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Like many earlier productions at the court of Louis XIV, Jean-Baptiste Lully’s and Philippe Quinault’s last court ballet, Le Temple de la paix (1685) entertained the king and his guests with the spectacle of singing and dancing “sauvages.” According to the livret’s description of the first performance, the fifth entrée of the ballet featured an opening rondeau performed by a troupe of dancers costumed as American Indians. In the solo récit that commenced the entrée proper “un sauvage” explained that his company of Americans had crossed the ocean in order to pay homage “au plus puissant des Roys.” His refrain accordingly praised Louis in exuberant terms:

Son nom est reveré des Nations sauvages.
Jusqu’aux plus reculez Rivages
Tout retentit du bruit de ses Exploits.
Ah! qu’il est doux de vivre sous ses loix (Quinault 28).

A chorus of basses repeated the refrain, and the Americans’ portion of the entrée concluded with a danced gavotte and gavotte air (“Dans ces lieux”) that hailed the return of the Golden Age in the “Provinces de l’Amerique qui despendent de la France.”

Though their American origins would seem to ensure their exotic differentiation in this context, Lully’s and Quinault’s Indians in fact sound more like ideal absolutist subjects. The Americans’ verses in Le Temple de la paix echoed royal panegyric familiar from decades of court performance, and in many respects their music, which I consider here, resembles that assigned to other celebratory figures in royal spectacles and operas. While the musical-dramatic idiom developed by Lully and his librettists could differentiate foreign peoples or places as exotic when that was desirable, the representation of foreign and colonial peoples depended more on the political demands of a particular performance or work than on an ideology of exotic difference per se. In Le Temple de la
paix, for example, the Indians’ role is similar to that performed by the shepherds, Basques, Bretons, and Africans, whose entrées also celebrate the peace wrought by Louis XIV’s rule. The Americans’ foreign difference—or exoticism—in relation to the French is perceptible in some aspects of their characterization, but their value in this ballet’s political economy stems mainly from their ability to enhance the king’s gloire through their tribute of praise (Pritchard 234).

Yet praise of a sovereign by colonial peoples has different political connotations than praise offered by native-born or naturalized subjects. Royal panegyric modeled subjects’ willing, even joyous submission to monarchical rule, and Quinault’s assignment of royal panegyric to Indians transferred its absolutist model of subjugation to the relation between Louis XIV and colonial peoples. The librettists’ universalization of royal panegyric symbolically absorbed colonial peoples into the absolutist power structures that the spectacles memorialized. This strategy of symbolic absorption had important correlates in the assimilationist colonial policy and practice overseen by the king’s finance minister, Jean-Baptiste Colbert, as I discuss below. However, the question of colonial peoples’ political and cultural relation to France was more vexed than the ballets’ and operas’ absolutist rhetoric could account for. Political historian K. A. Strandbridge argues that the absolutist centralization of power and governance under Colbert was at least compatible with, and may even have required the incorporation of non-French peoples (both in the Gallic peninsula and in North America) into the French body politic (Stanbridge 44-45). The symbolic political integration of colonial peoples in royal spectacles was thus in keeping with some aspects of absolutist political theory and ideology—in particular, the aim to centralize power in the institution of the monarchy, and the emphasis on imperial expansion of the crown’s territories. Yet the political and, especially, the cultural absorption of colonial peoples threatened the distinctiveness of the elite French cultural identity that Colbert cultivated assiduously through absolutist patronage of the arts (Isherwood 150–80). The absolutist logic of royal spectacles demanded the symbolic integration of colonial peoples as quasi-
French subjects; yet the threat that this posed to the integrity of a developing French cultural identity also encouraged performance of their difference.

The contradiction inherent in the spectacles’ dual posture toward colonial figures is a classic example of what Homi Bhabha terms colonial “ambivalence.” Ambivalence, in Bhabha’s sense, is apparent in colonial strategies of “mimicry” that realize “the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite” (emphasis in the original) (Bhabha 86). The ambivalence of colonial mimicry stems from its presentation of the colonial as an amenable object, that only just eludes regulation or representation. According to Bhabha, the near-identity of mimicry’s colonial other has a correlate in the nearly absolute difference of the colonial other figured as a “menace,” whose “difference...is almost total but not quite” (Bhabha 91). Both strategies—the desire for the colonial other as nearly the same (“mimicry”), and the fear of the colonial other’s near-total difference (“menace”)—involve ambivalence; and both are evident in early modern discourse and performance that invokes colonial relations, as, for example, in the twin stereotypes of the noble and ignoble savage. However, these and other colonial strategies were selectively preferred in colonial-era artistic productions according to the particular political demands that constrained the performance(s) in question. We should therefore expect to find different representational strategies at work in musical spectacles produced in different social and political contexts—which is why critical approaches that are only prepared to deal with “exotic” difference are often unable to account for the full range of colonial strategies evident in a particular work or performance (more on this below).

Royal spectacles produced under Louis XIV’s patronage are good to think with in this respect, because their rhetorical, material, and musical characterization of colonial peoples resists straightforward ideological analysis. Rarely do the spectacles depict colonial peoples’ “exotic” cultural difference without mediating marks of cultural likeness or political tractability, since in a French absolutist political context “difference” that was radicalized
beyond “pleasing variety” threatened to diffuse the ideal concentration of power and authority in the monarchy, by opening a space for a questioning response from elsewhere. Likewise, however, the spectacles often supplemented their characterization of politically *subjugated* colonial peoples with marks of their cultural difference (though rarely their political resistance). The latter strategy, of mimicry, dominated the spectacles’ portrayal of Indians, which seem to vacillate between the necessity of mirroring the king’s power and presence through Indians’ symbolic subjugation, and the necessary of maintaining their minimal difference, which justified the continued exercise of French colonial power. The preference for mimicry in French colonial performance likely reflected France’s unusual approach to colonial relations in the early period, which emphasized trade, political alliance, intermarriage, and a unidirectional cultural integration.

