Horace Vernet’s ‘Orient’: photography and the Eastern Mediterranean in 1839, part II: the daguerreotypes and their texts

by MICHELLE HANNOOSH

AS A PAINTER Horace Vernet was less interested in the ‘reality’ of the Near East than in what it could offer for the representation of biblical subjects. He developed a theory of the continuity between the dress and customs of the ancient Hebrews and those of modern-day Arabs, which he elaborated in lectures delivered to the Académie in 1848 and later published: in this work he calls upon his experiences from his 1839–40 journey to Egypt and the Levant and reproduces many of his letters from it. Such a theory, meant to steer painters towards a more authentic representation of biblical scenes and to free the Orient from the dominance of a classicising view, was itself based on a stereotype of the East as an unchangeable place outside history: ‘This land has no age. You can be transported back a few thousand years, it still looks the same. [. . .] Pharaoh mounted on his chariot and pursuing the Hebrews raised the same dust in the desert as the artillery of Mehmet Ali. The Arabs have not changed’. This view was expressed by many travellers and manifested in the picturesque conventions of much Orientalist art, such as the work of David Wilkie, David Roberts and William Holman Hunt – its ideal landscapes with ancient monuments and native figures lounging in the foreground, its broad horizons, its use of local colour as an authentic rendition of the past, its eschewal of signs of modernity, all giving a sense of timelessness (Figs. 15, 18, 20 and 26).3

Frédéric Goupil-Fesquet’s account in the <hi>Voyage d’Horace Vernet en Orient</hi> of their attitudes and behaviour often reflects these clichés. Despite their native dress, the travellers associated mainly with local grandees – Mehmet Ali himself, or Soliman Pasha – or with European consuls or churchmen; pesky locals were fended off with gentle lashes of Vernet’s whip.4 They bemoan their texts


Yet a different, more nuanced and complex view frequently pierces through the Orientalist commonplace in both text and image. The text of the *Voyage* bears witness to a certain self-reflection which the experience of these cultures and peoples inspires: ‘And yet we Europeans, who call these people barbarians [. . .], we find in our own societies scenes which are almost as hideous [. . .] and we dare to consider ourselves civilised’.10 The travellers note the exquisite artistry of the craftsmen, and the beauty of the jewellery despite the crude handiwork: ‘When the artist has managed to babble a feeling naively from the heart, do we not feel a more intense emotion than with a work of professional skill?’.11 They admire the enormous variety of forms, the ‘poetry’, the ‘delightful sensations’, the elegance, richness and delicacy of the local art.12 They acknowledge a native artistic superiority: ‘They are our masters when it comes to creativity. [. . .] The simplest worker is an artist, he covers the Orient with his wonderful inventions; without a compass, without a set-square, his hand can trace a beautiful form; he is subtle in his effort to embellish any object, knowing where to put richness or simplicity’.13 Rugs, pipes and slippers have a beauty with as much to teach the European, Goupil-Fesquet asserts, as the ancient monuments which are so regularly sought out.14 Among the usual statements about Oriental despotism there is an occasional recognition of a plurality lacking in France, as the dizzying variety of languages, religions and cultures makes him reflect on the restricted nature of his own country: ‘So why is it that in France, where we have proclaimed freedom of speech and of religion, we do not have in any of our cities a mosque where Muslims can practise their religion?’.15

