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ABSTRACT

MUSICAL POLITICS IN FRENCH PHILADELPHIA, 1781–1801

Myron Gray
Carolyn Abbate

This dissertation considers the musical people, places, and repertories of Philadelphia at the end of the eighteenth century, bringing the history of Franco-American politics to bear on the interpretation of selected musical works. The first chapter explores the role of music in diplomatic entertainments at Philadelphia’s French consulate during the closing years of the War of Independence. At the 1782 fête for the Dauphin of France and in Francis Hopkinson’s 1781 dramatic cantata, America Independent, music helped to solidify the postwar order and to forge a consensus on the meaning of the Revolution. Chapter two treats the Philadelphian reception of French revolutionary song, connecting it to the emergence of U.S. partisanship. After documenting the role of songs including “Ça Ira,” “La Carmagnole,” and “La Marseillaise” in Philadelphia street culture, I consider how the music printer Benjamin Carr reconciled such tunes to the refined context of the drawing room. Chapter three discusses Philadelphian examples of reactionary song that appeared in the wake of the Terror, primarily those by the St. Dominguan emigrant Jean-Baptiste Renaud de Chateaudun. English royalist laments also circulated, but they differed in terms of compositional approach. Editorial changes to Chateaudun’s music sheets point to an Anglo-American hegemony in the realm of musical style. Finally, chapter four describes the proliferation of anti-French contrafacts that accompanied the decline of diplomatic relations between the United States and France. Varying widely in terms of their source material and compositional quality, these songs portrayed the Quasi-War in terms
of an analogy with the American Revolution. Federalists leveraged the French crisis to promote a war-ready vigilance against perceived threats to a hard-won liberty. In all, the dissertation illustrates the contestedness of musical and political life in late-eighteenth-century Philadelphia. It shows not only that early American cultural and political expression were tightly connected, but that they were dynamic, conflicted, and necessarily related to developments in France and its colonies.
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Between the end of the American Revolution and the inauguration of Thomas Jefferson, diplomatic relations between the United States and France were in flux. American esteem for the French was nearly universal from the Franco-American alliance of 1778 until the radicalization of the French Revolution in 1793. Federalists abhorred the Terror, but Republican Francophiles were undeterred until in 1798 a Parisian diplomatic scandal and an undeclared Caribbean naval war forced them to moderate their position. At the close of the century, the fifteen years of friendship initiated by French aid in the War of Independence were a fading memory, as Americans stood at the brink of full-scale conflict with their former ally.

This crisis was resolved in 1800 with the Treaty of Mortefontaine, and with Jefferson’s election at the end of that year American politics entered a new era. In the preceding two decades, however, the United States—and in particular its largest urban center, Philadelphia—became home to substantial French populations. The first visitors were diplomats and military personnel who came during the American Revolution, but their numbers paled in comparison with the refugees who sailed for U.S. shores during the French and Haitian revolutions. Thousands of Francophone emigrants left their mark on Philadelphia during the 1790s.

This dissertation considers the place of Philadelphian music in the revolutionary Atlantic, particularly as it displays French influence. By considering the music of Franco-American diplomatic entertainments, the reception of French revolutionary and reactionary song, and the fashion for anti-French contrafacts during the Quasi-War, the following chapters stress the interconnection of local and global politics and the circum-Atlantic scope of cultural transmission in federal-era Philadelphia. Early American music and politics as are thus treated as interdependent, transmaritime affairs.
This chapter considers the role of music in diplomatic entertainments at the Philadelphia home of Anne-César Chevalier de La Luzerne, France’s foreign minister to the United States during the last years of the American Revolution. It divides into two larger sections, the first of which discusses an outdoor party held at the consulate in honor of the birth of an heir to the French crown. This was an extravagant affair, attended by the most important people in the new nation. It featured a concert and ball, but it was also noted at the time for the music that it lacked—namely, a sung ode tailored to the event. The second part of the chapter addresses a dramatic cantata that the American lawyer and congressman Francis Hopkinson presented in Luzerne’s quarters on multiple occasions. Hopkinson wrote the work’s libretto about the Franco-American alliance and outcome of the war, setting it to preexisting music.

By considering these examples, one negative (an absent song) and one positive, I aim to further our understanding of the political significance of music in early republican Philadelphia. Hosting two remarkable musical events during the closing years of the War of Independence, the home of the French minister was an important cultural hub. The Dauphin’s party, held in July 1782, came when American victory was assured, but, at this formative moment in national life, the celebration suffered from a lack of ideologically forceful music. Hopkinson’s cantata was initially written and performed in March 1781, when the outcome of the war remained uncertain. Its revision and revival later that year reflected both the changing fortunes of the revolutionary forces and dramaturgical problems with the work itself. Both versions of the cantata, however, exemplify the kind of ideological work that was missing at the Dauphin’s fête.
My discussion of the Dauphin’s fête focuses on a musical consideration that has eluded the attention of historians, and my study of Hopkinson’s *America Independent* advances a new understanding of the cantata by accounting for its ideological significance. Both investigations show that the music of Luzerne’s diplomatic entertainments was no mere diversion for the city’s elite. It sounded the depths of political transformation at the Revolution’s end.

### The French Fête

On the evening of July 15, 1782, all the carriages in Philadelphia rattled down Chestnut Street, turned right into Sixth Street, and converged on the home of the Chevalier de La Luzerne, French minister to the United States.¹ The day’s heat lingered as passengers stepped from their coaches and formed a line on the sidewalk. Sweating in their formal attire, they handed tickets to a gate attendant and were ushered onto the consulate grounds.²

For two months Luzerne had prepared for this occasion, which was the celebration of the birth of an heir to the French crown. He had borrowed cooks from the army and had engaged Pierre L’Enfant, the military engineer and future planner of Washington, D.C., to design a landscape fitted with temporary structures for dancing, dining, music, and visual display. The result was by all accounts enchanting. The garden was partitioned into groves adorned with arches and hanging glass lamps. From “most delightful and romantic” enclaves, guests viewed an illuminated palace “ornamented with a great number of pyramids and columns,” behind

---

¹ “To the Public,” *Pennsylvania Packet*, July 13, 1782. To minimize confusion and prevent accidents, this notice specified the route by which carriages were to arrive at the minister’s house. A major-general in the French army, Luzerne (1741–1791) was Louis XVI’s second minister to the United States. He served in that capacity from 1779 until 1784, when he was succeeded by François Barbé-Marbois. Luzerne entertained regularly at his Philadelphia home, becoming a mainstay of the social and cultural life of the city’s elite.

which fireworks were lit. But the center of the entertainment was the dance pavilion, which was surrounded by a colonnade and embellished with porticos on three sides. Inside, observers noted its neoclassical ornaments and allegorical paintings. An orchestra played from a raised platform at one end of the floor, next to “pyramidically” arranged “refreshments, flowers and lights.” Behind these were two “saloons” that merged into a single room before giving way to a dining area. The evening began with a concert at eight o’clock, continued with fireworks and dancing at nine, and culminated in a dinner at midnight. The ball continued into the morning, ending between two and three o’clock.

Among the hundreds in attendance was Benjamin Rush, a signer of the Declaration of Independence and former Surgeon General in the Continental Army, who described the event in a letter written the following day. He was struck by the irony of the occasion:

How great the revolution in the mind of an American! to rejoice in the birth of an heir to the crown of France, a country against which he had imbibed prejudices as ancient as the wars between France and England. How strange! for a protestant to rejoice in the birth of a prince, whose religion he had been always taught to consider as unfriendly to humanity. And above all how new the phenomenon for republicans to rejoice in the birth of a prince, who must one day be the support of monarchy and slavery. Human nature in this instance seems to be turned inside outwards.

There were reasons to overlook such incongruities. The Franco-American alliance of 1778 had secured U.S. victory in the war against Britain. If William Moore Smith’s “Ode, on the Birth of the Dauphin of France” is any indication, Americans were pleased to honor a king as their deliverer:

---

3 *Pennsylvania Packet*, August 1, 1782.
4 Ibid. For example, the *Packet* reported that “The cyphers of the queen of France, crowned with and encircled by garlands by a Cupid, are supported by Hymen, the rays from whose flambeaux shine upon them. This group looks toward the cyphers of the dauphin, likewise crowned with garlands by a genius and supported by Mercury who covers him with his wand. Some principal parts of the dauphin’s arms, peculiar to the province of Dauphiny, are alternatively spread upon the triglyphs with other figures.”
5 Ibid.
‘Twas then, the great Protector of our right,
The generous, God-like LEWIS rose;
Dispell’d the low’ring clouds of night,
And hurl’d destruction on our foes!^7

Nor were they reluctant to celebrate the birth of his successor:

For lo!------attentive to a MONARCH’S pray’r
Kind Heaven has sent a ROYAL HEIR,
This rising Empire’s future Friend;
Pleas’d his own lineaments to trace
Upon the smiling Infant’s face,
See, o’er the couch, the God-like Father bend.®

But if the fête was a chance to esteem the French, it also showcased American society. Rush’s description of the guests is telling. “In a word,” he wrote, “the assembly was truly republican. The company was mixed, it is true, but the mixture formed the harmony of the evening.”® Despite differences between French and American values, between “ancient” and “modern” families, between those trained in classics and those who did not know “whether Horace was a Roman or a Scotchman,” between “poets and philosophers” and “men who were never moved by beauty or harmony,” between congressmen and tradesmen, between, even, the civilized and the savage, “the whole assembly behaved to each other as if they had been members of the same family.”® The fête created a perfect “world in miniature,” where “Pride and ill-nature for a while forgot their pretensions and offices.” Faction and interest were

---

® Ibid., 75.
suspended. “All the ranks, parties and professions in the city” formed an undivided whole suggestive of “Elysium.”

Rush thus presented the fête as a harmonious, self-contained social microcosm. The reality, however, was somewhat more complicated. Even if his picture of the invited guests was accurate, they were a minority when compared with the uninvited masses who had gathered nearby. Depending on the estimate, those inside the gates at Luzerne’s accounted for between five and fifteen percent of the people out celebrating that night. During preparations, hundreds had “crowded daily” to watch the construction of the dance pavilion, and, when the hour arrived,

The doors and windows of the streets which led to the minister’s were lined with people, and near the minister’s house was a collection of all the curious and idle men, women, and children in the city, who were not invited to the entertainment, amounting, probably, to ten thousand people.

Though not entirely unusual for a state celebration, this was a cause of concern. How could the behavior of this large crowd be regulated? In the Old World, it was customary to divert the lower orders by passing out favors like coin and drink. Having been persuaded that such a gesture would provoke a riot in this context, however, Luzerne had to try something different. He had intended to distribute six hundred dollars in change among the multitude, but instead divided it among the residents of the jail and hospital. He also tore down the solid wall constructed around his property for the event, replacing it with a palisade fence through which

12 Ibid., 257.
13 Ibid., 258. By comparison, Rush estimated that seven hundred guests were inside the gates when he arrived. The *Pennsylvania Packet* reported that “more than fifteen hundred” people had been invited to the event, whereas “more than fifteen thousand” assembled in the streets (August 1, 1782).
anyone could view “the dancing room and walks.”\textsuperscript{16} The crowd was thus afforded a limited, sensory form of inclusion. As this was an experiment, however, no precaution was spared. On the night of the ball, French troops stood guard inside the property, and U.S. militias patrolled the nearby streets.\textsuperscript{17}

If an army was needed to ensure order, then all could not have been as rosy as Rush’s earlier comments suggest. Indeed, towards the end of his letter, Rush admitted that the evening’s bliss was superficial. During dinner, he had been disappointed to observe that “silence pervaded the whole company.” Humor was forgotten: “the simple jest, no less than the loud laugh, were [sic] unheard at any of the tables.” This severe propriety, the absence of “every species of convivial noise,” registered an underlying anxiety. Beneath the glamorous surface of the party there lurked a gnawing sense of unease.\textsuperscript{18}

After commenting on the dinner, Rush went on to qualify the general mood of the occasion. “Notwithstanding all the agreeable circumstances,” he wrote, the pleasure experienced was “of too tranquil a nature.” Indeed, “many of the company complained of the want of something else to render the entertainment complete.” But what was missing? According to Rush, “An ode on the birth of the Dauphin, sung or repeated, would have answered the expectations and corresponded with the feelings of everybody.”\textsuperscript{19} A poem, preferably one set to music, was needed to put the guests at ease. The right programmatic piece would have rendered the night an unqualified success.

It is indeed puzzling that none was performed, for at least two such works had been written with Luzerne’s party in mind. Smith’s “Ode” was presented to a gathering at the French

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Pennsylvania Packet}, August 1, 1782.
\textsuperscript{18} Rush, “French Fête,” 261.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., 262.
consulate on the morning of the fête, along with Annis Boudinot Stockton’s “On the Celebration of the Birth of the Dauphin of France,” but neither was repeated at the ball. Rush liked Smith’s poem, which was the less esoteric of the two. “Could it have been set to music,” he insisted, it “must have formed a most delightful and rational part of the entertainment.”

Even more intriguing than the failure to perform either Smith’s or Stockton’s poem, however, is the fact that Rush blamed the unsung ode for the evening’s shortcomings. How much difference could this apparent triviality have made? It was earmarked in Rush's mind to do important work, not merely to deliver nice-sounding words and a perhaps a catchy tune. So what deeper problem did the missing ode represent?

The issue could not have been the absence of music as such, because concert and dance had filled the evening. What Rush and others wanted was an artfully devised statement of the purpose of the evening, one that harnessed the rhetorical power of poetry and music to impose a desired perception of the event. On the one hand there was the tribute to a foreign prince. But on the other there was the tension between the nation's new power-brokers, safely ensconced on Luzerne's property, and the lower sorts who flooded the nearby streets. Ostensibly about a remote dynasty, the fête inadvertently brought the newly reconfigured local social order into sharp relief. To the extent that Luzerne's guests were conscious of this fact, they found it hard to relax. They were not yet confident of postrevolutionary stability, and they needed reassurance that the only thing at stake that night was a celebration of the Dauphin. In

---

20 Pennsylvania Packet, August 1, 1782. Although the Packet was “not authorized to give her name,” the “lady” who “manifested her patriotism by a fine ode” on the morning of July 15 was almost certainly Stockton. She had written a neoclassical dialogue, prefacing it with these directions: “The Genius of America enters the garden of the Chevalier de la Luzerne, with two attendant Sylphs, carrying baskets of flowers in their hands.” The poem then begins with an observation of Luzerne preparing for the fête. Annis Boudinot Stockton, Only for the Eye of a Friend: The Poems of Annis Boudinot Stockton, edited by Carla Mulford (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995), pp. 141–2.

other words, there was ideological work that needed doing—work to which sung text was well suited—and the unperformed ode was in that regard a wasted opportunity.

Rush’s concern about the missing anthem registered the insecurity of the republican elite as they tested their legs. The end of the war had not brought utter stability. Rather, the violent effort that secured independence from Britain gave way to a largely non-violent struggle within the young republic. The nation’s leadership had to assert its legitimacy, lest the same forces that swept it into power see fit to pull it down. Though subtler and less coercive than a clash of arms, this battle over the popular will was perilous in its own right. It would produce more than one violent outcome before the century’s end. More than in flesh and steel, however, its tension was felt in the social and cultural minutiae of early American life. Seemingly small matters had political import, such that Rush could scrutinize an absent song at the Dauphin’s birthday party as a governmental misstep. It was a lost chance to solidify the fledgling postwar order.

Scholars discussing Luzerne’s fête have attended insufficiently to this problem. Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, for example, has analyzed the party as a performance of gentility. She recognizes that the nation’s leadership was breaking in new shoes, framing this in terms of an effort to match European standards of decorum. The evening’s purpose, she argues, was to prove to all concerned “that educated and judicious men governed the new Republic and that civility refined their civic world.”22 This was true on some level, but it should be clear that the party was no mere show of politesse. The problem was deeper and more hazardous than a lapse of manners. The fête was a performance, evolving and indeterminate, of the immediate political

order, so that what happened within the gates was ultimately less significant than the relationship between those inside and outside. The assembled crowd assented to its own exclusion. As the night wore on, its passivity cemented the bond between rulers and ruled.

On some level, attendees of the fête understood that only the tacit consent of the crowd to the conduct of Luzerne’s privileged guests prevented a night of merriment from devolving into a civil uprising. Rush’s missing anthem would have distracted people from the underlying threat, focusing their attention on less troubling matters like French aid and the Dauphin’s birth. Even in its absence, we can therefore discern the proximity of music to early American politics.

***

But let us now move from a negative illustration of musico-ideological work to a positive one. To do so we need not look far. A year prior to the fête, a cantata was performed on Luzerne’s premises, and it had just the kind of programmatic content that was missing from the party. Like the fête, this work, including its performances and revisions, can be interpreted as a political symbol. We have seen how the Dauphin’s party staged the emergence of the new American order. Now, an allegorical pastiche assembled by one of the founding fathers shows how the finite course of the American Revolution was assigned metahistorical status. In each case music, or the lack of it, bore directly on political concerns.

Francis Hopkinson’s America Independent: A New-World Allegorical Pastiche

U.S. statesman and amateur musician Francis Hopkinson wrote the dramatic cantata America Independent, also known as The Temple of Minerva, in 1781 and oversaw its performance at the Philadelphia home of the Chevalier de La Luzerne on at least two occasions.
that year. In its conception and compositional method, the work both drew upon and departed from English models. It was a political allegory that owed a certain debt to George Frideric Handel’s Israelite oratorios, although it used new analogies and constructed its meaning in different ways. And as an arrangement of preexisting dramatic music, it was not unlike the London pasticcio, although it was not an opera and was never mounted in a public theater. In many respects the cantata was a unique product of the American situation. Its topic was the Revolutionary War, and it was revised toward the end of 1781, when the fortunes of the Continental Army changed for the better. Smarting from defeat, loyalists responded to the work with withering parodies. Ultimately, however, the cantata had an ambivalent relationship with the English metropole. Not only did it index the London oratorio and pasticcio as genres, it recycled the music of British elites with seeming indifference, using the music of Handel, among others, as a vehicle for revolutionary expression.

The cantata’s plot evinced support for the patriot cause while accenting France’s role in the war effort. Set in the temple of Minerva, the Roman goddess of wisdom, its other characters are personifications (“Geniuses”) of the United States and France, and a High Priest who intercedes with the goddess on their behalf. In the first of the cantata’s two scenes Minerva is

---

23 Born in Philadelphia, Hopkinson (1737-1791) was a signer of the Declaration of Independence and a member of the Second Continental Congress. He was a lawyer by training and in 1789 became the first judge of the United States District Court for Pennsylvania. As an amateur composer, designer, essayist, keyboardist, and poet, he is perhaps better known for his contributions to Philadelphia’s cultural life than for his professional achievements. He is thought to have been the earliest American composer of published secular music, an important collection of which is his Seven Songs for the Harpsichord (Philadelphia: Dobson, 1788). He also invented an improved method for quilling the harpsichord, published in the Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 2 (1786), and his considerable collection of printed and manuscript music is currently held by the University of Pennsylvania’s Rare Book and Manuscript Library.

24 Although Hopkinson labeled America Independent an “Oratorial Entertainment” (Fig. 1.1), it is more accurately described as a cantata. Indeed, Hopkinson’s use of the adjectival form suggests that the work was related to oratorio, but did not in fact exemplify the genre. The important criteria here are length and subject matter. America Independent was significantly shorter than an oratorio, and, being about contemporary events, its libretto was not sacred in the accepted sense.
absent, and the doors to her temple sanctuary are shut. Aided by the High Priest, America and France offer up praises and requests to Minerva. They seek knowledge of the war’s outcome, help for the American revolutionary cause, and they ask Minerva to descend into the temple. This she does, and the second scene begins with the sanctuary doors open. Minerva then assures her supplicants that America will be free, prosperous, and imperially great. America prays that it will be so, and the cantata concludes with a chorus of praise for the goddess.

To the modern eye, this is a strange scenario. What led Hopkinson to settle on this kind of story? Eran Shalev has shown that revolutionary America’s understanding of its place in history was informed by a combination of reformed Protestantism and civic humanism. Each of these traditions represented English influence, but Shalev argues that Americans mixed and mingled them in unique ways. Identifying “biblical republicanism” as a distinctively American outlook, Shalev insists that revolutionary thought involved a fusion of Roman classicism and Protestant biblicism. The merging of these two perspectives helps to explain Hopkinson’s plot, which showcases a Roman divinity while reflecting a Christian understanding of time and human agency. Success in the war against Britain is construed in terms of deliverance, as a form of grace. Victory cannot be attained in merely secular terms. The patriot representatives appeal to a force outside of time because the historical process is subject to extra-historical conditions. On its own, their ingenuity is insufficient.

The notion of human inadequacy—“corruption” in civic humanism and “sinfulness” in Protestant theology—is equally essential to the classical republican and reformed Christian

25 He explores these related traditions in American Zion: The Old Testament as a Political Text from the Revolution to the Civil War (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013) and Rome Reborn on Western Shores: Historical Imagination and the Creation of the American Republic (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009).
26 Shalev, American Zion, pp. 15–16.
perspectives, but each cosmology also entails a different historical process. In the civic humanist model, republics rise and fall according to an inexorable, cyclical logic. Christian history, meanwhile, is linear and redemptive. In the strictest of terms, these two understandings of time exclude one another. But thanks to a hermeneutic strategy derived from a long tradition of scriptural exegesis, the Christian view merged with the classical one. Typological interpretation, whereby a person or event in the Old Testament is understood to prefigure a New Testament phenomenon, introduces cyclicality to Christian time. The relationship between two historically distant occurrences can be one of both recurrence and progress, the first instance (the type or figura) both paralleling and anticipating the second (the antetype). For example, the story of Jonah being swallowed by a whale and emerging three days later can foreshadow the death and resurrection of Christ. The temporal model implied by typological exegesis is a spiral, cyclical and linear, and it thereby reconciles the classical and Christian systems.

According to Shalev, educated revolutionary-era Americans possessed a typological imagination. Uncovering “hidden prefigurative relationships” was a default mode of historical interpretation and an everyday rationalization for modern adversity.27 While the fusion of this mindset with classical republicanism was pursued with special intensity in America, typology had been a common literary-historical mode of representation in England. It was the framework within which the Puritans had understood their errand into the wilderness,28 and it was a method for explaining the various crises that confronted modern England. Britons, Linda Colley has argued, understood themselves as belonging to a “second and better Israel.”29 Through the Bible, tracts, sermons, and almanacs, among other media,

27 Shalev, Rome Reborn, pp. 73–113.
28 Ibid., 88–89.
Protestant Britons learnt that particular kinds of trials, at the hands of particular kinds of enemies, were the necessary fate and the eventual salvation of a chosen people. Suffering and recurrent exposure to danger were a sign of grace; and, if met with fortitude and faith, the indispensable prelude to victory under God.  

Importantly for our investigation of Hopkinson’s cantata, this outlook was exemplified in the music of Handel. As Ruth Smith has argued, Handel’s Israelite oratorios typologized British political history. Judea’s defeat of foreign persecutors in Judas Maccabaeus, for example, prefigured the Duke of Cumberland’s suppression of the Jacobite rising in 1746. Similarly, the suffering of the title character in Samson stood for the fate of oppositional politics in England after the Restoration. That Handel’s oratorios normally represented Whig interests is also significant, as this enhanced their appeal to American patriots.

To be sure, America Independent is not an oratorio in the accepted sense (it is secular and too short), nor does it represent an Israelite narrative. Nevertheless, Handel clearly influenced Hopkinson—as we shall see, the cantata features music from Judas Maccabaeus, Samson, and Susanna—and the plot of America Independent shares a basic affinity with Colley’s Israelite typology: imperiled by war, a nation seeks assistance from a deity with whom it enjoys a privileged relationship; in return for divine favor, it offers its worship. Still, Hopkinson’s cantata is not on the whole typological. It is not concerned with a hidden analogy between two historical moments, one of which prefigures the other. His audience did not have to decode his narrative in order to read it as a foretelling of more recent events, in the way that Handel’s

---

30 Ibid., 28–29.
32 Hopkinson’s familiarity with Handel is also apparent in his music collection, which includes eighteenth-century London editions of selections from Alexander Balus, Athalia, Belshazzar, Deborah, Esther, Israel in Egypt, Joseph, Joshua, Judas Maccabaeus, Messiah, the Occasional Oratorio, Samson, and Saul, among other Handel works.
audience had to read *Judas Maccabaeus*. Hopkinson’s work wore its politics on its sleeve. But this does not mean that a typological imagination, or a fascination with prefigurative relationships, was not important to Hopkinson’s conception of the cantata, and that it would not have characterized his audience. Vis-à-vis Handel, Hopkinson required of his listeners a different but related form of hermeneutic attention. Whereas the Israelite oratorios relied on an implicit correlation between their biblical plots and modern circumstances, Hopkinson’s reuse of existing theatrical music—often Handel’s—generated figurative relationships between the original narrative content of the music and its new situation within *American Independent*. It was up to Hopkinson’s audience to relate the cantata’s self-evident allegory to the absent texts that had once accompanied its recycled music.

In order to facilitate this task, Hopkinson chose well known numbers from popular British stage works and oratorios—music that his peers would probably have known. We are fortunate to know what these selections were, as no score for *America Independent* has survived. Among the many extant copies of the libretto, one valuable broadside version was annotated with clues to the source music for each number (Fig. 1.1). The cantata has thirteen numbers (symbolic of the original thirteen states), for which Hopkinson adapted music by Michael and Thomas Arne, Henry Carey, and, predominantly, Handel. For the work’s two instrumental numbers, an overture and an interlude, he chose music by the Italian opera composer Niccolò Jommelli. In all, Handel was used for five of the work’s numbers, Thomas Arne for four. Carey and Michael Arne are each featured once.

---

Figure 1.1
Annotated edition of Hopkinson’s libretto for *America Independent* (Philadelphia, 1781)
Hopkinson thus played the role of the pasticheur in putting together *America Independent*, but his motives were different from those of the London pasticcio composer. His production was a short, unstaged amateur cantata, performed for a domestic audience, whereas the English pastiche had emerged amid the exigencies of the public theater. The pasticcio saved time and money, and it enabled opera producers to more easily accommodate the needs (and whims) of professional singers.34 As a gentleman musician working for his own amusement and that of an elite diplomatic circle, Hopkinson did not have to worry about a strict deadline or budget for his cantata, and he selected its performers from among his friends and colleagues.35

Whereas the British pastiche had a reputation for haphazard assembly, Hopkinson carefully selected his music based on its familiarity and its thematic resonance with his libretto. In some cases he merely altered the preexisting words, but, more often, the source texts became absent prefigurative texts that subtly inflected his newly composed verse. The latent originals underscore important ideas, and reinforce connections between different points in his narrative. And, as we shall see, one recurring theme—the messianic arrival—is particularly important. This motif will provide an occasion to consider some of the cantata’s music in detail. But before discussing the music and the overwritten texts that haunt Hopkinson’s story, I offer a synopsis of the cantata.

35 This is not to say that Hopkinson enjoyed a Romantic kind of creative autonomy when conceiving *America Independent*, operating free or in the face of societal constraints. Rather, it is precisely the socioeconomic circumstances of this pastiche’s conception that preclude the genre’s standard dismissal on grounds of pragmatism.
America Independent: Synopsis

After opening with an overture from an unidentified Jommelli opera, America Independent features a short, homophonic trio for the Geniuses of America and France and the High Priest. Together they address the chorus (which does not respond until the final number), exhorting it to worship the goddess: “Arise! your voices raise / And swell the solemn hymn of praise / At great Minerva’s awful shrine / Bow down and own the Pow’r divine.”

Having begun with this reverent gesture, America and France make several requests of Minerva. They each do so in the form of an aria, before rejoining in a duet. America goes first, asking if its struggles in the War of Independence will be rewarded. France then goes a step further on America’s behalf, presenting an outright plea for patriot victory. In the duet that follows, the chorale-like texture of the opening trio returns, and the two nations reiterate their entreaties. They ask Minerva to declare what fate has ordained, imploring her to sympathize with their cause.

At this point the High Priest intercedes, petitioning the goddess on behalf of America and France. In a lengthy, florid aria, he endorses their appeal and invokes Minerva’s blessing. Emboldened by this display of solidarity, America and France again join the Priest in a trio, this time inviting Minerva’s descent into the temple. Finally, in the last number of the first scene, the High Priest narrates the goddess’s appearance: “On a cloud, she descends from above / All glorious reveal’d to the sight.” “What the Fates have ordain’d,” he announces, “Minerva herself shall declare.”

---

36 See Appendix 1a for an outline of the cantata in chart form.
38 Ibid. As a divine appearance (theophania) that initiates a reversal of fortune for characters in the cantata, Minerva’s descent owes something to the classical convention of the deus ex machina. It is not a
Thus the first scene ends in a state of suspense. Hopkinson’s script calls for an interlude in the form of a chaconne by Jommelli, after which the action resumes. At the onset of the second scene the sanctuary doors open, and Minerva addresses America and France in a pair of arias. She has nothing but good news: America’s “griefs shall be repaid” with future happiness, its “opposing pow’rs” will fall, and its freedom and commerce will flourish. If it can only remain united, imperial greatness is in store.39 Excited by these promises, America replies with a sprightly invocation of heavenly blessing, and, in the cantata’s closing number, the chorus sings for the first time, offering the goddess its praise.

**America Independent: Verbal and Musical Meaning**

Such is the dramatic sequence that Hopkinson devised. Let us now consider the preexisting material to which he set it, and the ways in which this inflects his libretto. For the cantata’s vocal numbers, Hopkinson naturally used music that already had words. Generally speaking, there are two ways in which those words relate to his newly composed texts. First, in a few cases, the original texts suited the new libretto so well that only small adjustments were required. These sources have a literal resemblance to Hopkinson’s script. More commonly, however, the originals have only a figurative connection to the cantata’s story. As a subset of this second variety, several of the preexisting texts can be grouped together as emphasizing a common *figura*—the glorious or messianic return.

For three of the cantata’s numbers, Hopkinson commandeered arias whose preexisting texts suited his purposes almost to a tee. The High Priest’s first solo, for instance, is a modified
version of the opening aria from Act III of Handel’s 1746 oratorio, *Judas Maccabaeus*, whose libretto was by Thomas Morell:

“Father of Heav’n” in *Judas Maccabaeus*  

Father of Heav’n, from thy eternal Throne,  
Look with an Eye of Blessing down,  
While we prepare the holy Rites,  
To solemnize the Feast of Lights.  
And thus our grateful Hearts employ;  
And in thy Praise,  
This Altar raise,  
With Carols of triumphant Joy.⁴⁰

“Daughter of Jove” in *America Independent*  

Daughter of Jove! from thy resplendent throne,  
Look, with an eye of blessing, down;  
Whilst we our sacred songs address,  
And thy propitious pow’r confess;  
Whilst we our grateful hearts employ,  
And to thy praise  
Our voices raise,  
In carols of triumphant joy.⁴¹

In Handel and Morell’s work, the aria is sung by an Israelite priest while preparing to celebrate Judea’s liberation from Seleucid rule. This emancipation narrative prefigured the American quest for independence, and this aria mapped neatly onto Hopkinson’s dramatic scenario. He only had to change a few details to make it serve his story.

The same was true of “Thou, like the glorious sun,” the closing number in Act II of Thomas Arne’s *Artaxerxes* (1761), which was based on a libretto by Metastasio. In Arne’s opera, the Persian general Artabanes sings a soliloquy about his jailed son, Arbaces, whom he wants to see installed as the next king of Persia. Making minor alterations to its text, Hopkinson turned this aria into Minerva’s prediction of America’s imperial glory:

“Thou, like the glorious sun” in *Artaxerxes*  

Thou, like the glorious sun,  
Thy splendid course shalt run:  
What tho’ the night,  
Obscure his light,  
When prison’d in the west;  
The day returns,  
Again he burns,  
The god of day confest.⁴²

“She, like the glorious sun” in *America Independent*  

She, like the glorious sun,  
Her splendid course shall run,  
And future days  
*Columbia’s* praise  
Shall spread from east to west:  
The Gods decree  
That she shall be  
A nation great confest.⁴³

When the Genius of America responds to this happy pronouncement, he draws similarly on the penultimate number of Handel’s 1743 oratorio, *Samson*. In the original libretto by Newburgh Hamilton, an Israelite woman sings in celebration of Samson’s last act of revenge on the Philistines. To repurpose her aria, Hopkinson made its words more generic, omitting references to specific angelic orders (seraphim and cherubim) and introducing the personage of Fame. The text is otherwise the same as that in *Samson*, and serves as a jubilant rejoinder to the goddess’s prognosis:

“Let the bright Seraphim” in *Samson*  “Let earth’s inhabitants” in *America Independent*

Let the bright Seraphim in burning Row
Their loud up-lifted Angel-trumpets blow:
Let the Cherubick Host, in tuneful Choirs,
Touch their immortal Harps with golden Wires.44

Let earth’s inhabitants heav’ns [sic] pleasure know,
And Fame her loud uplifted trumpet blow,
Let the celestial nine45 in tuneful choirs,
Touch their immortal harps with golden wires.46

But not all the sources for *America Independent* were so readily adapted. Most had more tenuous connections to Hopkinson’s story. Consider the arias appropriated for America’s and France’s solos in the first scene. America sings the tune of “As if yon damask rose be sweet” from Handel’s oratorio, *Susanna* (1748). In the original libretto, likely by Newburgh Hamilton, Susanna is overcome with anxiety during the absence of her husband Joacim. To ease her apprehension, she asks her attendant to sing “Ask if yon damask rose,” which Joacim had written for her. In Hopkinson’s cantata, America’s acute uncertainty about the war’s outcome mirrors Susanna’s distress. Likewise, Hopkinson assigned to France the music of “Yet awhile, sweet sleep” from Michael Arne’s dramatic romance, *Cymon* (1767), for which David Garrick

45 This refers to the Christian angelic hierarchy, which consists of nine orders.
adapted a poem by John Dryden. In Arne’s work, the aria is sung by the troubled object of Cymon’s love, Sylvia. Upon awakening, she utters an apostrophe to sleep, asking it to reclaim her, relieving her of the day’s sorrows. In Hopkinson’s hands, the music accompanies a parallel plea for deliverance from wartime adversity.

Other numbers in America Independent work similarly. Its second trio, in which America, France, and the High Priest ask Minerva to descend into the sanctuary, uses music from the opening duet in Thomas Arne’s ballad opera, Love in a Village (1762). Written by Isaac Bickerstaff, the text of Arne’s duet commends hope as the “softest soother of the mind” and “surest friend the wretched find.” His two characters, Rosetta and Lucinda, in fact pray to hope, asking it to “deal out pleasures unpossed,” making them in wishes “blest.” It is not hard to see the connection to Hopkinson’s trio, where the characters look to Minerva for relief and wish-fulfillment.

For the subsequent number, the aria in which the High Priest describes Minerva’s arrival, Hopkinson chose a second excerpt from Love in a Village. This time the tune was by a certain Bernard, and Bickerstaff’s original text compares his protagonists’ innocent love to a manifestation of heaven “on this side of the stars.” What is only a metaphor in Arne’s opera—earthly appearance of the divine—becomes a literal event in Hopkinson’s cantata. There the High Priest tells us to behold Minerva as “she descends from above” on a cloud.

Hopkinson used one other selection by Thomas Arne, the well known aria, “Water parted from the sea,” from Act III of Artaxerxes. In the source story, Arbaces, facing trumped-up
murder charges, sings this number before entering exile. He laments being doomed “to roam” until he can reclaim his “native home.” As taken up by Hopkinson, the music accompanies Minerva’s forecast of America’s “future happy state,” for which it will have to wait. “Water parted from the sea” thus becomes a parable for the fulfillment of Columbia’s destiny, as foretold by the goddess.

The texts of Hopkinson’s musical sources thus anticipated his newly created narrative in a variety of ways. Some did so directly, and he could simply import them, with modifications, into his libretto. More often, though, the relationships were thematic: the sources prefigured motifs in his cantata. As suggested above, one of these motifs had special significance, namely, Minerva’s descent into the temple. This did not merely signal her acquiescence to America and France’s invitation; it prefigured the advent of what Shalev has called an American Zion. The glorious entrance was a typological hinge between modern political and ancient biblical narratives. The secular return from battle of a victorious warrior mirrored the apocalyptic arrival of the Messiah and inauguration of his earthly reign. In the most general terms, Minerva’s visitation suggested millennial deliverance for God’s chosen nation.

Hopkinson emphasized this idea more than any other in his cantata. He did so discreetly, however, through his use of borrowed material. The music for America, France, and the High Priest’s opening trio, for instance, had originally celebrated a soldier’s homecoming in Henry Carey’s 1734 masque, Britannia. Its text had begun, “He comes, the hero comes / Sound your trumpets, beat your drums / From port to port let cannons roar / His welcome to the British shoar.” Significantly, however, Carey’s music had already been repurposed in a sacred

---

52 Arne, Artaxerxes, p. 8.
53 Hopkinson, America Independent (1781).
context when Hopkinson adopted it. It had been used for one of four songs on the theme of Christ’s return that concluded Charles Wesley’s *Hymns of Intercession for All Mankind* (1758), where it had these words: “He comes! the Judge severe! / The seventh trumpet speaks Him near! / His light’nings flash, his thunders roll / How welcome to the faithful soul!”55 The opening vocal number of Hopkinson’s cantata thus bore the traces of two texts that portended a glorious arrival: one did so in secular terms, the other was apocalyptic.

