

“THIS DRAMA THAT DISPLEASED” REPRESENTATION VS. REPRESENTATIVENESS

Vincent Chambarlhac, Professor, PhD., University of Burgundy

Professor Ion M. Tomuş, Professor, PhD., Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu

BIO

Vincent Chambarlhac is a French contemporary-history professor at Université Bourgogne Europe and Director of the LIR3S research unit (CNRS–UBE). A specialist in 20th-century social and cultural history, his work explores socialism, intellectuals, visual culture, theatre, and the intersections between artistic expression and political movements. He has authored and co-edited numerous books and studies, including research on the theatre troupe Les Copiaus, wartime imagery, and cultural heritage in the Bourgogne–Franche-Comté region. Chambarlhac is active on several editorial boards, directs a scholarly book series, and regularly contributes expertise to cultural and heritage institutions.

Institutional Affiliation and Contact: University of Burgundy, Maison de l'Université, Esplanade Erasme, BP 27877 - 21078, Dijon, France
vincent.chambarlhac@u-bourgogne.fr

BIO

Ion M. Tomuş is a Professor at Lucian Blaga University, Sibiu, where he teaches courses in History of Romanian Theatre, History of Worldwide Theatre and Drama Theory. In 2013 he finished a postdoctoral study together with the Romanian Academy, on the topic of the modern international theatre festival, with case studies on Edinburgh International Festival, Festival d'Avignon and Sibiu International Theatre Festival. He has published studies, book reviews, theatre reviews, and essays in prestigious cultural magazines and academic journals in Romania and Europe. Since 2005, Mr. Tomuş is part of the staff at Sibiu International Theatre Festival, where he coordinates *Aplauze*, the festival's journal, and oversees two editorial projects: *Cultural Conversations* and the annual volume of *Aplauze*. He is the Chair of the PhD School in Theatre and Performing Arts at Lucian Blaga University.

Institutional Affiliation and Contact: Lucian Blaga University, Sibiu, Faculty of Letters and Arts, Department of Drama and Theatre Studies. 12 Banatului St, 550011, Sibiu, Romania
ion.tomus@ulbsibiu.ro

ABSTRACT

This article analyzes the first performance of *Les Copiaus* in Demigny (1925), revealing how the reception hinged on a tension between representation and representativeness. Formed after the collapse of Jacques Copeau's pedagogical project in Burgundy, the young troupe had already woven strong social ties in the village. Their debut show mixed commedia dell'arte, parades, and comic interludes that aligned with local festive culture and were warmly received. The failure came with Copeau's naturalist drama *Le Veuf*, based on a recent village suicide linked to alcoholism. Intended as a moral lesson, the play instead provoked rejection: the audience refused a theatrical mirror that exposed a painful local reality. The article argues that popular theatre achieves representativeness only when grounded in shared prior experience between actors and audience—a condition fulfilled by the troupe's everyday presence but absent from *Le Veuf*. Re-examining this little-known episode, the study shows how it illuminates the early dynamics of French rural theatrical decentralization and the limits of Copeau's vision of a popular theatre.

KEYWORDS

Jacques Copeau, theatre, heritage, play, rejection

CITATION SUGGESTION

Chambarlhac, Vincent and Tomuş, Ion M. “This Drama That Displeased”. Representation vs. Representativeness”, *Journal of Performing Arts*, no. 3 (2025): 42-59.

DOI: 10.54989/JAS.24.02

Acknowledgement: This article is published as part of the “Establishing a Laboratory of Cultural Heritage in Central Romania” project (ELABCHROM - <https://grants.ulbsibiu.ro/elabchrom/>) funded by European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme. Grant agreement No 101079282.

Sunday, 17 May (1925)

First performance in Demigny, with the participation of the Demigny Brass Band.

(...)

Michel (Saint-Denis) as Tartaglia, carrying the Copiaus' banner, paraded with the band in the afternoon. Edi (Copeau) designed and decorated a large program posted in the hall.

The hall, adorned with greenery, is full. A festive atmosphere. A telegram from Madame Copeau sends her best wishes. Overall success. The drama displeased¹.