In the daguerreotypes, too, we can glimpse a different Orient from the one transmitted through the paintings. As Julia Ballerini remarked, they have a surprisingly inconsequential quality which is at odds with the conventions of Orientalist representation: the emphasis on grand but decaying monuments which marks the early period, or on ethnic and social types or local colour, which characterises later photography.16 To judge from *Excursions daguerriennes*, the *Voyage*, Goupil-Fesquet’s notes and Vernet’s letters, the pair took at least thirty daguerreotypes, of which eight were reproduced in *Excursions daguerriennes*, the *Voyage*, Goupil-Fesquet’s notes and Vernet’s letters, the pair took at least thirty daguerreotypes, of which eight were reproduced in the *Excursions* (see Part 1 of this article in the April issue of the Magazine, pp.264–71, notes 6 and 38). In these views, we find the banality of everyday life, not an idyllic or idealised picture of ruins; the mixing of present and past, not a unified scene; and discreet reminders of war. Moreover, if photography was later to be associated with containing and mastering the Orient,
photographers in 1839 were all too aware of the unpredictability of their art, which was dependent on temperature, weather and lighting, on the contrast between colour and light in the objects, on the sensitivity of the lenses and the degree of iodisation of the plate. This unpredictability is a recurring theme in the early publications on photography. Henry Fox Talbot emphasised that uniformity in paper photography was unattainable due to light conditions and the quality of the paper.17 Eugène Hubert insisted that it was impossible to provide definitive rules and to produce the same image twice, because of the infinite number of circumstances and variations which occur at any moment: ‘success in producing a fine print is very chancy’.18 He cites Goupil-Fesquet’s view of a snow-capped Mount Lebanon against a clear blue sky, which was washed out in the photograph, and contrasts it with a view of Naples with an equally snow-capped Vesuvius, which was very clear.19 Goupil-Fesquet himself acknowledged this element of chance, of the photographer’s lack of control over the image: ‘It often happens, especially with the camera obscura, that you take a view which seems very fine in reality only to get a really bad result, as a composition’.20 Early photographic practice was a struggle between an infinitely variable, unstable reality – the object depicted, the conditions under which it was taken, the materials of the process – and the photographer’s limited ability to manipulate these so as to produce a ‘fine image’. Always retaining something beyond the control of the artist, the daguerreotype harboured no pretensions of mastery over its subject.

Any analysis of the Goupil-Fesquet/Vernet images must begin with a series of caveats: we do not have the original daguerreotypes, but only the engravings from them; we have only a fraction of the total number taken, and those that we have were published in a travel album, for which a certain type of view would have been selected in preference to others; the limitations of the medium at this early stage, and the particular conditions of the journey, made figure daguerreotypes a rarity.21 In these images, figures were added later for publication in the Excursions, allegedly for scale but also to make the pictures conform...
more closely to standard engravings of Oriental scenes from the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Nevertheless, these views consistently elude pure convention. Even the added figures create an incongruity which brings out all the more the 'unartistic' quality of the daguerreotype. In the example of the Pyramid of Cheops (Fig.16), the local ‘natives’ with their camels in the foreground, similar to those found in the contemporary prints of David Roberts (Fig.18), contrast starkly with the kind of gritty, textured quality of the rest, as do the soldiers and horseman in the image of Pompey’s Pillar (Fig.17), a view also painted by Roberts shortly before (Fig.18). Goupil-Fesquet’s text about the pyramid of Cheops waxes lyrical on the sublimity of ‘those silent phantoms of past centuries [. . .] which give birth to feelings of boundless time, along with an insurmountable impression of immobility’ and ‘the astonishment, terror, humiliation and respect [. . .] grip the spectator all at once’, only to lapse into a searing criticism of the despotism and exploitation of the pharaohs that gave rise to these ‘vain sepulchres in which each stone is a letter of the words pride, vanity, servitude’; but the image contains no hint of this. Unlike the Roberts print, which, with its grand sweep and long perspective, gives a sense of the silence and solitude of the desert, much less of the despotism of the pharaohs or their passing. Banal elements punctuate the scene: reminders of the modern excavations such as the tent on the left, the mast to the right of it which sticks up and breaks the symmetry of the composition, and the wooden fence along the front; across the middle, at the foot of the pyramid, a rough and disordered landscape of boulders that contained the caves let out as rooms by the Englishman Howard Vyse who was in charge of the site, and which Goupil-Fesquet more sensationally described as resembling a pile of skulls or petrified sponges. Similarly, the image of Luxor (Fig.19) has nothing to do with its famous monuments, but rather is an unexotic view of boats on the Nile and modern houses on the shore. The text acknowledges explicitly this lack of visual stereotypes, thus debunking the pictorial conventions of the voyage en Orient: ‘the reader will look in vain [. . .] for some propylaeum, sphinx, obelisk or other gigantic fragment which is indispensable to every Egyptian site. However, it is Luxor, nothing can be truer [. . .] the daguerreotype [. . .] invents nothing and never embellishes its model.’

19. View of Luxor, by Frédéric Goupil-Fesquet (and Horace Vernet?). November 1839. Print after a lost daguerreotype from Excursions daguerriennes, I, 1840. (Rare Book Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library).