The same theme was soon reemphasized, during America and France’s duet. Hopkinson set their united prayers to a famous chorus from Act III of *Judas Maccabaeus*, the refrain of which echoed the prefigurative texts of the opening trio. Hailing their liberation from the Seleucid empire, the Israelites proclaim, “See, the conqu’ring Hero comes! / Sound the Trumpet, beat the Drums / Sports prepare, the Laurel bring / Songs of Triumph to him sing.”56 Because it was so well known, Hopkinson used this Handelian chorus for a special purpose. It is the only music featured more than once in the cantata, appearing both near the middle of the work, in the aforementioned duet, and at the end, in the final chorus. The familiarity and repetition of “See, the conqu’ring Hero comes!” ensured that Hopkinson’s audience would not miss the point: divine deliverance paralleled the earthly hero’s return. Minerva’s descent into the temple had messianic resonance, which was strengthened by Hopkinson’s articulation, through his selection of source material, of the theme of the glorious arrival at the cantata’s beginning, middle, and end.

Such are the ways in which the words of Hopkinson’s source music inflected his libretto. But what about the music itself? Given the figurative connections we have been considering, it is

no surprise that the affective qualities of the source music generally suit the cantata. In one aria, however, the chosen music drives home the messianic motif. In the broadest terms, *America Independent* represents an appeal from within history to a point outside of it. Minerva represents the universal. She accesses knowledge that the Geniuses of America and France cannot because they are particular—time-bound. But prophecy (i.e., that Columbia will be great and prosperous) is not revelation in the complete sense. More significant, again, is Minerva’s descent, a movement from heaven to earth. In Hopkinson’s cantata, the struggle for independence was not merely historical; it was eschatological. And none of its numbers shows this more clearly than the Genius of America’s final, heraldic aria, “Let earth’s inhabitants heaven’s pleasure know.”

As noted, the music of this number was taken from “Let the bright seraphim” in Handel’s *Samson.* It is a D-major da capo aria featuring luminescent fanfares, and, as such, was a clear descendant of “The trumpet shall sound” from *Messiah* (1741). Hopkinson’s subject (i.e., heaven’s pleasure manifest on earth) is not identical with Handel’s in “The trumpet” (i.e., the resurrection of the dead), but the two arias have a common purpose and a common theme. They portend a messianic moment in which the corruptible “put on incorruption” and the mortal “put on immortality.” Such reversals were thought to characterize the millennial age, in which the terrestrial would become heavenly and, according to the Genius of America’s plea, divine bliss would be known by earthly beings.

Handel’s original aria featured a musical analogue of this supernatural delight—namely, the melisma. In Hopkinson’s adaptation, the text setting remains syllabic until the key word,

---

57 See Appendix 2 for a reproduction of the Handel score that likely served as Hopkinson’s source for “Let Earth’s Inhabitants.”

“pleasure,” first arrives on beat one of measure ten (Ex. 1.1). There, a decorative oscillation between E and F-sharp anticipates longer melismatic flourishes to come. The line concerning Fame’s “uplifted trumpet” then makes a triadic ascent (mm. 12–14) similar to that of “the last trumpet” in Messiah, before the short melisma on “pleasure” is repeated and extended (mm. 19–21). The aria’s longest melisma, however, is reserved for the trumpet’s “blowing,” which lasts from the third beat of measure twenty-six until the first beat of measure thirty. And related melismas appear on the words “Fame” (mm. 32–33) and “uplifted” (m. 34). Like Fame’s trumpet, the harps of the celestial nine are effusive, triggering florid passages in the aria’s B section (Ex. 1.2).

This festively apocalyptic music provided a suitable follow-up to Minerva’s declarations. The Genius of America could rejoice over her promises while heralding their fulfillment. Similarly, as we have seen, Handel’s “See, the conqu’ring hero comes!” reinforced the cantata’s messianism, as did Henry Carey’s “He comes, the hero comes,” made by Charles Wesley into “He comes! the Judge severe.” Indeed, each music-theatrical source that Hopkinson chose anticipated his cantata plot in some way. The relationship was most often figurative, although sometimes it was literal, requiring only small adjustments to the original. Most notable, however, was his use of the glorious arrival as a unifying motif.
Example 1.1
Francis Hopkinson, *America Independent*, “Let earth’s inhabitants,” mm. 9–35

Let earth’s in-hab-i-tants heav’n’s plea-sure know,

and fame her loud up-lift-ed trum-pet blow.

Let earth’s in-hab-i-tants heav’n’s plea-sure know, heav’n’s plea-sure, plea-

-sure know, and fame her loud up-lift-ed trum-pet blow and
Example 1.1 continued
Example 1.2
Francis Hopkinson, *America Independent*, “Let earth’s inhabitants,” mm. 67–74

Not explicitly biblical, *America Independent* espoused a secularized millennialism that, as Shalev has shown, characterized the revolutionary worldview in the northern colonies-turned-states.\(^{59}\) Eschewing a strict typology between Old Testament Israel and modern America, the cantata nevertheless drew from the Roman classical tradition and from English musical theater to portray the war with Britain in apocalyptic terms. Hopkinson appealed to his audience’s typological imagination through implied figurative relationships between the source material and his newly composed verse. Only by relating the cantata’s surface text to the absent narrative content of its recycled music could listeners fully access Hopkinson’s message.

What we have yet to consider is the cantata in its practical mode, when it was performed for small gatherings at the French consulate. What were the circumstances of these concerts, and how were they received?

America Independent: Performances and Revisions

When America Independent premiered before a private assembly at Luzerne’s on March 21, 1781, it was Richard Peters, a member of the Continental Congress and the Commissioner of the Board of War, who sang the most Handel. Reputed to be a fine singer,60 he had been given the role of America. Next to Peters, at the harpsichord, sat Hopkinson. The other singers were Benjamin Franklin’s son-in-law, Richard Bache, who played the High Priest; “a Mr. Brown,” who sang France’s part; and a “Miss Bond,” who tackled the role of Minerva.61 Fittingly, the performance fell within the timeframe (March 19–23) of the ancient festival honoring the Roman goddess.

On this particular evening in 1781, however, Minerva’s sunny predictions might have seemed disingenuous. For at that moment the war was going badly. Despite the aid of French money and troops, the rebels’ prospects had seldom looked worse. Mutiny threatened the Continental Army, and the British position, both on land and at sea, was formidable. With his cantata, Hopkinson sought to boost the morale of the republican elite. If he did not replenish their optimism, he could at least provide them with a welcome distraction.

But if the audience was disheartened on the occasion of the March performance, its mood had surely improved by the time the cantata was remounted at Luzerne’s almost nine
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60 François-Jean Marquis de Chastellux, a high-ranking member of the French expeditionary forces, attested to this fact after hearing Peters sing at the home of James Wilson. Chastellux, Travels in North America in the Years 1780, 1781, and 1782, translated by George Grieve and Howard Rice (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1963), p. 176.

61 Martha Bland to Frances Tucker, March 30, 1781. “Randolph and Tucker Letters,” Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 43 (1935): 41–46. Based on our knowledge of Hopkinson’s source music, the Geniuses of America and France were tenor roles, the High Priest was a baritone, and Minerva’s part was for soprano. Beyond the fact that Hopkinson provided a continuo realization on the harpsichord, nothing is known with certainty about the instrumental forces. As Anderson has noted, however, other accounts of music-making within Hopkinson’s circle and that of the French ambassador make it likely that a small chamber ensemble doubled the vocal lines. Anderson, “‘The Temple of Minerva’ and Francis Hopkinson,” 172; and Hopkinson, America Independent, edited by Anderson, pp. iv–v.
months later. With their victory at Yorktown in October 1781, U.S. forces had turned the tables on the British. What had seemed a dim prospect earlier in the year was now an imminent reality. Minerva’s prophecies were coming true.

Like the war, the cantata looked rather different in December than in March. For one thing, it had a new title, *The Temple of Minerva*. And there were other changes: the text of the High Priest’s first aria was rewritten, the break between scenes was moved to an earlier point in the work, the interlude was omitted, and several stanzas were added to the final chorus (Fig. 1.2). Some of these revisions stemmed from the changing war situation: the work’s title became more abstract once the threat to independence was reduced, and the additions to the final chorus made it into a hymn to George Washington. Other changes, however, had less to do with the war than with the work’s internal logic. Yorktown not only invited Hopkinson to amend the cantata in light of patriot success; it offered an opportunity to correct certain shortcomings in the work.

---

62 Differences between the two versions are shown in bold in Appendix 1b.
Figure 1.2
Francis Hopkinson, The Temple of Minerva (Freeman's Journal, December 19, 1781, p. 3)

The TEMPLE of MINERVA:
An Oratorical Entertainment.


SCENE I. In the temple of Minerva. The doors of the sanctuary shut.

OVERTURE.
The Genius of France: the Genius of America; and the High Priest of Minerva.

TRIO.
ARISE! arise! your voices raise,
And swell the solemn hymn of praise;
At Minerva's awful shrine,
Bow down, and own the Pow'r divine.

GENIUS of AMERICA.
Oh, wise Minerva! hear my prayer,
And tell great Jove's decree:
Celestial Gods! I now declare
What Fate has fixed for me.

My warrior sons — the sons of Fame,
In deeds of virtue hold.
Among the nations nobly claim
An honour'd place to hold.

Say, will high Jove their labours crown,
And grant their arms success,
From his exalted throne look down,
And my orations blest?

GENIUS of FRANCE.
Wise Minerva! hear my prayer,
Make her valiant sons thy care;
To th' immortal breath of Fame,
Give, oh give, her honoured name.

Let her counsels fill precepts,
In the field her armies guide.
Thus directed she shall be
Great and glorious, wise and free.

DUETTO.
Great Minerva! hear our prayer,
What the Fates ordain, declare.
Thus before thy throne we bow —
Hear, oh gods, hear us now!

Humble offices thus we bring,
With united voices sing:
Let our favours songs ascend,
Thou hast ever been our friend.

HIGH PRIEST.
With solemn rites approach the shrine,
And humble homage pay;
Fit offices to the Pow'r divine,
Upon her altar lay.

From the central clouds ascending,
Hearts and voices sweetly blending,
Shall to Minerva grateful prove,
And call down blessings from above.

TRIO.
From those radiant fields as above,
Where thou firstenthroned with God,
Oh, defend thy temple grace,
With thy glories fill the place.

Hear, oh gods! hear our prayer;
Make Columbia's cause thy care;
Bless and patronize thy foe,
Great and powerful shall be.

SCENE II. Minerva. The doors of the sanctuary open.

HIGHER.
Doth the great daughter of Jove,
Behold, how resplendent with light,
On a cloud, she descends from above,
All glorious, unseen to the eye.

Your songs have her favour obtained,
She comes to reply to your prayer.
And now, what the Fates have ordained,
Minerva herself shall declare.

MINERVA.
In a golden balance weighed
Have I seen Columbia's fate,
All her griefs shall be repaid
By a future happy fate.

She with France in friendship joint'd,
Shall op'ning powers defy:
Thus united, thus combine'd,
Heaven will rob the sacred tie.

Freedom on her happy shore
Shall her banners wide display:
Commerce shall her rich'land flow
Through her numerous vales convey.

Jove declares his high command,
Fate confirms the great decree
If her counsels stand,
Great and glorious shall she be.

She, like the glorious sun,
Her splendid course shall sail,
And future days
Columbia's praise shall.

Shall spread from sea to sea:
The God's decree
That the shall be
A nation great confederate.

GENIUS of AMERICA.
Let earth's inhabitants hear us proclaim
And Parnassus, the same:
Let her sweetest voice be known
And her immortal harps with golden wires.

CHORUS.
Great Minerva, pow'r divine,
Praise, exalted praise, be thine:
Thus thy name in songs we blend,
Thus in songs thy pow'r confine.

Great Minerva, pow'r divine,
Praise, exalted praise, be thine.
By thee inspired virtuous Greece
In the blaze of battle seen,
To deeds of valor, deeds of worth,
He leads his gallant armies forth.

Columbia's gods and fate
By the sorrows of her course,
From the friendly shores of France
See the martial troops advance,
With Columbia's fate united,
And share the dangers of the day,
Equal honours to them pay.

Now the dreadful conflict o'er,
Now the cannon cease to roar,
Thrice the joyous tidings round
He comes, he conquers, with conquest crown'd.
Hail! Columbia's godlike son!
Hail! the glorious WASHINGTON!

Fill the golden trumpet of Fame
Through the world his worth proceeds.
Let vales, and hills, and cities sound
He comes, he conquers, with conquest crown'd
Hail! Columbia's godlike son!
Hail! the glorious WASHINGTON!
In the audience at the cantata’s first performance was Benjamin Franklin’s daughter, Sarah Bache, who was there to hear her husband sing the role of the High Priest. Writing to her nephew, William Temple Franklin, after the fact, she had some fun at the cantata’s expense, reflecting on the critical dramatic moment when the goddess was to appear from out of the heavens. To form a picture of the event, she told Franklin, “You must imagine Minerva descending from the Clouds &c &c for there was not even an arm Chair and rope to lower the Goddess from the Ceiling.” The actress, Miss Bond, was reportedly unfazed by this predicament. “I can assure you,” Bache wrote, “that she sat very composed behind the Harpsichord the whole time with the gravest face in the world.”

Bache’s comments bring to light a dramaturgical flaw in Hopkinson’s work. According to the original libretto, the doors to Minerva’s sanctuary remain closed until the second scene. In the final number of the first scene, however, the High Priest narrates the goddess’s appearance. To be sure, Hopkinson’s audience would not have expected much in the way of verisimilitude, and the performance was, after all, unstaged. But it was not even possible for Hopkinson’s characters—within the fiction—to see what the High Priest was describing. They had to wait for the High Priest to finish and then endure a ponderous interlude before the sanctuary doors opened, revealing Minerva at the beginning of the second scene. And yet all the while the goddess sat in plain view of actors and audience alike.

This situation taxed the viewers’ tolerance for an already unrealistic scenario, and Hopkinson had to make changes before the cantata’s December revival. He did two things to resolve the logical inconsistency surrounding Minerva’s appearance. First, he moved the break between scenes to an earlier point in the narrative, directly prior to the aria describing the

---

63 Sarah Bache to William Temple Franklin, June 22, 1781, Sarah Franklin Bache Papers, American Philosophical Society.
goddess’s descent. In the revised version, the first scene ends and the sanctuary doors open before we are told of Minerva’s arrival. Second, he omitted the interlude that had drawn undue attention to Minerva’s unstaged entrance. Now the cantata could proceed without interruption from the goddess’s appearance to her first aria.

Hopkinson made one other adjustment to improve the movement of his plot, and to tighten up the work’s dramatic logic. In the original version, the High Priest’s first aria is redundant with respect to the previous solos and duet by America and France. Although the Priest strengthens their cause by adding his endorsement as Minerva’s representative, he does virtually nothing to advance the narrative. For the revised work, however, Hopkinson rewrote the text of this aria as follows:

Original High Priest aria, “Daughter of Jove”

Daughter of Jove! from thy resplendent throne,
Look, with an eye of blessing, down;
Whilst we our sacred songs address,
And thy propitious pow’r confess;
Whilst we our grateful hearts employ,
And to thy praise
Our voices raise,
In carols of triumphant joy.  

Revised High Priest aria, “With solemn rites”

With solemn rites approach the shrine,
And humble homage pay;
Fit off’ring to the Pow’r divine,
Upon her altar lay.
From the censer clouds ascending,
Hearts and voices sweetly blending,
Shall to Minerva grateful prove,
And call down blessings from above.

In its second version, the Priest’s solo adds a new element to the story. Instead of repeating America and France’s prayers, he instructs them in how to approach the goddess. This not only makes the aria more interesting; it strengthens the rationale for the High Priest character. In the later version, he offers a necessary intervention, whereas before he seemed superfluous.

64 Hopkinson, America Independent (1781).
65 Francis Hopkinson, “The Temple of Minerva,” Freeman’s Journal, December 19, 1781. Given their differing syllabic patterns and rhyme schemes, it is doubtful that Hopkinson used the same music for the two versions of the sixth number. Unfortunately, however, the only indications of musical sources exist in the annotated libretto for the earlier version. No means of identifying the music for the revised High Priest aria have come to light.
The last and most significant changes Hopkinson made were to the cantata’s closing number. The finale initially consisted of a single verse offering praise to the goddess. Though it retains this strophe, the revised chorus has four additional verses, during which Minerva fades from view. She is acknowledged in the opening line of the second verse, which otherwise honors Nathanael Greene, a major general in the Continental Army. But the remaining verses do not mention the goddess. The third recognizes France’s contribution to the war effort, the fourth celebrates the ceasefire, and the fifth turns the commander-in-chief, George Washington, into an object of worship:

> Fill the golden trump of Fame,  
> Through the world his worth proclaim;  
> Let rocks, and hills, and vales resound,  
> He comes, he comes, with conquest crown’d.  
> Hail Columbia’s godlike son!  
> Hail the glorious WASHINGTON!66

Like the outcome of the war, this revelation of the earthly conqueror remained a mere potentiality when Hopkinson wrote the cantata’s first version. By the end of the revised work, however, it had been consummated. The anonymous hero alluded to in earlier numbers was now given explicit form, in the finale, as Washington. With patriotic victory secured, Hopkinson could comfortably suggest a typology in which Washington’s return from the battlefield represented Christ’s second coming. The commander’s triumphant arrival—prefigured by Hopkinson’s use of Carey’s “He comes, the hero comes” and Handel’s “See, the conquering hero comes,” not to mention by Minerva’s messianic appearance—modeled the advent of the millennium.

66 Ibid. For more on attributions of divinity to Washington, see François Furstenberg, In the Name of the Father: Washington’s Legacy, Slavery, and the Making of a Nation (New York: Penguin, 2006), pp. 26–70. Furstenberg argues that Washington became the focus of an American civil religion following his death.
But not all Americans welcomed the outcome of the war, or viewed the new Republic as the instantiation of a final, golden age in human history. Indeed, in the audience at Luzerne’s for the December performance there were a few who rejected the cantata’s message altogether. One of these disgruntled loyalists arranged to publish a parody of Hopkinson’s libretto, which became the opening salvo in a printed verbal skirmish with the cantata’s author.

**Hopkinson Battles the Loyalists**

At the cantata’s December presentation, souvenir copies of the revised libretto were distributed to the audience. This had an unintended consequence, as an anonymous loyalist took out his pencil during the concert, and began to sketch a parody in the margins of his program. If, as claimed, he completed this work while listening to the performance, then it was a clever feat. The rhymes and scansion of Hopkinson’s verse are perfectly retained in the new version, which lampoons the American rebels and their French allies, branding Washington a “fiend-like” upstart (Fig. 1.3).

The crux of the parody was the replacement of Minerva with Cloacina, the goddess believed to oversee the functioning of ancient Rome’s sewer system. Instead of invoking a hallowed space, the parody title, *The Temple of Cloacina*, thus conjured an outhouse. And, indeed, the loyalist’s vulgar reworking likens the cantata’s proceedings to bathroom events. Hopkinson and his supporters could take some relief in the fact that the parody was abridged: it treated only the first scene and three verses of the final chorus. But in the end the satire left Hopkinson stinging, as evidenced by a retort that he would soon publish.67

---

The Temple of Cloacina received its only printing in James Rivington’s New York newspaper, the Royal Gazette, on January 5, 1782, and his would be the first of four entries in an exchange between the loyalist press and Hopkinson. The second, a reply from Hopkinson, came in the January 17 issue of the Pennsylvania Packet. In lieu of another parodied libretto, Hopkinson offered a fictional prose narrative concerning his discovery of the Royal Gazette satire. It begins with Hopkinson walking about town, attending to his business. He is greeted on the way by various acquaintances, who implore him to get ahold of Rivington’s scandalous paper. At length he discovers a copy in the possession of man in a “dirty alley,” who has used the journal as toilet paper. He takes the soiled document home and has it cleaned, but will not divulge its crude contents to the Packet’s readership. His assistant finally throws the Gazette in the river, by way of which it returns to Rivington’s shop in New York. There, a worker inadvertently uses it to wrap Rivington’s lunch.68

---

68 Pennsylvania Packet, January 17, 1782.
Figure 1.3
The Temple of Cloacina, parody of Hopkinson's Temple of Minerva (Royal Gazette, January 5, 1782, p. 2)

An ORATORIAL ENTERTAINMENT.


SCENE I. In the Temple of Minerva. The Doors of the Sanctuary shut.

OVERTURE.
The Genius of France; the Genius of America; and the High Priest of Minerva.

TRIO.
A RISE! your voices raise,
And swell the solemn hymn of praise;
At great Minerva's awful shrine
Bow down and own the Pater divinæ.

GENIUS of AMERICA.
Oh, Minerva! hear my prayer,
And tell great Jove's decree;
Celestial Goddess! now declare:
What fate has fixed for me.

My warlike sons, the sons of fame,
In deeds of virtue bold,
Among the nations nobly claim
An honour'd place to hold.

Say, will high Jove their labour's crown,
And grant their arms success?
From his exalted throne look down,
And my orisons bless.

GENIUS of FRANCE.
Wife Minerva! grant her pray'r,
Make her valiant sons thy care:
To th' immortal breath of fame,
Give, oh give, her honour'd name.

O'er her council still preside,
In the field her armies guide;
Thus directed she shall be.
Great and glorious, wife and free.

Duetto.
Great Minerva! hear our pray'r,
What the Fates ordain, declare.
Thus before thy throne we bow—
Heav'n, oh Goddess! hear us now!
Humble sighs thus we bring,
With united voices sing:
Let our favour'd songs ascend,
Thou hast o'er been virtue's friend.

An ORA-WHIG-IAL ENTERTAINMENT.


SCENE I. In the Temple of Cloacina. The Doors of the Little-House shut.

OVERTURE.
The Genius of France, the Genius of America, and the High Priest of Cloacina.

TRI—O H! 
STRAIN hard! strain hard! your voices raise,
And swell your croaking throats with praise;
At Cloacina's flinking shrine
Squat down, and own you grunt like swine.

GENIUS of AMERICA.
Oh, Cloacina! hear my pray'r,
An easy fool do decree,
And do my Goddess I do declare,
What Bible is left for me.

My Yankie sons—who feel no shame,
In quick-step motions bold,
Among thy vot'ries, sure may claim
The highest rank to hold.

Say wilt thou soon their strainings crown,
And let them all succeed,
From thy round-hole'd throne come down,
And help me do my need.

GENIUS of FRANCE.
Cloacina! grant her pray'r,
Make her illust'ren sons thy care;
To the flinking breath of fame,
Give, oh, give the Yankie name.

O'er her council still preside,
Wipes with nettles her lack'hside,
Though, thus helped, she will be
No more clean than the is free.

DO—I T—O H!
Cloacina! hear our pray'r,
What thy foolest, contain declare;
Thus before thy throne we bend,
Goddess hear our Nether end!
Yellow o'ring's thus we bring,
With united voices sing:
Let our fav'ry scenes ascend,
Thou wait o'er the fluster's friend.
HIGH PRIEST.
With solemn rites approach the shrine!
And humble homage pay;
Fit offerings to the Power divine;
Upon her altar lay.
From the center clouds ascending,
Hearts and voices sweetly blending,
Shall to Minerva grateful prove,
And call down blessings from above.

T R I O.
From those radiant bliss abodes,
Where thou sitt'st enthroned with God,
Oh, descend! thy temple grace,
With thy glories fill the place.
Hear, oh Goddess! hear our prayer,
Make Columbia's ensign thy care;
Blest and patronized by thee,
Great and powerful shall she be.

SCENE II. Minerva. The Doors of the Sanctuary open.

C H O R U S.
From the friendly shores of France,
See the martial troops advance;
With Columbia's rose unite,
And share the dangers of the fight,
Equal heroes of the day,
Equal honors to them pay.

Now the dreadful conflict o'er,
Now the cannons cease to roar,
Spread the joyful tidings round;
He comes, he comes, with conquest crown'd,
Hail Columbia's godlike son!
Hail the glorious WASHINGTON!

Pill the golden trumpet of Fame,
Through the world his worth proclaim,
Let rocks, and hills, and vales, resound,
His comes, he comes, with conquest crown'd,
Hail Columbia's godlike son!
Hail the glorious WASHINGTON!

HIGH PRIEST.
With solemn rites approach the shrine!
And humble homage pay;
Fit offerings, to our Cisacine
Upon her crose-stool lay.
From the Pan see smoke ascending,
F-s, to and granting sweetly blending,
To Cisacine these grateful prove,
And call down blessings from above.

T R I - A G A I N... O H !
From those secret snug shades,
Where thou sitt'st enthroned on h--l,
Oh, descend! with quicken'd pace,
Help us fill up ev'ry place.
Hark! the Goddess—in your ear—
Make Columbia's B—ch thy care,
Keep it open—keep it free—
A fl--ten flat shall she be.

SCENE II. Cisacine. The Doors of the Little-House open.

C H O R U S.
From the common shores of France,
See Monsieur's sung and dance,
With Columbia's rose unite,
Take all honor of the fight,
Equal wagers we will lay;
We each other soon shall pay.

Now the dreadful training's o'er,
Now our bows we cease to roar,
Belch the joyful tidings round,
He comes, he comes, with Life's crown'd;
Hail Columbia's godlike son!
Hail the upstairs WASHINGTON!

Fill the yellow rump of Fame,
Through it squirt his worthiest name,
Let rocks, hard as his breast, resound,
He comes, he comes, with Life's crown'd;
Hail Columbia's godlike son!
Hail the upstairs WASHINGTON.
The New York editor, in turn, refused to take an insult lying down. On January 26 he ran another parody, this time of Hopkinson’s prose narrative. Much of Hopkinson’s text was retained, but parts were altered in order to ridicule him. For example, when Hopkinson asks the alley man to hand him the dirty newspaper, the man (now a “Caledonian”) becomes irate. He hurls excrement-caked newspaper fragments at Hopkinson, one of which becomes lodged in the statesman’s throat. Hopkinson is scorned by passers-by as he tramps home, sullied from head to toe. Once he and the paper are washed, Hopkinson finds himself in possession not of the *Royal Gazette*, but rather of a Philadelphia printing of his own libretto. At this point even his attendant begins to taunt him, and, after an episode of madness, Hopkinson resolves to seat himself on Cloacina’s “Stool of repentance,” the better to seek the goddess’s forgiveness.\(^{69}\)

Thus disgraced, the real Hopkinson had had enough. Two weeks later, he published a measured statement in the *Packet*, in which he assumed the moral high ground. Refusing to follow Rivington “into all the filth he is willing to wade through,” Hopkinson withdrew from the controversy. “I wipe my pen—not with a handful of shavings—but with a piece of clean cotton,” he wrote, “and lay it by.”\(^{70}\) He could afford to lose this literary battle, for after all his side had won the war.

***

For all the relief that accompanied the dénouement of the American Revolution, there remained divisions among its victors and hostility between patriot and loyalist adherents. The years 1781–82 saw the resolution of a long struggle over the sovereignty of the American colonies-turned-states, but this was hardly a time of political certainty. Once Yorktown had

---

\(^{69}\) “A true and faithful NARRATIVE of the ADVENTURES of a poor unfortunate POET and MUSICIAN, in his Search after RIVINGTON’s ROYAL GAZETTE, in the City of Philadelphia,” *Royal Gazette*, January 26, 1782.

\(^{70}\) “To the AUTHOR of two Columns and a half in Rivington’s Gazette, of the 26th of January,” *Pennsylvania Packet*, February 9, 1782.
neutralized the British threat, questions loomed about who would govern the new nation, and how.

Luzerne’s fête for the Dauphin was one occasion that brought the newly configured relationship between America’s rulers and ruled into sharp relief. The elite mingled there easily, distinguished from their subordinates by the property line of the French consulate, on which rested a flimsy wooden fence. It was a moment of truth for the new nation, when its constituents determined whether the leadership could safely rely on the consent of the governed. At this juncture, Benjamin Rush observed, music was a valuable ideological tool that the powers in question had failed to exploit.

But Francis Hopkinson was aware of the role that music could play in shaping the national imagination. Drawing on the English musical traditions of Handelian oratorio and theatrical pastiche, he created a programmatic cantata on the topic of the American Revolution. Trusting his audience to detect covert figurative relationships, and in accordance with a perspective shared by his fellow northern statesmen, he conflated secular patriot conquest with the advent of a divinely ordained golden age. In particular, by alluding to Handel’s *Messiah* through the use of related music, he presented a typology in which George Washington fulfilled the promise of Christ’s return.

Hopkinson’s exchange with James Rivington illustrates the hard feelings that lingered after Yorktown. Loyalists did not have much of a future in American politics, but other dissenters did. The ratification debates of the 1780s would in the nineties give way to explicit partisanship and, with the Whiskey and House Tax rebellions, to fresh instances of armed revolt. And this ongoing instability would be fed by changes in U.S. relations with France. At the end of the Revolutionary War, the Philadelphia home of the French consul was an important cultural site at
which Americans and French, united in their opposition to British colonial rule, articulated and strengthened a fledgling ideology for the newly United States. By the mid-1790s, however, Americans would be bitterly at odds over matters of Franco-American diplomacy, and by the end of that decade they would have come to the brink of full-scale war with the French. These matters—France’s role in the unstable U.S. politics of the 1790s and music’s relationship to such developments—form the substance of the remaining chapters.
CHAPTER 2


In his book on early U.S. outdoor political culture, Simon Newman suggests that French revolutionary song was active in two separate American domains. Citing a 1792 letter by Sarah Bache (in which she requested notation for popular radical tunes), Newman notes that “politics could be performed in the parlor as well as out in the street.”71 Since he is not concerned with domestic life, he leaves his statement at that. Yet although the music of the French Revolution has been studied both in its original context and in the United States, the relationship between its oral and printed forms has received little consideration.

The seminal French treatment of the repertory is Constant Pierre’s *Hymnes et chansons de la Révolution* (1904), a bibliography that includes extensive commentary. Edited collections from the time of the French Revolution’s bicentennial have enhanced our understanding of the place of music in that upheaval. These include Jean-Claude Klein and Jean-Rémy Julien’s *Orphée phrygien* (1989), Jean Mongrédien and Julien’s *Le tambour et la harpe* (1991), and Malcolm Boyd’s *Music and the French Revolution* (1992). Laura Mason’s *Singing the French Revolution* (1996) has analyzed verbal evidence surrounding the repertory, treating it as part of the larger French political climate.

On the American side, Oscar Sonneck’s *Bibliography of Early Secular American Music, 18th Century* lists most U.S. editions of French revolutionary song from the 1790s, and Newman’s *Parades and the Politics of the Street* contains the leading contextual examination of

---

the repertory across the Atlantic. But Liam Riordan is the only scholar to have combined culture-historical and music-analytical methods in a discussion of French revolutionary song in America. Riordan’s innovative study considers a single edition that also concerns us here: Benjamin Carr’s *Federal Overture* (1794). Because this work was composed for the theater, Riordan considers the social and political dimensions of that performance context to the exclusion of the salon. Scholars have yet to focalize the double life of French revolutionary song—the relationship of its public, oral vitality to its fashion in the private sphere of print.

Yet this double life is a critical issue. French revolutionary song played different roles in Philadelphia’s radical popular and private elite cultures, even though, at first glance, the latter seems an unlikely context for the repertory. In order to document this phenomenon, this chapter first introduces Carr as the leading U.S. publisher of French revolutionary song, situating him within Philadelphia’s musical milieu. It then elucidates the Franco-American political context in which Carr worked, before considering in detail the apparently contradictory existences of the music as public sound and private collectible. In the end, the twin trajectories of the repertory are seen to correspond with emergent U.S. partisan identities.

**Benjamin Carr and Federal Philadelphian Musical Life**

The eldest son of Joseph Carr (c. 1739–1819) and Mary Jordan Carr (c. 1739–1815), Benjamin Carr was born on September 12, 1768 in London. His father was an organist who also ran a music publishing shop at Middle Row, Holborn from the time that Benjamin was about two years old. Growing up around the family business, Benjamin learned the trades of music

---

engraving and printing, but his musical training was not limited to this skill-set. Such prominent figures as Samuel Arnold and Charles Wesley taught him to sing, arrange, compose, and to play the organ and keyboard, pursuits that he would nourish throughout a long, varied, and fruitful career. As a teenager he attended London’s musical theaters, and he would go on to have modest success as a stage singer. By the time of his death in 1831, Carr was a sought-after teacher, impresario, and church organist whose published works included two operas, seventy-one songs, assorted rondos, sonatas, and variations for the keyboard, medley overtures and incidental theater music for orchestra, instructors for the voice and piano, and eighty-five sacred pieces, including a celebrated organ voluntary from around the turn of the century.

Carr was most important not as a composer, however, nor as a performer, teacher, or promoter, but rather as a music publisher. His London career was short-lived, but his American one was significant. Before Benjamin turned twenty-five, the Carrs pulled up roots in England and sailed for the United States. Benjamin went separately and arrived first, founding a music emporium and printing shop at 136 High (now Market) Street in Philadelphia in mid-1793. His father, mother, and younger brother soon followed, settling in Baltimore. There, in 1794, Joseph opened his own music store, and without delay the father-son team began to dominate the nascent American secular music publishing trade.


Figure 2.1
Mezzotint portrait of Benjamin Carr (John Sartain, c. 1840, after John Clarendon Darley, 1831)
The Carrs’ transatlantic migration was a calculated business venture. They had had limited success in the competitive London market but arrived in America at an opportune moment. For decades religion had suppressed Philadelphia’s theatrical life and with it the secular music printing business. With the postrevolutionary decline of the Quaker elite, however, anti-theatrical strictures slackened, making room for cultural enterprise within what was now the U.S. capital. New political and economic leaders viewed Philadelphian stage life as a reflection of both their own prestige and that of the young nation. Thus, they funded the construction of an elaborate performance venue, meant to rival any in London, right in the heart of the city (Figs. 2 and 3). Slated to open in the fall of 1793, this New Theatre, whose directors would run a satellite operation in Baltimore, figured decisively in the Carrs’ financial success.

---

75 This is not to say that there had been no theater. A fledgling stage culture had sprung up on Philadelphia’s outskirts with the 1766 opening of the Southwark Theatre. Built by David Douglass, the Southwark served his touring troupe, the American Company, during its stints in Philadelphia. The building lay just beyond the city limit, near the corner of South Street and Fourth Street. It was an unadorned brick and wood structure and continued to house plays into the nineteenth century. Quakers, Baptists, and Methodists objected to Douglass’s productions at the Southwark, and the Continental Congress proscribed theatrical entertainments during the Revolution. The British mounted a number of plays during their 1778 occupation of Philadelphia, but the city would have to wait until 1789, when legal prohibition of the theater was repealed, before its stage life could openly flourish. Arthur Quinn, “The Theatre and the Drama in Old Philadelphia,” Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, new ser., 43 (1953), 313–15. See also William Dye, “Pennsylvania versus the Theatre,” Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography 55 (1931): 333–72; Douglas McDermott, “The Theatre and Its Audience: Changing Modes of Social Organization in the American Theatre,” in The American Stage: Social and Economic Issues from the Colonial Period to the Present, edited by Ron Engle and Tice Miller (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 6–9; and Fred Pattee, “The British Theater in Philadelphia in 1778,” American Literature 6 (1935): 381–88.

76 Also known as the Chestnut Street Theatre, the New Theatre was built above Sixth Street on the north side of Chestnut, less than a block from Congress Hall. It was based on a three-dimensional model of the Theatre Royal in Bath, and its seating consisted of three tiers of boxes on the sides and in back, a raked pit with thirteen rows of benches, and an upper gallery. The stage was about seventy feet deep and thirty-five feet wide, and the interior was finely decorated (Fig. 2.2). Susan Porter, With an Air Debonair: Musical Theatre in America, 1785–1815 (Washington: Smithsonian, 1991), pp. 90–98. The Martinique emigrant Médéric Louis Élie Moreau de St. Méry recorded a detailed description of the theater in Moreau de St. Méry’s American Journey, 1793–1798, edited and translated by Anna and Kenneth Roberts (New York: Doubleday, 1947), pp. 345–48. Another first-hand account survives in a letter by Ezekiel Forman, printed in “Amusements and Politics in Philadelphia, 1794,” Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography 10 (1886): 182–87. Heather Nathans, Early American Theatre from the Revolution to Thomas Jefferson: Into
the Hands of the People (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 176–78, lists eighty-six individuals who financially backed the New Theatre. Among them were lawyers, physicians, and merchants, most notably William Bingham and Robert Morris. Nathans notes the involvement of most of these names in other elite ventures like the Asylum Land Company, North American Land Company, Bank of North America, Bank of Pennsylvania, and City Dancing Assembly.
In early 1793, anticipation of the New Theatre’s opening began to build, but up to that point American secular music imprints were few and far between. A thriving, local theatrical life was vital to the early music-sheet industry. When people wanted to collect their favorite playhouse songs, they would turn to music engravers and printers. Buoyed by this prospect, Philadelphia publishers geared up early in 1793. That March saw the launch of two of the city’s first serial editions of secular music: John Moller and Henry Capron’s Monthly Numbers, which lasted through four issues; and John Young’s Vocal and Instrumental Musical Miscellany, which survived through eight. While neither of these series would endure, they anticipated Carr’s arrival by a few short months, signaling a new era of music printing and publishing in Philadelphia.

