursitory had already sealed Dunicha and Téréina’s fates. Therefore, it was Arniko who had to pay. The Ursitory decide that Arniko must pay the debt and declare he shall die when the last of the log is burned. Quick thinking, Dunicha grabs the burning log and throws it in the snow. Téréina spends the rest of her life protecting this log. Her protection gives Arniko supernatural strength and seeming immortality.

At the same time, another woman who also gave birth on Christmas eve dies. The tribe, already convinced that Dunicha’s malevolence killed her son-in-law, blames the witch for this death. They go to kill her. Sensing her impending death, Dunicha tells Téréina to flee far from the tribe to protect herself and her son. Téréina watches the tribe brutally kill her mother before she escapes. The rest of the novel tells of how this moment impacted their lives. They work for a Romanian baron until Arniko seeks peace amongst Romani tribes. Eventually, Arniko avenges his grandmother’s death. As predicted by the Ursitory, Téréina dies shortly after her fortieth birthday, and, finally, Arniko’s wife burns the log to kill him because he is unfaithful.
Fatalism and supernatural occurrences situate this story well within the realm of pure fiction. The two themes found here, the magical and the occult, are often employed in literature featuring gypsies, gitans, and/or tziganes. When presenting these topics, Maximoff does not rely on the tool of editorializing to educate as we saw he would later do in Vinguerka with lengthy explanations of cultural information. Rather, he wants to engulf the reader in a story, albeit a particularly Romani one. Just as he gave justification for the context of Vinguerka, he does so for Les Ursitory:

L’histoire que vous allez lire est la plus extraordinaires que les Roms aient connue [...] Notre race a vu beaucoup de vols, d’enlèvements d’enfants, des crimes de toutes sortes, des meurtres, des assassins, et pourtant celle-ci [cette histoire] dépasse en horreur tout ce qu’on peut imaginer

The story you are going to read is the most extraordinary that the Roms have ever known[...] Our people have suffered many thefts, kidnappings, crimes of all sorts, murders, assassinations, and yet this one [this story] is more horrific than anything one could imagine (3).

Whereas Vinguerka was possibly true, this is the most extraordinary, or beyond the realm of what is ordinary. Furthermore, this fictitious horror story exceeds the terrifying nature of reality.

Witchcraft is one tool used to depict horror. The non-Romani reader expects Romani women to practice specific types of witchcraft. Carmen created a love spell and practiced cartomancy, for example. Esmeralda had a magical goat who could count. Literature often casts Romani women as fortune-tellers. These novels present a one-sided view of sorcery - the craft is to be feared and is dangerous. In the novel, however, Maximoff challenges this view and complicates the themes. He does not deny that many Roma practice witchcraft, rather he brings a more balanced view to it. He provides two opposing Romani viewpoints on witchcraft
as it can be feared or celebrated, used for good or evil. It is not necessarily the witch or magic that is scary.

First, we have the negative viewpoint. Through Teréina’s marriage to Frinkelo, her family belonged to the Minesti (a tribe). The Minesti feared Teréina’s mother, Dunicha, because of her magical powers. Frinkelo dies as a young man, only six months after his wedding. They blame Dunicha.

Les Minesti, parents de Frinkelo, avaient chassé aussitôt Téréina parce que, disaient-ils, leur fils était mort par la faute de la vieille Dunicha. Ils savaient, comme tous les Roms, que Dunich était une drabarni (1) et que, s’il y avait une sagesse, on ne devrait jamais épouser la fille de la drabarni. Si dans le désir de se venger, les Minesti n’avaient point tué Téréina, c’est uniquement parce qu’ils redoutaient sa mère.

The Minesti, Frinkelo’s relatives, quickly ran off Téréina because, they said, their son was dead because of old Dunicha. Like all the Roms, they knew that Dunicha was a drabarni (1) and that, if there was a wise woman, one should never marry the daughter of the drabarni. If in the desire to seek revenge, the Minesti hadn’t yet killed Téréina, it’s only because they feared her mother (5-6).

The parentheses here refer to a footnote which translates drabarni as sorcière or witch. The Minesti, as mentioned earlier, kill Dunicha because she is a witch. This background information tells the reader much about the beliefs surrounding witches. One, they can cause death. Two, their powers have some sort of hereditary influence. Three, witches should be feared. Dunicha speaks of her powers herself when telling Téréina that she knows she will soon die.

Dunicha warns Téréina that she will be in danger after her death.

[...]il faut fuir le plus loin possible, loin de tous les Roms. Sinon, ils te feraient beaucoup de mal, comme ils ont essayé de m’en faire. Encore moi, je suis une sorcière. Je possède une force inconnue pour me défendre. Mais toi, Téréina, qu’auras-tu pour te défendre ? Personne.

You must flee as far as possible, far from all the Roms. If not, they will do many bad things to you, like they tried to do to me. I, however, I’m a witch. I possess an unknown force that protects me. But you, Téréina, what will you have to defend yourself? No one (26-27).
This paragraph tells the reader that witches have a supernatural power for self-protection that stops other people from being able to harm them. This power is a *thing*. Non-witches, however, do not have this *thing* to protect them. Dunicha highlights this when she asks, “qu’auras-tu pour te défendre / what will you have to protect yourself” with the non-sequitur response of “personne /no one” (27). Téréïna will not have this *thing* to protect her and will need *someone* to protect her instead. Dunicha had this *thing* and needed no one, showing a difference between witch and non-witch.

A few days later, on New Year’s Eve, Dunicha is blamed for a new crime, for which her tribe will murder her. Malilina, whom Dunicha and Téréïna had made godmother of Arniko and who had also given birth on Christmas eve, died. Her husband announced to his father in front of the rest of the tribe during their holiday party, “Père, Malilini n’est plus de ce monde / Father, Malilina is no longer part of this world” (30). Upon this declaration, all of the women left the party, and the men stayed. Malilina’s father-in-law, Yakali, claims it was because of Dunicha. The other men are not sure, “Pour les autres Roms, ce n’était pas la première fois qu’en une pareille saison une Romni succombait à une congestion. Ils ne voyaient là rien d’anormal / For the other Roms, this wasn’t the first time that during this season a Romni died of congestion” (30). However, Yakali believes it is because of her supernatural powers. He declares he will kill her: “Je suis assez vieux pour que la vie fasse de moi un mort. Je vais tuer cette Dunicha. Ainsi, ne nuira-t-elle plus à personne / I’m old enough that I can die. I am going to kill this Dunicha so that she doesn’t harm another person” (31). Here, Yakali recognizes Dunicha’s powers to hurt him, but he desires to kill her anyway. Another chief, Yerko, reinforces this idea that she could harm him, “Oublies-tu que Dunicha est sorcière et que les forces des esprits sont en elle? / Do
you forget that Dunicha is a witch and that the forces of spirits are in her?” (ibid). Despite this warning, Yakali leaves to kill her. Despite their hesitation, most of the other men follow to join him. On route, some of the women join, encouraging their men to kill her.

This scene shows us how witches could be used as scapegoats within Romani culture (as they were in other cultures – witches have been demonized and murdered across cultural lines). Though Malilina likely died of a respiratory infection and Frinkelo also died of an illness, they still wanted someone to blame. Someone upon whom they could exact vengeance for the deaths of their loved ones. The witches bore this burden. However, they did not accept this burden without fighting back. As Dunicha was tied up and brutally beaten to death with different tools and weapons, she cursed the men who killed her unjustly with her last breath, “Que chacun d’entre vous subisse un sort pire que le mien ! / May each of you suffer a fate worse than mine!” (34). And at the end of the novel, Arniko kills Yakali’s son in the duel. This killing demonstrates the power of Arniko’s curse -- this death is filled with both pain and shame.

However, the Minesti’s hatred of Duchina shows only one side of the complicated relationship with witches. Later, the Minesti consult their witch, Tekla, regarding what will happen with the Ilikesti. Tekla practices hydromancy and sees a dark future; “L’eau est sombre! ... L’eau est noire ! Non, non, elle est bleue !... Maintenant, elle rougit. Elle est rouge, rouge ! [...] Ce n’est plus de l’eau, c’est du sang / The water is dark ! ... The water is black ! No, no, it’s blue! Its blood!” (129-130). Not believing the water had turned to blood, Féro, one of the tribe’s leaders, stuck his finger in the liquid,

He felt the warmth of blood. He pulled out his finger, and, on his skin, there remained an almost clotted red mark. He said, ‘It is blood! How did something like this happen?’ Tekla didn’t respond. She kept her secret (130).

Here, the witch still has supernatural abilities - turning water into blood - that the non-witch cannot understand. However, this power does not cause fear of the witch but fear of the future. Tekla declares it is “Un présage de malheur pour notre race / It’s an omen of misfortune for our people” (ibid). Knowing that this foreshadows their future in relation to the Ilikesti and Arniko, several want to flee. However, one man, Vaya, responds “Qu’importe l’endroit où nous serons! Un jour ou l’autre, nous devrons payer nos dettes aux Ilikesti / It doesn’t matter where we are! One day or another, we will have to pay our debts to the Ilikesti”(134). Tekla’s response is to be respected and believed. The witch is not just a murderous, baneful being, but she is an asset to the tribe.

This discussion also returns the reader to a repetitive theme: fate. Maximoff uses fatalism in three specific aspects of the narrative: (1) fortune-telling, via hydromancy, reveals a predetermined outcome in a specific context; (2) the Ursitory play a deciding role in the fate of individual people; (3) justice has sway over fate. We can see all of these in the instance where Tekla reads the future, turning water into blood. After this reading, Vaya states, “Les Ilikesti n’ont pas que la force pour eux, ils ont aussi la justice / The Ilikesti not only have strength on their side, they also have justice” (ibid). Here, we have hydromancy revealing fate, Vaya revealing that justice influences the outcome, and Arniko’s strength stemming from his near-immortality gained from the declaration of the Ursitory. However, this scene is not the only scene that relies on fatalism.
Early in the novel, when Téréïna escapes after her mother’s murder, she and Arnikko become trapped when a storm knocks over their wagon. They are fatefully rescued by Romanian baron, in his words –

Ne me remerciez pas. Il faut remercier la Providence de m’avoir envoyé à la chasse ce jour-là. Si j’étais arrivé seulement une heure plus tard, je n’aurais, sans doute, trouvé que deux cadavres

Don’t thank me. You should thank Providence for having me go hunting that day. If I had arrived even one hour later, I would have, without a doubt, found two cadavers (48).

Here, Providence is a divine force that controls the outcome of a situation. Humans are not responsible for their good actions, but some sort of higher power is. This reliance on Providence occurs throughout the novel.

The baron had also fatefully been healed by her mother, Dunicha. When the baron offers Téréïna work and a home, she asks why he is being so kind to her, a tsigane. He explains,

il y a plus de vingt ans, j’étais très malade. Aucun médecin du pays n’avait pu me guérir. Je n’attendais plus que la mort. Des Tziganes, comme vous, passèrent dans le village, à quelques kilomètres d’ici. On apprit qu’il y avait parmi eux une sorcière. Mon père la fit chercher. Elle est venue ici portant un enfant sur les bras. Je ne me rappelle pas ce qu’elle a pu faire. Mais, tout ce que je peux dire, c’est qu’elle m’a sauvé. Depuis, j’ai promis une reconnaissance éternelle à tous les Tziganes

over twenty years ago, I was very sick. No doctor in the country could heal me. I was just waiting to die. Some Tziganes, like you, were traveling through the village, a few kilometers from here. We heard that there was a witch among them. My father had someone find her. She came here, carrying a baby in her arms. I don’t remember what she did. All I can say is that she saved me. Since then, I’ve promised an eternal gratitude to all Tziganes (50).

Curious about if this witch was her mother, Téréïna asks, “Son nom n’était-ce point Dunicha / Her name wasn’t Dunicha was it?” (ibid) and the baron responded, “Oui, c’est cela / Yes, that was it” (ibid). Then, Téréïna informs the baron of her mother’s brutal death. Again, Providence has tied the two families together.
This familial linking through fate is similar to Sand’s novel, Consuelo, where Consuelo’s mother had been given shelter by the Rudolstadt family when Consuelo was just a baby. Literarily, this lends to the idea of predestiny within a text. Culturally, this aids in understanding beliefs in clairvoyant abilities found in hydromancy, tarot reading, and other forms of fortune-telling.