The drama that displeased was *Le Veuf*, by Jacques Copeau. It was part of a performance given by *Les Copiaus* in Demigny, in Saône-et-Loire. This troupe—made up of students and members of the Copeau family—was formed in February 1925 after the collapse of the pedagogical project that Jacques Copeau had hoped to establish in Burgundy since September 1924. Lacking sufficient financial means, Copeau, then living in Morteuil, a hamlet of Demigny, gave up on his School. Having sacrificed everything to follow the theatre reformer, the head of the Vieux-Colombier, the young actors—some of them married—decided to form a troupe to earn a living and continue benefiting from Copeau's teaching. A tutelary figure, he lent the troupe his support and his pen; the locals soon nicknamed them "Les Copiaus." The 17 May performance was their first official appearance—a success for the village, within which the failure of *Le Veuf* was embedded.

A brief look back at the formation of the troupe and the preparation of the performance precedes the analysis of the representation itself. Here, in hindsight, the sources are fragmentary. The *Journal de Bord* of the Copiaus, kept by Suzanne Bing whose pen was consistently favorable to the Patron, Jacques Copeau; the more critical memoirs of Jean Villard-Gilles²; and a few folios from the French National Library³ form the principal sources. One must confront the "infinite from below"⁴ represented by rural life

(Demigny) in order to grasp the sibylline remark "the drama displeased." Yet this remark forms the nodal point of our inquiry, for it raises the question of *representation* versus *representativeness*—that is, of understanding what, for the popular audience of Demigny, is possible (or impossible) to have represented in its name. Here lies a partition of the sensible⁵: the moment at which the representativeness the public grants to a theatrical representation collapses, because it becomes intolerable in that time and place.

Understanding the specific horizon of reception.

In a short letter dated 18 February 1925 and addressed to his nephew Michel Saint-Denis, Jacques Copeau announced the dissolution of the School—the end of a brief attempt at a theatrical *phalanstère* in Morteuil that had begun in September 1924. Worn out by the long seasons at the Théâtre du Vieux-Colombier, where since 1913 he had been reforming the stage, Copeau decided to leave Paris with very young students in order to find a healthy audience and to "dé-cabottiner" actor training, which he felt had been corrupted by the success of boulevard theatre. This gesture accompanied his conversion to Catholicism; Burgundy would be his desert⁶. He explained the dissolution of the School to all the students on 22 February.

Jean Villard-Gilles and Auguste Bovério decided to support themselves through theatre, and a troupe was formed. At its beginnings it included several of Copeau's close collaborators: Suzanne Bing, Auguste Boverio, Léon Chancerel, Michel Saint-Denis, Aman Maistre, and Jean Villard-Gilles, among others. Copeau's relationship to the troupe was that of both a Patron—advising, instructing, proposing exercises—and a protector who lent his name and connections to the actors. In the immediate period between February and 17 May, exercises and rehearsals continued in and around Demigny, shaping in part the eventual reception of the performance.

Although Jacques Copeau and his family lived in a large house in Morteuil, a few of the students and their families lived a short distance away (three kilometers), in Demigny⁷. This geographical proximity between the troupe and the people of Demigny manifested itself in several ways. It even predated the founding of the troupe, as shown in this letter from Marie-Hélène Copeau to her father:

*(...) We already have a very good reputation in the area. 'You've got some mighty pretty girls at your place, and handsome lads too—ah, and polite! not stuck-up!' On the day of the festival in Demigny we made a sensational entrance into the village, marching in step and singing: all the girls had a red flower in their hair and the boys one in their buttonhole. We danced in the square and drank sparkling wine at the butcher's. We had a wonderful time. We do gymnastics every morning on the road and on the grass in front of the house.'*⁸

What is essential here is the youthfulness of the theatrical community within a countryside still marked by the bloodletting of the Great War. These young people took part in village festivities and social life. Jean Villard-Gilles played the organ during Sunday services at the church while the troupe sang. All of them, to varying degrees, chatted with the villagers at *La Chaumière*, the café run by the Bravard couple. To this everyday sociability woven into village life were added elements that revealed the theatrical skills of Copeau's former students. On 29 March 1925, following the Patron's suggestion, they all went together to the masked ball in Demigny, held at the local Vauxhall. In costume, they engaged in a practical exercise in learning *commedia dell'arte*, both in the costumes themselves and in the way of embodying them. The success was immediate:

*Masked ball in Demigny. We all went in costume, and our entrance caused quite a sensation. Prizegiving: the Brighella costume worn by Janvier and the Liar costume worn by Maïene (Marie-Hélène Copeau) won first prize. Michel (Saint-Denis) as Tartaglia, Claude as Columbine, second prize. Suzanne Bing as Guillemette, third prize—awarded in the form of bottles of wine and liqueur. Madeleine as Mirandolina, Edi (Copeau) as Gilles, Pascal (Copeau) as Scapin, Madame Janvier as the Spanish woman from *The Marriage of Figaro*.*⁹

In the eyes of the villagers, the profession of actor was made visible at the masked ball, just as—under Jacques Copeau's guidance—the troupe and its Patron made a striking appearance at the ball held on 5 April. This closeness between the theatrical community and the village population established, almost as a matter of course, the setting for the Copiaus' first performance. It would naturally take place in the Vauxhall, whose dance floor served as a stage. Demigny, only recently electrified, benefited from the help of the stage manager Janvier, who installed an electrical panel in the hall to provide lighting (12 May). The performance could then take place with the participation of the municipal brass band.

Theatre scholarship often pays little attention to this time before the performance itself, except for analyses of costumes, rehearsals, and dress rehearsals. Yet all these scattered notes, gleaned from letters and from the Copiaus' *Journal de bord*, partly foreshadow the reception the spectacle would receive. The daily ties between the troupe and the local population naturalized their presence in the social fabric of Demigny, embedding them in festive spaces (the Vauxhall and the Bravard café, where tickets were sold), while their attendance at church services—encouraged, if not explicitly required, by the newly converted Copeau—linked the actors closely to the village community.

Unlike the itinerant fairground and theatrical troupes whose arrival in rural areas was marked by novelty, here the actors formed part of the everyday landscape. Their craft had already been displayed at the masked ball, and the enthusiasm generated by their costumes created expectations for a performance on 17 May shaped by the horizon of *commedia dell'arte*. For our purposes—between representation and representativeness—these elements are crucial. In the anticipation surrounding the performance, representativeness informed representation twice over. The performance had to align with the Demigny audience's perception of the troupe: actors steeped in *commedia dell'arte*, embodying the theatrical ideals of their Patron. But because the troupe had inserted itself into village sociability, it also had to consider itself representative of Demigny's festive culture within the performance itself. Moreover, in light of the later theoretical construction of popular theatre in which Jacques Copeau is considered a foundational figure¹⁰, this representativeness is of central importance.

Points of Ambiguity

The 17 May performance was, for the troupe, a matter of urgency. After a joint procession through the streets of Demigny with the local brass band, the show opened with a prologue. The Copiaus were then introduced (*Jean Bourguignon et les Copiaus*). This was followed by *Les Sottises de Gilles*, an eighteenth-century parade piece after Thomas Gueulette, and then by Jacques Copeau's *Le Veuf*. A final divertissement, *Les jeunes filles à marier*, written by Léon Chancerel, closed the evening. Historiography quickly concluded that this first performance lacked unity—reading it as a trial run¹¹—following the account given in Jean Villard-Gilles's memoirs. Stepping outside strictly theatrical logic, one may also see here a tactic on the part of the troupe. The creation of the show was collective, while providing an opportunity to test Copeau's teaching. It was a kind of bricolage, characteristic of the Copiaus' "art of

making" and of their Patron's approach to theatre in the village¹². For this first performance, the aim was to anchor themselves within the socio-cultural texture of the village—to assemble a theatrical culture shaped by the place itself. The Copiaus (and Copeau) sought to take hold of the village through their theatrical culture.