But no entrepreneur could have predicted that a yellow fever outbreak would ravage Philadelphia during the final months of 1793, delaying the theater’s opening. The longer that Thomas Wignell (1753–1803), the New Theatre’s co-director, waited in quarantine with the performers he had recruited from London, the greater the profits that slipped through his fingers and those of the city’s aspiring music publishers. Some weathered the storm; others did not. Carr’s business survived thanks to the support of his family, and Young’s Miscellany lived to see further issues. But Moller and Capron were finished as publishers, at least in Philadelphia. Their shop was acquired in 1794 by the newly arrived German emigrant George (Georg) Willig, who, together with Carr, would finally lead the city’s music-sheet industry out of obscurity.

77 Exclusively the handiwork of John Aitken (c. 1746–1831), an immigrant metal-smith, these plates date from no earlier than the middle of 1787. Notable examples include William Brown, Three Rondos for the Piano Forte (1787); Francis Hopkinson, Seven Songs for the Harpsichord (1788); Alexander Reinagle, A Collection of Favorite Songs (c. 1789); and Reinagle, Twelve Favorite Pieces (c. 1789). On the output of early Philadelphian music publishers see Oscar Sonneck, Bibliography of Early Secular American Music, 18th Century, revised and enlarged by William Upton (New York: Da Capo, 1964 [1945]).
Between 1793 and the end of the century, when Carr scaled back his publishing activity, he and Willig issued the lion’s share of Philadelphian music. With his father working nearby, Carr had a competitive edge. The two shared plates and sold each other’s prints. In 1795 Benjamin expanded his enterprise by opening a shop in New York, which he sold in 1797 to fellow London emigrant James Hewitt. Following this deal Hewitt and the Carrs continued to collaborate, issuing many of the same sheets. Strategically located between his father and Hewitt, Benjamin ran a small publishing empire from the national capital.78

Had it not been for the eventual opening of the Chestnut Street Theatre, he could not have done so. In this regard Carr was indebted to his friend Alexander Reinagle, the New Theatre’s co-founder and musical director. Scottish by birth, Reinagle (1756–1809) was active as a composer and performer in London and the European mainland before relocating to Philadelphia in 1786. Although no sources unequivocally confirm that Reinagle encouraged the Carrs’ immigration, this was probably the case. The commercial connection between theater and publishing ran both ways. Just as Carr stood to benefit from proximity to a robust assortment of dramatic entertainments, Reinagle would profit from having a reliable music printer nearby. Because no dedicated music publisher was active in Philadelphia prior to 1793, Reinagle likely recruited Carr.79 This is more plausible in light of the fact that another of Reinagle’s former associates, his teacher Rayner Taylor, settled in the city that same year.80

---

79 Some evidence suggests a longstanding relationship between the Carrs and Reinagle. In the early nineteenth century, Carr entered into a business partnership with Reinagle’s nephew, George Schetky (1776–1831), and Sprenkle maintains that Carr stayed at Schetky’s when he first came to Philadelphia (“Benjamin Carr,” 5). As a corrective to Sprenkle, Siek notes that Schetky was living at Reinagle’s address in 1793 (“Musical Taste,” p. 74). Prior to Carr’s arrival, Reinagle relied on John Aitken for his publishing needs. Wolfe speculates that Reinagle and Aitken had a falling out at some point in 1793. Indeed, although Aitken had produced nearly a dozen editions for Reinagle, Carr took over in 1794, issuing the
But regardless of whether Carr had known Reinagle and Taylor in England, they formed the leading triumvirate of American musical life once assembled in Philadelphia. Indeed, it is hard to overstate the influence of fresh talent from the British Isles on early Philadelphian musical culture. The city’s repertories, printed and performed, were no less British than its musical personnel. Presses churned out of replicas of English works, which resounded in the playhouses and salons as musical professionals flocked westward from London.

Anglocentric though it was, however, Philadelphia was not impervious to other national musics. It was via Britain, in fact, that Americans came to know the music of other lands, that of France in particular. As the leading U.S. music publisher of the 1790s, Carr was the only one to issue all three of the French Revolution’s best-known songs: “Ça Ira,” “La Carmagnole,” and “La Marseillaise.” He offered each in multiple editions, basing these on existing London imprints.81

But before looking more closely at this music, it is useful to develop an understanding of the political climate into which Carr imported it. For even if the songs’ printed forms changed little in crossing the Atlantic, their reception—their meaning to those who published, heard, played, sang, and bought them—was different in the United States than in France and England. The following excursion offers a basis for interpreting French revolutionary song in America by explaining how its citizens responded to news of the French Revolution, how their reactions changed as events in Paris progressed, and what effect such foreign occurrences had on local

---

81 Carr also published the most popular reactionary anthem of the French Revolution, Pierre Gaveaux’s “Réveil du Peuple” (Philadelphia: Carr, 1796).
political life. An account of France’s role in federal-era U.S. politics sets the stage for a close assessment of Carr’s Philadelphian versions of French revolutionary music.

The French Revolution’s American Reception through 1796

As seen in the last chapter, American patriots of the early 1780s held France in high esteem. But however grateful they were for military aid, these revolutionaries had misgivings about the French political system. Recall Benjamin Rush’s remarks on Philadelphia’s fête for the Dauphin: “For republicans to rejoice in the birth of a prince,” he wrote, was an instance of human nature “turned inside outward.” But if the two nations could put aside their differences when only one was a republic, then would their relations not further improve once the other had shed the shackles of the Old Regime?

Initially, at least, yes. No sooner was George Washington inaugurated than Americans began hearing news from France that stirred their sense of national pride. During the spring and summer of 1789, it looked like the French were determined to gain freedom for themselves. On June 20, members of the Third Estate, the lowest and largest social category granted political representation in Old-Regime France, found themselves locked out of a meeting of the Estates-General at Versailles. Fearing unprincipled royal action, they gathered in a nearby tennis court and swore not to disband until a French constitution had been written. Unrest spread, and within a few weeks a crowd in Paris had overtaken the Bastille, a fortress-turned-prison and a widely perceived symbol of oppression. As a token of the connection between this event and the American Revolution, in which he had served, the Marquis de Lafayette sent George Washington the Bastille’s key. And when the French National Constituent Assembly ratified the

---

Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen in August 1789, this was taken as a further sign of
kinship with the United States.

At this point, few Americans doubted the French Revolution. It seemed to represent the
same ideals for which they had recently fought. Even Edmund Burke’s cogently argued
States, at least for the time being. Instead, Thomas Paine’s pro-revolutionary *Rights of Man*
(1791) captured the day, inspiring a transatlantic wave of radical feeling.83 And France’s
adoption of a written constitution on September 3, 1791 made its emulation of the United
States, whose founding documents were the first of their kind, appear undeniable.

The first hiccup in the American reception of the French Revolution came in the spring
of 1792, when France declared a preemptive war against Austria. The Hapsburgs attracted as
allies a number of European monarchies (i.e., Prussia, Spain, Portugal, and England) that were
threatened by French upheaval. The resulting War of the First Coalition placed the United States
in a difficult position. According to the 1778 alliance they owed loyalty to France, but war with
the British, on whom they remained commercially reliant, would entail economic adversity. So
although France would not formally declare war on England until February 1793, its military
aggression had troubling implications. U.S. neutrality in French conflicts would eventually
become a major point of controversy both at home and abroad.

In 1792 three nearly simultaneous events nonetheless heightened Americans’ faith in
France. On September 20, French forces stopped an Austro-Prussian march on Paris at Valmy,
sending the enemy into retreat. This was a momentous victory, on the heels of which the

---

83 Seth Cotlar, *Tom Paine’s America: The Rise and Fall of Transatlantic Radicalism in the Early Republic*
Cosmopolitanism.” A few years later, Paine’s *Age of Reason* (1794) would have the opposite effect,
inspiring U.S. clergy to renounce the French Revolution.
National Convention abolished the monarchy. Then, on September 22, the Convention swore the French Republic into existence. If France’s international embroilments at first gave Americans qualms, this founding of a kindred nation quelled them. Foreign war began to seem a necessary evil, if U.S. political ideals were to take root in Europe.

Back home, the end of 1792 saw the unopposed renewal of Washington’s presidency, with John Adams as vice president. The uncontested nature of this election was a sign that American politics were not as yet truly partisan. To be sure, there had been vigorous debate around the ratification of the Constitution, but the question of national leadership had not been divisive. This would begin to change in 1793, however, as events in France and the French Caribbean drove a wedge between Federalists, who aligned themselves with Washington and Adams, and an emerging Republican party centered around the Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson. Never again would a U.S. presidential election transcend partisanship.84

Earnest opposition to events in France started with the beheading of Louis XVI, the American Revolution’s great benefactor, in January 1793. Almost immediately, opinion divided between Federalists, who denounced the execution as an intolerable excess, and Republicans, who welcomed it as a blow to tyranny. The dispute intensified when Marie-Antoinette met the same fate later that year, and when radical Jacobins took control of the Convention, inaugurating the Reign of Terror. As heads rolled in Paris, American leaders entered into hot debate over whether the French Revolution still represented their principles, or whether it had veered irredeemably off course.

Subsequent events conspired to make matters worse. The French Republic’s war on England, declared in February 1793, presented the U.S. government with a dilemma. Would they support France’s revolution, as France had supported theirs, and risk war with Britain? Or would they decline involvement, incurring the displeasure of both nations? In the end neutrality seemed the wiser choice, and Washington decreed this policy in April. Even Jefferson, to the chagrin of his fellow Republicans, backed the decision. But Washington’s directive was not invariably followed. The revolutionary spirit was strong in certain quarters, and an overzealous French envoy soon exploited that feeling.

The Genet Affair and the Democratic Societies

The minister plenipotentiary Edmond-Charles Genet landed in April 1793 at Charleston, where Republicans warmly welcomed him. In the course of a month-long journey north to Philadelphia, his presence was the occasion of one celebration after another.85 This hospitality led Genet to overestimate his American support, however, and he made a series of diplomatic blunders: he declared his intention to incite Canadian rebellion against the British; he recruited American soldiers for attacks on the Spanish in Florida and Louisiana; he converted U.S. ships into French privateers; and he rechristened a captured English vessel the Petite Democrat, sending it to war.86 Anticipating Washington’s disapproval, Genet also made a final, more

85 In a letter to the French minister of foreign affairs, Genet wrote, “Je vis ici au milieu de fêtes perpétuelles; Je reçois des adresses de toutes les parties du Continent, je vois avec plaisir que ma manière de traiter plait à nos frères des Etats unis et je suis fondé à croire, Citoyen Ministre, que ma mission sera heureuse sous tous les rapports. [I live here in the midst of perpetual fêtes; I receive addresses from all parts of the Continent, I observe with pleasure that my conduct pleases our U.S. brothers and I am justified in believing, Citizen Minister, that my mission will be favorable in every respect.]” Genet to Pierre LeBrun, May 31, 1793, “Correspondence of the French Ministers to the United States, 1791–1797,” in Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1903, vol. 2, edited by Frederick Turner (Washington, 1904), p. 216.
damaging error: he defied the president to reproach him, claiming the allegiance of the American public. Washington was incensed, and the incident led to Genet’s recall. Even to Republicans, the minister’s reckless pursuit of French revolutionary interests became a liability.

But before his fall from grace, Genet made a splash among U.S. Francophiles. His presence was a boon to grassroots political clubs that sprang up in reaction to Federalist policies. These Democratic-Republican societies fostered community among detractors of the established government, and were important proto-partisan agencies. They were also invariably pro-French, organizing many of the fêtes held in Genet’s honor. The societies were so effective that in 1794 Washington denounced them as engines of insurrection. Indeed, despite Genet’s missteps, he seemed to represent a real threat to the administration. Writing later in life, John Adams reminded Thomas Jefferson of

the terrorism excited by Genet, in 1793, when ten thousand people in the streets of Philadelphia, day after day, threatened to drag Washington out of his house, and effect a revolution in the government, or compel it to declare war in favor of the French revolution and against England.  

Among Philadelphia’s unofficial political groups, the one that most welcomed Genet was the Société Française des Amis de la Liberté et de l’Égalité (hereafter SFALE). On July 9, 1793 it elected the French minister as its president. Although its name invoked the hallowed, abstract precepts of the French Revolution, this society had a local, pragmatic aim. It was a humanitarian organization devoted to aiding refugees from the French Caribbean colony of St. Domingue. That island’s rebellion had begun in 1791, but it was not until the devastation of its main city, the Cap Français, in June 1793 that former colonists came in droves to the United States.

---

Philadelphia in particular saw an influx of destitute French-speakers, many of whom had the SFALE to thank for funding and administering their relief.  

Members of the Philadelphia-based Democratic Society of Pennsylvania supported the mission of the SFALE. Like other Republicans, they subscribed to a powerful narrative that conflated the American and French revolutions in a historic quest for liberty. This perspective compelled them to overlook the tyrannical violence of the Terror and the fact that many St. Dominguan exiles held antirevolutionary views. The French Revolution seemed to reflect Republicans’ domestic ambitions, and Frenchness thus became a symbolic marker of their ideals. It came untethered, that is, from political reality.

But to the same extent that Republicans romanticized the French, the Federalists scapegoated them. The revolution in France seemed to poison Americans’ minds, filling them with anarchical notions. It spread radical sentiment that undermined the existing, hard-won order. And when boatloads of St. Dominguans arrived at American ports, they represented a physical danger: disease. The actual origin of Philadelphia’s 1793 yellow fever epidemic is lost to history, but political parties at the time felt certain of its cause. Federalists, that is, were sure that it had come from Haiti, whereas Republicans were confident of its indigenous source. But whatever the viewpoint, one thing was clear: in the course of a single year—one that saw the executions of Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette and the beginning of the Terror, Washington’s

89 Ibid. The minutes of the July 9 meeting record a collection of 725 dollars, 300 of which came from Genet, toward the relief effort. A committee to assess the validity of relief claims was also formed that day. At the next meeting, held on July 13, offers from Philadelphians to house displaced Haitians were reported to the assembly. For more on the Haitian Revolution’s U.S. impact, see Ashli White, Encountering Revolution: Haiti and the Making of the Early Republic (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010).
Proclamation of Neutrality and Genet’s American career, the rise of the Democratic-Republican societies and the burning of the Cap Français—Americans had transitioned from a state of near-unanimity in their assessment of the French Revolution to one of profound disagreement.

The Whiskey Rebellion and the French Fêtes

Indeed, it had begun to seem that no aspect of American political life could be separated from the question of pro- versus anti-French feeling. This was true even of events on the western frontier of Pennsylvania, far away from cosmopolitan Philadelphia. For several years, farmers there had been in a state of unrest over an excise tax that Washington levied, in 1790, on liquor distilled within the United States. This had hit the farmers hard, for they relied on whiskey as a non-perishable medium of exchange. They protested and rioted, harassed collection agents, ignored the jurisdiction of the federal courts, and, when things came to a head in the summer of 1794, formed an army of six thousand to march on the city of Pittsburgh. Washington had issued multiple statements condemning the resistance and threatening to enforce the excise law, and in late August he made good on that promise. He dispatched a militia of fifteen thousand to Pittsburgh, and the insurrection dissolved.92

The Whiskey Rebellion had little to do with events in France, but to Federalists it mirrored that upheaval. Rooted though it was in the radicalism of their own revolution, they blamed the Pennsylvania insurrection on the spread of French lawlessness. In his annual address to Congress, given on November 19, 1794, Washington singled out “certain self-created societies” for having encouraged the rebels. He challenged “every description of citizens” to decide for themselves.

---

whether [the rebellion] has not been fomented by combinations of men, who, careless of consequences, and disregarding the unerring truth, that those who rouse, cannot always appease a civil convulsion, have disseminated, from an ignorance or perversion of facts, suspicions, jealousies, and accusations of the whole government.93

But Washington might just as easily have targeted a different outlet of pro-French feeling. Beginning late in 1792, popular revelry had sprung up throughout the United States in response to French revolutionary events. The festivities for Genet were a subset of these celebrations, which also commemorated the fall of the Bastille (July 14), the storming of the Tuileries (August 10), and the abolition of the monarchy (September 22). Most of all, however, Americans fêted French military victories, including Valmy (1792), Toulon (1794), and, later, the “liberations” of Holland (1795) and Italy (1796). They did so in locales as diverse as Boston, Lexington, New York, Princeton, Providence, and Savannah, but the mood was especially buoyant in Charleston and Philadelphia, which hosted the nation’s largest Francophone populations.94

Before 1789 Americans had observed the anniversary of the 1778 alliance, but the focal points of the festive calendar remained July fourth and Washington’s birthday. Over the course of the first presidency, however, these holidays were dwarfed by growing numbers of French revolutionary celebrations. Hundreds occurred, and 1794 saw more than any other year.95

Arguably, this public revelry contributed more to the spread of revolutionary fervor than the

94 Newman, Politics of the Street. See especially chapter four, “Celebrating the French Revolution,” and chapter five, “Songs, Signs, and Symbols: The Everyday Discourse of Popular Politics.” Newman shows that tricolored cockades, liberty caps, and liberty poles were the most common icons used in American French revolutionary festivals, and that the standard rites included cannonades, bell ringing, parades, feasts, and toasts. Music—vocal and fife-and-drum renditions of French revolutionary song—also played a significant role, which is taken up later in this chapter. The other foundational account of early U.S. festive politics is David Waldstreicher, In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776–1820 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997).
95 Newman, Politics of the Street, p. 145.
private and literate deliberations of the Democratic societies, which were closed to the lower end of the social spectrum. The fêtes attracted wide participation. Their rhetoric of liberty and equality appealed most to the underprivileged, emboldening white male artisans, laborers, mariners, and mechanics. In limited cases, it also empowered white women and some black men. All told, American French revolutionary festivals catalyzed discontent. Unlike July fourth and Washington’s birthday, they were partisan affairs that transplanted Parisian radicalism, threatening the Federalist order.

Following 1794, however, these celebrations declined, and the Democratic-Republican societies followed suit. Genet was no longer a factor in national life, and in France the Terror had passed, bringing down the temperature of U.S. debate concerning the Convention. But this did not mean that Franco-American relations had faded from public view. On the contrary, a new diplomatic crisis had emerged.

_Jay’s Treaty and the Election of 1796_

For some time Republicans had lamented U.S. commercial dependence on Britain. They advocated self-sufficiency, even if this incurred hardships in the short term. Federalists, meanwhile, legitimately feared that anti-British sanctions would undermine Alexander Hamilton’s system of funded national debt. But things did not come to a head until 1794, when Britain started seizing U.S. ships engaged in trade with the French Caribbean. Though it hoped to resolve the matter peacefully, the Federalist administration could not ignore the threat of war, and so it began a military build-up. Republicans resented the prospect of a centralized army and navy almost as much as they hated England. They wanted to fight the British with tariffs and embargos. As soon as maritime hostilities relaxed, however, Washington sent his Chief Justice,
John Jay, as a special envoy to London in hopes of negotiating a truce. The resulting Jay Treaty, drafted in 1794 and ratified the following year, was to Federalists a success and to Republicans an abomination. It made concessions to England at the expense of republican France. For Francophiles, it was affront to all that the twin revolutions stood for. To the same extent that Federalists had viewed the Democratic-Republican societies and pro-French festivals as insidious engines of revolt, Republicans began to see Washington’s Anglo-friendly policies as the workings of a sinister, monarchical faction that threatened to return Americans to their prerevolutionary situation. As never before, they attacked the president’s personal character, paving the way to a deeply partisan election at the end of 1796.

Indeed, when the Federalist John Adams narrowly defeated Republican leader Thomas Jefferson to become the second president of the United States, the era of extrapartisan leadership in U.S. politics ended. As we have seen, this sea change was bound up with evolving American perceptions of the French, and it came about over the course of several years. In 1793, the Terror, the War of the First Coalition, the Genet affair, and the burning of the Cap Français conspired to split U.S. opinion, which had otherwise unanimously favored France. Republicans esteemed the French at fêtes and unofficial political gatherings, whereas Federalists began to blame them for social ills, including disease and political unrest. Jay’s Treaty intensified this antagonism, which accounts for the bitterly contested nature of Adams’s election. Were it not for French political upheaval, early U.S. partisanship would not have taken shape as quickly or as dramatically as it did.

***

Besides marking the end of Washington’s presidency and with it the ideal of a nonpartisan executive, 1796 was the final year in which Benjamin Carr issued new editions of
French revolutionary song. He had begun to do so in the middle of 1793, and in this respect his publication activity presents a quandary. When Carr’s first French revolutionary song went to press, France had already become a divisive topic in the United States. Why did he invest in publishing music that a good portion of his clientele (those with the means to acquire keyboard instruments and musical training) was likely to find distasteful? Even for Republicans within this group, what had radical street festivity to do with the refined environment of Philadelphia’s salons? What was at stake politically, and what ensured Carr’s success, in adapting these volatile songs for genteel consumption?97

What is certain is that Carr produced nearly a dozen editions of French revolutionary song between July 1793 and the end of 1796. To explain what made this venture feasible, the transmediation of the repertory must be a leading consideration. The conversion of French revolutionary song from sound to notes on the page, and the different lives that it led in the aural and visual realms, is key to understanding Carr’s appropriation of this music.

**French Revolutionary Song in Federal Philadelphia: Public Performances**

“Ça Ira,” “La Carmagnole,” and “La Marseillaise” each figured vitally in Philadelphia’s public musical culture during the 1790s. This is hardly surprising, given the city’s high concentration of French emigrants, and given the tunes’ wide international currency. Having become France’s national anthem, the “Marseillaise” is today the best-known of three, but in their day the others were no less prevalent. Not merely the title of a song, “ça ira,” which

---

97 The problem is aggravated by the fact that no surviving documents convey Carr’s political views. As a Briton with a conservative clientele, he might have been inclined to Federalism. Just as easily, however, his emigration could be taken as a sign of political defection, and of possible sympathy with the French Revolution. The closest thing to evidence of Carr’s political leanings comes in an 1821 letter, where he expressed disinterest in political journalism. Benjamin Carr to John Rowe Parker, October 4, 1821. John Rowe Parker Correspondence, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania.
translates literally as “it will go” and idiomatically as “it will be fine,” was a catchphrase of the era. It suffused poetry, journalism, and everyday speech.98 Similarly, the “Carmagnole” had a life beyond music as a figure of speech, signifying compliance with France’s revolutionary agenda. To suffer military defeat at the hands of the French Republic, for instance, was to “dance the Carmagnole.”99

But despite their popularity as slogans, “Ça Ira” and “La Carmagnole” were known primarily as songs. Along with “La Marseillaise,” they were frequently performed, without the aid of musical notation, in Philadelphia’s public spaces. John Fanning Watson, for instance, recalled that in the mid-1790s he

had caught many national airs, and the streets, day by night, resounded with the songs of boys, such as these: “Allons, enfans de la patrie, le jour de gloire est arrivé!” &c.—“Dansons le carmagnolé, vive le sang, vive le sang!” &c.—“À ç’ira, ç’ira,” &c. Several verses of each of these and others were thus sung.100

Watson met “French mariners or officers in the streets,” who sang revolutionary songs. He also remembered music pouring from the windows of Philadelphia’s French boarding houses. “The Marseilles Hymn was learned and sung by citizens every where,” he recalled, as émigrés fiddled, sang, and danced throughout the city.101

---

98 Benjamin Franklin reportedly popularized the phrase “ça ira” during his Paris years when responding to news of the American Revolution (“Ca Ira,” Independent Gazetteer, December 14, 1793). For examples of the phrase’s use in journalism, see “Ca Ira,” Independent Gazetteer, September 22, 1792; and “National Convention,” General Advertiser, October 27, 1794. The phrase was used satirically in Federalist poetry (e.g., Gazette of the United States, January 22, 1796), and as a common valediction in newspaper articles (e.g., Independent Gazetteer, February 2, 1793; Philadelphia Gazette, August 22, 1794; Aurora General Advertiser, July 21, 1795; and Claypoole’s American Daily Advertiser, January 26, 1796). Unless otherwise noted, all newspapers cited in this chapter were published in Philadelphia.

99 “November 23,” General Advertiser, February 20, 1794.


101 Ibid., 168–70.
French revolutionary songs were simple and infectious. Their melodies needed little notational help to spread from place to place. Watson remarked that most of his friends “understood no French,” however, so language was a barrier.\(^{102}\) This was remedied by local newspapers that published translations of the songs’ words, some of which retained the French meter and were accordingly singable. The extent to which these were relied upon for actual performances, however, remains a matter of speculation. At the least, they helped Philadelphians decode the foreign musical sounds with which their streets resounded.\(^{103}\)

And not only their streets—indoor public venues, too, echoed with the strains of “Ça Ira” and its counterparts. At the theater, French revolutionary songs were popular among the lower sorts, who populated the gallery. To the chagrin of elite theatergoers, who arrived at their curtained boxes through a private entrance so as not to mingle with the crowd, raucous spectators demanded to hear and sing radical anthems. If the orchestra did not comply, trouble ensued, as James Hewitt discovered when leading a band at the John Street Theatre in New York. On the evening of March 4, 1794, Hewitt was assaulted by an audience member when he

\(^{102}\) Ibid., 168.
\(^{103}\) Translations of “Ça Ira” appeared in *Dunlap’s American Daily Advertiser*, June 27, 1792; the *National Gazette*, June 28, 1792; the *General Advertiser*, June 29, 1792; the *Gazette of the United States*, June 30, 1792; the *Independent Gazetteer*, June 30, 1792; and the *Mail*, July 2, 1792. English versions of “La Marseillaise” were printed in the *Independent Gazetteer*, January 19, 1793; the *General Advertiser*, January 21, 1793; and the *American Star*, April 1, 1794. “La Carmagnole” was translated in the *Independent Gazetteer*, August 27, 1794; and *Dunlap and Claypoole’s American Daily Advertiser*, September 9, 1794. Along with Watson’s account, such translations indicate that some Philadelphians perceived French song as non-semantic noise. And yet Watson’s recollection also suggests that the linguistic otherness of the songs was meaningful unto itself. Even when the words were not understood, the Frenchness of the sound likely connoted radicalism.
refused to perform popular Republican songs.104 Similar incidents plagued the theater in Boston, where Jacobin sympathizers hurled objects at the orchestra.105

When the Chestnut Street Theatre opened in Philadelphia, its directors had to appease their rowdy patrons. Thus, the first song played on opening night was “Ça Ira.” According to Benjamin Franklin Bache’s Republican newspaper, the General Advertiser, the orchestra obediently responded to “the call for it,” and later voluntarily repeated the tune. In doing so, the musicians “shewed that they did not forget their audience was American.”106 But during the following week the band began instead with “The President’s March,” a tune composed in 1789 for George Washington, who frequented the theater. This displeased the gallery, and drew the ire of the General Advertiser:

> If the President was expected at the Theatre on Wednesday evening last, and if the President’s march was announced as the first piece to be performed by the orchestra under that expectation—the Managers certainly have mistaken the spirit of the citizens of Philadelphia. They are no friends to a mimickry of British customs and are sufficiently enlightened not to bear with patience even an indirect comparison between a king, the creature of chance, and a President, the choice of a People.107

105 “The Musicians,” Columbian Centinel (Boston), February 22, 1794. In this notice Boston’s theater musicians assured readers “that it is no more their duty than it is their wish to oblige in playing such tunes as are called for,” urging the “generous” public “to prevent the thoughtless, or ill disposed from throwing Apples, Stones, &c. into the Orchestra.”
106 “New Theatre,” General Advertiser, February 19, 1794. Bache (1769–1798) was Benjamin Franklin’s grandson. In November 1794, he renamed his paper the Aurora General Advertiser. The antithesis of John Fenno’s Federalist Gazette of the United States, the Aurora was a landmark in the emergence of the partisan press. For more on early U.S. newspaper politics, see Jeffrey Pasley, The Tyranny of Printers: Newspaper Politics in the Early American Republic (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2001). Opening night at the Chestnut Street playhouse was Monday, February 17.
107 “From a Correspondent,” General Advertiser, February 28, 1794. The Advertiser’s commentary typifies early American political rhetoric. Though clearly Republican, it eschews partisanship by appealing to the undivided “spirit” of Philadelphians. “The President’s March” was composed by a German emigrant and professional musician, Philip Phile (Pheil).
Even though, “after repeated calls from the mountain,”\textsuperscript{108} the orchestra eventually played “Ça Ira,” Republicans were slighted by the quasi-monarchical “President’s March.” And even though Benjamin Carr would attempt to resolve the theater’s political disunity with a popular medley of English and French tunes a few months later,\textsuperscript{109} playhouse music continued to cause tension between rival factions. In 1796 newspapers were still urging the New Theatre to consult Republican taste in musical matters. The \textit{Philadelphia Gazette}, for instance, applauded Alexander Reinagle for electing to present “Ca-Ira—the Marseillois hymn—Yankey-Doodle, and several other popular tunes, calculated to excite the most pleasurable emotions, and to gratify ‘the million,’ as well as the ‘few.’” It further admonished him to “follow on this course,” lest he fail to heed “a serious and friendly advice.”\textsuperscript{110}

Outside the theater, French revolutionary song accompanied overtly Republican commercial entertainments. In March and April of 1794, for instance, a traveling exhibit of automata ran “under the ladies’ academy room of Mr. Poor, No. 9, Cherry alley.” It featured two life-size mechanical men, “Citizen SANS CULOTTE” and “Mr. L’ ARISTOCRATE,” who dazzled patrons with “feats of dexterity.” The \textit{General Advertiser} reported that the figures “seem to rival each other to please the spectators with their agility. Their motions are formed to music, and they dance to many airs, Mr. L’Aristocrate excepted, who cannot be prevailed on to dance to the Carmagnole or Ca-ira.”\textsuperscript{111} This touring show would return to Philadelphia, becoming grander in conception each year. In 1795 there were “Four Figures, representing two Men and two Women,” who danced the “Carmagnole” and performed “a great many other surprising Feats.”

\textsuperscript{108}“New Theatre,” \textit{General Advertiser}, February 28, 1794. Here the writer draws a comparison between the gallery and \textit{La Montagne}, the Jacobin group that controlled France’s National Convention during the Terror.

\textsuperscript{109}I refer to his celebrated \textit{Federal Overture} (1794), discussed later in this chapter.

\textsuperscript{110}\textit{Philadelphia Gazette}, March 16, 1796.

\textsuperscript{111}\textit{General Advertiser}, April 23, 1794.
They did so in a temporary outdoor amphitheater, from which the audience also viewed “A Great Firework.” ¹¹² In 1796 “a representation of the Siege and Capture of the Bastille” was added to the display. ¹¹³

No public renditions of French revolutionary song were as rigorously partisan, however, as those that punctuated the city’s Francophile fêtes. On February 6, 1793, for instance, “bands of music, fife, drum, trumpets, &c. were heard from all quarters” of Philadelphia. The occasion was the anniversary of the Franco-American alliance, although “the glorious successes of the French republic over the combined forces of Austria and Prussia” were foremost in people’s minds. “About one hundred and fifty” individuals, including city and state militia officers and French diplomats, attended a banquet at City Tavern, where “At the head of the table a pike was fixed bearing the cap of liberty with the French and American flags entwined, surmounted by a dove and olive branch.” The first toasts made after the meal were as follows:

1. The day—may mutual good offices render perpetual the alliance between the republics of France and America.
2. The republic of France—may the spark of liberty kindled in America, never be extinguished till monarchies cease.
3. The United States of America—may they continue to rival with success, the conduct which, on this day they commemorate with admiration.

Upon leaving the tavern, “the officers accompanied with the band, proceeding to the house of the French minister—the musick struck up Ca Ira and Yankee-Doodle—gave three cheers and dismissed.” ¹¹⁴

¹¹² *Aurora General Advertiser*, October 31, 1795.
¹¹³ *Aurora General Advertiser*, September 30, 1796. In describing the Bastille reenactment, the advertisers promised authenticity: “The scene representing this fortress and part of the suburbs of Paris, is painted by an artist who was on the spot at that epoch, in such a manner, that persons who have seen the Bastille formerly, will find a perfect resemblance in the decoration, the attack will be made by pictures at full length, representing the people of Paris, each whereof will fire 12 shot, the bullets and balls will be seen as they come out of the muskets and cannons.”
On other occasions the “Carmagnole” and “Marseillaise” had pride of place. In 1794, “Arrangements for the festival of the 10th of August” were published in the General Advertiser. The celebration, which commemorated the siege of the Tuileries, was actually held on August 11, because the tenth was a Sunday. In any event, the Advertiser stated that “The music shall play the Carmagnole,” along with other “patriotic tunes,” and that “dances shall be performed every where.” This agenda was followed, as the Advertiser later reported that “The American and French citizens mingled together formed every where on the spot a number of dances at the sound of music and drums.” In addition, “The Marseillois and other patriotic hymns were [. . .] sung and reechoed by the whole assembly.”

A similar fête occurred on April 17, 1795, in honor of “the late victories of France and the emancipation of Holland.” That morning “a number of American, French, and Dutch citizens” gathered in Center Square, whence they “proceeded with the flags of the three republics to the garden of the minister of the French Republic, headed by a numerous band of martial music.” In the minister’s garden “an altar was erected on which the Statue of Liberty was placed.” Gathering around this monument, the celebrants sang various “patriotic hymns.”

It may have been this festival—or, more likely, the one of August 1794—that John Fanning Watson recollected in his Annals:

I remember several boyish processions; and on one occasion the girls, dressed in white and in French tricoloured ribbons, formed a procession too. There was a great Liberty Pole, with a red cap at top, erected at Adet’s or Fauchet’s house; (now Girard’s square, up High street) and there I and one hundred of others, taking hold of hands and forming a ring round the same, made triumphant leapings, singing the national airs. There was a band of music to lead the airs.

---

115 General Advertiser, August 9, 1794.
116 General Advertiser, August 28, 1794.
117 “Civic Festival,” Aurora General Advertiser, April 20, 1795.
Leaving the French minister’s with “the white Misses at our head,” Watson added, we marched down the middle of the dusty street, and when arrived opposite to Mr. Hammond’s, the British minister’s house (High, above Eighth street, Hunter’s house, I believe,) there were several signs of disrespect manifested to his house.119

Together with newspaper reports of the era, Watson’s narrative illustrates the role of music in Philadelphia’s public rituals. As at commercial entertainments, French revolutionary music helped Republicans express partisan feeling at the city’s fêtes.

Emanating from public spaces throughout Philadelphia, French tunes on the other hand affronted conservative ears. The reactionary writer William Cobbett, for instance, condemned “La Marseillaise” as “a murderer’s song.” Its “outlandish howling,” he complained, had shook Oeller’s Hotel during a 1793 dinner held for Genet.120 He lamented similarly that “‘Dansons la Carmagnole,’ pronounced in a broken accent, was echoed through every street and every alley of Philadelphia.” And, having overheard “the chorus of the bloody Ah! ça ira” during the fête of August 11, 1794, he denounced that song, too, as “French bombast.”121

If this was the Federalist reaction to French revolutionary tunes, then Carr’s success at publishing them appears counterintuitive. His keyboard-owning and music-reading clients belonged to the upper end of the social spectrum, whereas public renditions of radical French

---

119 Ibid., 169.
120 This banquet is described in Richard Hildreth’s History of the United States of America, vol. 4 (New York: Harper, 1851), p. 419; The Autobiography of Charles Biddle (Philadelphia: Claxton, 1883), pp. 252–3; and John Scharf and Thompson Westcott’s History of Philadelphia, 1609–1884, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: Everts, 1884), pp. 473–4. Held on May 18, the dinner was attended by state and federal officials and by the officers of L’Ambuscade, the ship on which Genet had arrived at Charleston. Genet himself composed and sang two original stanzas of “La Marseillaise,” after which “the red cap of liberty was placed on [his] head, and then, successively, on the heads of all present.” Scharf and Westcott, Philadelphia, vol. 1, p. 474.
music were associated with popular crowds. Carr’s editions thus bridged the gap between Philadelphia’s aristocratic and plebeian worlds, reconciling rowdy anthems to the refined context of the drawing room. What remains to be considered is how exactly they did so.

Printing French revolutionary song from oral performance contexts freed it from extravocal physical expressions, just as its separation from public utterance made it seem less politically involved. In Philadelphia, as elsewhere, mute arrangements of ink on paper and their musical renderings in salon performances were safely abstracted from the volatile scenarios in which French revolutionary song otherwise flourished. Indeed, it was only through this abstraction that the repertory came to constitute song in the modern sense: music given over to the solo voice.