The ambivalence of the spectacles’ colonial mimicry is reflected in their mixed representational strategies in relation to Indians. The formulaic panegyric, standardized dance forms, and minimally differentiated costumes assigned to Indians point to a desire to integrate them by extending normative artistic idioms to their characters. Yet departures from these stylistic norms could also highlight the exotic difference of Indian figures, for purposes of pleasure and cultural conservation. In this article I argue further that Lully’s musical characterization was itself shaped by a French absolutist ambivalence toward colonial peoples. The nuanced idiom that Lully developed from the 1660s onward sometimes exoticized Indian figures by assigning them contextually aberrant styles. Yet, strikingly, the formulaicism and conventionalism that characterized Lully’s mature noble style also defined much of his music for Indians, especially in the later works. Applied to colonial figures, Lully’s noble idiom endowed them with what the French regarded as the most highly cultivated form of music and movement (and this cultural endowment must surely count among the “bienfaits” that the *livrets* continually ascribed to Louis XIV’s conquest of foreign peoples). The decorous style that Lully assigned to Indians actively normalized their characters by minimizing or eliminating musical traces of their cultural difference or,
by extension, political resistance. It can thus be understood as an artistic mimicry of the “ideal” outcome of French colonial relations in the New World.

With this approach I aim to revise the tendency for early music scholarship to isolate composers’ exoticist stylistic differentiation as the sole significant point of contact between French Baroque music and colonial ideologies. Other intersections between early French music and early colonization included the effects of colonial encounters on French music concepts (Bloechl) and the performance of French works in the colonies (Powers). This article remains with the matter of musical style and its politics, due to its importance for the operatic querelles that erupted among the French literati from the period of Lully’s dominance through the late eighteenth century, as well as for present-day early music scholarship. However, rather than emphasizing the important work of stylistic differentiation in Lullian performances with colonial themes, I explore the possibility here that the exclusion of difference involved in Lully’s intensively normative, noble musical style was itself a powerful vehicle for colonial ideological meanings.

**Lully’s Savages**

The American “savages” of *Le Temple de la paix* had many antecedents in French court and public spectacles produced during the reigns of Henri IV (1589–1610) and Louis XIII (1610–1643) (De la Laurencie 284–89; McGowan 256–309). During the reign of Louis XIV (1643–1715), the king’s surintendant de la musique, Jean–Baptiste Lully, composed music for “Indian,” “American,” or “savage” characters in at least thirteen royal ballets de cour, *intermèdes*, and *tragédies lyriques* (Table 1). Table 1 lists all of the spectacles in Lully’s output that alluded directly or indirectly to French colonial relations in the Americas, through their use of terms that, in the spectacles as elsewhere, primarily designated native American peoples. The table thus includes numbers for non-American peoples, in recognition of the notorious multivalence of terms like “Indian” or “savage” in the seventeenth century, which was not simply the result of ignorance or carelessness on the part
### TABLE 1: Extant numbers with music by Jean-Baptiste Lully, for “les Indians/Indiennes,” “les Sauvages,” or “les Amériquains”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Work</th>
<th>Source(s) Consulted</th>
<th>Librettist(s)</th>
<th>Date/Location of Première</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Characters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>L’Amour malade</em> (LWV 8)</td>
<td>F-Pn Rés. F. 514 (S)</td>
<td>Francesco Buti</td>
<td>1657, Louvre</td>
<td>6 Indiennes (LWV 8/32)</td>
<td>“Six Indiens et six Indiennes basanenz portent des parasols pour se defendre du hasle”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paris: R. Ballard, 1657 (L)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ballet royal d’Alcidiane</em> (LWV 9)</td>
<td>F-Pn Rés. F. 507 US-BE MS 454 (S)</td>
<td>Isaac de Benserade</td>
<td>1658, Louvre</td>
<td>Zelmatide et Chevaliers de sa Suite (LWV 9/43, LWV 9/44a) 2me Air pour les mesmes (LWV 9/44)</td>
<td>“Zelmatide, Prince du Perou” and the “Chevaliers de sa suite”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paris: R. Ballard, 1658 (L)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paris: R. Ballard, 1659 (L)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Les Amours déguisés</em> (LWV 21)</td>
<td>F-Pn Res. F. 511 (S)</td>
<td>Octave de Périgny, Isaac de Benserade</td>
<td>1664, Palais Royal</td>
<td>Entrée des Sauvages de la Colchide (LWV 21/26) 2e. Air pour les mesmes (LWV 21/27)</td>
<td>“Les Sauvages de la Colchide”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paris: R. Ballard, 1664 (L)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>La Naissance de Venus</em> (LWV 27)</td>
<td>F-Pn Rés. F. 513 (S)</td>
<td>Isaac de Benserade</td>
<td>1665, Palais Royal</td>
<td>2e. air. Les phones [“faunes”] Indiens et Indienn[e(s)] (LWV 27/30) Sarabande pour les mesmes (LWV 27/31)</td>
<td>“Deux Indiens, deux Indiennes, et quatre Faunes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paris: R. Ballard, 1665 (L)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Le Triomphe de Bacchus dans les</em></td>
<td>F-Pn Rés. F. 505 (S)</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>1666, Hôtel de Créquy</td>
<td>Entrée des Indiens et Indiennes (LWV 30/6)</td>
<td>“Les Indiens et Indiennes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Alexandre et Porrus, cinq Grecs, et cinq Indiens”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Cinq Indiens”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Alexandre et Porrus, cinq Grecs, et cinq Indiens”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Quatre Faunes et quatre Femmes sauvages”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Les faunes[s] et femmes[s] rustiques[s]” (LWV 32/23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2me air: Les faunes et sauvages (LWV 32/24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballet royal de Flore (LWV 40)</td>
<td>F-Pn Rés. F. 515 (S) Paris: R. Ballard, 1669 (L)</td>
<td>Isaac de Benserade 1669, Tuileries</td>
<td>“Amour, n’est-ce point vous” (LWV 40/34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Venez, peuples divers/Peuples et Rois” (LWV 40/36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marche des 4. Nations (LWV 40/33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pour les 4. Parties du monde (LWV 40/35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canaries (LWV 40/38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Menuet (LWV 40/39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Les Quatre-Parties du Monde” (solists)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Les Quatre Parties du Monde” (chorus and soloists)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Les 4. Parties du monde” (dancers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Nom de l'œuvre                                    | Auteur(s)                                    | Année, Lieu                                |Drink
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| Divertissement de Chambord (LWV 41)             | Jean-Baptiste Molière                        | 1669, Chambord                             |Charmons ici toute la Terre” (LWV 40/37)
| Atys (LWV 53)                                   | Philippe Quinault                            | 1676, Saint Germain-en-Laye                |“Choeur des quatre Parties du Monde” “Quatres Sauvages” (L)
|                                                |                                              |                                            |“Troupe de Peuples differens chantans” (L) “Six Indiens dançans” (L) “Un Indien”
|                                                |                                              |                                            |“Deux Indiennes de la suite de Bacchus” “L’Indien, les deux Indiennes, et le Choeur” “Indiens de la suite de Bacchus, Filles grecques de la suite d’Ariadne” (L)
<p>|                                                |                                              |                                            |“Pourquoy tant se contraindre” (LWV 59/54) “Ah! Cedons, rendons-nous, rendons les armes” (LWV 59/55) “Choeur d’Indiens” “Les deux Indiennes, et...” |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Phaéton</strong> (LWV 61)</th>
<th>Paris: C. Ballard, 1683 (S)</th>
<th>Philippe Quinault</th>
<th>1683, Versailles</th>
<th>Chaconne (LWV 61/40) Petit air pour les mêmes (LWV 61/41)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Abbreviations:**