This dynamic was signaled at once by the morning parade, where Michel Saint-Denis, as Tartaglia, carried the Vieux-Colombier banner marked with the two doves, alongside the municipal band. The show thus announced itself in the manner of small itinerant circuses, with a fairground aesthetic reminiscent of the *balagan*, yet seamlessly integrated into the village's festive traditions. The prologue, like *Jean Bourguignon et les Copiaus*, offered an opportunity for dialogue with the audience and no doubt (though the text is missing) evoked the ties forged through dances and through visits to *La Chaumière* (the Bravard café). The very figure of Jean Bourguignon, the troupe's coryphaeus—rooted in the hillside, a vigneron character created by Michel Saint-Denis—embodied the Burgundian wine culture celebrated at the time by regionalist discourse¹³. Everything here fostered a form of mutual familiarity between the public and the troupe.

Les Sottises de Gilles reinforced this dynamic. It was a fairground parade, an eighteenth-century genre meant to draw spectators to the theatre. It provided an occasion to blend medieval farce with the *commedia dell'arte* types embodied here by Jean Villard-Gilles as Gilles, Michel Saint-Denis as the master of civility, Auguste Bovério as the fencing master, and Jacques Copeau as the grammar master, among others. The project had been rehearsed in Morteuil since 27 March, and one may assume that the costumes awarded prizes at the 29 March masked ball—and the style of performance they implied—were the same. The Copiaus' familiarity with the village's festive culture was amplified here, since such short comedic scenes were designed to link the spectators' reality (the dance floor itself) to the creation of theatrical illusion through costumes and stock characters¹⁴.

An interlude closed this first part, which relied entirely on genres and stock types to capture the audience. To achieve this, all the theatrical resources of the Copiaus and Jacques Copeau's knowledge drew on cultural elements of the village and region, transporting them to the other side of the stage, into theatrical illusion. The second part of the performance pursued the same intention. It began with a burlesque interlude (*Les trois musiciens*), followed by a dramatic scene, *Le Veuf* by Jacques Copeau, which he had read to the troupe on 3 May. He wrote it based on a local news item: a widower's suicide by alcohol. Here too, but in the dramatic register, the local served as material for the theatre. The tone became lighter again with the final divertissement, *Les jeunes filles à marier*, interspersed with songs written by Léon Chancerel and Jean Villard-Gilles.

Thus, this first performance can be viewed in two ways. The first—on which I will not dwell—relates to the genres assembled here: small forms (prologue, interludes, parade) alongside drama, with music and song playing a significant role. From the standpoint of theatre history, the lack of unity is obvious, and the whole may appear as the rough draft of later shows with a more assured stylistic coherence¹⁵. In relation to the village and the troupe's circumstances, however, a second interpretation posits a deliberate tactic at work: the effort to situate themselves within a rural, winegrowing region lacking theatres and theatrical infrastructure. If the initial wager was economic, it required adapting Copeau's theatrical methods to the reality of a supposedly popular audience that had to be drawn into the theatre. The procession with the brass band, the burlesque interludes, and the parade were all elements of early twentieth-century mass culture¹⁶—in which cabaret could complement the itinerant silent cinema accompanied by music, and in which the village dance—as forms recycled for theatrical purposes. The proximity of the parade genre to the urban history of the Parisian Vauxhalls, which later became an architectural fashion spreading to provincial towns¹⁷, illustrates this continual bricolage

designed for the audience of a rural commune. Copeau and the Copiaus fashioned their offering from an urban culture of popular theatre and its direct competitors (cabarets, music halls) of the 1920s.

In terms of the pair representation/representativeness, it is the troupe's representations that negotiate with the presumed representativeness of the show as perceived from Demigny. At this price, the troupe could insert itself into the local fabric, extend its influence, and hope for commissions and invitations. Laconically, Suzanne Bing could conclude in the *Journal de bord* on the evening of 17 May: "Success overall. The drama displeased."¹⁸

It is from this gap that we must examine more closely—through the lens of popular theatre—the friction between representation and representativeness.

“Was this the kind of play one should stage before a peasant audience?”