Fate remains a controlling force, giving Arniko his seeming immortality. Over 15 years later, Arniko and his mother were still living with the baron. The baron and Arniko take a hunting trip together, during which a male bear tries to attack the baron. Arniko saves the count from a bear attack by killing the bear (61). When the baron’s daughter, Hélène, comes to thank Arniko, he remarks that he could only do this because of chance, another form of fate - “il faut remercier le hasard. Sans lui, je n’aurais pas été aux côtés de Monsieur le baron à ce moment-là / You must thank chance. Without it, I wouldn’t have been with the baron at that moment. (62).

This begins Arniko’s reputation for being strong and brave, his fate. His mother notes his invincibility:

Elle songeait que vraiment il était invulnérable, puisque même un ours, de la plus grande taille, n’était pas parvenu à le vaincre ; qu’au fond, qui que ce soit ne pourrait jamais le vaincre, tant que le bois des Ursitory serait en lieu sûr

She thought he was truly untouchable, since a bear, even one of the biggest bears, couldn’t defeat him, so long as the Ursitory log was in a safe place (64).

This reflection differs from those above because it implies some human influence on fate.

However, we must remember that this influence was only obtainable through supernatural influence and magical means, that is, through the wisdom of a witch.

Arniko again benefits from hasard when he saves a woman, Parni, from being kidnapped. Parni is Arniko’s cousin and Prasniko’s sister, as fate would have it. They were part of the tribe.
from whom Téréina had run away. After this rescue, he met Prasniko, grateful for the chance to
find his family -

Je vous cherche, c’est-à-dire ta famille. Mais je crois bien que je ne vous aurais jamais
retrouvé si, par hasard, je n’avais eu l’occasion de sauver ta gracieuse sœur des mains de
ces canailles

I’ve been looking for you, or at least your family. But I don’t believe I would have ever found
you, if I hadn’t, by chance, been there to save your gracious sister from the hands of those
scoundrels (82).

In this instance, chance not only brings him to his family but helps to begin the chain of events
that will eventually fulfill his dying grandmother’s curse, fulfilling another form of fate.

Let us return to the link between the Romani legal system and fate. This fatalistic encounter
leads to Parni and Arniko falling in love. However, as destiny would have it, she is already
engaged to Pochona, whom “elle avait toujours détesté / she had always hated” (104).

Unrelenting, her father forces her to maintain the engagement with Pochona. The night before
the wedding, Parni commits suicide. When the Ilikesti left the Minesti, Parni’s tribe, the tragedy
occurred.

Mais lorsque le dernier eut disparu, une jeune fille poussa un long gémissement. C’était
Parni qui tombait en arrière, la robe tachée de sang. Elle tenait encore la manche du couteu
qu’elle venait de s’enfoncer dans sa tendre poitrine. Vers midi, au milieu des lamentations,
Parni mourut en répétant à plusieurs reprises : Arniko ! Arniko!

As soon as the last had disappeared, a young girl let out a long groan. It was Parni who fell
backward, her dress stained with blood. She was still holding the handle of the knife she
had just sunk into her soft chest. Around noon, in the middle of lamentations, Parni died,
repeating over and over, ‘Arniko! Arniko! (105).

Because she cried his name as she died, they hold Arniko responsible for her death, a repetition
of what happened to Dunicha. Téréina, protective of her son, reproached the Minesti for this
blame, “Vous aviez besoin d’un coupable afin de vous venger. Vous avez choisi Arniko. Mais il
n’est responsable de rien / You need someone to blame so you can seek vengeance. You chose Arniko. But he is not responsible for any of this” (109). Parni’s death triggers the Minesti’s desire to kill Arniko, which brings upon the painful destiny that Dunicha wished upon them.

The Minesti avoid the legal routes to punish Arniko, which gives Arniko the upper hand in justice. They wish to kill Arniko, but they have no legal grounds to do so. Therefore, in order to avoid a tribunal, they bait Arniko into a fight he cannot win, “Ce que nous ne pouvons obtenir par la force, nous le pouvons par le ruse / that which we cannot obtain by force, we can get by a ruse” (110). Ultimately, the Minesti lose against Arniko. Armed with a gun, Arniko killed or gravely wounded half of the men. The others fled (122). In response to this attack, Arniko calls upon the Vegesti, another tribe, to hold an impartial Kris, or tribunal (128), causing the Minesti to face the laws they had avoided.

Ultimately, Féro was found responsible by the Kris (151). Per Romani customs, the victim’s tribe chooses the punishment. The Ilikesti give the final say to Arniko (152). Rather than a punishment, Arniko decides to have the Minesti make a promise -- “à l’avenir, les Minesti ne chercheront plus aucune querelle aux Ilikesti / in the future the Minesti will no longer seek any quarrels with the Ilikesti” (ibid). Prasniko refuses to accept. Instead, he challenges Arniko to a duel. However, Pochona chooses to take Prasniko’s place. They declare it will be a “duel tzigane” which means a “duel à mort / duel to the death” (155). They are permitted a “fouet dans la main droit, le couteau dans la main gauche / a whip in the right hand and a knife in the left hand” (ibid), and no other rules apply. Arniko dominated the fight, even though he gave up his knife (157) and returned Pochona’s whip to him when he had taken it (159). Téreina is proud of Arniko for winning the fight avenging Dunicha’s death. At his victory, she pronounced
“Par de là sa tombe, la sorcière toujours présente, avait jeté le mauvais sort à ses meurtriers / from her tomb, the ever-present witch cast her wicked spell on her murderers” (162). Like all good fairytales, the magical supersedes the mundane; fate prevails over everything; and fate sways towards justice.

There are four fated deaths that occur (1) Dunicha, (2) Pochona, (3) Téréina, and (4) Arniko. According to the Ursitory, Dunicha’s death was preordained - “le maître puissant a décidé qu’elle mourrait quelques jours après la naissance de son petit-fils / the powerful leader decided she would die a few days after the birth of her grandson” (21). Her death fulfilled her destiny. Pochona’s death and the accompanying pain that the Minesti suffered fulfilled Dunicha’s dying curse. Téréina’s death, too, fulfilled prophecy, dying shortly after her 40th birthday. She had recently convinced Arniko to marry a woman named Orka. She confided the secret of the log to Orka, and “le lendemain, Téréina rendait son âme /the next day, she breathed her last” (176). Death is fated.

Arniko’s death is different, however, because the Ursitory gave no timeline. He only has the power of the log to keep him alive. As his mother never told him of the log, he is unaware of the source of his strength and seeming immortality. After Téréina’s death, he goes to inform the baron. When he arrives at the castle, he is told that it is the Héléna’s s engagement party. Héléna and Arniko were secretly in love as children, but neither ever divulged their affections to the other. They do so at the engagement party. As a result, Arniko decides to leave Orka for Helena. Angry, Orka avenges herself,

J’ai d’autres moyens pour me venger… mais pas sur ta gayzi, sur toi-même […] Je préférerais te voir mort et t’avoir tué moi-même plutôt que de te laisser à une autre femme
I have other means to avenge myself... but not towards your gayzi, towards you [...] I would rather see you dead and have killed you myself than let you be with another woman (187).

Orka then tells him about the log, and he does not believe her. He refuses the power of fate with fatal consequences. Yet again, fate and justice are on the same side.

However, fate has more power than belief. After this conversation, he leaves to reunite with Hélèna at the castle via the forest. As he walks, the forest becomes supernatural.

En passant près d’un grand chêne, il se dit en lui-même : ‘C’est là que grand’mère Dunicha est enterrée.’ Et, tout à coup, il crut entendre un cri sourd et des pleurs et ce cri et ces pleurs semblaient venir de la tombe de Dunicha. En Rom superstitieux, Arniko pensa sérieusement que c’était le fantôme de la drabarni. Il ne craignait ni les hommes ni les fantômes

Passing by a large oak, he said to himself, ‘that’s where grandma Dunicha is buried.’ And, suddenly, he thought he heard a muffled screaming and weeping. This screaming and weeping seemed to come from Dunicha’s tomb. As a superstitious Rom, Arniko seriously thought it was the drabarni’s ghost. He didn’t fear men or ghosts (191).

Arniko must deal with the supernatural even as he denies its power. At this time, Orka burns the log, fulfilling the Ursitory’s prophecy. Arniko began having chest pain and knew he was dying, “Il comprit qu’il ne pourrait jamais sortir de la forêt / he understood he would never leave the forest” (192). Once the log had burned, Orka “dit naturellement: Arniko est mort” (194). In his death, Arniko saw his mother, grandmother, Parni, Héléna, and the Minesti he had killed. Fate lifted the supernatural veil between the two worlds.

It is important to note here that these instances of fatality tell us more about Romani storytelling than about Romani culture. Sure, it highlights a belief in clairvoyance at times and demonstrates some roles of witchcraft. It reveals beliefs around death, as well. However, to use this as gospel for culture would be to use “Cinderella” as the basis for 18th-century French family life. Rather, we can see some critical components of the horror folktale - dark fatalism
and repetition. Remember, Maximoff tells us this story is also more horrifying than the reality of the “vols, [les] enlèvements d’enfants, [les] assassinats / thefts, kidnappings, and assassinations” (3). This literary tactic is a form of escapism. One’s imagination can find worse things that make reality seem less frightening.

“I am Romni and cannot live without liberty”

Another repetitive theme in this novel is that of liberty. Superficially, it seems that liberty and fatalism would oppose one another. However, we must consider that these two concepts support one another. For example, when the baron offers Teréina a job and housing, she nearly refuses it, “je suis une Romni et ne puis vivre sans la liberté / I am a Romni and can’t live without liberty” (49). However, the baron promises her freedom. Fate allows her to keep her freedom even away from her tribe.

Consuelo, Carmen, and Morena’s freedoms appear similar to Teréina’s, but they produce different reactions. These women buck social standards and refuse to be controlled by others. However, Maximoff’s presentation of Teréina’s freedom does not challenge the state. Teréina maintains this freedom while also functioning as a member of the dominant society. For years, she is employed by a baron – a symbol for the national structure. When she finally leaves this job, the baron is disappointed in losing her as an employee and as a friend. Her freedom is not inherently a challenge to the national structure or identity. Furthermore, Romani defiance to national identity does not necessarily mean that the state is in danger. Maximoff’s description of liberty and defiance demonstrates that the Roma can exist peacefully within a nation, so long as that nation respects the autonomy and liberty of the Roma. Consuelo, Carmen, and Morena, however, show that the state is not prepared to do so.
Robert Henri Guizelin, in the preface to this novel, stated to the reader,

Toute notre littérature traitant des Tziganes les a toujours représentés avant tout comme des êtres libres. Ils se promènent dans nos souvenirs d’enfance et dans nos rêves d’hommes comme les chevaliers du Mystère, de l’Aventure, de la Liberté. Lisez ce livre ! Laissez-vous captiver par Les Ursitory. Si vous n’y voyez qu’une banale aventure, c’est que l’aventure est morte pour vous. Si vous y découvrez un monde vivant, un message, sachez que vous êtes encore libre, que ce message est celui-là même que vous avez oublié avec vos souvenirs d’enfance, le jour où vous avez commencé d’être ce qu’on appelle tristement un adulte.

All of our literature on Tziganes has always depicted them as free beings. They walk in the memories of our childhood and in our adult dreams as knights of Mystery, Adventure, and Liberty. Read this book! Let yourself be captivated by Les Ursitory. If you only see a banal adventure, it’s because adventure is dead to you. If you discover within a living world a message, know that you are still free, that this message is that which you had forgotten with your childhood memories, the day when you became what we sadly call an adult (v-vi).

This novel is a fairytale - an adventurous escape from reality. If you can get lost in it, your liberty still exists. The magical nature of this fatalist novel reinvigorates one’s liberty, detaching it from the reality of societal pressures.

Maximoff’s novels and articles bridge a gap between the Gayzo and the Roma. He is intentional in the way he writes as an educator and author. His writing serves an ethnographic and pedagogical role as it bridges oral and written literatures. It sacrifices neither education nor literary value. He works within the French framework to do so, reincorporating and reappropriating extant stereotypes. Maximoff addresses dancing, singing, street performance, and fortune-telling in a well-rounded cultural context. He uses narrative tools established within the French canon, such as intertext and reliance on the novelesque. In doing this, he allows for a dialog between the French canon and Romani literature.

However, it is essential to note here that the connection between literatures of the dominant culture and minority literatures is not necessary to make minority kinds of literature valid or worthy of critical study. Minority literatures are valid sources of study even with no link.
to major cultures. Maximoff’s works, for example, are prime subjects for studying folklore, mythology, the translation of texts from oral to written, heterolinguistics, and more. As scholars diversify their corpuses, it makes literary study richer.