In its other life, as public sound, French revolutionary song was physically empowering and politically threatening. Each of the tunes in question had a purpose beyond vocal expression, which print obscured. “La Marseillaise,” to start with, was a march. Though it displays an artful pairing of words and melody, it was devised to coordinate military movement. For its part, “La Carmagnole” was as a ronde, a popular group dance accompanied by song, and “Ça Ira,” a contredanse, came from the ballroom. Neither “Ça Ira” nor “La Carmagnole” was a song in the first place, then, and even “La Marseillaise,” though songful, was not entirely vocalistic. Indeed, all three were adopted as marches throughout the late-eighteenth-century Atlantic world. By rendering such tunes as musical notation, publishers blunted their political edge, turning them into amusements for affluent individuals. In the early United States, no entrepreneur did so with as much regularity as Benjamin Carr. To develop an analytical language appropriate to his publications, I turn momentarily to the wider literature on the history of print.
Historians of print have recently sought to blur distinctions between the textual world of books and scores and the performative realm of orality. Roger Chartier, for example, has identified historical modes of transmission that defy modern norms of textual fixity and silent individual readership. In works such as The Cultural Uses of Print in Early Modern France, he has documented the codependence of monument and event, text and ritual, in traditions like the French fête. Chartier has resisted the separation “of texts from their ritual functions,” insisting on a “logic of practice” that modern interpretive approaches have tended to ignore.

Bringing Chartier’s work to bear on the history of music, Kate Van Orden suggests that the latter is a privileged domain for thinking about the relationship between text and performance. Musical print, she argues, has always unmistakably led “a dual life as text and performance.” Even for the most modern of readers, scores, unlike books, are intrinsically performative. For Van Orden, “musical texts presume a musical performance.” They have an inalienable “performative nature.”

All of this appears sensible. Chartier has illuminated past modes of print consumption that differ from our own, and Van Orden has singled out music as a peculiar form of print. But does this last singularity truly reside in the “insistence of musical texts upon being performed”? Does the score fundamentally differ, vis-à-vis performance, from other kinds of print? To be sure, it uses strange signs to represent aspects of sound with which books are not

---

125 Ibid., p. xii.
normally concerned. But does the relationship between score and sound consist of a guarantee, the one necessarily following from the other? I would argue that it does not, and that in this regard the score is no more intrinsically performative than a pamphlet, novel, poem, or newspaper. One can read a score silently, or not at all. It is an inherently mute object that may or may not be appropriated as a script for performance. Historically, of course, scores have facilitated performances, but this does not mean that notation and sound are not materially exclusive categories, between which no determinate relationship exists.

With this premise in mind, I borrow a category from Chartier in order to account for the relationship of oral French revolutionary song culture to its representation in Benjamin Carr’s publications. As performances, French revolutionary songs were, of course, sonorous. They were sung and heard, danced and marched to. They were processual, ephemeral, and contingent upon human participation. They inherently involved bodies making and responding to sound. But as visual culture—as print—they shed these properties. They became silent spatial arrangements of signs with no requisite relationship to the human body. The question for the historian is how to relate the abundance of surviving print to irrecoverable but no less important forms of orality.

One methodological solution that Chartier has proposed is to look for signs of performance in the very constitution of a printed text. Visual artifacts contain vestiges of practice. Details that initially seem puzzling from a notational standpoint can gesture beyond the document to lost worlds of performance. Following Paul Zumthor, Chartier refers to these textual elements as “indicator[s] of orality.”126 I wish to retain this basic idea, amending it in two ways. First, because Chartier is concerned with reading practices, his notion of orality is too

restrictive for the current investigation. In place of orality, and in order to encompass modes of performance beyond the vocal, I recommend the term *sonority*. For present purposes, sonority designates embodied sound—not merely bodies producing sound, but also bodies hearing and responding to it. Sonority thus comprises singing, dancing, and marching, for example, or a combination thereof.

Second, I take issue with the fact that Chartier’s indicators point toward performance. In his words, they “destine texts to addressees who will read them aloud or listen to them being read.” Like Van Orden, he endows print with the power to prescribe performance. In place of indicator, then, I propose the term *trace*. A trace of sonority is evidence that performance intervened in the constitution of a printed text—that the text is not wholly of the realm of print. It is not a guarantee that the text has been or will be used as a script for performance. Rather, it is a sign that embodied sound bore upon the composition of the text. Unlike an indicator of orality, a trace of sonority points backward. It is a window on a bygone practice.

In the very process of effacing the embodied public life of French revolutionary song, print unwittingly documented it. By examining the history of this repertory, we can determine what its printed manifestations reveal about the radical action in which it was involved. Of the three tunes, “La Marseillaise” was the most easily reconciled to print, and it therefore serves here as a point of departure. The more problematic cases of “La Carmagnole” and “Ça Ira” follow. Finally, Carr’s editions of all three songs informed his storied *Federal Overture* (1794), which brought full circle the abstraction of the music from revolutionary use, restoring it to the public.

---

127 Ibid.
“La Marseillaise”

The music that we know as “La Marseillaise,” a title it acquired in the nineteenth century, was first published in Strasbourg in 1792 as the “Chant de guerre pour l’armée du Rhin” (“War Song of the Rhine Army”). It was written in April of that year by an officer, Claude Joseph Rouget de Lisle, to boost troop morale and accompany their march. A battalion from Marseilles brought the tune to Paris, where in September it became known as the “Hymne des Marseillaise.” At about the same time the song reached London, where various publishers issued it as “The Marseilles March.”

Carr had at least one of the latter sheets to hand when he produced “The Marseilles Hymn in French and English (Marche des Marseillois)” in 1793. The London editions and Carr’s have identical keyboard arrangements with four English verses based loosely on de Lisle’s. They also separately present the song’s melody with its six original French verses (Fig. 2.4).

Carr’s score betrays the contradictory impulses at work in “La Marseillaise”—its songful complementarity of music and words, on the one hand, and its military functionalism, on the other. Consider first a few instances of text expression. One begins in the second measure of the third system, where the words take a grim turn. The B-flat here signals a shift to the minor, which persists until the refrain brings the return of B-natural in the third measure of the second-last system.

---


130 Possible British models for Carr’s version of “La Marseillaise” include “Marche des Marseillois” (London: Holland, 1792), “Marseilles March” (London: Goulding, 1792) and “Marseilles March” (London: Longman and Broderip, n. d.). Several U.S. editions appear to have been copied from Carr’s, including “Marseilles Hymn in French and English” (New York: Gilfert, [1794–95] and [1796]), “Marseilles Hymn” (Philadelphia: Willig, [1795–97]), and “Marseilles Hymn” (Boston: Hagen, [1798–99]).
More localized word painting happens in measure three of the first system, on the word “est” ("is"), and in the second-last measure of the second system, with the word “mugir” ("braying"). In the first case, although their alignment is unclear in Carr’s printing, “est” goes with the half-note C on the second beat of the measure. A more routine text setting would assign this long duration to “gloire” (“glory”), a word that merits emphasis. Placing the half note on a weak beat and assigning it to a syntactically weak word creates an unexpected emphasis, which is enhanced by the leap upwards to “est.” All of this depicts the arrival of “the day of glory,” which jolts the fatherland’s children into action.
Figure 2.4
Rouget de Lisle, “Marseilles Hymn in French and English” (Philadelphia: Carr, [1793]), p. 3
Keffer Collection of Sheet Music, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania
Allons enfants de la patrie,
Le jour de gloire est arrivé.
Contre nous de la tyrannie,
L'étendard sanglant est levé. (bis)
Entendez-vous dans les campagnes,
Mugir ces féroces soldats?
Ils viennent jusques dans vos bras,
Égorger vos fils, vos compagnes.

Aux armes, citoyens,
Formez vos bataillons.

Marchez, marchez,
Qu’un sang impur
Abreuve nos sillons.
Marchons, marchons,
Qu’un sang impur
Abreuve nos sillons.131

Come, children of the fatherland,
The day of glory is arrived.
Against us, the bloody flag
Of tyranny is raised. (repeat)
Don’t you hear, in the countryside,
The braying of these savage soldiers?
They come right into your midst,
To slaughter your children, your wives.

To arms, citizens,
Form your battalions.

March, march,
So that an impure blood
Shall water our furrows.
Let’s march, let’s march,
So that an impure blood
Shall water our furrows.

With the exception of “Mugir ces féroces soldats,” de Lisle begins each line of his text on an anacrusis. All other lines start on beat four, or on the second half of the third or fourth beat, but “mugir” lands squarely on beat three. It is thus elided with the preceding phrase, and seems to arrive too soon. This rhythmic surprise coincides with a melodic detour, as an F-natural pulls momentarily away from the home key. By thus displacing the syllable “mu-,” the composer conveys the enemy’s crude braying.

Such examples suggest that de Lisle wrote the words of the first verse before its music. This is further supported by his allotment of two measures of music to each line of text. There is an exception to this, however. At the end of the third system, beneath the words, “La General,” a series of repeated notes imitates a drum. This is an insertion and may have originated in the London source from which Carr copied his edition. The “General” was a rhythmic signal that

131 This is a modernized transcription of the first of six French verses (with refrain) published by Carr (Fig. 2.4).
instructed armies to arise and prepare for the march, so here it amplifies verbal imperatives:

“Aux armes, citoyens / Formez vos bataillons.”

Since it did not accompany the march itself, however, the “General” was an artificial addition to de Lisle’s song. Two centuries earlier the music theorist Thoinot Arbeau had notated the rhythm used to regulate the movement of French armies. It consisted of eight beats, the first five of which were struck, and the last three of which were silent. The first four beats were sounded with one stick, but the fifth was hit with both, creating an accent. This suggests a modern transcription in two measures of duple meter (Ex. 2.1), the same metrical unit to which de Lisle assigned each line of his text.

Example 2.1
Transcription of march rhythm in Thoinot Arbeau, *Orchésographie* (Langres, 1589)

![Transcription of march rhythm]

When repeated, Arbeau’s rhythm forms a grid with which we can compare de Lisle’s tune (Ex. 2.2). The melody does not follow the pattern strictly—that was the drum’s role. Instead, it provides embellishments that keep the music interesting. But even so, the rhythmic framework is evident. The quarter notes in the odd-numbered measures correspond with the strokes of the drum. When the drummer rests, the tune becomes rhythmically freer, consisting either of held notes and rests or multiplied activity. In the intervening measures the pulse is more insistent.

French revolutionary armies marched at one of two tempos. The *pas redoublé* (doubled step) was used for short maneuvers and had a cadence of one hundred steps per minute, whereas the *pas ordinaire* (standard step) moved at a tempo of seventy-six.\(^{134}\) “La Marseillaise” worked with both. If the step was assigned to the quarter note, the song served as a *pas redoublé*. If the step was assigned to the half note, then it functioned as a *pas ordinaire*.\(^{135}\) Since a regulation step was twenty-four inches, a single verse (with refrain) of “La Marseillaise” represented a walking distance of either 272 or 136 feet.

Even though it was conceived as a song, then, with a tune shaped to represent its words, “La Marseillaise” represents the movement of soldiers. In music-sheet form, it manifests traces of sonority. In 1796, Carr reissued this tune in two collections of non-vocal music, his *Evening Amusement* and *Military Amusement*. Once he had made it into a parlor song, it was


\(^{135}\) The slower march was thus musically fast, approaching the song’s limit of performability. The quicker and less frequently used *pas redoublé* accommodated moderately paced renditions of the song.
possible to publish arrangements of “La Marseillaise” that abstracted it not only from extra-
musical function, but from verbal meaning, too.

“La Carmagnole”

“La Carmagnole” became popular in Paris at the same time as “La Marseillaise.” It, too,
accompanied French army maneuvers and reached America via Britain. But here the comparison
falters. “La Carmagnole” was rooted in oral practice and the ronde, a rustic dance in which
participants formed a ring around an object like a tree or liberty pole. Dancers circled left and
right, moved in and out from the center, and made special steps at melodically marked
moments.136 The sung tune was their only accompaniment. The song had no definitive text
apart from its title, which designated a coat imported from Italy by French laborers, and its
militant refrain. Verses were often made up on the spot to commemorate local issues and
people. Constant Pierre identified more than fifty verses that were paired with the following
chorus:

Dansons la carmagnole,
Vive le son, vive le son,
Dansons la carmagnole,
Vive le son du cannon.137

Let’s dance the carmagnole,
Long live the sound, long live the sound,
Let’s dance the carmagnole,
Long live the sound of the cannon.

Given its popular origins, music publishers aiming to cast “La Carmagnole” as an elite
diversion faced a challenge, one that Carr’s 1794 edition met head-on. Arranged for solo voice

136 A historical reconstruction of the Carmagnole dance by the Compagnie Révérences of Lyon is available
on Youtube, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6dgJdPBeXRg (accessed March 22, 2013). The
performance’s choreography and staging were researched by Yvonne Vart, a leading expert on French
social dance of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Vart is a member of the European Association of
Dance Historians and has served on UNESCO’s International Dance Council.
and keyboard, it was copied from an existing London sheet and includes four French verses along with a self-standing version for the guitar (Fig. 2.5).

Figure 2.5
“La Carmagnole” (Philadelphia: Carr, [1794])
Reprinted in A Collection of New and Favorite Songs (Philadelphia: Carr, [c. 1800])
Dated Books Collection, American Antiquarian Society

138 “La Carmagnole” (London: Longman and Broderip, [c. 1792]). The only other extant texted U.S. edition of this song is “La Carmagnole” (New York: Hewitt, [c. 1794]). Hewitt’s version differs significantly from Carr’s, however, and was presumably based on another source.
Figure 2.5 continued
En vain des milliers d’ennuis
Contre nous se sont réunis
Les dangers le trepas
Ne nous effrayent Danfons & c.

Brunswick ce fameux général
Nous ont dit on beaucoup de mal
On n’en ferait raison
A grand coups de canon Danfons & c.

Il compte aussi qu’a Dumourier
Il arracherà le laurier
Qui compte ainsi je crois
Compte souvent deux fois Danfons & c.
This sheet departs radically from the renditions of “La Carmagnole” that sounded in Philadelphia’s public spaces. It is framed by an introduction and conclusion for the keyboard, which provides accompaniment throughout. This becomes conspicuous when a secondary dominant appears in the third measure of the third system on page two, and when this is followed by an acute dissonance (an F-sharp against C major) on the second beat of the last measure in the next system. Such harmonic niceties had no place in oral renditions of “La Carmagnole.” They belonged to the realm of cultivated, literate music-making.

Like the music itself, the visual arrangement of Carr’s “Carmagnole” gives the impression of a methodically crafted song rather than an unrefined, semi-improvisatory dance. For the already songful “Marseillaise,” it sufficed to combine the voice and keyboard on a double staff. The vocal part of “La Carmagnole,” by contrast, is printed above the keyboard part, on a third staff. This makes it look independent, even though the keyboard mostly doubles it. From the last measure of the first system on page two until the end of the following system, however, the melody is entrusted to the voice alone. “La Carmagnole” was thus changed from a vocally accompanied dance into an instrumentally accompanied song.

Verses for “La Carmagnole” were short and simple. The most famous ones took aim at Marie-Antoinette and Louis XVI:

Madame Veto avait promis (bis)  Mrs. Veto had promised (repeat)
De faire égorger tout Paris, (bis)  To slaughter all of Paris, (repeat)
Mais son coup a manqué  But her coup has failed
Grâce à nos canonniers.  Thanks to our gunners.

Monsieur Veto avait promis (bis)  Mr. Veto had promised (repeat)
D’être fidèle à son pays, (bis)  To be true to his country, (repeat)
Mais il y a manqué;  But he has failed;
Ne faisons plus quartier.  Let’s show no mercy.  

139 These are the opening strophes of the song’s most popular variant, “La Carmagnole des royalistes” (Paris: Frère, 1792). Pierre, Hymnes et chansons, p. 554.
But these did not make it into Carr’s edition, which begins more generically:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Le cannon vient de résonner, (bis)} & \quad \text{The cannon have sounded, (repeat)} \\
\text{Guerriers soyons prêts à marcher. (bis)} & \quad \text{Warriors are ready to go. (repeat)} \\
\text{Citoyens et soldats} & \quad \text{Citizens and soldiers} \\
\text{En volant aux combats.} & \quad \text{Are flying into combat.}
\end{align*}
\]

The repetition of each line in the opening couplet reflects the call-and-response manner in which it was originally performed. Parallel musical phrases are normally assigned to such repeated text, but not here. The first statement of “Le cannon vient de résonner” is set to a lilting two-measure melody whose rhythm matches the words. We expect this to be answered by a phrase of the same length (Ex. 2.3a), but it is instead followed by a three-measure unit, with which it forms an asymmetrical pair (Ex. 2.3b).

**Example 2.3a**

**Expected setting of opening text repetition in “La Carmagnole”**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Le cannon vient de résonner, le cannon vient de résonner}
\end{align*}
\]

**Example 2.3b**

**Setting of opening text repetition in Carr edition of “La Carmagnole”**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Le cannon vient de résonner, le cannon vient de résonner}
\end{align*}
\]

Example 2.3a is fictional and shows a symmetrical response to the initial statement. The main difference between this normalization and the phrase as it appears in Carr’s edition is the metrical treatment of the word “de.” In Example 2.3a it is assigned to an eighth-note on the weakest beat of the measure, whereas in Example 2.3b it is emphasized by duration and by placement on a strong beat. Carr is not to blame for this faulty accentuation, though, because
the “Carmagnole” tune was not devised to suit its words. Although we do not know what the step entailed, this otherwise unaccountable phrase is a trace of sonority—it must have accompanied a distinctive moment in the “Carmagnole” dance.

Along with “La Marseillaise,” Carr included the melody of “La Carmagnole,” without words, in his *Evening Amusement* of 1796. And he later reissued the texted version from the plates he had made in 1794, including it in his *Collection of New and Favorite Songs* (c. 1800). He thus published it one time less than he would “Ça Ira.”

“Ça Ira”

Like “La Carmagnole,” “Ça Ira” originated as a social dance, albeit a more sophisticated one. Composed by a Parisian theater musician named Bécourt, it was initially called “Le Carillon National” and its earliest known printing is an arrangement for two violins. As a *contredanse*, “Le Carillon” had roots in the English country dances (which, despite their name, were genteel) introduced at the court of Louis XIV, and was performed by four couples in a square formation. The music was played through four times, giving each pair a chance to lead. Among the dance figures indicated in an early edition are the rigaudon, pirouette, hand-turn, and English half-chain. Like all *contredanses*, “Le Carillon” is in rounded binary form.\(^{140}\)

This dance became a song during the early French Revolution.\(^{141}\) Its verses were as varied as those of “La Carmagnole,” but it had a consistent refrain, set to a repetitive tune:

Example 2.4
“Ça Ira” refrain

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ah! Ça i-ra, ça i-ra, ça i-ra} \\
\text{Le peuple en ce jour sans cesse répète,} \\
\text{Ah! Ça i-ra, ça i-ra, ça i-ra,} \\
\text{Malgré les mutins tout réussira.} \\
\text{Nos ennemis confus en restent là,} \\
\text{Et nous allons chanter “Alléluia.”} \\
\text{Ah! Ça i-ra, ça i-ra, ça i-ra,} \\
\text{Quand Boileau jadis du clergé parla,} \\
\text{Comme un prophète il a prédit cela;} \\
\text{En chantant ma chansonette,} \\
\text{Avec plaisir on dira,} \\
\text{Ah! Ça i-ra, ça i-ra, ça i-ra.}^{142}
\end{align*}
\]

The original verses were devised by a street singer named Ladré and became popular during preparations for Paris’s Fête de la Fédération of July 1790. The first one was as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ah! Ça i-ra, ça i-ra, ça i-ra,} & \quad \text{Oh, it will be fine,} \\
\text{Le peuple en ce jour sans cesse répète,} & \quad \text{The people on this day incessantly repeat,} \\
\text{Ah! Ça i-ra, ça i-ra, ça i-ra,} & \quad \text{Oh, it will be fine,} \\
\text{Malgré les mutins tout réussira.} & \quad \text{Despite the mutineers, all will succeed.} \\
\text{Nos ennemis confus en restent là,} & \quad \text{Our enemies remain confused,} \\
\text{Et nous allons chanter “Alléluia.”} & \quad \text{And we shall sing “Hallelujah.”} \\
\text{Ah! Ça i-ra, ça i-ra, ça i-ra,} & \quad \text{Oh, it will be fine,} \\
\text{Quand Boileau jadis du clergé parla,} & \quad \text{When Boileau spoke of the clergy,} \\
\text{Comme un prophète il a prédit cela;} & \quad \text{Like a prophet, he predicted as much;} \\
\text{En chantant ma chansonette,} & \quad \text{By singing my little song,} \\
\text{Avec plaisir on dira,} & \quad \text{With pleasure you’ll say,} \\
\text{Ah! Ça i-ra, ça i-ra, ça i-ra.} & \quad \text{Oh, it will be fine.}
\end{align*}
\]

Songs generally have one note per syllable of text. Because Bécourt wrote his melody for non-vocal instruments, however, it has stray notes that do not correspond to the words. This becomes a problem when setting the second line of Ladré’s text, a likely solution to which is shown in Example 2.5a. At least one Parisian printer had other ideas, however, as seen in Example 2.5b.

---

Example 2.5a
Hypothetical alignment of “Le peuple en ce jour sans cesse répète” in “Ça Ira”

Example 2.5b
Alignment of “Le peuple en ce jour sans cesse répète” in Bécourt and Ladré, “Ah! Ça Ira” (Paris: Frère, 1790)

In the same Paris edition, the assignment of text to music becomes altogether haphazard at times. Example 2.6 shows three successive settings of the phrase, “ça ira,” each of which is metrically different, and none of which is desirable when compared to Example 2.4.

Example 2.6
Indiscriminate accentuation of “ça ira” in Bécourt and Ladré, “Ah! Ça Ira” (Paris: Frère, 1790)

Bécourt’s tune resists song in further ways. The simplicity of its opening phrase is both a virtue and a vice: it is rhythmically memorable but has almost no melodic interest. A bigger problem, however, arises from the fact that Bécourt wrote his melody without consideration for the range of the human voice. In its original form, it requires of the singer a G3 and a B5, along with nearly every diatonic note in between. This led Pierre to describe “Ça Ira” as unsingable,

143 Ibid.
but we know that it was sung nevertheless.\textsuperscript{144} Performances of “Ça Ira,” especially those by popular crowds, therefore edged closer to rhythmic shouting than to song.

Such considerations deterred Carr from publishing “Ça Ira” in an arrangement for voice and keyboard, in the manner of “La Marseillaise” and “La Carmagnole.” As far as we know he never issued it with words. The challenge of transforming a dance with revolutionary words into an urbane song, while considerable in the case of “La Carmagnole,” seemed insuperable in the case of “Ça Ira.” Carr’s first edition of it was an arrangement for solo keyboard, which he combined on a single page with Philip Phile’s “President’s March” (Fig. 2.6). He later reproduced the melody alone in three different collections: the \textit{Philadelphia Pocket Companion} (1794), \textit{Gentleman’s Amusement} (1795), and \textit{Evening Amusement} (1796).

\textsuperscript{144} Pierre, \textit{Hymnes et chansons}, p. 492. “La mélodie se développe sur une étendue qui dépasse l’échelle vocale moyenne et, par conséquent, est inchantable.”
Figure 2.6
Phile and Bécourt, “President’s March and Ça Ira” ([Philadelphia:] Carr, [1793–94])
Keffer Collection of Sheet Music, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania
In each of these editions, Carr presented “Ça Ira” as a wordless, instrumental arrangement of a popular song, but it remains marked by its origins as a dance. In Figure 2.6, notice that the tune begins with an incomplete measure. The music itself does not suggest this. It makes more sense, in fact, to notate the opening melody this way:

Example 2.7
Re-measured opening of “Ça Ira”

![Example 2.7](image)

Carr’s unusual measuring owes to the song’s history as a contredanse, and more specifically to a convention known as “dancing across the bar.” Opening on an anacrusis accommodated an upward motion of the hand or foot, which was then lowered in accordance with the downbeat.\(^\text{145}\) Even as print distanced “Ça Ira” from its initial performance contexts, the song continued to manifest traces of embodied sound.

***

The most popular tunes of the French Revolution resisted the identity of song as a self-standing form of vocal expression. “La Marseillaise” betrayed the movement of soldiers, the music and words of “La Carmagnole” were bent to accommodate the dance, and “Ça Ira” was better suited to the rhythmic chanting of the crowd than the cultured singing of the drawing room. It is thus no surprise that Carr’s next treatment of this music took non-vocal form. The

---

*Federal Overture* was a fitting culmination to Carr’s career as a publisher of French revolutionary song, for it brought “La Marseillaise,” “La Carmagnole,” and “Ça Ira” together in a single, wordless work. Though it represents a different genre, it advances the same purpose seen in his other editions, broadening the appeal of an otherwise partisan repertory.

**The Federal Overture**

Carr’s *Federal Overture* was premiered by an orchestra at Philadelphia’s Southwark Theatre on September 22, 1794 and issued in a keyboard arrangement two months later.\(^{146}\) He composed introductory, transitional, and closing material for this work, which was otherwise an arrangement of nine existing tunes, and exemplified the British genre of the medley overture.\(^{147}\) It had a uniquely American purpose, however, which was to preempt theatrical disorder. It featured Federalist favorites like “Yankee Doodle” and “The President’s March” along with the songs we have been considering.

The idea of uniting ideologically opposed pieces in a single publication was not unique to the *Federal Overture*, as Figure 2.6 suggests. Nor was pairing tunes like “The President’s March” and “Ça Ira” necessarily a conciliatory gesture. As Liam Riordan has argued, the *Overture* appealed to Republican taste while subtly validating Federalism. Its title suggests as much, but, according to Riordan, Carr also musically affirmed the status quo. His newly composed material

---

\(^{146}\) The premiere was announced in the *Philadelphia Gazette*, September 20, 1794. The keyboard arrangement was advertised in *Dunlap and Claypoole’s American Daily Advertiser*, November 21, 1794, and is available in the New York Public Library Digital Gallery. A facsimile also appears in Irving Lowens, *Benjamin Carr’s Federal Overture (1794)* (Philadelphia: Musical Americana, 1957).

\(^{147}\) Other American examples of the medley overture include James Hewitt’s *New Federal Overture* (New York: Carr, [1797]) and *New Medley Overture* (New York: Hewitt, [1798]). The University of Pennsylvania Rare Book and Manuscript Library has string parts for additional medleys by Hewitt (c. 1802) and Alexander Reinagle (n. d.). The Music Division of the Library of Congress has a medley sketch in Carr’s hand.
lent a menacing quality to the French selections while foregrounding “Yankee Doodle” and “The President’s March.”

Carr’s other editions of French revolutionary song do not underscore Federalism in this way. But they did separate music from public utterance and from social actions like marching and dancing, and these trends continued in the Federal Overture. Carr’s orchestral score for the Overture has not been located, so we only have the keyboard arrangement (along with an abridged version for flute duet, shared between the fifth and sixth numbers of Carr’s Gentleman’s Amusement) to compare with his other publications. The three discussed here were issued before the Overture—“The Marseilles Hymn” in 1793 and “La Carmagnole” and “Ça Ira” in 1794. Even in the absence of its original performing version, however, it is clear that Carr’s medley further removed this music from the functions it otherwise knew. His earlier editions made it into parlor song (or a keyboard solo in the case of “Ça Ira”), but now it became a nonverbal orchestral symbol. The refrain of “La Marseillaise,’’ for instance, is given a newly composed, symphonic accompaniment, and Carr reconceived the melodies of “La Carmagnole” and “Ça Ira” for violin—each ascends in the overture to an E6. In addition, “Ça Ira” is realigned so as to begin with a complete measure, while the introductory and closing keyboard material for “Carmagnole” is retained. He also added volume contrasts to each number, according to the conventions of instrumental theater music.

---

149 Carr’s “Marseilles Hymn” was advertised in Dunlap’s American Daily Advertiser, August 24, 1793. His edition of “La Carmagnole” was announced in the Philadelphia Gazette, May 30, 1794. Sonneck and Upton’s Bibliography dates Carr’s “President’s March and Ça Ira” to 1793–94. The popularity of these tunes around the time of the New Theatre’s opening, however, makes early 1794 the likely time of publication.
Carr’s editions initially distanced “La Marseillaise,” “La Carmagnole,” and “Ça Ira” from public utterance, turning them into private amusements. But his Federal Overture restored these songs to the public in a carefully managed and wordless form. His political ambition in doing so should not be exaggerated—he was selling music. But Carr’s publications did soften the radicalism of French revolutionary song, if only to make it more palatable to drawing-room and theater-going consumers alike.

**Conclusion**

The label “French revolutionary song” is misleading insofar as it appears to designate a uniform sphere of cultural production. It encompasses not one but two repertories, one inhabiting the world of performance, the other the realm of print. Although the practical and textual dimensions of music have informed and continue to inflect one another, a material distinction between sound and notation persists. On this level the performance and printing of French revolutionary song are divergent histories.

In late-eighteenth-century Philadelphia, the rise of the secular music publishing trade, facilitated by the opening of the Chestnut Street Theatre and the arrival of new equipment and personnel from Europe, coincided with the emergence of intensely pro- and anti-French partisanship. The national leader in musical commerce, Benjamin Carr, set up shop at a moment when Federalists and Republicans were aligning themselves in terms of loyalty to England or France. In this climate of diplomatic controversy, Carr published an array of French revolutionary songs. In the same city where radical theater patrons and rowdy outdoor crowds were belting out, dancing, and marching to “Ça Ira,” “La Carmagnole,” and “La Marseillaise,” Carr issued refined keyboard and vocal arrangements of the same music, intended for consumption in the security of wealthy homes. Despite the division of U.S. opinion over events
like the Terror, the War of the First Coalition, and the Genet Affair, and despite the popularity of French revolutionary song among lower social elements, Carr marketed that music to Philadelphia’s elite.

This phenomenon is explained by the dual existence of French revolutionary song in the oral and literate domains. Print safely abstracted the repertory from physical displays of popular radicalism. As notational commodities, the songs were largely divested of their public vitality. At the same time, however, my analysis of Carr’s music sheets shows that print did not entirely eradicate performance. Visible traces of sonority continue to implicate French revolutionary song in a lost world of empowering sound.

Perhaps it remains puzzling, after all, that revolutionary song required adaptation for an American clientele, or that France and the United States enjoyed better relations while espousing antithetical political systems than they did as ideological allies. But once France had embarked on a parallel revolution, its fate seemed to merge, for better or worse, with that of the United States. Depending on the point of view, France became identified with the hope or despair of republican life.

In this chapter I have examined only one musical side of this polemic. I have addressed the role of U.S. partisanship in the reception of radical French music, but I have yet to consider the body of counterrevolutionary song that emerged during the same period. Such tunes were suppressed in France, but in England, the chief refuge of French conservatives, they flourished, and from there they moved westward. In Philadelphia, Federalists embraced this repertory, and, as seen in the next chapter, one displaced Haitian elite crafted distinctive contributions to the genre of the royalist lament.
CHAPTER 3

RENAUD DE CHATEAUDUN AND THE ROYALIST LAMENT IN FEDERAL PHILADELPHIA

This chapter considers an unusual group of songs that the St. Dominguan emigrant Jean-Baptiste Renaud de Chateaudun published in Philadelphia at the end of the eighteenth century. The songs are peculiar in the context of republican America for two reasons. First, they fixate sorrowfully on the passing of the ancien régime in France. Not all Americans viewed the French Revolution with equal favor, and many feared its radical excesses, but royalism remains a perplexing form of expression in the federal-era United States. Second, Chateaudun’s musical style was idiosyncratic. Rooted in the postrevolutionary Parisian romance, his laments were melodramatic when compared with the staple musical fare imported from London. His expressive manner stood in contrast to the reserved English galant idiom that dominated Philadelphia’s musical market. Combined with the politics of Chateaudun’s music, its style rendered it a conspicuous commodity.

Yet Chateaudun’s songs were not entirely unrelated to other music in circulation. Several English royalist laments, similar in verbal content to Chateaudun’s songs, were reprinted in Philadelphia. What sets the St. Dominguan’s work apart is its combination of stylistic Frenchness and conservative refugee politics. Direct evidence of music reception in early Philadelphia is hard to come by, and I have struggled to find any pertaining to this repertory. By attending to Chateaudun’s biography, to the politics of St. Dominguan exile in the United States, and to more general evidence concerning the musicality of Francophone emigrants, however, it is possible to approach an understanding of what his music meant to those who heard it.

The material evidence does suggest that Chateaudun’s musical style was contested.
In the last part of this chapter, a bibliographic analysis of his music sheets determines that engravers modified Chateaudun’s songs. By pulling his musical style towards the London model of lament, these revisions attest to the fact that Philadelphia hosted competing standards for representing royalist loss. They point to an operative English hegemony in the realm of musical style.

But to start this investigation I turn to revolutionary Paris, whence the genre of the royalist lament emerged. I follow its passage, along with that of Chateaudun, to the United States, before discussing in greater detail the politics of Franco-American exile, the American reception of French musicality, and the style, form, and publication history of Chateaudun’s laments. Ultimately, I will suggest that American anxiety about the aristocratic tendencies of St. Dominguan emigrants informed the redaction of Chateaudun’s expressive manner. In his laments, royalist sympathy blended with an eccentric musical language to form an alien amalgam, one whose departure from the Anglo-American mainstream was a probable cause of concern.

The Transatlantic Royalist Lament

On January 15, 1793, the National Convention convicted Louis XVI of crimes against the French state. The next day, the same body decided by a much narrower margin in favor of his immediate execution. An appeal on behalf of the deposed king was then voted down, and on January 21 the thirty-eight-year-old “Citoyen Louis Capet” was beheaded at the Place de la Révolution. Thus began a period of mourning for the former queen, Marie-Antoinette, whose fate hung in the balance. The royal couple had been imprisoned since August 1792, and the “Widow Capet” would wait nearly nine months more for her own trial and death. In the meantime, Louis’ execution, along with Antoinette’s suffering and eventual demise, became the
subject of musical tributes in France and especially in England, which was a haven for royalist exiles.

It was dangerous to publish such material under the Convention in France, and a rare example survives in Antoine Windtsor’s monarchist tract, *Agonie et mort héroïque de Louis XVI*, at the end of which are printed the words of a *romance*, “Louis XVI mourant, aux Français.” The five stanzas were purportedly written by the king himself and sung to the tune of “Dans les jardins de Trianon,” a popular *chanson*. The first verse encapsulates the song’s plea:

> Le monde pour moi n’est plus rien!  
> Un instant…. et je cesse d’être.  
> Un instant...... et je vais paraître  
> Aux pieds de ton juge et du mien.  
> O France! à son heure dernière,  
> Entends un prince malheureux,  
> Et juges, par ses derniers vœux,  
> S’il fut ton tyran ou ton père. (bis.)\(^{151}\)

The world for me is nothing more!  
One moment…. and I cease to be.  
One moment...... and I will appear  
At the feet of your judge and mine.  
Oh, France! At his last hour,  
Hear an unfortunate prince,  
And judge, by his final vows,  
If he was your tyrant or your father. (repeat.)

This song is sincere, but parodies were more common. The singer Louis Boussemart, for instance, wrote mock *complaintes* from the perspectives of Antoinette and her sister-in-law, Élisabeth. Other tunes that condoned the executions include “La confession générale de Louis l’assassin,” “La fin de Louis Capet,” “Dialogue de la tigresse Antoinette avec la guillotine,” and “Crimes de Marie-Antoinette, veuve Capet.”\(^{152}\)

More so than in revolutionary Paris, sympathy for the French royal family was evident in musical publications from the British Isles. Jan Ladislav Dussek’s *Sufferings of the Queen of France* (Edinburgh: Corri, 1793), for instance, is a narrative work for keyboard that depicts


Antoinette’s misfortunes from the time of her imprisonment until her death.153 Before fleeing to London in 1789, Dussek (1760–1812) was a favorite musician at the French court. Most English royalist tributes were less elaborate than his, however, taking the form of simple strophic songs.154

London editions of songs on the fall of the French monarchs were transmitted to the United States and in particular to Philadelphia, where local publishers made unauthorized copies of them. George Willig, for instance, reissued John Percy’s “The Captive” (London: author, 1793) as “Maria Antoinette’s Complaint” (Philadelphia, [c. 1800]).155 Benjamin Carr replicated John Stevenson’s “Louis the Sixteenth’s Lamentation” (London: Preston, 1793) in his Philadelphia Pocket Companion for the Guittar or Clarinett (Philadelphia, 1794), and he released a derivative edition of Stephen Storace’s “Captivity” (London: Dale, 1793) upon his arrival in the United States. In addition, the Philadelphia publishers H. and P. Rice sold a 1794 Carr engraving of

153 The work has ten movements: (1) The Queen’s imprisonment, (2) She reflects on her former greatness, (3) They separate her from her children, (4) They pronounce the sentence of death, (5) Her resignation to her fate, (6) The situation and reflections the night before her execution, (7) The guards come to conduct her to the place of execution, (8) The savage tumult of the rabble, (9) The Queen’s invocation to the almighty just before her death—The guillotine drops, and (10) The apotheosis.