‘Ces fantômes silencieux des siècles passés [. . .] font naître le sentiment d’une durée sans borne, jointe à une impression insurmountable d’immobilité [. . .] l’étonnement, la terreur, l’humiliation et le respect saisissent à la fois le spectateur [. . .] vains sépulcres, où chaque pierre est une lettre des mots orgueil, vanité, servitude’; ibid., ‘Pyramide de Cheops’; see also Voyage, pp.119–20.

‘Pyramide de Cheops’, Excursions daguerriennes; see also Voyage, p.118. The tent was that of J.R. Hill, an engineer who was assisting in the excavations.

‘Le lecteur cherchera vainement sur la gravure quelque propylée, sphinx, obélisque ou autre fragment gigantesque, indispensable à tout site égyptien. C’est Luxor cependant, rien n’est plus vrai; [. . .] le daguerreotype [. . .] n’invente rien et n’embellit jamais son modèle’; ‘Louqsor’, Excursions daguerriennes.
two small figures of bathers, their stylisation contrasting markedly with the rest. The text expresses the boredom of the passengers as they make their way slowly up the Nile, and the Europeans’ commonplace complaint about the laissez-faire attitude of the local boatmen – ‘you are at the mercy of their whims, for no threat bothers them and they are never in a hurry to get anywhere’, but the image gives no sign of this, and one can only think, on the contrary, that any enforced leisure on the journey had the benefit of allowing, during one of those moments of tedium, the taking of such a visually striking image.

Even an episode in which Vernet demonstrates the daguerreotype process to Mehmet Ali, replete as it is with suggestions of the technical superiority of France, takes on a different character in the accompanying daguerreotype (Fig.21). Having already heard about Daguerre’s invention, Mehmet Ali had asked Vernet for a demonstration and had invited his generals to observe it. ‘The view they took was of the harem, the wing of the palace containing the women’s apartments. We showed them the image in the camera obscura, to the amazement of all; what intrigued them the most was seeing the guard walk upside down without falling. [. . .] The shutters were opened and the plate emerged from its mysterious mercury bath. “It’s the work of the devil, he cried”’.

Back in France, independently of the travellers, the episode spawned a ludicrous feuilleton entitled ‘Le Daguerréotype au harem’ that appeared in La Presse on 10th March 1840, during the trip itself: a tale of mistaken identity, mysterious love tokens and an odalisque in which Vernet, having taught the pasha to take daguerreotypes, allegedly gains access to the harem. Goupil-Fesquet alludes to this ‘fantasy’ in the Excursions and relates the more prosaic, truer version of events. Nothing in the image is suggestive of any European superiority, nor is there any suggestion of eroticism apart from the word ‘harem’; the need to invent a tale of illicit romance and entry into the forbidden space emphasises all the more the prosaic quality of the image. The austere view could be of any important administrative complex.

The other images are similarly unremarkable in terms of narrative. Several are panoramic views of towns, such as Beirut, Jerusalem, Acre and Nazareth. Far from conveying a sense of containment, closure and intelligibility, however, these panoramas include evidently haphazard elements which were not edited out by the engravers. ‘A View of Beirit’ (Fig.22) taken from the terrace of the French consulate, looking towards Mount Lebanon over the rooftops and with the Palace Mosque in the centre, retains the laundry hanging on the lines and between the crenelations on the walls (in the middle left, in the centre foreground and in the middle right); the views of Nazareth and Acre do likewise (Figs.23 and 24). Some lack a clear sense of order: in the View of Beirit, modern villas in the light, airy countryside of the background contrast with the dense, strongly shadowed jumble of buildings in the old city, cut off at the bottom, in the front.

The View of Jerusalem (Fig.25) depicts one of the most common panoramas of the city, taken from the Mount of Olives and looking over the Temple Mount or Noble Sanctuary on the image of Luxor, the boats on the Nile are set against a broad background of precisely such monuments (Fig.20). Goupil-Fesquet describes the famous statues half-buried in the sand that face the obelisk ‘well known to everyone’, but these are not in his image. Instead we find modern houses in the centre, a minaret on the right and boats under repair in the foreground, their reflections projected in the water. To the right of these have been added two small figures of bathers, their stylisation contrasting markedly with the rest. The text expresses the boredom of the passengers as they make their way slowly up the Nile, and the Europeans’ commonplace complaint about the laissez-faire attitude of the local boatmen – ‘you are at the mercy of their whims, for no threat bothers them and they are never in a hurry to get anywhere’, but the image gives no sign of this, and one can only think, on the contrary, that any enforced leisure on the journey had the benefit of allowing, during one of those moments of tedium, the taking of such a visually striking image.