Maximoff’s works demonstrate a diversity of ways in which we can apply high theory, low theory, and critical theory to minority literatures. He presents folklore in a literary fashion, maintaining key aspects of oral traditions such as repetition and superstition. He relies on fatalism as an allegorical tool. By combining novel-writing and oral storytelling in this cultural middle ground, Maximoff can create nuance. This nuance creates a new space in which the fictional Romani can exist with much more freedom than the constraints of the French canon. It has much closer ties to reality. Maximoff’s cultural bridge allows for a literary rebuttal to the stereotyping and discrimination that Roma in Europe often face, humanizing Roma rather than reifying their role as a literary and cultural scapegoat. He shows that Romani characters, stories, and folklore can be translated from oral tradition to written text. But, the success of this translation requires it to be done through or heavily informed by a Romani voice. As such a text, his work defies categorization as simplistic as ‘novel,’ ‘folktale,’ or ‘ethnograph’ – a defiance that is freedom-giving.
Conclusion

The gypsy myth has cemented itself as part of mainstream culture since the first documented arrivals of Roma in Western Europe during the 15th-century. This mythology treats the Roma as scapegoats, both in literature and reality. Reduced to scapegoats, they became literary tools to discuss more dangerous ideas. Mid-nineteenth-century French authors, such as Mérimée, Hugo, Sand, and Nodier, used the literary tzigane/gitan/gypsy to explore complex concepts related to social and political changes within mid-nineteenth-century France. Because audiences were already familiar with the idea of the gypsy, the character was a comprehensible symbol for the reader. Using culturally imbued knowledge, the reader interpreted the tzigane/gitan/gypsy as a threat against what mainstream society deemed “civil society.” The gypsy myth highlights fears of societal degradation. As the myth highlights these fears, the myth reifies itself in the social imagination. A dangerous cycle for the Roma, mainstream beliefs about the tzigane/gitan/gypsy feed the myth, and the myth feeds mainstream beliefs.

My work shows how the authors of this period relied on the tzigane/gitan/gypsy myth to codify social anxieties of the time. Changes in the concepts of French identity during a period of political instability fueled these anxieties. As regimes shifted and changed, the people and the state had to redefine Frenchness. The tzigane/gitan/gypsy myth provided a relief to this question. Even if the dominant society of France had not defined Frenchness, tzigane/gitan/gypsy characters allowed for a definition of who was not French. They represented an otherness incompatible with French identity. The French person had an origin and a birth relation to the land, following social norms and never rebelling against societal expectations. French women were pious and sexually pure, while French men strived to avoid
sexual temptation. A unified France had strong, national borders to protect the interior. The
*tzigane/gitan/gypsy* character eschewed these expectations, showing how not to be French.
These characters were licentious thieves, ready to kidnap children and efface their national
identity. Furthermore, by highlighting these differences, the *tzigane/gitan/gypsy* character
embodied the threats to concepts of Frenchness. The French wished to safeguard their identity,
and the *tzigane/gitan/gypsy* could destroy it with her presence. Figures 13 and 14 summarize
how the literature treated in this research developed as linguistic tools for discussing ideas of
national identity, defining spaces, reifying the stereotype of the Tzigane, and discussing
interests in etiology.
Figure 13. Mind Map 1
Figure 14. Mind Map 2
In Victor Hugo’s *Notre Dame de Paris*, Esmeralda shows how easy it is to lose French identity. Though she was born to a French mother, her kidnapping erased her Frenchness. Her Frenchness becomes invisible when shrouded in the veil of *gypsyness*. Through the performativity of identity, Hugo highlights the importance of spectacle in the 19th-century. He shows that our vision is deceitful to a sinful fault. Phoebus loses his resolve to remain faithful to his fiancée because of the way he perceives Esmeralda. He expects her to fulfill his sexual desires because of her appearance. Frollo refuses to accept responsibility for his sexual wants, blaming Esmeralda for his moral downfall. The Parisians who once adored Esmeralda turn on her because they begin to see her as a sorceress. This whole time, however, Esmeralda remains virginal and pure. The reader is aware of her piety and the tricks behind her “magic.” Through the character of Esmeralda, reflected in the disrepair of Notre-Dame Cathedral during the early 19th-century, Hugo reminds readers how easy it is to forget cultural identity and its place in society.

For Hugo and Mérimée, myths and fictional narratives of western Europe play a key role. The Parisian characters of *Notre-Dame de Paris* rely on these myths and ideologies to justify their newfound fear and hatred of Esmeralda. Not understanding her Romani heritage, they compare her to a stryge – a vampire-like creature who is out to kill men. Not knowing that she is speaking of her own child, her birth mother seeks to avenge her daughter’s kidnapping by eating Esmeralda. Convinced by social beliefs, the mother thinks that the *gypsies* are cannibals who stole her daughter and ate her too. The characters in Hugo translate their misunderstandings regarding Romani culture through the languages of mythology and folklore. The readers of *Carmen* understand her *gypsyness* through comparisons with well-known works.
Mérimée uses references from authors such as Corneille, Brantôme, and Pantagruel alongside the reference to the *Bellum Hispaniense* to culturally connect the reader to the text. Though the novel takes place outside France, Mérimée successfully “Frenchifies” Spain. He translates Spanish and Romani culture through European literature. Hugo and Mérimée use intertextual references to both written and oral texts to continue the tradition of using the *tzigane/gitan/gypsy* character to define the limits of Frenchness.

In addition to intertext, Mérimée’s writings allow the reader to explore imagined mappings of France, disturbing the reader’s understanding of such maps. He uses critical locations from the Napoleonic occupations alongside references to the Battle of Munda to concretize the places within a western-European, and more precisely French, viewpoint. Through mapping, Mérimée writes Spain as it exists in the French imagination. The character of Carmen complicates the reader’s relationship with this map. Though the use of the Napoleonic occupations and the Battle of Munda make Spain more comprehensible, Carmen’s refusal of land-based identity reminds the reader of the importance of space in identity-making. Thus, we must consider land ownership and national boundaries when defining national identity.

The obsession with Carmen’s origin and the obsession with finding the Battle of Munda’s location reflects France’s confusion regarding land-based social identities. As regimes shifted, land ownership became one of the few constants in determining social rank. Landowners consistently held power, though to varying degrees, across these shifts. They generally remained in the upper class. However, the social identities of non-landowners shifted constantly. The image of the *tzigane* highlighted this concern on identity. How could someone
with no known origin be identified? How did non-landowners fit into the social landscape of France as it shifted power dynamics?

Continuing the theme of changing cultural identities, Nodier’s *Histoire du roi de Bohème et de ses sept châteaux* (RBSC) pushes the limits of reading culture in France. Whereas Hugo and Mérimée remained within the constraints of the French literary corpus to translate foreign concepts into ideas easily consumed by the French reader, Nodier eschews French tradition to the point of failure. His extremely bizarre novel challenges the notions of literature and genre. His obsession with form over content produced an illegible text to his French audience. Though he used intertext, his references often read as straight plagiarism and do not contribute to any sort of narrative line. Nodier refuses French culture within his conceptualization of *Bohemia*. Novelty cannot exist within the bounds of the nation-state and requires shifting into the fictional world of *Bohemia*.

Sand also explores the boundaries of genre by entering this fictional space. However, Sand does so in a legible and commercially successful way. *La Filleule* focuses on the idea of the “Romanesque” or novelesque. The writers constantly remind the reader that they are reading a novel. Though they may have equivalencies outside the novel, the things they encounter are fictitious. Her usage of the Romanesque allowed her to avoid political censorship and produced what she claimed was a purely literary novel. As a strictly literary figure, the character of Morena is a reduction of stereotypes that fulfills cultural expectations. This novel shows how the tzigane/gitan/gypsy figure should operate in literature. Morena fulfills this duty when she marries a gitan and begins her life as an international performer. Sand dutifully remains within French literary limits.
Sand’s novel Consuelo, on the other hand, pushes the limits of traditional culture. Though this novel also focuses on the novelesque, it does so within the relatively new genre of the Fantastic. As such, Consuelo required a different setting than La Filleule. The latter novel occurred primarily in France, whereas the former took place in 18th-century Bohemia. The more fantastic elements had room to develop by moving the setting eastward. Morena’s novelesque aspirations focused on love and family. Consuelo, conversely, encountered a family entrenched in the complications of having a radical son whose political and religious views endangered their social position. Count Albert, the son, also suffered from prophetic visions and ecstatic religious experiences, which caused him to disappear for weeks at a time. His beliefs caused his family to be social outcasts. Through these wealthy recluses, the novel freely explores concepts of religion and political ideology. By avoiding the setting of France, Sand freely critiques Catholicism and the patriarchal structures that historically aligned with it. She introduces utopian ideologies which coincided with the Saint-Simonian movement, a fringe movement in France. She clarified the fictionality of her novel, which allowed her to challenge concepts of French culture. This could only happen through a Bohemian lens.

The usage of the myth allowed for different approaches to understanding French identity yet had dangerous consequences for the Roma. These approaches relied on rewriting history, exoticism, and genre (re)definition. These writings resulted in the reification of the tzigane/gitan/gypsy stereotypes, which have been used throughout history to justify atrocities committed against the Roma. Even when authors, such as Sand, attempt to write in an

---

45 See Appendix 2 for such atrocities which include imprisonment, expulsion, destruction of homes, the removal of children, and, at its worst, the Holocaust.
empathetic manner, writing more complex characters who are more than regurgitations of the stereotype, the cultural beliefs surrounding the Roma come through. The stereotype becomes endemic to the national literature.

A focus on Romani literatures is one way we can balance views on the Roma and change the literary viewpoint. It is important to note that I am not proposing that changing syllabi or even personal reading habits is a cure-all for anti-Romani sentiments. Far from this, I suggest that it is simply a way for non-Romani to develop a more accurate understanding of Romani culture, which challenges the cultural norms of the dominant society. Far more work needs to be done to reduce the harms caused by anti-Romani sentiments. Romani activists should lead this work, and non-Romani persons should play a supporting role to accomplish goals as identified by the Roma themselves.

That being said, let’s review how Matéo Maximoff challenges the extant stereotypes through his writings. Maximoff does this three ways: (1) he flips the script on criminality and the justice system; (2) he refers to real atrocities to remind the reader of reality; (3) his pedagogical efforts require the reader to work to understand and learn. The novels shun French expectations for the gadjo reader, the intended audience for his texts. In Vinguerka, Maximoff makes a Russian prince the criminal as he kidnaps and kills. Maximoff notes how the gadjo would never face punishment for crimes committed against the Roma in most cases. However, Drago returns his child to himself in a fatalistic ending when he avenges his kidnapping. Justice

46 There are certainly many more measures which could and should be taken. I suggest reading the writings of Nicole Bitu, Enikő Vincze, Ethel Brooks, Debra L. Schultz, and Carol Silverman. As these scholars focus on human rights, feminism, and ethnography much of their works remain outside the scope of this research.

47 A list of additional Romani authors can be found in Appendix 5.
is served by fate. Through this injustice, Maximoff forces the reader to grapple with the idea of children being unjustly removed from their families by the state, most never to be reunited with their parents. This is one instance in which he brings fiction face-to-face with reality. He does this with murders and expulsions as well. The usage of these facts makes the reader aware of the atrocities that their government may be committing. In making the reader aware, he also makes the reader responsible for their reaction. In a sort of object lesson on responsibility, Maximoff also requires the reader to work to understand his text. He commonly does this by introducing Romani words with a definition once and then reusing the term later in the text. The reader is required to learn the vocabulary to understand the narrative. Maximoff makes the reader reconsider their preconceived knowledge about the Roma through these writing tools.

Today’s readers should consider this information when choosing the texts they wish to consume. Jodie Matthews does an excellent job of outlining consumer responsibility in her article, “Visibly Authentic: Images of Romani people from 19th-century culture to the digital age.” Matthews notes how the image of the gypsy as created in the 19th-century continues to drive consumer expectations and desires. The gypsy image present today is not that different from the one that Hugo, Mérimée, and Sand wrote about. Matthews states that the present-day consumer should be aware of the “use and abuse of these images” and to use “opportunities brought by online communities to express opinions, answer back, contextualise, own, and disavow particular images and interpretations” (69-70). In other words, informed consumers are responsible for challenging the stereotypes as they encounter them. Matthews also reminds us that “there are alternative ways of creating and learning about Romani heritage that do not depend on these centralised, powerful forms of production that are then consumed
passively” (ibid). Much like Maximoff requires of his reader, Matthews calls on us to shift from the passive consumption permitted through texts such as those examined in this research to active self-education.