154 Jane Girdham, “Marie Antoinette: Martyr in Song” (unpublished paper). Focusing on London, Girdham divides songs about the queen’s demise into two groups: those published early in 1793, which focus on her imprisonment and widowhood; and those issued later the same year, which highlight her execution and apotheosis. Examples from the first group include Stephen Storace’s “Captivity” (Dale) and John Percy’s “The Captive” (author). Examples of the second kind include Thomas Attwood’s “Reflections of Marie Antoinette” (Preston), William Edward Miller’s “The Queen of France” (Longman and Broderip), and Thomas Augustus Rawlings’ Cantata on the Death of the late unfortunate Marie Antoinette (author). Though marketed to amateurs for domestic use, some of the earlier songs received professional public performances, and some of the later ones call for instruments other than a keyboard. As noted, most of the settings are strophic, but Rawlings’ “Cantata” is an exception. Songs about Louis XVI were also published, but were not as common. Examples include Bristow’s “La guillotine: a new song describing the woes of the unfortunate Lewis XVI” (author) and Samuel Webbe’s “Resignation” (Longman and Broderip). 155 In London there were two versions of Percy’s “The Captive.” As Girdham has shown, the song originally had the same text as Stephen Storace’s “Captivity,” which resulted in a copyright dispute. Storace appears to have had the upper hand, as Percy republished “The Captive” with a new set of words. It was this second version that reached the United States. Willig’s edition is not, however, in the same key as either London one. Percy wrote the music, which was retained between his two versions, in E-flat major; Willig printed it in D. John Christopher Moller issued a similarly transposed version of “The Captive” in New York in 1797, and this was probably Willig’s model.
Johann Paul Aegidius (Jean-Paul-Gilles) Martini’s “À son altesse royale, Madame Élisabeth de France, sœur de roi.” Martini was a French court musician whose music was published in London by the Chevalier de Curt.\textsuperscript{156}

Most reactionary songs about the French Revolution that appeared in the United States came from London, but there were exceptions. During the 1790s Philadelphia saw an influx of refugees from the French Caribbean colony of St. Domingue, where a slave insurrection was under way, and one such emigrant became a leading composer of laments on the passing of the ancien régime.

Jean-Baptiste Renaud de Chateaudun

Aside from the fact that he published at least a dozen musical works while in the United States, little is known about the life of Jean-Baptiste Renaud de Chateaudun. Writing in 1795, François-Alexandre-Frédéric La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt noted the arrival at Asylum, a remote French settlement on the banks of the Susquehanna in northern Pennsylvania, of a “Mr. Renaud” and family. Liancourt identified Chateaudun as a “merchant of St. Domingue” who possessed “some remains—still considerable—of a large fortune.”\textsuperscript{157} Although most St. Dominguan refugees came to the United States in 1793, this account suggests that Chateaudun arrived somewhat later. Indeed, his name does not appear in any U.S. sources until 1796, when he is listed as a composer and performer on a concert program in a Baltimore newspaper.\textsuperscript{158}

\textsuperscript{156} Philadelphia’s General Advertiser announced the sale of “À son altesse royale,” along with assorted Carr imprints, on April 15, 1794. In the advertisement, the song is identified along with Martini’s “Ronde chantée à la reine par Monseigneur Le Dauphin” as being from “une collection, publiée à Londres par M. Curt.”


\textsuperscript{158} Federal Gazette, April 12, 1796. The concert was to occur at the Old Theatre the following day.
Following this notice Chateaudun disappears from the historical record, until in 1799 his name begins to appear in the Philadelphia papers.\textsuperscript{159}

This biographical sketch is wanting, but the situation at Asylum, where Chateaudun initially settled, provides a basis for conjecture about the course of his U.S. career. This misbegotten colony owed its 1793 founding to a combination of land speculation and French idealization of American agrarian life. It was a project of the Asylum Company, which had acquired tracts of land in the area, and whose principal investors included the high-profile émigrés Omer Talon and Louis-Marie Vicomte de Noailles. With backing from wealthy Philadelphians like Thomas Mifflin, Robert Morris, and John Nicholson, Noailles and Talon recruited French and Haitian settlers while planning the town, which was to be a beacon of civilization in the Pennsylvania backcountry.\textsuperscript{160}

French Enlightenment writers like Voltaire and U.S. propagandists like Benjamin Franklin had cultivated a utopian vision of rural American life, which was thought to epitomize simplicity, virtue, and natural abundance.\textsuperscript{161} This naïve image of wilderness existence influenced the

\textsuperscript{159} He is listed in concert notices and programs in the \textit{Aurora}, March 15 and 26, 1799; \textit{Philadelphia Gazette}, April 9, 1799; \textit{Philadelphia Gazette}, February 17 and April 22, 1800; \textit{Claypoole’s American Daily Advertiser}, May 1, 1800; \textit{Gazette of the United States}, April 11, 1801; and \textit{Poulson’s American Daily Advertiser}, March 27, 1804. He is also named in a program announcement for the New Theatre (\textit{Philadelphia Gazette}, March 1, 1802), and on May 14, 1804 he placed the following advertisement in the \textit{Gazette of the United States}: “\textit{FENCING SCHOOL. MR. DE CHATEAUDUN informs the amateurs of that fine accomplishment, that his school will be opened for the summer at Mr. Francis’s ball room, Harmony Court, where gentlemen will be attended to every Monday, Wednesday and Friday, from 8 o’clock to 11 in the morning. Mr. De C continues to teach the harp, and musick in all its branches. He has just received from Naples an assortment of beautiful harp strings that he will sell on the most reasonable terms.”


construction of Asylum, whose large houses and urban amenities—including a large central market, shops and taverns, a bakery, and a theater—were unlike anything seen in other frontier towns. There was even a mansion rumored to have been built for Marie-Antoinette. The settlement was difficult to access, yet exquisite furnishings and rarified building materials were conveyed up the barely navigable Susquehanna.\textsuperscript{162} Once arrived at Asylum, elite French and Haitian exiles were confronted with a labor-intensive life to which they were unaccustomed. Even those eager to work found that the local economy could not support the town as it had been conceived. In short, although it flourished temporarily thanks to stores of settler capital, Asylum was unsustainable. Inhabitants trickled away as soon as it was safe to return to France, and the colony was abandoned altogether in the early years of the nineteenth century.

Asylum’s history sheds light on Chateaudun’s U.S. itinerary. It would not have taken long for the ill-conceived colony to drain his resources, considerable though they were, or at least for him to ascertain the futility of a long tenure at the settlement. When he participated in the Baltimore concert of 1796, he may have been scouting alternatives to Asylum. Or perhaps he had permanently left the colony by then, although in this case the dearth of evidence from 1797 and 1798 is hard to explain. Most likely, Chateaudun abandoned the colony between the middle of 1798 and early 1799, or around the time that many exiles left Asylum for Paris. Lacking connections in the métropole, he was unable to go there as some Caribbean refugees did.

Chateaudun had to make a living in the United States, and Philadelphia was the natural location for a man of his abilities to do so.

Although we have only the rough contours of his biography, there is little question about what music Chateaudun published once he had settled in the U.S. capital. His extant work comprises twelve songs and one instrumental dance.\textsuperscript{163} Emily Laurance has studied one composition, a vocal \textit{romance} based on Jacques-Henri Bernardin de St. Pierre’s 1787 novel \textit{Paul et Virginie}.\textsuperscript{164} Here I consider the musical style and form of three other Chateaudun songs, along with their publication history. Central to this investigation is “The Queen of France to Her Children Just Before Her Execution” (n. p., n. d.), which was an openly royalist lament. Its musical and poetic congruity with two other laments by the composer, “Elegy on the Death of Mrs. Robinson” (n. p., n. d.) and “Marian’s Complaint” (n. p., n. d.), suggest that these, too, were conceived as political statements. Laurance has likewise argued that Chateaudun’s “Paul au tombeau de Virginie” (Philadelphia: Carr, n. d.) was a covert reactionary work.

Besides establishing connections among Chateaudun’s songs, however, consideration of his musical style reveals its dissimilarity from the prevailing Anglo-American idiom. Philadelphia editions of English royalist laments by John Percy, John Stevenson, and Stephen Storace represent the London \textit{galant}. Meanwhile, Chateaudun’s music was rooted in the proto-


Romantic tradition of the postrevolutionary French romance. In addition to having antirepublican connotations, his laments departed from U.S. musical convention.

As we shall see, this is significant when investigating the publication history of “The Queen of France,” “Elegy,” and “Marian’s Complaint,” none of which is dated or displays a publisher name. Donald Krummel’s method of comparative graphic analysis resolves most of the ambiguities attending the bibliography of these songs, but musical style also factors in. Benjamin Carr made editorial changes to “Paul au tombeau de Virginie” that indicate discomfort with Chateaudun’s compositional choices. Although scholars have previously named Carr as the likely publisher of Chateaudun’s works, the Englishman’s revision of Chateaudun’s musical language is one of several considerations that point to a different primary engraver.

Carr’s mistrust of Chateaudun’s musical Frenchness was not, however, an isolated phenomenon. It represented a wider suspicion of Francophone refugee politics. Accustomed to Old-Regime privilege, St. Domingue’s exiled white elites were forced to adapt to humble circumstances in the United States. Some embraced republican ideals (or claimed to, at least), but others clung to vestiges of their former lives, and this was to many Americans a disconcerting prospect. For all their differences, however, the white refugee colonists were united in their opposition to French republican agents, both on the island and in the United States. This was the crux of their political survival, regardless of whether they declared themselves republicans.

Chateaudun’s songs represented different things to Francophone refugees and to the Anglo-Americans with whom they came into contact. What consoled the first group threatened the other. Though semantically void, the music of Chateaudun’s songs was suspect to certain
populations by virtue of its Frenchness. To conservative Anglophones it signaled an alien world
whose culture was hard to separate from its politics.

The Politics of St. Dominguian Exile in the United States

As seen in the last chapter, St. Dominguian refugees were greeted in United States with
efforts to administer their relief. As a Francophile initiative, this benevolence was tethered to
Republican politics, including the activities of the Democratic societies. In certain cases it
involved Edmond-Charles Genet and other French officials. But this situation should not obscure
the fact that many St. Dominguian emigrants were political antagonists of France. Newspapers
and other Philadelphian sources from the 1790s portray a struggle between St. Domingué’s
exiled elites and proponents of French republicanism. Given this reality, and given the hardships
that the white planters experienced as a result of the Haitian upheaval, it was only natural for
some Americans to suspect them of counterrevolutionary feeling.

This was true even if the same Americans also viewed the white refugees as victims.

Whereas the United States had celebrated the revolution in France, initially embracing the
European power as a republican ally, Americans took a dim view of the 1791 slave uprising in St.
Domingué. In certain respects the Haitian Revolution paralleled their own exertions in the name
of liberty, but the vast majority of white Americans were unprepared to endorse a black
insurgency. Rather than view St. Domingué’s rebels as political agents in their own right, U.S.
citizens preferred to see them as pawns in political games played by white elites. Americans
thus understood the insurrectionists as unwitting participants in a contest for power that unfolded between creole planters and French republican agents.\textsuperscript{165}

Although significant numbers of slaves, free blacks, and \textit{gens de couleur} migrated to the United States during the Haitian Revolution,\textsuperscript{166} it was the exiled white colonists who, by virtue of their comparative wealth and of their wrangling with French ambassadors, exerted the most influence on U.S. opinion. To begin with, however, they were at a disadvantage when compared to the Convention’s representatives. The Girondin leader Jacques Pierre Brissot de Warville had issued a compelling account of the 1791 uprising, which he blamed on the white colonists.

Addressing the National Assembly in Paris, he accused the planters of inciting the rebellion in order to further their own aristocratic interests:

This is not a revolt of blacks that you have solely to punish; it is a revolt of whites. The revolt of the blacks was only a means, an instrument in the hand of the whites who wanted, by freeing themselves from French dependency, to overcome laws that degraded their vanity and debts that hampered their taste for dissipation.\textsuperscript{167}

\textsuperscript{165} Ashli White sets forth this account of the Haitian Revolution’s U.S. reception in \textit{Encountering Revolution: Haiti and the Making of the Early Republic} (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010), pp. 87–123.


\textsuperscript{167} “Ce n’est pas une révolte de noirs que vous avez seulement à punir, c’est une révolte de blancs. La révolte de ces noirs n’a été qu’un moyen, qu’un instrument dans la main de ces blancs qui voulaient, en s’affranchissant de la dépendance française, s’affranchir des lois qui humiliaient leur vanité, et de ces dettes qui gênaient leur goût pour la dissipation.” Jacques Pierre Brissot de Warville, \textit{Discours de J.P. Brissot, Député, Sur les causes des troubles de Saint-Domingue, Prononcé à la Séance du premier Décembre 1791} (Paris: printed by order of the National Assembly, 1791), p. 4.
French officials applied a similar explanation to the June 1793 destruction of the Cap Français, which they attributed to the machinations of the island’s creole governor, Thomas-François Galbaud, and a coterie of prominent locals. To the chagrin of white St. Dominguans who fled Le Cap, Brissot’s interpretation gained traction in the United States. Many Americans sided with the French republicans, and were wary of counterrevolutionary factions. Nor did the ministers plenipotentiary Jean-Baptiste Ternant and Edmond-Charles Genet offer much help to the refugees. Relations were particularly strained between the exiles and Genet, who was Brissot’s agent. Upon fleeing to the United States, St. Domingue’s white colonists were received as both victims and scapegoats of the Haitian Revolution.

To court U.S. sympathy, the creoles countered the accusations of their metropolitan adversaries. Turning the tables on the French officials, they claimed to be the true inheritors of the revolutionary spirit. The Convention’s version of republicanism was corrupt, they asserted, and had ruined their once-prosperous island. In particular, the exiles targeted Étienne Polverel and Léger-Félicité Sonthonax, the civil commissioners who had come to St. Domingue in 1792. These agents had orders to check the power of local elites, tame hostilities between the colony’s racial groups, and enforce a recent decree granting legal rights to free men of color. The white colonists resented the commissioners. Under the guise of republicanism, the planters charged, Polverel and Sonthonax had instituted one despotic “negrophile” policy after another.168

---

168 Sonthonax declared an end to slavery in the northern province of St. Domingue on August 29, 1793.
Consider for example the rhetoric of the American Star, a Philadelphia newspaper published by the white St. Dominguan exile Claude-Clorentin Tanguy de la Boissière.\(^\text{169}\) The front page of its second issue carried this statement:

> A Portion of this journal is intended to be appropriated to the history of the French part of St. Domingo; its riches; the happiness of its Inhabitants, now elapsed as the phantom of a beautiful day; its trying calamities, which cannot be spoken of without compassion; and the natural, moral, and machivialian \(\text{sic}\) causes that produced them.\(^\text{170}\)

Noting that St. Domingue was currently under the jurisdiction of “the destroyers, Polverel and Sonthonax,” the paper asked readers to consider how the colony “has been able to thrive under the ancient arbitrary government,” and “how it is possible that \textit{ten months}, ten months \textit{only} of a Commissarial Government should be sufficient to convert the richest of the Antilles into a land of tears and poverty.” St. Domingue “might yet have been in its former state of splendour, but for those wicked principles which [the commissioners] held forth—those acts of tyranny which they exercised, and which have been sufficient to draw on and hasten its entire overthrow.”\(^\text{171}\)

The Star was no less stinging in its criticism of Genet. If the minister “had sent the French forces, which were at his disposal, to St. Domingo,” it contended, “he might have saved the remains of this rich colony.” Furthermore, “he might have sent Polverel, Sonthonax, Pinchinat, and Savary to keep company with Brissot,” who had been guillotined.\(^\text{172}\) The same article labeled Genet a “\textit{negrophile} minister,” complaining that he had mistreated Tanguy and

\(^{169}\) Prior to the American Star, Tanguy edited another Philadelphia paper, the \textit{Journal des Révolutions de la Partie Française de Saint-Domingue}. For a discussion of this publication see White, \textit{Encountering Revolution}, pp. 95–99.

\(^{170}\) “Island of Saint Domingo,” \textit{American Star}, February 4, 1794. The Star was printed in parallel French and English.

\(^{171}\) “French Saint Domingo,” \textit{American Star}, February 4, 1794.

\(^{172}\) “Information to the Mulattoes of St. Domingo, and to their powerful Protectors on the Continent,” \textit{American Star}, February 6, 1794. Brissot was executed at the Place de Révolution on October 31, 1793. Pierre Pinchinat and Joseph Savary were free men of color from St. Domingue. Polverel and Sonthonax appointed Pinchinat to the island’s Colonial Assembly. Savary served as an officer in the French army.
other white exiles while offering favors to their colored enemies. When a Republican newspaper printed a toast to “The persecuted citizen Genet,” writers for the Star scoffed. “We could hardly contain ourselves from laughing,” they wrote. “The persecuted Genet. Poor man! may his country recompense his honest zeal, as it recompensed that of his patron Brissot, is the sincere wish of all of us. AMEN.”

The colonists’ attacks on the commissioners were shrewd. They capitalized on Federalist aversion to the Jacobin regime while appealing to Republicans by portraying the French commissioners as tyrants. The planters leveraged Americans’ pride in being the first modern republicans and the guardians of a revolutionary heritage. No U.S. citizen wanted to see his nation’s principles usurped and perverted by a foreign power.

But the exiles’ condemnations of the French officials represented only one half of their political task. Disparaging Polverel, Sonthonax, and Genet was one thing; establishing their own republican credentials was another. Brissot had struck first with his denunciation of the colonists, and his account packed a lot of punch. Had the planters not lived aristocratically on the island? It was easy enough to believe that these ancien régime elites harbored antirevolutionary sentiment.

Still, the exiles tried to shake free of their pasts. As aristocrats they would have no stake in U.S. politics, nor could they expect any favors from the French government. As a matter of expediency, then, many pledged to be republicans. Tanguy, for instance, avowed that he and his fellow refugees were “French republicans, and friends to true equality.” Tanguy also soft-pedaled the community’s Catholicism, the better to earn American trust, and other exiles cited

their U.S. residence as evidence of republicanism.\textsuperscript{175} These were dubious ploys. It is unlikely that many of the displaced colonists were Huguenot descendants, as Tanguy claimed,\textsuperscript{176} and most exiles had fled the island out of sheer necessity.

Indeed, although some planters professed republicanism, others held to their old convictions. Many declared allegiance to the French crown when filing immigration documents, and this gave way to a 1794 scandal in which refugees allegedly held a funeral service for Louis XVI.\textsuperscript{177} For exiles trying to promote themselves as revolutionaries, this was bad press; it spurred dozens to sign a public declaration of republicanism.\textsuperscript{178} But try as they might to cast off their aristocratic backgrounds, such refugees could not deny that royalist sentiment endured in the exile community. In the eyes of many Americans, the former colonists of St. Domingue represented a legitimate threat to liberty, and this fear exhibited itself beyond the domain of politics as such.

**The U.S. Reception of French Musicality**

American suspicion of St. Dominguan exiles—and, more generally, of French exiles—was not always expressed in manifestly political terms. The trustworthiness of the emigrants was debated in government forums, to be sure,\textsuperscript{179} but it was also addressed in literary and journalistic venues, where refugee culture took center stage. In such accounts, it is possible to discern American anxiety about exiles’ aristocratic habits, which pointed back to the problems of royalism and anti-American feeling. It is noteworthy that, within refugee culture, music stood out as a marker of Old-Regime status. It represented a leisure-oriented lifestyle that in turn

\textsuperscript{175} White, *Encountering Revolution*, pp. 96 and 98.
\textsuperscript{176} Tanguy, “Proposals,” p. 1.
\textsuperscript{177} White, *Encountering Revolution*, pp 93.
\textsuperscript{179} White, *Encountering Revolution*, pp. 113–23.
signaled antirepublican ideals. U.S. commentary on emigrant musicality was thus bound up with political mistrust of the French.

For example, consider Charles Brockden Brown’s “Portrait of an Emigrant,” a magazine piece that the writer published in 1799. It relates an interview with a Philadelphia woman whose neighbors “escaped with difficulty to these shores in 1793.” She has observed them carefully. There is “a man of fair complexion, well formed, and of genteel appearance” and a woman who is “half negro.” We learn that

the lady was the heiress of a large estate in St. Domingo, that she spent her youth in France, where she received a polished education, and where she met her present companion, who was then in possession of rank and fortune, but whom the revolution has reduced to indigence.180

Making matters worse, “The insurrection in St. Domingo destroyed their property on that island,” whence they fled to Philadelphia.181

But despite their destitution, life for the emigrants is blithe. The man works less than three hours a day for a local merchant, while the woman “is an actress in Lailson’s pantomimes.”182 The couple sleeps in every morning and socializes each evening. “These people,” the neighbor says,

182 Lailson’s Circus opened in Philadelphia on April 11, 1797. Located at the northwest corner of Locust and Fifth streets, its premises were large, abutting the Walnut Street prison (to the west) and St. Thomas’ Church (to the north). The director was French, as were most of the performers, and the atmosphere was democratic by comparison with that of the Federalist-dominated Chestnut Street Theatre. In this respect Lailson’s Circus mimicked Ricketts’ Amphitheater, which had opened two years earlier, directly across the street from the New Theatre. In addition to pantomimes and farces, Lailson’s fare consisted of equestrian shows and the occasional French opera, such as Nicolas Dezède’s Blaise et Babet (1783) and Pierre-Alexandre Monsigny’s Le déserteur (1769). Lailson’s Circus did not survive past the end of the 1798 season, at which point the director returned to France. Thomas Pollock, The Philadelphia Theatre in the Eighteenth Century, Together with the Day Book of the Same Period (Philadelphia: University of
though exiles and strangers, and subsisting on scanty and precarious funds, move on smoothly and at ease. Household cares they know not. They breakfast upon bread and wine, without the ceremony of laying table, and arranging platters and cups. From the trouble of watching and directing servants they are equally exempt. Their cookery is performed abroad. Their clothes are washed in the same way. The lady knows no manual employment but the grateful one of purifying and embellishing her own person.\(^1\)\(^8\)\(^3\)

The emigrants are “Very happy.” Their “enjoyments are unquestionably great,” and this in the face of poverty, without a thought wasted on mundane chores. “No attention is paid to the house or furniture,” the neighbor insists. “As to rubbing tables, and sweeping and washing floors, these are never thought of. Their house is in a sad condition.”\(^1\)\(^8\)\(^4\)

Brown’s account is patronizing. He implores the reader, for instance, to “grow wise by the contemplation” of conduct that “scarcely produces any intermission of recreation and enjoyment.”\(^1\)\(^8\)\(^5\) He feigns admiration for the emigrants’ adherence to a labor-free existence, even when stripped of the material supports of privilege. And for Brown, significantly, there was no better symbol of this quasi-aristocratic lifestyle than music, which his brief “Portrait” mentions half a dozen times. Being an actress, the woman is “a capital performer and singer.” During the day she “sings without intermission, or plays on a guitar.” When the man returns from work he “takes out his flute, on which he is very skillful; and the woman either sings or plays in concert till evening approaches.” The happiness of the couple is bound up with music.

\(^1\)\(^8\)\(^3\) Brown, “Portrait,” 163.
\(^1\)\(^8\)\(^4\) Ibid., 162.
\(^1\)\(^8\)\(^5\) Ibid., 163–64.
Despite their troubles and above all else, they have retained “their propensity to talk, laugh and sing—their flute and their guitar.”

Although Brown’s letter stereotypes the emigrants, portraying them as hedonists, it is accurate in certain respects. Most exiles had been wealthy but took little with them to the United States. Their property was difficult to move, if it had not been confiscated or destroyed, but musical skill and memory were mobile. Amid the trials of exile, these assets offered a vital connection to home. Suffering material losses and the deaths of friends and family, exiles strove to maintain semblances of their former lives, and music was one means of doing so.

Whereas the keyboard was the instrument of choice for locals of means, however, emigrants relied on more portable ones. For instance, John Fanning Watson’s *Annals of Philadelphia* relates that in the mid-1790s “Instrumental music abounded in the city everywhere, by day as well as by night, from French gentlemen, (may be) amateurs, on the hautboy, violin and clarionet, exquisitely played.” At the same time, Philadelphia’s boarding houses were “filled with colonial French to the garret windows, whistling and jumping about, fiddling and singing, as fancy seemed to suggest, like so many crickets and grasshoppers.” The refined playing of the gentlemen, probably Parisian émigrés, contrasted with the noisy creole frolicking, but the end effect was the same: the Francophone diaspora was conspicuously musical.

For many exiles, in fact, music represented more than a pastime. It was a livelihood. The Moreau de St. Méry, who ran a Philadelphia bookstore from 1794 to 1798, remarked in his memoirs that “Most of the musicians of the [Chestnut Street Theatre] orchestra are Frenchmen,

---

186 Brown, “Portrait,” 162–63. In a possible musical allusion, Brown names the male emigrant “de Lisle” (164). He may have intended to highlight the fact that the man was “of the island,” but the moniker also calls to mind the composer of “La Marseillaise.”

enabled to exist by this means."\(^{188}\) The same was no doubt true of the bands at Ricketts’ and Lailson’s circuses, venues that were more welcoming to the French. Yet although the city employed a corps of French musicians, its theater- and concert-goers did not necessarily sympathize with the emigrants. At a 1793 benefit concert, the New Theatre actress Mary Pownall presented an “Address in Behalf of the French Musicians,” in which she solicited relief for orchestra members. Judging from her remarks, it was not easy to persuade her patrons of the musicians’ virtue. She put forward several arguments (in poetic form) for “the cause of exiled merit.” One of her stanzas shamed the audience by reminding it of French aid during the War of Independence:

What say you Sirs;—but put it to the vote,
You can’t see \textit{Genius} in a thread-bare coat.
Shall it be said, \textit{Columbia’s} Sons forgot
That \textit{Frenchmen} in their cause once bravely fought?\(^{189}\)

Other verses assured Philadelphians that the emigrants were worse off than they appeared:

Though modest shame forbids them tell their tale,
Though o’er their poverty she draws the veil;
Yet did I paint the sorrows of \textit{those few},
With pity’s tear wou’d many a cheek bedew.
[. . .]
Say you’ll relieve them, else this little Troop,
Dear as they lov’t, must give up Beef and Soup.
I freely own it puzzles me to tell,
How they can here acquit Themselves so well.
You may believe me, for as I’m a Sinner,
I cou’d not Sing, if I had eat no Dinner.
And these, however gay they try t’appear,
Certainly feel a monstrous craving \textit{Here}.\(^{190}\)


\(^{189}\) Mary Wrighten Pownall, \textit{Mrs. Pownall’s Address in Behalf of the French Musicians, Delivered on Her Benefit Concert Night, at Oeller’s Hotel, Chestnut-street, Philadelphia. To Which Are Added, Pastoral Songs, Written by Herself at an Early Period of Life} (Philadelphia: Story, [1793]), p. 2.

\(^{190}\) Ibid., 2 and 3.
Pownall had to convince her audience that the exiles’ situation warranted charity. She had to counter the prevailing assessment, evident in Brown’s and Watson’s accounts, of the emigrants as shiftless and unproductive.

Pownall’s defense of the orchestra members focused on their moral character, but this was bound up with their political orientation. Though evident in the cultural realm, U.S. suspicion of the Francophone community was rooted in an assumption that the exiles harbored antirevolutionary views. In fact, Pownall’s apologetics resemble those of refugee colonists who claimed republican allegiance. French music-making was tantamount to vice because it represented Old-Regime privilege. Convincing the U.S. public otherwise was an uphill struggle, whether undertaken by an Anglo-American singer or by the planters themselves.

***

As a St. Dominguan merchant turned Philadelphian musician, Renaud de Chateaudun was a likely object of American mistrust. Though not an aristocrat in the strict sense, he had been wealthy and represented the kind of emigrant portrayed in Brown’s and Watson’s texts. Indeed, had he fled the Caribbean sooner, he might have been among the band members endorsed by Pownall. But unlike some exiles, Chateaudun did not attempt to position himself as a republican. On the contrary, judging from his extant music, the composer stayed close to his roots. The one openly political work that he published, “The Queen of France to Her

---

191 Laurance has suggested that Chateaudun was a “moderate constitutional monarchist” rather than a genuine counterrevolutionary (“French Vocal Romance,” 155). It is true that prominent émigrés like La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt and Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord initially supported the French Revolution, as did Asylum’s founders, Noailles and Talon. They were liberal by comparison with other French nobles, who defected to enemy nations and took up arms against the French republic. It is not advisable, however, to conflate the views of France’s metropolitan and colonial emigrants. Although they shared the experience of exile in the United States, they represented competing interests. While no sources suggest that Chateaudun was a militant royalist, neither do they confirm his liberalism. What is evident is that he looked unfavorably on the demise of the French monarchy. For more on the moderate political orientation of France’s more illustrious American exiles, see Allan Potofsky, “The ‘Non-Aligned
Children,” was, as noted, a royalist lament. Yet in addition to his St. Dominguan past and the words of this particular song, Chateaudun’s musical style was suspect by U.S. standards. External to the prevailing Anglo-American idiom, it represented cultivated traditions of the northern European continent, modeling a maligned Old-World culture.

The Music of Chateaudun’s Laments

Most printed American secular songs of the late eighteenth century represented London’s predilection for the Italianate galant. Their melodies are unassuming, predictably phrased, and lightly accompanied. Intended for the amateur, they emphasize clarity, simplicity, and a universal pleasantness that leaves little room for the expression of contrasting moods. In this they differ from contemporary Franco-Germanic songs, particularly those in the related traditions of Sturm und Drang and the postrevolutionary romance. These reflect varied and intense emotions. They exploit chromatic harmony, dissonance, dynamic contrasts, mode mixture, and registral extremes, along with diversified accompaniments and vocal declamation, to make music correspond to unstable subjective states.

When it comes to vocal laments printed in Philadelphia at the end of the eighteenth century, both the Anglo-Italian and Franco-Germanic paradigms are evident. John Stevenson’s “Louis XVI Lamentation” exemplifies the London galant, as do Stephen Storace’s “Captive” and John Percy’s “Maria Antoinette’s Complaint.” Meanwhile, Chateaudun’s “Queen of France,” “Elegy,” and “Marian’s Complaint” represent the northern Continental model, even though Chateaudun (like Stevenson, Storace, and Percy) chose British poems for his texts.192

---

192 Chateaudun selected poems by Peter Pindar, which was the nom de plume of John Wolcot (1738–1819). Two of these, “The Queen of France” and “Marian’s Complaint,” he may have found in the Pindariana, a collection that Benjamin Franklin Bache published in an unauthorized Philadelphia edition in...
Although “The Queen of France” is his only overtly royalist work—“Elegy” mourns the passing of the British writer Mary Robinson (1757–1800) and “Marian’s Complaint” is a pastoral meditation on lost love—Chateaudun consistently joined a turbulent musical discourse to a disconsolate poetic one, and this habit appears to have stemmed from his political misfortune. For instance, as Laurance has noted, Chateaudun quoted Dussek’s *Sufferings of the Queen of France* in the prelude to his vocal romance, “Paul au tombeau de Virginie.” The allusion is hard to mistake (Exs. 1a and 1b), and Laurance argues that it turned Paul’s sorrowful response to the drowning of his beloved into an oblique tribute to Marie-Antoinette.¹⁹³

Example 3.1a
Dussek, *Tableau de la situation de Marie-Antoinette* (Amsterdam: Kuntze, 1794), mm. 1–2

Example 3.1b
Chateaudun, “Paul au tombeau de Virginie” (Philadelphia: Carr, n. d.), mm. 1–2


1794. I have yet to identify a U.S. source containing Wolcot’s “Elegy on the Death of Mrs. Robinson.” The author of Percy’s text is unknown, that of Stevenson’s was Walley Chamberlain, and that of Storace’s was Reverend Jeans. Bache’s possible connection to the songs is intriguing, given that he was an avid Republican. The *Pindariana* was a large, multi-faceted collection, and Wolcot was popular in America for his criticism of the British government. Evidently Bache and Chateaudun turned to Wolcot for contrasting political purposes, which the poet’s work was versatile enough to accommodate.
It is curious that Laurance does not mention “The Queen of France,” because it would concretize the political views that she ascribes to Chateaudun. In light of “The Queen of France,” and given the precedent set by “Paul au tombeau,” it is reasonable to assume that Chateaudun’s “Elegy” and “Marian’s Complaint” were clandestine reactionary works. After all, Chateaudun lived among a group of Pennsylvania settlers who had hoped to rescue Antoinette from Paris. The queen’s death dashed exile hopes at Asylum, representing a triumph for the forces that had expelled them from their homes. For Chateaudun and his peers, lament was naturally associated with the demise of the French monarchs, and it provided an outlet for general feelings of loss and dislocation that characterized the refugee experience.

Beyond their poetic similarity as laments, however, “The Queen of France,” “Elegy,” and “Marian’s Complaint” cohere in terms of their musical form and style. In so doing, they differ from royalist laments by English composers. This contrast is borne out primarily in the relationship of music to text, and in the manner of the songs’ accompaniment.

Philadelphia’s English Royalist Laments

Though not entirely uniform in style, Stevenson’s “Louis XVI Lamentation,” Storace’s “Captivity,” and Percy’s “Maria Antoinette’s Complaint” all represent the galant. Despite their grim subject matter, they represent grief in much the same way as an aria like “Che farò senza Euridice,” the notoriously dissociative number from Christoph Willibald Gluck’s Orfeo. They are written in major keys, contain mostly diatonic harmony, and make limited use of expressive dissonance. Moreover, they are easy to perform. Carr printed only the words and melody of Stevenson’s song, and the Percy and Storace laments appear in simple arrangements for voice.

---

194 Murray, Azilum, pp. 8–10.
and keyboard. The accompanist’s right hand doubles the melody, and the left hand is primarily monophonic. The amateur could thus accompany him- or herself with ease.

At the same time, however, these songs contain emotive gestures, some more so than others. Of the three, “Louis XVI Lamentation” is the most Italianate. It shows little evidence of the king’s anguish as he faces execution. Presented in the key of G major, its melody is triadic and features sprightly dotted rhythms (Ex. 3.2). Despite being labeled espressivo and affettuoso, the song shows minimal dramatic impulse. Its emotive details are limited to a few melismas (mm. 7, 16, and 17) that enhance the urgency of Louis’ pleading, and to a chromatic inflection in the final phrase (mm. 16–17), which has a similar effect. The nearest thing to expressive dissonance is found on the words “grave” and “grieve” (mm. 4 and 12), which coincide with implied cadential six-four progressions.

Example 3.2
Example 3.2 continued

2
Ye vain ambitious who delight
In idle pomp and state,
Behold alas my dismal plight,
And mourn a monarch’s fate.
What homage did my subjects pay
When Louis king was made?
’Twas then their pleasure to obey,
Who now must be obeyed.

3
My friends alas become my foes,
For loyalty’s no more;
I’m judg’d, accus’d, condemn’d by those
Who sought my smiles before.
Oh false and flatter’ring world adieu,
How vain, vexatious all;
’Tis thee, my wife—my children, you
Who cause these tears to fall.

The music of Storace’s “Captivity” is more responsive to its text. The song is set in E-flat major, and the lean accompaniment during its first one and a half measures depicts Antoinette’s solitude—the singer is alone (Ex. 3.3). Subsequently, occasional chromaticism and dissonance convey the queen’s despondence. Beginning on beat three of measure nine, for instance, the left hand descends by semitone from B-flat to G, as Antoinette complains of being a “Victim of anguish.” Earlier, in measure three, there is a suspension when she laments that her friends are “fled,” and, on the first half of beat two in measure six, a grating minor ninth sounds as she prays for her “unprotected” head.

But Storace saves his most dramatic effects for last. In measure fourteen, the singer ascends to her highest note, an A above the treble staff, while the keyboard descends to a low F. This contrary motion propels the phrase towards a drawn-out and ornamented suspension on the word “care,” at which point the meter dissolves, mirroring Antoinette’s degeneration. After a brief ad libitum passage, the word “sad” is assigned a tritone before resolving to the subdominant. In the postlude, the right hand then plays a melancholic descending line.
Example 3.3
Stephen Storace, “Captivity” (Philadelphia: Carr, [1793])

My foes prevail, my friends are fled. These suppliant hands to Heav'n I spread. Heav'n guard my unprotected head, amid this sad, sad captivity. Victim of anguish and despair, how grief has chang'd thy flowing hair,* how wan thy wasted cheek with care, amid this sad, this sad captivity.

* The hair of this once lovely woman was of a bright flaxen color, but three years of sorrow have brought on a premature old age. Antoinette is now grey-headed, wan, and wrinkled.
Example 3.3 continued

Like Storace’s treatment of the suffering of the French queen, Percy’s “Maria Antoinette’s Complaint” has affecting moments. Conceived for orchestra, it employs an even wider range of expressive devices, which remain evident in the arrangement for voice and keyboard. In measure seven, for instance, there is an appoggiatura at the onset of the word “anguish” (Ex. 3.4), and in measure thirty the singer ascends a chromatic tritone at the mention of her fevered brain. Finally, when Antoinette sings of joining Louis in the afterlife in measure fifty-three, a melisma reflects her momentary exuberance. Having more dissonant than consonant notes, however, this brief flourish does not transcend her pathos.
Example 3.4
John Percy, “Maria Antoinette’s Complaint” (Philadelphia: Willig, [c. 1800])

hush my soul, for heav’n prepare; inur’d to anguish learn to bear. Thy

silent agony is known, where mercy’s tears begem the throne, begem the throne.
Example 3.4 continued

wild despair, whose echo round the weeping dome, responsive

warns the sufferer home, whose echo round the weeping
dome, responsive warns the sufferer home.