Even an episode in which Vernet demonstrates the daguerreotype process to Mehmet Ali, replete as it is with suggestions of the technical superiority of France, takes on a different character in the accompanying daguerreotype (Fig.21). Having already heard about Daguerre’s invention, Mehmet Ali had asked Vernet for a demonstration and had invited his generals to observe it. ‘The view they took was of the harem, the wing of the palace containing the women’s apartments. We showed them the image in the camera obscura, to the amazement of all; what intrigued them the most was seeing the guard walk upside down without falling. [. . .] The shutters were opened and the plate emerged from its mysterious mercury bath. “It’s the work of the devil, he cried”’.

Back in France, independently of the travellers, the episode spawned a ludicrous feuilleton entitled ‘Le Daguerréotype au harem’ that appeared in La Presse on 10th March 1840, during the trip itself: a tale of mistaken identity, mysterious love tokens and an odalisque in which Vernet, having taught the pasha to take daguerreotypes, allegedly gains access to the harem. Goupil-Fesquet alludes to this ‘fantasy’ in the Excursions and relates the more prosaic, truer version of events. Nothing in the image is suggestive of any European superiority, nor is there any suggestion of eroticism apart from the word ‘harem’; the need to invent a tale of illicit romance and entry into the forbidden space emphasises all the more the prosaic quality of the image. The austere view could be of any important administrative complex.

The other images are similarly unremarkable in terms of narrative. Several are panoramic views of towns, such as Beirut, Jerusalem, Acre and Nazareth. Far from conveying a sense of containment, closure and intelligibility, however, these panoramas include evidently haphazard elements which were not edited out by the engravers. ‘A View of Beirit’ (Fig.22) taken from the terrace of the French consulate, looking towards Mount Lebanon over the rooftops and with the Palace Mosque in the centre, retains the laundry hanging on the lines and between the crenelations on the walls (in the middle left, in the centre foreground and in the middle right); the views of Nazareth and Acre do likewise (Figs.23 and 24). Some lack a clear sense of order: in the View of Beirit, modern villas in the light, airy countryside of the background contrast with the dense, strongly shadowed jumble of buildings in the old city, cut off at the bottom, in the front.

The View of Jerusalem (Fig.25) depicts one of the most common panoramas of the city, taken from the Mount of Olives and looking over the Temple Mount or Noble Sanctuary on the


21. Harem of Mehmet-Ali, by Frédéric Goupil-Fesquet and Horace Vernet. 7th November 1839. Print after a lost daguerreotype from Excursions daguerriennes, I, 1840. (Rare Book Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library).
22. View of Beirut, by Frédéric Goupil-Fesquet (and Horace Vernet). 31st January–1st February 1840. Print after a lost daguerreotype from Excursions daguerriennes, I, 1840. (Rare Book Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library).

23. View of Nazareth, by Frédéric Goupil-Fesquet (and Horace Vernet). 23rd December 1839. Print after a lost daguerreotype from Excursions daguerriennes, I, 1840. (Rare Book Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library).
24. View of Acre, by Frédéric Goupil-Fesquet (and Horace Vernet?). 25th–28th December 1839. Print after a lost daguerreotype from Excursions daguerriennes, I, 1840. (Rare Book Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library).

25. View of Jerusalem, by Frédéric Goupil-Fesquet (and Horace Vernet?). c.18th December 1839. Print after a lost daguerreotype from Excursions daguerriennes, I, 1840. (Rare Book Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library).
right, the church of the Holy Sepulchre in the middle distance and the Tower of David in the far distance on the left. If we remember that the figures in the foreground were added for the Excursions daguerriennes, the photograph would have been a sweeping panorama of the city and not much more. Roberts’s version, in contrast, is almost biblical in its grandeur, the distant city surrounded by a vast landscape of billowing hills, deep gorges and jutting plateaux (Fig.26). In the text accompanying his own image, Goupil-Fesquet draws attention to the multiplicity of peoples, religions and languages without turning it into a narrative of origins: the Dome of the Rock (which he, like most European travellers, incorrectly calls the ‘mosque of Omar’) is on the site of the Temple of Solomon and dates to the seventh century; the Church of the Holy Sepulchre is a mixture of Moorish and Gothic architecture, its new dome, replacing one destroyed by fire in 1807, is by a Muslim architect, and the church is shared by several Christian sects. Between the landmarks are strewn those ‘prosaic buildings’, which, as he puts it ironically in the Voyage, hide the sacred ground from the ‘investigatory gaze of those amateurs most passionate about the scent of the age’. The irony indicates the author/photographer’s knowledge, and rejection, of the tropes of Orientalist travel.