- **F-Pn** Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Musique, Philidor Collection
- **L** Printed livret
- **S** Musical score
- **US-BE** Berkeley, Cal., University of California, Music Library
of librettists. Rather, a careful reading of the livrets suggests that poets deliberately exploited the flexibility of American colonial terminology in order to elicit analogies between ancient models of conquest and modern French colonization. They thus emphasized likenesses among peoples whose cultural identities strike us as irreducibly diverse, as is the case with the spectacles’ broad application of the terms “Indien” or “Indienne.”

Although the French were aware of cultural differences among peoples they labeled “Indians” or “savages,” specifying their mutual differences was far less of a priority than representing their subordinate political relation to France, either directly or through parallels with ancient empires.

In the court ballets, “Indian” characters sometimes had their own entrées, or else they joined other foreign or “exotic” characters in the ballets des nations or grands ballets that concluded some performances. Lully’s and Quinault’s tragédies lyriques had fewer Indian characters, and when they did appear their roles were limited to the divertissements, sections that preserved many of the features of the ballets. In both genres, Indian figures could be inflected as pastoral, martial, comic, or noble characters, though the pastoral variety, as in Le Temple de la paix, was by far the most common type, especially in later works. The music that Lully assigned to Indians always corresponded to the dramatic level and situation of their character type, and it therefore differs considerably across works.

However else their characterization might vary, “Indians” and “savages” were uniformly represented as subject peoples pacified under the Sun King, or his heroic alter-egos. The artistic characterization of Indians as compliant subject peoples presented an idealized outcome of French colonial policy. The most influential early articulation of French colonial policy was in relation to the Americas; and as Cornelius Jaenen, Sara Melzer, and others have shown, throughout the seventeenth century colonial officials advocated the assimilation, or francisation, of indigenous American peoples through conversion, intermarriage, and education, as well as political or military domination (Aubert;
Louis XIV’s minister, Jean-Baptiste Colbert, was a particularly staunch advocate of this policy, even when faced with evidence of its dismal failure (Belmessous; Jaenen 173–185). Although royal spectacles were far more than propaganda for Colbert’s colonial policies, their fantastic mimicry of pacified, culturally assimilated colonial peoples was consistent with the policy aims of Louis’s minister.