I come, I come, be

calm my fever'd brain.

I will not now com-
Example 3.4 continued

plain. Ill fat-ed queen, it seems to say, thy decrease in time until the second verse begins

drows wash thy crimes a-way. Thy saint-ed lord still wears a crown. Oh,
haste to share his pure re-nown, his pure re-nown.

I come, bright saint, but if de-creed, dis-tract-ing

thought, these babes must bleed, to-ge-ther may we take our
Example 3.4 continued

Percy enlists further parameters to portray his text. In measure nineteen, for example, the word “weeping” arrives at the peak of a crescendo, where he assigns it a fully diminished seventh chord. And, in the interlude between verses one and two (mm. 26–34), Percy varies the tempo and the singer’s declamation in accordance with the narrative context. Here the text comprises a turning point, as Antoinette becomes resigned to her fate: “I come, I come / be calm my fever’d brain / I will not now complain.” Percy prepares for this by slowing the pace to lento in measure twenty-four, and then he marks the presentation of the text as recitative (mm. 29–33), signaling its dramatic importance.
The music of “Maria Antoinette’s Complaint” resembles Storace’s “Captivity,” and both songs are more responsive to their texts than Stevenson’s “Lamentation.” They test the limits of the Italianate model. But even at their most emotive, Philadelphia’s English royalist laments do not approach the more daring expressive world of comparable songs from the Franco-Germanic mainland, where the threat of revolutionary violence was keenly felt.

*The Postrevolutionary French Romance*

After waning during the early 1790s, the French vocal *romance* experienced a resurgence following the Terror, albeit in a form different from the one it had taken before the Revolution. Advocated by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, the early *romance* was known for its simplicity and bucolic charm. It naïvely related comic and sentimental tales from the distant past. In the latter half of the 1790s, however, French *romances* began to reflect the turmoil of the revolutionary era. They continued to be relatively simple strophic songs composed as amateur entertainments and as numbers in *opéras comiques*, but their musical language became graver and more sophisticated. Their accompaniments grew more expressive, and they drew on the *Sturm und Drang* movement in order to convey bleaker subjects.195

During the Thermidorian Reaction, it became safe for French composers to express dissatisfaction with the republican government that had come to power in 1792. For instance,

---

195 On the postrevolutionary transformation of the French *romance* see Henri Gougelot, *La romance française sous la Révolution et l’Empire: étude historique et critique* (Melun: Librairie d’Argences, 1938). Gougelot reviews the genre’s prerevolutionary history before detailing its literary and musical characteristics from 1789 to 1815. On the transmission of the *romance* to the German-speaking lands, see David Ossenkop, “The Earliest Settings of German Ballads for Voice and Clavier” (PhD diss., Columbia University, 1968), pp. 150–79 and 529–41. French absorption of Austro-German culture is evident in *romances* like Louis-Emmanuel Jadin’s “Mort de Werther” (1796), and in a more general affinity between the postrevolutionary *romance* and vocal works by *Sturm und Drang* composers like Johann Rudolf Zumsteeg (1760–1802). Although Zumsteeg cultivated the ballad in addition to the strophic lied and Romanze, his bold expressive language, particularly its rich harmonic palette, was related to that of the later *romance*. For an example, see his posthumously published “La jeune fille et la rose (Das Mädchen und die Rose),” *Kleine Balladen und Lieder*, vol. 7 (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1805), pp. 29–36.
Martin Joseph Adrien (1767–1822), a Flemish musician known in Paris as Adrien l’aîné, published a romance based on a text by Nicolas Montjourdain, a commander in the French revolutionary army who had been imprisoned at the Conciergerie. Along with word painting, the “Complainte de Montjourdain” (1795) features a brooding keyboard part replete with dynamic and articulation markings. The end of the opening strophe serves as an example. Condemned to death, Montjourdain cries, “Ah! je dois regretter la vie.” Adrien renders the initial exclamation vividly, assigning it dynamic, melodic, and rhythmic accents (Ex. 3.5). This occurs on the subdominant, whence Adrien moves to an incomplete applied diminished chord before arriving on the dominant. Meanwhile, syncopation heightens the tension in both the vocal and keyboard parts. The composer saves his most striking idea, however, for the word “vie.” The singer sustains the first syllable for a full measure, while underneath the keyboard slips downward chromatically. To all of this Adrien applies the direction smorzando, indicating that the voice and keyboard are to slow and decrescendo in tandem. Montjourdain’s “life” thus ebbs away. Afterwards, the keyboard repeats an idea that first appears in the prelude. A syncopated fortissimo tonic chord gives way to a piano subdominant, but the fifth of the tonic (an E) is suspended, generating an affective dissonance in relation to the D minor sonority. Such grimly evocative music is uncharacteristic of the prerevolutionary romance, and it likewise surpasses the intensity of expression seen in Philadelphia’s English royalist laments.
But the “Complainte de Montjournain” was not a true royalist lament. It bemoaned the Terror’s extremism, yet it did not convey nostalgia for the ancien régime. Under the Directory one could safely espouse moderate republicanism, but open expression of royalist sentiment had to wait for the coup of Brumaire—the Consulate and then the Empire. The postrevolutionary royalist romance is thus exemplified by the Cimitière de la Madeleine (1801), a collection with words by Jean-Joseph Regnault-Warin (1773–1844) and music by an obscure composer, C. D’Ennery. Madeleine Cemetery was one of four Parisian interment sites used to dispose of guillotine victims, and the king and queen were among those rumored to have been buried there. D’Ennery’s collection contains three works: (1) “Le lys et la rose” sets the scene with a poetic rumination on the cemetery’s flora; (2) “Marie Stuart” narrates the misfortunes of
this sixteenth-century monarch, drawing an implicit parallel between her fate and that of the French queen; and (3) “Romance de Marie-Antoinette” makes the royalism of the collection explicit, presenting a sorrowful meditation from the perspective of Louis’ widow.

Figure 3.1
D’Ennery, Romances du Cimetières de la Madeleine (Paris: Momigny, [1801]), cover page
Reprinted in Gouglelot, La romance française sous la Révolution et l’Empire: choix de textes musicaux (Melun: Librairie d’Argences, 1943), p. 113
Unlike “Le lys et la rose,” “Marie Stuart” and “Marie-Antoinette” are laments properly called, and they evince the same grave feeling as Adrien’s “Complainte.” The prelude to “Marie Stuart,” for instance, is disquieting. It opens with a broad, fortissimo E-minor chord in the keyboard’s lower register (Ex. 3.6). This is followed by a contrasting piano progression in the treble range, which concludes with a deceptive cadence. Adopting the submediant as a new tonic, D’Ennery then repeats the three-measure phrase in C major, arriving at A minor. A gravelly fortissimo A-minor chord then gives way to a gentle yet agonizing two-measure phrase, the downbeats of which are laden with suspensions. This unit is repeated at a lower octave and dynamic level to finish the prelude. With its minor-mode context and liberal use of dissonance, along with its registral and dynamic contrasts, this keyboard passage takes the listener on a troubling journey even before the voice enters.\(^{196}\)

Example 3.6
D’Ennery, “Marie Stuart” (Paris: Momigny, [1801]), mm. 1–12

\(^{196}\) The debt of laments in the French vocal romance tradition to the instrumental genre of the tombeau is evident in this prelude. Points of overlap include the commemoration of a deceased historical figure, a close relationship to literature, and the use of lute mannerisms. The tombeau must have influenced the conception of Chateaudun’s “Paul au tombeau de Virginie,” along with related works including Jean-Frédéric-Auguste Lemièr de Corvey’s “Le chevalier au tombeau de son amie.” Lemière (1771–1832) composed “Le tombeau de Mirabeau, le patriote” (c. 1791), the only known example of a tombeau honoring a French revolutionary leader.
Though written in a major key (E-flat), D’Ennery’s “Romance de Marie-Antoinette” is similarly emotive. Consider first the harmonic twist that he introduces at the mention of “le tourment.” The phrase begins in measure fifteen as a garden-variety consequent: the listener expects to reach the tonic in measure eighteen, counterbalancing the half cadence in measure fourteen (Ex. 3.7). But in measure seventeen D’Ennery veers toward the chromatic mediant. The subsequent arrival on G major depicts Antoinette’s unsettled state, and this is an effect solely of the unanticipated modulation—there is not a non-chord-tone, syncopation, or minor chord in sight.

Example 3.7
D’Ennery, “Romance de Marie-Antoinette” (Paris: Momigny, [1801]), mm. 11–18

The song’s climactic phrase is similar. The first two lines of the opening stanza pose questions (“Oh! Qui peut calmer de ma vie et les regrets et le torment? / Qui peut dans mon âme flétrie faire éclore un doux sentiment?”) that the third line answers (“C’est toi, c’est toi, dont l’image adorée vit et respire dans mon cœur”). This last sentence, and in particular the exclamation “C’est toi,” which refers to Louis XVI, represents the emotional core of the song. D’Ennery sets it high in the singer’s range, sets the dynamic at forte, and supports it with thick chords in the accompaniment (Ex. 3.8). He also chromatically intensifies parts of the phrase,
emphasizing the arrival at “toi” in measure twenty-eight by tonicizing it, and diverting the remainder of this progression from an expected cadence in E-flat by setting the word “adorée” to a half cadence in F minor. Like the harmonic detour in the “tourment” passage, this one conveys the queen’s internal sense of dislocation. Unlike the earlier phrase, however, this one also exploits melodic dissonance. The accented passing tone on beat one of measure twenty-nine is particularly affecting, as it forms a tritone in relation to the root of the chord.

Example 3.8
D’Ennery, “Romance de Marie-Antoinette” (Paris: Momigny, [1801]), mm. 27–30

In their departure from the rustic sentimentality of the prerevolutionary romance, works like Adrien’s “Complainte de Montjouardain” and D’Ennery’s Cimitière de la Madeleine also distanced themselves from the expressive neutrality of laments in the galant idiom. The Rousseauan romance shared its naïve charm with English songs like Stevenson’s “Louis XVI Lamentation,” Storace’s “Captivity,” and Percy’s “The Captive.” But Adrien and D’Ennery embraced an aesthetic that reflected recent upheaval. Because Chateaudun was personally afflicted by revolutionary events, it is hardly surprising that his songs represent the musical language of the later romance.
The Expressive Manner of Chateaudun’s Laments

Although they are not romances in the traditional sense, “The Queen of France,” “Elegy,” and “Marian’s Complaint” have much in common with this genre. Indeed, their expressive manner correlates with that of Adrien’s “Complainte” and D’Ennery’s “Marie Stuart” and “Marie-Antoinette.” They are in minor keys, they are replete with chromatic inflections, non-chord-tones, and diminished seventh chords, and they make expressive use of altered harmonies such as augmented-sixth and Neapolitan chords. Additionally, Chateaudun’s music is harder to perform than that of the English composers. In Storace’s and Percy’s songs the accompaniment is as simple as possible, so that the performer can easily sing while playing it. In Chateaudun’s works, however, the accompaniment is independent of the voice, serving in its own expressive capacity. In the manner of the postrevolutionary romance, his songs place greater demands on the performer.

197 Although the romance was an important French musical genre for roughly a century (1750–1850), it is not easily defined. Romances were composed for both professional and amateur venues, and their texts display a variety of subjects (historical, pastoral, sentimental), modes of presentation (narrative, dramatic, lyric) and poetic forms. Indeed, their principal characteristic—that they consist of strophically set stanzaic French verse—hardly distinguishes them from other varieties of song. In the case of Chateaudun’s publications, only his Six romances nouvelles represent the genre as historically defined, a distinction owed to the language of their texts and to the mere appellation romances. Had “The Queen of France,” “Elegy,” and “Marian’s Complaint” been written in French and titled appropriately, they would be indistinguishable from romances. Gougelot, La romance française, 21–106; “Romanz / romance / Romane,” Handwörterbuch der musikalischen Terminologie, vol. 5, edited by Hans Eggebrecht (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1972–2005).

198 There is, however, one noteworthy difference. The Six romances were published “avec accompagnement de Harpe ou de Piano,” whereas no similar indication was given for “The Queen of France,” “Elegy,” or “Marian’s Complaint.” It was conventional to specify that romance accompaniments could be performed on the harp, but this was rarely reflected in the music as such. Composers and printers appealed to the popularity of the harp among French amateur musicians of the late eighteenth century, but for all intents and purposes the accompaniments remained idiomatic to the keyboard, which was more widely used. Henri Gougelot, La romance française sous la Révolution et l’Empire: choix de textes musicaux (Melun: Librairie d’Argences, 1943); Hans Joachim Zingel, “Studien zur Geschichte des Harfenspiels in klassicher und romantischer Zeit,” Archiv für Musikforschung 2 (1937): 455–65.
Of the three Chateaudun works to be considered, “The Queen of France” is the most impassioned. Although its style is similar to that of his “Elegy” and “Marian’s Complaint,” it is clear that the composer invested his one explicitly royalist lament with special emotion, and it therefore serves here as a point of departure. The political tumult of the 1790s uprooted Chateaudun from his home, and although he became resigned to the career of a professional Philadelphian musician, this compared poorly to the life he had once enjoyed as a wealthy merchant. In this song, Chateaudun appears to have projected his own misfortune onto that of Antoinette. The music features extreme dynamic contrasts, including several abrupt fortissimos that coincide with diminished-seventh chords (Ex. 3.9, mm. 12, 13, 15, and 23), and a related moment occurs in measure twenty, where a Neapolitan harmony accompanies the fortissimo marking. Here an appoggiatura adds urgency, and similar non-chord-tones are found at the end of every other vocal phrase (mm. 6, 8, 10, 12, 16, 18, 22, and 25). Of these dissonances, the most substantial is the minor-ninth appoggiatura on “woe” in measure eighteen. Chromatic inflections in the prelude and postlude (mm. 3 and 26) also contribute to an unsettled atmosphere, as does the insistent pulse of the eighth-note chords in the accompaniment.

And yet the mood of the song is not entirely uniform. The music represents an overall state of distress while accommodating contrasting emotion. Witness the mention of “smiles,” which inspires a turn to the relative major. In measure nine, the word is set to a second-inversion dominant seventh harmony, which progresses through an applied dominant to arrive at A minor in measure ten. Here, on the pivot chord that gives way to a first-inversion D dominant-seventh and eventually to G major, “smiles” is repeated. This detour is interrupted at the end of measure twelve, however, offering only a short reprieve from the prevailing melancholia.
Example 3.9
Chateaudun, “The Queen of France to Her Children Just Before Her Execution” (n. p., n. d.)

From my prison with joy could I go,

and with
Example 3.9 continued
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smiles, with smiles meet the savage decree,

were it only to sleep from my woe,

from my woe, since the grave holds no terrors for me, since the
“Elegy on the Death of Mrs. Robinson” does not exhibit the same degree of emotional investment as “The Queen of France,” but it fits nevertheless within the same expressive paradigm. Though not as frequent, its use of diminished seventh chords is noteworthy (Ex. 3.10, mm. 19, 25, and 28), as is its use of melodic dissonance at phrase endings (mm. 6, 10, 12, and 30). The minor ninths that occur between the voice and accompaniment in the anacruses to
measures five and nine are affecting, and they set the tone for the remainder of the song.

Indeed, although it lacks certain expressive details, such as the dynamic fluctuations that enliven “The Queen of France,” Chateaudun’s “Elegy” creates a mournful atmosphere through devices like the chromatic descent in measure thirty-one and the subsequent suspension, in the final measure, of the dominant seventh against the tonic.

Example 3.10
Chateaudun, “Elegy on the Death of Mrs. Robinson” (n. p., n. d.)
Example 3.10 continued

From these with a tear I de-

part, with a tear I de-part, I de-part, where

pleasure so of-ten was mine, where plea- sure, where plea - sure so
In terms of its affective quality, “Marian’s Complaint” is of a piece with the “Elegy.” Though not as dramatic as “The Queen of France,” it is written in a dark key, F minor, and contains boldly expressive moments. The first of these occurs in measures thirteen through sixteen, where Marian bids “adieu” to “the cheerful pipe and song,” symbols of the shepherd Colin’s faithfulness to her (Ex. 3.11). While the shepherdess strains to reach high Fs, Gs, and A-flats, the accompaniment ascends chromatically from a first-inversion tonic, through a second-inversion fully diminished seventh and an applied fully diminished seventh, to the dominant. The high tessitura, combined with this tense harmonic progression and open cadence, generates a sense of yearning.

When setting the last line of the stanza, Chateaudun creates a related effect by postponing the final cadence. We first expect an authentic cadence on “May” in measure thirty-two, where we arrive instead at the dominant. Then the final line is repeated, and Chateaudun heightens our anticipation of the tonic with a cadential six-four progression in measure thirty-
five. This gives way, however, to a diminished seventh chord, which is prolonged for two measures before resulting in an avoided cadence. Finally, the text is partially repeated once more, and a perfect authentic cadence is achieved on the first beat of measure forty.

Example 3.11
Chateaudun, “Marian’s Complaint” (n. p., n. d.)
Example 3.11 continued

“Marian’s Complaint” also evokes suffering through its use of melodic chromaticism (mm. 7, 21, 23, and 43). This is especially evident in measure twenty-one, where a cross-relation results between the treble and bass. Like Chateaudun’s “Queen of France” and “Elegy,” this work displays proto-Romantic characteristics.
The Formal Congruity of Chateaudun’s Laments

Besides displaying uniformity in their expressive manner, Chateaudun’s laments are consistent in terms of their formal planning. In large part this stems from the similarity of their texts, all of which consist of either octo- or nona-syllabic quatrains. The music parses analogously in each song, in accordance with the design of Wolcot’s poems. This is especially true in the case of “The Queen of France” and “Elegy,” which are nearly identical in their organization, but it is also evident in “Marian’s Complaint.”

Wolcot’s “Queen of France” and “Elegy” are both in anapestic trimeter, although the latter is catalectic—one weak syllable is subtracted from the beginning of each line. Each line of “The Queen of France” thus has nine syllables, whereas each line of the “Elegy” has eight. But this has minimal effect on Chateaudun’s settings, both of which are in duple meter.

Chateaudun’s musical framing of these stanzas, along with his melodic and harmonic treatment of each poetic line, is the same between the two songs (Table 3.1). Each begins with a four-measure prelude based on the opening vocal phrase (A). The prelude and first line of text establish the tonic, after which the second line carries new melodic material (B) and modulates to the relative major. This concludes the first couplet, and a brief interlude ensues. In “The Queen of France” this emphasizes the dominant, whereas in the “Elegy” it reaffirms the relative major. When the text resumes it is assigned a third melodic phrase (C), which builds to a climactic cadence—reached by way of an augmented sixth chord—on the dominant. Though considerably longer in the “Elegy” than in “The Queen of France,” this phrase has the same harmonic result. Following a fermata, the fourth line of text commences, bringing with it a melodic return (A¹). This phrase concludes on the tonic, and is followed by a brief postlude.
Table 3.1
Form of Chateaudun’s “Queen of France” and “Elegy”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Melody</th>
<th>Harmony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1–4</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>A-based</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9–12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–14</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>V / III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–18 / 15–22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>(+6) V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19–25 / 23–30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–27 / 31–32</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The poetic form of Wolcot’s “Marian’s Complaint” differs from that of the “The Queen of France” and “Elegy,” and so consequently does Chateaudun’s musical treatment. This time the text is in iambic tetrameter, and the composer sets it in triple meter. And there are further differences: the prelude and interlude are longer, the third line of the text cadences in the tonic instead of on the dominant, and the A material does not return (Table 3.2). But despite these incongruities the overall form of “Marian’s Complaint” is similar to that of “The Queen of France” and “Elegy.” All three songs have the same basic musical shape.

Table 3.2
Form of Chateaudun’s “Marian’s Complaint”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Melody</th>
<th>Harmony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1–8</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>A-based</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9–12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>V, III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–24</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29–40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–44</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to their stylistic congruity, the formal identity of these songs supports the sense of them functioning as a unit. Their music reinforces the common character of their
texts—all are laments that reflect Chateaudun’s political misfortune. Whereas his adaptation of “The Queen of France” does so explicitly and with the least emotional restraint, his “Elegy” and “Marian’s Complaint” do so more discreetly. “The Queen of France” is echoed in the affective manner and musicopoetic structure of the other two songs, and it therefore appears that Chateaudun conceived this trio of laments together. As in Laurance’s assessment of “Paul au tombeau de Virginie,” his “Elegy” and “Marian’s Complaint” covertly represent the sorrows of exile.

Beyond their affective and formal unity, however, there is a further connection between these laments that remains to be explored. This has to do not with their words or music, but rather with the medium in which these were conveyed. As printed objects, Chateaudun’s songs initially present an unclear history, and one purpose of what follows is to set for them a more precise chronology. But lest this seem like a merely technical excursion, the bibliographic analysis of Chateaudun’s laments has important interpretive consequences. Close comparison of multiple editions of “Paul au tombeau” suggests that the normative status of English lament required adjustments of Chateaudun’s musical language. In order to establish this possibility, it is first necessary to resolve certain ambiguities in the publication history of “The Queen of France,” “Elegy,” and “Marian’s Complaint.”

The Publication History of Chateaudun’s Laments

The bibliography of early American music sheets is normally vexed, and yet “The Queen of France,” “Elegy,” and “Marian’s Complaint” are especially problematic. Publishers normally marked music sheets with imprints containing their names and addresses. When eighteenth-century music printing businesses were listed in city directories, or when their proprietors advertised address changes in newspapers, bibliographers can check this information against
music-sheet imprints in order to estimate when they were made. But in the case of these editions only the title and author(s) are provided (Figs. 3.2–3.4). Two of the songs reference dated events (the deaths of Marie-Antoinette and Mary Robinson), but otherwise there appears to be little on which to hang a date.

Figure 3.2
Chateaudun, “The Queen of France” (n. p., n. d.), title area and first system
Keffer Collection of Sheet Music, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania
Figure 3.3
Chateaudun, “Elegy on the Death of Mrs. Robinson” (n. p., n. d.), title area and first system
Library Company of Philadelphia
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Andantino.

The Music by M. R. Chateaudun.

Figure 3.4
Chateaudun, “Marian’s Complaint” (n. p., n. d.), title area and first system
Keffer Collection of Sheet Music, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania
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Donald Krummel proposes, however, that we can date music sheets by comparing them in terms of their design as printed objects, a method that he calls “graphic analysis.” 199 Considering the layout of the page together with symbols like clefs, accidentals, and rests can be productive, as these are often peculiar to a given publisher for a period of time. Engravers developed design habits and used characteristic tools, such that the very appearance of their sheets can be a reliable means of dating.

Graphic analysis reveals commonalities among Figures 3.2–3.4. The letter-style, content, and spacing of the text are uniform enough to suggest the work of a single artisan. Moreover, the three-stave layout of each score and the identical flat and rest symbols in “Elegy” and “Marian’s Complaint” point to one engraver. Most important, however, is the uniformity of the clefs between the three editions. Krummel notes that the complexity of the treble clef, in particular, makes its “variant shapes” easy to detect. 200 In the absence of an imprint, a treble clef is often the most reliable way to identify a publisher. Observe the equivalence of the clefs (both treble and bass) in the three editions, and their difference from other U.S. clef symbols from the same period (Table 3.3). It is clear that the same punches made the clef symbols in each of Chateaudun’s songs.

---


Table 3.3
Representative clef symbols used by U.S. music publishers of the 1790s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benjamin Carr</th>
<th>George Gilfert</th>
<th>P.A. von Hagen</th>
<th>James Hewitt</th>
<th>Filippo Trisobio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Philadelphia)</td>
<td>(New York)</td>
<td>(Boston)</td>
<td>(New York)</td>
<td>(Philadelphia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The problem is then the identity of the engraver. I have examined many American music sheets from the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries—primarily Philadelphian ones but also many from Baltimore, Boston, and New York—and of these only a handful feature the same clefs as the songs in question. All of these bear the imprint of Philadelphia’s George Willig, including the address “Market Street No. 185,” where his shop was located from 1798 until 1804 (Figs. 3.5–3.8).201

---

Figure 3.5
“Come Genius of Our Happy Land” (Philadelphia: Willig, n. d.), title area and opening systems
Music Division, Library of Congress

Figure 3.6
Music Division, Library of Congress
Figure 3.7
Phile, “President’s March,” (Philadelphia: Willig, n. d.), title area and opening systems
Music Division, Library of Congress

Figure 3.8
Hopkinson, “The President’s March” (Philadelphia: Willig, n. d.), title area and opening systems
Music Division, Library of Congress
That George Willig almost certainly engraved “The Queen of France” represents a step forward in the bibliography of Chateaudun’s music. The lone scholar to have previously suggested a publisher for this work was William Upton, who wrote that it was “Published probably by Carr.” And although it is longer than we might prefer, the date range of 1798–1804 adds clarification. Formerly, “The Queen of France” could have been dated as early as 1793. The six-year span also corroborates newspaper evidence discussed earlier, which suggests that Chateaudun was in Philadelphia from 1799, at the latest, until at least 1804.

Yet we can further reduce this date range based on the editions shown in Figures 3.5–3.8. It is an established fact that Joseph Hopkinson set words to Philip Phile’s “President’s March” in 1798, resulting in the popular patriotic song, “Hail Columbia.” Willig’s edition of this anthem (Fig. 3.8) therefore probably dates from that year. Furthermore, the anti-French rhetoric of Henri Capron’s “Come Genius of Our Happy Land” (Fig. 3.5) suggests that it was published during the fallout of the XYZ Affair and escalation of the Quasi-War. Indeed, on May 9, 1798, a Portland newspaper printed the words of this song, reporting that it had been “Sung by near two hundred staunch federalists, at an entertainment given at Philadelphia.” Such information suggests that the Willig editions under consideration, including Chateaudun’s songs, date from the early part of his tenure at 185 Market Street. The latest date suggested by any evidence is early 1801 for “Elegy on the Death of Mrs. Robinson,” and Chateaudun would have been eager to build his reputation upon arriving in Philadelphia. All things considered, Willig

---

205 “Patriotic Ode,” *Oriental Trumpet*, May 9, 1798.
probably issued the composer’s “Elegy,” “Marian’s Complaint,” and “Queen of France” between 1798 and 1801.

There is, however, a final problem in the publication history of this music. It requires further analysis, which pays off by giving us a glimpse of Chateaudun at work as a revisionist. In addition to the three songs discussed, two other editions of Chateaudun’s music show Willig’s distinctive clefs. The trouble is that one of these, a complete set of the composer’s *Six romances nouvelles*, bears the imprint, “Se vend chez Carr à Philadelphie” (Fig. 3.9). Meanwhile the other edition, an offprint of the first of the *Six romances*, the familiar “Paul au tombeau,” shows the expected “Printed and sold by G Willig Market street No. 185” (Fig. 3.10). In fact, although they have different publishers, the two editions of “Paul au tombeau” are nearly identical. They were made from the same plates, and so could only have been engraved by *either* Willig or Carr.
Figure 3.9
Chateaudun, *Six romances nouvelles* (Philadelphia: Carr, n. d.), cover and first page
Keffer Collection of Sheet Music, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania
Figure 3.9 continued
Figure 3.10
Chateaudun, “Paul au tombeau de Virginie” (Philadelphia: Willig, n. d.), cover and first page
Sheet Music Collection, Free Library of Philadelphia
Figure 3.10 continued
Three considerations point to Willig as the engraver. First, a total of six verified Willig publications show the clef symbols in question, as opposed to only one bearing Carr’s name. Second, parts of measures fifteen, twenty-two, and twenty-three in Carr’s version of “Paul au tombeau” have been altered (Fig. 3.9), suggesting that he was not the original editor. Finally, there is a crucial difference between the imprints on the two editions. Whereas Willig specified that he “Printed” Chateaudun’s “Paul au tombeau,” Carr claimed merely to sell (“vend”) the Six romances. It thus appears that Willig engraved all of Chateaudun’s Six romances nouvelles, and that Carr subsequently acquired the plates, modifying them and then reissuing the music with a new cover page. If this is the case, then 1795, the date that Laurance has assigned to Carr’s version of “Paul au tombeau,” is too early, even though Chateaudun may have composed the romance by then.

Carr’s edition of the Six romances offers insight into Chateaudun’s dealings with Philadelphia music publishers. It appears, for one thing, that the composer first brought his manuscripts (which are not extant) to Willig, paying him to engrave and print them. Even though Carr was the better-established merchant, newspaper advertisements from 1800 indicate that Chateaudun relied on Willig to vend concert tickets from his shop on Market Street. The composer evidently liked doing business with Willig, and a private arrangement would explain the printer’s unusual decision to withhold his name from the plates for “The Queen of France.”

---

206 In addition to the examples shown in this chapter, Willig’s edition of the overture to Nicolas Dezède’s Blaise et Babet displays the clefs in question.
207 Laurance, “French Vocal Romance,” 170. Carr was selling the collected romances by March 26, 1799, when he advertised them in the Aurora.
208 For example, see “Concert,” Philadelphia Gazette, February 17, 1800; “Concert,” Philadelphia Gazette, April 22, 1800; and “Concert,” Claypoole’s American Daily Advertiser, May 1, 1800. Occasionally Chateaudun was involved in concerts advertised by other promoters, in which case Carr is listed as a ticket vendor. For instance, see “Grand Concert,” Aurora, March 26, 1799; “A Concert,” Philadelphia Gazette, April 9, 1799; and “Concert,” Poulson’s American Daily Advertiser, March 27, 1804.
“Elegy,” and “Marian’s Complaint.” Unless the sheets were printed for Chateaudun’s use and at his expense, Willig would have wanted to include his imprint.

Yet although the composer had a working relationship with Willig, he eventually found it necessary to revise “Paul au tombeau,” and for this purpose he turned Carr, who introduced two changes. The first of these can be seen by comparing measure fifteen in Figure 3.9 with the same measure in Figure 3.10. Between the end of measure fourteen in Willig’s edition and beat two of the subsequent measure, the vocal line ascends a minor ninth, from G to A-flat. This is a significant demand to make of the singer at an early point in the song. Beneath this immoderate gesture, the accompaniment is assigned a third-inversion G dominant seventh, an unstable harmony against which the vocal A-flat is dissonant. Together, the voice and accompaniment thus register Paul’s wretchedness.

But in the Carr version this passage is less dramatic. The vocal F and A-flat are lowered to D and F, curtailing the melodic range and making the phrase more predictable. Moreover, the singer’s climactic note is rendered consonant with the underlying harmony, which has been changed to a first-inversion predominant triad. The result is a less daring musical representation of Paul’s distress, and a related modification appears in measures twenty-two and twenty-three. Here the Willig accompaniment shows a third-inversion dominant seventh (created by the vocalist’s G in measure twenty-two) resolving to a first-inversion tonic, whereas Carr’s edition displays a root-position fully diminished seventh moving to a root-position tonic. The revised
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209 It has been suggested to me that these songs originally had cover sheets, which have been lost. “The Queen of France,” “Elegy,” and “Marian’s Complaint” each comprise only two pages, however, and publications of this length did not typically warrant title sheets. Moreover, had covers been provided, it would not have been necessary to indicate the title and author(s) at the head of each score. In the case of “Paul au tombeau,” whose length did merit a cover page, Willig printed neither the title nor the composer above the score. In Carr’s version of “Paul au tombeau,” the title appears to the left of the first system, because the song was one of six in the edition. It was not itemized on the cover sheet.
progression is stronger, the form of the music clearer. But whereas the original, avoided
cadence reflects Paul’s uncertainty and emotional fragility, Carr’s edition effaces this effect.

In comparing the two editions of “Paul au tombeau,” it is clear that Carr’s version
pushes the song towards the English model of lament. The edits render the music less radically
expressive—simpler, more pleasant, and clearer—bringing it nearer to the galant, and it is
noteworthy that this occurs in “Paul au tombeau,” rather than in “The Queen of France,”
“Elegy,” or “Marian’s Complaint.” It is as though a musical Anglicization was required to offset
the Frenchness of the romance text, whereas the British poetry of the other songs licensed their
musical otherness. When music and words alike were foreign, publications were evidently
harder to sell. As an Englishman and the leading U.S. purveyor of Anglo-American music, Carr
was the natural person to whom Chateaudun could turn for assistance in this regard. More so
than Willig, a German emigrant for whom the Continental lament was a naturalized expressive
form, Carr understood how to tailor “Paul au tombeau” to the Philadelphian market for genteel
music.

***

Despite its antirepublican connotations, the royalist lament enjoyed a measure of
popularity in the early United States. It did so primarily when representing the galant, which
was equally popular in London and Philadelphia. Reactionary songs by English composers
including John Stevenson, Stephen Storace, and John Percy were marketable in federal America
because they catered to the Anglophilia of elite consumers of music. And the politics of such
laments were not merely tolerated; they resonated with Federalists who opposed the radical
turn of the French Revolution.
Although Chateaudun used British texts for most of his laments, including “The Queen of France,” these songs were Philadelphian anomalies. Their political message matched that of the English laments, but they stood apart by virtue of their musical Frenchness. Their alien expressive manner fed politically grounded suspicions of French, and especially of Franco-Caribbean, emigrants. Although Americans had reason to believe that St. Dominguan exiles held anti-revolutionary views, U.S. aversion to refugee culture was partly phobic. Music represented a livelihood and a source of comfort for Francophone exiles. Lament was a natural creative outlet for a community suffering loss and dislocation, and if the laments of that community were royalist, then they were no more subversive than comparable songs from Britain.

Even as many Americans feared refugee conservatism, they sanctioned the royalist lament. The political implications of such songs did not prevent them from circulating in Philadelphia, and the Frenchness of Chateaudun’s music did not entirely preclude its publication. Indeed, although it factored in the reception of Chateaudun’s music, the Francophobia described in this chapter was moderate by comparison with the American reaction to the XYZ Affair and Quasi-War, the twin symbols of the decline of Franco-American relations at the end of the eighteenth century. The story of these events and the music that they inspired occupies the remaining chapter.
It was a big night for Gilbert Fox. An actor at the Chestnut Street Theatre, he was accustomed to working long evenings for meager pay. The playhouse owners took most of the earnings, leaving even a crowd-pleaser like Fox to split the remains with dozens of others—managers, musicians, fellow actors and actresses, stage hands, the list went on. But not on Wednesday, April 25, 1798. This was the date of his annual benefit, when he was entitled to the bulk of the revenue. A full house would mean a full cashbox, and Fox just might earn enough to carry him through the long off-season.

In order to make his benefit stand out from the others clustered at the end of the theatrical calendar, Fox wanted to turn the already popular “President’s March” into a rousing song. Such a performance would tap the city’s patriotic fervor, drawing a big crowd. The problem was devising words to fit the jaunty tune, which in truth was not well suited to singing. The poets at the theater tried and failed, pronouncing the task impossible. So Fox turned instead to a former classmate and highly regarded local wordsmith, the lawyer Joseph Hopkinson.210

Operating on a tight deadline, Fox approached Hopkinson the Saturday before the benefit. Hopkinson wrote four verses and a chorus overnight, and Fox presented them on Monday to the journalist and publisher William Cobbett. In the Tuesday edition of Cobbett’s Philadelphia newspaper appeared the full program of “Mr. Fox’s Night,” which was to include
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210 Joseph Hopkinson to the Wyoming Band at Wilkes-Barre, August 24, 1840. Correspondence of Joseph Hopkinson, Hopkinson Family Papers, Historical Society of Pennsylvania.
“an intire [sic] NEW SONG (written by a Citizen of Philadelphia) to the Tune of the ‘PRESIDENT’S MARCH’.” An editorial followed the announcement:

It is not often that I interest myself in the success of Theatrical Representations; but, I cannot help bestowing a word or two in approbation of what is advertised for tomorrow night. Mr. Fox has, with singular propriety, admitted a SONG, written by a gentleman of Philadelphia, adapted to the PRESIDENT’S MARCH, which has long been the national, and is now the popular tune. Long, much too long, have the lovers of the drama been shocked and insulted with the sacrilegious hymns of atheism and murder; and the actor, let his theatrical merits be what they may, who, by his voluntary choice, first breaks through the disgraceful practice, and appeals to the virtues in place of the vices of his audience, deserves every mark of applause, which it is in the power of the public to bestow.

The following night a full house gave Hopkinson’s performance “unanimous and enthusiastic” ovations. According to the Philadelphia Gazette, “the introduction of a patriotic song upon the stage” was “a novelty interesting and welcome to Americans.” Its “stanzas were intermitted by frequent and general peals of applause, and the whole repeated in compliance with the calls of the house; after which, actuated by one impulse, the audience rose and gave three loud cheers.” Fox exited the stage that night a happy man, probably already sensing that he had just premiered the first American national song.