In the View of Acre (Fig.24), signs of the recent war are evident in the holes created by the cannonballs that pierced the walls and by the half-ruined houses on the right below the White, or Jezzar Pasha Mosque. The Siege of Acre was one of the most significant campaigns of the first Egyptian–Turkish war, and the city’s surrender, on 27th May 1832, virtually guaranteed an Egyptian victory. In the text, Goupil-Fesquet alludes briefly to the conflict: ‘Its fortifications, freshly repaired by our able compatriot Soliman Pasha, would be enough to attest that even recently, an attack no less ferocious than that of the Crusaders or Napoleon was launched against [the city], if the cannonballs and the bombs half-buried in the plain left any doubt in that regard’. It was soon to be the site of one of the most ferocious battles of the second Egyptian–Turkish War, when it was bombarded by the British navy, allied with the Ottoman sultan against Mehmet Ali, on 3rd November 1840. In the Voyage, Goupil-Fesquet notes that Acre’s convent and fortress were inhabited by detachments of Egyptian infantry; he describes a scene in which a soldier was punished, and another in which Turkish, Jewish and Christian draft-dodgers (réfractaires) were tortured.

In comparison to the daguerreotypes and their related texts, Vernet’s Oriental genre paintings such as The Arab tale-teller, Rebecca at the well, Hagar banished by Abraham, Judah and Tamar, and Arabs travelling in the desert (see part 1 of this article in the April issue of the Magazine, pp. 264–71, Figs. 39, 40, 42 and 44) are clearly composed with a view to audience expectations. Their brilliant colouring, abundance of ethnographic detail and high degree of finish would become hallmarks of later Orientalist painting. The preparatory drawings, too, reveal significant differences in this regard. Judah and Tamar, executed in Malta on the return journey, is a good example. The eroticism inherent in this biblical subject, in which the widowed Tamar tricks her father-in-law, Judah, into fulfilling his duty of providing her with a new husband by posing as a prostitute and successfully propositioning him, lent itself perfectly to Vernet’s desire to merge the Oriental and the biblical. Describing the subject and its commercial appeal, he wrote to his wife: ‘you will scold me, because it is racy. It is widow Tamar in which the widowed Tamar tricks her father-in-law, Judah, into fulfilling his duty of providing her with a new husband by posing as a prostitute and successfully propositioning him, lent itself perfectly to Vernet’s desire to merge the Oriental and the biblical. Describing the subject and its commercial appeal, he wrote to his wife: ‘you will scold me, because it is racy. It is widow Tamar who will make my career’. The subject, according to Vernet, had already been sketched by the English artist William Brockedon in the early 1840s, although the image by Vernet is, perhaps, more sensuous than the etching by Brockedon. Critics at the Burlington Magazine, pp. 264–71. (Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division, Washington DC).
1843 Salon were certainly sensitive to the ‘libidinous’ aspect of the picture, which Léon Curmer judged would be ‘downright pornographic’ without its biblical gloss, and Heine, with a pun on Tamar’s character, described as ‘perfectly fit for the new Parisian church of Notre-Dame de Lorette’. A study for Tamar, which was probably done on the journey, however, has none of the provocatively uncovered leg or breast of the finished painting, and instead concentrates on her elaborate dress (Fig.28).