The presentation of subjugated colonial peoples also fitted the spectacles’ absolutist ideological aims, since it reinforced the “naturalness” of concentrating political power in the increasingly imperialist institution of the French monarchy. Lully’s musical production has itself been closely associated with absolutism since the publication of Robert M. Isherwood’s study, *Music in the Service of the King*, which argued that Lully’s music provided “sonic glitter for ceremonies designed to inspire public awe of the ruler” (352). While Isherwood’s analysis of the ideological function of Lully’s music remains persuasive, his subtle trivialization of its stylistic processes as “merely” decorative (“sonic glitter”) limits the force of his critique. In recent years music scholars have nuanced Isherwood’s model of the relationship between elite music spectacles and absolutist power, noting, among other things, the popularity of parodied tragédies lyriques during and after Lully’s lifetime (Gordon-Seifert 137–63) and the instability of heroic representation in the operas themselves (Thomas 53–99). As importantly, the rise of ideological criticism in Anglo-American musicology in the last few decades has led scholars to consider the role that musical structures and processes themselves played, along with choreographic, verbal, and material elements, in producing the power effects of royal spectacles (Burgess; McClary, “Temporality” 32–43; Pruiksma; Taruskin 1:89–113). In pursuing this approach—which accords ideological meaning to musical processes—scholars have had to come to terms with Lully’s characteristic reliance on formal conventions and melodic, rhythmic, and harmonic formulas in his most decorous and, not insignificantly, French-identified theatrical style. The conventionalism of Lully’s music has long been recognized, but it has too often been viewed as, at best, a neutral aesthetic “rationalism” or, at worst, a
sign of outright incompetence (McClary, “Temporality” 4–18).\textsuperscript{6} However, a more compelling possibility is that Lully’s method of varying a set of established and authorized style processes (particularly in his mature style) was both appropriate to its cultural and institutional circumstances and, moreover, ideologically significant in itself. Applied to noble or pastoral characters, Lully’s deliberate restriction of the musical expression to a high, French-identified style could model the pleasure of giving oneself over to a regulated \textit{bon goût}, the aesthetic expression of the politicized decorum that governed court culture (McClary, “Unruly Passions” 104). Applied to colonial or other foreign characters, though, it performed a musical \textit{francisation} that worked by suppressing or eliminating radical difference.

Lully did sometimes convey a sense of Indians’ cultural difference by distinguishing the style of their music from that for other characters. For example, a stylized simplicity or excessive repetitiveness could sometimes mark characters as belonging to uncivilized or “primitive” culture groups. In the ballet \textit{L’Amour malade} (1657) the binary \textit{entrée} for “6 Indiens et 6 Indiennes” has four distinct sections demarcated by metrical changes. While the A section is in a standard French entry style—with dotted rhythms, elided, irregular phrasing, and meandering harmony—the triple, duple, and cut-time passages of the B section all show signs of a stylized simplicity, with their regular phrasing, fairly uniform rhythms, and static, inconclusive harmonic progressions. These sections also have a fragmentary feel, due to the verbatim repetition of each of their musical phrases immediately following its initial statement (Example 1).\textsuperscript{7} While all of these features could have signaled something other than an exotic character per se, the text declaimed by “La Ragione/La Raison” in this entrée does support an exotic interpretation of their music, as an expression appropriate to intemperate peoples and climates:

\textit{Ces Indiens que nous voyons}
\textit{Apres que le Soleil a noircy leurs visages}
\textit{Eviter avec soin l’ardeur de ses rayons,
Ne nous paroissent pas trop sages:
Mais combien d’amants incensez

Example 1: LWV 8/32 “6 Indiennes,” Amour malade
Example 1, cont’d.

Semblent les imiter par leur tardive crainte,
Et qui des traits d’Amour veulent parer l’atteinte
Lors seulement qu’il s’en trouvent blessez ([Buti] 29).

Other style features that may have indicated exoticism in Lully’s compositions for Indian characters include the use of the “doubled continuo” texture (which I discuss below in relation to Le Temple de la paix), or, as in L’Amour malade, the presence of multiple meters in a single dance number, which sometimes indicated a comic or grotesque character. The entrées for Indians in the Ballet d’Alcidiane (1658) and the Ballet des Muses (1666), as well as L’Amour malade, each included internal metrical shifts, though this may also have indicated their accompaniment of pantomime dances. As the tentativeness of the above discussion indicates,
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caution is necessary when trying to identify exoticist style features in Lully’s music, as in French Baroque music in general, because of the subtlety and equivocation that typically attach to such gestures.  

Moreover, the great majority of Lully’s numbers for Indian characters have more normative forms and styles, as an example from the Ballet de la Naissance de Venus (1665) illustrates. The unmarked gavotte (Example 2) for four fauns, two male and two female Indians in La Naissance de Venus is a skillfully composed, but unremarkable example of the dance type, with its four-bar

Example 2: LWV 27/30 “Les Indiens et Phones” Naissance de Venus

phrasing and its strong opening motif of three long pulses, followed by a faster dotted-rhythm consequent.
The Indians in La Naissance de Venus appear in the retinue of Bacchus, and their performance of a gavotte (together with the fauns) probably signals their pastoral identity. As here, the conventionalism of much of Lully’s music for Indian figures was probably influenced by the increased use of standardized dance forms in his later works, which restricted the means available for encoding difference. It was also in keeping with the overall tightening of dramatic organization in the tragédies en musique and the late ballets, which discouraged comic or exotic episodes that were not dramatically justified. As in the early ballet, L’Amour malade, colonial figures in Lully’s late works have some musical qualities that distinguish them from noble or heroic French-identified characters; but the overwhelming tendency is toward their integration through the underlying stylization and conventionalism of their music.

Lully’s music for the troupe of “sauvages Amériquains” in his last ballet, Le Temple de la paix, illustrates this well. As was often the case with foreign characters in Lully’s works, the Americans commenced their performance with one of the standard courtly dances, here, an F-major rondeau in the style of a gigue (Example 3). The division into a grand couplet (measures 1–4), which acts as a refrain, and two intermediate couplets (mm. 4–8 and 12–16) was the preferred form for Lully’s rondeaus, and the harmonic shift to the keys of B-flat and C in the first and second couplets is also unexceptional. The rondeau’s style identification as a gigue is somewhat less certain. Though the dance has the expected triple meter and halting dotted rhythms, it lacks the contrapuntal dialogue among inner “voices” and the irregular phrase length that characterized many gigues. The simplicity of the internal rhythms and regular phrasing even suggest the alternate possibility of a canary or loure style for the rondeau. However, an early eighteenth-century edition of the ballet ([Lully]/Roger) labeled the rondeau as a “gigue,” and Lully even
Example 3: LWV 69/37 “Sauvages de l’Amerique,” Temple de la paix
used the first phrase of the rondeau in the gigue from Act IV of \textit{Persée} (Example 4).\footnote{\textit{Persée} (Example 4).} If the rondeau in \textit{Le Temple de la paix} was choreographed as a gigue, its choice as the opening dance would have underscored the \textit{entrée}’s dominant affect of joy. Moreover, its character would have been appropriate for the pastoralism of the Indians in the ballet, and it may even have highlighted their identity as mariners, though this is speculative. We can at least say with certainty that the simplicity of the rondeau’s chordal texture and the regularity of its phrase structure (in the context of a gigue) suggested a lower-order, and possibly a comic characterization, which is borne out by their music in the rest of the \textit{entrée}.