The research in this work highlights the impacts of passive readership and points towards the need for active learning when discussing texts that objectify minority cultures, specifically in the case of the Roma. Future research stemming from my analyses could include additional research on Romani authorship and writing, textual studies of gypsy tales from other time periods, historical analyses of non-fiction texts as they engage with the gypsy stereotype, and examinations of authors who reappropriate extant stereotypes in their works.
Appendix 1. Terminology

This dissertation requires a specific lexicon that requires explanation. This appendix serves as a dictionary to help the reader navigate the text. In this dictionary, exonym means terms applied by outsiders. They may or may not be considered slurs. Endonym means a term used by a people group to refer to themselves. Here, this would be a term that the Roma use to speak about themselves. When using exonyms throughout this research, I use italics because these terms often carry the weight of the stereotype and do not accurately reflect the Roma. A word map, figure 15, follows this dictionary showing how these terms are interlinked.

Bohémien(ne). Exonym. Used often in French literature. It can refer to the Roma, artists, or outcasts. It is a more encompassing term and often a slur.

Calé. a group within the Roma umbrella. It can be spelle Kalé.

Égyptien(ne). Exonym. Used often in French literature. It comes from the confusion around the origin of the Roma.

Gadjo. Romani word. A non-Roma person. Can be spelled Gayzie or Gayzio.

Gypsy. Exonym. Most commonly used in English. A slur. It is often linked to the stereotypical images of the Roma. This term comes from the word “Egyptian” and the confusion regarding the origins of the Roma. The term “to gyp” someone, or to swindle, comes from this slur. It has strong links to the belief that the Roma are thieves.

Gitan(e). Exonym. Considered to be of Spanish origin. This term can be a slur. It is often linked to the stereotypical images of the Roma. Used often in literature, particularly in the nineteenth-century.
*Kaldersh.* a group within the Roma umbrella.

*Manouche.* a group within the Roma umbrella.

*Rom.* Endonym. A man in a Roma community, often a husband.

*Roma.* Endonym. This term can be used as noun or adjective. For consistency purposes, I have chosen to use this term as a collective noun for all Roma.

*Romani.* Endonym. This term can be used as noun or adjective. It can refer to people or the language. I have chosen to use it as an adjective and as the name of the language. It can be spelled *Romani* or *Romany*. Its original spelling is Rromanës.

*Romanichel.* a group within the Roma umbrella.

*Romnia (plural: Romni).* Endonym: A woman in a Roma community, often a wife.

*Sinti.* a group within the Roma umbrella.

*Traveler.* Exonym. This is the legal term used in Britain to designate Roma. It is sometimes considered a slur. In general, the Roma consider travelers to be of a different ethnicity.

*Tzigane.* Exonym. Considered to be of French origin. This term can be a slur. It is often linked to the stereotypical images of the Roma. Used often in literature, particularly in the nineteenth-century. It can be spelled *tsigane.*
Figure 15. Terminology
Appendix 2. Romani History

This appendix provides a brief overview of Romani history. As such, it does not and cannot cover every detail of the nearly 700-year history of Roma in Europe. Instead, it guides the reader of this work to become familiar with the historical context and gives tools for further research. Additionally, much of the works which treat Romani history have been written by non-Roma and contain certain biases. I have tried to avoid these biases here, but some may still come through. The reader should also consider this when referencing the works cited here. As for the history of the Romani themselves, academia has neglected the study. In 2021, Becky Taylor and Jim Hinks, in their article “What Field? Where? Bringing Gypsy, Roma and Traveller History into View,” described the state of research particularly in Britain: “Unlike the massive surge of interest, and the intellectual and empirical steps forward that have been taken, in the histories of Britain’s wider Black, Asian and minority ethnic populations in recent decades, Gypsy and Traveller history remains something of a backwater, seemingly cut off from this same flow of historical attention” (629). While this geographical constraint was necessary to limit the realm of Taylor and Hinks’ study, this dearth remains across historical analyses.

For this reason, the historical notes given here are given with the caveat that this is a very understudied field, requiring some dated sources that are biased, contain stereotypes, and lack modern ethical approaches. It is also important to note that the information may lose some accuracy as this field hopefully grows and emerges. I ask that the reader be gentle in criticizing this section for these reasons. However, I welcome any rebuttals or critics which rely on more updated information. The scholars that I cite here include Angus Fraser, a scholar on Romani
history, David Abulafia, a historian focused on attitudes towards non-Christians in the medieval period, and François de Vaux de Foletier, an ethnographer focusing on Romani groups.

In *The Gypsies*, Angus Fraser explains the theories behind the Roma’s early migrations. He describes how detailed linguistic analyses and physical anthropology have been used to argue that the Roma arrived in western Europe from India. However, he notes that this research, particularly linguistic research, has limitations. These methodologies, tend to confirm [...] the Indian link between language and original speaker and to indicate that the origin of both is to be sought in the Indian subcontinent, even if not combination of linguistics, physical anthropology and genetics gives us any clue as to the historical circumstances which brought about the Romani-speakers’ migration and diffusion, or why there should have been an exodus at all (25)

After their unexplained departure from India, the Roma were first recorded in Persia. According to Fraser, Bahram Gur, a Persian monarch, requested that the king of India send him 12,000 musicians to perform for his people. Fraser assumes that these musicians formed part of the early Roma populations (33). He supports this assumption using linguistic analysis, noting the influence of the Persian language on the proto-language that became Romani (37-40). Fraser argues that the Roma migrated further through Europe via Byzantium from Persia. He states that the Seljuk invasion played a critical role.” It drove many Gypsies into western Byzantine territory – Constantinople and Thrace – from where they eventually spread throughout the Balkans and the whole of Europe” (46). By the establishment of the Ottoman Empire, the Roma were present in Bulgaria, Serbia, Wallachia, Macedonia, Yugoslavia, Moldovia, Romania,

---

48 It is within Byzantium that we first began hearing of the *gypsy* stereotype. During the 14\textsuperscript{th} and 15\textsuperscript{th} centuries, religious treatises such as a commentary on the Council in Trillo and another by Joseph Bryennius urged Christians to avoid the *adingánoüs* or gypsies who were “fortune-tellers, bearkeepers, and snake-charmers[...] because they teach devilish things” (47).
and Greece (48). Wallachia and Moldavia hold a dark place in Romani history. Both countries instituted a form of chattel slavery that endured centuries. The leading classes saw the Roma as a “valuable labour force” (58) which the government and church wished to preserve. Slave ownership began in the church, which later gave their enslaved people to the boyars (58).

Fraser explains this situation:

to make the controls all-embracing, it was declared that every Gypsy without a master was the property of the state. The Gypsies of the Crown paid an annual tribute but were not obliged to remain in the one spot; they were in fact often hounded from place to place [...] They Gypsies owned by the monastaries and boyars saw their personal rights eroded until they were absolutely at the disposal of their masters; they and their children became chattels who could be sold, exchanged or given away [...] Their liberty would not be restored fully in Moldo-Wallachia until 1856 (58-59).

As this took place in Moldo-Wallachia, the Roma migrated further west. Their arrival is generally documented as the early 15th-century based on the dates of their letters of safe passage signed by Sigismund, the Holy Roman Emperor. Abulafia notes that the Roma likely obtained these letters while Sigismund was attending the Council of Constance

They [the Roma] appear to have been at Lindau on Lake Constance in about 1417, where they obtained privileges from Sigismund, who was at present in the region during the Council of Constance, though at this point his mind was more pre-occupied with the resolution of the papal schism and the elevation of the new pope, Martin V, not to mention the Hussite threat to the Catholic Church and Ottoman expansion towards the borders of Hungary (332).

Abulafia uses chronicles written by Ulrich Richental to determine that the Roma were present in this region. The letter, or letters as scholars are not sure of the number, were used to gain entry and safe passage into countries such as France, Spain, and Italy.

The Roma are thought to have arrived in Paris in 1427. Abulafia, Vaux de Foletier, and Fraser all use this date based on the Journal d’un Bourgeois de Paris. This journal describes the
presence of the Roma and the backstory that the Roma used to justify their presence. Abulafia retells the story recounted by the Bourgeois as such:

At their head was a single duke, accompanied by a count and ten mounted men. ‘They said that they were good Christians; they came from Lower Egypt.’ The Bourgeois reports the story of their Christian past, though he provides plenty of detail absent elsewhere. They originally lived in a land that had become Christian, following its conquest by other Christians. Their heathen rulers had accepted the new faith and were permitted, therefore, to remain in power as king and queen. Conquered by the Saracens (a term the Bourgeois uses for any pagans of idolaters), they had then abandoned their faith, only to become Christian once more when the Holy Roman Emperor and the king of Poland overran their land. The emperor was unhappy about their disloyalty and insisted that jamais ne tiendraient terre en leurs pays, si le pape ne le consentait. So they were sent to Rome to receive the consent of the pope to their eventual return, for which they desperately hoped. The pope then imposed a penance on them. They must wander the world for seven years without ever sleeping in a bed. Yet, their harsh life was to be made less difficult to bear, since the pope ordered every bishop and abbot to give them a one-off gift of ten livres tournois (thereby ensuring that they kept moving). The pope supposedly issued letters in their favor, though needless to say none has ever been found in the papal archives. The Parisian response to their arrival was to keep them outside the city walls, at Chapelle-Saint-Denis, even though they only numbered between 100 and 120. They became quite an attraction to a grande allée de gens who were curious to see them (336).

The author also described them as

pickpockets and fortune-tellers, for among them were sorcières qui regardaient les mains des gens and predicted the future, sometimes sowing discord when they convinced men and women that they were being cuckolded by their spouse (ibid).

The writer documents that when the bishop of Paris heard of this, he “excommunicated the fortune-tellers along with those who believed their false claims” (ibid). As Abulafia notes, the dichotomy of these descriptions is striking: the Roma are seen both as penitent Christians and dangerous pagans (337). We continue to see beliefs that informed the stereotype used in Hugo, Mérimée, and Sand’s works. As these beliefs became more widespread, efforts to expel the Roma took shape.
Expulsion efforts continued from this point and have not ceased. Abulafia summarizes the 15th-century as follows:

western European princes and cities gradually decided that they had no place for wandering nomads within their states, trapping the Gypsies within the negative stereotypes that condemned them as thieves and sorcerers (338).

In 1449, for example, the Roma were refused entry into and expelled from Frankfurt am Main (88). Expulsion decrees became more and more prevalent across Europe (88-90). Within France, there were edicts to expel the Roma in 1537 and 1539. By the 16th-century, the Holy Roman Empire had been making concerted efforts to rid the realm of Roma. According to Fraser, “the Imperial Diet had issued three edicts (in 1497, 1498, and 1500) in which Gypsies were accused of espionage and single out for expulsion” (85). These edicts, however, were not very successful as the populaces did not support them. Many noblemen and wealthy individuals supported the Roma, which allowed them to stay within these countries without expulsion. This frequently occurred throughout France. Fraser notes that Alsace and Lorraine “maintained cordial relations with Gypsies,” “Colmar distributed bread to the Saracens,” and that many Frenchmen served as godfathers and godmothers to Roma babies (92-93). 49 These safe havens gave the Roma spaces to live during this period.

As these favors continued, there was a rise in Roma movement across the countryside. According to Foletier in his article “Tsiganes en France aux XVIIe siècle,”

Jamais, en dépit de édits, des ordonnances, ces errants que l’on nommait ‘Égyptiens’ ou ‘Bohèmes’ n’ont circulé aussi librement à travers les provinces françaises

Never, despite the edicts and ordonnances, had these wanderers we called Égyptiens or Bohémiens moved so freely across the French countryside. (147).

---

49 Saracens was an exonym used to identify and describe the Roma.
In fact, according to Foletier, many of the Roma in France were treated with respect and distinction (148). Foletier goes on to cite three Romani “captains,” or leaders, - Charles de la Grave, Jean-Charles (his son), and Jeremye Robert - who were interred with honors at churches in Brissac, Châlons, and René (ibid).