A drawing of dancers (Fig.27) likewise shows no concern for the enormous erotic possibilities of the subject, exploited so sensationally by later artists including Vernet’s nephew Emile Vernet-Lecomte (Fig.29). Vernet’s drawing seems to be based on an episode that took place on board their boat from Alexandria to Cairo on 12th November 1839. At a stop in the village of Kafir Zait, about halfway up the Nile, they hired two almehs for a day’s entertainment. Originally professional poetesses and singers, by this period almehs had become equated with more banal public dancers, or ghawazi. They had been banned from most of the country by Mehmet Ali in 1834 and confined to Upper Egypt; one could only see them surreptitiously or with official permission. In chapter 8 of the Voyage, Goupil-Fesquet described these dancers, their costume and the erotic nature of their performance. They wore a blue wool chemise with long sleeves and Oriental trousers, a short jacket tightly buttoned under their breasts which the chemise barely covers, a striped kerchief tied behind the head from which their hair flowed down in tresses dotted with little metal baubles and a belt knotted below their hips and moulding their thighs ‘like the drapery of the Venus of Milo’. They lifted their arms above their heads, holding in their hands little copper castanets, threw their heads voluptuously back and leaned to one side or the other, shaking their hips and thighs in a kind of simmering movement. He concludes: ‘The dance ends with frenetic contortions of such a brutal frankness that I would not dare describe them here’. Describing the same episode, Joly remarks: ‘In my opinion, nothing equals the brazenness, shamelessness and avidity of these women’. Once again, Vernet’s drawing concentrates on details of costume and on the highly graceful, more than lascivious, movement of the dancers. Interestingly, he never executed this subject in a painting, despite its potential appeal.

In contrast to the highly contrived paintings, the other evidence from Vernet’s 1839–40 trip betrays a more nuanced and complex ‘Orient’, one in which traces of the East as a historical space are clearly discernible amid the clichés. Vernet’s prejudices did not prevent him from being an astute observer of internal and international politics. As photographers, he and Goupil-Fesquet were well aware of the preconceptions of Orientalist travel, the conventions of Orientalist representation and photography’s ability, or propensity, to undermine these. Goupil-Fesquet explicitly acknowledged the uncontrollability of the photographic image by which they sought to capture what they saw. The daguerreotypes themselves retain the marks of this, elements of the banal and prosaic, of war, of the haphazard and contingent, of an order outside pictorial convention, of historicity – not to mention the uncaptable: those sites for which attempts to photograph failed altogether, a point that Goupil-Fesquet draws to the reader’s attention, in direct contrast to the pretention to encyclopedic exhaustivity of the format of the travel album.

---

27. Study of Oriental dancers, by Horace Vernet. 1839.
Pencil on paper, 23.3 by 32.5 cm. (Musée du Louvre, Paris).
the picturesque, but it stubbornly rendered something of the real. While some may have sought to temper this reality with cultural ‘filters’ from literary and pictorial models, Goupil-Fesquet seemed more interested in exploring, by design or necessity, the different possibilities that the camera offers.

In this sense, Vernet’s case may provide a useful direction for future research on the relationship between the photographic and the pictorial ‘Orient’. The scholarly narrative of the place of photography in the European construction of the ‘Orient’ has largely followed that of painting. As has been shown, however, there may be subtle or significant differences, elements of the haphazard, the momentary, the everyday or the historical that persist in even the most calculated photographic image. Some photographers, like Vernet and Goupil-Fesquet, were well aware of the conventions of Orientalist representation and believed that photography could — or would by necessity — provide a more truthful view. If, as Stevens observes, almost all the Orientalist painters after Vernet used photography, a fuller investigation of its relation to Orientalist painting, beyond the obvious recourse to familiar critical formulas, seems compelling. Vernet’s and Goupil-Fesquet’s trip of 1839–40 may thus have been path-breaking beyond being the first in which two European painters photographed the Near East, leading to a reconsideration of how the camera, in its earliest use, not only constructed but also deconstructed the ‘Orient’, infusing the realm of the imaginary with the historical and the real.

Aubin and R. Blanchet, eds.: *Voyage en Orient* (1839–1840), Quebec 2010, p.151, states that the village was about halfway up the Nile to Cairo, which corresponds to Kafr Zaiat on maps of the period.

40 *On the almeh*, see Stevens, *op. cit.* (note 3), p.139. Goupil-Fesquet indeed equates ‘almées’ with ‘gaouasys’ or ‘gaouazis’ (singular ghaziya); see *Voyage*, pp.72–75. They were later described by other travellers, such as Gustave Flaubert and Gérard de Nerval.

41 Vernet describes the circuitous route by which he was led to the house in Damascus where the dancers were to perform; Vernet to Montfort, 20th January 1840; AMN P30; see also *L’Illustration* (12th April 1856); and Durande, *op. cit.* (note 2), p.144. Joly notes that in Keneh, in Upper Egypt, permission from the provincial governor was required for the performance; see Desaurel, Aubin and Blanchet, *op. cit.* (note 39), p.181.

42 *Voyage*, p.74.