\textbf{Example 4: LWV 60/71 “Gigue,” Persée}

The remaining numbers for Indians in the \textit{entrée} include a solo \textit{récit} (“Nous avons traversé”) and refrain (“Son nom est reveré”) and a danced gavotte and chorus (“Dans ces lieux”). (The rest of the \textit{entrée} features a \textit{scène} for the pastoral characters Amaryllis, Lycidas, and Alcipppe.\footnote{The Americans’ vocal numbers are composed exclusively for bass voices, \textit{basse continue}, and strings, and the voices mainly follow the instrumental bass line, as in the gavotte chorus “Dans ces lieux” (Example 5). Here the voices’ angular melodies and their predictable rhythms, chordal...})

The remaining numbers for Indians in the \textit{entrée} include a solo \textit{récit} (“Nous avons traversé”) and refrain (“Son nom est reveré”) and a danced gavotte and chorus (“Dans ces lieux”). (The rest of the \textit{entrée} features a \textit{scène} for the pastoral characters Amaryllis, Lycidas, and Alcipppe.)\footnote{The Americans’ vocal numbers are composed exclusively for bass voices, \textit{basse continue}, and strings, and the voices mainly follow the instrumental bass line, as in the gavotte chorus “Dans ces lieux” (Example 5). Here the voices’ angular melodies and their predictable rhythms, chordal...}
Example 5: LWV 69/40 “Dans ces lieux,” Temple de la paix

Dans ces lieux, il faut que tout repose, Les deux paix charmeront le cœur, le plus barbare, Les Amants sont les seuls de sourire, Que l’on doive en tendre l’écuyer,
texture, and limited harmonic range conform to a type of “doubled continuo” air (Bukofzer 158) that Lully assigned to a variety of bass-voiced characters in the ballets and tragédies lyriques. Patricia Howard and Miriam Whaples have noted that this type of texture—a bass voice paralleling the melody played by the basse continue—could connote a “grotesque” (Howard 144–51) or “primitive” (Whaples 21–22) character, which is certainly possible in light of its stylized naiveté. In Le Temple de la paix this texture and scoring reappear in the solo récit (“Quel bonheur pour la France”) for “un Afriquain” in the sixth entrée, suggesting that it
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might in fact be an exoticizing gesture in this context. However, the doubled continuo texture was widely distributed among high and low characters in Lully’s works, and its dramatic polyvalence should caution us against trying to fix its connotations too securely. In Le Temple de la paix, for example, Lully also used this texture in several decidedly non-exotic numbers: a duet for the shepherds Alcipe and Lycidas, “Choisis l’amant le plus fidelle,” in the pastoral scène that concludes the fifth entrée; and two solo airs for shepherds, “Que ce Roy Vainqueur à de gloire” and “Entre les autres Roys,” both of which precede refrain choruses in the Prologue. The texture and dramatic function of the latter two airs is closest to the Americans’ numbers: both have a single vocal line accompanied by the five-part violons and basse continue, and both feature panegyric verses, as do the doubled-continuo numbers for the African in the sixth entrée. Though the doubled-continuo texture in the Americans’ numbers may also have contributed to their exotic characterization, its dramatic association with panegyric celebration in Le Temple de la paix was undoubtedly a primary determining factor in its use here.

There are two points at which the chorus departs from ordinary practice: first, the unmediated downward leap of a diminished fourth on the phrase, “Que l’on doit” (mm. 13–14), and, second, the stepwise descent from the G on “Sans l’amour” (mm. 17–18), through the E-flat on “seroit [en paix]” (mm. 20–22), to the conclusion of the phrase on F. Though the dissonant melodic interval of the diminished fourth in mm. 13–14 is not uncommon at passionate moments in Lully’s vocal music, it is usually approached indirectly via a port de voix that softens the interval’s harshness; here, however, the unison basses land directly on the dissonant C-sharp, on the downbeat of the measure. Second, the E-flat in m. 21 (on “seroit”) is non-diatonic in the key of F, and its occurrence in the descending sequence in mm. 17–22 is initially surprising, though it is clear by the end of the phrase that the odd-sounding E-flat has facilitated a key change from F major to B-flat major. However, both of these gestures can also be accounted for rhetorically as word-painting: the diminished fourth conveying a sense of the lovers’ complaints (the only sign of trouble in this
paradise), and the descent to E-flat conveying the conditional sense of “seroit,” that everyone would be at peace in Louis XIV’s American provinces were it not for the passionate lovers.