Hopkinson’s contrafact generated much excitement. Repeated two nights later at a benefit for Fox’s colleague, Mrs. Francis, it prompted Cobbett to print the following review:

[W]hat gave life to everything was the SONG (which will be seen in this day’s paper) written by Mr. HOPKINSON, and sung by Mr. FOX, to the tune of the President’s March. Never was anything received with applause so hearty and so universal. The Song was sung at the end of the comedy, as mentioned in bills; it was called for again at the end of the pantomime, and again after all the performances were over, and encored every time. At every repetition it was received with additional enthusiasm, ‘till, towards the last, a great part of the audience—pit, box, and gallery—actually joined in the chorus. It was very
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212 “Philadelphia,” Porcupine’s Gazette, April 24, 1798.
pleasing to observe that the last stanza received particular marks of approbation. Every one was closed with long and loud clappings and huzzas, but no sooner were the words, “Behold the CHIEF WHO NOW COMMANDS,” pronounced, than the house shook to its very centre; the song and the whole [band] were drowned in the enthusiastic peals of applause, and were obliged to stop and begin again and again, in order to gain a hearing.214

News of the performances reached New York, where on April 30 the song appeared in the Daily Advertiser. The May 4 program for a New York theater included “a new Patriotic SONG, called HAIL COLUMBIA: DEATH OR LIBERTY,” noting that the number had been “received in Philadelphia with more reiterated Plaudits than were perhaps ever witnessed in a Theatre.”215 Music publishers rushed to print the anthem, which Hopkinson maintained “was sung at night in the streets by large assemblies of citizens, including members of Congress.” The song was shortly heard “in every part of the United States.”216

All at once, Hopkinson’s adaptation of “The President’s March”—variously designated “The National Song,” “The New Federal Song,” and “Hail Columbia”—instituted an American fashion for patriotic contrafacts. In the words of Burton Konkle, it “brought on an epidemic” of similar songs, none of which would rival its success.217 It is true that the popularity of “Hail Columbia” was unsurpassed, and it is invariably cited as an iconic song of the Federalist era. But it is not true, as Konkle asserts of the many comparable songs from that time, that “none was good enough to attract attention.”218 The popular “Adams and Liberty” (1798), which the New England poet Thomas Paine—not to be confused with the Republican patron-saint and better-

216 Hopkinson to the Wyoming Band, August 24, 1840.
218 Ibid.
known author of *Common Sense*—created by setting new words to the British melody, “To
Anacreon in Heaven,” is proof enough of this. 219

But as Glenda Goodman notes there are countless other examples. 220 The quality of the
music aside, it was an important modality for early American interpretations of foreign and
domestic affairs. And although, as Goodman observes, most patriotic contrafacts circulated in
words-only formats (e.g., broadsides, songsters, plays, newspapers, and magazines), many
reached the public via the more costly and laborious means of music-sheet publication. The very
appearance of such songs in musical print meant that they were accorded some value. They
represented considerable investments of time and money.

The task of this chapter is to account for various patriotic contrafacts that appeared as
music sheets in northeastern American cities, primarily Philadelphia, shortly after “Hail
Columbia.” To do so, and to undertake a closer investigation of the song that started it all, it is
necessary to develop an understanding of the geopolitical climate in which the editions took
root. Unless considered together with the deterioration of diplomatic relations between France
and the United States in the late 1790s, and with the effects of this decline on American
domestic affairs, these texts are difficult to parse. They illustrate the tight relationship of music
and politics in the federal era.

219 A Massachusetts native, Thomas Paine (1773–1811) legally changed his name to Robert Treat Paine in
1801, in order to avoid association with the radical English writer Tom Paine (1737–1809). In addition to
“Adams and Liberty,” Treat Paine produced Federalist contrafacts including “The Green Mountain
Farmer” (Boston: Linley and Moore, [1798]) and “Rule New-England” (Boston: von Hagen, [c. 1800]). The
former has music by William Shield, the latter a tune by Schaffer.
220 Glenda Goodman, “Musical Sleuthing in Early America: ‘Derry Down’ and the XYZ Affair,” *Common-
place* 13 (Winter 2013), http://www.common-place.org/vol-13/no-02/goodman/ (accessed March 13,
2014).
The interconnection of local and global politics, and in particular the escalation of early American partisanship in response to European conflicts, is by now a familiar theme. Chapter two explained how Federalist identity evolved during the mid-1790s to encompass a rejection of radical French republicanism, represented by the violence of the Terror and military aggression against England. Republicans, meanwhile, hardened in their support of the French, vigorously opposed the Jay Treaty for its protection of British trade. Our narrative resumes in 1797, at which point Jay’s Anglo-friendly policies were beginning to attract naval aggression from France.

U.S. shipping had first presented a problem to the French in 1793, when they entered war with England. According to the 1778 Treaty of Alliance, the United States was obliged to defend French interests, but America in fact remained economically reliant on Britain. Hence George Washington’s official policy of neutrality vis-à-vis the European war. He hoped to balance the demands of the two powers. But with the ratification of the Jay Treaty, the end of naval peace between the United States and its former revolutionary ally became a fait accompli. France began confiscating the cargoes of U.S. ships engaged in trade with England, and the conflict soon escalated.

When John Adams bested Thomas Jefferson in the 1796 presidential election, French treatment of the United States went from bad to worse. The Directory would have preferred to deal with a Republican administration, and in 1797 France instituted fresh policies against Anglo-American shipping. It declared that all U.S. ships carrying British goods were liable to capture and that American soldiers discovered on English ships would be treated as enemy pirates. In response Adams began a naval build-up, but he also made plans that he hoped would bring the conflict to a peaceful conclusion.
Ironically, Adams turned to Jay’s London mission as a model of diplomatic crisis resolution. It had been, after all, a great success in Federalist eyes. Following Washington’s example, Adams sent a delegation to Europe. Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, John Marshall, and Elbridge Gerry arrived at the French capital in October 1797, but they were dismayed by the treatment that they received. Talleyrand and his representatives (denoted by the letters X, Y, and Z in Marshall’s reports on the mission) refused to entertain the American diplomats unless a series of exorbitant demands was met. The French officials requested a retraction of Adams’ Message to Congress of May 16, the absolution of existing French debts to the United States, a $12 million U.S. loan to France, and personal tributes worth hundreds of thousands of dollars. Underlying these ultimatums was a desire for more equitable treatment from the Americans, who, from France’s perspective, had become de facto allies of Britain.

At length, and particularly irked by the attempts of Talleyrand and others to extort personal bribes, Marshall and Pinckney lost heart and sailed for home in April. Adams had already announced the failure of the mission in March, stressing the need to arm American commercial vessels. These events brought into full swing the Quasi-War, an era in which Congress introduced a range of measures against France without declaring a formal state of hostilities. Official policies included a full trade embargo, the suspension of all treaties, permission for the navy to attack French ships that interfered with U.S. commerce, and a naval budget of nearly one and a half million dollars for 1798 alone.
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221 Having been treated more favorably, the Republican Gerry remained in Paris longer than the Federalist Marshall and Pinckney.
But in order to introduce such measures, Adams needed to maintain public support, and an American nation united in its opposition to republican France had never before been probable. Pro-French sentiment among Republicans was too strong. In another ironic turn, however, it was the Republicans who turned the tide of popular favor against France. Adams had meant to keep Marshall’s dispatches confidential, but this aroused suspicion among Republicans, who demanded to see them. Little did they know how damning of the French officials, and how damaging to their own position, the reports were. When Adams conceded and published the documents, they afforded him unprecedented popularity. Public opinion turned decisively anti-French, leading some Republicans to renounce their political attachments.223

Popular reaction to the XYZ Affair took many forms. Former Francophiles traded their tricolored cockades for black (i.e., Federalist) ones, and volunteer militias formed throughout the nation in anticipation of conflict. In all corners of the union people organized meetings where they made resolutions in support of the federal government. These statements were drafted into petitions, endorsed with hundreds, sometimes thousands, of signatures, and mailed to Adams, who penned personal replies to as many as he could. He received nearly three hundred such addresses within the course of a year, and these issued from every sector of the literate population. According to Thomas Ray, the petitions were thus “no mere reflection of Federalist party ideology.” They show that “In the aftermath of the XYZ Affair, a highly polarized American public began to develop a consensus on certain key issues in domestic and foreign


affairs.” At the heart of this newfound unanimity was a disdain for France’s treatment of Adams’ envoys and a renunciation of America’s ties with the French republic.224

As Seth Cotlar has argued, the XYZ Affair prompted the formation of a “xenophobic and chauvinistic spirit” in the United States beginning in 1798.225 This constituted a reversal of the American fashion during the early 1790s for Francophilic cosmopolitanism and the citizen-of-the-world model espoused by Thomas Paine. Formerly esteemed, the French-friendly democrat became an object of derision. Once respected for his high-minded universalism, the proponent of transatlantic radical ideals became a scoundrel, a demagogue, and a danger to domestic well-being. No less threatening than the prospect of outright war was the precedent of French “disorganizers” infiltrating European polities, where they exploited “native collaborators” to overthrow established regimes (e.g., in the Netherlands, Switzerland, and Italy).226 Was the United States not also vulnerable? Theories circulated of French conspiracies to undermine the federal government by means of secret societies, such as the Bavarian Illuminati.227 Such paranoia turned cosmopolitanism from a virtue into a marker of treasonous intent, and it rendered anyone arriving from Europe a potential enemy spy. French and Irish immigrants, in particular, were deemed susceptible of siding with France against the United States and Britain.

In response to waves of Francophone migration during the French and Haitian revolutions, Federalists and Republicans had agreed in 1795 to increase the residency requirement from two to five years, making it more difficult to become a naturalized U.S. citizen. In June and July of 1798, Adams capitalized on his newfound popularity by introducing a
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227 Ibid., 244; Cotlar, *Paine’s America*, pp. 97–111.
series of acts that further curtailed immigrant freedom. The Naturalization Act (June 18) extended the residency requirement to fourteen years, mandated that immigrants report to government officials within forty-eight hours of arrival, and excluded citizenship for immigrants from nations with which the United States was at war. Republicans opposed both this legislation and the Alien Friends Act (June 25), which empowered the president to deport any non-citizen deemed “dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States,” including during peacetime. The Alien Enemies Act (July 6), which provided for the restraint of immigrants from enemy nations during wartime, was supported by Republicans and remains in effect today.228

Adams leveraged public suspicion of the French to pass legislation that would have otherwise probably been dismissed. Although the Alien Enemies Act has endured, the other two acts were widely construed as unconstitutional. The president had begun to strain the bonds of consent, but there was still more that he wanted to accomplish. He next targeted the Republican press. Federalists saw certain kinds of newspapers, like certain kinds of immigrants, as threats to domestic order. On July 14, 1798, they passed the Sedition Act, which made it illegal to maliciously or unjustly defame the established government. Intended to shut down the trade in Republican print, this law had little long-term impact on the industry, serving rather to weaken the administration in the eyes of its opponents.229

But even less popular than the Alien and Sedition Acts were the new taxes that Adams levied on houses, land, and slaves in order to pay for military expansion. Protest to these measures culminated in the House Tax Rebellion, organized by John Fries in 1799 among
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228 François Furstenberg has argued that the Alien Acts were meant to interfere with French designs on the Mississippi Valley, particularly the plans of suspected spies like the Comte de Volney. Furstenberg, *When the United States Spoke French: Five Refugees Who Shape a Nation* (New York: Penguin, 2014), chapter 6.

farmers in southeastern Pennsylvania. Owing to a display of armed force by the federal government, the resistance was suppressed without causalities, but by this point Adams’ credibility had been compromised. He would ultimately resolve the French diplomatic crisis by dispatching William Vans Murray to Paris, resulting in the Treaty of Mortefontaine. But unfortunately for Adams, news of this success did not reach home until too late, when he had already lost the election of 1800 to Thomas Jefferson.

The Republican victory was a landmark event. Not only did it represent the first peaceful transfer of political power from one party to another; it brought sweeping reform in its wake, leading some to consider it a revolution in its own right. At the same time, however, the Republicans who took office in the nineteenth century looked different than the party that had taken shape a decade earlier. This change, which Cotlar has labeled “the moderation of American democratic discourse,” was largely a result of the Federalist surge that followed the XYZ Affair. The nativist and authoritarian spirit of the Alien and Sedition Acts had lasting influence, and the profound anti-French stimulus of the Quasi-War required political adjustments of Republicans. “The universal rights of man”—a radical cosmopolitan slogan that had initially united the party—yielded to a measured position whereby Republicans stood for “the American people.”

Historians recognize that this taming of democratic rhetoric was a widespread and multifaceted cultural phenomenon, one that extended to the realm of music. Yet in addition

230 Ibid., 276–314.
232 Cotlar, Paine’s America, p. 85.
to the often-cited “Hail Columbia” and “Adams and Liberty,” a whole variety of related contrafacts appeared during the Quasi-War. Not all of these songs saw equal commercial success, but taken together they represent a significant musico-political initiative, inviting two kinds of investigation. The first concerns the verbal content of the songs. What kind(s) of political argument did the newly written texts advance? The second addresses the musical aspect of contrafaction. What source material was used? How does it relate to the verbal content? And finally, what accounts for the ubiquity of contrafaction in this musico-Federalist project?

Examples ranging from “Hail Columbia” and “Adams and Liberty” to “Columbia and Liberty,” “Brother Soldiers All Hail,” “The Ladies’ Patriotic Song,” “The Federal Constitution,” and “The New Yankee Doodle” serve to outline different ways in which American poets and musicians used existing melodies to convey new texts, while at the same time illuminating the role of such practices in the discursive construction of American Francophobia and the related marginalization of radical cosmopolitanism. In the last part of this chapter, I will consider the consequences of this shift in popular politics for two Francophone immigrant musicians who endeavored to position themselves as legitimate members of the national community.

**Federalist Contrafacts of the Quasi-War**

Music-sheet editions of at least a half-dozen similar contrafacts appeared on the heels of “Hail Columbia.” The work of no single individual, this repertory reflects the agency of numerous authors, performers, publishers, and other actors who variously collaborated and competed to maintain a share of the market. As the city’s leading music publisher, Benjamin Carr enters our story most frequently. For the most part, however, his involvement was more opportunistic than innovational. Rather than a neatly coordinated effort, these texts represent a
widely distributed commercial and Federalist response to the decline of Franco-American
diplomatic relations at the end of the eighteenth century. The example of “Columbia and
Liberty” serves to introduce some key aspects of that response.

“Columbia and Liberty”

“Columbia and Liberty: A New Patriotic Song” consists of six stanzas adapted to the
melody of the English imperialist anthem “Rule Britannia.” The original song, with music by
Thomas Arne and words by James Thomson, received its premiere at Maidenhead in 1740 as
part of the masque Alfred. It soon gained independent popularity and was contrafacted in
London prior to being appropriated by a certain Davenport in the United States. The copyright
for Davenport’s version was entered in the state records of Massachusetts on October 27, 1798,
and an arrangement of “Columbia and Liberty” survives in Benjamin Carr’s Collection of New and
Favorite Songs (Philadelphia, [c. 1800]), which was issued in collaboration with New York’s
James Hewitt and Baltimore’s Joseph Carr. Davenport’s song thus appears to have achieved
some popularity, circulating throughout the northeastern United States.

The new text has an ambivalent relationship to the source song. One the one hand, both
“Columbia and Liberty” and “Rule Britannia” are patriotic anthems that urge resistance to
foreign tyranny. Just as Davenport and his countrymen sought to vanquish the French on the
high seas, Thomson’s refrain asserts national naval supremacy: “Rule, Britannia! Britannia, rule
the waves / Britons never shall be slaves.” Owing to the history of imperial conflict between
England and France, the original text is implicitly anti-French, rendering it suitable to
Davenport’s purposes in the context of the Quasi-War.
But on the other hand “Columbia and Liberty” is as opposed to British imperialism as it is to French. Davenport retains Thomson’s opening words, but he turns the rest of the stanza into a tribute to American colonial resistance:

**First verse of Thomson, “Rule Britannia”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thomson</th>
<th>Davenport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When Britain first at heaven’s command</td>
<td>When Britain with despotic sway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arose from out the azure main,</td>
<td>Would at her feet our freedom lay,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This was the charter of the land,</td>
<td>We raised the standard; “To arms!” we cried;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And guardian angels sang this strain:</td>
<td>Our patriots fought, they bled, they died.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Rule, Britannia! Britannia, rule the waves;</td>
<td><strong>Independent Columbians they would be,</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britons never shall be slaves.”</td>
<td><strong>Resolved to perish or be free.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Davenport’s use of a British imperialist melody to convey American revolutionary sentiment is ironic, to be sure, but this is only the opening gambit in a narrative designed to convey the rationale of U.S. Francophobia in the wake of the XYZ scandal. Davenport invokes the American Revolution, that is, as an analogue to the present conflict with France. His point is that “Independent Columbians” will meet French infringements on their liberty with the same lethal determination that secured their independence in the first place.

Davenport unpacks this argument in phases. First he completes his summary of the American Revolution in the second verse:

Great Washington did then command;
He led the bold, heroic band.
They fought and conquered; Columbia’s sons were free,
Resolved on death or liberty.
**Independent Columbians they would be,**
**Resolved to perish or be free.**

Then he explains how the United States and France, as kindred republics and former revolutionary allies, have become enemies. He acknowledges American sympathy for the initial phase of the French Revolution in the third stanza:

When France her struggle first began
For liberty, the right of man,
In the fourth verse, however, Davenport blames France for the breakdown in relations between the two nations, and in the fifth he alludes to the XYZ Affair. He construes France’s attempt to extract a bribe from Adams’ envoys as an assault on American liberty—one on par with British exploitation in the colonial era—urging his fellow Columbians to “be free or nobly die.”

But France you now forget your friend;  
Our amity is at an end.  
You rob our commerce, insult us on our coast;  
Divide and conquer is your boast.  
*Know, proud Frenchmen, united we will be,*  
Resolved to perish or be free.

Shall we to France a tribute pay?  
Or at her feet our freedom lay?  
“Forbid it, heaven!” Columbia’s freemen cry,  
“We will be free or nobly die.”  
*Know, proud Frenchmen, united we will be,*  
Resolved to perish or be free.

In the sixth and final stanza Davenport reaffirms the parallel between the Quasi-War and the American Revolution, resolving to hand the French the same fate as the British:

United then with heart and hand,  
Our Constitution firm shall stand.  
Then raise the standard, let this the motto be:  
Our fathers fought, and so will we.  
*Hail, Columbians! United we will be;*  
Like them, we’ll conquer and be free.

From a verbal standpoint “Columbia and Liberty” is a conflicted yet compelling redeployment of “Rule Britannia.” The song originally stood for British imperialism, but its existing associations as a patriotic naval anthem lent force to Davenport’s adaptation in the context of the conflict with France. Arguably, the tune’s Britishness strengthened the rhetorical
strategy of equating English colonial oppression with diplomatic mistreatment by the French. As a cultural act, Davenport’s usurpation of Arne’s melody reinforced his verbal affirmations of American political autonomy. He staged a revolution of sorts in his revision of Thomson’s text, turning the British version on its head.

If the ideological significance of contrafacting “Rule Britannia” was to assert sovereignty in cultural terms as a warning to the French, the conceptual force of this gesture was partially denied in the convergence of Arne’s melody and Davenport’s words. A perennial problem of contrafaction is that the new words do not suit the tune as well as the originals. In places where Arne portrayed Thomson’s words, problems arise for Davenport.

The first such difficulty appears three words into the song, where Davenport substitutes “with” for “first” (Ex. 4.1). In Thomson’s text, “first” marks the mythological moment at which England sprang into being from beneath the blue sea. Arne thus assigns the word a sprightly sixteenth-note ascent. “With” carries less significant syntactic meaning and resists musical representation. In the context of “Columbia and Liberty,” the melismatic ascent that Arne devised for “first” constitutes an unmerited emphasis of a bland preposition. Its compositional justification vanishes in the process of contrafaction. The same can be said of the instances where Davenport replaces the word “arose,” which Arne vividly depicts, with the phrase “would at”: the extended melisma in measure four and the repeated upward leap in measure six become illogical. Similarly, Davenport’s placement of the word “perish” in measure fifteen is less desirable than Thomson’s insistent repetition of “never,” and the scansion at the beginning of that measure also suffers: “Bri-tons” is better than “Re-solved.”
Example 4.1
Opening stanza of “Columbia and Liberty,” in A Collection of New and Favorite Songs
(Philadelphia: Carr, [c. 1800]), with text of “Rule Britannia” added for comparison

When Britain first at heaven’s command, a-

When Britain with despotic sway, would

rose from out the azure main,
at her feet our freedom lay,

rose, rose from out the azure main,

would at, would at her feet our freedom lay,

this was the charter, the charter of the land, and guardian angels

we raised the standard; "To arms, to arms!" we cried, our patriots fought, they

sang this strain: Rule, Brit-ann! Brit-ann, rule the wave;
bled, they died.

Independent Colum-bians they would be,

Brit-tons never, never, never shall be slaves.

resolved to perish or be free.
But contrafacts do not always suffer in this way by comparison with the original song.

Not all composers attend equally to text expression, with the result that some melodies are more adaptable than others. In the early American context, two ideologically opposed contrafacts serve to illustrate this point.

“Freedom Triumphant” and “Adams and Liberty”

Even more familiar than “Hail Columbia” among early American contrafacts is Francis Scott Key’s “Defence of Fort McHenry” (1814), known today as “The Star-Spangled Banner.” Key set his verse to the melody of “To Anacreon in Heaven,” which originated in the 1760s as the theme song of a London music club, the Anacreontic Society. With words by the Society’s president, Ralph Tomlinson, and music ascribed to a young John Stafford Smith (1750–1836), “To Anacreon” was popular in both England and the United States. Key’s was only one of several American retextings going back to the 1790s, two of which concern us here.

American retextings of “To Anacreon in Heaven” demonstrate its ideological malleability. In the space of two years, Smith’s tune was used to convey conflicting assessments of French political life. In “Freedom Triumphant,” an anonymously authored contrafact that Benjamin Carr published in 1796, “To Anacreon” was enlisted to commend France:

Unfold, Father Time—thy long records, unfold,
Of noble achievements accomplished of old,
When men by the spirit of liberty led
Undauntedly conquered or cheerfully bled.
But now midst the triumphs these moments reveal,
Their glories all fade and their luster turns pale,
Whilst France rises up and proclaims the decree
That tears off their chains and bids millions be free.

In a later stanza, the author assures France that the United States shares in its “raptures,” as “the Genius of Liberty bounds over [French] hills.” This depiction of French republicanism
contrasts with that found in “Adams and Liberty: The Boston Patriotic Song” (1798), Paine’s aforementioned contrafact:

While France her huge limbs bathes recumbent in blood,
And society’s base threatens with wide dissolution,
May peace like the dove who returned from the flood,
Find an ark of abode in our mild Constitution.
But though peace is our aim,
Yet the boon we disclaim,
If bought with our sovereignty, justice, or fame.
For ne’er shall the sons of Columbia be slaves,
While the earth bears a plant or the sea rolls its waves.

The scene in France has changed from an idyll to a bloodbath, and the American response from admiration to militant objection. Paine continues by invoking the Quasi-War:

Let our patriots destroy anarch’s pestilent worm,
Lest our liberty’s growth should be checked by corrosion.
Then let clouds thicken round us—we heed not the storm;
Our realm fears no shock but the earth’s own explosion.
Foes assail us in vain,
Though their fleets bridge the main,
For our altars and laws with our lives we’ll maintain.
And ne’er shall the sons of Columbia be slaves,
While the earth bears a plant or the sea rolls its waves.

On either side of the XYZ Affair, Smith’s melody was deployed for contradictory ideological purposes, first as a pro-French Republican—and later as an anti-French Federalist—anthem. Following the presidential election of 1800, the tune would continue its political transformation, serving as the basis for “Jefferson and Liberty,” a parody of Paine’s work.²³⁴

Figure 4.1
“Freedom Triumphant,” in A Collection of New and Favorite Songs (Philadelphia: Carr, [c. 1800])
Dated Books Collection, American Antiquarian Society
Figure 4.1 continued

Chorus

While France signs up and proclaims the decree that

Tears off their chains and bids Millions be FREE

2

As Spring to the fields and as dew to the flowers,
To the earth parch’d with heat as the soft dropping showers;
As health to the wretched that lies languid and wan,
So cheerful, so grateful is Freedom to man.
Where Freedom the light of her countenance gives,
There only he triumphs there only he lives;
Then seize the glad moment and hail the decree,
That tears off their chains and bids Millions be FREE.

3

Too long bad oppression and terror entwined,
Those tyrant form’d chains that enslave the Free mind;
Whilst dark Superstition with Nature at strife,
For Ages had lock’d up the fountain of life.
But the Demon is t’ed the delusion is past,
And Reason and Virtue have triumph’d at last;
Then seize the glad moment and hail the decree,
That tears off their chains and bids Millions be FREE.

FRANCE we share in the raptures thy bosom that fills
Whilst the Genius of Liberty bounds o’er thine hills
Redundant henceforth may thy purple Juice flow
Provided we’re free.

Flourish, O free, the Greenwoods, and thin Olive trees grow
Whilst the hand of Philosophy long shall entwine

Blest Emblems to the Laurels, the Myrtles, the Vines
And be thine all ages confirm the decree.
That tears off their chains and bids Millions be FREE.
Figure 4.2
“Adams and Liberty,” in *A Collection of New and Favorite Songs* (Philadelphia: Carr, [c. 1800])
Dated Books Collection, American Antiquarian Society
Figure 4.2 continued
Of “Freedom Triumphant” and “Adams and Liberty,” only the latter became popular. Paine’s song is a rare early American example of a perfectly singable contrafact. The new text scans infallibly, making a compelling counterpart to Smith’s tune (Fig. 4.2). “Freedom Triumphant,” on the other hand, fails on this and other counts (Fig. 4.1). The words fit the melody awkwardly (e.g., at the opening anacrusis, the middle of measure four, and the middle of measure eight), and the publication represents an anomaly within Carr’s otherwise consistent output. There is a notation error in measure seven, where the first quarter note in the treble staff should be dotted, but bigger problems arise in measure four. Here in the treble staff there are less than five beats, where there should be six, and it is not immediately clear what rhythm the author had in mind. Based on Carr’s more successful engraving of the analogous material in measure eight, however, the following treatment is possible:

Example 4.2a
Alternative rhythmic distribution in “Freedom Triumphant,” m. 4

An even better, albeit hypothetical, solution is given in Example 4.2b. This rhythm would have corrected the poor scansion that otherwise occurs on the fourth beats of measures four and eight.
Example 4.2b
Alternative rhythmic distribution in “Freedom Triumphant,” m. 4

The relationship between words and music in “Freedom Triumphant” is problematic, but this is not because the tune was inadaptable. Rather, it appears to have been the result of two factors. First, the Carr engraving of “Freedom Triumphant” was closely modeled on a London edition of “The Anacreontic Song” by Longman and Broderip (Fig. 4.3). The American copyist’s adherence to the original notation prevented him from making necessary adjustments in light of the new text. Second, the poor fit is hardly surprising given the fact that the same text had been assigned to other melodies, and may not have been intended for singing in the first place, let alone devised to suit “To Anacreon in Heaven.” American songsters associated the words of Carr’s “Freedom Triumphant” with tunes including “The Tear That Bedews Sensibility’s Shrine” and “Derry Down.” The aesthetic shortcomings of “Freedom Triumphant” were a consequence of careless contrafaction rather than melodic structure.

235 A Tribute to the Swinish Multitude (Philadelphia: Carey, 1796) and Paddy’s Resource (Philadelphia: Stephens, 1796), respectively.
Figure 4.3
“The Anacreontic Song” (London: Longman and Broderip, [178–]), p. 1
“Brother Soldiers All Hail” and “The Ladies’ Patriotic Song”

Thus far we have considered American contrafacts of popular British songs. “Columbia and Liberty” and “Adams and Liberty” were successful because they capitalized on the familiarity of their source tunes while advancing an American political agenda. But if an English patriotic anthem like “Rule Britannia” and a London pub song like “To Anacreon” could be recruited for assertions of U.S. sovereignty, then the same was certainly true of tunes that were already associated with American political independence. In addition to English music, the authors of Federalist contrafacts naturally turned to existing American patriotic melodies.

Contrafacts like “Columbia and Liberty” compared the Quasi-War to the American Revolution, so it is to be expected that Federalists exploited American revolutionary music to convey anti-French sentiment. The problem was that the American Revolution (unlike the French Revolution) had not inspired a robust song tradition, at least not in print.236 It had given rise, however, to familiar instrumental tunes. Marches dedicated to revolutionary leaders were a formative aspect of American culture, with George Washington being the most popular object of veneration. Three different marches honoring Washington—“Washington’s March,” “Washington’s March at the Battle of Trenton,” and “The President’s March”—were converted during the Quasi-War into Federalist anthems, with varying degrees of success. Whereas “The President’s March” would become the most popular song to its point in U.S. history, the others were of mixed quality. “The Battle of Trenton,” in particular, was ill-suited to vocal adaptation.

Benjamin Carr’s 1799 edition of “Brother Soldiers All Hail: A Favorite New Patriotic Song in Honor of Washington” is an example of a contrafacted march that esteems the revolutionary

---

hero. Composed shortly before Washington’s death, the text deifies the former president, declaring that “heaven has lent him in love to mankind / to add a new grace to the earth.” This couplet is excerpted from the third verse and engraved around a portrait of Washington in the title area of the sheet (Fig. 4.4). The tune—known variously as “Washington’s March,” “General Washington’s March,” “The New President’s March,” and “The President’s New March”—is thought to date from the time of Washington’s inauguration. Its author is unknown. On the third page of the edition, there is a separate “Toast” to Washington with words and music by Francis Hopkinson.

237 Ibid., pp. 450–52.
Figure 4.4
“Brother Soldiers All Hail” (Philadelphia: Carr, [1799])
Music Division, Library of Congress
Figure 4.4 continued

No nobly he darr'd not how nobly he fought
Let fires to their offspring relate
And dwell on the price with which freedom was bought
While they fight o'er the war-like fate around
For them shall the vine spread it branches
Their dwellings war 'ne'er shall deform
Their sons shall arise from inglorious ease
To brave with our Hero the storm
Chorus Their soul shall arise &c

Then since he the hope and the pride of the just
Whenever his faulthions display'd
We may bidly march on in the generous trust
That heaven shall rise to our aid
For sure my brave friends the great p owe above
Who aids fire and force to our cause
Shall give us with honor that peace which we love
And avenge both our country and laws
Chorus Shall give us with honor &c
Figure 4.4 continued
In the context of the Quasi-War, Washington represented the legacy of American independence. He was a model leader who, if properly revered and emulated, would ensure the continued liberty of U.S. citizens. The first verse of “Brother Soldiers” relates,

His word is a legion, his name is a host,  
His spirit’s the soul of the brave;  
His firmness and talents, our pride and our boast,  
Shall warm e’en the breast of the slave.

And the next stanza emphasizes the need to instill in the young an admiration for Washington:

How nobly he dared and how nobly he fought  
Let sires to their offspring relate,  
And dwell on the price with which freedom was bought,  
While they sigh o’er the warriors’ fate.

As long as the memories of Washington’s greatness and the cost of independence were preserved, the revolutionary generation had nothing to fear from new conflicts:

From [the revolutionary soldiers] shall the vine spread its branches around,  
Their dwellings war ne’er shall deform;  
Their sons shall arise from inglorious ease  
To brave with our hero the storm.

Washington became a quasi-divine figure who abetted American resistance to foreign tyranny, the implied perpetrator being France. The final verse reasons,

Then since he’s the hope and the pride of the just,  
Whenever his falchion’s displayed,  
We may boldly march on in the generous trust  
That heaven shall rise to our aid.

As for the tune of “Brother Soldiers,” its crisp dotted rhythms and decorative triplets make for a lively fife-and-drum number but not for great singing. Nevertheless, the text scans reasonably well, and the overall musical result is satisfactory. But the same cannot be said of “The Ladies’ Patriotic Song,” in which words were imposed on a tune known as “Washington’s March at the Battle of Trenton.” This contrafact has much in common with “Brother Soldiers.”
The editions were issued within a year of one another, each was based on one of two popular Washington marches, each featured a portrait of Washington in its caption area (Fig. 4.5), and the two texts emphasized similar themes. More so than “Brother Soldiers,” however, “The Ladies’ Patriotic Song” is an example of a contrafact in which the fit between words and melody is a secondary consideration, even though it was performed for public and private audiences to apparent acclaim.\(^{238}\) Its ideological appeal overrode its compositional shortcomings.

Nominally, at least, the tune of “The Ladies’ Patriotic Song” was associated with Washington’s victory over Hessian forces at Trenton, New Jersey on December 26, 1776. Sonneck and Upton confirm that the melody circulated in the revolutionary era, although its composer has not been identified with certainty.\(^{239}\) With patriotic associations reaching back to independence, this particular “Washington’s March” was a prime candidate for contrafact during the French conflict. Like “Brother Soldiers,” “The Ladies’ Patriotic Song” upholds Washington as a model whose emulation can secure American freedom. The difference is that it does so from a feminized perspective, with “Columbia’s fair daughters” exhorting their men to Washingtonian heroism:

\begin{verbatim}
Columbians, arise, independence proclaim,
’Tis beauty now calls you in liberty’s name;
Copy Washington’s deeds, each like him guard his post,
Then like Washington each will himself be a host.
Foreign threats disdaining,
Scorn all mean complaining.
Liberty calls; shew your zeal in the cause,
Defend freedom’s soil, constitution, and laws.
Spurn foreign influence and never agree
To let innovation spoil liberty’s tree.
\end{verbatim}

\(^{238}\) It was arranged for voice and keyboard (with the melody additionally notated for flute or violin) and reportedly “Sung by Mrs. Hodgkinson with Universal Applause at the Columbia Gardens” (Fig. 4.5).

\(^{239}\) It has been suggested that Francis Hopkinson wrote the tune. Sonneck and Upton, *Early Secular American Music*, pp. 450–52.
Figure 4.5
“The Ladies’ Patriotic Song” (New York: Gilfert, [1798])
Sheet Music Collection, American Antiquarian Society
What hero will beauty's soft influence improve
What sword will not start, urg'd by honour and love
Columbia's fair Daughters will bless with their charms
The generous in Peace - The Triumphant in Arm's
Love and Beauty smiling
Wars rough cares beguiling.
The sweet prayer of innocence grateful shall rise
Success, in return, shall descend from the skies
Thus Heroes by Arms; by Love's influence we
From Treachery's blights will guard Liberty's Tree.

Here's to WASHINGTON, ADAMS, Columbia's pride
The Army and Navy, to honour allied
By Beauty's kind, with still attended they go
Can Heroes thus favour'd else stoop to a foe
Honour call to battle
Thundering Cannon rattle!
Inspired by your President, Sweethearts and Wives
Columbia's Freedom defend with your lives
Returning we'll hail you Triumphant and Free
'Tenjoy the sweet Fruits of fair Liberty's Tree.
The rhetoric of this opening stanza, which conflates British opposition during the War of Independence with current French aggression, is familiar. What is special in this case is that the melody’s patriotic associations, and specifically its identification with the American Revolution, amplify the verbal argument. The choice of tune itself recommends the parity of past and present military endeavors, and this ideological conceit takes precedence over the practical matter of fitting the words to the tune. As is often the case in early American contrafacts, scansion errors arise, although here they are particularly glaring. For example, consider the emphasis of the last syllable of “Washington” in measures eleven and thirteen. Even this is elegant, however, when compared to the treatment of “in-flu-ence” in measure twenty-five and that of “in-no-va-tion” two measures later.

Yet there are deeper problems than these local misalignments. Beginning in the middle of the stanza, entire lines of verse are out of sync with the music. Measures seventeen and eighteen contain parallel musical phrases to which the couplet, “Foreign threats disdaining / Scorn all mean complaining,” might have been conveniently assigned (Ex. 4.3).

Example 4.3
Alternative word-music alignment in “The Ladies’ Patriotic Song,” mm. 17–18

But instead of being distributed over a complete measure, each half of the couplet spans only three beats, resulting in unseemly alignments between text and music. The latter half of the couplet begins too early, comprising the final beat of measure seventeen and the first two beats
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of the subsequent measure. It bridges two otherwise distinct melodic units, initiating a succession of elided verbal phrases that do not correspond to musical ones. “Liberty calls; shew your zeal in the cause” starts halfway through measure eighteen, and it does not realign with the musical syntax until the downbeat of measure twenty. This could have been corrected as follows.

Example 4.4
Alternative word-music alignment in “The Ladies Patriotic Song,” mm. 19–20

“The Ladies’ Patriotic Song” and, to a lesser extent, “Brother Soldiers All Hail” illustrate the pitfalls of adapting words to non-vocal source music, in these cases marches associated with the virtue and military prowess of George Washington. It was easier to contrafact an existing song than an instrumental tune, because the author could retain the form of the original verse to ensure a good fit with the melody. What “Washington’s March” and “Washington’s March at the Battle of Trenton” lacked in vocal adaptability, however, they made up for in ideological appeal. Songs like “Rule Britannia” and “To Anacreon in Heaven” made for musically compelling contrafacts, but they were marked as English. Although less successful in compositional terms, “Brother Soldiers” and “The Ladies’ Patriotic Song” were comparatively indigenous musical assertions of American sovereignty.
“The Federal Constitution” and “The New Yankee Doodle”

The patriotic associations of “Washington’s March at the Battle of Trenton” also appealed to the New York composer and publisher James Hewitt, who selected the tune for use in “The Federal Constitution and Liberty Forever,” a contrafact with words written by a certain Milns.240 “The Federal Constitution” is in fact a medley that combines and assigns new text to two existing patriotic melodies, first “The Battle of Trenton” and then “Yankee Doodle.” An established composer and publisher of medley overtures, Hewitt was a leading American proponent of this genre, and his skill as an arranger is evident in “The Federal Constitution.” He modified “The Battle of Trenton” in order to join it with the more memorable “Yankee Doodle,” devising an attractive alternative to “The Ladies’ Patriotic Song.”