While Suzanne Bing downplays the Patron's failure through her terse phrasing, Jean Villard-Gilles is far more forthcoming in his recollections:

It looked like one of those naturalist dramas from Antoine's era. It was the story—drawn from a real incident that had taken place in the village of Demigny—of an old, neurasthenic peasant who committed suicide by swallowing almost in one gulp a liter of marc de Bourgogne. Was this a show to present to peasants, modest people par excellence, who cannot bear to see their weaknesses or their flaws laid bare (...)?

The villagers were at last going to see this Monsieur Copeau, who was so famous... It was a disaster. Wounded in their modesty, offended, petrified, they watched this unbelievable spectacle in silence. And when Copeau collapsed after a long monologue that grew increasingly slurred, struck down by alcohol, the audience did not react... except with a disapproving silence.¹⁹

The allusion to Antoine is more revealing than it first appears. On 23 March 1925, Jacques Copeau set to work on “a long monologue based on a subject taken from the local news, *Le Veuf*,” as the *Copiasus’ Journal de bord* notes²⁰. That same day, Antoine, in his column for *L’Information financière, politique et économique*, reproduced a letter sent to him by Jacques Copeau²¹. Copeau was responding to Antoine’s previous column (9 March), in which, while criticizing *George Dandin* performed at L’Atelier by Charles Dullin—who, he claimed, had “butchered” it—Antoine suddenly inserted a jab: “this is, moreover, what happened at the Vieux-Colombier when Jacques Copeau gave us *Les Fourberies de Scapin*.”

Copeau replied to this last remark, emphasizing the influence and reputation of the Vieux-Colombier in its adaptations of canonical plays. He added:

I am not much given to polemics. But since some critics seem to enjoy spreading the rumor that I have never known how to discover a new author, if you now start claiming that I have never known how to perform an old one, I wonder what on earth I could have been doing for ten years at the Vieux-Colombier to deserve even a little of my contemporaries’ esteem.

What, then, can Copeau perform? His wounded pride is evident in the letter, and one may suppose that both the writing and the performance of *Le Veuf* were conceived as a response to Antoine. All the more so since, as Jean Villard-Gilles notes, the drama is naturalist, echoing Antoine’s recommendations in “*Causerie sur la mise en scène*” (1903)²². The character played by Jacques Copeau is socially determined by the flaws of his milieu—alcoholism. In short, he is, in the dramatist’s eyes, representative of a part of Demigny’s culture. For Copeau, constructing the character as a type also corresponded to his proselytizing intentions and to a re-enactment of his experience during the Vieux-Colombier’s American tour in the

Great War. Proselytizing: as a recent convert, he wished to make theatre an example for a popular audience, thus delivering a moral lesson through the naturalistic depiction of the effects of alcoholism leading to suicide. For the moral content of *Le Veuf*, he was likely inspired by the propaganda performances organized by prohibitionist leagues—which helped secure the Volstead Act—that he had witnessed during his American tour.

Whatever the case, *Le Veuf* was a failure.

At this point, Jean Villard-Gilles’s account takes on its full meaning when read through the lens of representativeness:

After the performance, Boverio, Chancerel, and I (Jean Villard-Gilles), who were living in Demigny at the time, found ourselves at the Bravards’ café—run by a delightful cooper-café owner—together with the mayor and two or three local notables. They expressed their disapproval at the evocation of a local tragedy that everyone wished to forget, and urged us to insist that Copeau withdraw his play from the upcoming performance that had already been announced. ‘Otherwise, you won’t have anyone there,’ they told us.²³

Because of the location—the Bravard café, central to village sociability—and the protagonists involved (the mayor and a few local notables), what is at stake here is the *representativeness* of the performance in the eyes of the public. At this stage of the analysis, two possibilities, more complementary than they may seem, come into view. Either the drama performed by Jacques Copeau is unbearable for the Demigny audience because it is authentic (drawn from a local news item) and therefore representative of the population; or it is unbearable because it is performed by “Monsieur Copeau, who was so famous”, a mirror held up to the public in which it cannot recognize itself. Through the distancing effect of the stage, the reality of the local tragedy becomes unsustainable—something the notables of Demigny, as representatives of the community,

sought to persuade the Copiaus of in view of the second performance. Jean Villard-Gilles's class-inflected question forms the keystone of this chiasm: "Was this a show to be presented to peasants?" In retrospect, the reader may infer that a different audience (non-peasant?) might have tolerated it.