In short, the music for the Americans’ entrée in *Le Temple de la paix* does delineate aspects of their character, but these owe more to their low pastoralism and the celebratory function of their entrée than to their identification with a discrete ethnic, racial, or national group. Indeed, it is striking that we find no consistent musical stylistic features exclusively associated with “Indians,” “Americans,” or “savages” here or elsewhere in Lully’s works. Though Lully did sometimes differentiate Indian characters as exotically foreign by giving them conventionally aberrant music, this type of musical exoticism—though ideologically significant—was nonetheless relatively amorphous, not specific to an “Indian” or “American” identity per se. Indeed, Lully’s selection of dance types and musical styles for Indian characters appears far more interested in absorbing them into the French social and political order, as it was imagined in the ballets and lyric tragedies, via pastoral and celebratory conventions.

The plurality of the spectacles’ ideological requirements vis-à-vis colonial figures is nowhere more evident than in the chaconne and chaconne chorus (“Chantons tous sa Valeur triomphante”) that the Americans perform at the conclusion of the ballet, together with Basques, Bretons, and Africans. Example 6a–b shows the chaconne’s opening *couplet* and the first two *couplets* from its minor-mode middle section. Chaconnes were often performed by

Example 6a: LWV 69/45 “Chaconne,” mm. 1–8, *Temple de la paix*
foreign or colonial characters in Lully’s theatrical works, perhaps reflecting the genre’s reputed New World origins (though the French thought it was North African) (Pruiksma 227–48). It is entirely possible that the exotic and even the erotic associations of the chaconne could have communicated a sense of the Americans’ colonial otherness here. However, in the context of a celebratory ballet des nations it seems as likely, if not more so, that the chaconne’s music, verses, and choreography, like those in the fifth entrée, strongly reinforced the Indians’ identity as subjects of the king—that the chaconne was, in other words, as much an instrument of the spectacles’ assimilationist ideology as the rest of the Americans’ music.

Recent scholarship has offered compelling, but apparently divergent interpretations of the French chaconne’s ideological significance, proposing that it mimicked the exercise of absolutist control, modeled subjects’ ecstatic submission to power, conveyed
erotic passion, or displayed a stylized exotic difference (Burgess 81, McClary, “Social History”, Pruiksma 227–28). However, the chaconne’s multivalence is only a problem for scholarship if we assume that the absolutist-imperialist ideology it expressed was internally rational and consistent. On the contrary, the chaconne’s own ambivalence seems well-suited to express the contradictions that surfaced with attempts to represent an idealized relation between colonial peoples and the French state. On the one hand, the ideological impetus to absorb colonial peoples as subjects of the French sovereign led to assimilationist policy initiatives, as well as their symbolic artistic integration in royal spectacles. Yet, on the other hand, the impetus to preserve a distinctive French cultural identity lent an urgency to measures aimed at reinforcing boundaries between French and colonial cultures. The ambivalence that was built into relations with France’s colonial “others” was expressed in royal spectacles as a tension between the display of colonial peoples’ integration into the French body politic and the display of their exotic difference.

Beyond Exoticism

Musicologists have tended to frame the matter of foreign or provincial peoples’ characterization in French Baroque music exclusively in terms of the presence or absence of strategies of exotic differentiation (see Betzwieser; de la Laurencie; Powell 91–97; Whaples). In studies concerned with intercultural representation in Lullian ballets or operas, stylistic exoticism has been overemphasized—or its absence has had to be explained—owing to twin anachronisms that early music scholarship has inherited from studies of exoticism in music of later periods. The first of these is the concept of exoticism itself, which usually assumes the cultural relevance of essentialized categories of national, ethnic, or racial difference. Though this post-Enlightenment understanding of difference is amply evident in later works such as Bizet’s Carmen, for example, it is alien to the ancien régime and its music. Second, musicological studies of exoticism usually build on the expectation that music could and should express the essence of a character through distinctive and representative style processes, even inde-
pendently of language, costume, dance, or scenography. This idea of musical expression would have seemed nonsensical to seventeenth-century French listeners, and it only achieved prominence in France beginning in the 1760s and 70s, with the reform operas of Gluck. On the contrary, Lully’s musical idiom was intimately connected with verbal and dance expression, and it tended to conserve its expressive means, even in representing foreign peoples: with some exceptions, style gestures that designated cultural difference in one context were readily adapted in other exotic or non-exotic contexts, so long as they were amenable to the sujet. Performative aspects of the music that have not left traces in musical notation (idiosyncratic tempos, diction, rhythmic emphasis, or instrumentation come to mind) may well have contributed to its exotic effect, and the allied arts of dance, poetry, and costume and scenic design could certainly have supplied an exoticism that is not evident in the score. Even so, the reticence and multivalence of stylistic differentiation in Lully’s music for foreign figures has tended to register as an absence, or a failure of the idiom. Frankly speaking, a major problem that generations of scholars have faced in addressing the question of exoticism in Lully’s music is that, for listeners accustomed to later styles, its music for nominally “exotic” characters just does not sound different enough.

In contrast, I propose that we re-conceive musical exoticism as one of a range of strategies for mimicking political relations of identity and difference in the early modern period. In its most basic definition, exoticism is a cultural strategy of differentiation whose impetus and effects are ideological. Not all musical exoticism pertains to colonial peoples or places, though exoticism in European music from the seventeenth century onward is inconceivable without the enabling ideological structures of colonialism and colonizing practices. Likewise, however, not all musical representations of colonial peoples or places make use of exotic techniques. Colonial ideologies and practices have varied across colonizing societies and periods, and so too have the strategies by which societies translate colonial relations into cultural meanings. For this reason, it is better to take our analytical and critical cues
from the political relations at stake, rather than applying an *a priori* model of musical exoticism, as is often done.