It was during this period that the Romany began to take space as cultural objects and spectacles to be consumed, mainly, by the French nobility. According to Foletier’s research les Bohémiennes viennent rompre la monotonie de la vie de château. Ils sont capables de rendre des services: gardes armés, serviteurs temporaires; remarquables connaisseurs en cheveux, ils peuvent les soigner et les guérir [...] Les musiciens exercent leurs talents, avec harpes, flûtes ou violons. Mais c’est avant tout la danse qui confère au monde tzigane un prestige considérable en France pendant tout le cours du XVII siècle

Bohemiens came to break up the monotony of castle life. They were capable of rendering services: armed guards, temporary servants, skilled horsemen who could care for and heal the animals [...] The musicians exercised their talents with harps, flutes, or violins. But above all, it was danse that made the tsgianes quite prestigious in France during the course of the 17th century (149).

Inspired by the trendy entertainment factor that the nobility derived from the Romany in their courts, it was during this period that there was an increased presence of tsigane characters within literature, theater, and dance. Foletier notes of particular interest the inclusion of “égyptiens et égyptiennes” in Molière’s Le mariage forcé as well as “dans de nombreux ballets donnés sous Louis XIII et Louis XIV / in numerous ballets given under Louis XIII and Louis XIV” (150).

Unfortunately, the popular fascination wanes at the end of the 17th-century with the “Déclaration du Roi contre les Bohème” declared in 1682. A copy of this edict can be found in Appendix 3. However, Foletier summarizes it thusly:
[La loi] renouvelle et précise des mesures de répression, jusqu’alors peu appliquées; les hommes seront envoyés aux galères; les femmes, si elles persistent à vagabonder, seront enfermées dans les hôpitaux

[The law] renewed and clarified measures of repression, until then rarely applied. Men would be sent to the galleys; women, if they continued to beg, would be locked away in hospitals (152).

The edict also scolds the noblemen who had welcomed the Romany into their courts, threatening them “d’être privés de leurs justices et de voir leurs fiefs réunis au Domaine du roi / to remove their legal privileges and to have their fiefs returned to the king’s domain” (ibid).

Fraser notes that this decree was quite effective and that

no other [decree] aimed specifically at Gypsies was thought necessary during the remainder of the ancien régime [...] Right up to the time of the Revolution, there are numerous records being hunted down by rural police, many of whom were quick to use their muskets if resisted” (145).

The Roma found their last vestiges of relief in the “forests of Alsace and Loraine” and the “Basque country,” where they could quickly cross borders to flee from the police (ibid).

Towards the end of the 18th-century, the French government realized that they might be creating problems through these raids. The raids were not reducing Roma populations as hoped. Foletier summarizes the 18th-century as follows:

Cependant les Tsiganes ne disparaissent pas du royaume. Mais ils se font moins voyants. Les grandes compagnies se fragmentent en petits groupes. Les femmes renoncent à leur bariolage, à leurs grandes capes rayées. Les chefs ne se vantent plus d’être capitaines d’Égypte ou de Bohême. Sous Louis XV la mode bohémienne a disparu; les philosophes raillent les superstitions de ces ‘geux errants’; à quelques exceptions près, le Siècle des Lumières les méprise ou les ignore

Nevertheless the Tsiganes didn’t disappear from the kingdom. But, they made themselves less visible. The large companies broke into small groups. The women renounced their bright clothing and their large, striped cloaks. The chiefs no longer bragged of being Egyptian or Bohemian captains. Under Louis XV, bohemian style disappeared; the philosophers mocked these ‘errant paupers’ superstitions. With few exceptions, the Age of Enlightenment disdained or ignored them [the Romani] (152).
Fraser explains that the monarchy began searching for better alternatives to the raids in 1786. In talks with Romani leaders, they found that the Roma had few options for survival hounded on all sides as they were, their only way of feeding their families was to extract subventions from the local populace when they could; however, they were willing to submit to the French government and accept agricultural work in France or overseas, on condition that they were not confined and not taken in chains to their ultimate destination (Fraser, 146).

Unfortunately, the Revolution ended this agreement. The regime change brought renewed vigor and violence to expulsion efforts (ibid).

Continuing these violent expulsion efforts, the 19th-century débute par une féroce râfle de Bohémiens dans le pays basque; pendant quatre à cinq ans, sans l’ombre de jugement, plusieurs centaines d’entre eux, hommes, femmes, et enfants, croupissent dans les prisons et les dépôts de mendicité. Avec le romantisme la littérature s’intéresse de nouveau aux Tsiganes, mais pour les peindre sous les plus sombres couleurs began with a ferocious roundup of Bohemians in the Basque country; during four to five years, without the shadow of judgment, several hundred of them - men, women, and children - rotted away in prisons and beggar’s homes(??). With Romanticism, a literary interest in Tsiganes was revived, only to paint them in the darkest colors (Vaux de Foletier, 152).

The 19th-century brought good and bad to the Roma. First, as mentioned earlier, Roma in Moldovia and Wallachia finally obtained their freedom. At the turn of the century, “some 35,000 families” were still enslaved in these regions (Fraser, 224). However, in 1855, Grigore Ghica, prince of Moldovia, finally ended this system. According to Fraser, Ghica “propos[ed...] that the owners should be recompensed for the loss on their investments [... and] the buying and selling of human beings were banned for good” (224). Wallachia followed Ghica’s lead and ended slavery a few weeks later (225). However, Fraser notes that “complete legal freedom came in 1864 [...] following the Crimean War” because of the unification of Romania (ibid).
The mid-nineteenth-century saw a rise in Roma migration, though as Fraser points out, this was not entirely due to the liberations in Moldovia and Wallachia (235). As countries reexperienced this rise in Roma populations, expulsion efforts returned with vigor. András Tapolcai examines how Hungary responded to this rise in “Assimilative Mechanisms in Late 19th-Century Hungary: The History of a Romani Settlement.” Though this is a specific analysis, it points to the anxieties that nations felt in response to the Roma. Tapolcai examines, specifically, how the Roma challenged the rise of capitalism. Per his analysis, capitalistic labor divisions meant that all forces of production were supposed to have well-defined economic functions. In such a structure, groups of nomadic Roma, who had arrived in Hungary after the abolition of slavery in Romania in the mid-1850s, were considered deviant. Their specific economic role (small volume handicrafts production, smithery, fortune-telling, entertainment, and so forth) and their method of working (considered to be ‘undisciplined’) were not tolerated by the state administration and local authorities. They remained the *masterless* people of the Hungarian society (2, emphasis mine).

A *masterless* people implies a threat to the power structure, which derived its power from capitalist enterprise. The Roma were a threat to the overall systems which established these nations. In response to these anxieties, anti-Romany sentiments grew across Europe. As for the realities of Roma in France during the 19th-century, we currently have very limited resources. One of the most cited authors on the subject is François de Vaux de Foletier. His research, however, is quite dated. His ethnographic approaches are not always the most ethical and social biases can be read in many of his works. They often lack evidentiary support as well. That being said, we can glean some facts from his works.
Though the Roma began arriving in France in the 15th-century,\(^{50}\) Vaux de Foletier notes that the 17th-century saw a rise in anti-Romani legislation within France alongside a rise in their movement across the country. In his article “Tsiganes en France aux XVIIe siècle,” he writes, “Jamais, en dépit d’édits, des ordonnances, ces errants que l’on nommait ‘Égyptiens’ ou ‘Bohêmes’ n’ont circulé aussi librement à travers les provinces françaises / Despite edicts and ordonnances, never had these nomads that were called ‘Égyptiens’ or ‘Bohemians’ moved about so freely across provincial France” (147). Despite the edicts and ordonnances Vaux de Foletier\(^{51}\) mentions, Roma in France were treated with respect and distinction: “les chefs de ces bandes sont traités comme gens de distinction / The leaders of these groups were treated like people of distinction” (148) Foletier goes on to cite three Romani “captains,” or leaders, - Charles de la Grave, Jean-Charles (his son), and Jeremie Robert - who were interred with honors at churches in Brissac, Châlons, and René (ibid). All in all, the 17th-century was not a particularly violent century for the Roma.

During the 17th-century, the French began to see the Roma as cultural objects and spectacles to consume. According to Vaux de Foletier’s research:

Les Bohémiens viennent rompre la monotonie de la vie de château. Ils sont capables de rendre des services : gardes armés, serviteurs temporaires ; remarquables connaisseurs en cheveux, ils peuvent les soigner et les guérir [...] Les musiciens exercent leurs talents, avec harpes, flûtes ou violons. Mais c’est avant tout la danse qui confère au monde tsigan un prestige considérable en France pendant tout le cours du XVIIe siècle

**Bohemians** came to break up the monotony of castle life. They were capable of rendering services: armed guards, temporary servants, skilled horsemen who could care for and heal the animals [...] The musicians exercised their talents, with harps, flutes, or violins. But

---

\(^{50}\) Glen W. Davidson states that the first documented arrival of Roma in France was in 1419 in his article “Gypsies’ People with a Hidden History.”

\(^{51}\) The most notable edicts were signed by Charles Quint and François I in 1537 and 1539 respectively. These edicts mandated the expulsion of Roma from France. Other edicts and ordonnances were occurring on a local level, referencing this first edict.
above all, it was danse that made the tsiganes quite prestigious in France during the course of the 17th century (149).

Inspired by the trendy entertainment factor that the nobility derived from the Roma in their courts, there was an increased presence of tsigane characters within literature, theater, and dance. Foletier notes of particular interest the inclusion of “égyptiens et égyptiennes” in Molière’s Le mariage forcé as well as “dans de nombreux ballets donnés sous Louis XIII et Louis XIV / in numerous ballets performed under Louis XIII and Louis XIV” (150). By the 17th-century, the Roma themselves were profiting from this cultural interest, expanding their stages from the Court to cities and towns across Europe. Foletier notes their presence in Nevers, Grenholc, and Florensac, in the faubourgs and countryside (150).

Unfortunately, the popular fascination wanes at the end of the 17th-century with the “Déclaration du Roi contre les Bohèmes” issued in 1682. A copy of this edict can be found in appendix 3. However, Foletier summarizes it thus:

[La loi] renouvelle et précise des mesures de répression, jusqu’alors peu appliquées; les hommes seront envoyés aux galères; les femmes, si elles persistent à vagabonder, seront enfermées dans les hôpitaux

[The law] renewed and clarified measures of repression which had until then been rarely applied. The men were sent to the galleys; the women, if they continued to roam were institutionalized (152).

The edict also scolds the noblemen who had welcomed the Roma into their courts, threatening them “d’être privés de leurs justices et de voir leurs fiefs réunis au Domaine du roi / with the removal of their legal privileges and having their fiefs returned to the king’s domain” (ibid).

With this threat, the nobleman who socialized with the Roma risked losing their social, economic, and political statuses. The Roma would often, therefore, lose the protections they once had. Vaux de Foletier summarizes the 18th-century consequences to this edict as follows:
Cependant les Tsiganes ne disparaissent pas du royaume. Mais ils se font moins voyants. Les grandes compagnies se fragmentent en petits groupes. Les femmes renoncent à leur bariolage, à leurs grandes capes rayées. Les chefs ne se vantent plus d’être capitaines d’Égypte ou de Bohême. Sous Louis XV la mode bohémienne a disparu; les philosophes raillent les superstitions de ces ‘gueux errants’; à quelques exceptions près, le Siècle des Lumières les méprise ou les ignore.

Nevertheless, the Tsiganes didn’t disappear from the kingdom. But, they made themselves less visible. The large companies broke into small groups; The women renounced their bright clothing and large, striped cloaks. The chiefs no longer bragged of being Egyptian or Bohemian captains. Under Louis XV, bohemian style disappeared; the philosophers mocked these “errant paupers” superstitions. With few exceptions, the Age of Enlightenment disdained or ignored them [the Roma] (152).

Essentially, the Roma attempted to hide their identities to avoid legal persecution. They were almost forgotten.

However, the 19th-century brought new light to the Roma in France. The century

débute par une féroce râfle de Bohémiens dans le pays basque; pendant quatre à cinq ans, sans l’ombre de jugement, plusieurs centaines d’entre eux, hommes, femmes, et enfants, croupissent dans les prisons et les dépôts de mendicité. Avec le romantisme la littérature s’intéresse de nouveau aux Tsiganes, mais pour les peindre sous les plus sombres couleurs

began with a ferocious roundup of Bohemians in the Basque country; during four to five years, without the shadow of judgment, several hundred of them - men, women, and children - rotted away in prisons and workhouses. With Romanticism, literary interest in Tsiganes was revived, only to paint them in the darkest colors (ibid).