What is at stake for the audience during *Le Veuf* concerns the *partition of the sensible*. Although Copeau, in both his writing and his performance, believed that *Le Veuf* offered a shared element of common experience—the local news item—the audience rejected it. The dramaturge's "art of doing", here understood (as with the entire production) as a tactic meant to naturalize the troupe within the rural setting and thereby allow it to tour, failed. This failure is all the more ambiguous because the public, recognizing itself in the drama, refused the mirror held up to it, refused that identity. What the audience does recognize in the performance, ultimately, are the elements that preceded it and which they had already shared: the *commedia dell'arte* types encountered at the masked ball, the burlesque interludes, the music, the experience of parading through the streets with the brass band. The daily presence of the Copiaus in Demigny ensured the success of the performance. That presence was representative of a shared experience. *Le Veuf*, coming from the hand of Jacques Copeau—who, as a Patron, was more distant from Demigny and often absent—could not suit an audience more mixed than it appeared, because alongside the "peasants" cited by Jean Villard-Gilles were notables whose presence anticipated the summer performances in Fontaine, Gergy, and then Meursault²⁴.

There is a bias here that Villard-Gilles glosses over: for the notables, situated within an economic regionalism that was in the process of transforming the Côte and its wines into a brand²⁵, a denunciation of alcoholism by Jacques Copeau—whose fame they hoped to capitalize on—was impossible. Whatever segment of the public was present at the Vauxhall on the evening of 17 May 1925, *Le Veuf* could not be representative, and thus could not be praised. There was no shared common ground here.

What, then, can be retained from this micro-historical approach to the brief episode that launched the Copiaus—a troupe that enabled its Patron to theorize, retrospectively (in 1942), the notion of popular theatre, while also constituting one of the pioneering experiences of theatrical decentralization? The *representativeness* of a performance depends on a shared experience with the audience. Such sharing can, in some cases, take the form of co-construction. That was not the case here. The experience was built *before* the performance, even *outside* the theatre frame: the cabaret, the church, and the inn were among the spaces in which this shared experience was formed, beyond the stage itself. It was not the moment of performance that allowed the audience—largely passive—to identify with the actors and thereby validate a form of representativeness. Rather, it was the spectacle, already glimpsed beforehand at the masked ball, of what it meant to be actors—their craft—that ensured the success of the performance.

Le Veuf lay outside this tight social contiguity that allowed the local audience to appropriate the troupe as its own. It did not reveal Jacques Copeau's professional identity—his art—but imposed a local identity that the audience refused. Later, on the Côte, journalists would describe the Copiaus in these terms, writing about the *Fêtes de la vigne* in Beaune in August 1926:

The succession of scenes proves that the Copiaus are well informed about our little affairs, our sayings, our habits—like the old 'go off to the vines.' They know all our secrets, the rascals, and they reveal them to the public! It's a betrayal. (...) Several tasks of the vineyard are then mimed by the performers with remarkable truth and an absolutely wonderful precision of gesture. The vinegrower's wife grinding the coffee, the women peeling potatoes, the staking, the spraying, the washing—these are all astonishing studies that required a long 'apprenticeship' and, above all, a keen sense of observation and proportion.²⁶

It is this preliminary work—of appropriation and reciprocal understanding—that ultimately grounds the scene’s representativeness.