In the present context, the question of how Lully’s music for royal spectacles framed French colonial relations, and to what effect, opens a wider range of musical processes to ideological critique than asking how his music encoded exotic difference per se. Though both lines of questioning are valuable, the latter runs the risk of fetishizing “difference” as a positive characteristic susceptible of musical representation, rather than regarding difference in a poststructuralist sense, as a relational quality enacted in performance. This effect of absence, similar to the Derridean process of *différance*, is perceptible in the workings of the normative idiom that served as Lully’s most decorous noble style (Derrida). Jacques Attali has brilliantly characterized this negative process in early modern music as the displacement of violence and its ritualized display “par la spectacle de son absence,” “pour faire croire à une réalité consensuelle du monde” (Attali 83). I can think of no better way to describe the identity-consolidating force that I perceive in the suave assuredness of Lully’s music, including much of his music for colonial characters. It is notoriously difficult to pinpoint the ideological effects of intensely normative, tonal music, because it works so hard to convince us that its decorum is both desirable and inescapable. Lully’s music is unusually good at this, but I am intrigued by the possibility of approaching his style from the structural perspective of the violence that its *bienséance* normally aestheticizes or excludes. What is sacrificed, we might ask, in this music’s imperial assertion of presence? And what is at stake in its exclusion of radical difference, much less its stylization of difference as exoticism?

The strange spectacle of Indians in absolutist drag begs the question of what their performance leaves unsaid (or unsung). The royal spectacles summoned colonial figures to witness the *gloire* and perfection of Louis XIV’s reign, but the decorous manner in which such characters were often staged attests to a violence that has been discreetly shunted off-stage, as it were. It is possible to introduce an awareness of what royal spectacles omitted, by plac-
ing their mimicry of colonial relations in encounter with aspects of French colonial history, as I argue elsewhere (Bloechl). Such knowledge was of course not admissible in the idealist milieu of the king’s spectacles—indeed, anything of the sort would have been in flagrantly bad taste—but it can provide leverage for a latter-day postcolonial criticism of their characterization, and the ideologies it supported.

This postcolonial approach reassesses elite music in Louis XIV’s France from the suspicion that its most authoritative and celebrated processes involved a vexed relation to alterity, which strikingly parallels the ambivalence evident in French colonial relations of the period. This is admittedly a troubled account of the grand siècle’s most prestigious musical dramatic idiom, at odds with the “Parnassus” myth that developed around Lully and his music after his death (Sadie). As the eulogist Évrard Titon du Tillet wrote of Lully in the 1732 edition of his Parnasse françois,

Ce fut alors que l’Opera parut entre les mains de Lully avec toutes les beautez et tout l’agrément qu’on pouvoit desirer, et attira non-seulement l’admiration des François, mais celle des Etrangers. On trouve dans ses Recits, dans ses airs, dans ses choeurs et dans toutes ses symphonies un caractere juste et vrai, une varieté merveilleuse, une melodie et une harmonie qui enchante.... Enfin Lully merite avec raison le titre de Prince des Musiciens Français, étant regardé comme l’inventeur de cette belle et grande Musique françoise, telle que celle de nos Opera, et des grands Concerts de Voix et de Symphonie, qui n’étoit connue que très-imparfaitement avant lui: il l’a portée à son plus haut point de perfection, et a été le pere de nos plus illustres Musiciens qui travaillent dans ce goût (Titon du Tillet 395–96).

Titon du Tillet gives Lully pride of place in his lineage of “Musiciens Français,” emphasizing the “perfection” of taste that
governed Lully’s compositional style and, by extension, its eighteenth-century legacy. There is little hint here that the “beautez” that Titon du Tillet singles out for praise in Lully’s operas involve any relation of difference, save perhaps in his nervous appeal beyond France’s boundaries, to the judgment of foreigners. We have seen something of the importance attached to foreign peoples’ tribute of praise in the panegyric economy of court spectacles under Louis XIV. By the mid-eighteenth century a cosmopolitan opera criticism regularly speculated about the global reception or even production of French music, less in the interest of absolutist propaganda now than in an effort to align French culture with a newly privileged category of nature. In this spirit, Toussaint Rémond de Saint-Mard speculated in his Réflexions sur l’Opéra (1741) that, climate-based cultural differences notwithstanding,

En tous temps et en tout pays, un sentiment tendre s’exprimera d’une maniere tendre. Par-tout un mouvement de colere sera rendu d’une maniere vive. Qu’on mette Armide à la Chine, qu’on la mette où l’on voudra, qu’on lui fasse dire, le vainqueur de Renaud si quelqu’un le peut être, il faudra nécessairement qu’elle fasse sentir la parenthese, et sûrement la maniere dont sera exprimée la parenthese ressemblera à celle de Lulli, du moins est-il sûr qu’elle ne s’en éloignera guère [emphasis in original] (Saint-Mard 86n–87n).

The prospect of a Chinese staging of Armide should give us pause (as it evidently did not Rémond de Saint-Mard). Leaving aside the bizarreness of the suggestion that elite kunqu audiences in eighteenth-century Suzhou, for example, would have been interested in a French lyrical rendering of the first Crusade, the common indulgence of such fantasies in French writing of the period itself indicates that something important was at stake.