In conjunction with this roundup, the Code Pénal de 1810 prohibited the Roma’s free movement. Marc Bordigoni explores the penal code and later legislation such as the law of 8 August 1893 more thoroughly in “Comment la France inventa ses ‘Nomades’". The Penal Code of 1810 itself defined a particular image of who is a vagabond: “Section V: Association de malfaiteurs, vagabondage, et mendicité / Section V: Association of wrongdoers, vagrancy, and begging” (Code Pénal de 1810). It places miscreants, vagabonds, and beggars in the same category – though each has its own subparagraph - implying that itinerancy is equal to general
delinquency and gang activity. It is important to note that, legally speaking, “vagabond” and “Roma” were considered synonymous. Article 269 of the code states, “Le vagabondage est un délit / Vagrancy is a crime.” Article 272 declares that

Les individus déclarés vagabonds par jugement, pourront, s’ils sont étrangers, être conduits, par les ordres du gouvernement, hors du territoire de l’Empire

Individuals declared vagabonds by judgment will be, if they are foreign, expelled from the Empire on government order

This article laid the framework for subsequent decrees, legal circulars, and legislation. France recognized a core concept of Romani culture at the time – itinerancy – as a criminal act. 52

Legislatively speaking, little development occurred between the publication of the Penal Code of 1810 and the mid-century. However, this is likely because the Romani population in France had remained somewhat stagnant in the interim. However, as Brown notes, the vagabond populations were expanding exponentially in Paris by the mid-19th-century. In 1856, there were 1,456 “beggars and vagabonds” in the entire department of the Seine, but by 1872 there were 15,258 in the city of Paris alone (23). While it is impossible to know how many of these vagabonds were Roma, Brown notes that there were at least 50 Romani families in one community in Paris (ibid). At the same time, this increase in the Romani population was occurring, popular fascination with them grew as well. Brown notes that with these increases, fear and prejudice grew amongst the French population (15). With such an influx in population numbers and public fear, the government thought it necessary to respond with legislation.

---

52 While many Romani populations were itinerant during the 19th-century, the Roma, in general, became more sedentary during the 20th-century.
One such attempt at enforcing legislation was Paul Bodet’s 1864 circular. In this circular, Bodet asks the police commissioner to expel a group of Roma. He wrote,

Monsieur le Préfet, depuis longtemps le gouvernement se préoccupe des moyens de garantir nos populations rurales contre les méfaits et les dépréciations de bandes d’individus vagabonds et nomades connus sous le nom de Bohémiens

Mr. Police Commissioner, for a while the government has taken measures to protect our rural populations against the wrongdoings done by and losses caused by groups of individual vagabonds and nomads known as Bohémiens (Bodet).

From this first sentence, we can see that, at least colloquially, there was no distinction between bohémiens and Roma. Law and myth were intertwined in the public view. Following this entanglement, Roma were expelled from the country on various occasions because of their relationship to this idea.

In addition to Paul Bodet’s 1864 circular, there were new approaches from the police. Brown notes that the Nouveau Manuel complet de la police de France of 1855 “laid down a set format of interrogation to be used when arresting gypsies and other vagabonds” (24). Seeking out Romani persons for arrest was systematic. However, Brown argues that this systemic response was not proportional to reality: “the police archives are surprisingly meager in hard evidence of Bohemian criminality. Most infractions were of anti-nomadism and anti-congregation statues” (25). That is to say, the Roma were not stealing from or harming Frenchmen. Instead, they were simply moving about in groups.

The 19th-century significantly influenced public perception of the Roma and defined what the popular image of the Gypsy is today. It is important to keep this background in mind when approaching the literature of the time. The social and political instability significantly influenced this literature in France. The novels I discuss sprung from the ideals of the Revolution, the
Napoleonic regimes, the Bourbon Restoration, the July Monarchy, and then eventually the events of 1848. With all these shifts and transitions, it became difficult to define “Frenchness.” Different social groups and political leaders attempted to answer this question of identity through legislation, economic policy, and societal rebellion. These attempts had varying degrees of success. The bohemian movement of the 19th-century embodied the countercultural movements of the time. In my analyses, I show how movement reified stereotypes about bohémien or tziganes. These chapters examine how authors attempted to explore French identity through tzigane characters within the contexts of the various political, social, and economic reactions to France being in flux and how this method of writing impacted the Roma.

The 20th-century brought a new wave of anti-Romany legislation, which encouraged forced assimilation. In 1912, France passed a law “introducing a carnet anthropométrique for itinerants of whatever nationality [...] a document of about 100 pages, to be stamped in each commune on arrival and departure. The carnet gave rise to all kinds of harassment” (Frazer, 253). The carnet remained a legislated requirement for over sixty years. Marie-Christine Hubert’s article “Les Réglementations anti-tsiganes en France et en Allemagne, avant et pendant l’occupation” examines how this law was later used by the Nazis to track and identify Roma for internment. On the other hand, Switzerland used the Pro Juventute foundation to remove Roma children from their families. Frazer summarizes that the organization believed that these children “should wherever possible be resettled in order to divert them into the mainstream of society” (252). This program removed children from their families until 1973 (253). In Germany, 1926 legislation made “settlement compulsory” and stated that those not regularly employed could be sentenced to “workhouses for up to two years” (252).
The Roma were the second largest population interred by the Nazis. As Frazer points out, “Jews and Gypsies were in fact the only two ethnic groups which would be designated for annihilation by National Socialist ideology” (257). The Nazis believed the Roma to be “a dangerous Fremdrasse (alien race) whose blood was a mortal threat to German racial purity” (ibid). Despite these horrific classifications and the deaths of up to 500,000 Roma (ERRC), Germany argued that the internment was not racially based but that the cause for Roma “victimization was that he was a possible criminal.” (268-269). Based on this justification, “his fate was ‘only’ a consequence of ordinary security measures” (269). Because of this argument, Roma survivors of the Holocaust received no compensation until 1963. Even then, they ended up with “conspicuously modest amounts of compensation, if they proved themselves tenacious and literate enough to battle their way through the stringent requirements for documentary and medical evidence and successfully established a claim” (ibid).

Anti-Romanyism did not end with the Holocaust. In fact, it continues today in various fashions. The European Roma Rights Council maintains records for anti-Romany actions committed across Europe. The Council of Europe also has an information page on these atrocities. In October 2020, a group of far-right protesters attacked a Roma neighborhood in Kyiv (Jonathan Lee). In 2021, the Metropolitan Court in Budapest ruled that the Ministry of Human Capacities had discriminated against Roma families when removing children from their homes due to impoverishment (Kevin Byrne). In 2019, French President Emmanuel Macron racially degraded a Roma boxer involved in the gilet jaune protests saying, “le type, il n’a pas les mots d’un gitan. Il n’a pas les mots d’un boxeur gitan/ the guy, he doesn’t speak like a gypsy. He doesn’t speak like a gypsy boxer” (Dorde Jovanović). As we can see from this small number of
examples, anti-Romanyism is alive and well across Europe and extends to those in power. This context should be kept in mind while reading this research and conducting further research.
Appendix 3. Some Notes on French History

The following section highlights some pertinent events in French history. These notes are not intended to be a thorough examination of 19th-century France. Rather, they provide some context for the analyses found in the preceding chapters.

When Hugo, Sand, Mérimée, or Nodier struck pen to paper, the weight of the French Revolution still weighed heavily on society when these authors wrote their texts. France was still asking itself many questions in response to the aftermath of the Revolution. What did it mean to be a republic? What did it mean to no longer be a monarchy? Which political system is better? With the power shifts, what should social structures look like? Who should have power? How is money to be redistributed? Who had a voice within this new society? These were only some of the questions that France was trying to answer in the early 19th-century. The following historical summary highlights some of the moments that attempted to answer these questions. Whereas this section focuses on social, economic, and political responses, the literary analyses in the chapters to follow reexamine these same questions, exploring how literature incorporated current events and myths in reaction to this period of instability in France.

In the Bourgeois Revolution in France, Henry Heller discusses how the Napoleonic regime struggled and fought to answer questions regarding social positioning. Whereas the monarchy primarily defined social rankings through nobility, the Empire failed to delineate modes of class distinction and mobility. For Heller, the crux of these questions lies in the relative uncertainty of the nation's socioeconomic structure. In chapter 7, Heller states that “Continuing the fundamental gains of the Revolution and spreading them beyond France, the Napoleonic era
marked the consolidation of the Revolution as well as the power of the bourgeoisie” (125). In other words, as the ideas of the Revolution took hold, power shifted from the aristocracy to the bourgeoisie. This power shift created a significant economic change on which the Napoleonic regime wanted to capitalize. While the government wanted to use this economic shift as “a means of struggle against the industrial and economic power the implacable enemy, England,” the power shift was not a direct result of an industrial boom (127). In a somewhat ironic, non-revolutionary fashion, “[t]he land, rather than commerce or manufacturing, remained the basis of the social and political power” of the bourgeoisie (ibid). That is to say, though industry funded the wealth of the new elite, industry was not the force behind it. The force behind their power remained land possession, not unlike the feudal regimes of the past. In this system, the Gypsy plays a scary role. The character is from no land yet can destroy Frenchmen.

Despite this ironic source of power, industry did play a critical role in maintaining France’s presence as a European powerhouse. Though the maritime regions did not benefit as much from industrialization, the Napoleonic Regime did use it to create a pan-European economic network, with France seemingly at the center. Heller continues,

the Continental System helped to stimulate the external and internal market, especially in the provinces on the eastern and northern frontiers. Alsace saw commercial expansion, major public works programs and industrial and technological progress especially in cotton manufacturing. Swiss, and to a certain extent German, rather than Parisian bankers, were the major sources of financing in that province. The département of the Nord which included such important industrial centers as Lille, Tourcoing, Roubaix, and Douai, experienced a prodigious economic development. The rich Anzin coalfields as well as the operation of fisheries, sheep and other livestock production, and the output of grain, linen, hops, tobacco, potatoes, sugar beets, chicories and colza, provided a diversified economic base. Linen, wool cloth, cotton, lace, ribbon, and stocking manufacture occupied both the rural and urban population. Significant steps toward mechanization and factory production were taken in many of these sectors. Belgium entered into the first phases of the Industrial Revolution under the Empire. Mechanization and the concentration of production in the hands of seven great textile manufacturing firms including the Ternaux marked the
response of local entrepreneurs to the opportunities of the Continental market. Wool manufacturing at Reims expanded prodigiously during these years (133). By making economic connections outside France which relied on institutions within the Hexagon, the Continental System made France an integral part of the European economic system and a competitive rival to England.

While this economic strategy worked on an international front, mostly by uniting the economic force to defeat England, the dangerous outsider, it had differing consequences within the nation itself. Again, the uncertainty surrounding the socioeconomic structure of this new world reified uncertainties of national identity. In a system in which the elite is not inherently political, as in the case of the aristocracy, how could the leader be sure that he had their political support? Rafe Blaufarb explores this tension in a chapter entitled “The Ancien Régime Origins of Napoleonic Social Reconstruction” in Jeremy Black's compilation *Revolutions in the Western World 1775-1825*. According to Blaufarb, “the fate of the Napoleonic settlement hinged on the ability of the regime to form a new elite capable of enduring after the death of its master [Napoleon]” (409). How could the continuation of any regime be guaranteed in such a system? The administration sought loyalty through reward and praise. The Napoleonic Regime used three methods to reward citizens, granting them higher social statuses and encouraging loyalty to the state.

First was the *notabilité*. The men of the *notabilité* formed a new nobility who “possessed sufficient interest, enlightenment and economic independence to make sound decisions and shape public opinion” (411). Through this selection method, the new elite was populated with “the new political class created by the Revolution” and failed to represent the “real social and economic *notabilité* of the Consulate” (ibid). To better reflect the new social
structure, the Senatus-Consultum “made land ownership the principal requirement for
inclusion in the notabilité” (ibid). Soon, public servants such as “military officers, administrators,
magistrates and ecclesiastics” also made up a large portion of the notabilité. Public servants
maintained their positions in the notabilité through education. The government gave public
servants bourses for their children to attend public schools, which strengthened their familial
positions in this new upper class. The right to education via heritage resulted in nepotism
within the notabilité (ibid). The notabilité had too many shortcomings - notably that it relied too
much on wealth which was considered a moral failing. Additionally, economic independence
did not meet the goal of creating loyalty to the state. Blaufarb explains,

With their status deriving from the entrepreneurship or, as was more often the case,
resting on inherited wealth, the notables were too independent from the regime and
thus too little interested in its fate to second Napoleon’s dynastic ambitions [...] One
day, self-interest might lead them to betray their current protector (Ibid).