Hewitt retains the initial four-measure phrase of “The Battle of Trenton,” which begins with a triadic ascent of the octave and comes to rest on the third scale degree (Figs. 4.5 and 4.6, mm. 5–8). The tune then normally reprises the second half of this opening phrase, coming to a close on the tonic (Fig. 4.5, mm. 9–10). But Hewitt alters the two-measure consequent so that it cadences on the dominant (Fig. 4.6, mm. 9–10), at which point he abandons “The Battle of Trenton” and presents four newly composed measures (mm. 11–14). Hewitt thus inserts transitional material precisely where the author of “The Ladies’ Patriotic Song” began to struggle with the alignment of words and music. He exploits the ideological resonance of the Washington march by featuring it at the opening of his song, but he avoids the difficulties that attend the remainder of the march.

---

240 This song was first published in New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore in 1798. It appeared soon after in Benjamin Carr’s Collection of New and Favorite Songs (c. 1800)
Figure 4.6
“Federal Constitution,” in *A Collection of New and Favorite Songs* (Philadelphia: Carr, [c. 1800])
Dated Books Collection, American Antiquarian Society
ADAMS, the man of our choice, guides the helm,
No tempests can harm us, no storm overwhelm.
Our fleet anchor's safe,
And our bark rides secure,
So here's to the toast
We Columbians boast.

The FEDERAL CONSTITUTION, and the PRESIDENT for ever.
A free Navigation, Commerce and Trade,
We'll sing no more of sin, nor be afraid.
Our frigates shall ride
Our defence and our pride;
Our stars guard our seafarer,
And barge to our toast.

The FEDERAL CONSTITUTION, and the TOAST for ever.
MONTGOMERY & WARREN, still live in our songs,
Like them our YOUNG HEROES shall spring at our command,
The world will admire
The fool and the wise,
Which blight in the toast
We Columbians boast.

The FEDERAL CONSTITUTION and its ADVOCATES for ever.
When an enemy threatens all party that dare,
We hope no injuries to buy a mean base case.
Columbians will fear no
Friend or foe to inform,
We'll never stain the toast
Which a wise man we toast.

The FEDERAL CONSTITUTION and INTEGRITY for ever.
FAME's trumpet shall be Washington's praise.
A time grant a fortune, to lengthen his days,
May health weave the thread
Of delight round his head;
No nation can boast
Such a name - such a toast.
Hewitt’s newly composed transition is artful, comprising textural and registral variety as it prolongs the dominant function. It consists of a homophonic two-measure phrase over a dominant pedal in the treble range, followed by a contrapuntal and chromatically intensified unit of the same length that returns to the dominant. A fermata here enhances anticipation of the tonic and accommodates a change of meter, whereupon “Yankee Doodle” emerges. As with “The Battle of Trenton,” Hewitt uses only part of “Yankee Doodle,” namely, the opening antecedent-consequent phrase. In the context of “The Federal Constitution,” this excerpt serves as the refrain, the words of which take the form of a toast.

Each verse of Milns’ text highlights a different aspect of Federalist politics during the crisis of 1798, and each verse concludes with a different toast, which encapsulates the preceding lines. For example, the second stanza lauds the Federalist leadership, whereas the third articulates the desire for unregulated shipping:

Adams, the man of our choice guides the helm;  
No tempest can harm us, no storm overwhelm.  
Our sheet anchor’s sure,  
And our bark rides secure;  
So here’s to the toast  
We Columbians boast:  
*The federal Constitution and the president forever.*

A free navigation, commerce, and trade;  
We’ll seek for no foe, of no foe be afraid.  
Our frigates shall ride,  
Our defense and our pride;  
Our tars guard our coast  
And huzza to our toast:  
*The federal Constitution, trade, and commerce, boys, forever.*

Of particular interest with regard to Franco-American diplomacy is the fifth verse:

When an enemy threatens, all party shall cease;  
We bribe no intriguers to buy a mean peace.  
Columbians will scorn  
Friend or foe to suborn;
We’ll ne’er stain the toast,
Which as free men we’ll boast:
The federal Constitution and integrity forever.

Such themes are reflected in another Hewitt contrafact from around the same time, one that features “Yankee Doodle” in its entirety along with words by an unnamed author. Like “The Federal Constitution,” this “New Yankee Doodle” showcases Hewitt’s ability as an arranger. Its prelude is judiciously assembled, consisting of the melody in parallel sixths over a newly composed bass line, all in the treble register (Fig. 4.7, mm. 1–8). The same deft brand of counterpoint found in the transitional section of “The Federal Constitution” appears in the verse of “The New Yankee Doodle” (mm. 13–14), whose refrain features an unconventional yet compelling harmonic shift from the dominant of F to the dominant of C (mm. 22–23). An inventive postlude rounds out Hewitt’s arrangement.

Verbally, “New Yankee Doodle” represents the same broad ideological commitments as the other contrafacts under consideration. Its repeated imperative, “Yankee Doodle, guard your coast / Yankee Doodle dandy,” alludes to the Quasi-War, although the XYZ scandal is not specifically mentioned. Otherwise the expected rhetorical gestures are present: the call to abandon party interests for “union at home”; the exhortation “always to be well prepared” for war; praise for Washington and Adams; and the espousal of “commerce free from fetters.”
Figure 4.7
“New Yankee Doodle,” in *A Collection of New and Favorite Songs* (Philadelphia: Carr, [c. 1800])
Dated Books Collection, American Antiquarian Society
Figure 4.7 continued
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The only way to keep off war,
And guard against perfecution,
Is always to be well prepared,
With hearts of resolution.
Yankee Doodle's the saile,
Yankee Doodle Dandy,
As patriots still maintain our right,
Yankee Doodle Dandy.

Great WASHINGTON, who led us on,
And liberty affected,
Shall we all die or else be free.
We will not be subjected
Yankee Doodle, guard your coast,
Yankee Doodle Dandy,
Fear not then nor threat nor boast,
Yankee Doodle Dandy.

Band of Brothers let us be,
While ADAMS guides the nation;
And still our dear bought Freedom guard,
In every situation.
Yankee Doodle guard your coast,
Yankee Doodle Dandy.
Fear not then nor threat nor boast,
Yankee Doodle Dandy.

May soon the with'rd for hour arrive,
When PEACE shall rule the nations.
And Commerce free from letters prove
Mankind are all relations.
The Yankee Doodle be divine,
Yankee Doodle Dandy.
Bomast, the fig tree and the vine,
S! Yankee Doodle Dandy.
Having surveyed a range of songs that emulated Hopkinson’s adaptation of “The President’s March,” appearing in the wake of Carr’s edition of “Hail Columbia,” let us now return to a consideration of that original contrafact. We have rehearsed the song’s conception, reception, and widespread imitation. What remains is to examine its verbal and musical content, and finally to account for its place in the Federalist cultural offensive of 1798.

“Hail Columbia”

Judging from the variety of editions and the sheer number of copies of “Hail Columbia” that have survived, it was the single most printed song in the eighteenth-century United States. That it was also patriotic, encouraging Americans to relinquish party attachments in favor of a strong national identity, is beyond question. Yet although “Hail Columbia” was devised, according to its author, “to get up an American spirit which should be independent of—and above the interests, passion, and policy of—both belligerents [i.e., Republicans and Federalists],” it does not follow from this, as William Upton has argued, that the song was not political. “Hail Columbia” represents a common ploy whereby Federalists proffered their interests as non-interests. In the xenophobic atmosphere of 1798, this strategy proved particularly effective, as the ruling party managed to align its objectives with the welfare of the nation as such.

That Hopkinson’s song did not represent a rapprochement between Federalists and Republicans is signaled by the publication venue in which announcements of its first performance and printing appeared. William Cobbett was an ardent Francophile, his Gazette

241 Sonneck and Upton, Early Secular American Music, p. 171.
242 Porcupine’s Gazette advertised Benjamin Carr’s publication of “Hail Columbia” on April 27, two days after the song’s premiere.
an ultra-conservative organ. Recall the advertisement for the song’s premiere, where Cobbett extoled “Hail Columbia” as an alternative to “the sacrilegious hymns of atheism and murder” that had appealed to the “vices” of playhouse audiences. What were these maligned anthems if not French revolutionary songs?

Even if the words of “Hail Columbia” contained “no party allusions whatsoever,” as Upton maintains, the association of the song with Cobbett would mark it as a Federalist initiative. But examination of Hopkinson’s verse reveals key similarities with other Federalist contrafacts of the time, finally discrediting any notion of the song’s bipartisanship. Like many of the texts under consideration, “Hail Columbia” opens with a gesture to the revolutionary past:

Hail Columbia, happy land,  
Hail ye heroes, heaven-born band,  
Who fought and bled in freedom’s cause,  
And when the storm of war was gone,  
Enjoyed the peace your valor won.

Let independence be our boast,  
Ever mindful what it cost,  
Ever grateful for the prize,  
Let its altar reach the skies.

Firm, united let us be,  
Rallying ’round our liberty;  
As a band of brothers joined,  
Peace and safety we shall find.

In a familiar rhetorical move, Hopkinson then jumps in the second stanza to the contemporary conflict with France:

Immortal patriots, rise once more,  
Defend your rights, defend your shore.  
Let no rude, impious hand  
Invade the shrine where sacred lies

---


244 “Philadelphia,” *Porcupine’s Gazette*, April 24, 1798.
Of toil and blood the well earned prize.

But not only does “Hail Columbia” share with other Federalist songs a master narrative that aligns the American Revolution and the Quasi-War; it contains the kind of praise for Washington that by the late 1790s had become the exclusive purview of Federalists. The third stanza ascribes “godlike power” to the former president, calling for his name to “Ring through the world with loud applause.” And the fourth verse represents Washington as “The rock on which the storm will beat,” “Armed in virtue firm and true,” and with a “steady mind from changes free.” In its veneration of “The chief who now commands,” “Hail Columbia” was a distant cry from the attacks on Washington’s status that had characterized Republican discourse since the time of the Jay Treaty. Contrary to Republican interest, the song valorized the status quo—the Federalist administration established by Washington and handed down to Adams. No matter how dire the threat that France represented to American political autonomy, this was not an impartial position to take.

Upton’s contention that “Hail Columbia” transcended partisanship is further called into question by the fact that its source melody had anti-Republican connotations. Recall from chapter two the dispute that arose over which tune, “The President’s March” or “Ça Ira,” should open performances at the New Theatre. In tandem with the Republican press, playhouse crowds objected to “The President’s March” as a quasi-monarchical “mimickry of British customs.” The tune thus served as a foil for the French revolutionary songs embraced by Republicans, and this antagonism carried over into the career of “Hail Columbia.” The Federalist Gazette of the

---

245 When he wrote it, Hopkinson’s phrase, “the chief who now commands,” referred to John Adams. In anticipation of full-scale war with France, however, Adams offered Washington the position of Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. army in July 1798. Thereafter the phrase had an additional meaning. Washington served as Senior Officer of the army until his death in December.

246 “From a Correspondent,” General Advertiser, February 28, 1794.
United States, for instance, fêted Hopkinson’s song while noting with relief “the entire banishment of the execrablé [sic] French murder shouts which once disgraced our places of public amusement.”²⁴⁷ Nor was the partisanship of “Hail Columbia” lost on the Republican press.

The Aurora ran the following account of the song’s premiere:

For some days past, the Anglo Monarchical-Tory party, have appeared at the Theatre in full triumph—and the President’s March and other aristocratic tunes have been loudly vociferated for, and vehemently applauded. [. . .] On Wednesday evening [. . .] the admirers of British tyranny again assembled, in consequence of the managers having announced in the bills of the day that there would be given a Patriotic song to the tune of the President’s March. All the British merchants, British agents, and many of our congress tories, attended to do honor to the occasion. When the wished-for song came—which contained, amidst the most ridiculous bombast, the vilest adulation to the Anglo-Monarchical Party, and the two Presidents—the exacdy of the party knew no bounds, they encored, they shouted, they became Mad as the Priestess of the Delphic God, and in the fury of their exultation threatened to throw over, or otherwise ill treat every person who did not join heartily in the applause. [. . .] For what reason the managers presume to offend a great body of the citizens of Philadelphia by devoting their theatre to party purposes, we are at a loss to determine, or why the Orchestra who had so readily gratified one party, should refuse to play Ca Ira when repeatedly called for by the others is equally mysterious, unless the managers wish to drive from the Theatre every friend to plain republican principles, and depend alone upon the tories for support. [. . .] It is said, that the same song is to be again sung on Friday—The Republican party would do well therefore to absent themselves entirely from the Theatre, unless they wish to have their noses pulled by the Tories.²⁴⁸

A more partisan assessment of “Hail Columbia” would be difficult to conceive, and yet the politically motivated representational practices surrounding this contrafact were not limited to newspaper accounts. For instance, Federalist producers and consumers of the song emphasized its ideological continuity with “The President’s March” by placing portraits of Washington and Adams in the caption areas of “Hail Columbia” prints. This paratextual convention, which was replicated in editions of “Brother Soldiers All Hail,” “The Ladies’ Patriotic Song,” and “New

²⁴⁸ “Theatre,” Aurora General Advertiser, April 27, 1798.
Yankee Doodle," originated when Benjamin Carr undertook the first printing of “Hail Columbia.” The Philadelphia publisher implemented an unusual design in the title area of this plate, leaving the middle of the page empty. In this opening he engraved an excerpt from Hopkinson’s text (“Behold the chief who now commands”), intending this to serve as the caption for a portrait. The plate itself contained no illustration, only a space that allowed for a portrait to be mounted or impressed upon the sheet at a later time.

Carr’s plate thus afforded a number of adaptations (Fig. 4.8). Multiple mounted portraits have been identified, along with a copy where the illustration was inked directly onto the sheet (A). Upton has suggested that a more widely available variant, which features a mounted portrait of Adams, was Carr’s initial product (B), but it seems more likely that Figure 4.8a represents Carr’s original design. In another surviving copy a mounted portrait was removed, leaving a wax residue (C). Evidently this illustration was more valuable to the consumer for another purpose, perhaps for inclusion in a commonplace book. Other variants display portraits of Washington instead of Adams (D), a change that Sonneck attributes to Washington’s appointment as Senior Officer of the army. At all events the attachment of such images to “Hail Columbia” indicates a thematic resonance with “The President’s March,” marking the contrafact as an outcome of Federalist cultural praxis.

David Waldstreicher has argued that the circulation of presidential images helped Federalists to infuse their objectives with the legacy of the Revolution. Representations of

---

250 Carr thus inverted the technique associated with the passe-partout title page, where a fixed illustration is combined with a blank space in which varying text can be written or printed. The London music publisher John Walsh popularized this practice in the early eighteenth century, so Carr was probably familiar with it.
252 Ibid., 172. Figure 4.8d shows one of two Washington portraits that were used. The other was excised from the title page of James Hewitt’s programmatic keyboard sonata, *Battle of Trenton* (New York: Hewitt, 1797).
Washington—and, to a lesser extent, of Adams—fostered widespread veneration and feelings of federal union. Personal encounters between the executive and the people evinced reciprocal affection, “dissolving distance in order to recreate and ratify hierarchy,” and this dynamic extended to the realm of print. Looking fondly at the president was a way of affirming his virtue and identifying as a deferential citizen. Vision, physiognomy, moral character, and nationalism therefore coalesced in a popular fascination with the presidential countenance.  

Figure 4.8
Variants of “Hail Columbia” ([Philadelphia: Carr, 1798]), title area and opening system

A. Adams Portrait 1 (Music Division, Library of Congress)

---

B. Adams Portrait 2 (New York Public Library for the Performing Arts)

C. Removed Portrait (Music Division, Library of Congress)
If there is one moment when Upton’s assertion concerning the unbiased sentiment of “Hail Columbia” acquires some legitimacy, it is when Carr imposed a more permanent image on his edition of the song. For reasons that are obscure, he effaced the circular legend (“Behold the chief who now commands”), and in its place he engraved (or had engraved) an eagle with a shield in its beak, backed by rays of light bursting through dark clouds (Fig. 4.9). This was standard American iconography, of a more abstract and ideologically flexible variety than honorific portrayals of Washington and Adams. Nothing about such an image would have offended Republican feeling. But in light of the existing Federalist associations of “The

---

254 Two considerations support the assumption that the presidential versions of the caption area came first, the eagle illustration second. First, it would have been easier to replace the circular legend with the eagle illustration than vice versa. Second, within two days of the premier of “Hail Columbia,” Carr announced that he would publish “The very favorite New Federal Song, Written to the tune of the President’s March, By J. Hopkinson, Esq. and sung by Mr. Fox, at the New Theatre with great applause, ornamented with a very elegant Portrait of the President” (Porcupine’s Gazette, April 27, 1798, p. 3). It is unlikely that the eagle version intervened between this advertisement and Fox’s introduction of the song to the public on April 25.
President’s March” (not to mention the words that Hopkinson assigned to it), this illustration was a characteristic attempt to clothe the ruling ideology in the trappings of disinterested citizenship. Subtler than a portrait of Washington or Adams, it was less on the nose but no less partisan in intent.

Figure 4.9
Variant of “Hail Columbia” ([Philadelphia: Carr, 1798]), title area and opening system
New York Public Library for the Performing Arts

From these interventions in the publication of “Hail Columbia,” it is clear that Carr gave special consideration to this song. To my knowledge, his was the first instance of a substitutable image in the caption area of an American music sheet. The illustration of sheet music in general would not become a widespread phenomenon for decades. But Carr’s investment in this contrafact is not only evident in the paratextual realm of illustration; it is discernable in the music as such. Contrafaction is not a scenario in which one expects to locate significant musical innovations. It is by definition a compositional practice in which the music stays the same, and yet Carr introduced a small but important modification.
Figure 4.10
“Hail Columbia” ([Philadelphia: Carr, 1798])
Sheet Music Collection, American Antiquarian Society
Figure 4.10 continued

Immortal Patriots rise once more
Defend your rights—defend your shore
Let no rude foe with impious hand
Invade the shrine where sacred lies
Of tall and blood the well earned prize
While offering peace sincere and just
In heaven we place a manly trust
That truth and justice will prevail
And every scheme of bondage fail
Firm—united &c.

Sound the trump of fame
Let Washington's great name
Ring thro' the world with loud applause.
Ring thro' the world with loud applause
Let every clime to Freedom dear
Listen with a joyful ear—
With equal skill with godlike power
He governs in the fearful hour
Of horrid war or guides with care
The happier times of honest peace—
Firm—united &c.

Behold the Chief who now commands
Once more to serve his Country stands
The rock on which the storm will beat
The rock on which the storm will beat
But armed in virtue firm and true
His hopes are fixed in heaven and you—
When hope was sinking in dismay
When glooms obscured Columbus's day
His steady mind from changes free
Resolved on Death or Liberty—
Firm—united &c.

For the Flute or Violin
The passage in question begins in measure twenty-one of “Hail Columbia” (Fig. 4.10), which corresponds to measure thirteen of “The President’s March” (Fig. 4.11). With one exception, measures thirteen through twenty of every extant edition of “The President’s March” show the same harmonic material as Carr’s version, or a close derivative. After a cadence on the dominant in measure twelve, the B section opens with an applied dominant that resolves to

---

255 Carr’s edition of “Hail Columbia” includes a prelude and postlude that are not found in the original march. It thus comprises an additional eleven measures. In “The President’s March” measure thirteen marks the onset of the B section, but in “Hail Columbia” internal repetitions are eliminated and with them the demarcation of internal sections.

256 Editions showing the same harmonization as Carr’s sheet include “President’s March” (New York: Gilfert, [1797]), “The President’s March” (New York: Moller, [c. 1800]), “President’s March” (New York: n. p., n. d.), and Rayner Taylor’s arrangement of “The President’s March” as a keyboard duet (Philadelphia: Priest, [c. 1795]). The harmonization is also found in Gilfert’s version of “Hail Columbia” (New York, [1798]).
the supertonic (E minor) in measure fourteen. This is followed by prolonged emphasis of the dominant (mm. 15–17) and then the tonic (mm. 18–20). But in adapting this material for use in “Hail Columbia,” Carr altered the chord progression in measures fifteen and sixteen, which correspond to measures twenty-three and twenty-four in his edition of “Hail Columbia.”

Carr evidently made this change in response to Hopkinson's text, which in those measures reads, “ever mindful what it cost,” referring to the sacrifices incurred in the Revolutionary War. The words strike a mournful note, and Carr reacts by extending the minor tonality from the preceding measure (twenty-two). At a moment when other editions move to the dominant, Carr lingers on the supertonic (D minor—the piece has been transposed to C), retonicizing it. He thus withholds the dominant (G major) until measure twenty-five. This deferral and the minor-mode extension generate tension, reflecting the hardship with which independence was gained. It is a uniquely text-expressive moment in a contrafacted march whose music is otherwise indifferent to its words.

Though slight within the overall scope of “Hail Columbia,” Carr’s musical innovation cannot be discounted. That he bothered to modify the existing music at all is noteworthy, because his existing arrangement of “The President’s March” worked perfectly well. Carr’s compositional intervention reflected the recurring Federalist analogy between the American Revolution and the Quasi-War. Hopkinson’s appeal to the cost of independence reinforced an anti-French logic. If French aggression constituted the same threat to American liberty as British imperial administration, and if American liberty had first been secured at great expense, then it followed that the United States should resist French interference. Carr’s musical intensification

257 The exceptional case is Willig’s “President’s March” (Philadelphia: [c. 1800]), which remains on the dominant in measures thirteen and fourteen.
258 The variant also appears in “Hail! Columbia: Death or Liberty” (Boston: von Hagen, [1798]), which was copied from Carr’s edition.
of Hopkinson’s verbal appeal to the revolutionary tradition was part and parcel of this Federalist line of argument.

**Conclusion**

In 1798, anti-French patriotic songs proliferated in Philadelphia and other urban areas of the northeastern United States. Taking into account the popularity of French revolutionary song and the general esteem for republican France that characterized the early 1790s, this represents a shift in the overall American opinion of the French. But the songs do not merely reflect a spontaneous popular reaction to the publication of the XYZ dispatches; they belong to a strategic attempt to portray the conflict with France in terms of an analogy with the American Revolution. Federalists leveraged the XYZ Affair and Quasi-War to promote a particular vision of America’s role in the turn-of-the-century Atlantic world, one characterized by a war-ready vigilance against perceived threats to a hard-won liberty.

That this repertory was ideological in the first place and musical in the second is indicated by its authors’ invariable recourse to contrafaction. Setting carefully devised, topical texts to well liked melodies was a fast and unobjectionable way to flood the musical market with Federalist propaganda. Words were the leading concern; they exhibit thematic and narrative consistency across the examples considered. Musically the repertory is less coherent, often suggesting a cavalier attitude towards the selection of source tunes and the fit between words and music. Melodies ranging from British imperialist anthems and innocuous social songs to American revolutionary marches were recruited, with varying aesthetic results. As suggested by the success of songs like “Adams and Liberty” and “Hail Columbia,” careful attention to the relationship between words and music improved audience reaction. In these most popular Francophobic contrafacts, music and words formed compelling compositional wholes.
The Federalist contrafacts that multiplied in the wake of the XYZ Affair are a singular aspect of the eighteenth-century American music-sheet repertory. In no other instance did a political event inspire such a broad reaction in the realm of musical print. The U.S. publication of French revolutionary songs in the mid-1790s, for example, was limited in comparison. What this, along with the evidence considered by Seth Cotlar and Thomas Ray, suggests is that the deterioration of Franco-American diplomatic relations left as deep a mark as any foreign or domestic affair of the late eighteenth century on American public consciousness. More than any other extra-musical phenomenon, it permeated the culture of musical print.

What began as foreign intrigue—the XYZ scandal—became a domestic affair of the highest proportions, evincing the fluidity of global and local politics. Americans simultaneously viewed themselves as members of a bounded nation-state and constituents of an evolving geopolitical system, as U.S. citizens and as denizens of a volatile transmaritime sphere of commercial and military action. The two realities were inescapable and intertwined. To be American was to be in relationship to England and France, and the nature of those relationships was contested. The crisis of 1798 was a heightened moment in the construction of American national identity, as Federalists opportunistically promulgated their interpretation of the United States’ role in the history of the modern Atlantic world.

**Epilogue: The Price of Franco-American Musical Legitimacy**

The consequences of the XYZ Affair and Quasi-War for Anglo-American music are clear enough. They are the array of anti-French contrafacts that we have considered. But what were the ramifications of these events for Francophone emigrants who had labored to establish themselves as professional musicians in the United States? Doubtless the community came under suspicion, and the Alien Acts meant that its numbers dwindled. But not all Franco-
American musicians fell victim to local Francophobia. Some took measures to ensure that their careers would not suffer as a result of the political crisis. In particular, two leading French-born composers, Henri Capron of Philadelphia and Victor Pelissier of New York, wrote and published songs in an effort to align themselves with the emerging Federalist consensus.

Sonneck and Upton have been cautious in assigning dates to Capron’s “Come Genius of Our Happy Land: A Favorite Patriotic Song” (Philadelphia: Willig) and Pelissier’s “Washington and Independence: A Favorite Patriotic Song” (New York: Gilfert). They suggest a range of 1797–99 for Capron’s sheet and 1797–1801 for Pelissier’s. But it is reasonably certain that both songs appeared on the heels of the publication of the XYZ dispatches and the ensuing Alien and Sedition Acts—that is, in the second half of 1798. Faced with mounting suspicion of French emigrants as potential enemy agents, Capron and Pelissier were under pressure to persuade Americans of their good intentions.

What better way to vindicate themselves than to publish songs that abjured France? Capron’s and Pelissier’s editions are a perplexing sight: French composer’s names affixed to anti-French propaganda. And yet they are easily understood in the context of 1798. By means of these publications, the composers disavowed sympathy for the current French regime. They did this unambiguously, in the words of the songs, and they lent authenticity to their disavowals by setting them to newly written music. Original composition signaled a level of personal commitment that contrafaction lacked.

Musically the songs are of a piece, invoking the *galant* keyboard idiom that dominated the Anglo-American market for printed music. Their compositional style is normative, and in this
regard they could not be politically safer—or less French. But the main point of interest is the words, which dissociate the composers from French republican identity. Pelissier’s text does so by virtue of a nine-stanza narrative, the most thorough rendition yet of the master story that we have traced in related Federalist songs. The first four verses recount conflicts of the colonial and revolutionary eras, culminating in the emergence of Washington as a national hero. Verse five mythologizes Washington’s retirement after the Revolution, and the sixth stanza laments the subsequent rise of American partisanship. Not until verse seven do we arrive at the present, when “Hark! The clarion strikes [Washington’s] ears,” and “Again for war he arms his breast.” The eighth strophe lingers on the re-emergence of “The hoary chief,” before, finally, verse nine condemns France:

Then shall thy sons, mistaken Gaul,
Revere the virtues of our land;
Their blood-stained swords innocuous fall,
And bear the olive in their hand.
Rise, Columbia! Columbia, rise again!
And pour thy thunders o’er the main.

Capron’s text is no less urgent in its denunciation of France. The third of its five stanzas promises to “rend the thin disguise” from “traitor friends with serpent smile [...] Who speak of faith and love the while / they pillage and despise.” Capron positioned himself as a protagonist in the quest to rid the United States of French conspirators. Defying ethnically grounded suspicions of his own political values, he espoused an Anglo-American brand of xenophobia. And he went further. The next verse retrospectively deplores the pro-French spirit that had consumed Americans in the early 1790s. Even the widely sanctioned Francophilia of the early French Revolution, Capron suggests, was imprudent. It was “folly’s sons” who “once [...]”

---

259 Their style contrasts, for example, with that of Jean-Baptiste Renaud de Chateaudun, the Haitian emigrant discussed in chapter three.
displayed the Gallic standard” on American soil, and the current hostility to France is a welcome change: “No ribband now our feasts invade / There waves our flag alone.”

Capron had lived in Philadelphia since the early 1780s, so his apparent attachment to the United States at the expense of France is perhaps unsurprising. Still, however, this song, along with Pelissier’s “Washington and Independence,” represents a significant self-refashioning, or at least a strategic alignment with the Federalist agenda. Regardless of how Capron and Pelissier felt about the matter, these native Frenchmen lent their voices to the dominant Francophobic discourse in order to secure the viability of their American careers. The price of legitimacy for a Franco-American composer during the Quasi-War was evidently a musico-verbal renunciation of his Frenchness. If in chapter three we noted a compromise between the Haitian Renaud de Chateaudun and Anglo-American musical taste, then here we see a related concession at a more personal level. It is clear that at the end of the eighteenth century the American musical market afforded little standing to French identity.

This situation differs markedly with respect to the status of Frenchness described in chapters one and two. Partnership with France figured centrally in the Chevalier de La Luzerne’s fête for the Dauphin and in Francis Hopkinson’s cantata, America Independent. These diplomatic entertainments celebrated Franco-American unity at the expense of British interests, even though Hopkinson relied on English musical precedents. Likewise, the popularity of French revolutionary song in the mid-1790s represented enduring affection for France. Even after many Americans had begun to drift away from French sympathy and towards an Anglo-friendly politics, entrepreneurs like Benjamin Carr continued to capitalize on a fashion for things French. Although Francophobic feeling was clearly established (and aligned with the Federalist position) by 1793, it was not until 1798 that collective American opinion turned against France.
The musical consequences of this shift have been noted in the genres of the royalist lament and the Federalist contrafact. Together with the verbal content of Chateaudun’s songs, the revision of his musical language represented American aversion to postrevolutionary developments in France. Likewise, Gilbert Fox and Joseph Hopkinson’s popular “Hail Columbia” and its imitations embodied an effort to distance the United States from French interests. Ironically, the two nations enjoyed better relations while espousing contrary political systems than they did as twin republics.

The foregoing chapters have demonstrated not only that early American musical and political expression vis-à-vis France were closely connected, but that their forms varied considerably between the end of the American Revolution and the presidential election of Thomas Jefferson. Philadelphian music shaped and reflected the trajectory of Franco-American diplomacy from 1781 to 1801, as the two powers went from being allies in the War of Independence to opponents in the Quasi-War. As a result of Francophone migration and the transatlantic scope of the music publishing trade, among other factors, local U.S. culture stimulated and responded to politics on a global scale. Early American music and politics must therefore be considered together, studied in dynamic relationship to France and its colonies.
APPENDIX 1A

Outline of Francis Hopkinson’s dramatic cantata, *America Independent* (March 1781)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Cast</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Musical Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scene 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Niccolò Jommelli (1714–74), unidentified opera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A, F, H</td>
<td>Exhortation to worship</td>
<td>Henry Carey, <em>Britannia</em> (1734), “He comes, he comes, the hero comes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Prayer for knowledge of war’s outcome</td>
<td>Handel, <em>Susanna</em> (1748), “Ask if yon damask rose be sweet”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Prayer for victory on America’s behalf</td>
<td>M. Arne, <em>Cymon</em> (1767), “Yet awhile, sweet sleep”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A, F</td>
<td>Reiteration of requests</td>
<td>Handel, <em>Judas Maccabæus</em> (1746), “See, the conquering hero comes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Intercession on behalf of America and France</td>
<td>Ibid., “Father of Heaven”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Minerva’s descent</td>
<td>Ibid., “In love there should meet a fond pair”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Interlude</td>
<td>Niccolò Jommelli, Chaconne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Promise of imperial greatness for America</td>
<td>Ibid., “Thou, like the glorious sun”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td>Praise for Minerva</td>
<td>Handel, <em>Judas Maccabæus</em> (1746), “See, the conquering hero comes”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Genius of America (tenor)  F = Genius of France (tenor)  H = High Priest of Minerva (baritone)  M = Minerva (soprano)
Outline of Hopkinson’s revisions to *America Independent*, retitled *The Temple of Minerva* (December 1781)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Cast</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Musical Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Invitation to America and France</td>
<td>unidentified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Minerva’s descent</td>
<td>Ibid., “In love there should meet a fond pair”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Interlude</td>
<td>Niccolò Jomelli, <em>Chaconne</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Promise of imperial greatness for America</td>
<td>Ibid., “Thou, like the glorious sun”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td>Praise for Minerva (<em>additional verses</em>)</td>
<td>Handel, <em>Judas Maccabæus</em> (1746), “See, the conquering hero comes”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Genius of America (tenor)  F = Genius of France (tenor)  H = High Priest of Minerva (baritone)  M = Minerva (soprano)
APPENDIX 2

Handel, “Let the Bright Seraphim,” in *Handel’s Songs Selected from His Oratorios* (London: Walsh, [c. 1765])
Hopkinson Collection of Music, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania
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Primary Sources

Manuscripts


Correspondence of John Rowe Parker. Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania.


Hopkinson Collection of Music. Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania.


Newspapers

American Star (Philadelphia)

Aurora General Advertiser (Philadelphia)

Claypoole’s American Daily Advertiser (Philadelphia)

Columbian Centinel (Boston)

Courier de l’Amérique (Philadelphia)

Courier Français (Philadelphia)

Courier de la France et des Colonies (Philadelphia)

Courier Politique (Philadelphia)
Diary (New York)

_Dunlap's American Daily Advertiser_ (Philadelphia)

_Federal Gazette_ (Philadelphia)

_Gazette of the United States_ (Philadelphia)

_General Advertiser_ (Philadelphia)

_Independent Gazetteer_ (Philadelphia)

_Journal des Révolutions_ (Philadelphia)

_National Gazette_ (Philadelphia)

_New York Daily Advertiser_

_Oriental Trumpet_ (Portland)

_Pennsylvania Packet_ (Philadelphia)

_Porcupine’s Gazette_ (Philadelphia)

_Poulson’s American Daily Advertiser_ (Philadelphia)

_Philadelphia Gazette_

_Radoteur_ (Philadelphia)

_Royal Gazette_ (New York)

Published Essays, Letters, Memoirs, Novels, Speeches, and Treatises


______. *Moreau de St. Méry’s American Journey, 1793–1798*, edited and translated by Anna


**Published Librettos, Poetry, and Songsters**


*The Democratic Songster*. Baltimore: Keatinge, 1794.


Morell, Thomas. *Judas Maccabaeus: A Sacred Drama*. York, [c. 1775].


Pownall, Mary Wrighten. *Mrs. Pownall’s Address in Behalf of the French Musicians, Delivered on Her Benefit Concert Night, at Oeller’s Hotel, Chestnut-street, Philadelphia. To Which Are Added, Pastoral Songs, Written by Herself at an Early Period of Life*. Philadelphia: Story, [1793].


[Wolcot, John]. *Pindariana; or Peter’s Portfolio*. Philadelphia: Bache, 1794.

**Published Music**
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“Brother Soldiers All Hail.” Philadelphia: Carr, [1799].


“La Carmagnole.” London: Longman and Broderip, [c. 1792].


“La Carmagnole.” Philadelphia: Carr, [1794].


Dezède, Nicolas. Ouverture de Blaise et Babet, arranged by C. Fodor. Philadelphia: Willig, [1798–


______. *Tableau de la situation de Marie-Antoinette*. Amsterdam: Kuntze, 1794.


Handel, George Frideric. *Handel’s Songs Selected from His Oratorios*. London: Walsh, [c. 1765].


______. *New Medley Overture*. New York: Hewitt, [1798].


“The Ladies’ Patriotic Song.” New York: Gilfert, [1798].


______. “Marseilles Hymn.” Boston: Hagen, [1798–99].


______. “Marseilles Hymn in French and English.” New York: Gilfert, [1794–95].

______. “Marseilles Hymn in French and English.” New York: Gilfert, [1796].

______. “Marseilles Hymn in French and English.” Philadelphia: Carr, [1793].


“The New President’s March [with] Washington’s March [at the Battle of Trenton].”
Philadelphia: Carr, [1796].

______. “Green Mountain Farmer.” Boston: Linley and Moore, [1798].


______. “Maria Antoinette’s Complaint.” Philadelphia: Willig [c. 1800].

Phile, Philip. “President’s March.” New York: Gilfert, [1797].
______. “President’s March.” New York: Moller, [c. 1800].
______. “President’s March.” Philadelphia: Willig, [c. 1800].
______. “President’s March,” arranged by Rayner Taylor. Philadelphia: Priest, [c. 1795].
Phile, Philip and Bécourt. “President’s March and Ça Ira.” [Philadelphia:] Carr, [1793–94].


______. “Hail Columbia.” Boston: von Hagen, [1798].

______. “Hail Columbia.” New York: Gilfert, [1798].

______. “President’s March: A New Federal Song.” Philadelphia: Willig, [1798].
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