Imagining French high culture celebrated or repeated elsewhere, “où l’on voudra,” was a way of affirming the universal
validity and naturalness of its expressive norms, against the threat of the arbitrary. Nevertheless, just such an alterity enters with the unwelcome possibility that a Chinese Armide would, in fact, differ significantly from Lully’s setting of the livret, a potential that Rémond de Saint-Mard minimizes but cannot dismiss due to the Enlightenment’s broadening awareness of cultural difference. Such awareness is far less evident in late seventeenth-century royal spectacles and operas with music by Lully, yet I have argued here that their mimicry of colonial peoples and places was shaped by a similar ambivalence, even at the micro-level of style process. Much of the time, Lully’s “savages” sounded almost French, permitting the absolutist fantasy of political and cultural absorption to go forward, at least provisionally. Recognizing the intimate relevance of colonial relations to the grand siècle’s most celebrated form of music does not detract from its accomplishments, but it does decline to take at face value the politicized decorum of its bienséance. Indeed, it suggests, in the end, something anathema to the political and cultural ideals that this music was designed to instill: namely, that its beauty and elegance were possible in part due to the exquisite, yet profound silencing of all that it is not. Perhaps it is not so strange to perceive something savage in Lully’s music after all.
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NOTES

1 This sharply distinguishes the French from other colonial powers of the period, though it does not exempt French colonialism from charges of violence and cultural devastation, as is sometimes asserted. Unlike the other colonial powers, in the early period, at least, the French did not use native populations as a source of labor, immigration was relatively limited, immigrants did not settle extensively on native territory, and they therefore did not engage in large-scale military actions to acquire or protect seized land. In contrast, English colonial relations were characterized by a focus on physically and culturally isolated agricultural settlements, which required vast amounts of seized and militarily defended
native land; whereas the Spanish notoriously killed, enslaved, and conquered indigenous people through large-scale military engagements, in the interest of gold and silver production (Eccles; Jaenen 190–97; Pagden; and Seed).

2 The exception to the rule of inclusiveness here is the representation of Africans in the spectacles. Though the characterization of African figures in ballets and operas is shaped by a colonial ideology of slavery, as articulated in the infamous Code Noir (Roach 115–25), this topic deserves its own dedicated study and, for this reason, is bracketed here. The spectacles also do not refer to African characters as “Indians” or “savages,” though they often have comparable attributes.

3 Five of the works in Table 1 do not specify the geographic origins of their “Indian” characters, but seven of those that do are divided between Americans and East Indians. Works that refer explicitly to American Indians are the Ballet royal d’Alcidiane, the Ballet royal de Flore, and Le Temple de la paix; those that refer explicitly to East Indians are La Naissance de Venus, Le Triomphe de Bacchus dans les Indes, the Ballet des Muses, and Le Triomphe de l’amour. In a striking parallel with representations of American Indians, ballets with East Indian figures depicted their conquest by Alexander the Great or by the god Bacchus, both of whom were symbolic proxies for Louis XIV. The homonymic relation between American and East “Indians” supported a homology between their political status as conquered peoples. Likewise, the terms “sauvage” or “sauvagesse” permitted other analogies between ancient and modern conquests, as in the Entrée des Sauvages de la Colchide (in Les Amours déguisés), which depicted the natives of Colchis celebrating the arrival of Jason the Argonaut. Hellenic sources cast Colchis as the barbaric fringe of the Greek empire, and the librettists Périgny and Benserade reworked the ancient colonial palimpsest of the Argonauts myth into a parable of French conquest in the New World. See Hall (1–55, 101–59) for a discussion of Greek ethnocentrism as expressed in Hellenic tragedy.

4 The “quatres sauvages” who appear in the fourth Intermède of the Divertissement de Chambord are an exception, in that their dances
have no explicit or implicit thematic relation to conquest. Molière’s authorship, or the fact that these were intermèdes performed between acts of a comedy, not a royal ballet or lyric tragedy, may explain the absence of conquest in the Indians’ characterization.

It is important to note that Lully was renowned during his lifetime and after for the innovations that he brought to French dramatic music, including the French overture, new theatrical dances, the novel use (in the French context) of expressive dissonance at passionate moments, and a more frequent use of counterpoint (see, for example, Titon du Tillet 393–401). However, Titon du Tillet and other eulogizers always point to Lully’s supreme adherence to the decorum, or bon gout, that dictated a regulated artistic expression of the passions, with departures permitted only in relation to liminal characters or extreme affective states. Titon du Tillet perfectly expressed the expressive and regulatory capacity of Lully’s music in his “Remarques sur la poësie et la musique” (appended to the 1732 edition of his Parnasse françois), noting that “Lully et nos grands Musiciens par l’excellence de leur Art font ressentir toutes les passions, et peuvent les calmer” (xxv).

In his classic study of baroque music Manfred Bukofzer characterized Lully’s music as representing the “acme of stylization” in the ancien règime (Bukofzer 160–61), and musicologist Paul Henry Lang likewise noted that “wherever we look we see Lully codifying French tastes, conventions, and aspirations” (Lang 3).

I would like to thank Rose Pruiksma for her suggestions regarding the exotic character of this entrée and the relationship of internal shifts of meter to pantomimed dances, discussed below. Responsibility for the interpretation here is, of course, my own.

The multiple meters in Le Grand combat (LWV 32/12), in the Ballet des Muses, for example, undoubtedly reflected the Greek and Indian warriors’ pantomimed combat, rather than a grotesque or comic character.
Of course, there are important exceptions, including in Lully’s output. Among the best-known examples of overt and vivid exoticist style differentiation is Lully’s music for “La Cérémonie des Turcs,” in his and Molière’s *comédie-ballet, La Bourgeois gentilhomme* (1670).

The gigue is performed by a troupe of Ethiopians in celebration of Persée’s slaying of the monster. While Ethiopians would have had default exotic associations for the French, the tragedy is set in Ethiopia, and the peoples who dance the gigue are therefore rightful subjects of the Ethiopian king, Céphée, not conquered peoples or visiting foreigners. If my argument is correct, this political relation would have influenced their musical representation, which shows no signs of exoticism per se.

All of the exotic entrées in *Le Temple de la paix* except the sixth have numbers for the exotic peoples in the first half of the entrée, and numbers for pastoral characters in the second half.
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