It was time for a new method of praise.

Next, under Napoleon’s empire came the Legion of Honor, which imposed a limit on the
financial influence on merits. It also avoided the creation of hereditary wealth, a critique of the
aristocracy and the notabilité. Inclusion in the Legion “would be award only au mérite personnel
without distinction of birth” (414). Like the notabilité, the Legion was not without controversy. It
was too reminiscent of the actions of the ancien régime in the minds of republican legislators.
According to Blaufarb, “[f]ormal distinctions not only undermined the principle of equality, but
also threatened to revive the monarchical sentiment of honour” (ibid). The Legion was to honor
both military and civilian merit to avoid inegalitarianism. However, this ambition quickly fell
short. It “soon became a purely military distinction” (415) and created an impoverished elite.
Having an impoverished elite does not bode well for governance. Driven by Napoleon’s drive to systematize the government, the regime sought to relieve impoverishment through merit. Blaufarb notes that to reduce poverty amongst the members of the Legion, “Napoleon believed it necessary to make the transmission of titles contingent upon not only merit but also the possession of a stable fortune” (421). To prove their wealth, members of the nobility had to prove a certain landholding or *majorat* (421-422). Not wanting to alienate those who were not independently wealthy, Napoleon “made numerous land-gifts that could be used to constitute *majorats*” (422). This class eventually evolved into the nobility of the Empire. Blaufarb concludes of the Napoleonic social approach that “[t]he solution it ultimately found, a nobility originating in service but perpetuated through wealth, was intended to reconcile these principles and transcend the divisions which had shattered the unity of the *ancien régime* elites” (423).

Ultimately, the regime tried to force a moral identity upon a populous who was still defining itself. According to Blaufarb, the Napoleonic government attempted “to solve a debate, raised during the final decades of the *ancien régime*, over whether material or moral criteria should predominate in the social order” and in doing so “sought to accomplish what the *ancien régime* had failed to do: reconcile wealth and service within a new conception of social hierarchy” (410). These efforts attempted to force a reconciliation upon society rather than allowing society to restructure itself organically. These attempts left unanswered questions. What was France in the post-Revolution world? Who were the French? What was her social structure, and how could that be maintained? What was her relation to Europe? These questions remained unanswered.
As all pendulums do, it swung back in the absence of stability. In 1814-1815, with the decline and defeat of Napoleon, France shifted into the period known as the Bourbon Restoration. France returned to its monarchical state. Though I do not focus too heavily on this moment, it boldly embodied the plurality of political, social, and economic shifts that France underwent and would continue to undergo for several decades. The tensions between royalists and republicans were rising. In “The New ( Emotional) Regime: Bourgeois Reactions to the Turmoil of 1814-1815,” Denise Z. Davidson summarizes the period as such:

Few moments have brought more rapid and far-reaching change to Europe than the multiple diplomatic and political revolutions of 1814 and 1815: an emperor faced military defeat twice, a Bourbon king returned to the French throne twice, diplomats redrew the map of Europe, new political regimes were established, new political ideologies took shape, and new social structures and cultural practices emerged even as older aristocratic models of behavior remained influential. This period of intense chaos unleashed anxiety and confusion among the French populace as they faced yet more turmoil after having already lived through so much during the preceding decades (595).

Davidson’s article presents a unique point of view on this moment in history. She examines letters written by average citizens during this time and notes how these letters contrast with the letters from the Revolutionary period which have typically been examined. Rather than being emotionally charged, “the letter writers express a sentiment of ‘keep calm and carry on,’ with little in the way of histrionics” (596). Rather than suffering from the chaos, people “sought the comfort of long-term friends and allies” (ibid). Connection and identity were condensed on a more local, intimate level rather than a national one. In fact, it seems that personal connection to the national dwindled during this period. Davidson observes that

While anger and frustration on seeing France defeated and occupied appear in these letters, those emotions come across as surprisingly subdued. The message correspondents wanted to share, as well as the sense of self they sought to present, was that of a person in control of her situation despite the difficulties of the times (596-597, emphasis mine).
Responsibility and loyalty shifted from the national to the personal. For self-preservation, political allegiances amongst the elites destabilized. According to Davidson,

Regardless of their particular affiliations or ideologies, what drove these men and women to think and act as they did was a desire for emotional and mental stability [...] If Napoléon could bring economic and political order to France, they would support him; if Louis XVIII could accomplish the same feat, and particularly if he would accept a constitution, they would be satisfied as well (601).

Rather than political affiliation being linked to loyalty to the state or national ideology, it was self-serving - and understandably so. However, in a nationalist context, this reaction to the political turmoil of these two years led to further confusion on a shared national identity and socioeconomic structure. The question of what it meant to be “French” remained unanswered.

After the turmoil of 1814 and 1815 and fifteen years of the Restoration, the pendulum had swung back to the monarchy. Louis XVIII reigned over France, restoring his family's political legacy. However, with the monarch's return, France faced a complex situation. Were people to ignore all that had happened since the Revolution? How could myth be used to restore legitimacy to Louis XVIII’s reign? Sheryl Kroen explores how the answers to these questions presented themselves theatrically in her monograph Politics and Theater: The Crisis of Legitimacy in Restoration France, 1815-1830. In her introduction, she notes this difficulty which Louis XVIII faced:

Louis XVIII could not merely present himself as the only ‘natural,’ ‘legitimate’ ruler of France; the previous twenty-five years had taught his subjects precisely the opposite lesson, namely that legitimate authority could be constructed out of many different elements, sustained by different symbols and legends, and based on different ideologies (6-7).
She argues that the monarchy, its institutions, and officials effectively instituted a “politics as theater,” which created staged environments and scenarios that created loyalty to and support of the monarchy.

The return to a monarchical society created economic shifts in France, which played a critical role in the construction - or deconstruction - of the social identity of mid-19th-century France. In his article “Shopkeepers, Ideology and the State during the Bourbon Restoration and July Monarchy,” Charles P. Crouch analyzes how 18th-century politician Anne-Robert Turgot’s six edicts of 1776 impacted the social sphere during these 19th-century moments. According to Crouch,

Ever since Anne-Robert Turgot’s decision to introduce physiocratic economic principles into the French polity, specifically the suppression of the corporations, identity and thus ideology has been unsettled for those members of society most concerned: workers and masters [...] especially so for masters (and small business people in general), especially in the nineteenth century (358).

Crouch notes a significant shift in identity politics which resulted from these edicts. Identity was no longer conferred by birthright but by “critical capital,” or economic role (ibid). This shift made it more difficult to identify social groupings, a difficulty enhanced by the growth of domestic consumption in the years leading up to the Revolution [....which blurred...] the lines of class identification and social identity as common people began to dress (and consume other items such as household articles) like their betters (359).

In this same paragraph, Crouch notes how gender equity efforts such as the “legalization of divorce [and] equal inheritance” also caused identity confusion “despite the Civil Code’s reassertion of the husband-dominated family as the social norm (ibid). He concludes these shifts by observing that “[b]y the advent of the Bourbon Restoration [...] social identity was a contested and unknown territory” (ibid).
Crouch notes that the Bourbon monarchy’s return to the throne threw another wrench into the social confusion. The petit-bourgeois lost their suffrage rights and thus their political influence. This class now had no political recourse except direct petition to the king. According to Crouch, this caused members of the petit-bourgeois to act in the shadows: “Being excluded from active participation in politics, the petit-bourgeois ‘political’ activity took other extra-constitutional forms, such as membership in secret societies and the like” (369). These secret societies brought about exposure to “alternative systems of thought” - often anti-government - and to “the emerging working-class movement” (370). Political loyalties became unstable.

Ultimately, this diminished support for the monarchy. According to Crouch, for petits-bourgeois, continued support for a monarchical position was problematic although there are scattered examples of support for the Legitimists among shopkeepers. [...] Following the Revolution of 1830, the lower middle class would gravitate into the orbits of those movements opposed to the Orléanist regime. There were three main movements: republicanism, Bonapartism, and socialism (370-371).

Interestingly, the state-sponsored edicts from the 18th-century, which intended to drive the French economy, caused the petits-bourgeois, key economic actors for the domestic economy, to detach their identity from the state. The political edicts caused a distinct erosion of the cohesiveness of French identity. Ultimately, the divisions that resulted from these economic outcomes “increased in intensity and severity [and] seriously undermined the nature of the alliance between the petite bourgeoisie and the laboring classes, preparing the ground for its collapse in the spring and summer of 1848” (372). Crouch concludes that this led to the petite bourgeoisie supporting the “authoritarian figure” of Louis Napoléon Bonaparte (ibid). Following Crouch’s line of argument alongside the other factors that impacted French social identity, I would add that the deconstruction of French social identity schemas commenced efforts to
remap the French social sphere so that it would return to a navigable state. This remapping occurred across society in politics, activism, economics, and literature.

In July 1830, France experienced yet another regime change – the establishment of the July Monarchy. The public, split between royalist and revolutionary ideologies, was frustrated. In response, moderates and centrists rallied behind Louis-Phillipe. On 28 July, the bourbon monarchy fell, and the “July Monarchy” took its place. Louis-Phillipe, the duc d’Orléans, became the lieutenant general. Tensions regarding political beliefs were very high. As H.A.C. Collingham notes, “[w]homever he betrayed, Orléans almost certainly saved France from civil war” (20). In an effort to unite the people, Louis-Phillipe became “King of the French” rather than the “King of France” (28).53 Louis-Phillipe didn’t rule the land of France (though land certainly played a role in identity formation), but he ruled the people, united under one nationality.

Despite efforts of unification through language and political centrism, or perhaps because of these efforts, there were many threats to Louis-Phillipe’s reign. Much of this unrest derived from the instability of the social classes. For the upper classes, the political shift meant a change in social and economic statuses. Some lost social and economic power. The lower classes grew discontented with the government as well. They had hoped for better economic outcomes, but new limitations prevented economic advancement. 1830 to 1836 was problematic for the regime as ministers frequently resigned. Louis-Philippe could not maintain a stable government, and tensions rose between him and the politicians (Collingham, 155). In fact, on 5 February 1836, the political tensions between the king and the ministers met a breaking point. All of the ministers resigned from the cabinet (201). This instability highlighted a

---

53 This terminology was also used in the constitution of 1791.
division within the political elite itself. Towards the end of the regime, the *petit-bourgeois* united in their disdain for these economic and social tensions. They began to “feel like revolutionaries” (363).

In 1848, this working-class, the *petit-bourgeois*, rose against the monarchy. William Fortescue in *France and 1848: The End of Monarchy* explains that from 1845 to the 1851 revolution, France experienced an economic crisis that made life difficult for the poor. A famine impacted crop harvests and led to increases in food costs. (38). Simultaneously, there was increased unemployment coupled with reduced working hours (ibid). In response to these crises, widespread protests began in 1845 (42). These protests gained revolutionary steam by February 1848 when student protestors rioted in the streets (60). These protests, which grew more violent, led to the end of Louis-Philippe’s reign.

In the wake of Louis-Phillipe’s abdication, the Provisional Government called for a republic. The republic could only be established “on the basis of manhood suffrage,” in which a national vote would be required to support the regime change (63). These efforts ushered in the Second Republic. The populous elected the National Assembly in April. According to Fortescue,

> There was a general expectation that the National Assembly elections of 23 April 1848 would unite France. For the first time, a new parliament had been elected on the basis of manhood suffrage and therefore represented all adult male French citizens [... it] would be able to bring France out of its current state of crisis. The reality, however, was rather different. By isolating the left-wing republicans and socialists, the election campaign had been divisive (99).

In the face of political division, the National Assembly was tasked with naming an interim government.

While the National Assembly was taking place, there was simultaneously a rise in Bonapartism. The government’s attempts to quell this movement only gave it more
power. Unity was out of reach. Protests that continued in the capital “finally destroyed the myth of national unity and further alienated left-wing republicans and socialists” (110).

On 10 and 11 December, the French populace voted for their president. Louis Napoleon-Bonaparte won in a landslide, getting nearly seventy-five percent of the vote (136). Even under the democratically elected rule of Louis Napoleon-Bonaparte, the Second Republic would continue to be marred by divisions between the left and right for its entire existence. The Second Republic would end with the 1852 coup, which began the Second Empire. This coup certainly did not alleviate the tensions around political stability.