ENDNOTES

1. Denis Gonthard (ed.), *Le Journal de bord des Copiaus (1924-1929)* (Segers, 1974), 76.
2. Jean Villard-Gilles, *Mon demi-siècle* (Payot, 1954), 117-119.
3. Jacques Copeau Papers, National Library of France (BnF).
4. See Alain Corbin, *Le monde retrouvé de Louis-François Pinagot* (Flammarion, 1998).
5. See Jacques Rancière, *Le partage du sensible* (La Fabrique, 2000).
6. The expression is Ivan Goll’s, writing in *L’Intransigeant* about the flight to Burgundy: “So he found his desert in Burgundy, among the peasants, the simple and uneducated people. There, the actor pitched his tent and performed only for them, with a company of ten very young people who had never done theatre before—this being the sole valid condition for engagement and recommendation. And there, in meditation and asceticism, in poverty and in obscurity, Copeau began to perform in order to earn his own bread and to entertain human beings. (...)”. Ivan Goll. “Jacques Copeau’s Pure Theatre”, in *Le Journal de Beaune* (16 octobre 1926)
7. According to the *Journal de bord* of the Copiaus, the community settled in Morteuil comprised the Copeau family (Jacques Copeau, his wife, and their three children), the household of his nephew Michel Saint-Denis (three members), Suzanne Bing’s family (three), the régisseur Janvier and his wife, as well as two younger residents. In nearby Demigny lived the Boverio couple, the family of Jean Villard-Gilles (three), the household of Aman Maistre, and Mme Saint-Denis. Although substantial in size, this community included at the time only five actors: Michel Saint-Denis, Suzanne Bing, Auguste Boverio, Jean Villard-Gilles, and Aman Maistre, together with one apprentice actress, Marie-Madeleine Gauthier. *Le Journal de bord des Copiaus (1924-1929)* (Segers, 1974), 70.
8. Jacques Copeau, *Registres VI : L’école du Vieux-Colombier* (Gallimard, 2000), 429.
9. Denis Gonthard (ed.), *Le Journal de bord des Copiaus (1924-1929)* (Segers, 1974), 71-72.
10. Marco Consolini, Jacques Copeau et la « découverte » de la dimension populaire du théâtre », in Marion Denizot (dir) *Théâtre populaire et représentations du peuple* (PUR, 2010), 151-166.

11. See Denis Gonthard’s commentary on the *Journal de bord* of the Copiaus: Denis Gonthard (ed.), *Le Journal de bord des Copiaus (1924-1929)* (Segers, 1974), note 101, 182. A comparable conclusion is likewise reached by Maria Inès Aliverti et Marco Consolini in *Jacques Copeau, Registres VII, Les années Copiaus (1925-1929)* (Gallimard, 2017).
12. On this question of tactics and the specific “arts of doing” associated with them, see Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life. Arts of Doing* (vol. 1), Paris, Folio, 1990, p. XLVI and following.
13. See Vincent Chambarlhac, *Un Vieux-colombier bourguignon, Une expérience de la décentralisation théâtrale (1925-1929)* (Presses de la Sorbonne, 2021) 125-137.
14. See Jennifer Ruimi. “Modernité de la parade de société en France au XVIII^e siècle” in *Diversité et modernité du théâtre du XVIII^e siècle* (Hermann, 2014), 327-341. Also see Guy Spielmann, “Investigations sur les traces de l’événement-spectacle : la parade de société et son Gilles” in A. Zygel-Basso and K. Gladu *De la conversation au conservatoire : Scénographies des genres mineurs (1680-1780)* (Hermann, 2014), 271-298.
15. “This is, all in all, the assessment of the first historian of the Copeaus, Denis Gonthard (“the Copeaus’ first program is lacking in unity, to say the least!”), later taken up by a large part of the historiography. *The Logbook of the Copiaus (1924-1929)*, edited by Denis Gonthard, (Seghers, 1974), note 101, 182.
16. See Dominique Kalifa, *La culture de masse en France (1860-1930)* (La Découverte, 2001).
17. Hélène Mazzoleni. “Les Vaux-halls parisiens : vers une politique moderne des espaces urbains et spectaculaires”, in Florence Fix (ed.) *Théâtre et ville. Espaces partagés : patrimoine, culture, savoir* (EUD ? 2018) 89-104. The link between Vauxhall and the parade is also discussed by Guy Spielmann in “Investigations sur les traces de l’événement-spectacle: la parade de société et son Gilles” in A. Zygel-Basso et K. Gladu, *De la conversation au conservatoire : Scénographies des genres mineurs (1680-1780)* (Hermann, 2014) 271-298.
18. Denis Gonthard (ed.), *Le Journal de bord des Copiaus (1924-1929)* (Segers, 1974), 77.
19. Jean Villard-Gilles, *Mon demi-siècle* (Payot, 1954), 117-119.
20. Denis Gonthard (ed.), *Le Journal de bord des Copiaus (1924-1929)* (Segers, 1974), 70.
21. Antoine, La semaine théâtrale “Une lettre de Jacques Copeau”, *L’Information financière, politique et économique*, 23/03/1925, 2.
22. Brigitte Prost, *Le peuple et la scène naturaliste d’André Antoine*, In Marion Denizot (dir) *Théâtre populaire et représentations du peuple* (PUR, 2010), 61-72.