As we can see, the early-to-mid 19th-century was a period of remapping France politically, socially, and economically. The aim was to create a cohesive post-Revolutionary France. This remapping relied on collective memory. The actors mentioned in this historical overview manipulated and presented specific versions of French history to create a foundation for this cohesion. As I show in the literary analyses, authors, too, relied on collective memory and the manipulation thereof to navigate this transitional period. The remapping within the collective memory allows for establishing social and national identity. It created ideas of belonging as well as exclusion.

In his book How Societies Remember, Paul Connerton explains how collective memory functions in society. Fittingly, Connerton shows how France used collective memory in the mid-19th-century as a case study. He shows how the government attempted to create the concept of a fresh start. He discusses how renaming the months in the aftermath of the Revolution was an attempt to mark a new beginning of time by attempting to destroy prior knowledges of time (6). There was an attempt at linguistically erasing the past. However, as Connerton argues, a society can't forget its past completely. According to Connerton,
It is not just that it is very difficult to begin with a wholly new start, that too many old
loyalties and habits inhibit the substitution of a novel enterprise for an old and established
one. More fundamentally, it is that in all modes of experience we always base our particular
experiences on a prior context in order to ensure that they are intelligible at all; that prior to
any single experience, our mind is already predisposed with a framework of outlines, of
typical shapes of experienced objects. To perceive an object or act upon it is to locate it
within the system of expectations. The world of the percipient, defined in terms of temporal
experience, is an organized body of expectations based on recollection (6).

Paul Connerton notes that history is only known through its “traces.” He explains,

Whether it is the bones buried in Roman fortifications [...] or a word in a Greek inscription
whose use or form reveals a custom [...], what the historian deals with are traces: that is to
say marks, perceptible to the senses, which some phenomenon, in itself inaccessible, has
left behind (13).

It is important that the study of traces of things no longer accessible implies a form of
translation and transcendence. To understand the current social state, one must transcend a
temporal boundary.

I propose that literature was one tool used to translate history into comprehensible
knowledge for the masses. Writers used literature as a means of temporal transcendence to
navigate current situations. However, these translations, like all translations, are inherently
biased. In this way, the author writes to disrupt or manipulate social memory’s power to answer
questions about the present. The following chapters explore how 19th-century texts used the
tzigane character as a translation tool or means of temporal and spatial transcendence.
Déclaration du Roi contre les bohèmes 1682
DECLARATION DU ROY,
Contre les vagabonds, & gens appellez Bohèmes & Bohemiennes, & ceux qui leur donnent retraite.

O U I S par la grace de Dieu, Roy de France, & de Navarre; A tous ceux qui ces présentes Lettres verront, S A L U T, quelques fois que les Rois nos Prédécesseurs ayent pris pour purger leurs Etats de vagabonds & gens appellez Bohèmes, ayant en joint par leurs Ordonnances aux Prevôts des Ma-

refchaux, & autres Juges, d’envoyer lesdits Bohèmes aux Galères, sans autre forme de procès; néanmoins il a été impossible de chaf-

er entièrement du Royaume ces Voleurs, par la protection qu’ils ont de tout temps trouvée, & qu’ils trouvent encore journelle-
ment auprès des Gentils-hommes, & Seigneurs Justiciers qui leur donnent retraite dans leurs Châteaux & maisons, nonobstant les 

Arrets des Parlemens, qui le leur défendent expressément, à peine de privation de leurs Justices, & d’amende arbitraire, ce de-

fendre étant commun dans la plus part des Provinces de nostre 

Royaume. Et d’autant qu’il importe au repos de nos Sujets, & à la tranquillité publique, de renouveler les anciennes Ordonnances, à l’égard desdits Bohèmes, & d’en établir de nouvelles contre leurs 

femmes, & contre ceux qui leur donnent retraite, & qui par ce moyen se rendent complices de leurs crimes. A C E S C A U S E S, & autres considérations à ce nous mouvans, de l’avis de nostre 

Conseil, & de nostre certaine science, pleine puissance & autorité 

Royale, Nous avons dit & déclaré, disons & déclarons par ces 

présentes, signées de nostre main, voulons & nous plaist que les 

anciennes Ordonnances faites au sujet desdits Bohèmes, soient 

exécutées selon leur forme & teneur; Et ce faisant, enjoignons à nos Baillis, Sénéchaux, leurs Lieutenans; comme aussi aux Pre-

vôts des Mareschaux, Vice-Baillis, & Vice-Sénéchaux, d’arrestez 

& faire arrêter tous ceux qui s’appellent Bohèmes, ou Egyptiens, 

leurs femmes, enfants, & autres de leur suite, de faire attacher les 

hommes à la chaîne des forçats, pour estre conduits dans nos Ga-
lérès, & y servir à perpétuité : Et à l’égard de leurs femmes, & filles, Ordonnons à nosdits Juges de les faire raser la première fois qu’elles auront été trouvées menant la vie de Bohémiennes, & de faire conduire dans les Hospitaux les plus prochains des lieux les enfants qui ne seront pas en état de servir dans nos Galeries, pour y être nourris & élevées comme les autres enfants qui y sont enfermez. Et en cas que lesdites femmes continuent de vaguer, & de vivre en Bohémiennes, de les faire fuiriger, & bannir hors du Royaume, le tout sans autre forme ny figure de procès. Faisons défenses à tous Gentils-hommes, Seigneurs hauts Justiciers & de Fiefs, de donner retraitée dans leurs Châteaux & maisons auditd Bohémes & à leurs femmes ; & en cas de contravention, voulons que lesdits Gentils-hommes, Seigneurs hauts Justiciers soient privés de leur Justice, & que leurs Fiels soient réunis à noitre Domaine, même qu’il soit procédé contre eux extraordinairement, pour y être punis d’une plus grande peine, si le cas y échut, sans qu’il soit en la liberté de nos Juges de moderer ces peines. Si DONNONS EN MANDEMENT à nos Ames & Feaux les Gens tenans noitre Cour de Parlement de Paris, que ces presente ils ayent à faire lire, publier, & enregistrer mesme dans les Senechaussées, & Bailliages de son ressort, & le contenu en icelles entretenir & faire entretenir & observer selon leur forme & teneur, fans y contravenir, ny souffrir qu’il y soit contrevenu en quelque sorte & manière que ce soit. CARTEL EST NOSTRE PLAISIR. Et témoins de quoy, nous avons fait mettre le sceau à ce dites Presentes, DONNE à Versailles le onzième jour du mois de Juillet, l’an de grace mil six cens quatre-vingt-deux, & de noitre Regne le quarantième. Signé, LOUIS ; Et sur le reply, Par le Roy, COLBERT. Et icellé du grand sceau de cire jaune.

Registres, ouy, & ce requérant le Procureur General du Roy, pour être exécutées selon leur forme & teneur, suivant l’Arrêt de ce jour. À Paris en Parlement le 4. Aoust 1662. Signé, DongoiS.
Appendix 5. Code Pénal de 1810

SECTION V. - ASSOCIATION DE MALFAITEURS, VAGABONDAGE ET MENDICITÉ

1. - ASSOCIATION DE MALFAITEURS.

ARTICLE 265.
Toute association de malfaiteurs envers les personnes ou les propriétés, est un crime contre la paix publique.

ARTICLE 266.
Ce crime existe par le seul fait d'organisation de bandes ou de correspondance entre elles et leurs chefs ou commandants, ou de conventions tendant à rendre compte ou à faire distribution ou partage du produit des méfaits.

ARTICLE 267.
Quand ce crime n'aurait été accompagné ni suivi d'aucun autre, les auteurs, directeurs de l'association, et les commandants en chef ou en sous-ordre de ces bandes, seront punis des travaux forcés à temps.

ARTICLE 268.
Seront punis de la réclusion tous autres individus chargés d'un service quelconque dans ces bandes, et ceux qui auront sciemment et volontairement fourni aux bandes ou à leurs divisions, des armes, munitions, instruments de crime, logement, retraite ou lieu de réunion,

II. - VAGABONDAGE.

ARTICLE 269.
Le vagabondage est un délit.
ARTICLE 270.

Les vagabonds ou gens sans aveu sont ceux qui n'ont ni domicile certain, ni moyen de subsistance, et qui n'exercent habituellement ni métier ni profession.

ARTICLE 271.

Les vagabonds ou gens sans aveu qui auront été légalement déclarés tels, seront, pour ce seul fait, punis de trois à six mois d'emprisonnement, et demeureront, après avoir subi leur peine, à la disposition du gouvernement pendant le temps qu'il déterminera, eu égard à leur conduite.

ARTICLE 272.

Les individus déclarés vagabonds par jugement, pourront, s'ils sont étrangers, être conduits, par les ordres du gouvernement, hors du territoire de l'Empire.

ARTICLE 273.

Les vagabonds nés en France pourront, après un jugement même passé en force de chose jugée, être réclamés par délibération du conseil municipal de la commune où ils sont nés, ou cautionnés par un citoyen solvable.

Si le gouvernement accueille la réclamation ou agrée la caution, les individus ainsi réclamés ou cautionnés seront, par ses ordres, renvoyés ou conduits dans la commune qui les a réclamés, ou dans celle qui leur sera assignée pour résidence, sur la demande de la caution.

PARAGRAPHE III. - MENDICITÉ.

ARTICLE 274.
Toute personne qui aura été trouvée mendiant dans un lieu pour lequel il existera un établissement public organisé afin d'obvier à la mendicité, sera punie de trois à six mois d'emprisonnement, et sera, après l'expiration de sa peine, conduite au dépôt de mendicité.

ARTICLE 275.
Dans les lieux où il n'existe point encore de tels établissements, les mendiants d'habitude valides seront punis d'un mois à trois mois d'emprisonnement.
S'ils ont été arrêtés hors du canton de leur résidence, ils seront punis d'un emprisonnement de six mois à deux ans.

ARTICLE 276.
Tous mendiants, même invalides, qui auront usé de menaces, ou seront entrés sans permission du propriétaire ou des personnes de sa maison, soit dans une habitation, soit dans un enclos en dépendant,
Ou qui feindront des plaies ou infirmités,
Ou qui mendieront en réunion, à moins que ce ne soient le mari et la femme, le père ou la mère et leurs jeunes enfants, l'aveugle et son conducteur,
Seront punis d'un emprisonnement de six mois à deux ans.

DISPOSITIONS COMMUNES AUX VAGABONDS ET MENDIANTS.

ARTICLE 277.
Tout mendiant ou vagabond qui aura été saisi travesti d'une manière quelconque,
Ou porteur d'armes, bien qu'il n'en ait usé ni menacé,
Ou muni de limes, crochets ou autres instruments propres soit à commettre des vols ou d'autres délits, soit à lui procurer les moyens de pénétrer dans les maisons,
Sera puni de deux à cinq ans d'emprisonnement.

ARTICLE 278.
Tout mendiant ou vagabond qui sera trouvé porteur d'un ou de plusieurs effets d'une valeur supérieure à cent francs, et qui ne justifiera point d'où ils lui proviennent, sera puni de la peine portée en l'article 276.

ARTICLE 279.
Tout mendiant ou vagabond qui aura exercé quelque acte de violence que ce soit envers les personnes, sera puni de la réclusion, sans préjudice de peines plus fortes, s'il y a lieu, à raison du genre et des circonstances de la violence.

ARTICLE 280.
Tout vagabond ou mendiant qui aura commis un crime emportant la peine des travaux forçés à temps, sera en outre marqué.

ARTICLE 281.
Les peines établies par le présent Code contre les individus porteurs de faux certificats, faux passe-ports ou fausses feuilles de route, seront toujours, dans leur espèce, portées au maximum quand elles seront appliquées à des vagabonds ou mendients.

ARTICLE 282.
Les vagabonds ou mendients qui auront subi les peines portées par les articles précédents, demeureront, à la fin de ces peines, à la disposition du gouvernement.
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- Dan Allum (English)
- Louise Doughty (English)
- Ian Hancock (English)
- Eric Fontaine-Roux (French)
- Caren Gussoff (English)
- Ronald Lee (English)
- Oksana Marafioti (English)
- Rudolph Meidinger (French)
- Anne Montagne (French)
- Hélène Montardre (French)
- Patrick Pecherot (French)
- Jessica Reidy (English)
- Alain Serres (French)
- Diana Norma Szokolyai (English)
- Dorothy Shoes (French)
- Sterna Weltz-Zigler (French)
- Cecilia Woloch (English)
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