23. Jean Villard-Gilles, *Mon demi-siècle* (Payot, 1954) 119.
24. Vincent Chambarlhac, *Un Vieux-colombier bourguignon, Une expérience de la décentralisation théâtrale (1925-1929)* (Presses de la Sorbonne, 2021), 31-33.
25. Gilles Gilles, *Folklore savant et folklore commercial. Reconstruire la qualité des vins de Bourgogne. Une sociologie économique de l'image régionale de l'entre-deux-guerres*, 2 vol, PhD thesis, Université de Bourgogne, 2002.
26. "La Ile fête de la Vigne et du Vin", *Le Journal de Beaune*, 31/08/1926, 1.

REFERENCES:

- ALIVERTI, Maria Inès, and Marco CONSOLINI, eds. *Jacques Copeau, Registres VII: Les années Copiaus (1925–1929)*. Gallimard, 2017.
- ANTOINE. "Une lettre de Jacques Copeau." *L'Information financière, politique et économique*, March 23, 1925.
- CERTEAU, Michel de. *The Practice of Everyday Life. Vol. 1: Arts of Doing*. Folio, 1990.
- CHAMBARLHAC, Vincent. *Un Vieux-Colombier bourguignon: Une expérience de la décentralisation théâtrale (1925–1929)*. Presses de la Sorbonne, 2021.
- CONSOLINI, Marco. "Jacques Copeau et la 'découverte' de la dimension populaire du théâtre." In *Théâtre populaire et représentations du peuple*, edited by Marion DENIZOT, 151–166. Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2010.
- CORBIN, Alain. *Le monde retrouvé de Louis-François Pinagot*. Flammarion, 1998.
- GILLES, Gilles. *Folklore savant et folklore commercial: Reconstruire la qualité des vins de Bourgogne. Une sociologie économique de l'image régionale de l'entre-deux-guerres*. 2 vols. PhD diss., Université de Bourgogne, 2002.
- GOLL, Ivan. "Jacques Copeau's Pure Theatre." *Le Journal de Beaune*, October 16, 1926.
- GONTHARD, Denis, ed. *Le Journal de bord des Copiaus (1924–1929)*. Seghers, 1974.
- KALIFA, Dominique. *La culture de masse en France (1860–1930)*. La Découverte, 2001.
- "La Ile fête de la Vigne et du Vin." *Le Journal de Beaune*, August 31, 1926.
- MAZZOLENI, Hélène. "Les Vaux-halls parisiens: Vers une politique moderne des espaces urbains et spectaculaires." In *Théâtre et ville. Espaces partagés:*

patrimoine, culture, savoir, edited by Florence FIX, 89–104. Éditions universitaires de Dijon, 2018.

RANCIÈRE, Jacques. *Le partage du sensible*. La Fabrique, 2000.

RUIMI, Jennifer. "Modernité de la parade de société en France au XVIIIe siècle." In *Diversité et modernité du théâtre du XVIIIe siècle*, 327–341. Hermann, 2014.

SPIELMANN, Guy. "Investigations sur les traces de l'événement-spectacle: La parade de société et son Gilles." In *De la conversation au conservatoire: Scénographies des genres mineurs (1680–1780)*, edited by A. ZYGEL-BASSO and K. GLADU, 271–298. Hermann, 2014.

VILLARD-GILLES, Jean. *Mon demi-siècle*. Payot, 1954.

ARCHIVAL SOURCES

Jacques COPEAU Papers. Bibliothèque nationale de France (BnF).